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Abstract

Adults in Iceland who have a native language that is not Icelandic vary widely in their proficiency in Icelandic. This study sought to examine factors that might influence these individual differences, with a particular interest in the role of English as a lingua franca in Iceland, along with attitude and motivation to learn and use Icelandic and English. While the study was particularly interested in recruiting participants who possess low proficiency in Icelandic as well as in English (a group that is hard to reach and seldom participates in studies), a broader inclusionary criterion was employed in an attempt to include a range of proficiency levels. This criterion consisted of distribution of over 2,000 invitations to this study through compulsory schools in Reykjavík that were translated into multiple languages. The study itself involved a questionnaire constructed from a variety of sources as well as questions that were constructed for this study in order to examine the Icelandic social context in particular. The results of the study revealed that English plays an important role in the lives of individuals in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic. Affective attitude was measured through a questionnaire by Dr. Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2015), and a more positive affective attitude was found towards English among the participants. However, participants who had a higher positive affective attitude towards Icelandic had lower self-perceived proficiency in English. Self-perceived proficiency was also higher among participants who had resided in Icelandic for longer and were more educated. Finally, questionnaires from Robert C. Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery revealed that the participants were more instrumentally oriented towards learning and using English, but were more integratively oriented towards learning and using Icelandic.
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1. Literature Review

The goal of this review of the literature is to provide an overview of the relevant literature for the study that examines the role of attitudes and motivation in learning Icelandic and English in Iceland. The first chapter focuses on the target group of study, immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland. The second chapter focuses on English in Iceland, an important variable in the study. The third chapter focuses on factors in second language learning, and the fourth chapter focuses on the role of motivation in learning a second language, followed by information regarding the instrumental-integrative motivation dichotomy and models of motivation.

1.1 Second language speakers of Icelandic

Second language speakers of Icelandic in Iceland are more numerous than ever before as a result of immigration. The definition used by Statistics Iceland for ‘an immigrant’ is an individual that is not born in Iceland and whose parents were also not born in Iceland while ‘a second generation immigrant’ is an individual that was born in Iceland but has parents that were not born in Iceland (Hallfríður Þórarinsdóttir, Sólveig H. Georngsdóttir & Birgitta L. Hafsteinsdóttir, 2009, p. 21). Naturally, immigrants make up the bulk of second language speakers of Icelandic in Iceland while persons with a foreign background make up the rest. A person with a foreign background in this context could be a person that has taken up residence here temporarily or is a student in the country. While immigrants, by definition, are persons with a foreign background, both terms are emphasized to include all persons who fit the overall participation criterion of the study of residing in Iceland but not having Icelandic as a native language. On January 1st, 2017, there were 35,977 immigrants or persons with a foreign background living in Iceland or about 10.6% of the population (Statistics Iceland, 2017). There has been a sharp increase in immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland over the past two decades. While 10.6% of the population fit this criterion in 2017, the number of immigrants or persons with a foreign background living in Iceland in 1996 was 5,357 or about 2% of the population of Iceland.
An increase of around 8% in the number of persons in a country who are of a foreign background in bound to bring with it changes to the language environment and potentially the social context of that country. Naturally, not all immigrants or persons with a foreign background in Iceland are second language speakers of Icelandic or even learners in the language, and no reliable figures exist that detail the number of second language speakers or learners of Icelandic in Iceland. It is entirely possible to reside in Iceland or another country for that matter without being an active language learner of the language/s of that particular country. Attempts have however been made to examine the linguistic capabilities of immigrants in Iceland.

A large study featuring 797 respondents by The Social Science Research Institute (Félagsvísindastofnun) within the University of Iceland, examined the status of immigrants all over Iceland. The results of the study revealed that over 60% of the respondents found that they had adapted to Icelandic society ‘well’ or ‘very well’ (Vala Jónsdóttir, Kristín Erla Hardardóttir, & Ragna Benedikta Garðarsdóttir, 2009, p. 12). Around 40% of the respondents had a ‘very good’ or ‘pretty good’ understanding of Icelandic while 27% understood the language neither well or poorly, and 33% had a ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ understanding of the language (Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009, p. 12). These figures provide a good overview of how well immigrants in Iceland generally feel they have adapted to Icelandic society, though their idea of adaptation may vary based on individual ideas of adaptation.

In another study by the same institution, that included 214 respondents from the Westfjords and East Iceland, participants were asked the same questions about their understanding of Icelandic. Around 34% of the respondents in the study said that they had a ‘very good’ or ‘pretty good’ understanding of the language, while 43% of the respondents reportedly understood it neither well or poorly, and 23% said that they had a ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ understanding of the language (Heiður Hrund Jónsdóttir et al., 2004, p. 36). These numbers do not seem to indicate that there is a significant difference in comprehension of Icelandic between immigrants that live in the Greater Reykjavík Area and those that only live outside the Greater Reykjavík Area in more remote parts of the country. The numbers from the question relating to the respondents’ ability to express themselves in Icelandic and how easy it was for them to learn the language also did not
reveal any significant difference between the groups (Heiður Hrund Jónsdóttir et al., 2004, p. 37; Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009, p. 40). These numbers do, however, provide an overview of self-perceived proficiency among immigrants in Iceland. However, self-perceived proficiency does not reflect actual proficiency as speakers or learners of drastically different proficiency levels may rate themselves to be in the same category.

Results from the study also showed a correlation between the frequency of parents speaking to their children in their native language and how long they had lived in Iceland (Vala Jónsdóttir, et al., 2009). The study revealed that respondents that had lived in Iceland for longer spoke to their children in their native language less. This could be attributed to the children spending an insufficient amount of time learning their native language or their desire to learn another language, such as Icelandic or English, being greater than learning their native language. However, the study could not comment on the reasons as the questions did not examine the respondent’s motivation to learn Icelandic and English, or their attitude towards the languages.

While the results of that study did not directly examine the respondents’ motivation for learning Icelandic or English, some emphasis was placed on their interest in learning Icelandic and the number of Icelandic courses they had attended. Of the respondents in the study, 86% stated that they were interested in learning Icelandic or learning it better, 8% stated that they knew Icelandic well enough, and only 6% stated that they were not interested in learning Icelandic better or at all (Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009, p. 41). Follow-up questions about why these individuals would be interested in learning the language were not included in the survey.

Additionally, the study revealed that around 75% of the respondents had attended an Icelandic course while 13% had attended five or more courses (Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009, p. 41). There is no mention in the article of a correlation or a possible correlation being found between the frequency at which the respondents attend Icelandic courses and their interest in learning the language so their reasons for attending the courses are not clear. However, some general figures about interest in the language among immigrants were revealed in the study. Closer inspection is however needed in order to determine why these aspiring second language speakers of Icelandic
were interested in learning the language, and why some of these individuals had not attended an Icelandic course and were not interested in doing so.

In an interview conducted by MIRRA (Miðstöð ínflytjendarannsókna Reykjavíkurakademíunni) in 2009, one of the many participants in the study stated that it was important to her to learn Icelandic so that she could pay attention to Icelandic media, but it was difficult for her due to the lack of formal instruction in Icelandic in her area (Hallfríður Þórarinsdóttir et al., 2009, p. 73). Few other responses were given in the study in response to the importance of learning Icelandic. The lack of availability of instruction in Icelandic is certainly a problem worth considering as Iceland is a sparsely populated country. While the population is concentrated in areas where such formal instruction is common, not everyone lives in those areas. In the countryside, the availability of such formal instruction is generally low. However, with the arrival of mediums such as Icelandic Online, anyone in Iceland with an internet connection has the ability to receive formal instruction in Icelandic as a distance student. Most immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland do however receive formal instruction at some point in time, and the same can be said for children of immigrants as they receive compulsory education in primary schools (Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009). Children of immigrants also make up a large portion of second language speakers in Iceland so it is important to examine their attitudes and motivations, and their acquisition of the language, as they will form the large portion of second language speakers of Icelandic in a decade or two.

Results from a study in Iceland conducted by Anna Katarzyna Wozniczka and Robert Berman (2011) demonstrated that little correlation was found between the orientation of 7-8 year old Polish children towards integrating into Icelandic society and the orientation of their parents (p. 12). These results would seem to indicate that there is a difference in the effect that parental influence has on children in different social settings as results from Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) study indicated that parental influence was an important factor in their Philippine study. In the Icelandic study, fifteen 7-8 year old Polish children and their parents took part in a study which involved a examination of their academic achievement in Icelandic, their language use at home, as well as their orientation towards staying in Iceland in contrast to their parents’ orientation. The study ultimately found that parent-child home interactions did not play a
significant role in the children’s academic achievement in Icelandic which would seem to indicate that their motivation for learning Icelandic is not an extension of their parents’ motivation to integrate into Icelandic society (Wozniczka & Berman, 2011, p. 12). That conclusion derives from the fact that parents of five children that participated in the study had intentions to relocate to another country and viewed themselves as temporary migrants. This however did not impact the children’s academic achievement despite the fact that they were aware of the fact that they had to move to another country (Wozniczka & Berman, 2011, p. 12). This could potentially be tied to children of immigrants not viewing themselves and their current society in the same way that their parents do. The argument can however be made that the seven year old children do not perhaps think this far ahead, and that they are more concerned with things that are currently happening in their lives. It may thus be more relevant to examine their views through their vernacular. The children in the study repeatedly referred to Poland in the past tense and spoke of it as a place they visited during the summer (Wozniczka & Berman, 2011, p. 12). This would seem to indicate that they viewed Iceland as their home and were thus more integratively oriented towards Iceland rather than Poland. Overall, the study revealed that very young children seem be integratively oriented towards the environment in which they reside regardless of the views of the parents (Wozniczka & Berman, 2011). In addition, this study also reveals that second generation immigrants are heavily influenced by Icelandic society, and thus their attitude towards Icelandic society is much different than that of their parents (Wozniczka & Berman, 2011).

In recent years, numerous studies have been conducted that examine the proficiency in Icelandic among school age second language learners of Icelandic in Iceland (Elín Þóðóldóttir, 2012, 2017, 2018). Due to the surge in immigration to Iceland over the past couple of decades, the number of adults living in Iceland who are of a foreign background has increased substantially in proportion to the Icelandic population, and this means that more children are now born in Iceland who will learn Icelandic as a second language. Primary schools in Iceland have thus seen a sharp increase in the number of children that have Icelandic as a second language. In the context of the role that Icelandic will play in Icelandic society among people with a foreign background, it is imperative that attitude, language use and proficiency among both first-generation immigrants, and those who are born in Iceland, is examined. School age individuals who have Icelandic as a
second language will make up a relatively large portion of the Icelandic adult population that has Icelandic as a second language, and thus it is important to study the progression of their proficiency in the Icelandic language all the way until they reach adulthood.

Overall, studies have found that school age native language speakers of Icelandic are generally far more proficient in Icelandic than school age second language speakers (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2017, 2018). In recent years, proficiency in Icelandic among school age second language speakers of Icelandic has become a cause for concern as proficiency levels indicate that a vast number of students in Icelandic primary schools, that have Icelandic as a second language, have very low proficiency levels (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018). Exposure to Icelandic or a lack thereof has been identified as one of the major hindrances to learning Icelandic as a second language among school age children with a foreign background in Iceland (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018).

Learning Icelandic for school age children in Iceland is vital for them to reach academic success, and thus they and their parents should ideally be motivated to ensure that their children learn the Icelandic language. Should children fail to achieve sufficient proficiency in Icelandic to fulfil academic standards, then they will be at a disadvantage throughout their pursuit of education in Iceland. Studies compiled and conducted by Gestur Guðmundsson (2013) indicate that individuals who have Icelandic as a second language struggle in secondary schools in Iceland, and interviews with these individuals indicate that they feel their proficiency in Icelandic and lack of Icelandic friends is the greatest impediment to their studies in Icelandic secondary schools.

In order for children to learn Icelandic, they have to be exposed to the language for longer periods of time, and preliminary results from studies examining the amount of time children are exposed to Icelandic have revealed that the amount of time spent doing activities in Icelandic is insufficient (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018). A lack of exposure to Icelandic means that their competence in the language decreases to a point where they are unable to fully comprehend their learning materials in schools, and they are unable to add to their vocabulary effectively due to their insufficient vocabulary size and poor linguistic competence (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018; Sigríður Ólafsdóttir et al., 2016, p. 18). Nation (2013) refers to studies that indicate that
understanding of around 98% of words on a page is required for adequate text coverage, and by extension, this amount would lead to more effective vocabulary acquisition (p. 14). Studies do in fact indicate that language learners learn languages fairly quickly at the start of the language learning process and then the process slows down greatly. That is why studies in Iceland show that children are not adding to their vocabulary in Icelandic, with the reasoning behind that being that they simply do not have the vocabulary necessary to comprehend what they are reading or hearing (Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir, 2018; Sigríður Ólafsdóttir et al., 2016, p. 17-18). The term linguistic competence refers to a person’s overall knowledge in a language, and it is lacking among children in Iceland. The studies that emphasized the lack of vocabulary that L2 children in Iceland have also indicated a lack of syntactic and semantic ability to process sentences, and thus they are unable to extrapolate the meaning of the vernacular that they are exposed, particularly in their learning materials (Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir, 2018; Sigríður Ólafsdóttir et al., 2016). It is thus important that factors are examined that influence the acquisition of syntactic and semantic ability in Icelandic so that the language learning process in Icelandic is not impaired by a lack of linguistic competence. It is also important to note that this scenario may also apply to the adult language learning process.

It is without question that increased exposure to Icelandic is thus vital for children with a foreign background to have academic success in Iceland, but the question remains whether such increased exposure would come at a cost. Increased exposure to Icelandic in the daily activities of school age children would undoubtedly detract from their exposure to their native language or English. If the language of their home were to switch to Icelandic, the children would likely not manage to attain a high level of proficiency in their native language. Clyne (2003) notes that despite languages being used heavily with friends and relatives, if the language is not used at home, it is likely that it will not survive and will not be transferred to another generation (p. 22). In order for incidental language acquisition to occur, a great deal of exposure is needed, and thus decreased exposure to either Icelandic or the native language will undoubtedly lead to decreased proficiency in those languages. Evidence for the effect that exposure has on language learning and acquisition can be found in literature concerning the language acquisition of children and adolescents in Iceland as they gain a great deal of linguistic competence in English without
formal instruction (see Birna Arnbjörsdóttir, 2011, 2015; Birna Arnbjörsdóttir & Hafdis Ingvarsdóttir, 2018).

1.2 English as a lingua franca in Iceland

After having conducted numerous studies that examine the impact that attitudes and motivation have on second language learning, Gardner and Lambert (1972) learned that while attitudes and motivation seemed to impact second language learning, each ethnolinguistic group, each setting, and each social context had its own socio-psychological influences that determined the attitudes and motivation of the participants in the studies (p. 121). All societies are essentially unique, and within them a host of ethnolinguistic groups can be found, each with their own culture, customs and traditions. The intermingling of different cultures and languages has shaped societies throughout human history, and the ethnolinguistic groups within those societies. These migrations of cultural influences have also shaped languages and the contexts in which they are spoken. English, for instance, is certainly a language that has seen much change with texts of Old English and Middle English such as *Beowulf* or Geoffrey Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* being completely indecipherable by most speakers of contemporary dialects of English. Before that, the British Isles saw periods of significant language change. Variants of Celtic origin were spoken, and to some extent still are. The language of the isles was influenced by the Romans before the Saxons came. Anglo-Saxon was replaced with Norman French in administrative roles, and then it was replaced with forms of Early English. These changes to the English language can obviously be attributed to cultural and political migrations such as the Roman, Saxon, and Norman conquests of the British Isles. The point is that the vernaculars of a country or region are dominated by the ethnolinguistic group that inhabits the space in question. If there is anything we can take away from the history of regions such as the British Isles, it is that migrations often result in a change in vernaculars, and although significant language change is often attributed to changes in administrative vernaculars, linguistic spaces can switch varieties without any kind of political or administrative interaction (Anderson, 1983).

Languages and language environments can be altered over time and in a minor capacity through the migration of speakers of other languages into a society. Though it has not always been so,
English has become an integral part of Icelandic society much like it has in many other societies across the world where English varieties now fulfil needs in language environments that were previously fulfilled by the local language (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir & Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, 2018). It can be considered common knowledge that English now serves an integral role as a language in the western world that can bridge the communication gap of two or more individuals or groups that do not share the same native language. This is generally referred to as English as a lingua franca or ELF (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir & Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, 2018; Seidlhofer 2005).

According to Seidlhofer (2005), ELF involves people of different first language backgrounds using English as a medium of intercultural communication (p. 339). A lingua franca is thus the language in which all individuals in a given language environment are capable of communicating, and that language happens to be English in the Western world. ELF is considered to be a type of sub-concept of ‘English as an international language’, ‘English as a global language’, and ‘English as a world language’ (Seidlhofer, 2005, p. 339). These broad terms encompass the notion that English has become a dominant language in the global context with Seidlhofer (2005) referring to it as a ‘global lingua franca’ (p. 339). A language that is a ‘global lingua franca’ is essentially the language that is a medium for intercultural communication across multiple cultures all over the planet.

While the status of English as a medium for intercultural communication in the global context is undeniable according to Seidlhofer (2005), the rise of English has resulted in a change in the language environment of Iceland with English varieties now being able to fulfil linguistic spaces and roles previously filled by the Icelandic language (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir & Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, 2018). English is now used as the language of choice in multiple linguistic spaces within sectors such as academia, business and tourism. This position that English has in Icelandic society can be found in many other societies around the world. An example would be the Philippines where English is a prominent language in instruction and business despite the fact that the language is not a used as a ‘home language’ (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 122). The Philippines however have over sixty languages that are spoken in various communities, and thus it is difficult to compare the two language environments, especially considering the amount of
research that has been conducted in the Philippine context in contrast to the Icelandic context (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 121-122).

It has been noted that almost everyone in Iceland comes into daily contact with the English language, and that is a fact has been established through a number of studies (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015). Despite the fact that comparatively little research has been done to examine the use and influence of English in particular linguistic spaces in Iceland, it is considered common knowledge that exposure to English is common in various linguistic contexts such as in academic institutions, various businesses, and tourism, with English being used heavily and sometimes exclusively within particular linguistic spaces. The rise in tourism has certainly affected the language environment in Iceland as a steady influx of people inserted in a community, albeit briefly, is bound to do. Tourism has undeniably grown in Iceland and statistics are readily available to demonstrate this fact. For instance, overnight stays in hotels in Iceland rose from 54,600 in January 2010 to 285,200 in January 2018 according to Statistics Iceland (2010; 2018). This sharp increase has certainly led to growth in the tourism industry. In 2008, there were an estimated 11,200 employees working in the tourism industry in Iceland according to Statistics Iceland (2018). This number had more than doubled in 2018 and had grown to 24,600 (Statistics Iceland, 2018). Tourism is one of the industries in Iceland that absolutely requires an employee to be able to communicate in English. In most cases, tour guides or other employees in the tourism industry share only one language with the tourists. This language is most often English, though other languages are occasionally used when possible. ELF or lingua francas in general are a prerequisite for a tourism industry as people will need to be able to communicate to each other verbally in order to navigate a country. The tourism industry is an example of how English has become important for employment opportunities in Iceland. As a result of the employment opportunities available to persons who are able to communicate in English, a person may be instrumentally motivated to learn English in order to obtain a job in a sector such as the growing tourism industry.

Despite the fact that English is very prevalent in Icelandic society, there is little indication that it is taking over as a potential official language. Preliminary results from research conducted in Iceland that examined, among other factors, proficiency in English, and did so in contrast to
countries where English is the native language, revealed that proficiency levels among Icelandic adolescents in English, although high, were extremely low in contrast to their counterparts in English speaking countries (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018). Only time will tell what position English will have in Icelandic society. For now, the only thing that is clear that English has become an integral part of multiple areas of Icelandic society, and it has had a significant effect on the language environment in Iceland.

The language environment in Iceland has shifted considerably over the past few decades and that shift is marked by an increase in the presence of English in multiple linguistic spaces. Children are now learning English much earlier, or before they are even exposed to formal instruction in the language. Studies have shown that children in Iceland actually manage to exceed the curriculum goals of fourth grade prior to receiving formal instruction which further reinforces the notion that English is an important part of the lives of people in Iceland (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2011, p. 3). Additionally, studies have revealed that young learners in Iceland felt that their formal instruction in English was not challenging and that it did not contribute greatly to their proficiency in English (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015, p. 200). Learners in Iceland thus associate their proficiency in the English language with extra-curricular activities rather than their curriculum in formal instruction. Their perceived proficiency in English is thus likely the result of time committed to extracurricular activities that involve exposure to the English language. A 2005/2006 survey by the Icelandic Ministry of Education (cited in Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015) revealed that children were heavily exposed to English through television and video games. It is important to note that figures in the study are likely to change the arrival of advent of streaming services such as Netflix to Iceland. The participants in the study were children in 5th, 9th and 10th grade. The study revealed that 73% of the children in 5th grade reported that they often watched television in English, and 19% reported that they did sometimes, while 49% reported that they were often exposed to English video games while 31% reported that they were often exposed to English through video games (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015, p. 209). These figures would indicate that young children in Iceland are generally exposed heavily to English during their early years, and that their proficiency in English at such a young age could be tied to incidental language acquisition from watching television, playing video games, or from other extracurricular sources. It is thus important to examine the types and forms
of English that people in Iceland are exposed to. These studies all seem to support the notion that this increased exposure to the English language is affecting and perhaps changing the linguistic repertoire of residents in Iceland.

A survey was conducted in 2011 featuring 740 respondents that examined the spread of English in Iceland (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015). The respondents in the survey were residents in Iceland, and much emphasis was placed on ensuring that the respondents were distributed equally by gender, age group, residence and education (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015). The results of the survey revealed that most of the respondents were exposed to English on a daily basis with 86% of the respondents claiming that they hear English on a daily basis, and 43% read English on a daily basis (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015, p. 200-201). Furthermore, specific data in the survey revealed that 95% of Icelandic individuals aged 18-29 state that they hear English every day (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015, p. 202). These figures strongly indicate that people in Iceland are in fact frequently exposed to English, at least for short periods of time throughout their day. The survey did, however, not offer detailed language diaries so information was not readily available on where this exposure to English occurred, yet evidence through other studies would suggest that people in Iceland are often exposed to English through various forms of media (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015). Information regarding language use in more specific linguistic spaces, such as workplaces and social lives, is however unavailable.

Schools and universities in Iceland are linguistic spaces where information regarding language use is available. Education in Iceland has been greatly affected by the rise of English within the academic sphere of the western world. It is considered common knowledge that English is a prevalent language in the international business world and in sciences. Educational institutions in Iceland are thus aware that for people from Iceland to participate on an international level, they must be able to communicate their ideas in English. A reflection of this awareness can be seen in a number of initiatives in Icelandic society. English instruction for children in primary schools now starts as early as in fourth grade. English is also a dominant language in higher education in Iceland as around 90% of textbooks at the University of Iceland are in English, and courses that were previously taught in Icelandic are now taught in English (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2010). Despite the fact that learning materials in higher education have been predominantly in English
for decades, there has unquestionably been a shift towards more use of English as a language of instruction in higher education. It can thus be safely stated that English has been and is increasingly becoming the language of instruction at the university, much like it is in other countries. This is also the case in Norway where English it is becoming more common for English to be the language of instruction in higher education as a result of political internalization efforts (Ljosland, 2010). The rise in English in Iceland however is not a recent change in the language environment, but it is a change that has been happening for the past few decades. It is a change that corresponds with the rise of English as a lingua franca on an international level.

It is difficult to classify the language environment in Iceland as a unique one as English as undeniably become a global phenomenon. However, examining how this lingua franca, that has become so prevalent in Iceland, impacts the Icelandic language is an important topic of discussion.

1.3 Second language acquisition and learning as a field

People have been learning languages for thousands of years and many have managed to learn more than one. During the turbulent time period that humanity has inhabited this planet, great migrations have occurred that have resulted in clashes between cultures. Some cultures have been assimilated into others, individuals have been assimilated into other cultures, and naturally, the movement of ethnic groups or individuals from a particular language environment to another has generally led to something we refer to as learning a second language. Some individuals manage to learn a second language while others do not, and some manage to achieve a level of proficiency above their peers in a shorter period of time while others struggle with learning even the most basic aspects of a language. This struggle is evident in various other aspects of life as well, as some individuals are for instance more proficient in particular sports while others are more intelligent. Polyglot savants, for instance, are individuals who are simply more capable of learning languages due to an innate faculty for language that we do not fully understand. The explanation for this range of proficiency between individuals has often been tied to a concept known as aptitude which is a person’s natural ability in various aspects. As a species, we have
unquestionably become more aware of what defines us as such, and which factors impact our ability to learn a language and our performance in the learning process. However, in order to understand the factors that influence the language learning and acquisition processes, we have to trace back the history of how languages have generally been learned and taught.

Second language acquisition and learning is a topic that has been researched extensively and many theories have been crafted out of the research that has been conducted. Before any of this extensive research in language learning had been conducted, languages were taught as any other skill through a method that was generally known as the Grammar Translation Method or Classical Method (Brown, 2007). Learning languages such as Latin was referred to as “mental gymnastics” and emphasis was placed on memorization of grammatical rules and vocabulary (Brown, 2007, p. 18). Numerous other theories rose to prominence while others fell into obscurity, with some rising again and others being forgotten. The Audio-Lingual Method rose to prominence in the 1950s and was based on ideas from behavioural psychology and structural linguistics (VanPatten & Williams, 2015). The method involved listening and repeating the words that were spoken. Emphasis was placed on correcting mistakes as you would when you apply behavioural psychology to other types of learning. The entire method revolved around conditioned learning that was entirely implicit, and students thus had very little idea of what they were learning and why they were learning it (VanPatten & Williams, 2015, p. 23). Psychology is a field that has always heavily influenced the field of second language acquisition and learning, as well as learning in general. However, the field of second language acquisition or SLA started to become its own unique field with the arrival of theories such as Krashen’s Monitor Model as well as Chomsky’s generative grammar and universal grammar where emphasis is placed on language learners having an innate faculty for language acquisition and learning (VanPatten & Williams, 2015, p. 34).

Despite the fact that all human beings share some innate traits, all human beings are moulded into unique creatures by their experiences. People generally learn second languages when they have a reason for learning the language, and thus they may be more motivated to pursue and accomplish the task (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). For adults, learning a second language is largely a conscious decision. Despite the fact that language may be acquired incidentally,
learning a language is often presented as a choice as adults need to find a way for themselves to
learn the language, such as signing up for a class, finding someone to talk to or find something
to read. This is somewhat different for children as curriculum is often provided for them as most
societies have compulsory formal instruction. Therefore, adults that decide to learn the language
must have a reason for doing it. That decision may involve the pursuit of a job, a desire to
integrate into another ethnic group, or perhaps an interest in the language itself. Regardless of
what their reasons may be, in the second language learning context, the learner’s motivation for
learning the language has to be related to the social context of the language. The social context
is, in some capacity, the prerequisite for the learning of the second language due to the fact that if
nobody spoke the language in relation to the learner, there would likely be no reason for the
learner to learn the target language as the term ‘second language’ implies that the language is
spoken in the person’s language environment or locale. One thing that has remained a constant
throughout history, as illustrated by Gardner and Lambert (1972), is that people generally master
a second language if the social setting demands it regardless of what their aptitude may be (p. 2).
Within the social context however, learners of a second language may have different reasons for
learning the language, and these reasons are tied to a phenomenon we refer to as motivation.

1.4 The study of second language learning and acquisition

Languages are a complex form of communication, and examining how they are learned is a
daunting task. The enormity of the task of studying language learning and acquisition derives
from the sheer number of factors that can influence the process. VanPatten and Williams (2015)
describe the study of second language acquisition through a parable of four blind men
approaching an elephant. The first man grabs the tail of the elephant and says that the elephant is
like a rope, the second grabs the leg of the elephant and describes it as a tree, while the third hugs
the belly of the elephant and describes it as a wall, and the fourth grabs the trunk of the elephant
and says that the elephant is like a snake (VanPatten & Williams, 2015, Preface). This parable is
meant to identify how researchers approach second language learning and acquisition as a field
of study. It is a field filled with an innumerable amount of factors that can be attributed to the
acquisition and learning of a language, and for the most part, these factors are concepts, many of
whom only known to researchers through theoretical frameworks. These frameworks have been
constructed through empirical studies and rely on observations that are perhaps no more complex than blindingly grabbing the tail of an elephant and stating that it is like a rope.

1.4.1 Second language learning

Second language learning and acquisition is a topic that receives a great deal of attention in academic institutions around the world as evidenced by the volumes of books and journals that have been written on the subject and its innumerable influencing factors. ‘Second language learning’ is difficult to define as presenting one single definition of what a second language is and what learning the language entails is involves a great deal of examination into a person’s upbringing and language use. Animals and ropes aside, it is important to note that language learning cannot be boiled down into generalizations about which factors are more important than others due to the complexity of the language learning process and the innumerable amount of influential factors. But before we can even discuss factors in second language learning and acquisition, we have to examine the definitions surrounding the terms.

One of the complications in defining second language learning involves the separation of the terms ‘language learning’ and ‘language acquisition.’ Krashen (1982) covered this topic extensively in his ‘acquisition-learning hypothesis’ as he defined the two distinct ways that adults use in order to develop competence in a second language. Krashen (1982) postulates that language acquisition is a process that is entirely subconscious as people are generally not aware when they acquire competence in certain aspects of a language. On the other hand, language learning involves the conscious development of linguistic competence, and this competence is generally tied to more formal knowledge such as grammatical competence or the understanding of grammatical rules, syntax and other aspects (Krashen 1982). Gardner’s (2006) interpretation of Krashen’s hypothesis is that ‘language learning’ refers to the development of knowledge that allows for, in some capacity, communication with others while ‘language acquisition’ is more closely related to the development of the language within a person’s ‘self’ (p. 5). The clear problem with Krashen’s definition of ‘language learning’ and ‘language acquisition’ is that there is no real way to distinguish between learned knowledge and acquired knowledge. VanPatten and Williams (2015) state that researchers have no way of knowing, through empirical testing,
whether individuals are using acquired knowledge of learned knowledge, and that this is the main problem with Krashen’s hypothesis (p. 31). By highlighting this problem with Krashen’s hypothesis, which does attempt to define ‘language learning,’ we may arrive at the conclusion that defining ‘second language learning’ is a complicated endeavour.

Following Krashen’s theories, a number of other fields proposed their own theories on second language learning and acquisition. In linguistics, Chomsky’s theory of Universal Grammar for instance suggests that individuals are born with an innate faculty for language acquisition, which is basically demonstrated through a mismatch between the input that children receive from their language environment and their attainment of the target language (White, 2015, p. 34). On the other hand, results from psychological studies by Bates and Goodman (1997) indicate that the emergence of grammar is highly dependent on vocabulary size (p. 2). This approach to the acquisition of grammatical competence is generally referred to as ‘development’ by psychologists rather than ‘acquisition.’ However, we primarily deal with the term ‘learning’ when the focus is centred around adults as adults have already acquired a degree of linguistic competence that can be applied to a number of languages, yet this terminology may apply to certain aspects that have not been acquired.

Other complications with defining ‘second language learning’ mostly relate to the assessment of achievement and attainment in second language learning. Very little of past research on the motivational aspects of second language learning has placed emphasis on achievement while emphasis has been more prominently placed on attainment (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 11). In language learning, achievement a term used to describe a learner’s progress in learning the language while attainment is used to describe whether he has in fact managed to learn some aspect of a language or the language in its entirety.

1.4.2 Assessment, achievement and attainment

Learning a second language, like many other tasks, is also a goal that learners set out to attain. While all learners of a second language are focused on attaining competence or proficiency in the target language, learners in formal instruction are generally more concerned with
achievement. Assessment of this attainment is usually done through some form of standardized testing. These tests must adhere to the fact that languages are a multifaceted phenomenon and therefore must test both receptive and productive vocabulary, grammar, listening comprehension and more. In Iceland, this assessment takes place in all primary schools in Reykjavík with all children whose native language is not Icelandic. As attending schools in Iceland is compulsory, all children receive formal instruction in Icelandic. Beyond typical standardized testing where achievement is measured, another type of assessment is also performed through the Milli Mála test by Dr. Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir. The goal of the test is to determine whether children are sufficiently capable in the Icelandic language to receive formal instruction in Icelandic in other subjects. Attainment is thus measured through this test so that the examiners can determine whether the child requires additional instruction or aid in the language. This is a more formal instruction oriented assessment of a child’s competence in a language as the test is constructed from Icelandic textbooks. In other countries, for a variety of reasons, these types of assessment may not be applicable with certain groups of second language learners. Some second language learners may simply be inaccessible to examiners due to social reasons and will thus not receive any formal instruction oriented assessment of their proficiency in their second language. This is not the case for children in Iceland as primary school education and this standardized form of testing is compulsory. Language learning in Iceland for children is thus more standardized in general.

While children in Iceland undergo assessment of their proficiency and competence in the Icelandic language in primary schools, adults are also required to undergo limited assessment of their proficiency in the Icelandic language. First-generation immigrants are required to pass an Icelandic test in order to apply for Icelandic citizenship. This assessment of a person’s attainment of Icelandic only occurs once and includes reading comprehension, listening comprehension, a writing portion, and a oral examination (Menntamálstofnun, n.d.). Completing this assessment is thus a goal that learners set out to attain as they will attain citizenship as a result of passing the test. They are not be required to complete any further assessment upon completion of this exam. Aside from this assessment, no other literal demands are placed on adults by the social context to learn Icelandic as a second language in Iceland. It is clear that adults in Iceland, whose native language is not Icelandic, experience assessment of their proficiency in Icelandic much
differently than children do. While society provides children with formal instruction in Icelandic and English through compulsory education, adults are, under most circumstances, not provided with the same in any official capacity when it comes to learning Icelandic. This would indicate that the political context places very little demands upon adults to learn Icelandic, and at the same time, it does not provide the education unless the circumstances allow for special dispensation of services. Whether or not the social context demands a level of proficiency is however a more important question, and it is one that can hardly be answered with any type of compulsory assessment of a learner’s proficiency in Icelandic.

Compulsory assessment aside, researchers have made efforts to determine the linguistic requirements that a learner needs to fulfil in order to reach the goal of having learned a second language (Gardner, 2001). The socio-educational model postulates that in order to fully learn a second language, individuals must gain near native-like proficiency in the target language, and research has indicated that native-like proficiency can take up to ten years to reach (Gardner, 2001, p. 4). Naturally, the amount of time it will take for an individual to learn a language is affected by a number of factors. Among these factors, it has been suggested that motivation is an important factor when it comes to learning a language though not necessarily the most important factor (Dörnyei, 2009; Gardner 2006).

1.5 Factors in second language learning and acquisition

There is an innumerable number of factors that can influence language learning acquisition, and researchers have been debating the influence that specific factors have on the language learning process for years. For instance, a learner’s age has been a prevalent subject of discussion in language learning and acquisition through the critical period hypothesis. The critical period hypothesis was adopted into the field of second language acquisition, and it contended that adult learners of a second language are less susceptible to language input than child learners of a second language (Vanhove, 2013). Age of onset has thus been argued as being a critical factor in language learning and acquisition, with emphasis being placed on adults’ inability to effectively acquire language like children do, and children’s inability to employ learning strategies that adults do.
Age is only one of the vast number of factors that can influence an individual’s ability to learn a language, and various studies have been conducted to examine the role and impact of each individual factor. Due to the sheer number of factors that can impact second language learning and acquisition, we will only be discussing the factors in this section that are the most relevant factors in relation to what recent literature has shown us about the Icelandic context. Studies have shown that some factors that were once thought to be impactful in second language learning and acquisition may be considered less impactful later as a result of more recent studies. For instance, the age at which bilingual children are exposed to a language has traditionally been considered an important factor in language acquisition. The notion that age of exposure has a strong impact on learning another language among bilingual children was thought to be a significant factor. While the results of a relatively recent study by Kovelman, Baker and Petitto (2008) for instance showed that children who were exposed to the language at an earlier age performed better, the results of another study by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2012) suggested that the amount of input that the children receive is a far more significant factor than age of exposure.

A person’s ability to acquire proficiency in a second language is also influenced by his or her mother tongue. Learners for instance need to acquire a number of language processing habits in order to fully learn a language, and these may be morphological, syntactic, phonetic, or grammatical aspects in a language. We generally refer to the system that regulates this acquisition of processing habits between two languages as ‘interlanguage’ (Archibald, 2011). Since interlanguage influences the learning and acquisition of languages, it is important to examine the processing habits of both the native language and the target language when examining second language acquisition and learning. Boers (2017) highlights an issue with French language learners, whose native tongue is Mandarin, as Mandarin makes little use of inflectional morphology while French does. A French language learner of Chinese origin is thus likely to struggle in learning the correct inflections in the French language.

An individual’s proficiency in a second language will however always be tied heavily to one factor in particular, exposure, as human beings acquire languages from their surroundings. Exposure is a critical factor in learning a second language, and it is generally examined through
either length of exposure in terms of how long an individual has been exposed to a language, or
the amount of exposure in the individual’s daily routine. Nikolov and Djigunović (2006)
conducted a review of the studies on length of exposure as a factor in second language
acquisition among children and adults. The results of those studies indicated that while research
indicates that length of exposure can favourably impact second language acquisition, it does in
no way guarantee a better outcome in terms of if and how well the individual acquires the
language (Nikolov and Djigunović, 2006). The reason for that can primarily be attributed to the
fact that length of exposure does not reliably indicate the amount or quality of exposure that an
individual receives.

1.6 Motivation as a factor in second language learning

‘Language learning motivation’ is a term that is difficult to define and many definitions
concerning the various aspects of motivation have been put forth that differ in a number of
aspects yet all arrive at the conclusion that motivation in language learning is an important
Dörnyei (2009) states that motivation can provide the primary impetus to initiate the process of
learning a second language as well as being the driving force behind sustaining the process (p. 117).
Despite the fact that we know that high levels of motivation can produce positive results,
we still do not actually understand what motivation is or how exactly it affects learning. We
know that human beings consciously choose to do one thing and not the other, and we know that
human beings desire to do one thing and not another. There is always a reason for conscious
actions undertaken by human beings and learning a language should be no different. However,
we still do not actually know whether conscious decisions to learn a language are the same as
learning another subject or profession. However, Dörnyei (2009) states that languages are
considerably more complicated than other subjects as they are, at the same time, a
communication coding system that can be taught and learned, an integral part of an individual’s
identity involved in almost all mental activities, and an important channel of social organization
embedded into cultures and communities (p. 118). The argument has thus been made that
languages are in fact learned differently than other subjects. That may suggest that being
motivated to learn a language could be different than being motivated to learn other subjects.
That is why it is important to research, in particular, the role that motivation plays in language learning.

Despite the volumes of academic literature, the role of motivation as a factor in relation to second language achievement has been comparatively less researched than other factors such as aptitude and intelligence (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 11-12). However, in recent years, emphasis has been shifted more towards general individual differences and usage (Gardner, 2006). The two topics, language learning motivation and second language learning, are often covered together as a number of researchers do consider the two topics to be closely linked (Gardner, 2006, p. 2-3). Both of these terms also share the distinction of being difficult to define. The difficulty in defining ‘motivation’ stems from the difficulty of conceptualizing and measuring motivational variables (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 11). By extension, researching motivation in the language learning context is also challenging as measuring a person’s motivation to pursue a goal or complete a task is a complicated endeavour, and it may depend on the nature of the goal or task. Different types of motivation will be discussed later in the chapter.

The importance of motivation in language learning is tied to the theories discussed in the previous chapter. The numerous theoretical frameworks present in the current cross-disciplinary literature alter the actual effect that motivation can have on the language learning process. For instance, whether or not human beings have an innate faculty for language acquisition and learning is an important part of the discussion. Theories such as Chomsky’s Universal Grammar suggest, through the logical problem of language acquisition, that the amount and quality of the input from the environment cannot account for all the knowledge that a child learning a language possesses (White, 2015). On the other hand, other theories prevalent in behavioural psychology suggest that language is learned like any other behaviour, through imitation and conditioned learning (VanPatten & Williams, 2015). Whether human beings have an innate faculty for language learning and acquisition could be a crucial factor as it implies that language is not learned like any other skill is. Additionally, language learning, according to behavioural psychology, is highly implicit so the learner is not aware of what he is being taught. An example would be Audio-Lingual method used during WWII as military personnel in the United States Army were taught German through a method where they would basically listen and repeat what
they heard, with emphasis being on them learning through imitation (Brown, 2007). The military personnel were thus not fully aware of the context of the classroom. A learner’s understanding of the learning process could impact motivation in language learning as people could be motivated differently to complete a task if they knew what the purpose of the task was rather than just the end result of attainment.

People tend to learn languages for different reasons rather than just one specific reason, and we generally refer to these reasons as ‘orientation.’ Orientation by itself does not determine success in language learning or at least there is very little evidence that shows a correlation between a learner’s reasons for learning a language in and of themselves and his success in learning the language (Gardner, 2001, p. 16). A person’s orientation does however influence a person’s motivation towards a subject, and is one the factors that make up the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, a collection of tests and questionnaires that examine a person’s motivation towards learning a language (Gardner, 1985).

The amount of factors that could influence a person’s motivation to learn a language are so numerous that ‘language learning motivation’ is simply not comparable to a person’s motivation for other subjects (Dörnyei, 2009). Dörnyei (2009) emphasizes that motivation towards learning a language is vastly different from learning other subjects due to the nature of language itself and the importance it has in an individual’s life. According to Dörnyei (2009), language is a communication coding system, the most important channel of social organization, and an integral part of an individual’s identity that is involved in almost all mental activities (p. 118). Regardless of whether we believe that human beings have an innate ability to acquire language, learning languages is simply not comparable to other subjects due to the fact that it is an enormous part of an individual’s identity. Therefore, being motivated to learn a second language is vastly different from being motivated to learn other subjects as a second language forms a type of second language identity for the learner while learning algebra does not form a type of mathematical identity for the learner.

Language learners also do not have the same motives when learning languages. Individuals sometimes learn a language due to an intrinsic desire to be able to communicate with a specific
group of people while others may learn a language in order to fulfil some form of goal-oriented extrinsic reason such as getting a particular job or being able to fulfil certain academic standards. The circumstances of the learning process are also a critical factor and affect a person’s motivation and attitude towards the process. When discussing second language learning, it is important to consider the context in which this learning takes place and how a person’s motivation for the language can be affected by the context.

Gardner (2006) postulates that there are two types of motivational constructs relevant to learning a second language: language learning motivation and classroom learning motivation. Both of these constructs are relevant as a second language is often learned through formal instruction, particularly in Iceland, which generally takes place in a classroom. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, language learning motivation is a person’s motivation to learn a language, and is the motivational construct that is mostly discussed in the current literature concerning motivation in second language learning. Classroom learning motivation on the other hand is a person’s motivation to learn in a classroom situation or in another similar situation (Gardner, 2006). Learning a second language in a classroom introduces a host of variables into the language learning process. In formal instruction, a learner is usually not permitted to choose his or her own learning materials, with the exception of extensive reading maybe. A teacher is another variable that is inserted into the process to facilitate the education of the learner. Other individuals are also present in the class, and numerous social or psychological issues can arise in such situations that make the learner more motivated to participate in the classroom or less motivated. We know that formal instruction is common in Iceland as a large study by The Social Science Research Institute at the University of Iceland reported that around 75% of the 797 immigrants that participated in the study had attended a Icelandic course (Vala Jónsdóttir, Kristín Erla Harðardóttir, & Ragna Benedikta Garðarsdóttir, 2009, p. 41). While it is not possible to distinguish between two types of motivation during a task, Gardner (2006) contends that both types can be considered operative during the task (p. 3). This means that we look at the language learning and classroom learning motivational constructs as factors in the classroom situation.

Archibald (2011) mentions that the fact is often stated that people have been learning languages for thousands of years without receiving formal classroom-oriented instruction, and that the
success rate tends to plummet whenever teachers are inserted into this process (p. 418). The accuracy of this statement is highly questionable though this would indicate that the second language classroom is not always viewed positively. Gardner (2006) contends that there is a host of factors that can affect a person’s motivation to learn a language while in a classroom setting. These factors can be social, psychological or academic in origin, tied to various individual differences, or, as Archibald (2011) alludes to, be potentially tied to the teacher’s position in the classroom. The actual effect that teachers and other classroom variables have on a learner’s motivation for the classroom remain a mystery as motivation, in and of itself, is a concept that is difficult to study, and thus the various social and environmental factors that can influence it are as well. While classroom learning motivation can promote the learning of certain aspects of a language, other forms of motivation are needed in order to master a language (Gardner, 2006, p. 12). It is undoubtedly true that the classroom is another set of variables inserted into the language learning context, and that it could impact a person’s motivation towards the overall goal of learning the language to an unknown extent. The classroom however remains a reality in today’s world, especially in Icelandic society. It is thus important when examining a person’s motivation to learn a language to also examine their motivation towards a classroom setting in general through pedagogical and psychological research.

1.6.1 Instrumental motivation and integrative motivation

Gardner and Lambert (1972) identified two specific types of motivation that detail a learner’s desire to learn a language. These two types are now commonly known as instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. This specific dichotomy arose from studies conducted by Gardner, Lambert, and others (1972) in their laboratory. The findings of these studies gradually reinforced their beliefs in a theory of second language learning that was psychological in origin (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 228). Such a theory would emphasize a learner’s behaviour and attitude towards learning the second language as well as the group to which the language belongs. From this proposed theory came the instrumental-integrative dichotomy which emphasized a learner’s orientation towards the various aspects the second language and the culture of the language (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 229).
An ‘instrumental’ form of motivation is considered to be more utilitarian in nature as linguistic achievement in the target language has to serve some kind of practical purpose such as aiding the learner in finding employment (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). For instance, if you see the language as a tool to achieve some sort of goal that is not related to the language or culture, then you are instrumentally motivated to learn the language in order to achieve that goal. This is closely linked to extrinsic motivation although it is not entirely the same concept.

While ‘instrumental’ motivation is more concerned with linguistic achievement for utilitarian purposes, an ‘integrative’ form of motivation, as the word implies, involves the learner striving to learn the target language in order to learn more about the culture of the language (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). From this learning process, the goal of the learner could be to become a member of the culture that he is learning about. Integration, as the term implies, is thus the goal of individuals who are integratively motivated to learn a language. The reasons for integration can however vary greatly as well. It has been noted that in previous studies conducted on motivation to learn a second language, the positive effect that integrative motivation has on language learning and acquisition has primarily been tied to proficiency in producing the language orally (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 128).

Individuals who are motivated to learn another language in order to interact with or gain membership in another culture may do so for different reasons. Some may interested in gaining membership simply due to some intrinsic desire or fascination with the culture while others may feel a need to adapt due the environment they live in. Individuals torn between two different cultural groups may be faced with a choice which naturally would affect their motivation to learn the language of the newly encountered group. The term “anomie” was coined by researchers for those individuals who are faced with such social uncertainty (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 229). Social uncertainty can of course stem from a variety of psychological or social factors. Individuals may simply be more interested in the culture of the language they learning, they may meet people in that culture that they are more in tune with, or they may be dissatisfied with their own ethnolinguistic group. Gardner and Lambert (1972) hypothesized that learners could perceive learning a new language as a means of creating a better life for themselves as a result of a basic dissatisfaction that learners could develop with their own ethnolinguistic group (p. 16).
Regardless of what their reasons may be, it is important to examine the role of the participants’ own ethnolinguistic group, learners’ feelings towards it, and their role it plays in second language learning.

In order to fully understand the instrumental-integrative dichotomy, we have to look at the studies that laid the foundation for this theoretical framework. Results from a study by Gardner and Lambert (1972) revealed that the attitude of students of French-American origin toward their own ethnolinguistic group had a significant impact on their language development in English and French (p. 77). The participants in the study were French-American high school students in Louisiana and Maine. Certain parts of Louisiana and Maine have bicultural communities where French is the language that is used at home but English is used in many other contexts, including schools (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). American high school students learning French in a more monocultural American community in Connecticut were used for comparison. Both groups of participants underwent examinations of their proficiency in English and French, along with a questionnaire examining their multiple aspects of their attitude towards the languages and their ethnolinguistic groups, and their motivation to learn the languages (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). The results of the study provide strong support for attitudinal factors playing a large role in language learning of English and French in a French-American bicultural community, and that attitude can impact language proficiency (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 77-78).

Two additional studies conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972) examined the views and motivation of English-speaking high school students in conjunction with their performance in learning French. In the first study, the students were residents in Montreal, a French-speaking community. The students that participated were tested for verbal intelligence, language learning aptitude, and their orientation toward the language and its culture. The results of the study found a correlation between the students’ performance in learning the target language and a combination of all three factors; aptitude, intelligence and an integrative orientation. Other factors aside, the students that were integratively oriented performed better than the students whose orientation was more instrumental (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 4). The latter study used a larger sample of the English-speaking Canadian high school students and confirmed the findings of the former study (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 5). A follow-up study later indicated
that integrative orientation towards the language was likely developed within the family of the students as information was gathered from their parents about the topic (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 5). Overall, the studies did find a correlation between linguistic and academic achievement in French and an integrative motive to learn the target language which would seem to indicate, according to Gardner and Lambert (1972), that basic personal dispositions toward a language and its social context can impact language learning (p. 5).

A study was also conducted in the Philippines by Gardner and Lambert (1972) that brought their notions from the North American context over to a very different language environment. English is a prominent language in education and business in the Philippines, and thus this study was of particular interest to Gardner and Lambert, and it is also somewhat comparable to the Icelandic context as English has a similar instrumental value in both contexts. The participants in the study were 103 high school students that underwent testing similar to the tests that Gardner and Lambert (1972) had conducted in earlier studies (p. 122). In addition, the participants, along with their parents, also answered a questionnaire to determine their orientation, level of motivation, and attitude towards English. The results of the study indicated that a relationship exists between integrative motivation and oral-aural proficiency in a second language (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 130). Support for this notion seems to derive from a correlation between a group of students who identified strongly with the cultural group that is represented by English and oral-aural proficiency in the English (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 130). The results would also seem to indicate that students who are instrumentally oriented to learn English in the Philippine context become more proficient in the language than those who do not (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 130). This would seem to support the notion mentioned earlier that people will learn a second language when the social context demands it. The social setting in the Philippines does demand it as English as an important language in education and business within the country. Additionally, a correlation was found between students who were instrumentally motivated to learn the language and parental encouragement. Despite the fact that newer research has shown that parental encouragement becomes a far less significant factor as people grow older, the participants in this study are high school students so they are still relatively young and susceptible to being influenced by their parents (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 2006).
Gardner and Lambert (1972) also state that there is an additional type of orientation that can have a significant impact on language learning (p. 15). A learner that is forced to learn a language through social or economic pressure could end up being overly dissatisfied with his situation and actually resent the language that he is or feels forced to learn or use (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Naturally, this type of resentment could impact the learner’s progress in learning the target language. Support for this notion can be found in Gardner’s and Lambert’s (1972) studies, that were covered earlier in this chapter, about French-American students studying through English whilst living in the United States, and Filipino students studying through English (p. 15).

Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) work would seem to indicate that correlation is found between instrumental and integrative motives to learn a language and the social context of the language. This correlation is highlighted in the three studies covered in this chapter. Gardner (2001) states that while research has indicated that motivation is a factor in a learner’s success, very little evidence has been presented to support the notion that a learner’s orientation is associated with a learner’s success in learning a second language (p. 16). It should thus be the directive of researchers to focus on a learner’s motivation to learn a language rather than his or her orientation according to Gardner (2001). In subsequent versions of Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, the Orientation Index was removed as it gave the impression that the language learners were either classified as being instrumentally oriented or integratively oriented (Gardner, 2001, p. 14). This index was omitted in favour of emphasizing Integrative and Instrumental Orientation as a part of a language learners’ motivation.

While motivation remains a factor in second language learning and acquisition, Gardner’s (2006) research has concluded that neither the integrative and instrumental dichotomy nor the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can fully explain the role that motivation plays in second language learning (p. 12). Motivation is such a complex phenomenon that it cannot be fully explained through placing various motives into dichotomies. Gardner (2006) goes on to state that it is much rather the intensity of the motivation rather than where it stems from that is most important, and that behavioural, cognitive and affective aspects are incorporated into this intensity (p. 12). These conclusions would seem to indicate that individual differences play an important role in a learner’s motivation to learn a second language.
Regardless, various other models and frameworks have been constructed over the past few decades.

1.6.2 Socio-educational model

The notion of learning a second language being a deeply social event has been broadly supported by social psychologists and researchers (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 2001; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Dörnyei, 2003). The social dimension of second language learning is related to a number of terms such as multiculturalism, language contact, and relations with and between ethnolinguistic groups (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 4). Various studies have been conducted examining the social event that second language learning is believed to, and a number of models have been constructed as a result.

The socio-educational model is a model of language acquisition by Robert C. Gardner, and it is primarily centred around three components. The three components are attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and motivation. All of the components are believed to influence achievement in learning a second language, though the effect that attitudes toward the learning situation and integrativeness have on achievement are thought be indirect (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). As the model tests a learners’ attitudes toward the learning situation, it is safe to say that the model is primarily centred around the classroom context. The attitudes toward the learning situation component is supported by two subtests; evaluation of the course and evaluation of the teacher (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003).

Integrativeness refers to an individual’s genuine interest in learning a second language so that the individual may identify with or become a part of a particular group or culture (Gardner, 2001, p. 5; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 126). Integrativeness is generally measured through three scales; attitudes toward the target language, integrative orientation, and interest in foreign languages.
It has been postulated that the two components, integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation, are the two components that influence a learner’s motivation to learn a second language, and that achievement in learning a second language is a result of the learner being motivated to learn the language (Gardner, 2001, p. 4; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 124).

1.6.3 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

By looking at the instrumental-integrative dichotomy, we look at motivation as a factor in a social context where patterns between individuals and groups are measured through variables such as attitudes and orientation. These theories were predominantly put forth by social psychologists such as Gardner, Lambert, and their associates (1972). It is important that social psychologists are the only ones who research the motivational concept. Other theories on motivation are put forth by motivational psychologists, and they focus on human behaviour through internal factors such as cognition (Dörnyei, 2009). It is however worth noting that according to Dörnyei (2009), the gap between social psychologists and motivational psychologists has decreased as a result of social psychologists incorporating cognitive concepts into their models and motivational psychologists incorporating social concepts into their models (p. 119). Highlighting the theories conducted by motivational psychologists when considering the topic of ‘motivation.’

One of the most prominent theories put forth by motivational psychologists is the theory of intrinsic motivation. Based on self-determination theory, it involves the pursuit of goals among individuals who are intrinsically motivated (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to Deci and Ryan (2000), people are intrinsically motivated when they freely engage in activities that they find interesting, provide novelty and present an optimal challenge (p. 235). The individual or learner is thus the source of the motivation. The goals of an intrinsically motivated learner are thus not characterized as utilitarian. The learner will thus pursue goals that are important to learner, yet they may be inexplicable to others. While individuals who are intrinsically motivated to complete a certain task will do it for reasons that are more personal and difficult to define, people that are extrinsically motivated to complete a task will do it to reach some sort of goal (Deci &
Ryan, 2000). The source of extrinsic motivation thus derives from a person’s surroundings rather than from within his or her self.

Deci and Ryan (2000) consider their ideas of motivation in a social context as well, and they describe ‘integration’ as being the fullest and most complete form of extrinsic motivation being internalized in an individual (p. 236). The need for integration is however also described as an innate component by Deci and Ryan (2000, p. 229). This suggests that it is a biological or organismic component that compels people to attain some form of membership in a group. If we assume that integration is in fact an innate component that can highly influence a person’s need or desire to learn a language, then we really need to examine what integration means to people in a given context or whether there is a certain level of integration that people seek. Integration could entail integrating with an entire society or a small group with that society. In terms of immigrants or persons with a foreign background living in a particular country, integration to those individuals could entail integrating into a society with the intention of attaining membership in that society’s ethnic group. However, it could also simply involve merging with the same ethnic group of the person in question, and remaining on the fringe of the society as a whole as the group may be on the fringe. This is an example of social concepts being incorporated into the models of motivational psychologists.

1.7 Summary and the road ahead

This review the current literature concerning the role of Icelandic and English among persons in Iceland, whose native language is not Icelandic, has revealed some quantitative information regarding the topic in question. Information regarding the overall self-perceived proficiency in Iceland among immigrants and persons with a foreign background is readily available, as well as general information regarding exposure to English in Iceland (Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, 2015; Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009; Heiður Hrund Jónsdóttir, 2004).

Little information is however available regarding the language use and proficiency in various linguistic spaces among individuals whose native language is not Icelandic. Emphasis is thus placed in the present study on a person’s capability to produce languages in specific linguistic
spaces which is reflected in their self-perceived proficiency in each linguistic space and their actual language use in those spaces. The study will attempt to produce the necessary information regarding the language use of participants within the relevant linguistic spaces. Very limited information is also readily available concerning the proficiency and language use of individuals that are incapable of communicating effectively in Icelandic or English. The existence of this group is evident as a majority of compulsory schools in Iceland hire translators for parent-student interviews every year due to an inability to communicate with parents in Icelandic or English, and this has been made clear through personal conversations with school personnel in multiple schools. While emphasis is generally placed rather broadly on examining the language environment in Iceland for persons whose native language is not Icelandic, specifically reaching out to those individuals, who are not considered proficient in either Icelandic or English, was a great priority in the study. This is accomplished through translators in parent-student interviews and translated invitations to participate in a study about learning Icelandic and English. The study will specifically examine the relationship between motivation and attitude in learning and using Icelandic and English in Iceland. The impact that various background information and factors, such as length of residence and language use in relevant linguistic spaces, will be examined in contrast to information gathered about a person’s motivation to learn and use Iceland and English in Iceland, and their attitude towards the languages.
2. Purpose of Study

In order to explore the relationship of attitudes and motivation to the learning of Icelandic and English among immigrants or persons with a foreign background in Iceland, a study was conducted. Focusing on the perceived need to learn Icelandic and English by residents in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic, and what factors contribute to the degree in which adult immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland learn each of the aforementioned languages. The goal of the study was to examine language learning motivation for Icelandic as a second language in Iceland along with attitude towards the language and the context in which it is spoken. Questionnaires from Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery were used in order to examine instrumental orientation, integrative orientation, desire to learn Icelandic and English, attitudes toward the languages, including positive and negative questions, along with questions that examine the affective factor in language learning. A questionnaire adapted by Elín Þórdóttir (2015) from Baker (1992) and Ibarraran, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2008) was used to examine the participants’ affective attitudes toward Icelandic, English, their native language, and their ethnolinguistic group.

As a result of studies conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972), it was hypothesized that a correlation would be found between a greater desire to learn Icelandic, more positive attitudes toward the language and greater integrative orientation on one hand and an increased use of Icelandic on the other hand. At the same time, it was hypothesized that a greater connection would be found between use of the English language in Iceland, attitudes toward the English language, and instrumental orientation toward the English language, as a result of the utilitarian role that English plays as a lingua franca in multiple linguistic spaces in Icelandic society.

The importance of conducting a study of this scale in Iceland has been illustrated in the literature concerning the changed language environment in Iceland and the rise of English as a prevalent lingua franca in Icelandic society. English has also become an important part of extramural activities in Iceland as a study by Sergio Garcia Ortega (cited in Birna Arnbjörsdóttir, 2011, p. 3) revealed that a grand majority of television material in Iceland is in English, an amount that was around 62.6% in 2011, according to Ortega’s findings. Ortega’s study, along with other
studies, have revealed that people in Iceland are generally exposed to English on a daily basis, although the amount of exposure does of course vary depending on the individual (Birna Arnbjörgsdóttir, 2011, 2015). Emphasis is thus placed on examining the participants’ usage of the English language, their exposure to it, and their proficiency in the language. These aspects are then viewed as variables to be examined alongside a person’s motivation to learn Icelandic and their attitude towards the Icelandic language and language environment.

The steady influx of immigrants, tourists, and other persons with a foreign background has resulted in a shift in the Icelandic language environment as proportionately more individuals residing or visiting the country do not have Icelandic as their native language. This increase results in an increased need for a lingua franca to establish communication between persons of various ethnicities and different language backgrounds. As the dominant lingua franca in the Western world has been identified as English (Seidlhofer, 2005), it is important to examine the views of people residing in Iceland towards learning English, their views towards the language in Icelandic society, their proficiency in the language, and their usage of the language. The study thus places emphasis on the impact that English may or may not have on the language environment in Iceland. Furthermore, a great deal of emphasis is placed on examining whether English actually impacts a person’s motivation to learn Icelandic as a second or third language.

While previous studies have indicated how much people are exposed to English throughout their day, this study examined how much the participants in the study are exposed to Icelandic, English, and their native language in each linguistic space relevant to them. Emphasis is thus placed on examining the detailing how much the participants are exposed to each language in and outside their home, as well as in more specific linguistic spaces such as at work, at school, and during social events. The questions do not greatly detail the quality of the exposure to each language but they should give an adequate approximation of the quantity of exposure in each linguistic space.

The decision was made to examine a number of factors that relate to the term ‘motivation’ that was discussed in previous chapters. A variety of factors that contribute towards motivation are included as they relate to motivation. Emphasis is generally placed on the instrumental-
integrative dichotomy in order to examine the role of orientation towards language learning among immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland. The affective factor is considered as it is considered important in the work by Krashen (1982), and is a factor in Gardner’s Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. Attitude towards Icelandic and English is calculated through questions directly from Gardner’s (1985) AMTB and from a questionnaire previously adapted from Baker (1992) by Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir. Motivation is examined both indirectly through a combination of factors that are thought to affect a person’s motivation towards learning a language, and directly through questions that examine motivational intensity but do not derive from a questionnaire that has undergone significant testing and were designed for this study.

Examining a number of background factors is also an important step in determining the role of motivation in learning Icelandic as a second language. For instance, examining the amount and type of instruction that learners have received in the language is important to see how much time and effort they have put into learning the language. Not all individuals are however taught a language, some manage to learn it without formal instruction. It important to examine whether individuals who learned the language without instruction were differently motivated to learn the language or whether their attitude towards the learning the language and its environment is different. Other background variables were also considered such as age of onset, length of residence, exposure, and language use.

Despite the fact that the socio-educational model presents a more contemporary model of second language learning and acquisition, a decision was made to use the somewhat older instrumental-integrative dichotomy. In order to permit a focus on the role of orientation in relation to motivation, that is, to examine the role of the reasons that immigrants and persons with a foreign background have to learn Icelandic in Iceland, and examine their reasoning alongside their motivational intensity and background factors. Examining orientation in the Icelandic context is relevant in order to ascertain why immigrants and persons with a foreign background seek or do not seek to learn the Icelandic language. While reasons for learning a language do not necessarily result in a positive outcome in terms of language learning, having a reason is a prerequisite for actually learning the language in the first place. Emphasis is thus placed on examining whether
differences can be found in language use, self-perceived proficiency, and other factors among learners who seem to be more instrumentally oriented towards learning Icelandic versus those who seem to be more integratively oriented. Another reason why the socio-educational model was not chosen in this study is that it is generally used in a context where the target group is already actively working towards the goal of learning the language, and that the language is being taught. The socio-educational model emphasizes a learner’s attitudes toward the learning situation which includes the subtests of the learners evaluating their course and their teacher. As the study is conducted in a manner that does not assume that the learners are in fact in a course or have been in one, these measurements do not apply to the study. Emphasis on classroom instruction would also emphasize differences between the classes available to the learner.

The interest of the study is thus squarely placed on the participants’ views toward the Icelandic and English, the participants’ orientation toward the languages, and the participants’ motivation toward learning the languages, with little emphasis being placed on the actual learning situation. These views are examined in contrast to various other factors such as self-perceived proficiency, exposure, age of onset, length of residence,

The study was approved as an addendum to a larger related study conducted by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir by the Institutional Review Board of the Faculty of Medicine of McGill University and The Data Protection Authority (Persónuvernd). The larger study is entitled Individual variability in L2 and L3 learning in Iceland: The role of motivation and ability factors and is funded by a grant from Rannís (Rannsóknamiðstöð Íslands), awarded to Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir.
2.1 Research questions

The research questions in the study were the following:

1. How does the status of English as a lingua franca in Iceland impact a person’s motivation and attitude towards learning Icelandic as a second language?
2. What is the role of Gardner’s integrative and instrumental dichotomy in learning Icelandic as a second language?
3. What is the role of a person’s affective attitude in learning Icelandic as a second or third language for individuals residing in Iceland?
4. How does a person’s ethnolinguistic group or their relationship with the group impact their motivation to learn Icelandic or English in Iceland?
5. What is the relationship between background factors and a person’s motivation and attitude to learn Icelandic or English?
3. Methodology

3.1 Data collection

Over 2000 individuals, who are residents in Iceland, but have a native language other than Icelandic, were contacted and invited to participate in the study. These individuals were either offered to participate by receiving an invitation to participate in the study at a parent-student interview, or they the invitation was sent to home to the parents by compulsory schools in the Greater Reykjavík Area. Special emphasis was placed on reaching individuals who may not be proficient in either Icelandic or English through translators, translated invitations and translated questionnaires. Participation entailed answering a web survey with a questionnaire that featured 110 questions.

Participants in the study were individuals who have a native language other than Iceland and live in the Greater Reykjavík Area. While the primary target group of individuals for the study were individuals who reside in Iceland yet have a native language other than Icelandic, a secondary target group was also established and featured individuals who fit the primary target group criteria but also have the distinction of having very low levels of proficiency in both Icelandic and English. The participants in the study were recruited with the help of primary schools in the Greater Reykjavík Area. In total, 31 schools in Reykjavík and one in Hafnarfjörður agreed to aid in distributing invitations (Appendix A) to participate in the study to parents of children in the schools. Out of the 32 schools that agreed to distribute the invitations, 22 schools distributed over 1200 invitations through parent-student interviews conducted in late January or early February of 2018. This method was thought to be efficient as interpreters are often present in these interviews, and thus, individuals who would fit the criteria of the secondary target group could be reached. Parents were presented with the invitation at the end of the interview and it was translated if necessary. If they wished to participate, they would fill out their name on a sign-up sheet attached to the invitation, as well as their information on native language, their e-mail address and the languages in which they could complete the survey. By signing the sheet, they also agreed to allow school personnel to hand the sign-up sheet to the researchers, though by the signing the sign-up sheet, for the purpose of obtaining more information about the study
and how to participate in it. The parents could either fill out the sign-up sheet on the spot and leave it with school personnel, or they could take it home with them and decide later whether they wished to participate.

After varying degrees of success in finding a suitable number of participants through the student-parent method, an additional ten schools agreed to aid in distributing over 800 invitations to parents of children the schools by asking the children of the parents to bring home a sealed envelope containing an invitation to participate in the study. The invitations were translated into Arabic, Chinese (simplified), English, Polish, Russian, Spanish and Thai in order to reach the individuals who may fit the criteria of the secondary target group. The decision to translate the invitations to those languages was based on the size of certain ethnic groups in Iceland in conjunction with the availability of translators within a certain timeframe. All parents in those ten schools received a sealed envelope with the invitation in Icelandic and English, as well as a version translated into their native language if possible. The invitation sent through this method was nearly identical to the one in the student-parent interviews. The only relevant change was a clause that encouraged the parents to take a picture of the sign-up sheet and send it directly to the researchers, though the option still remained to leave the sign-up sheet with school personnel. Additionally, participants in the study were permitted to convey invitations to persons whom they know and fit the criteria of the study.

After the minimum target of at least 100 sign-ups was reached, an online survey was sent out to the participants who had consented to participate. The e-mail addresses of the participants were compiled into a list of participants in the LimeSurvey web application. The participants received an e-mail with instructions on how to participate in the survey as well as a link to the survey itself. In addition to being available in Icelandic and English, the survey was translated into Arabic, Chinese (simplified), Polish, Russian and Spanish. Most of the participants received the survey in the language they requested although a few participants had requested the survey in Lithuanian which was not available. The LimeSurvey web application generated individual tokens for each of the participants’ e-mails so that their answers could be tracked and so that they would only be able to complete the survey once with the link that they were provided.
3.2 Content of the Questionnaire

The survey featured questions from a variety of sources. In total, the web survey featured 110 questions that were split into four groups.

The first group of questions included background information such as general information about the participant, the participants’ perceived proficiency in Icelandic and English, the participants language use and exposure to the languages, along with information about the language instruction that the participant has received and his or her attitude towards learning Icelandic and English. The first group of questions regarded the participants’ background, including the participants’ gender, age group, native language, place of birth, level of education, and employment. Information was gathered on the participants’ language use and exposure as well with the participants detailing the amount each that language is spoken within their home and the amount they are exposed to outside their home. The participants listed the amount of hours they speak, read, write and listen to Icelandic and English on a normal day, and also listed the amount in which they use Icelandic and English within particular linguistic spaces. In terms of language proficiency, the participants were asked to evaluate their proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading and writing Icelandic and English. In addition, the participants were asked to provide details on the education they had received in Icelandic through the various forms of instruction available to them in Iceland or to provide information how they learned the language without the aid of formal instruction. Finally, the participants were asked to state at the age at which they started learning Icelandic and English.

A majority of the questions relating to a person’s motivation to learn a language came either directly or indirectly from Robert C. Gardner’s Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (1985). The questionnaire can be found in Appendix B (Appendix B is in a separate printed document that accompanies this paper. An electronic version can be obtained by through e-mail: bmv9@hi.is). Some of the questions in the survey were taken directly from the manual. Questions on affective attitude towards Icelandic, English and the native language respectively came from a questionnaire that was modified and translated into Icelandic by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2015) from the questionnaire used by Baker, 1992; Ibarraran, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2009. This
questionnaire, among others, has been used to examine motivation, attitude, and other factors among children and adolescents in Iceland (Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir, 2018). The questions that were originally intended for adolescents were altered to be more suitable for adults as the questions originally made the assumption that the person filling out the questionnaire was in fact a L2 learner of Icelandic as it is entirely possible to reside in a country without being a learner of the official language of the country. These additions and changes were made to reflect the fact that the participants of the present study may not be enrolled in in Icelandic and English courses or pursuing any kind of competence in Icelandic or English, and thus they may simply be present in a language environment that contains those two languages. The questions taken from this questionnaire include all of the questions in part 2 of the study (Motivation, M1-M30). Further, questions in part 3 (Ethnic group and cultural background, E1-E8) came from another questionnaire adapted by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2015) by Kouli and Papaioannou (2009). In part 4 (Motivation and Attitude), 12 questions (MA1-MA8, MA13-MA16) were borrowed directly from the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (1985). The questions used in part 1 (Background information) that ask the participant to evaluate his or her ability to understand and produce Icelandic and English (B1-B4, C1-C4) were borrowed from two large studies by The Social Science Research Institute that examined the status of immigrants in Iceland (Heiður Hrund Jónsdóttir et al., 2004; Vala Jónsdóttir et al., 2009). Information on reliability testing of those questions can be found in the AMTB manual (1985). The remainder of the questions were created by the researcher in order to provide more context to the results of the survey, and were not measured for internal consistency or reliability aside from some minor pilot testing by students at the University of Iceland.

3.3 Participants

The participants in the study were 42 immigrants or persons with a foreign background who reside in Iceland. After distribution of the invitations had concluded, 105 persons originally signed up to receive the study via e-mail yet only 42 of them participated. The participants all fit the criterion of being an immigrant or a person with a foreign background, and thus they have a native language that is not Icelandic. More females participated in the study with 26 females participating and 16 males. Originally, the participants all filled the criterion of being parents as
the invitations were only distributed to parents in compulsory schools in the Greater Reykjavík Area. However, after referrals were allowed among participants in the study, it is doubtful that all of the participants do fill that criterion, yet at least 38 out of 42 the participants were known to be parents.

3.3.1 Background information

Table 1 displays background information collected in the questionnaire. Participants in the study had spent 10.45 years on average living in Iceland (standard deviation, SD, 7.06). The amount of time that the participants had spent living in Iceland varied greatly and ranged anywhere from five months to 25 years.

The participants came from 24 different countries and thus spoke a variety of languages, the most common of which was Polish as nine of the participants were from Poland. Due to the low overall number of participants in the study, and the variety of languages spoken by the participants, placing ethnolinguistic groups and the languages of the participants in contrast with other variables was not possible.

Overall, the participants were considerably well-educated, with 23 of the 42 participants having completed some form of higher education at the university level. Thus, the mean for the number of years that the participants had spent in schools was 15.90 (SD 4.78). This mean number may however not be representative of either group as twenty of the participants had received fifteen or fewer years of education, with one participant having only completed twelve years of education despite having a Bachelor’s degree.

Only six of the participants reported not being employed outside their home, and those participants reported being on-site students or homemakers. Seven participants reported being on-site students in an unspecified capacity, while two reported being self-employed and working from home, and four reported being homemakers. The participants were given the ability to select more than one option.
The participants were asked to list the education that they had received in Icelandic in order to gain a better understanding of their pursuit in educating themselves in the language. The participants had the ability to choose more than one option. A text box was placed next to the questions where the participants were able to further specify the education they received. Ten of the participants reported having received formal education through schooling, 26 participants reported having attended on-site Icelandic courses, five had received instruction through online courses, and 23 had spent time learning Icelandic by themselves. Seven of the participants that reported some form of self-education had not received any form of formal instruction in Icelandic. These numbers can be seen in Chart 1.

Chart 1: Education in Icelandic (Number of participants)

The participants were given the option of selecting an age group of 18-21, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, and 71 or older. None of the participants selected the 18-21, 61-70, and 71 or older options. The age group of 21-30 was thus given the value of 1, 31-40 was given the value of the 2, 41-50 was given the value of 3, and 51-60 was given the value of 4. The average value of 2.38 (SD .87) indicates that the average age of the participants was between 30 and 40.

The total percentage of language use in and outside the participants’ home exceeded 100% as a number of the participants provided a percentage breakdown of their language exposure that
exceeded 100%. However, comparison of the percentages reported permitted a comparison of the relative language use in each context. The participants reported using their native language significantly more than Icelandic or English in their homes, with the mean displaying that the percentage amount is 63.75% for native language spoken at the participants’ home, 24.4% Icelandic and 21.3% English. Outside the participants’ home, the percentage breakdown is more even with 46% of the language contact that the participants have being in Icelandic, 35.40% being in English and 24.3% being in their native language. As seen in Table 1, the standard deviation in the participants’ language use and exposure is very high which would seem to indicate that the language use and exposure can vary greatly among the participants.

Participants were also asked about proficiency in specific situations such as being able to read books in Iceland and English, news articles in Icelandic and English, watch television material and films in Icelandic and English, and being able to listen to songs in Icelandic and English. The means for all of these situations were high and nearly equal between the languages and thus they will not be listed.

Table 1: Background information and language use in and outside the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years spent living in Iceland (length of residence)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>7.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>4.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of home context speaking Icelandic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>27.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of home context speaking English</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of home context speaking the native language</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>34.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were also asked to specify the amount of Icelandic and English that they use in various linguistic spaces. The goal here was to examine how much Icelandic is used in these linguistic spaces among those who do not have Icelandic as a native language in contrast to English. In Chart 2, we can see that the use of Icelandic in the participants’ workplace is nearly equal to the use of English in the same linguistic space. This would indicate that the participants rely on English about as much as they rely on Icelandic in their workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of contexts outside home speaking</th>
<th>Icelandic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>31.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the native language</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Icelandic and English use in various linguistic spaces
In addition to estimating the amount of Icelandic and English that they used in various linguistic spaces, the participants were asked to estimate the amount of hours they spent speaking, reading, and listening to Iceland and English on a normal day. This was done in order to gain further information about their exposure to Icelandic and English. Percentage language use was calculated by dividing the amount of hours provided by the participants with 16 as those are the estimated waking hours of the participants. Percentage language use through speaking, reading and listening to Icelandic and English can thus be seen in Chart 3.

Chart 3: Time spent speaking, reading and listening to Icelandic and English on a normal day
4. Data Analysis and Results

The questions in the survey that derive from the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (1985) were compiled into the groups or sets of variables according to the manual. Likewise, the questions regarding background information were also grouped.

4.1 Self-perceived language proficiency

The participants’ self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic and English can be seen in Table 2. The participants’ self-perceived proficiency Icelandic and English represents the sum of the participants’ ratings of comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, for Icelandic and English, respectively. The mean English proficiency score for the group was 7.44 (Standard deviation 4.18) while the corresponding score for Icelandic was 10.74 (SD 4.46). Participants rated their proficiency as very good (1) to very poor (5), therefore lower scores represent higher proficiency. The group’s mean overall proficiency in Icelandic and English was compared statistically by means of a paired samples t-test, revealing a significantly higher self-reported proficiency in English ($t_{38}$)=3.856, $p$<.000. Inspection of individual scores revealed that the overall proficiency rating was higher in English for some of the participants. Three participants reported that they had higher proficiency in English than Icelandic, while five participants reported roughly equivalent skills in the two languages. The skills of these participants in the two languages varied greatly from very high skills in both (one participant) to very low in both (two participants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in understanding Icelandic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in speaking Icelandic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in reading Icelandic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in writing Icelandic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Icelandic proficiency | 40 | 4.00 | 20.00 | 10.88 | 4.48
Proficiency in understanding English | 39 | 1 | 5 | 1.72 | 1.05
Proficiency in speaking English | 39 | 1 | 5 | 1.95 | 1.08
Proficiency in reading English | 39 | 1 | 5 | 1.72 | 1.08
Proficiency in writing in English | 39 | 1 | 5 | 2.05 | 1.19
Total English proficiency | 39 | 4.00 | 20.00 | 7.44 | 4.18

Higher numbers mean lower proficiency.

### 4.2 Proficiency groups

Four groups were established based on the participants’ self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic. The groups were formed based on the combined self-perceived proficiency of the participants, and can be seen in Table 2 as ‘Total Icelandic proficiency.’ Participants that had a score of 1-4 were placed in Group 1 (highest performers), those who had a score of 5-9 were placed in Group 2, while those who had a score of 10-14 were placed in Group 3, and those who had a score of 15-20 were placed in Group 4 (lowest performers).

After splitting the participants into groups, the mean of several other factors was calculated for each of the groups. Tables 3 and 4 show, for each performing group, the mean for age group, length of residence, the number of years spent in school, Icelandic and native language exposure at home, Icelandic and English exposure outside the home, and the participants’ perceived importance of learning Icelandic. The questions regarding the participants’ perceived importance of learning Icelandic derive from Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery and represent questions that form a learner’s combined instrumental and integrative orientation towards learning a language. The mean thus represents a total value of the number of aspects in which Icelandic is important.
There are a number of significant results that can be found in Tables 3 and 4. By looking at Groups 1 and 2, in contrast to Groups 3 and 4, we can see that participants that had higher self-perceived proficiency in Iceland also had longer length of residence and more education in terms of the number of years spent in schools. The highest performers in Group 1 were also the only group that had higher self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic than English. It is also interesting to note that the lowest performers in Group 4 spoke significantly more English outside of their home and significantly less Icelandic. Self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic and Icelandic use did not impact native language use at the participants’ homes.

We can also see that little to no connection was found between the participant groups and overall orientation towards Icelandic as the mean for that variable was nearly equal between the lowest performers and highest performers in Groups 1 and 4 respectively. It is however significantly lower among Groups 2 and 3. Orientation is examined in more detail later in this chapter.

Table 3: Proficiency groups: Background and exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Years in Iceland (length of residence)</th>
<th>Years of education</th>
<th>Icelandic exposure at home</th>
<th>Native language exposure at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>31.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>27.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4: Proficiency groups: Exposure and perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Icelandic exposure outside home</th>
<th>English exposure outside home</th>
<th>Proficiency in Icelandic</th>
<th>Proficiency in English</th>
<th>Perceived importance of learning Icelandic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Attitude towards Icelandic, English and the native language

The participants’ affective attitude toward Icelandic, English and native language was derived by averaging the 10 questions addressing each language (see questions M1 to M30). The resulting means for each language for the group are displayed in Table 5. As Table 5 reveals, scores for English were roughly four points higher than the scores for Icelandic and two points higher than those for the native language. Paired sample t-tests (2-tailed) were used to compare the attitudes towards the three languages, confirming that the attitude to English was significantly higher than the attitude to Icelandic \((t(37) = -3.128, -p<.003)\), and it was also higher than the attitude to the native language \((t(36) = 4.893, -p<.000)\). No significant difference was found between the attitude towards Icelandic and the native language \((p=.512)\).
A correlation \( (p<.0.31) \) was found between self-perceived proficiency in English and affective attitude towards Icelandic. As higher numbers on the proficiency scale (see Table 2) equal lower proficiency, and higher numbers on the affective attitude questionnaire (see Table 5) equal a more positive affective attitude towards Icelandic, the result is that those who have lower self-perceived proficiency in English have a more positive affective attitude towards Icelandic. No other significant correlations were found between self-perceived knowledge and affective attitude.

As emphasis is placed on English, the results were also calculated without the responses collected from native speakers of English. The results, as seen in Table 5, were almost identical in terms of attitudes towards Icelandic and English. However, attitude towards the native language was two points lower with the inclusion of the responses collected from native speakers of English. No significant correlations arose from omission of native speakers of English in this questionnaire.

*Table 5: Motivation/Attitude list adapted by Elín Pöll Pórðardóttir (2015). Questions M1-M30.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Icelandic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards English</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards native language</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Icelandic (No English speakers)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards English (No English speakers)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards native language (No English speakers)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘English speaker’ refers to an individual whose native language is English.
4.4 Instrumental and integrative orientation towards Icelandic and English

Numerous factors were examined through Gardner’s (1985) Motivation/Attitude Battery Test including instrumental and integrative orientation, attitude towards the Icelandic and English languages, and the affective factor. The specific factors examined are listed in Table 6. Contrary to the results collected through the questionnaire adapted by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2015) seen in Table 5, Attitudes towards the Icelandic and English languages were more even with participants showing a slightly more favourable attitude towards Icelandic than English through more agreement in positive statements and equal agreement in negative statements.

The participants’ orientation towards Icelandic and English in Iceland was tested with Gardner’s (1985) instrumental-integrative dichotomy. As we can see in Table 6, the mean for instrumental orientation towards Icelandic was 3.21 (SD 1.42) and 3.57 (SD 1.42) for English. The participants’ instrumental orientation towards English was thus significantly higher than it was towards Icelandic. Integrative orientation was however significantly higher towards Icelandic than it was English as it was 3.46 (SD 1.41) towards Icelandic and 3.04 (SD 1.40) towards English.

No significant correlation was found between instrumental/integrative orientation towards Icelandic and English and background factors such as language use, exposure and self-perceived proficiency.

The affective factor did have a high mean as it had a mean of 2.68 (SD 1.34) for Icelandic and 2.11 (SD 1.09) for English. Most of the participants did not express that they feel uncomfortable expressing themselves in Icelandic or English, and in general, do not often experience anxiety or stress in those situations.
Table 6: Attitude/Motivation Battery Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Icelandic language (positive statements)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Icelandic language (negative statements)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards English language (positive statements)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards English language (negative statements)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentally oriented to learn Icelandic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentally oriented to learn English</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integratively oriented to learn Icelandic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integratively oriented to learn English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective factor Icelandic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective factor English</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While numerous questions were asked of the participants based off Gardner’s Motivation/Attitude Test Battery, a number of similar questions were added in order to gain some specific information and views relevant to the Icelandic context in particular.

The desire for social interaction in Iceland through Icelandic or English was measured through a number of nearly identical questions in order to examine an important aspect of a person’s motivation to learn a language. Overall, the mean for a desire to socially interact with people in Icelandic, 3.92 (SD 1.05), was considerably higher than the mean for the participants’ desire to socially interact with other persons in English which was 2.26 (SD 1.11). Total desire for social interaction was also measured and ended up being slightly less than desire for social interaction in Icelandic or 2.50 (SD .58). These figures can be seen in Table 7.

A person’s opportunities in Iceland were measured through a number of questions that are somewhat similar to the ones used in Gardner’s (1985) AMTB yet they focus more heavily on the social context in Iceland, and they focus on opportunities that are specific to Iceland. The participants views toward the influence that Icelandic has on their opportunities in Iceland was considerably higher than the influence that English has on their opportunities as can be seen in Table 7.

An additional question was added in order add some support to the motivational intensity of the participants. The participants were asked how important it was to them to learn Icelandic. Overall, the mean for the question was 1.51 (SD .77) which represents great importance as higher numbers in this question equal greater importance. None of the participants selected the option of learning Icelandic being very unimportant, while only one participant selected the option of it being pretty unimportant to the participant to learn Icelandic.

Closer inspection of that participant reveals that the participant is among the lowest performers in Group 4 (see Tables 3 and 4). In addition, the participant is exposed to Icelandic for at least five hours on a normal day, yet does not speak Icelandic at all. The participant had not received any instruction in the language despite having lived in Iceland for almost two years. Instrumental orientation, integrative orientation, and affective attitude also had very low means for the participant. The participant did not agree with the statement that it is necessary to learn Icelandic.
in order to become a part of Icelandic society (MA31), and also did not agree with the statement that it is better to learn Icelandic rather than English in order to get a job in Iceland (MA33). It is thus a result in and of itself that not all residents in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic believe that it is important to learn Icelandic.

Table 7: Groupings for the Icelandic context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Groupings for the Icelandic context</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire for social interaction in Icelandic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for social interaction in English</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total desire for social interaction</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic language influence on a person’s opportunities in Iceland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language influence on a person’s opportunities in Iceland</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is learning Icelandic to you? (Lower number means increased importance)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of questions were also posed to the participants that examine their views towards the language environment in Iceland. Questions MA10, MA31, MA32, MA33 and MA36 (see Appendix B) were used. The questions were placed in a rank order that can be seen in Table 8, and their means were calculated. The high mean values of questions MA31 and MA33 would seem to indicate a positive attitude toward learning Icelandic, in both a instrumental and integrative capacity. Those means also indicate that it is important to the participants in general to learn Icelandic. Likewise, question MA32 would indicate that the participants feel that learning Icelandic is more important than learning English in Iceland. No significant correlations were found between the answers to these questions and other variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA31: “Learning Icelandic is necessary to be a part of Icelandic society.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA33: “It is better to learn Icelandic rather than English in order to get a job in Iceland.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA36: “If English was not spoken so much in Iceland I would have an easier time learning Icelandic.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA12: “I think it is enough to learn either Icelandic or English if you live in Iceland.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA32: “I prefer learning English rather than Icelandic.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Survey open-ended comments

At the end of the questionnaire, the participants were offered a chance to express their opinions on the subject of the study or the survey itself. Eleven participants chose to write a comment on either the survey itself or the subject of the study. The comments can be found in Appendix C. Two of the participants voiced their opinion about how the study could be improved while three of the participants stated that they wished to improve their proficiency in Icelandic, with one providing some additional background on his or her competence in Icelandic and English. Another two participants wished the researchers good luck with the study, with one adding that it
would also be interesting to examine the role that children play in their parents’ motivation to learn Icelandic.

Three of the participants wrote comments that address the opportunities for learning Icelandic in Iceland. One participant made a point about how Icelandic is taught in classes in Iceland. The participant mentioned that the Icelandic classes that the participant attended were taught in English, and that the instruction being English was not helpful as the participant’s native language was Spanish. The participant referred to this as a “double problem” which likely means that the participant was attempting to learn a language that he or she did not understand through another language that he or she did not understand either. This presented the learner with the difficult task of learning a language without aid from an instructor in his or her native language, and may have affected the learner’s motivation to learn the target language.

Another participant wrote a comment about how persons with a foreign background face a ‘glass wall’ in Icelandic society regardless of whether or not they have reached a high level of fluency in Icelandic. The reasons provided were that the participant reported having experienced a level of prejudice towards immigrants and people with a foreign background. The participant also referred to having encountered a level of nepotism in Icelandic society. The response seems to reflect a positive attitude towards the Icelandic language but a somewhat negative attitude towards the language environment, or at least certain linguistic spaces within the language environment.

Finally, one participant stated that people who move to Iceland should be required to learn Icelandic, respect the country’s culture and traditions, and that interpreters should only be provided during the first few years of living in Iceland.
5. Discussion

It was unfortunate that the group of participants in the study was limited in size and variance. While it was regrettable that only 42 persons participated out of the 105 that had originally signed up for the study, it was also unfortunate that the target group of individuals was not reached. While the primary target group in the study were individuals who reside in Iceland yet have a native language other than Icelandic, the secondary target group within the study included individuals who fit the same criteria as the primary target group yet also are unable to communicate effectively in either Icelandic or English. Much effort was thus placed into recruiting translators, translating both the invitations and survey, and reaching individuals who may live on the fringes of Icelandic society. Evidence for the existence of this group was attained through personal conversations with various school personnel through the city of Reykjavík that indicated that most schools if not all schools in the city hire translators for parent-student interviews every year. It is also no secret that in various societies around the world there are individuals who live on the fringes of the those societies. Those individuals may be unable to communicate in the language of those societies as a result of their societal position or their position may be a consequence of their inability to communicate in the language of the society in question. Regardless, attempts were made to reach individuals who may be unable to communicate in either Icelandic or English, but few individuals were reached that fit that criterion. That may however be a result of the small size of the overall participant pool in the study as only 42 persons participated in the study.

One of the results of the study was thus that it is difficult to find adults in Iceland with a foreign background to participate in a study that examines second language learning and acquisition. Despite the fact that over 2,000 persons received an invitation, and most of them in a language that they can understand, only 105 persons agreed to receive the survey via e-mail or mail. Out of those 105 persons, 42 participated in the study by completing or partially filling out the survey. Based on number of immigrants and persons with a foreign background that participated in the study, it is safe to say that it is difficult to reach the primary target group of the study. Reaching out to the secondary target group of individuals who lack proficiency in both Icelandic and English was even more difficult, and only a handful of persons participated that could fit that
It is difficult to explain why reaching out to this particular group of individuals is so difficult. The method that was used in the administration of the study to invite persons to participate ensured that a wide group of persons was reached as over 2,000 persons were presented with an invitation to participate, and the ones that are incapable of communicating in Icelandic and English were presented with the invitation in their own language. Those who could not read the invitation during the parent-student interviews received an explanation by translators present during the interview, and hundreds of parents received an invitation in their own language. The reason as to why participation was so low among persons who lack proficiency in Icelandic and English remains somewhat ambiguous. There may however be a link between participating in studies such as this one and the pursuit of instruction in a language. Persons may be uncomfortable with participation for a number of social or psychological reasons. Regardless, this study does not present much useful information regarding the motivations and attitudes of persons whose proficiency in Icelandic and English is low.

Interesting results were however gathered through the survey despite the limitations of the sample. In regards to the first research question of how the status of English in Iceland as a lingua franca may impact a person’s motivation and attitude towards learning Icelandic, some interesting results were found. In general, the participants had a significantly more positive affective attitude towards English than Icelandic and their native language as we can see in Table 5. In addition to that, the participants instrumental orientation was significantly higher towards English than it was towards Icelandic as we can see in Table 6. These numbers would seem to indicate that the participants value English above Icelandic in at least some regard. While we cannot directly the participants’ level of motivation towards pursuing an education in Icelandic, we can examine attitude towards English and usage of the language in contrast to Icelandic.

After the participants were split into groups based on proficiency, it became immediately clear that higher performing groups used significantly more Icelandic and significantly less English. We can couple this result with one of the more interesting results of the study which was that participants who had lower self-perceived proficiency in the English language had a more positive affective attitude towards Icelandic. This was established through a correlation (p=<.0.31) between the participants’ self-perceived proficiency of the Icelandic language and the
affective attitude questionnaire by Elín Þöll Þórðardóttir (2015). With the added result of length of residence being an important factor in higher performing groups, we can arrive at the conclusion that English is very important to persons who do not have Icelandic as a native language and have not resided in Icelandic for at least a decade. This is further supported with the omission of native English speakers from the calculations. A very positive affective attitude is thus developed towards English due to its importance in the lives of aforementioned individuals. The importance of English in the lives of the participants is highlighted through the amount that the participants use it in outside of their homes, particularly in the workplace (see Tables 1 and 4; Chart 2), and through studies that have shown that English has become an integral part of multiple areas in Icelandic society (see Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir 2011, 2015; Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir & Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, 2018).

Gardner’s (1985) instrumental and integrative dichotomy revealed some interesting information regarding the orientation of the participants in the study towards Icelandic and English in Iceland. The results of the questionnaire used from the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery to examine the participants’ instrumental and integrative motivation towards learning Icelandic and English revealed that the participants were more integratively oriented toward learning Icelandic but more instrumentally oriented toward learning English (see Table 6). This would seem to indicate that the participants feel that in order to become a part of Icelandic society, it is important to learn Icelandic. This is further supported in as we can see in Table 7 that the participants had a significantly greater desire to socially interact in Icelandic. However, the fact that the participants were more instrumentally oriented toward learning English would indicate that learning English is more important for utilitarian purposes in Iceland, which is contrary to the results in Table 7 which indicate that Icelandic has a greater influence on a person’s opportunities in Iceland. It is also important to mention that the instrumental orientation questionnaire from the AMTB has generally tested poorly in reliability, even reaching a mean reliability of 0.57 (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 125; Gardner, 1985). It was used regardless as it presents the other half of the instrumental-integrative dichotomy, and fits the notion of English fulfilling a utilitarian role as a lingua franca in particular linguistic spaces. Results regarding the instrumental portion of the instrumental-integrative dichotomy were thus somewhat inconclusive. Regardless, the answer to the second research question would be that persons
whose native language is not Icelandic believe that Icelandic plays an important role in integrating into Icelandic society.

A number of questions and groupings of questions were created for the purposes of this study with the intention of supporting the results found through Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir’s questionnaire and Gardner’s questionnaires from the AMTB (1985). These questions had however not been tested for reliability aside from some minor pilot testing by selected students at the University of Iceland. The questions were highly influenced by the instrumental-integrative dichotomy yet they were not borrowed from Gardner’s AMTB. The participants’ desire for social interaction in the languages was for instance measured with some emphasis being placed on whether the participants’ had a desire for social interaction in general. Overall, the mean for social interaction in Icelandic was considerably higher than the mean for social interaction in English. This could indicate a number of different scenarios. The participants could be interested in communicating more in Icelandic as a result of their proficiency. There is a chance that they desire to communicate in Icelandic as they are interested in integrating into Icelandic society, or perhaps they just wish to interact with people in this country out of some intrinsic desire. However, the results seen in Table 7 clearly point toward a more favourable attitude towards Icelandic than English in terms of the participants’ social interaction in Iceland. The participants’ views on the influence that Icelandic and English have on a person’s opportunities in Iceland were also measured through questions created for this study. The participants’ responses indicated that they believe that Icelandic has slightly more influence on a person’s opportunities in the country. The fact that the official language of a country, and a foreign language that functions as a lingua franca, present an immigrant or a person with a foreign background with relatively the same amount of opportunities is an interesting result.

As was stated before and in response to the third research question, some interesting results were found in regards to the participants’ affective attitude towards Icelandic and English. Results regarding the participants’ attitudes towards Icelandic and English in Iceland were somewhat inconclusive as a whole due to the fact that the two questionnaires used to evaluate attitudes toward the languages did not produce similar results. There are however some results that we can draw from the two lists separately. The primary difference in the items used was that the
questions from Gardner’s (1985) AMTB included both positive and negative statements, and they were more focused on practical concerns such as having time to pursue an education in Icelandic or English. The items in Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir’s (2015) questionnaire examined the participants’ affective attitude towards learning Icelandic and English. In general, the participants’ views toward learning Icelandic and English, and toward Icelandic and English in general, were fairly positive. Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir’s (2015) affective attitude questionnaire indicated that the participants had a significantly more positive affective attitude toward English, even after the responses from native English speakers were omitted. The fact that the participants had a more favourable affective attitude towards English than Icelandic and their native language is extremely strange, especially after the answers from native English speakers were omitted. While it would be interesting to tie this result to the spread of English as a lingua franca in the Western World, this cannot be done without more qualitative information about the participants’ views towards the languages. Gardner’s questionnaire, however, indicated that the attitudes toward the languages were considerably more even, in both the positive statements and the negative statements, with the participants having a slightly more favourable attitude towards Icelandic. The overall result from these lists is that attitude towards the Icelandic language is, overall, not significantly higher than the attitude towards a lingua franca found in various linguistic spaces in the country.

An important idea during the planning of the study was to evaluate the role that ethnolinguistic groups play in learning Icelandic and English. However, due to the low number of participants in the study, this was not possible, and thus no answer is provided for the fourth research question.

A number of background factors were calculated alongside the attitudes and orientations of the participants. In response to the fifth and final research question, no significant correlation was found between background factors and the attitudes of the participants, with the exception of self-perceived proficiency. As we can see in Tables 3 and 4, participants in the higher performing groups had resided in Iceland for longer and had received more overall education. We can also see that participants who were more proficient in Iceland also used more Icelandic at home. However, increased Icelandic use at home could be a result of increased proficiency in Icelandic rather than the other way around. Little connection was made between orientation and
proficiency in those calculations. However, as was previously mentioned, a significant correlation was found between a positive affective attitude towards Icelandic and low self-perceived proficiency in English.

Motivation will always remain a fairly ambiguous and abstract term, and this is evidenced through the volume of definitions surrounding the term. By drawing upon the number of factors examined in this study, through the Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery and Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir’s (2015) affective attitude questionnaire, we cannot surmise the exact role that motivation plays in learning Icelandic and English, but we can put forth notions about the role that motivation plays from the information gathered in this study. The results of this study provide a valuable insight into the attitudes and orientations of second language learners of Icelandic in Iceland, and why they perceive it is important to learn Icelandic, as well as English. Questions from the instrumental-integrative dichotomy would on one hand support the notion that persons in Iceland, whose native language is not Icelandic, are generally more motivated to learn Icelandic for reasons that relate to integration rather than for utilitarian purposes. And on the other hand, the dichotomy would support the notion that the aforementioned individuals are more motivated to continue using English for utilitarian purposes due to its strong presence in Icelandic society.

5.1 Limitations of the study

In addition to the limited number of participants in the study, there were questions that ideally should have been included in the survey, and those would, for instance, be questions regarding the participant’s intentions and willingness to live in Iceland. A person’s intention and willingness to remain in the country could have a significant impact on their motivation to learn Icelandic, and it would be interesting to see if it would also impact their motivation to learn English. Questions regarding a person’s desire to live in Iceland would add further context to a person’s attitude towards the environment. Despite the fact that some of the questions refer to a person’s current motivation to learn Icelandic and English, many of the questions do refer to a person’s experience living in Icelandic society through general statements about the usefulness of learning Icelandic. Those questions about general attitude toward learning Icelandic in Iceland
are thus not as impacted by this oversight. It is also possible that participants may voice their intention of leaving Iceland in the final question in the questionnaire as it offers the participants a chance to openly express themselves about their views toward learning Icelandic and English in Iceland.

While there is a good amount of quantitative information available about the use of English in Iceland, there is a considerable lack of quantitative and qualitative information needed to determine the role of English as a lingua franca in linguistic spaces in Iceland. Thus, one of the limitations of the study is the quality of information available about the role that ELF plays in the various linguistic spaces that the participants are in. The study did shed some light on the participants’ language use within these spaces but more qualitative information, perhaps through interviews, is needed to fully understand the nature of these linguistic spaces. Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) state that it is important for traditional quantitative research methodologies to be complemented by qualitative methodologies (p. IX). This mixture of quantitative and qualitative methodologies is often referred to as mixed method research, and this type of methodology is currently needed to examine the role of English as a lingua franca in Iceland across multiple linguistic spaces.

Since all of the participants in the study are presumed to be parents, a follow-up study that examines the motivation of adults without children would certainly either strengthen or weaken the notion that parents are motivated to learn a second language as a result of their children having learned the language. The study was thus somewhat limited in regards to the fact that nearly all of the participants in the study were parents.
6. Conclusion

This study produced some interesting results in regards to the attitudes and orientations of persons in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic. The participants were more integratively oriented towards learning Icelandic, but also more instrumentally oriented towards English. Participants had a more positive affective attitude toward English overall, but participants that had a more positive affective attitude toward Icelandic also had lower self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic. Overall, participants that had higher self-perceived proficiency in Icelandic were more educated and had resided in Iceland for longer. The study revealed that English appear to play a very dominant role in the lives of persons in Iceland who do not have Icelandic as a native language, but this role is decreased over time as people reside in the country for longer.

A follow-up study with a larger group of participants would further support the results of this study for a number of reasons. It is apparent that a significantly larger sample is needed for a study of this scale due to the sheer number of variables. While a larger and broader sample would provide a greater overview in regards to the variables in the study, further amendments to the study itself can be made to produce more accurate results. While using self-perceived proficiency is relatively convenient for a number of reasons, testing actual proficiency would undoubtedly produce more interesting results. In addition, a more qualitative approach to understanding the motivations and attitudes of immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland in terms of learning Icelandic as a second language could provide information that cannot be accumulated through a questionnaire.

As was discussed in the review of the literature, the increase in the number of immigrants and persons with a foreign background in Iceland is a relatively recent increase. Many of these individuals have children that are growing up in Iceland and are in Icelandic compulsory schools. Dominant exposure to the native language at home and frequent exposure to the English language outside of the home is bound to result in a lack of exposure to Icelandic (Elín Þóll Þórðardóttir, 2018). In the future, it would be interesting to conduct a study like this for these coming generations to examine whether their attitudes and orientations towards the Icelandic and
English languages differ from the preceding generations that are being tested in this study and have not gone through Icelandic compulsory schools. If there anything apparent from the results of this study and studies that have been conducted on the same subject, it is that English plays multiple significant roles in Iceland, and among those roles is its prevalent role as a lingua franca for persons in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic. Whether or not future generations of second language speakers of Icelandic will also rely heavily on English is an important question.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Invitation to participate

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in an online study focusing on the language use of adult individuals living in Iceland whose native language is not Icelandic. You are invited to participate because you have a native language that is not Icelandic.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and is intended for individuals who are at least eighteen years old. Whether you participate or not has no impact on your child’s programming in school. All information collected in the study will be kept strictly confidential.

The study is a part of a larger investigation focusing on Icelandic and English learning in Iceland by Dr. Elin Thordardottir. This part of the study is a part of the Master’s thesis research of Birkir Már Viðarsson (University of Iceland), conducted under the supervision of Dr. Elin Thordardottir, professor at McGill University, Canada and lecturer at the University of Iceland.

You can take a photo of the attached sheet and send it to us in order to receive the study via e-mail. You can also leave it at the office of your child’s school where it will be collected by researchers. By filling out your name and contact information on the attached sheet and leaving it with school personnel, you give your consent for this information to be given to the researchers who will then contact you by e-mail. You are free to decide later whether you will participate in the study after receiving the e-mail. No information other than the attached sheet will be shared between the researchers and the school. If you wish to participate but do not have access to a computer, you can contact the project manager, Birkir Már Viðarsson at 849-8430.
By signing this sheet, I give school personnel permission to hand this sheet to the researchers responsible for the study.

Nafnið mitt/My name: ____________________________

Netfangið mitt/My e-mail address: ____________________________

Móðurmálið mitt/My native language: ____________________________

I would be able to answer the survey in the following language/s:

☐ Íslenska/Icelandic

☐ Enska/English

☐ Móðurmál/Native language

In order to receive the online survey, either bring this sheet to the office of your child’s school or take a photo of it and send it to bmv9@hi.is.
Appendix B: Survey questionnaires

The questionnaires for this survey are printed separately and accompany the printed version of this paper. An electronic version can be obtained by e-mailing the author at bmv9@hi.is.
Appendix C: Survey comments

79: Los cursos o estudios que se hagan para aprender islandés los expliquen en español. Encontramos que el islandés lo explican en ingles y es doble problema para los que hablamos sólo español un saludo y gracias

   Translation: The courses or studies that are done to learn Icelandic are explained in Spanish. We found out that the Icelandic language is explained in English and it is a double problem for those of us who speak only Spanish. A greeting and thanks

61: Það tekur mörg ár að læra íslensku fyrir mig stundum erfitt að segja rétt orð en ég get bjarga mér og ekki gefast upp að læra ????????

59: Sumar spurningar koma tvisvar. Í fyrsta þáttinn er kvarðinn 1-5 stundum í einni átt (1 = lítið, 5 = mikið) og stundum öfugt (5 = mikið, 5 = lítið) sem er ruglingslegt, sérstaklega þegar leiðbeiningar koma undir spurningar. Hef þurft að fara til baka til að leiðrétta svörin mín.

77: Очень важно находиться в исландском обществе и практиковать язык. Очень печально, что английский язык вытесняет исландский. Все, кто приезжает в Исландию, обязаны учить исландский язык, уважать культуру и традиции этой маленькой и прекрасной страны. Переводчик должен предоставляться только на первых годах жизни в Исландии, дальше люди должны учиться сами понимать или оплачивать переводчика сами.

   Translation: It is very important to be in Icelandic society and practice the language. It is very sad that Icelandic language supplants English. Everyone who comes to Iceland is required to learn the Icelandic language, to respect the culture and traditions of this small and beautiful country. The interpreter should be provided only at the first years of life in Iceland, then people should learn to understand or pay for the interpreter themselves.
87: Það eru kanski fleiri en ég sem lærði íslensku með því að tala og lesa og vinna, ekki gegnum neinum námskeiðum né bókaserium eða neitt svoleiðis en i helst gegnum felagslega hliðina í lífinu. Kanski væri ágætt að hafa þann valmöguleiki líka þar sem er spurt hvernig fólk hefur lært íslensku.

55: I need More learn Icelandic

82: I think a foreigner faces a "glass wall" when you have reached a high level of fluency in Icelandic, you still cannot get the jobs that equal you level of education. I think this is the problem with highly educated people here. There are plenty of jobs in afternoon clubs and nurseries and restaurants, but when you try to get a job on higher level it is always given to an Icelandic candidate. Additionally, corruption is very high in Iceland and being someone's relative goes above the real skills or papers what the person has. Icelandic people have their friends since high school and are not very open to get to know foreigners. Even though I love to learn Icelandic and I use it always everywhere, I feel frustrated about the attitudes of people here. Local people think that Iceland is a paradise and each foreigner should be just thankful being here, despite what level of their education is, they should be happy with low-paid jobs.

40: Þetta er mikilvæg könnun og mér þætti vænt um að vera upplýst um niðurstöður hennar. Það hefi verið áhugavert að þæta spurningum um móðurmál barnanna sem alast upp í fjölskyldum - en þau eru mikilvægur hluti af hvatningu fullorðins fólk að tala móðurmál / læra íslensku.

60: I hope this is useful and all the best with the survey.

47: Im a bad person for learn languages, because hard for me learn it and i dont enjoy learn languages. I like languages more in an historical or antropologic way, in that way Icelandic is very precious in my point of view, more precius than my own language for example. I like how it sounds too. My english is ok but i get better during my volunteer work in Romania.

80: Several thoughts: 1) it was unclear whether as an English-speaker, I was only supposed to answer questions directed towards learning/speaking/understanding ICELANDIC--not the ones
regarding English 2) the meaning of the values on your scales (in part 2?) abruptly switched from 1 being lowest to 1 being highest -- this causes confusion and makes your data less conclusive on those points. 3) in the last section, the wording of negative questions like "There is no better language to learn than Icelandic" causes confusion when paired with Agree/Disagree choices--you get double-negatives: " ' not a better' plus 'strongly DISagree' equals means there IS a better...?!!"