

Motivation

Emu Ushioda and Zoltán Dörnyei

Historical discussion

Motivation has been a major research topic within second language acquisition (SLA) for over five decades, ever since it became recognized as an important internal cause of variability in language learning success. Of course, the study of motivation in general has a much longer history across the broader disciplines of mainstream and educational psychology. Second language (L2) motivation research has evolved somewhat independently, however, originating in a concern to address the unique social, psychological, behavioral, and cultural complexities that acquiring a new communication code entails. Over the years, the field has evolved through successive phases reflecting increasing degrees of integration with developments in mainstream motivational psychology, while retaining a sharp focus on aspects of motivation unique to language learning. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) have identified these phases as follows:

- The *social-psychological period* (1959–1990), characterized by the work of Robert Gardner and his associates in Canada
- The *cognitive-situated period* (during the 1990s), characterized by work drawing on cognitive theories in educational psychology
- The *process-oriented period* (turn of the century), characterized by a focus on motivational change
- The *socio-dynamic period* (current), characterized by a concern with dynamic systems and contextual interactions.

L2 motivation research owes its origins to two Canadian social psychologists, Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert, who conducted a series of studies investigating language learning attitudes and motivation dating back to 1959, and published a collective report in 1972 that was to prove seminal in shaping this research area for the next two decades. Gardner and Lambert (1972) theorized that motivation was a significant cause of variability in SLA, and that its effect was independent of ability or aptitude. They speculated moreover that SLA had important social and psychological dimensions which distinguished the motivation to learn a second language from other types of learning motivation, since learners are expected not simply to acquire knowledge of the language but to identify with the target language community and adopt their distinctive speech behaviors and styles. Individuals' attitudes toward the target language community, as well as their ethnocentric orientation in general, were hypothesized to exert a directive influence on their L2 learning behavior, which led Gardner and Lambert (1972) to propose two kinds of motivational orientation in language learning: an *integrative* orientation “reflecting a sincere and

personal interest in the people and culture represented by the other group”; and an *instrumental* orientation “reflecting the practical value and advantages of learning a new language” (p. 132).

Founded in the bilingual social context of Canada, L2 motivation research thus originated in a *social-psychological* framework implicating the social context of SLA and attitudes and relations between different communities. This social perspective sharply differentiated L2 motivation research from the individual-cognitive perspectives then dominating mainstream motivational psychology, and as Dörnyei (2005) comments, was radically ahead of its time since socio-contextual perspectives did not really begin to inform motivation research in mainstream psychology until the 1990s (p. 67). Through the 1970s and 1980s, Gardner and Lambert’s theory and later models developed by Gardner and his associates generated a wealth of empirical investigation in Canada and beyond (see e.g., Gardner, 1985; Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993).

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, however, there was a sense that the social-psychological line of inquiry had run its course and that alternative research perspectives were needed to complement the existing findings and thus widen the horizon of L2 motivation research. This view was voiced independently by a number of scholars at the turn of the decade (e.g., Brown, 1990; Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Julkunen, 1989; Skehan, 1989), and prompted a series of discussion papers published in *The Modern Language Journal* in 1994 on broadening the research agenda (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994a, b; Gardner and Tremblay, 1994; Oxford and Shearin, 1994). These discussions marked a shift toward what Dörnyei (2005) has called the *cognitive-situated period* of L2 research. This period was characterized by two interrelated trends: (a) the need to bring L2 motivation research in line with *cognitive* theories in mainstream motivational psychology, and (b) the desire to move from the broad macro perspective of ethnolinguistic communities and learners’ general dispositions to L2 learning to a more *situated* analysis of motivation in specific learning settings (e.g., classrooms). Essentially, the cognitive-situated period entailed focusing more on motivation in L2 instructional contexts, integrating cognitive motivation concepts from the education field (e.g., intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, attributions) and developing more extensive theoretical frameworks (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994a; Williams and Burden, 1997), yet without discarding social-psychological perspectives altogether.

With this more situated analysis of motivation in the classroom setting, attention was also drawn to the unstable nature of motivation during the learning process, whether during engagement in a task, through successive lessons, or across the broader time span of a course of study. Analyzing the temporal structure of motivation has always been a challenge in mainstream motivational psychology, since motivation research has typically relied on theoretical models and corresponding research designs that attempt to measure motivation at a particular point in time and investigate relationships with other variables such as achievement or performance. These approaches do not lend themselves to investigating the complex ebb and flow of motivation. Such snapshot approaches have also dominated L2 motivation research, and it is only relatively recently that we have begun to address temporal perspectives and adopt more *process-oriented* approaches to the analysis of L2 motivation (e.g., Dörnyei, 2002; Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998; Shoaib and Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 1996a, 2001; Williams and Burden, 1997). In this connection, a basic first step in analyzing motivation from a temporal perspective is to clarify the conceptual distinction between motivation to engage in L2 learning (choices, reasons, goals, decisions), and motivation during engagement (how one feels, behaves, and responds during the process of learning). Dörnyei and Ottó’s (1998; see also Dörnyei, 2000, 2001b) process model represents the most elaborate attempt to date to delineate the temporal structure of L2 motivation, which it divides into pre-actional (choice motivation), actional (executive motivation), and post-actional (evaluation) phases, each shaped by various internal and contextual motivational influences and regulatory mechanisms. These influences and mechanisms can be enhancing (e.g., sense of self-efficacy, positive teacher

feedback), or inhibiting (e.g., competitive pressures, distracting influences), depending on whether they contribute to successful implementation of the goal or dampen the actor's endeavor.

The process model of L2 motivation has two key shortcomings: (a) it assumes that we can define clearly when a learning process begins and ends; (b) it assumes that the actional process occurs in relative isolation, without interference from other actional processes in which the learner may be simultaneously engaged. These shortcomings in fact reflect limitations of most approaches to motivation in SLA to date, which, in the effort to identify explanatory linear models, have not taken adequate account of the dynamic and situated complexity of the learning process or the multiple goals and agendas shaping learner behavior. Within the past decade or so in the broader field of mainstream motivational psychology, there has been a move toward more dynamic contextual paradigms for the analysis of motivation (e.g., Järvelä, 2001), where the relationship between individuals and context is conceived of in terms of complex and dynamic organic systems emerging and evolving over time. Such perspectives have also begun to influence thinking in the L2 motivation field, heralding a shift to the current new *socio-dynamic* phase. This phase is characterized by a focus on the situated complexity of the L2 motivation process and its organic development in interaction with a multiplicity of internal, social, and contextual factors—that is, a move toward relational or dynamic systems perspectives on motivation (e.g., Dörnyei, 2009a; Ushioda, 2009); and characterized by a concern to theorize L2 motivation in ways that take account of the broader complexities of language learning and language use in the modern globalized world—that is, by reframing L2 motivation in the context of contemporary theories of self and identity (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009a).

It should be noted that complexity theory and dynamic systems perspectives have also begun to pervade discussions across the wider field of SLA (e.g., Ellis and Larsen-Freeman, 2009; Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, 2008a; see also Larsen-Freeman, Chapter 5, this volume). In this regard, the current socio-dynamic phase may represent a period when motivation research contributes to the development of major lines of thinking within SLA. Surprisingly perhaps, this kind of integration of motivation research with the more dominant linguistic traditions that prevail in SLA has been slow in coming. As Dörnyei (2003) comments, motivation research has endured a somewhat isolated and marginalized position within SLA, largely because it has had rather little to say about how the psychology of motivation relates to the actual processes and intricacies of linguistic development, which are the major emphasis in SLA, regardless of the theoretical motivation. The analysis of motivation and its role in SLA has largely been at the level of global learning outcomes or measures of proficiency. Thus while motivation is recognized as a prerequisite for SLA to take place, the relevance of motivation research to understanding the finer detail of how SLA happens has been rather unclear. Despite the moves toward more cognitive-situated and then process-oriented approaches, L2 motivation research has not really succeeded in bridging the gap between psychological and linguistic perspectives in SLA. It will be interesting to see if the current socio-dynamic phase brings about a real change in this respect.

Core issues

Throughout the history of L2 motivation research to date, a central preoccupation has been to develop a theoretical analysis of motivation and its role in SLA. Until the 1990s, the theoretical concept that prevailed was a social-psychological construct, composed of three motivation components (motivational intensity, desire to learn the language, attitudes toward learning the language); and motivational antecedents comprising orientations (i.e., integrative or instrumental reasons for learning) and attitudinal factors (interest in foreign languages, attitudes toward the target language community, attitudes toward the L2 learning situation) (for detailed discussion,

see Gardner, 1985, pp. 146–150). In short, the social-psychological tradition established a rigorously articulated analysis of L2 motivation, which distinguished between motivation per se (encapsulating effort, desire, and positive affect toward learning the language) and its social-psychological determinants (orientations and attitudes). While Gardner and Lambert's (1972) original model predicted direct causal links between orientations, attitudes, and L2 proficiency, Gardner's later conceptualization hypothesized that this association was mediated by motivation (Gardner, 1985, p. 150). Empirical investigations largely confirmed this analysis, as well as the independence of motivation and aptitude as causal variables influencing L2 achievement (Gardner, 1985; Masgoret and Gardner, 2003).

Research findings also pointed to the prevalence and significance of a particular constellation of attitudinal-motivational variables reflecting integrative motivation—that is, a combination of integrative orientation, positive attitudes, and motivation, providing empirical support for Gardner's (1985) key claim that L2 motivation “always has an integrativeness component,” since even when motivation is instrumental “this has associated with it some level of willingness to interact with other communities” (p. 168). Undoubtedly this claim represents the core issue to emerge from the social-psychological analysis of L2 motivation, provoking critical questions about the nature of integrative motivation, its strong or weak forms (i.e., whether it expresses a desire to identify and integrate with the target language community, or simply positive attitudes and interest), its generalizability and relevance to foreign language (FL) versus L2 learning settings, and its conceptual distinctiveness from instrumental motivation or other possible kinds of motivational orientation (e.g., Clément and Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1990; McDonough, 1981).

As the analysis of L2 motivation moved beyond social-psychological perspectives through the 1990s, the integrative and instrumental dimensions of L2 motivation continued to be recognized as important in determining basic learning goals and language choice, but insufficient to explain the processes of motivation shaping engagement in learning, particularly in formal classroom contexts. Intrinsic and extrinsic orientations gained theoretical prominence as motivation concepts more relevant to the analysis of classroom language learning, and more directly amenable to pedagogical influence and to internal as well as external regulation (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994a; Noels, 2001; Ushioda, 1996b; Williams and Burden, 1997). Dörnyei's (1994a) expanded framework analysed L2 motivation in terms of three levels: the *language level* (integrative and instrumental motivational subsystems), the *learner level* (individual motivational characteristics), and the *learning situation level* (situation-specific motives relating to the course and social learning environment). Core issues during the cognitive-situated and process-oriented periods increasingly turned to practical questions of how motivation might be initiated, influenced, supported, or sustained. Attention thus focused on the interaction between the learning situation (e.g., instructional techniques, classroom environment, interpersonal relations), and individual motivational cognitions and behaviors (e.g., goals, attitudes, beliefs, processing of experience, self-regulatory strategies) (Dörnyei, 2002; Dörnyei and Tseng, 2009).

From a conceptual point of view, this interactional focus considerably complicates the analysis of motivation, since its theoretical boundaries are seen to extend beyond the individual to embrace the dynamic interaction between the individual and the social learning environment. A key issue now emerging is how to integrate the individual and context in the analysis of motivation (for a recent overview of the challenging nature of this task, see Dörnyei, 2009d). This issue mirrors similar theoretical concerns in contemporary mainstream motivational psychology, and also reflects broader debates within the SLA field concerning cognitive-psycholinguistic versus social-contextual perspectives on language learning (e.g., Lafford, 2007; Zuengler and Miller, 2006). Where the analysis of motivation is concerned, a further issue is the difficulty of isolating “motivation” (traditionally classified as an affective variable and individual difference

characteristic—e.g., Skehan, 1989) from the range of cognitive and emotional processes that interact with one another (and the social environment) to shape engagement in learning. Addressing these issues, Dörnyei (2009a) has recently argued against an individual difference approach to motivation in favor of a dynamic systems framework. Dynamic systems approaches concern the behavior of complex systems that contain multiple interconnected components, where development is characterized by non-linear growth as systems adapt and evolve organically in response to contextual processes and in ways that contribute to shaping context. As Dörnyei (2009a, d) argues, this dynamic systems perspective on SLA processes renders the notion of discrete individual difference variables (such as motivation) rather meaningless, since processes of motivation, cognition, and emotion and their constituent components continuously interact with one another and the developing context, thereby changing and causing change, as the system as a whole restructures, adapts, and evolves. As noted above, complex systems perspectives have also begun to influence thinking across the wider field of SLA (see Larsen-Freeman, Chapter 5, this volume), and it seems likely that a dynamic systems approach to the analysis of motivation will entail much closer integration with other dimensions of SLA than hitherto, given that the focus is across evolving systems of interacting internal and contextual factors shaping engagement in SLA, and given the need to consider the processes of human agency and intentionality that are fundamental to the interactions between individual and context (Sealey and Carter, 2004). However, a key challenge will be to develop workable research designs and analytical tools to investigate such systems in a coherent way (see Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, 2008b).

Returning to the social-psychological dimensions of L2 motivation, the integrative/instrumental motivation concepts have maintained their enduring influence on theorizing about why people learn languages or choose particular languages to learn. Since the turn of the century, however, growing discussions about the global spread of English have provoked a new critical issue in the analysis of integrative motivation. A basic question we have begun to ask is whether it is meaningful to talk about integrative motivation in the case of English as target language, given the status of English as a global language, an international lingua franca, and a basic educational skill in more and more educational curricula. One response has been to broaden the target reference group from a specific geographical community of speakers to a global community, transmuted the notion of integrative motivation to a generalized international outlook or what Yashima (2002) has called “international posture.” However, as Ushioda (2006) asks: Precisely because it is a global community, is it meaningful to conceptualize it as an external reference group, or as part of one’s internal representation of oneself as a *de facto* member of that global community? (p. 150). This shift in focus from an external reference group to the internal domain of self and identity represents a significant development in current L2 motivation theory, and was prompted in large part by the findings of a major longitudinal survey of Hungarian students’ language learning motivation (Dörnyei and Csizér, 2002; Dörnyei *et al.*, 2006). Commenting on the salience and multifaceted composition of an integrative motivation factor in their data, Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) speculated that the process of identification theorized to underpin integrativeness might be better explained as an internal process of identification within the person’s self-concept (p. 453).

Based on these findings, Dörnyei (2005, 2009b) has drawn on the psychological theory of “possible selves” (Markus and Nurius, 1986) and developed a new conceptualization of the “L2 Motivational Self System” centered on people’s vision of themselves in the future. Its central concept is the *ideal self*, signifying the attributes that one would ideally like to possess (i.e., a representation of personal hopes, aspirations, or wishes). A complementary concept is the *ought-to self*, signifying the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., a representation of someone else’s sense of duty, obligations, or responsibilities). A basic tenet is that if proficiency in the target language is integral to one’s *ideal* or *ought-to self*, this will serve as a powerful motivator

to learn the language because of our psychological desire to reduce the discrepancy between current and future self states. Key issues for analysis and empirical investigation concern how such self images develop and evolve in interaction with the complex constellations of internal and contextual processes shaping engagement in learning, represented as a third component (L2 learning experience) in the L2 Motivational Self System, and thus relating back to the dynamic systems perspectives discussed above.

Data and common elicitation measures

As an abstract, multifaceted construct subject to various internal, contextual and temporal processes, motivation is notoriously difficult to measure in an objective way. It is not directly observable, since observable behaviors (e.g., how many times students bid for turns in class) may well reflect a variety of underlying motivational factors (e.g., interest in learning, or a desire to display knowledge, outperform others, please the teacher, seek attention or praise). Consequently, motivation research has generally relied on gathering self-report data to access L2 learners' own perspectives, such as, for example, how much they agree or disagree with, rate the importance of, or perceive as true for themselves, certain statements reflecting particular attitudes, intentions or behaviors (e.g., "I don't think that foreign languages are important school subjects," Dörnyei *et al.*, 2006, p. 160).

To minimize the inherent subjectivity of such data, considerable attention has been paid to constructing rigorous measurement instruments with good psychometric properties, as exemplified in particular by the standardized Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) developed by Gardner and his associates (see Gardner, 1985, Appendix). In its original form, the AMTB operationalizes the main attitudinal-motivational constituents of Gardner's theory, and also includes measures of language anxiety and parental encouragement. It comprises a number of multi-item Likert, multiple choice, and semantic differential scales, yielding composite indices of attitudinal-motivational variables such as *interest in foreign languages* and *integrative or instrumental orientation*. These indices are then entered into statistical analyses of relationships with other independent or dependent variables (e.g., measures of language aptitude or L2 proficiency), typically using factor analytical, correlational, regression analysis, or path analysis methods.

The AMTB has been adapted for use in a variety of L2 contexts (e.g., Clément *et al.*, 1994; Kraemer, 1993). Its psychometric design principles have been applied to the development of measures of other motivational constructs such as intrinsic and extrinsic orientations (e.g., Noels *et al.*, 2000), and have influenced approaches to constructing self-report scales to measure new L2 motivation constructs such as *ideal* and *ought-to* selves (e.g., MacIntyre *et al.*, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi *et al.*, 2009). In short, there has been a robust tradition of quantitative psychometric measurement in L2 motivation research, reflecting the methodological traditions that have prevailed in mainstream cognitive and social psychology. Strengths of this quantitative approach include rigor and systematicity in data-gathering and analysis, as well as comparability and replicability of data, and generalizability to wider populations.

As noted in our historical review earlier, however, the evolution of L2 motivation research has been characterized by a growing concern with temporal and contextual variability, and with the limitations of linear models in representing the dynamic complexity of motivational processes. Current quantitative methods of SLA inquiry are ill-equipped to investigate these more complex, process-oriented, and contextual perspectives, since such methods typically rely on superficial snapshot measures at an arbitrary point in time, seek to generalize on the basis of statistically representative patterns in the data, and are not sensitive to the particularities of evolving motivational experiences or individual-contextual interactions. Within the last decade or so, more qualitative

methods of inquiry have gradually begun to complement the dominant quantitative paradigm, in an effort to address the dynamic and situated complexity of L2 motivation, and also mirroring a general trend in SLA research. In particular, unstructured or semi-structured interview techniques have been used to elicit in-depth self-report data on motivation and motivational experience, with the transcribed data then subjected to thematic analysis based on predetermined codes and categories, grounded or emergent categories (Gibbs, 2007), or a mixture of the two (e.g., Shoáib and Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 2001; Williams *et al.*, 2001).

While interview studies are inevitably limited in scale and scope, the data elicited can offer very rich insights into the process and experience of motivation, particularly when a longitudinal research design is adopted with multiple interviews with participants (e.g., Kim, 2009). Moreover, limitations in the scope of the dataset can be offset by complementing it with more large-scale quantitative data in a mixed methods research design (e.g., a questionnaire survey of attitudes and motivation, combined with follow-up interview data from a sub-sample; or an exploratory interview study followed by a questionnaire survey to generalize the findings to a wider sample). In L2 motivation research as in much SLA research in general, there is increasing recognition that mixed methods approaches can help to capture more of the complexity of the issues under investigation (Dörnyei, 2007a; Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, 2008b). In particular, with current moves toward more socio-dynamic perspectives on motivation, the investigation of contextual factors and individual-contextual interactions is likely to entail triangulation of multiple forms of data from diverse points of view (e.g., interviews with teachers and students, classroom observations, classroom interaction data, focus group discussions, learner journals, written narratives), in order to obtain a rich holistic analysis of motivation-in-context, rather than relying (as traditionally) on a single set of self-report measures (on researching the classroom as a dynamic system, see also Jessica Williams, Chapter 33, this volume). Needless to say, however, such research designs pose some interesting challenges for the analysis and representation of these complex datasets.

We now consider empirical verification. As noted above, the study of L2 motivation has been characterized by a solid tradition of empirical research, beginning with the pioneering investigations conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Attitudinal-motivational, aptitude, and achievement data elicited from various groups of L2 learners in Montreal, Louisiana, Connecticut, and the Philippines were factor analysed to see if independent attitudinal-motivational and aptitude factors would emerge, each with loadings on the criterion variable achievement. The clearly bilingual setting of Montreal produced the strongest evidence of an independent relationship between integrative motivation and achievement, with findings less conclusive for the other settings. Thus, causal relationships (between motivation and achievement) and applicability to different ethno-linguistic settings became key issues during the social-psychological period, leading to critical and empirical analyses of the direction of causality (e.g., Hermann, 1980), of the chains of causation linking attitudes, orientations, motivation, and achievement (Gardner, 1985), and of their generalizability to a range of cultural and linguistic settings (e.g., Clément *et al.*, 1994; Kraemer, 1993).

To investigate causality and test the validity and generalizability of Gardner's theoretical model, sophisticated structural equation modeling techniques became adopted to verify hypothesized causal links between constructs (e.g., *attitudes toward the learning situation* and *motivation*) and between constructs and their constituent components (e.g., *attitudes toward the learning situation*, and its constituent components of Evaluation of the L2 Teacher and Evaluation of the L2 Course) (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Gardner *et al.*, 1983; Gardner *et al.*, 1997; Tremblay and Gardner, 1995). As Masgoret and Gardner (2003) summarize in their meta-analysis of empirical studies involving 75 independent samples and 10,489 L2 learners, the overall evidence underlines positive relationships between L2 achievement and five classes of attitudinal-motivational variables (attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, motivation, integrative orientation, instrumental

orientation), with motivation emerging as the strongest predictor of achievement. These composite findings are irrespective of the age of the learners or the availability of the target language in the immediate environment, although it should be noted that most of the studies analysed were conducted in a single country, Canada.

Regarding the claim that L2 motivation “always has an integrativeness component” (Gardner, 1985, p. 168), the empirical evidence has been more mixed depending on cultural setting (Noels *et al.*, 2000). Even in Gardner and Lambert (1972), data from their Philippines study suggested that parental instrumental forms of motivation were more significant, a finding mirrored in more recent investigations in East Asian settings such as Warden and Lin (2000), and Chen *et al.* (2005), where a “required motivation” factor emerged, reflecting culturally valued and internalized motivation to meet social and parental expectations. While factor analytical studies in other settings have often produced a factor reflecting a positive disposition toward native speakers and the cultural values linked to the language, it is not always clearly distinguished from more pragmatic instrumental aspects of motivation or defined with reference to a specific community of speakers (Irie, 2003). Such was the finding in a major longitudinal survey of Hungarian teenagers’ language learning attitudes and motivation, spanning the period from 1993 to 2004 and involving 13,391 respondents across three phases of data collection (Dörnyei and Csizér, 2002; Dörnyei *et al.*, 2006). Although an integrative motivation factor did emerge consistently strongly in the data, it was shown to be underpinned by both practical instrumental motivation as well as attitudes to target language speakers, thus raising questions about the conceptual distinctiveness of integrative and instrumental motivation. As we saw earlier, this finding has led Dörnyei (2005, 2009b) to reframe the process of identification theorized to underpin integrativeness as an internal process of identification within the self-concept, leading to his new conceptualization of the L2 Motivational Self System. Recent attempts to operationalize the self system and test its key claims in a diverse range of contexts (China, Hungary, Iran, Japan) with extensive datasets offer cumulative empirical evidence that future self-guides act as powerful motivators for L2 learning (Csizér and Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi *et al.*, 2009).

As noted earlier, within the last decade or so L2 motivation research has also been characterized by a growing number of more qualitative studies which seek to explore the process and experience of individual motivation and its dynamic interactions with contextual factors. In these studies, motivation is defined not in terms of measurable attitudes, effort or behavior, but in terms of how learners think about their learning and process relevant experience, and how their thinking affects their motivation and engagement in learning. Qualitative interview studies by Williams and Burden (1999), Williams *et al.* (2001), and Ushioda (1996a, 2001), for example, have provided a rich source of insights into causal attributional processes shaping learner motivation—that is, how L2 learners make sense of positive or negative outcomes in their learning experience, and how their thinking then shapes subsequent motivated engagement in learning. Ushioda’s (2001) longitudinal interview study of Irish learners of French also uncovered variation between and within individuals in the temporal frame of reference shaping learner motivation, depending on how strongly motivation was perceived to be shaped by past learning experiences or future goals. Her findings suggested that goal-orientation may be better conceived as an evolving dimension of motivation, rather than as its defining rationale. Examining motivational change on a more extensive timescale, Shoaiab and Dörnyei (2005) conducted retrospective qualitative interviews with 25 learners of English ranging in age from 18 to 34, and identified a number of recurring temporal patterns and key transformational episodes affecting motivation, such as transitions to new life phases (e.g., leaving school and entering the world of work) or experiences of being in an English-speaking environment. More recently, Kim (2009) has used longitudinal interview data from Korean ESL learners in Canada to provide qualitative evidence in support of Dörnyei’s

(2005, 2009b) concepts of the *ideal* and *ought-to selves*, and to elaborate the possible interrelationship between these self-guides by drawing on analytical perspectives from Vygotskian sociocultural theory and activity theory (see Lantolf, Chapter 4, this volume).

Applications

A key criticism of the social-psychological tradition of L2 motivation research was that it provided few genuinely useful insights for teachers, beyond highlighting the desirability of promoting students' positive attitudes to the target language culture (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991). As noted earlier, the shift to more cognitive-situated approaches in the 1990s brought about a stronger emphasis on the classroom context of L2 learning and on pedagogical issues such as how motivation might be generated and sustained. In particular, attention was drawn to the importance of intrinsic motivation and how it could be fostered through engaging students in setting optimal challenges or short-term (proximal) goals and promoting feelings of success and competence (Ushioda, 1996b; Williams and Burden, 1997). Personalizing learning content and making it meaningful and relevant were also emphasized as important strategies for promoting intrinsic motivation (Chambers, 1999). In addition, certain aspects of teacher behavior and teacher-student relations were identified as significant in shaping students' intrinsic motivation. For example, Noels *et al.* (1999) found that teachers who were perceived to adopt an autonomy-supportive (rather than controlling) communicative style and provide informational feedback on students' learning were likely to reinforce students' sense of self-determination and intrinsic enjoyment of learning. This finding has been mirrored in research exploring connections between L2 motivation and learner autonomy (e.g., Ushioda, 1996b, 2003), and points to the importance of adopting a democratic (rather than authoritarian) leadership style in the classroom (Dörnyei, 2007b). Among other things, this means involving students in some of the decision-making processes that shape their learning (Ushioda, 2003), and fostering trust, good interpersonal relations, and a cohesive learner group (Dörnyei, 2007b).

More generally, these and other implications of relevant theory and research have been developed into a comprehensive framework of classroom motivational strategies by Dörnyei (2001a). The framework comprises 35 motivational strategies organized according to four key phases of the teaching-learning process: creating the basic motivational conditions, generating initial motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation, and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation. This framework of motivational teaching practice was derived in part from empirical research with Hungarian teachers, which led to the development of an influential set of "ten commandments" for motivating students (e.g., Set a personal example with your own behavior. Increase the learners' linguistic self-confidence) (Dörnyei and Csizér, 1998). More recently, the framework has been used as the basis for large-scale investigations of teachers' motivational strategies in Taiwanese and Korean EFL contexts (Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007; Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008). The research findings provide empirical confirmation that the teachers' motivational instructional practice does have a positive bearing on student motivation, but also suggest that motivational strategies may vary in importance according to cultural setting, and that context-appropriate strategies may indeed be influential in increasing student motivation. However, interesting questions remain about how far teachers can be trained to use motivational strategies or adopt a more motivational teaching practice (Kubanyiova, 2009), as well as whether the impact on student motivation may depend on how strategies used by teachers are actually perceived by students (Bernaus and Gardner, 2008).

While teachers' motivational strategies focus primarily on teacher behaviors and practices for motivating students, a related but separate angle of inquiry has focused on what has been variously

called self-motivational strategies, self-regulation of motivation, or motivational thinking (Ushioda, 2008). This angle of inquiry has been shaped by theoretical and research perspectives on the process-oriented dimension of L2 motivation (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998; Dörnyei and Tseng, 2009; Ushioda, 2001, 2003), and has been informed in particular by theories of action control, self-regulation, and autonomy. Although concerned principally with developing L2 learners' own capacity to sustain, enhance, and protect their motivation (in the face of negative affective experiences and competing distractions), this growing literature on motivational self-regulation has clear implications for instructional practices. In particular, it highlights the important role of teacher feedback and teacher–learner dialog in helping learners to reflect on their learning process, to attribute negative outcomes to factors within their control such as effort or choice of strategies, and to engage in constructive thinking about themselves as active agents of their learning (Ushioda, 2003, 2008).

Most recently, this focus on how L2 learners think about themselves has been developed further in the context of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System, which has led Dörnyei (2009b, c) to speculate about practical pedagogical strategies for helping learners (a) to construct and sustain visions of their future ideal selves as L2 users, using visualization techniques and guided imagery; (b) to develop action plans comprising interim goal-setting and self-regulatory strategies in order to operationalize the vision and build realistically toward it; and (c) to counterbalance this image of their desired self with that of their feared self (i.e., the consequences of not learning the language or failing in one's aspirations), in order to stay firmly committed to their future ideals. These ideas have been developed into a collection of practical classroom activities for teachers and learners by Hadfield and Dörnyei (in press), providing, for example, various visualization scenarios as well as protocols to substantiate the ideal self image by looking at potential obstacles and ways by which certain role models have overcome those.

Future directions

There is no doubt in our minds that future research *should* be moving toward increasing integration between: (a) group-based quantitative approaches representing a macro-perspective and (b) individual-centered social approaches representing a situated, micro-perspective. However, we cannot currently say with certainty that this direction will achieve mainstream status in L2 motivation research because there are certain salient obstacles currently blocking the way. Therefore, in this concluding section we first reiterate the main reasons why such an integration would be desirable and then discuss some obstacles that will need to be overcome by future research.

We have argued recently (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009b) that the study of SLA—including L2 motivation research—has been characterized by a “schizophrenic” situation whereby research approaches have been framed through polarizing dichotomies such as positivist-interpretive, quantitative-qualitative, or cognitive-sociocultural, and scholars have by and large occupied “two parallel SLA worlds” (Zuengler and Miller, 2006; see also Lafford, 2007). We have two main concerns with this state of affairs: on the one hand, we believe that both approaches can shed important and unique light on research questions—the history of L2 motivation research outlined earlier offers convincing evidence for this. On the other hand, we also feel that pursuing research agendas in such a demarcated fashion may prevent scholars from doing justice to the complex and dynamic nature of most acquisitional/developmental phenomena within the broad remit of SLA. In an inherently social process such as language acquisition, the learner cannot be meaningfully separated from the social environment within which he/she operates, and therefore the challenge is to adopt a dynamic perspective that allows us to consider simultaneously the ongoing

multiple influences between environmental and learner factors in all their componential complexity, as well as the emerging changes in both the learner *and* the environment as a result of this development (Dörnyei, 2009d).

The other side of the coin is, however, that while adopting a complex, dynamic systems perspective to the study of L2 motivation—and more generally, of individual differences—seems so beneficial in theory, it turns out to be a rather challenging task in practice. How can we meaningfully operationalize the dynamic relationship between language, learner, and the environment on the one hand, and motivation, emotion, and cognition on the other, in specific measurement terms? Admittedly, there are no easy answers or simple templates to follow, because what is needed, in essence, is changing our natural and traditional research outlook from trying to identify cause-effect relationships on the basis of selected variables to focusing on overarching processes and changes in a fluid tapestry of interrelated factors. Howe and Lewis (2005) explain that developmental psychology has been grappling with this issue for over a decade, but while many scholars have highlighted the value of dynamic systems-based thinking in theoretical articles, research in the dynamic systems vein remains a clear minority. Their conclusion of why this might be so is not at all optimistic:

We think this is because the trajectory of developmental psychology, like other dynamic systems, tends toward stability much of the time. Researchers stick to well-established habits of thinking and working, and their students acquire the same habits, often because that is the easiest road to publication and career advancement.

(Howe and Lewis, 2005, p. 250)

In sum, the current challenge in the study of L2 motivation appears to be a research methodological one: How can we establish valid “stories of motivation” which are powerful enough to resonate in the audiences and to offer concrete suggestions for application; which are backed by sufficient empirical evidence, whether qualitative or quantitative; and which are comprehensive rather than reductionist so that the complexity of motivation is not treated in a simplistic manner by focusing on one or two selected aspects only? We conclude this chapter by listing three potentially fruitful (and interrelated) research areas for future investigations in this vein:

- How does motivation change over time, and what factors drive this change? This question can be explored with regard to individual learners (i.e., multiple case studies) or whole groups of learners (i.e., longitudinal studies). The emphasis should be on trying to identify constellations of specific learner variables that form optimal patterns with environmental factors, thus constituting powerful channels of progress.
- How are aspects of one’s identity/self related to facets of one’s motivational intentions or motivated behaviors? The framework offered by the L2 Motivational Self System is obviously helpful in structuring such an investigation, but other self-aspects (e.g., professional or gender-related identities—see in particular the work of Norton, 2000; see also Duff, Chapter 25, this volume) are also likely to interact with motivational factors. A particularly relevant corollary of this issue is how identity changes may reflect motivational changes.
- How do environmental influences and contingencies shape motivational dispositions? From a theoretical point of view, this question concerns the social dimension of motivation and may lead to the exploration of motives rooted in one’s situated language identity (see Clément *et al.*, 2007). From a practical perspective, the question concerns conscious attempts to increase motivation by applying various motivational strategies or by generating language-specific vision in the learners.

References

- Bernaus, M. and Gardner, R. C. (2008). Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 387–401.
- Brown, H. D. (1990). M and Ms for language classrooms? Another look at motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on language and linguistics 1990* (pp. 383–393). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Chambers, G. (1999). *Motivating language learners*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Chen, J. F., Warden, C. A., and Chang, H. T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 609–633.
- Cheng, H.-F., and Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1, 153–174.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., and Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417–448.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: 1. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning*, 33, 273–291.
- Clément, R., Noels, K. A., and MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Three variations on the social psychology of bilinguality: Context effects in motivation, usage and identity. In A. Wetherall, B. M. Watson, and C. Gallois (Eds.), *Language, discourse and social psychology* (pp. 51–77). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469–512.
- Csizér, K. and Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experience, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 98–119). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45–78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation. On with the challenge! *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 515–523.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 519–538.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2002). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In P. Robinson, (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 137–158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research and applications. In Z. Dörnyei (Ed.), *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning* (pp. 3–32). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007a). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007b). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 719–731). New York: Springer.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009a). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009c). Motivation and the vision of knowing a second language. In B. Beaven (Ed.), *IATEFL 2008: Exeter Conference Selections* (pp. 16–22). Canterbury: IATEFL.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009d). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. In N. C. Ellis and D. Larsen-Freeman (Eds.), *Language as a complex adaptive system* (pp. 237–255). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 203–29.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 421–62.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., and Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Dörnyei, Z. and Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London)*, 4, 43–69.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Tseng, W.-T. (2009). Motivational processing in interactional tasks. In A. Mackey and C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass* (pp. 117–134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (Eds.) (2009a). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (2009b). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: Future research directions. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 350–356). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (Second Edition) Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, N. C., and Larsen-Freeman, D. (Eds.) (2009). *Language as a complex adaptive system*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., and Pierson, R. (1983). The socio-educational model of SLA: An investigation using LISREL causal modeling. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2, 1–15.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. and MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26, 1–11.
- Gardner, R. C. and Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas and theoretical frameworks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 359–68.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., and Masgoret, A.-M. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 344–62.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Sage.
- Guiloteaux, M. J. and Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 55–77.
- Hadfield, J. and Dörnyei, Z. (in press). *Theory into practice: Motivation and the ideal self*. London: Longman.
- Hermann, G. (1980). Attitudes and success in children's learning of English as a second language: The motivational vs resultative hypothesis. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 34, 247–54.
- Howe, M. L., and Lewis, M. D. (2005). The importance of dynamic systems approaches for understanding development. *Developmental Review*, 25, 247–251.
- Irie, K. (2003). What do we know about the language learning motivation of university students in Japan? Some patterns in survey studies. *JALT Journal*, 25, 86–100.
- Järvelä, S. (2001). Shifting research on motivation and cognition to an integrated approach on learning and motivation in context. In S. Volet and S. Järvelä (Eds.), *Motivation in learning contexts: Theoretical advances and methodological implications* (pp. 3–14). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Julkunen, K. (1989). *Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Kim, T.-Y. (2009). The sociocultural interface between Ideal Self and Ought-to Self: A case study of two Korean students' ESL motivation. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 274–294). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kraemer, R. (1993). Social psychological factors related to the study of Arabic among Israeli high school students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 83–105.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 314–332). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lafford, B. A. (Ed.) (2007). Second language acquisition reconceptualized? The impact of Firth and Wagner (1997) (Focus issue). *Modern Language Journal*, 91.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008a). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008b). Research methodology on language development from a complex systems perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 200–213.
- MacIntyre, P., Mackinnon, S., and Clément, R. (2009). Toward the development of a scale to assess possible selves as a source of language learning motivation. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 193–214). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Markus, H. R. and Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954–69.
- Masgoret, A.-M. and Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and his associates. *Language Learning*, 53 (Supplement 1), 167–210.
- McDonough, S. (1981). *Psychology in foreign language teaching*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Noels, K. A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation. In Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 43–68). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Noels, K. A., Clément, R., and Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23–34.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., and Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50, 57–85.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman.
- Oxford, R. L. and Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12–28.
- Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 120–143). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sealey, A. and Carter, B. (2004). *Applied linguistics as social science*. London: Continuum.
- Shoaib, A. and Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Affect in lifelong learning: Exploring L2 motivation as a dynamic process. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 22–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., and Papi, M. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66–97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Tremblay, P. F. and Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 505–20.
- Ushioda, E. (1996a). Developing a dynamic concept of L2 motivation. In T. Hickey and J. Williams (Eds.), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239–245). Dublin/Clevedon, UK: IRAAL/Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. (1996b). *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93–125). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2003). Motivation as a socially mediated process. In D. Little, J. Ridley, and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 90–102). Dublin: Authentik.
- Ushioda, E. (2006). Language motivation in a reconfigured Europe: Access, identity and autonomy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27, 148–61.
- Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 19–34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Warden, C. and Lin, H. J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in Asian EFL settings. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, 535–47.
- Williams, M. and Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, M. and Burden, R. L. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 193–201.
- Williams, M., Burden, R. L., and Al-Baharna, S. (2001). Making sense of success and failure: The role of the individual in motivation theory. In Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 171–184). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 54–66.
- Zuengler, J. and Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 35–58.