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Motivation and ‘Self-Motivation’

It is appropriate that the coverage of language aptitude in chapter 3 should be followed by the discussion of the other major ID variable that has been found to significantly affect language learning success: motivation. It is easy to see why motivation is of great importance in SLA: It provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process; indeed, all the other factors involved in SLA presuppose motivation to some extent. Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals, and neither are appropriate curricula and good teaching enough on their own to ensure student achievement. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies both in one’s language aptitude and learning conditions, and Robert Sternberg (2002), one of the leading aptitude researchers of our time (whose work was briefly described in chapt. 3), goes as far as to say that:

Much of what appears to be foreign-language learning aptitude may reflect a valuing process. In Belgium, those who learn Flemish as a first language are much more likely to learn a second and even a third language than are those who learn French as a first language. Why? Can anyone seriously believe that the difference is one of language-learning aptitude? Probably not. Rather, the difference is that of the perceived need for additional languages. There is a practical need for additional languages, and the languages are taught with this practical use in mind.

(p. 19)

This argument is almost exactly the same as the one put forward by Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1972) more than 30 years ago, namely that although language aptitude accounts for a considerable proportion of individual variability in language learning achievement, motivational factors can override the aptitude effect. In certain language environments, as Gardner and Lambert point out, where the social setting
demands it (e.g., when the L1 is a local vernacular and the L2 is the national language), many people seem to master a L2, regardless of their aptitude differences.

Let me conclude this introductory section with a personal note: This chapter is somewhat different from the others in the sense that when discussing other ID factors I have taken on the role of the informed observer and largely restricted my contribution to a selective review of other people’s work, whereas much of the material in this chapter concerns my own research. Ever since the beginning of my PhD research in the mid-1980s, which was inspired by Robert Gardner’s seminal work, I have been actively examining the relationship of motivation and L2 attainment, and therefore my account of the topic will be inevitably subjective. My intentions in this chapter are twofold: First, I would like to outline the overall history of L2 motivation research; however, in this overview I will spend less time on the past than on the present and particularly on forward-pointing new theorizing and research. During the last few years several detailed overviews of L2 motivation research have been published representing different perspectives (e.g., Clément & Gardner, 2001; Cohen & Dörnyei, 2002; Dörnyei, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2003b; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; MacIntyre, 2002) and therefore I felt it unnecessary to simply repeat what has already been said. My second objective is to offer a new perspective on L2 motivation and reexamine some of the historical tenets in this light. The new theory that I present—the L2 Motivational Self System—is broad in its scope and is compatible with the major findings of past research in the field. It does not claim to provide a comprehensive answer to all the outstanding questions—I believe that just as motivation is a dynamic, ever-changing process, its research should also evolve over time. After all, motivation concerns the fundamental question of why people think and behave as they do, and we should never asume that we know the full answer.

THREE PHASES OF L2 MOTIVATION RESEARCH

L2 motivation research has been a thriving area within L2 studies with several books and literally hundreds of articles published on the topic since the 1960s. To provide a concise overview of the field, it is useful to divide its history into three phases:

(a) The social psychological period (1959-1990)—characterized by the work of Gardner and his students and associates in Canada.

(b) The cognitive-situated period (during the 1990s)—characterized by work drawing on cognitive theories in educational psychology.
The social psychological period

The initial impetus in L2 motivation research came from social psychologists working in Canada, most notably from Wallace Lambert, Robert Gardner, and their associates. Interested in understanding the unique Canadian social situation characterized by the often confrontational coexistence of the Anglophone and Francophone communities, Gardner and Lambert (1972) viewed second languages as mediating factors between different ethnolinguistic communities and thus regarded the motivation to learn the language of the other community as a primary force responsible for enhancing or hindering intercultural communication and affiliation. These researchers adopted a social psychological approach that was based on the main tenet that “students’ attitudes toward the specific language group are bound to influence how successful they will be in incorporating aspects of that language” (Gardner, 1985, p. 6). This seemingly obvious recognition had major theoretical implications both for theory and classroom practice. From a theoretical point of view, it meant that the study of L2 motivation required the supplementation of traditional motivation research—which used to focus entirely on the individual—with social psychological insights and methods concerning the interrelationship of the L1 and L2 communities. This integration of individualistic and social psychology in the study of the antecedents of human behavior was radically new in the 1960s and almost three decades ahead of its time: It was only in the 1990s that motivational psychologists started to show an active interest in the social context of motivation (for reviews of social motivation, see Dörnyei, 1999b, 2001c).

From an educational point of view, Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) claim indicated that unlike several other school subjects, a foreign language is not a socioculturally neutral field but is affected by a range of sociocultural factors such as language attitudes, cultural stereotypes, and even geopolitical considerations. This social argument has been accepted by researchers all over the world, regardless of the actual learning situation they were working in; for example, referring to European classroom learning contexts, Marion Williams (1994) expressed thoughts that were similar to the Canadian assertion:

There is no question that learning a foreign language is different to learning other subjects. This is mainly because of the social nature of
such a venture. Language, after all, belongs to a person’s whole social being: it is part of one’s identity, and is used to convey this identity to other people. The learning of a foreign language involves far more than simply learning skills, or a system of rules, or a grammar; it involves an alteration in self-image, the adoption of new social and cultural behaviors and ways of being, and therefore has a significant impact on the social nature of the learner. (p. 77)

This distinction between foreign languages and other school subjects is a very important one, and it explains partly, for example, why the theory of L2 learning and teaching has never managed to fully integrate into the broader domain of educational studies.

Gardner’s motivation theory and motivation test

Robert Gardner’s motivation theory has often been described in the past and therefore here I highlight three main aspects only: Gardner’s theory of second language acquisition, his theory of L2 motivation, and a test battery that he developed with his associates and which allows for the scientific measurement of a wide range of motivational factors.

Gardner’s theory of second language acquisition, the Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Acquisition, is not an elaborate model but a schematic outline of how motivation is related to other ID variables and language achievement (see Gardner, 2001, for the most recent version of the model). The model posits that language achievement is influenced by integrative motivation, language aptitude, as well as a number of other factors.

The theory of Integrative motivation is a detailed, empirically based construct that is made up of three main constituents, each further broken down to subcomponents (see Fig. 4.1, for a schematic representation):

- Integrativeness, which subsumes integrative orientation, interest in foreign languages, and attitudes toward the L2 community, reflecting the “individual’s willingness and interest in social interaction with members of other groups” (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a, p. 159).
- Attitudes toward the learning situation, which comprises attitudes toward the language teacher and the L2 course.
- Motivation, that is, effort, desire, and attitude toward learning.
I argued a decade ago (Dörnyei, 1994b) that the interpretation of this model has been hindered by two sources of terminological difficulty: First, the term integrative appears in it three times at three different levels of abstraction (integrative orientation, integrativeness, and integrative motive/motivation), which has led to misunderstandings. The second area which causes confusion in some researchers is that within the overall construct of ‘Integrative motivation’ there is a subcomponent labeled ‘Motivation’. This makes it difficult to decide what is meant when Gardner talks about ‘motivation’ in his writings: L2 motivation in general? Integrative motivation? Or the specific ‘Motivation’ subcomponent of the integrative motive?

Gardner’s theory has been highly acclaimed among L2 researchers and practitioners but it is fair to say that the popular interpretation has been rather different from the actual theory because L2 scholars tended to pay attention only to two prominent motivational components:
1. An interpersonal/affective dimension, which is usually called either integrative orientation or integrative motivation. This notion is indeed in accordance with Gardner’s motivational thinking and later in this chapter I analyze in detail what this component might cover and how it can be reconceptualized to fit into more recent L2 motivational theories.

2. A practical/utilitarian dimension, associated with the concrete benefits that language proficiency might bring about (e.g., career opportunities, increased salary). Interestingly, this dimension, which has been referred to as the instrumental orientation/motivation, is not part of Gardner’s core theory. Although the concept of instrumental orientation does derive from Gardner’s writings, in actual terms it only appears in his motivation test battery without any real theoretical clarification.

The misrepresentation of Gardner’s theory as the sum of integrative and instrumental motivation has been pervasive, as evidenced even today by the many manuscripts submitted to international journals which start out by conceptualizing motivation purely (and poorly) along the instrumental–integrative dichotomy. Of course, from a human point of view this simplified misrepresentation is easy to explain in a situation where an academic field—applied linguistics—that has traditionally drawn on linguistic and educational expertise tries to incorporate such a complex psychological variable as motivation.

Recently, Gardner (2000, 2001) addressed the question of how to conceptualize Instrumental Motivation within his overall theoretical framework. He stated, “there can be other supports for motivation not directly associated with integrative motivation. Thus, there may be instrumental factors contributing to motivation, and we could label this combination of instrumental factors and Motivation as Instrumental Motivation” (Gardner, 2001, p. 7). In other words, Gardner proposes that the ‘Motivation’ subcomponent of the Integrative Motive can be combined with instrumentality (instead of integrativeness) to form Instrumental Motivation. This is in line with the conception that the ‘Motivation’ subcomponent concerns a central motivational engine that needs to be ignited by some specific learning goal such as instrumental or integrative orientation. However, integrative motivation in Gardner’s model was also associated with a third major constituent, ‘Attitudes toward the learning situation,’ and it is not clear whether this, too, can be linked to instrumental motivation if the dominant learning goal is instrumental.

The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB; reprinted in the Appendix of Gardner, 1985) is a multicomponential motivation questionnaire made up of over 130 items (see Table 4.1, for a list of the constituent scales with sample items), which has been shown to have good psychometric properties,
including construct and predictive validity (see Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993b). It operationalizes all the main constituents of Gardner’s theory of the integrative motive and it also includes the additional components of language anxiety (L2 class anxiety and L2 use anxiety), parental encouragement, and instrumental orientation.

Gardner’s theory was the dominant motivation model in the L2 field for more than three decades, and the AMTB as well as the advanced statistical data processing techniques that Gardner introduced set high research standards in the area. However, in retrospect, we can see that the theory has remained relatively unmodified over time: Gardner’s famous 1979 summary already contained all the major elements and this lack of development contrasts with the dramatic changes that took place in mainstream motivation research in the 1980s following the ‘cognitive revolution’ in psychology (see next). As a consequence, by the beginning of the 1990s, there was a growing conceptual gap between motivational thinking in the second language field and in educational psychology and the time was ripe for a new phase in L2 motivation research. This does not mean, however, that Gardner’s theory became marginalized—as we will see, all the main subsequent models drew on the social psychological construct extensively, and Gardner’s model also persevered because of the “pervasive use of the battery of tests (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery) developed to measure it” (Jacques, 2001, p. 186).

The AMTB is a useful self-report instrument and it has been adapted for many learning contexts all over the world. Its design followed the psychometric principles governing questionnaire theory and it is a scientific measuring instrument both in terms of its presentation and its content. Having said that, let me raise two issues here concerning the content validity of the test. First, as described in (Dörnyei, 1994b) at the item level three of the subscales defining the ‘Motivation’ subcomponent (‘Desire to learn the L2,’ ‘Motivational intensity,’ and ‘Attitudes toward learning the L2’) overlap, which may explain the high intercorrelations between these scales. The second issue is of a theoretical nature: In operationalizing the ‘Motivation’ subcomponent, Gardner included items that are related to motivated behavior, asking, for example, about the extent of volunteering answers in class. Such behaviors, however, are associated with the consequences of being motivated in the motivation → behavior → outcome chain. To illustrate this, the sample item for ‘Motivational intensity’ cited in Table 4.1 does not target the unobservable mental phenomenon of motivation but rather asks students to report on the amount of effort they put into doing their homework. In other studies such items are usually seen as behavioral criterion measures and researchers compute correlations between them and the learners’ motiva-
Table 4.1. The constituent scales of Gardner’s (1985) ‘Attitude/Motivation Test Battery’

- **Attitudes toward French Canadians** (10 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “French Canadians add a distinctive flavor to the Canadian culture.”

- **Interest in foreign languages** (10 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “I would really like to learn a lot of foreign languages.”

- **Attitudes toward European French people** (10 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “I have always admired the European French people.”

- **Attitudes toward learning French** (10 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “I really enjoy learning French.”

- **Integrative orientation** (4 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.”

- **Instrumental orientation** (4 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “Studying French can be important for me only because I’ll need it for my future career.”

- **French class anxiety** (5 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our French class.”

- **Parental encouragement** (10 Likert scale items)
  E.g., “My parents really encourage me to study French.”

- **Motivational intensity** (10 multiple choice items)
  E.g., “When it comes to French homework, I:
  (a) Put some effort into it, but not as much as I could.
  (b) Work very carefully, making sure I understand everything.
  (c) Just skim over it.”

- **Desire to learn French** (10 multiple choice items)
  E.g., “If there were a French Club in my school, I would:
  (a) Attend meetings once in awhile.
  (b) Be most interested in joining.
  (c) Definitely not join.”

- **Orientation index** (1 multiple choice item)
  E.g., “I am studying French because:
  (a) Think it will some day be useful in getting a good job.
  (b) Think it will help me to better understand French people and way of life.
  (c) It will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
  (d) A knowledge of two languages will make me a better-educated person.”


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of the French teacher (25 semantic differential scale items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., “efficient <em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:___ inefficient”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of the French course (25 semantic differential scale items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., “enjoyable <em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:___ unenjoyable”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tion (cf. e.g., the motivation–effort correlations in Dörnyei & Clément, 2001). Thus, the AMTB assesses both motivation and motivated behavior; this increases the instrument’s predictive validity with regard to learning outcomes (e.g., course grades) because in the motivation → behavior → outcome chain the battery covers the combined effect of the first two elements, but the downside of this measurement gain is that from a theoretical point of view it is not easy to decide the exact nature of the underlying learner trait that the instrument targets.

Clément’s Theory of Linguistic Self-Confidence

The Canadian social psychological strand also subsumes a second important research tradition, the empirical and theoretical work conducted by Richard Clément and his colleagues to examine the interrelationship between social contextual variables (including ethnolinguistic vitality), attitudinal/motivational factors, self-confidence, language identity, and L2 acquisition/acculturation processes (for reviews, see Clément & Gardner, 2001; Dörnyei, 1999, 2001). From a motivational perspective, the most important factor studied by Clément and his associates is self-confidence, which in general refers to the belief that a person has the ability to produce results, accomplish goals, or perform tasks competently. It was first introduced in the L2 literature by Clément, Gardner, and Smythe (1977) to describe a powerful mediating process in multi-ethnic settings that affects a person’s motivation to learn and use the language of the other speech community.

Clément and his associates provided evidence (cf. Clément, 1980; Clément & Kruidenier, 1985) that in contexts where different language communities live together, linguistic self-confidence—derived from the quality and quantity of the contact between the members of the L1 and L2 communities—is a major motivational factor in learning the other community’s language, and determines the learners’ future desire for intercultural communication and the extent of identification with the L2 group. Thus, linguistic self-confidence in Clément’s view is primarily a socially defined construct (in contrast to the cognitive nature of self-efficacy
in the motivational psychological literature), although self-confidence also has a cognitive component, the ‘perceived L2 proficiency.’ Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1994) extended the applicability of the self-confidence construct by showing that it is also a significant motivational subsystem in foreign language learning situations in which there is little direct contact with members of the L2 community but considerable indirect contact with the L2 culture through the media (e.g., as is the case with world languages such as English).

The Cognitive-Situated Period

Although the starting point of the cognitive-situated period in motivation research is often seen as Graham Crookes and Richard Schmidt’s (1991) influential article on ‘reopening the motivation research agenda,’ the need for a change was ‘in the air’ at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s and several other publications from around the same time voiced a similar view (e.g., Brown, 1990; Julkunen, 1989; Skehan, 1989, 1991). The cognitive-situated period was characterized by the intertwining influence of two broad trends:

(a) The desire to catch up with advances in motivational psychology and to extend our understanding of L2 motivation by importing some of the most influential concepts of the 1980s. These concepts were almost entirely cognitive in nature, which reflected the effect of the ongoing cognitive revolution in psychology. Motivational psychologists representing a cognitive perspective argued convincingly that how one thinks about one’s abilities, possibilities, potentials, limitations, and past performance, as well as various aspects of the tasks to achieve or goals to attain (e.g., values, benefits, difficulties) is a crucial aspect of motivation.

(b) The desire to narrow down the macroperspective of L2 motivation (i.e., the broad view focusing on the motivational disposition of whole communities, typically taken by the proponents of the social psychological approach) to a more a fine-tuned, situated analysis of motivation as it operates in actual learning situations (such as language classrooms), characterized by a microperspective.

Accordingly, a growing amount of research examined the motivational impact of the main components of the classroom learning situation, such as the teacher, the curriculum, and the learner group (cf. Dörnyei, 1994a; Williams & Burden, 1997). This did not mean, however, that researchers rejected the findings of the previous period; it was generally accepted that Gardner and his associates’ macroperspective was useful to characterize and
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compare the motivational patterns of whole learning communities and then to draw inferences about important issues such as intercultural communication and affiliation, language contact, multiculturalism, and language globalization. However, if we also want to understand the motivational features of actual language classrooms, these broad factors have little explanatory power and need to be supplemented with motives associated with the learners’ immediate learning situation. This emerging situated approach was summarized by McGroarty (2001) as follows:

Existing research on L2 motivation, like much research in educational psychology, has begun to rediscover the multiple and mutually influential connections between individuals and their many social contexts, contexts that can play a facilitative, neutral, or inhibitory role with respect to further learning, including L2 learning. (p. 86)

This process of linking motivation to contextual factors was fruitful: Researchers have repeatedly found that variables related to the language course explained a significant portion of the variance in the students’ motivation, indicating that “classroom L2 learning motivation is not a static construct as often measured in a quantitative manner, but a compound and relative phenomenon situated in various resources and tools in a dynamic classroom context” (Kimura, 2003, p. 78). To illustrate the significance of situation-specific factors, let me describe briefly two interesting studies. Analyzing unsuccessful Hungarian language learners, Nikolov (2001) found that although her participants typically shared positive attitudes toward knowing foreign languages (and thus they would have been traditionally labeled as being integratively motivated), the main reasons for their lack of success in the L2 concerned their perceptions of the classroom practices they had been exposed to. As she summarized, “The most problematic areas relate to classroom methodology in general, and assessment, focus on form, and rote-learning in particular” (p. 149). Thus, for these learners situation-specific motives overrode the positive attitudes toward the L2. We may add that it is highly likely that the negative perceptions were also related to some sort of unfavorable aptitude-treatment interaction (Robinson, in press) as described in the previous chapter.

Examining a strikingly different language learning context, Israeli students learning modern spoken Arabic, Donitsa-Schmidt, Inbar, and Shohamy (2004) and Inbar, Donitsa-Schmidt, and Shohamy (2001) found that the best predictor of the intention to continue studying Arabic was the quality of the teaching program. This was, as McGroarty (2001) pointed out in a review, a remarkable finding because it showed that even when relations between language groups are marked by tension and lack of unanimity at the level of policy, L2 learners are sensitive to the quality of language instruction and
the learning experience. Thus, in this case situation-specific motives overrode a generally negative language attitudinal disposition. Inbar et al. (2001) also compared the L2 attitudes of learners who were studying and who were not studying Arabic at the time they were surveyed, with each group further divided into two subgroups depending on whether the learning vs. not-learning situation was a result of their own choice or the policy or provision of the school that they attended. The researchers found an interesting pattern: Students who studied Arabic displayed higher motivation in all the dimensions measured than those who did not, and there were few differences between those who chose versus those who were assigned to study/not to study the language. Thus, the authors concluded that it was studying the language and not the ‘choice vs. assigned condition’ that affected students’ motivation, implying that being actively engaged in learning a foreign language in a school enhanced language attitudes and motivation. This was further confirmed by Dörnyei and Csizér’s (2002) national survey in Hungary, in which we also found a consistent difference between active learners and non-learners of an L2 in terms of their attitudinal/motivational dispositions, with active learners always having more positive attitudes.

The intertwining influences of situating L2 motivation and adopting new cognitive variables in the motivational paradigms were well illustrated by two featured research areas that appeared in the L2 motivation field in the 1990s: the investigation of self-determination theory in L2 learning and the analysis of language attributions. Let us look at these areas and then examine the most situated research direction, the study of task motivation.

Self-Determination Theory

*Self-determination theory* (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002), which focuses on various types of intrinsic and extrinsic motives, has been one of the most influential approaches in motivational psychology, and several attempts have been made in the L2 field to incorporate certain elements of the theory to explain L2 motivation. Douglas Brown (1990, 1994) was one of the main proponents of emphasizing the importance of intrinsic motivation in the L2 classroom, arguing that traditional school settings cultivate extrinsic motivation, which, over the long haul, "focuses students too exclusively on the material or monetary rewards of an education rather than instilling an appreciation for creativity and for satisfying some of the more basic drives for knowledge and exploration" (Brown, 1994, p. 40).

In the 1990s, Kim Noels came in contact with two leading international experts of self-determination theory, Luc Pelletier and Robert Vallerand, and this association inspired her to conduct empirical research into the L2 appli-
cations of the theory; over the following years Noels and her associates added several further studies to the initial project, resulting in a systematic research program (McIntosh & Noels, 2004; Noels, 2001a, 2001b; Noels, Clément & Pelletier, 1999, 2001, Noels, Pelletier, Clément & Vallerand, 2000). In line with the general thrust of the cognitive-situated period, the researchers pursued two main objectives: (a) to relate the various intrinsic/extrinsic components established in motivational psychology to orientations developed in L2 research, and (b) to examine how the learners’ level of self-determination is affected by various classroom practices.

With regard to the first issue, Noels and her colleagues found (for a review, see Noels, 2001b) that Gardner’s integrative orientation was most strongly associated with the more self-determined forms of motivation (i.e., identified regulation and intrinsic motivation), although it did have modest correlations with the less self-determined orientations as well. Instrumental orientation, on the other hand, correlated highly with external regulation. Moreover, as Noels, Pelletier, Clément, and Vallerand (2000) concluded, the instrumental and the external regulation scales correlated in similar ways with the antecedent variables of ‘perceived autonomy’ and ‘competence,’ as well as with the consequence variables of ‘intention to pursue language study’ and ‘anxiety.’ Based on these findings, Noels (2003) proposed a larger motivation construct made up of three interrelated substrates. The first substrate includes intrinsic reasons inherent in the language learning process, such as whether learning the language is fun, engaging, challenging, or competence-enhancing. The second category includes extrinsic reasons for language learning lying on a continuum of self-determination, including external and internalized pressures; Gardner’s instrumental orientation belongs to this group. The third substrate comprises integrative reasons relating to positive contact with the L2 group and perhaps eventual identification with that group.

With regard to examining environmental influences on learner self-determination, Noels and her colleagues found a consistent pattern (see Noels, 2001a): The more students perceived their teachers as controlling and as failing to provide instructive feedback, the less they were intrinsically motivated. Thus, perceptions of autonomy support and informative feedback from teachers enhanced the students’ feelings of intrinsic motivation. Interestingly, the perception of autonomy-supporting vs. controlling teacher behavior turned out to be a more salient factor in learners than the more general perceptions of the teacher as negative vs. congenial; in fact, structural equation modeling showed that the former factors mediated the latter. A further intriguing finding in this respect has been that the directive influence of the language teacher’s communicative/instructional style on the students’ sense of self-determination (autonomy) and enjoyment did not reach signif-
Table 4.2. Description of Noels, Pelletier, Clément and Vallerand’s (2000) Language Learning Orientations Scale: Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Amotivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amotivation            | A lack of motivation caused by the realization that ‘there is no point…’ or ‘it’s beyond me…’  
E.g., [Why are you learning the L2?] Honestly, I don’t know, I truly have the impression of wasting my time in studying a second language. |
| External Regulation    | The least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation, coming entirely from external sources such as rewards or threats (e.g., teacher’s praise or parental confrontation). E.g., Because I have the impression that it is expected of me. |
| Introjected Regulation | Externally imposed rules that the student accepts as norms he/she should follow not to feel guilty (e.g., rules against playing truant). E.g., Because I would feel guilty if I didn’t know a second language. |
| Identified Regulation  | The person engages in an activity because he/she highly values and identifies with the behavior, and sees its usefulness (e.g., learning a language which is necessary to pursue one’s hobbies or interests). E.g., Because I think it is good for my personal development. |
| Intrinsic Motivation: Knowledge | Doing the activity for the feelings associated with exploring new ideas and acquiring knowledge. E.g., For the satisfied feeling I get in finding out new things. |
| Intrinsic Motivation: Accomplishment | Sensations related to attempting to master a task or achieve a goal. E.g., For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in the second language. |
| Intrinsic Motivation: Stimulation | Sensations stimulated by performing the task, such as aesthetic appreciation or fun and excitement. E.g., For the ‘high’ feeling that I experience while speaking in the second language. |
icance with students who pursued learning primarily for extrinsic (instrumental) reasons. This indicated that learners who studied a language primarily because they had to were less sensitive to this aspect of teacher influence than those who did it of their own free will.

Noels and her colleagues (2000) also developed a valid and reliable measuring instrument assessing the various components of self-determination theory in L2 learning, the Language Learning Orientations Scale: Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Amotivation. Table 4.2 presents descriptions of the constituent scales and sample items.

A recent study by Wu (2003) attempted to further situate the self-determination framework proposed by Noels and her colleagues by adding a new dimension to it, the immediate classroom environment. In a quasi-experimental study, the author examined the effect of a range of environmental variables on L2 intrinsic motivation and demonstrated that (a) providing young L2 learners with a predictable learning environment, moderately challenging tasks, necessary instructional support, and evaluation that emphasizes self-improvement are effective ways of developing students’ perceived competence, and (b) giving them freedom in choosing the content, methods, and performance outcomes of learning, as well as providing integrative strategy training, lead to enhanced perceived autonomy. Perceived competence and autonomy, in turn, resulted in a significantly higher level of L2 intrinsic motivation.

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory has achieved a special status among contemporary motivation theories in psychology because this was the first theory that successfully challenged Atkinson’s classic achievement motivation theory in the 1970s (for a review, see Dörnyei, 2001a). Subsequently, it became the dominant model in research on student motivation in the 1980s. The theory is also unique because it successfully links people’s past experiences with their future achievement efforts by introducing causal attributions as the mediating link: As the main proponent of the theory, Bernard Weiner (1992), argued, the subjective reasons to which we attribute our past successes and failures considerably shape our motivational disposition underlying future action. If, for example, we ascribe past failure in a particular task to low ability on our part, the chances are that we will not try the activity ever again, whereas if we believe that the problem lay in our insufficient effort or the unsuitable learning strategies that we had employed, we are more likely to give it another try.
Because of the generally high frequency of language learning failure worldwide, attributional processes are likely to play an important motivational role in language studies, which was indeed demonstrated by Ushioda’s (1996, 1998, 2001) interview study of Irish learners of French. In accordance with Weiner’s theory, Ushioda found that positive motivational thinking involved two attributional patterns: (a) attributing positive L2 outcomes to personal ability or other internal factors (e.g., effort, perfectionist approach), and (b) attributing negative L2 outcomes or lack of success to temporary (i.e., unstable) shortcomings that might be overcome (e.g., lack of effort, lack of opportunity to spend time in the L2 environment).

Qualitative research by Williams and Burden (1999; Williams, Burden, & Al-Baharna, 2001) further confirmed the importance of motivation-enhancing attributions in school children’s perceptions of their learning. Besides providing evidence that attributions play an important role in shaping learner motivation, the researchers also found that the range of attributional categories that the pupils cited was partly a function of their cultural background; for example, in Williams et al.’s (2001) sample of Arab students, the notion of ‘luck’ was never mentioned, and ability was cited very rarely either by students or teachers. On the other hand, their participants mentioned a wide range of attributional factors related to the classroom environment, circumstances, exposure to the language, interest, strategy use, and support from others. These findings confirm that the study of attributions is clearly an important line of investigation with much future scope.

Task Motivation

SLA researchers have been attracted to tasks because focusing on them allows to break down the complex and prolonged L2 learning process into discrete segments with well-defined boundaries, thereby creating researchable behavioral units. Thus, from this perspective, tasks constitute the basic building blocks of instructed SLA. Accordingly, an interest in the motivational basis of language learning tasks can be seen as the culmination of the situated approach in L2 motivation research since L2 motivation can hardly be examined in a more situated manner than within a task-based framework (Dörnyei, 2002). Indeed, in a recent study, Kormos and Dörnyei (2004) emphasized that a focus on tasks as the unit of analysis brings to a head the recent shift from the macroperspective toward more situation-specific and process-oriented approaches in L2 motivation research, but as we concluded, hardly any empirical research has been conducted to examine the motivational basis of language learning tasks. This is in stark contrast with the
abundance of research on cognitive operations underlying various aspects of task performance (Ellis, 2003; Skehan, 2003).

In the few studies that did look at task motivation, the construct was seen as a combination of generalized and situation-specific motives (Julkunen, 1989, 2001), corresponding to the traditional distinction between state and trait motivation. In a study specifically devoted to the analysis of the motivational characteristics of language learning tasks, I proposed (Dörnyei, 2002) that task motivation may be more complex than the state–trait dichotomy because on-task behavior is embedded in a series of ‘actional contexts’ (e.g., going to a specific school, attending a particular class, taking up the study of a particular L2), each of which exert a certain amount of unique motivational influence. That is, it may be insufficient to assume that the learner enters the task situation with some ‘trait motivation baggage’ and to obtain a comprehensive picture of task motivation all we need to do is add to this ‘baggage’ the motivational properties of the instructional task. Instead, I believe that engaging in a certain task activates a number of different levels of related motivational mindsets or contingencies associated with the various actional contexts, resulting in complex interferences. Some empirical basis for this proposal has been supplied by a series of studies on the co-construction of motivation by participants in dyadic communicative tasks (Dörnyei, 2002; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004; cf., also Edmondson, 2004).

The main question in understanding task motivation is how we operationalize the dynamic interface between motivational attributes and specific language behaviors. This question takes us to the third phase of L2 motivation research, the process-oriented period, described next, but for the sake of coherence I provide a brief summary here. In my view, the complex of motivational mindsets and contingencies activated during task performance feed into a dynamic task processing system that consists of three interrelated mechanisms: task execution, appraisal, and action control (see Fig. 4.2).

Task execution refers to the learners’ engagement in task-supportive learning behaviors, following the action plan that was either provided by the teacher (through the task instructions) or drawn up by the student or the task team. Appraisal refers to the learner’s continuous processing of the multitude of stimuli coming from the environment and of the progress made toward the action outcome, comparing actual performances with predicted ones or with ones that alternative action sequences would offer. This importance attached to the appraisal process coincides with Schumann’s (1998) emphasis on ‘stimulus appraisal.’ Finally, action control processes denote self-regulatory mechanisms that are called into force in order to enhance, scaffold, or protect learning-specific action (for more details about motivational self-regulation, see the separate section below). Thus, task processing
can be seen as the interplay of the three mechanisms: When learners are engaged in *executing* a task, they continuously *appraise* the process, and when the ongoing monitoring reveals that progress is slowing, halting, or backsliding, they activate the *action control* system to save or enhance the action. The process-oriented conception of motivation and the role of various action-control mechanisms will be analyzed in more detail later in this chapter.

![Diagram showing the three mechanisms making up the task-processing system: Task execution, Appraisal, Action control.](image)

**FIG. 4.2.** Schematic representation of the three mechanisms making up the task-processing system.

Task motivation can also be connected to an intriguing motivational feature examined in motivational psychology by Csikszentmihalyi and his colleagues in great detail, the experience of *flow* (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 1997). As Egbert (2003) summarized in a recent pioneering study on the role of flow in SLA, the experiential state of flow involves a particularly intense focus and involvement in an activity, to the extent that we may even lose self-consciousness and a track of time amidst our absorption. Thus, flow can be seen as a heightened level of motivated task engagement, leading to improved performance on a task; in many ways it is the optimal task experience. From our current perspective, the important aspect of this line of research is that flow theory specifies the task conditions under which flow can occur. These, according to Egbert, can be organized along four dimensions: (1) there is a perceived balance of task challenge and participant skills during the task, (2) the task offers opportunities for intense concentration and the participants’ attention is focused on the pursuit of clear task goals, (3) the participants find the task intrinsically interesting or authentic, and (4) the participants perceive a sense of control over the task process and outcomes.
Thus, Egbert proposes that “teachers can theoretically facilitate the flow experience for students by developing tasks that might lead to flow” (p. 513) and she subsequently analyzes several computer-based and reading tasks that may be good candidates for supporting flow because they present a way for individuals to experience optimal levels of challenge, control, and interest.

**The Process-Oriented Period**

The cognitive-situated approach emerging in the 1990s soon drew attention to another, rather neglected, aspect of motivation: its dynamic character and temporal variation. As I argued elsewhere (Dörnyei, 2000b, 2001c), when motivation is examined in its relationship to specific learner behaviors and classroom processes, there is a need to adopt a process-oriented approach/paradigm that can account for the daily ups and downs of motivation to learn, that is, the ongoing changes of motivation over time. Even during a single L2 class one can notice that language-learning motivation shows a certain amount of changeability, and in the context of learning a language for several months or years, or over a lifetime, motivation is expected to go through rather diverse phases. Looking at it from this perspective, motivation is not seen as a static attribute but rather as a dynamic factor that displays continuous fluctuation. As the following quote demonstrates, this characteristic of motivation is becoming a basic assumption in contemporary motivational psychology: “Many of the tasks faced by students extend over time, and as noted in chapter 1 of any Introduction to Motivation text, one of the prime characteristics of motivation is that it ebbs and flows” (Garcia, 1999, p. 231).

With language acquisition being a particularly lengthy learning process, the potential importance of a temporal perspective that includes the division of various motivational phases has not gone unnoticed in L2 research. Williams and Burden (1997, p. 121), for example, separated three stages of the motivation process along a continuum: “Reasons for doing something” → “Deciding to do something” → “Sustaining the effort, or persisting.” As they argued, the first two stages involved initiating motivation whereas the third stage involved sustaining motivation. Similarly, Ushioda (1996, 2001) also emphasized that when it comes to institutionalized learning, the common experience appears to be motivational flux rather than stability, which highlights the “notion of a temporal frame of reference shaping motivational thinking” (Ushioda, 1998, p. 82). Finally, a recent study by Manolopolou-Sergi (2004) made an interesting attempt to look at motivational variation
according to the three main phases of SLA within an information-processing framework: Input, central processing, and output.

Next I present first a process model of L2 motivation that I developed with István Ottó to specify the components and mechanisms making up the L2 motivation process. Then I describe several recent empirical studies that were carried out in the process-oriented vein, looking at motivational evolution either in a school context or in the broader frame of the life span.

The Dörnyei and Ottó Model of L2 Motivation

In an attempt to operationalize the process-oriented conception of L2 motivation, István Ottó and I drew up a process model that describes some aspects of motivational evolution (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). This model and its further elaboration (Dörnyei, 2000, 2001) broke down the motivational process into several discrete temporal segments, organized along the progression that describes how initial wishes and desires are first transformed into goals and then into operationalized intentions, and how these intentions are enacted, leading (hopefully) to the accomplishment of the goal and concluded by the final evaluation of the process. In this process, at least three distinct phases can be separated (see Fig. 4.3 for more details):

1. Preactional Stage: First, motivation needs to be generated—the motivational dimension related to this initial phase can be referred to as choice motivation, because the generated motivation leads to the selection of the goal or task that the individual will pursue.

2. Actional Stage: Second, the generated motivation needs to be actively maintained and protected while the particular action lasts. This motivational dimension has been referred to as executive motivation, and it is particularly relevant to sustained activities such as studying an L2, and especially to learning in classroom settings, where students are exposed to a great number of distracting influences, such as off-task thoughts, irrelevant distractions from others, anxiety about the tasks, or physical conditions that make it difficult to complete the task.

3. Postactional Stage: There is a third phase following the completion of the action—termed motivational retrospection—which concerns the learners’ retrospective evaluation of how things went. The way students process their past experiences in this retrospective phase will determine the kind of activities they will be motivated to pursue in the future.
### Preactional Stage

**B. Choice motivation**

**Motivational functions:**
- Setting goals
- Forming intentions
- Launching action

**Main motivational influences:**
- Various goal properties (e.g., goal relevance, specificity and proximity)
- Values associated with the learning process itself, as well as with its outcomes and consequences
- Attitudes towards the L2 and its speakers
- Expectancy of success and perceived coping potential
- Learner beliefs and strategies
- Environmental support or hindrance

### Actional Stage

**A. Executive motivation**

**Motivational functions:**
- Generating and carrying out subtasks
- Ongoing appraisal (of one’s achievement)
- Action control (self-regulation)

**Main motivational influences:**
- Quality of the learning experience (pleasantness, need significance, coping potential, self and social image)
- Sense of autonomy
- Teachers’ and parents’ influence
- Classroom reward- and goal structure (e.g., competitive or cooperative)
- Influence of the learner group
- Knowledge and use of self-regulatory strategies (e.g., goal setting, learning and self-motivating strategies)

### Postactional Stage

**MOTIVATIONAL RETROSPECTION**

**Motivational functions:**
- Forming causal attributions
- Elaborating standards and strategies
- Dismissing intention and further planning

**Main motivational influences:**
- Attributional factors (e.g., attributional styles and biases)
- Self-concept beliefs (e.g., self-confidence and self-worth)
- Received feedback, praise, grades

---

**FIG. 4.3. A process model of L2 motivation.**
A key tenet of the process-oriented approach is that these three actional phases are associated with largely different motives. That is, people are influenced by a set of factors while they are still contemplating an action that is different from the motives that influence them once they have embarked on the activity. And similarly, when they look back at what they have achieved and evaluate it, again a new set of motivational components will become relevant. Thus, we can organize the manifold motives that are relevant to language learning by grouping them according to which actional phase they are related to. An important corollary of this perspective is that different motivational systems advocated in the literature do not necessarily exclude each other but can be valid at the same time if they affect different stages of the motivational process. I believe, for example, that the Canadian social psychological construct is effective in explaining variance in choice motivation but to explain executive motivation, more situated factors need to be taken into account.

The process model described above is a good starting point in understanding motivational evolution but it has two obvious shortcomings. First, it implies that the actional process in question is well-definable and has clear-cut boundaries. But where exactly does action start in an educational context? As already pointed out when discussing task motivation, the task-specific behavior characterizing a concrete learning activity is not entirely independent of the actional character of the whole course, and this behavioral domain is further embedded in the complex tapestry of other activities in the particular school. These actional contexts generate somewhat different motivational mind sets in the students, resulting in a task motivation complex that is made up of motivational influences associated with various levels of action-oriented contingencies or hierarchical action sequences.

The second problem is related to the fact that the actional process does not occur in relative isolation, without any interferences from other ongoing activities the learner is engaged in. Instead, people are typically involved in a number of parallel action processes, an issue already highlighted by Atkinson and Birch (1974) in their Dynamic Action Model more than 30 years ago. This multiple engagement means that various action episodes can be simultaneously active; for example, a new action may be initiated while the success of the previous action is still being evaluated. This is particularly valid for classroom contexts where student motivation and achievement are the product of a complex set of interacting goals and intentions of both academic and social nature (Juvonen & Nishina, 1997; Wentzel, 1999): Whereas academic motivation is—hopefully—an important facet of the learners’ general disposition toward attending school, the classroom is also a social arena in which students go through some of the key developmental
experiences in their lives, such as establishing friendships, falling in love, and experimenting with increasingly elaborate personal identities. Thus, academic goals will be accompanied by different social goals and practicing teachers know all too well how such social agendas can modify or disrupt the academic action sequence. However, hardly any research has been done to examine how people deal with multiple actions and goals, how they prioritize between them, and how the hierarchies of superordinate and subordinate goals are structured (cf. Boekaerts, 1998).

**Empirical Studies on Motivational Evolution**

The process-oriented conception of L2 motivation is a novel research paradigm and at the moment few of its tenets have been explicitly tested in L2 contexts. This does not mean, however, that motivational changes have not been documented in the past; they have, particularly the frequent phenomenon that motivation loses its intensity in school contexts over sustained periods. Koizumi and Matsuo (1993), for example, examined attitudinal and motivational changes of 296 Japanese 7th grade students learning English and reported a definite decrease over a period of seven months. After this period student motivation appeared to stabilize as learners started to develop realistic goals. Tachibana, Matsukawa, and Zhong (1996) investigated 801 Chinese and Japanese pupils and also found that the students’ interest in learning English declined from junior to high school both in Japan and in China. Gardner, Masgoret, Tennant, and Mihic (2004) observed motivational changes over a period of one academic year in Canadian university students learning French and found a general tendency for the scores on the measures of language attitudes and motivation to decrease from the fall to the spring. Interestingly, situation-specific motives such as attitudes toward the learning situation displayed almost twice as big a change as more generalized motives such as integrativeness. In their Israeli study already mentioned, Inbar et al. (2001) found a consistent and significant small drop in motivation for all groups in all motivational dimensions. Finally, two separate studies, by Chambers (1999) and Williams, Burden, and Lanvers (2002), found that the motivation of British language learners declined between Year 7 and Year 9. Chambers summarized this as follows:

Year 7 pupils are looking forward with enthusiasm to learning their subject. ... The scene is set for a very positive start. Two years later, the picture is not quite so encouraging. It seems that pupils’ expectations are not matched by the reality. The honeymoon is over. The enthusiasm
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is on the wane. Pupils appear disgruntled. Something has gone wrong. (p. 81)

Recently, there have been a few data-based studies specifically addressing aspects of motivational change from a process-oriented paradigm. In a qualitative study, Ushioda (2001) interviewed 20 Irish young adult learners of French twice, with an interval of 16 months between the two sessions. The researcher’s main interest was not so much to examine the magnitude but rather the quality of the motivational evolution. The interview data revealed definite changes in the temporal frame of reference that shaped the students’ thinking, particularly with regard to the evolving nature of goal-orientation in the learners’ motivational experience: Over the 16-month period learners appeared to have developed a clearer definition of L2-related personal goals.

The changing nature of L2 motivation has also been documented in studies focusing on longer periods in the learners’ life span (e.g., Lim, 2002; Shedivy, 2004). The most systematic study of this sort to date has been carried out by Shoaib and Dörnyei (in press), who conducted qualitative interviews with 25 language learners to identify different motivational influences and various temporal patterns over a period of approximately two decades. Based on the learners’ personal histories, we discovered a number of salient recurring temporal patterns and motivational transformation episodes in the learners’ lives that resulted in the profound restructuring of their motivational disposition. Six such motivation-specific temporal themes were identified: (a) maturation and gradually increasing interest, (b) stand still period, (c) moving into a new life phase, (d) internalizing external goals and imported visions, (e) relationship with a significant other, and (f) time spent in the host environment.

Thus, while empirical results are still scarce, the available evidence indicates that examining the temporal progression of L2 motivation is a potentially fruitful research direction that can significantly enrich our understanding of the attitudinal/motivational basis of language learning.

NEW CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

We have seen in the previous sections that the study of L2 motivation has made considerable progress since the 1960s, adopting new research paradigms and approaches. The brief outline, however, could not give us more than a cursory overview of the specific issues and therefore in this section I highlight four conceptual developments which, I believe, may have a considerable bearing on future research.
Motivation and Group Dynamics

The discipline of group dynamics is a thriving interdisciplinary field in the social sciences, focusing on understanding the behavior of humans in various small group contexts such as sports teams, business committees, psychotherapy groups, or political task forces. Because contemporary education typically takes place in groups of various sizes, the principles of group dynamics are highly relevant to the study of institutional teaching/learning. This has been recognized by several recent publications in the L2 field which have examined classroom life and processes from a group perspective (e.g., Dörnyei, 1997, in press; Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997, 1999; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Ehrman & Dörnyei, 1998; Senior, 1997, 2002; Ushioda, 2003). It becomes clear from these analyses that the motivation of individual learners is significantly affected by the various groupings they are part of; as Ushioda (2003, p. 93) concluded, “The social unit of the classroom is clearly instrumental in developing and supporting the motivation of the individual.” This social influence is well illustrated by everyday statements such as someone ‘got into bad company’ or ‘you simply cannot teach in this class.’

Given the salient impact of learner groups on the members’ learning behavior, in a recent summary I have argued (Dörnyei, in press) that to create a motivating classroom environment group issues need to be taken into account just as much as more traditional motivational concerns. It is my belief that group influences can be seen as a major aspect of the L2 motivation complex and the notion of group norm is in many ways the group equivalent of individual student motivation. ‘Group norms’ refer to the overt and covert rules and routines that help to prevent chaos in the group and allow everybody to go about their business as effectively as possible. They range from explicitly imposed school regulations to spontaneously and unconsciously evolved routines as a result of copying certain behaviors of some influential member or the leader, which are then solidified into unofficial but powerful norms of classroom existence. A negative example of such covert norms is the norm of mediocrity, which refers to the peer pressure put on students in many schools not to excel or else they may be called names such as ‘nerd,’ ‘swot,’ ‘brain,’ and so on. For a more detailed analysis of the motivational impact of the social group context, please refer to Dörnyei (2001c).

Demotivation

Although there are both positive and negative forces exerting their influence on ongoing student behaviors, past motivation research has typically overlooked the negative motives and conceptualized motivation as a kind of in-
ducement, that is, as a force whose strength ranges on a continuum from zero to strong. This, however, is not in accordance with students and teachers’ classroom experience that suggests that motivational influences that ‘de-
energize’ action (Dörnyei, 2001c) are rather common. Drawing on the lessons of a large-scale longitudinal classroom investigation, Ushioda (2003) analyzed this dark side of student motivation as follows:

The inevitable problems in classroom motivation arise when there is not a happy fusion between internal and external forces but a negative tension, where the latter dominate at the expense of the former. In other words, individual motivation becomes controlled, suppressed or distorted by external forces. As argued below, this may happen through negative influences in the classroom social dynamic, or through regulating forces in the educational system. … Collective motivation can all too easily become collective demotivation, boredom, or at the far end of the spectrum, collective dissatisfaction or rebellion, often in the form of classroom counter-cultures defined by rejection of educational aims and values. (pp. 93-94)

Dörnyei (2001c) defined ‘demotivation’ as “specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action” (p. 143). I argued that being demotivated does not necessarily mean that all the positive influences that originally made up the motivational basis of a behavior have been annulled; rather, it is only the resultant force that has been dampened by a strong negative component, while some other positive motives may still remain operational. This has been illustrated by Nikolov’s (2001) study of demotivated language learners mentioned earlier. She found that although the learners in her sample all considered themselves unsuccessful, their attitudes toward knowing languages were positive. In this study the decisive force was related to negative experiences associated with the language classroom.

A review of the scarce literature on demotivation in the L2 field and in education in general reveals that the phenomenon is rather salient in learning environments and that teachers have a considerable responsibility in this respect: The majority of demotives identified in past research concern some aspects of classroom existence ‘owned’ by, or under the control of, the teacher (cf. Dörnyei, 2001c).

**Motivational Self-Regulation**

When we view motivation as a dynamic, continuously changing resultant of a variety of internal and external forces, it becomes clear that the internal monitoring, filtering, and processing mechanisms that learners employ in
Motivation and ‘Self-Motivation’

This dynamic process will have an important role in shaping the motivational outcome. It makes a great difference, for example, if someone consciously plays down any negative influences and focuses instead on forward-pointing and controllable aspects, thereby putting things in a positive light, or if the same person dwells in negative experiences without making an effort to move on. In chapter 6, I describe an important recent shift in educational psychology which has highlighted the importance of learner self-regulation, integrating the learners’ proactive involvement in controlling the various facets of their learning in a broad and unified framework. The important point from our current perspective is that self-regulation has been conceptualized to also include motivational self-regulation besides the cognitive and metacognitive components.

The study of this motivational self-regulatory process goes back to Heckhausen and Kuhl’s Action Control Theory (e.g., Heckhausen, 1991; Heckhausen & Kuhl, 1985; Kuhl & Beckmann, 1994), which formed the basis of the Dörnyei-Ottó process model of motivation (just described). As Pintrich (1999) summarizes in the conclusion of a special issue of the journal Learning and Individual Differences (Garcia, 1999), the renewed focus on the ‘whole’ person and how they control their own motivation, emotions, behavior (including choice, effort, and persistence), and their environment, has been a welcome addition to research on academic self-regulation. In the introduction of a special issue of the International Journal of Educational Research on the related topic of ‘volition in education,’ Corno (2000) expresses a similar view, namely that volitional control over sustaining motivation and implementing goals is “critically important in education, not only as means to goals but as goals in themselves” (p. 659).

The basic assumption underlying the notion of motivational self-regulation is that students who are able to maintain their motivation and keep themselves on-task in the face of competing demands and attractions should learn better than students who are less skilled at regulating their motivation (in this respect, these strategies are very similar to the affective learning strategies discussed in chapt. 6). Learning, as Wolters (2003) pointed out, is an effortful process and academic tasks are fraught with obstacles that are likely to interfere with the students’ initial motivational state; therefore their ability to remain in control of their attitudinal/motivational disposition should be seen as an important determinant of self-regulated learning and achievement. In addition to this consideration, Ushioda (2003) argued that a further function of motivational self-regulation is to help learners to ‘step outside’ certain maladaptive motivational belief systems and engage in constructive and effective thinking to regulate their motivation. In order for this to happen, learners must be brought to view their motivation as “emanating...”
from within themselves, and thus to view themselves as agents of their own motivation and their own learning” (p. 98).

Empirical evidence for the role of motivational self-regulation has been provided by Wolters (1999), who found that the effective use of five motivational regulation strategies together explained approximately 22% of the variance in effort, and approximately 16% of the variance in the learners’ grade-point average (GPA). The issue of self-motivational strategies is further analyzed and a concrete example is provided at the end of this chapter when discussing the educational implications of motivation research.

Recently, Willis Edmondson (2004) put forward an interesting typology of six motivational syndromes, indicating six typical ways or scenarios whereby learners deal with motivational conflicts. By motivational conflict Edmondson means situations when the learner’s internal motives clash with external demotivating conditions such as the lack of social acclaim (or success), social utility, and institutional support. Because these scenarios, then, concern strategic ways of dealing with partially learner-owned difficulties, they can be seen as linked to motivational self-regulation. The six syndromes are as follows: (1) P.O.R. Syndrome [Press On Regardless], involving persistence and maintained effort, (2) T.O.Y. Syndrome [Take Over Yours], involving a weaker version of the previous syndrome by also taking over some of the imposed learning goals/behaviors, (3) I.K.B. Syndrome [I Know Best], involving a confident, autonomous approach, (4) G.Y.T. Syndrome [Grit Your Teeth], involving an increased effort to do better, (5) I.N.P. Syndrome [I Need Pressure], involving a reliance on the environment for pressure to keep one going, and (6) N.E.P. Syndrome [No External Pressure], involving the opposite of the I. N. P. Syndrome as here the individual relies entirely on his or her internal resources. Edmondson suggests that the issue of which syndromes characterize an individual’s learning is an ID variable that constitutes part of the individual’s motivational profile.

The Neurobiology of Motivation

The final novel conceptual approach that I highlight in this chapter is the neurobiological investigation of motivation, introduced by John Schumann in the 1990s (for reviews, see Schumann, 1998, 1999, 2001a, 2001b; Schumann et al., 2004). As Schumann (2001a) argued, recent technological developments in brain scanning and neuroimaging have made the brain increasingly amenable to direct psychological investigation. This means that the various mental processes that have been by and large unobservable in the past might now receive direct empirical validation in neurobiological stud-
ies. What is particularly important from our perspective is that the first area of SLA that Schumann has examined from a neurobiological point of view is L2 motivation, and the result of this examination has been an intriguing motivation theory.

The key constituent of Schumann’s theory is *stimulus appraisal*, which occurs in the brain along five dimensions: *novelty* (degree of unexpectedness/familiarity), *pleasantness* (attractiveness), *goal/need significance* (whether the stimulus is instrumental in satisfying needs or achieving goals), *coping potential* (whether the individual expects to be able to cope with the event), and *self and social image* (whether the event is compatible with social norms and the individual’s self-concept). As Schumann has demonstrated, these appraisals become part of the person’s overall value system through a special ‘memory for value’ module and thus stimulus appraisals are largely responsible for providing the affective foundation of human action. More specifically, Schumann et al. (2004) proposed that stimulus appraisals compute the emotional relevance and motivational significance of stimulus events in relation to information stored in the value memory, and the generated emotions (such as joy, fear, or anger) lead to action tendencies.

Schumann (2001b) has broadened his theory by outlining a conception of learning as a form of ‘mental foraging’ (i.e., foraging for knowledge), which engages the same neural systems as the ones used by organisms when foraging to feed or mate, and which is generated by an incentive motive and potentiated by the stimulus appraisal system. Accordingly, Schumann et al. (2004) hypothesized a neural system for mental foraging in which the incentive motive or goal is held over time in the form of emotional memory or value memory, and appraisal information modulates the intensity of the incentive motive in relation to the current stimulus situation. This circuit is linked to brainstem motor nuclei, thereby enabling the generation of motor activity to achieve the organism’s goal. Although Schumann’s theory is based on the results of neurobiological research, he admits that there is as yet no direct evidence available that the proposed mechanisms do operate in SLA. However, indirect evidence for the role of stimulus appraisal and mental foraging in SLA can be found, Schumann argued, in autobiographies of L2 learners (Schumann, 1998; Schumann et al., 2004).

**REFRAMING L2 MOTIVATION AS PART OF THE SELF-SYSTEM**

Having offered an overview of the evolution of L2 motivation theory over the past decades and having highlighted some of the most promising new conceptual themes, in this section I would like to present a new conceptualization of L2 motivation that re-orientates the concept in relation to a theory of
self and identity. Three basic observations have led me to this major refor-
mulation:

• Along with many other L2 scholars, I believe that a foreign language is
  more than a mere communication code that can be learnt similarly to
  other academic subjects; instead, it is also part of the individual’s per-
  sonal ‘core,’ involved in most mental activities and forming an impor-
  tant part of one’s identity. Thus, I have become increasingly open to
  paradigms that would approach motivation from a whole-person per-
  spective.

• I have been intrigued by Robert Gardner’s concept of ‘integrativeness’
  throughout my whole research career. Although Gardner’s conceptua-
  lization of the concept makes sense in the multicultural context of Mon-
  real, where it originated from, extending the relevance of integrativeness
to learning environments that are significantly different from this con-
text (because, e.g., there is no real contact with L2 speakers available for
the learners) has not always been straightforward. Thus, I have been
trying to find a broader interpretation of the notion than was originally
offered by Gardner—the new paradigm I propose builds on the robust
body of past research but reinterprets the concept in a way that it goes
beyond the literal meaning of the verb integrate.

• Empirical results concerning various dimensions of L2 motivation have
  been relatively consistent with regard to identifying the range of factors
  that play a decisive role in a learner’s motivational disposition, but the
  exact relationship between the key components in various studies has
displayed a variety that did not seem to add up to an obvious big picture.
The specific trigger for the proposed construct was provided by my em-
pirical research with Kata Csizér (e.g., Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Csizér
& Dörnyei, 2005), in which we submitted the data obtained from a
large-scale motivation survey conducted in Hungary to a range of com-
plex multivariate statistical procedures. Structural equation modeling re-
vealed a consistent relationship in our dataset between the key variables
of integrativeness, instrumentality, attitudes toward L2 speakers, and
learning behavioral measures, and the emerging theoretical framework
to be presented in the following is an attempt to accommodate our find-
ings.

In this section I first present evidence to support the case that the classic
concepts of integrativeness and integrative motivation needs to be reinter-
preted. Then I go on to describe research in personality psychology con-
cerning possible and ideal selves, which forms the theoretical basis of the
new model. Finally, I put the pieces together in an extended theory of L2 motivation, the *L2 Motivational Self System*.

**The Need to Reinterpret ‘Integrativeness’**

If we look at the L2 motivation literature carefully, we find a certain amount of ambivalence about Gardner’s notion of ‘integrativeness’ and the ‘integrative motive,’ which sometimes amounts to a kind of ‘love–hate’ relationship in researchers outside Gardner’s Canadian circle. The concept is certainly an enigma: It is without any doubt the most researched and most talked about notion in L2 motivation studies and yet it has no obvious equivalent in any other approaches in mainstream motivational and educational psychology. Partly for this reason and partly because the actual empirical findings did not always fit Gardner’s original interpretation of the notion, several scholars in the past have questioned the validity and relevance of integrativeness. For example, a Canadian research team consisting of prominent motivational psychologists has stated:

> Although it was originally suggested that the desire for contact and identification with members of the L2 group [i.e. integrative orientation] would be critical for L2 acquisition, it would now appear that it is not fundamental to the motivational process, but has relevance only in specific sociocultural contexts. Rather, four other orientations may be seen to sustain motivation. (Noels et al., 2000, p. 60)

The four orientations—or learning goals—the researchers were advocating are *travel*, *friendship*, *knowledge*, and *instrumental orientation*, which echoes the findings of Clément and Kruidenier’s (1983) seminal paper in the early 1980s that was the first ‘insider challenge’ to the integrative construct proposed by Gardner.

Other scholars arrived at a similarly critical perspective on different bases. For example, investigating language learning in Japan, McClelland (2000) called for a definition of ‘integrativeness’ that focuses on “integration with the global community rather than assimilation with native speakers” (p. 109), highlighting a “need to reappraise Gardner’s concept of integrativeness to fit a perception of English as an international language” (ibid). Using path analysis, Yashima (2000) actually attempted this reappraisal and found that the results confirmed the “causal relations proposed in Gardner’s model, although here integrativeness was replaced with two orientations [instrumental and intercultural friendship orientations] which had been operationally defined as most important in the Japanese English learning context” (p. 131).
In a survey article reviewing motivation research in Japan, Irie (2003) also mentioned the ambiguous disposition toward integrative motivation:

Most studies on Japanese university students report a factor indicating positive disposition toward native speakers and the cultures of the TL [target language] community. One can interpret this as a form of integrative motivation, and indeed researchers refer to the concept by acknowledging the similarity to Gardner’s expanded definition: positive attitudes toward TL communities and TL speakers, without a desire to assimilate into them (Gardner, 1985, 2001a). However, the researchers avoid using integrative motivation as a label, as they believe the factor does not fit the original definition. Another possible reason for avoiding the label is that in many studies the positive disposition factor included items on utilitarian interests, such as traveling, which blurred the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation as pointed out by Dörnyei (1990, 1994a). (pp. 90–91)

Based on a recent qualitative study in Indonesia, Lamb (2004) drew a similar conclusion:

Moreover, we have seen that an integrative and instrumental orientation are difficult to distinguish as separate concepts. Meeting with westerners, using computers, understanding pop songs, studying and traveling abroad, pursuing a desirable career—all these aspirations are associated with each other and with English as an integral part of the globalization processes that are transforming their society and will profoundly affect their own lives. (p. 15).

Finally, in an article focusing on the existence of integrative motivation in Taiwan, Warden and Lin (2000) did not succeed in identifying such a motive; as they summarized, “This preliminary study has discerned the existence of two motivational groups and two temporal orientations in the Taiwanese EFL environment. An integrative motivational group is notably absent” (p. 544). This result, in fact, is not unique, as several studies in the past, particularly in foreign language learning situations, failed to detect a motive that could be labeled as ‘integrative’ in Gardner’s original sense. In light of these findings and because our own Hungarian data did not confirm the traditional content validity of the integrative concept either, Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) concluded:

Although further research is needed to justify any alternative interpretation, we believe that rather than viewing ‘integrativeness’ as a classic and therefore ‘untouchable’ concept, scholars need to seek potential new conceptualizations and interpretations that extend or
elaborate on the meaning of the term without contradicting the large body of relevant empirical data accumulated during the past four decades. (p. 456)

So, what does an integrative disposition involve? In broad terms, an ‘integrative’ motivational orientation concerns a positive interpersonal/affective disposition toward the L2 community and the desire for affiliation with its members. It implies an openness to, and respect for, the other cultural group and its way of life; in the extreme, it might involve complete identification with the community and possibly even withdrawal from one’s original group. Thus, a core aspect of the integrative disposition is some sort of a psychological and emotional identification. According to Gardner (2001a), this identification concerns the L2 community (i.e., identifying with the speakers of the target language), but I argued over a decade ago (Dörnyei, 1990) that in the absence of a salient L2 group in the learners’ environment (as is often the case in foreign language learning contexts in which the L2 is primarily learnt as a school subject) the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language, as well as to the actual L2.

Thus, one way of extending the concept of ‘integrativeness’ is to talk about some sort of a virtual or metaphorical identification with the sociocultural loading of a language, and in the case of the undisputed world language, English, this identification would be associated with a non-parochial, cosmopolitan, globalized world citizen identity. In several parts of the world there is a clear indication that such a ‘world identity’ exists, and it is merely a terminological issue as to whether we label this a modified version of integrativeness or in some other way. Yashima (2000, 2004) for example talked about an ‘international posture,’ referring to a complex trait that includes an “interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness to go overseas to study or work, readiness to interact with intercultural partners and … a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures” (Yashima, 2000, p. 57). This variable appears to be similar to ‘international orientation,’ which Nakata (1995a, 1995b) found to be an important individual difference variable among Japanese learners, involving a general cosmopolitan outlook.

The World English identity is, of course, also related to instrumental aspects because the English-speaking world coincides with several of the technically most developed industrialized nations and therefore English has become the language associated with technological advances, for example computing and the Internet. This may explain the frequently observed blending of integrative and instrumental motives, which has been explicitly expressed by Kimura, Nakata, and Okumura (2001) when they talked about an ‘Intrinsic-Instrumental-Integrative Motive.’ The conceptualization of this
global language identity is in line with psychological research on the effects of globalization: Lamb (2004) draws attention of Arnett’s (2002) summary of the psychology of globalization, in which the author argues that “most people now develop a bicultural identity, in which part of their identity is rooted in their local culture while another part stems from an awareness of their relation to the global culture” (p. 777). Through the media, especially television but increasingly the Internet, young people in diverse countries “develop a global identity that gives them a sense of belonging to a worldwide culture and includes an awareness of the events, practices, styles and information that are part of the global culture” (ibid).

At this stage it is important to introduce the intriguing concept of the ‘imagined community’ proposed by Bonny Norton (2001). Based on Wenger’s (1998) notion of ‘imagination’ as a mode of belonging to a community, Norton conceptualizes the concept of ‘communities of imagination’ as being constructed by a combination of personal experiences and factual knowledge (derived from the past) with imagined elements related to the future. It appears that the notion of ‘imagined community’ lends itself to be used with regard to the various international or World English identities described above as these identities concern membership in a virtual language community. Indeed, Norton explicitly states that a learner’s imagined community invites an “imagined identity” (p. 166). Looking at integrative motivation from this perspective, it can be viewed as the desired integration into an imagined L2 community.

While the concept of extended or metaphorical or imaginary integration does help to explain findings that are in many ways similar to the Canadian results but have been obtained in contexts without any realistic opportunity for direct integration, I would suggest that we can get an even more coherent picture if we leave the term ‘integrative’ completely behind and focus more on the identification aspects and on the learner’s self-concept. An important theoretical strand in personality psychology which has elaborated on ‘possible’ and ‘ideal selves’ appears to be particularly relevant in this respect.

‘Possible’ and ‘Ideal Selves’

Personality psychology, as we saw in chapter 1, has made considerable progress in understanding the structural basis of individual differences, and there have been substantial advances in the taxonomic efforts to chart the major and stable personality dimensions (cf. the Big Five model). These advances, according to Cantor (1990), have paved the way for paying more attention to questions about how these individual differences are translated into behavioral characteristics, examining the “‘doing’ sides of personality”
Thus, over the past two decades self theorists have become increasingly interested in the active, dynamic nature of the self-system. As Markus and Ruvolo (1989) summarized, the traditionally static concept of self-representations was gradually replaced with a self-system that mediates and controls ongoing behavior, and various mechanisms, including ‘self-regulation’ (described earlier), have been put forward to link the self with action. As a result, recent dynamic representations of the self-system place the self right at the heart of motivation and action, creating an intriguing interface between personality and motivational psychology.

I believe that possible selves offer the most powerful, and at the same time the most versatile, motivational self-mechanism, representing the individuals’ ideas of what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming. As Markus and Nurius (1986) described in their seminal paper that introduced the concept,

The possible selves that are hoped for might include the successful self, the creative self, the rich self, the thin self, or the loved and admired self, whereas the dreaded possible selves could be the alone self, the depressed self, the incompetent self, the alcoholic self, the unemployed self, or the bag lady self. (p. 954)

Thus, possible selves are specific representations of one’s self in future states, involving thoughts, images, and senses, and are in many ways the manifestations, or personalized carriers, of one’s goals and aspiration (or fears, of course). As Markus and Nurius (1986) emphasize, possible selves are represented in the same imaginary and semantic way as the here-and-now self, that is, they are a reality for the individual. According to the scholars, it is a major advantage for framing future goals in this way—that is, in terms of self images—because this representation seems to capture some elements of what people actually experience when they are engaged in motivated or goal-directed behavior. As Markus and Ruvolo (1989) state, by focusing on possible selves we are “phenomenologically very close to the actual thoughts and feelings that individuals experience as they are in the process of motivated behavior and instrumental action” (p. 217).

It is clear from the above description that positive ‘possible selves’ are closely related to ‘visions.’ Tim Murphey (1998) gives a fascinating account of the motivational disposition of a former Olympic athlete, Marilyn King, and of top sportspeople in general:

Marilyn says now that most people think that Olympic athletes have a lot of will-power and determination and that’s what enables them to work so hard. She says no, it’s not that; it’s the vision. It’s the power of an image that inspires great passion and excitement—so much that you
have enormous energy to do what you want. … She started bringing together other ex-Olympians to find out if they had had similar experiences. She discovered that most Olympians had a very clear vision of what they wanted and that this vision was constantly present. The vision (or goal or outcome) also inspired great passion and excitement. The vision and the passion inspired them to take a lot of action, over and over again. To do something about it. (p. 62)

I believe that Marilyn King’s vision can be seen as a possible self, and it certainly had a powerful motivational effect on her. This direct link between vision and action was very clearly depicted in her recollection of how she managed to get up at dawn for training. Her typical first reaction was ‘Oh I’m too tired…,’ but as Murphey (1998, p. 62) describes, as she lay there, “the image of her walking into the Olympic stadium would pop into her head, and she would smile, and get excited! And she just couldn’t stay in bed! She would get up and run!” (p. 62) This appears to be a perfect illustration of Markus and Ruvolo’s (1989) claim that “imaging one’s own actions through the construction of elaborated possible selves achieving the desired goal may thus directly facilitate the translation of goals into intentions and instrumental actions” (p. 213). A similar idea has been expressed by Wenger (1998) when describing the concept of ‘imagination:’

My use of the concept of imagination refers to a process of expanding our self by transcending our time and space and creating new images of the world and ourselves. Imagination in this sense is looking at an apple seed and seeing a tree. It is playing scales on a piano, and envisioning a concert hall. (p. 176)

Thus, possible selves give form, meaning, structure, and direction to one’s hopes and threats, thereby inciting and directing purposeful behavior. The more vivid and elaborate the possible self, the more motivationally effective it is expected to be. Furthermore, research has shown that the impact of the self will be even stronger if a positive possible self is offset by a feared possible self in the same domain (cf. Carver, Reynolds & Scheier, 1994; Oyserman, Bybee, Terry, & Hart-Johnson, 2004). This makes sense: A positive image will be a stronger motivational resource if it is linked with representations of what could happen if the desired state should not be realized. Therefore, Markus and Ruvolo (1989) concluded that a dynamic balance between one’s expected and feared selves in a given domain will create a more powerful motivational state than either an expected possible self or a feared self alone.

The educational relevance of possible selves has been documented by a number of studies (e.g., Oyserman, Terry, & Bybee, 2002; Oyserman et al., 2004; Yowell, 2002). They can act as ‘academic self-guides,’ and in this re-
spect I found the concept of one type of possible self, the *ideal self*, particularly useful. It was introduced by Higgins (1987), referring to the representation of the attributes that someone would ideally like to possess (i.e., representation of hopes, aspirations, or wishes). Higgins also mentioned another self-guide that has particular relevance to future behavior strivings, the *ought self*, referring to the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., a representation of someone’s sense of your duty, obligations, or responsibilities) and which therefore may bear little resemblance to desires or wishes. The motivational aspect of these self-guides is explained by Higgins’s *self-discrepancy theory*, postulating that people are motivated to reach a condition where their self-concept matches their personally relevant self-guides. In other words, motivation in this sense involves the desire to reduce the discrepancy between one’s actual and ideal or ought selves.

Although ideal and ought selves are similar to each other in that they are both related to the attainment of a desired end-state, Higgins (1998) emphasized that the predilections associated with the two different types of future selves are motivationally distinct from each other: Ideal self-guides have a *promotion* focus, concerned with hopes, aspirations, advancements, growth, and accomplishments; whereas ought self-guides have a *prevention* focus, regulating the absence or presence of negative outcomes, and are concerned with safety, responsibilities, and obligations. This distinction, Higgins adds, is in line with the age-old motivational principle that people approach pleasure and avoid pain.

Although I believe that the concept of ideal self may be useful when conceptualizing academic motivation, we should note that the ideal self theory is far from complete. Nasby (1997) points out, for example, that we still do not have an accurate description of the actual structures (e.g., associative networks, frames, lists of behaviors, propositions, prototypes) that describe the ideal self, even though different structures would entail different information-processing and self-directive properties. Neither is it clear how one’s ideal self, which serves as a positive reference point, is related to the aspirations that others have about the particular individual. Higgins (1996) suggested that, to begin with, ideal self representations typically involve the standpoint of others and the person’s own distinct standpoint develops only gradually.

Higgins (1987, 1996) emphasized that there are several types of self-representations beyond the ideal or ought self concepts and that not everyone is expected to possess a developed ideal or ought self guide. This lack of desired self guides would, then, explain the absence of sufficient motivation in many people, and this claim is also related to Markus and Nurius’s (1986) argument that aspirations will only be effective in motivating behavior if they have been elaborated into a specific possible self in the working self-
concept. Ruvolo and Markus (1992) provide empirical evidence that imagery manipulations (in their case, asking participants to imagine themselves as successful or unsuccessful before a task) increased the accessibility of possible selves and this was reflected in the subjects’ performance. We come back to the question of the enhancement of self-representations at the end of this chapter when we consider practical implications about how to increase learner motivation by priming positive possible selves and by stimulating a desired end-state.

Integrativeness and the Ideal Language Self

In the multivariate statistical analysis of Hungarian school children’s generalized motivational dispositions already mentioned briefly, Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) found that a latent factor that would have been traditionally identified as ‘integrativeness’ played a key role in mediating the effects of all the other attitudinal/motivational variables on two criterion measures related to motivated learning behavior, intended effort and language choice (see Fig. 4.4, for a schematic representation). Curiously, the immediate antecedents of this latent variable were attitudes toward L2 speakers/community and instrumentality; thus, our results indicated that ‘integrativeness’ was closely associated with two very different variables, faceless pragmatic incentives and personal attitudes toward members of the L2 community. I believe that applying the ‘self’ framework just described offers a good explanation of our findings. Looking at ‘integrativeness’ from the self perspective, the concept can be conceived of as the L2-specific facet of one’s ideal self: If one’s ideal self is associated with the mastery of an L2, that is, if the person that we would like to become is proficient in the L2, we can be described as having an ‘integrative’ disposition.

This self interpretation of integrativeness is fully compatible with the direct relationship of the concept with ‘attitudes toward members of the L2 community’ in that L2 speakers are the closest parallels to the idealized L2-speaking self, which suggests that the more positive our disposition toward these L2 speakers, the more attractive our idealized L2 self. Earlier I introduced Norton’s (2001) concept of the ‘imagined community’ and I believe that this concept can be meaningfully linked to the self approach: Our idealized L2-speaking self can be seen as a member of an imagined L2 community whose mental construction is partly based on our real-life experiences of members of the community/communities speaking the particular L2 in question and partly on our imagination. Thus, it is difficult to envisage that one can develop a potent ideal L2-speaking self while at the same time despising the people who speak the L2 in question.
The self interpretation also explains why instrumentality, the other main antecedent of integrativeness, correlated highly with integrativeness in the Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) study: Because the idealized language self is a cognitive representation of all the incentives associated with L2 mastery, it is also linked to professional competence. To put it broadly, in our idealized image of ourselves we may not only want to appear personally agreeable but also professionally successful. We should note here, however, that from a self perspective the term *instrumentality* can be divided into two types: Depending on the extent of internalization of the extrinsic motives that make up instrumentality, the concept can be related either to the ‘ideal self’ or to the ‘ought self.’ In the former case, instrumentality will be closely associated with the ideal L2 identity and will therefore contribute significantly to the learner’s effort expenditure. On the other hand, non-internalized instrumental motives associated with the ‘ought self,’ that is, motives generated by a mere sense of duty or a fear of punishment, are more likely to have a short-term effect, without providing the sustained commitment that the successful mastery of an L2 requires. This division is in accordance with Higgins’s
(1998) distinction of a promotion versus prevention focus described above: Instrumental motives with a promotion focus (e.g., to learn English for the sake of professional advancement) are related to the ideal self, whereas instrumental motives with a prevention focus (e.g., study in order not to fail the test) are part of the ought self. Interestingly, a study by Kyriacou and Benmansour (1997) proposed a data-based five-factor construct that seems to reflect this duality well as it comprises a component labeled ‘long-term instrumental motivation,’ focusing on acquiring the L2 to enhance one’s future professional career, and also a ‘short-term instrumental motivation’ factor, focusing on getting good grades.

Thus, instrumentality and the attitudes toward the L2 speakers constitute two complementary aspects of the ideal language self: its general agreeableness and its achievement-related effectiveness/competence. Within this framework what has traditionally been called ‘integrativeness’ refers to the overall driving force to approximate this idealized vision as much as possible. I do not think that the term integrativeness does justice to the broader interpretation of the concept described here; rather, I suggest that it be re-labeled as the Ideal L2 Self.

As noted earlier, the conception of the Ideal L2 Self does not conflict with Gardner’s original notion of integrativeness related to an identification process; in fact, a model put forward by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) as an extension of Gardner’s traditional construct indirectly confirms this conceptualization. The Tremblay and Gardner model proposes three main motivational facets: the first one is centered around ‘Language attitudes,’ a composite factor made up of ‘Attitudes toward L2 speakers,’ ‘Integrative orientation,’ ‘Interest in foreign languages,’ ‘Instrumental orientation,’ and ‘Attitude toward the L2 course.’ This core cluster is linked to ‘Motivational behavior’ (the third facet), through the mediation of three variables making up of the second facet: ‘Goal salience,’ ‘Valence’ (denoting an L2-learning related value component) and ‘Self-efficacy.’ The important aspect of the model from our current perspective is the ‘Language attitudes’ factor in the first facet, because this bears a close resemblance to the proposed concept of Ideal L2 Self in that it subsumes integrative orientation, instrumental orientation, and L2-speaker-related attitudes.

Thus, although the Ideal L2 Self perspective provides a good fit to the motivational data accumulated in the past and does not contradict the traditional conceptualizations of L2 motivation, it presents a broader frame of reference with increased capacity for explanatory power: Integrativeness seen as Ideal L2 Self can be used to explain the motivational set-up in diverse learning contexts even if they offer little or no contact with L2 speakers (e.g., in typical foreign language learning situations where the L2 is primarily a school language), and it would also be suitable for the study of the
motivational basis of language globalization, whereby international languages, and World English in particular, are rapidly losing their national cultural base and are becoming associated with a global culture. That is, the Ideal L2 Self perspective offers a paradigm that can explain the ‘integrativeness enigma’ that has emerged in various data-based studies (reviewed above). One indication that this is a realistic prospect has been offered recently by Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004), who argued as follows:

Those who are conscious of how they relate themselves to the world tend to be motivated to study English as they probably visualize ‘English-using selves’ clearly. The ‘possible selves’ and ‘ideal selves’ Dörnyei (2003b) cited in his discussion might be helpful for understanding the motivation process of Japanese learners. … Is it possible to hypothesize that learners who clearly visualize ‘possible’ or ‘ideal’ English-using selves are likely to make an effort to become more proficient and develop WTC and engage in interaction with others using English? (pp. 142–143)

The answer to Yashima et al.’s question is affirmative, as evidenced by Masgoret and Gardner (2003)’s meta-analysis of 75 empirical studies conducted by Gardner and his associates in the social psychological vein. The researchers found that that integrative orientation displayed an overall pattern of higher correlations with criterion measures than instrumental orientation in both foreign and second language contexts.

**The L2 Motivational Self System**

The Ideal L2 Self perspective creates links with two important recent conceptualizations of L2 motivation by Noels (2003) and Ushioda (2001). It appears that the various models converge in a broad pattern of three main dimensions of L2 motivation, and if we compare this pattern with Gardner’s original theoretical model we also find striking similarities. I have labeled the emerging new motivation construct, described below, the *L2 Motivational Self System*. Let us look at this system in more detail.

As discussed earlier, based on her systematic research program to examine the L2 relevance and links of self-determination theory, Kim Noels (2003) suggested a larger motivation construct made up of three interrelated types of orientations: (a) intrinsic reasons inherent in the language learning process, (b) extrinsic reasons for language learning, and (c) integrative reasons. Using qualitative rather than quantitative methods, Ushioda (2001) has identified a more complex construct which, however, is conceptually related to the one offered by Noels. Her findings pointed to eight motivational di-
dimensions, which can be grouped in three broad clusters which correspond closely to Noels’s framework: The first cluster concerns the actual learning process (subsuming the following components: Language-Related Enjoyment/Liking, Positive Learning History, and Personal Satisfaction); the second cluster corresponds to the dimension that Ushioda labeled External Pressures/Incentives; the third cluster is made up of four constituents, forming a board integrative dimension: Personal Goals, Desired Levels of L2 Competence (consisting of language-intrinsic goals), Academic Interest (which had the greatest contribution from interest in French literature), and Feelings about French-speaking Countries or People.

In an attempt to synthesize these two paradigms with my own research findings, I would like to propose a new L2 Motivational Self System, which is a broad construct of L2 motivation, made up of three dimensions:

1. **Ideal L2 Self**, referring to the L2-specific facet of one’s ideal self: If the person we would like to become speaks an L2, the ideal L2 self is a powerful motivator to learn the L2 because of the desire to reduce the discrepancy between our actual and ideal selves. This dimension is related to Noels’ integrative category and the third cluster formed of Ushioda’s motivational facets.

2. **Ought-to L2 Self**, referring to the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes. This dimension corresponds on the one hand to Higgins’ ought self and thus the more extrinsic (i.e., less internalized) types of instrumental motives, and on the other hand to the ‘extrinsic’ constituents in both Noels’ and Ushioda’s taxonomies.

3. **L2 Learning Experience**, which concerns situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience. Although Csizér and Dörnyei’s (2005) study only concerned generalized (i.e., non-situation-specific) motives and therefore did not offer information about this dimension, past research conducted in the spirit of the situated approach described earlier has provided ample evidence of the pervasive influence of executive motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience. This dimension corresponds to Noels’ intrinsic category and the first cluster formed of Ushioda’s motivational facets.

Ushioda (2001) summarized her findings as follows: “We can classify all the factors in each language learner’s motivational configuration as either causal (deriving from the continuum of L2-learning and L2-related experience to date) or teleological (directed toward short-term or long-term goals and future perspectives)” (p. 107). This summary fits the proposed construct closely, because the Ideal and the Ought-to L2 Selves are by definition
teleological, concerning future motivational perspectives (as they concern imagined future end-states) and the \textit{L2 Learning Experience} component is the causal dimension. It is interesting that Ushioda found that the future-oriented dimension of motivational goals/incentives and the past/present-oriented perception of the learning experience are in a complementary relationship: In her study, students with positive learning experiences tended to emphasize intrinsic motivational factors whereas participants with less illustrious learning histories tended to define their motivation principally in terms of particular personal goals or career plans. This would suggest that there may be two potentially successful motivational routes for language learners, either fueled by the positive experiences of their learning reality or by their visions for the future.

Finally, let us compare the proposed system to Robert Gardner’s conceptualization of the integrative motive (cf. Fig. 4.1). At first sight there is little resemblance but if we take into account that the ‘motivation’ subcomponent is associated to a considerable degree with motivated behavioral measures and that Gardner has recently attached a possible instrumental motivational link to the Motivation subcomponent, we find striking similarities: The model suggests, in effect, that motivated behavior (i.e., the Motivation subcomponent) is determined by three major motivational dimension: Integrativeness, Instrumentality, and the Attitudes toward the learning situation, which corresponds closely with the proposed L2 Motivational Self System.

**Temporal aspects of the L2 Motivational Self System**

Although I have demonstrated that the L2 Motivational Self System is in accordance with some of the most influential lines of thoughts in L2 motivation research, further research is needed to establish its compatibility with the process-oriented conception of L2 motivation (described earlier). The L2 Learning Experience dimension is undoubtedly related to executive motives associated with the actional stage of motivated behavior, and the Ideal and Ought-to L2 Selves are by definition involved in pre-actional deliberation, but it needs to be specified how the latter two components relate to motivational processing occurring during the actional and post-actional phases of the motivational process. Ushioda (2001) suggested that motivational change entails the evolving nature of goal-orientation, that is, achieving a clearer definition of L2-related personal goals. Within a self framework this would correspond to the elaboration of the Ideal L2 Self and perhaps the internalization of the Ought-to L2 Self.

A possible promising inroad into understanding the interface of the Ideal L2 Self and the actional phase of motivation opens up if we consider
Norton’s (2001) concept of ‘imagined communities’ discussed earlier. Analyzing the stories of two immigrant language learners in Canada, Norton described their ‘imagined communities’ as follows:

When Katarina and Felicia entered their language classrooms, they not only saw a classroom with four walls, but envisioned a community that transcended time and space. Thus although these learners were engaged in classroom practices, the realm of their community extended to the imagined world outside the classroom—their imagined community. (p. 164)

Norton argued that while Katarina and Felicia were actively engaged in classroom practices, the realm of their community extended beyond the four walls of the classroom; that is, they were operating at the interface of reality and imagination. However, in their case some serious problems occurred because their imagined communities were not accessible to the teacher, who, in each case, focused her energy on practices of engagement, rather than on practices of the imagination. As Norton concludes, it was for this reason that Katarina and Felicia ultimately withdrew from their ESL classes. This is a notable insight that offers a way of combining the imagined and the social aspect of classroom reality, leading to the pedagogical recommendation that teachers should encourage learners to think of themselves as living in multiple communities, including the classroom community, the target language community, and the imagined community.

Norton (2001) also highlighted Wenger’s (1998) proposal of three modes of belonging to a community: engagement, imagination, and alignment. The conceptualization of imagination and alignment can lead us to a better understanding of how ideal self images are realized in concrete situations, because, as Norton explained, “imagination does not necessarily result in the coordination of action. It is here that the notion of alignment becomes central, because it is through alignment that learners do what they have to do to take part in a larger community” (p. 164). The author argued that the concept of ‘investment’ deserves special attention in this respect because this can capture the learner’s active process of promoting belonging to the imagined community (see also Pittaway, 2004).

Finally, it may also be useful to consider Wenger’s (1998) conceptualization of ‘alignment’ more closely. It reflects people’s coordinating their “energy and activities in order to fit within broader structures and to contribute to broader enterprises” (p. 174). Thus, alignment concerns motivated behavior whereby participants coordinate their energies, actions, and practices. It directs and controls energy, bringing into the picture, in Wenger’s words, a “scope of action writ” (p. 179). The crucial question from our perspective is how imagination and alignments interact. Wenger gave
some general guidelines when he stated that imagination can change both our understanding of alignment and our ability to control it because imagination helps to build a picture of how our part fits.

**L2 MOTIVATION AND SLA RESEARCH**

Before we look at the practical, pedagogical implications of L2 motivation research, let us examine a curious situation that characterizes the position of motivation research within the broader domain of SLA. Although the study of language learning motivation has undoubtedly been one of the most developed areas within SLA research, it has virtually no links with other SLA research traditions, resulting in what appears to be a total lack of integration of motivation research into the traditional domain of applied linguistics. What is the reason for this puzzling isolation? One obvious cause may be the different scholarly backgrounds of the researchers working in the two areas. L2 motivation research has been initiated and spearheaded by social psychologists interested in second languages, whereas the scholars pursuing the mainstream directions of SLA research have been predominantly linguists by training. I suspect, however, that this is only part of the answer, and some of the reasons are inherent to the past practice of motivation research.

In my view, the crux of the problem is that SLA research, naturally, focuses on the development of language knowledge and skills and therefore analyses various language processes from a situated, process-oriented perspective. This perspective, however, has been largely incompatible with the product-oriented approach adopted by traditional motivation research, especially within the social-psychological paradigm. Broadly speaking, the main questions motivation researchers have traditionally asked are these:

- *What are the motivational characteristics of the students who decide to study an L2?*
- *How do different types of motivational dispositions affect L2 learning achievement?*

That is, the traditional motivational focus has involved matching motivational conditions and learning outcomes. In contrast, and again broadly speaking, the main question SLA researchers seek to answer is this:

- *How does the acquisition of a second language take place?*

That is, SLA researchers have concentrated on the process of language development in learners who have already made a commitment to L2 learning, without being too concerned about what exactly initiated this process.
Edmondson (2004) called this view the *enabling function of motivation*, explaining it as follows:

It hypothesizes that some minimal motivational profile is a necessary precondition for acquisition. Roughly, we can’t do it, unless we ‘put our minds to it,’ and this enabling function can be translated metaphorically as the lowest tolerable rheostat setting, in Stevick’s terms, or a slightly porous affective filter in Krashen’s terminology. (p. 4)

Thus, traditional L2 motivation researchers were not particularly interested in the process of language learning because for them the focal issues of SLA were rather irrelevant—if one is interested in the social foundation of intercultural communication and affiliation, then the developmental order of various morphological features of the L2, to give only one example, is likely to seem unimportant. And, similarly, traditional SLA researchers have not been particularly interested in motivation—if one is interested in interlanguage development, then learning about the attitudinal orientations of ethnonational communities is rather unhelpful. Thus, the two different research perspectives have prevented any real communication between the two camps.

Recently, however, the prospects for some real integration between the study of L2 motivation and mainstream SLA have improved considerably for at least two reasons. First, as argued in the Introduction of this volume, there has been a changing climate in applied linguistics, characterized by an increasing openness to the inclusion of psychological factors and processes into research paradigms. Second, the introduction of the process-oriented approach to motivation research has created a research perspective that is not unlike the general approach of SLA research, thereby enabling scholars coming from the two traditions to look at their targets through the same lens. This potential interface still does not automatically guarantee integration. For real integration to take place, L2 motivation research needs to meet a final criterion, namely that it should focus on specific *language behaviors* rather than general learning outcomes as the criterion measure. To exemplify this, instead of looking, for instance, at how the learners’ various motivational attributes correlate with language proficiency measures in an L2 course (which would be a typical traditional design), researchers need to look at how various motivational features affect learners’ specific learning behaviors during the course, such as their increased willingness to communicate in the L2, their engagement in learning tasks, or their use of certain learning/communication techniques and strategies. The viability of such an approach has been shown by Markee’s (2001) intriguing study in which he related conversation analytical moves in interlanguage discourse to underlying motivational themes.
EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS: DEVISING MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES

The cognitive-situated period of L2 motivation research shifted the attention to classroom-specific aspects of motivation and created a fertile ground for educational implications directly relevant to classroom practice. In conclusion to this chapter, I discuss three areas where recent advances have generated material that can promote the effectiveness of instructed SLA: (a) the systematic development of motivational strategies that can be applied by the teacher to generate and maintain motivation in the learners, (b) the formulation of self-motivating strategies that enable the learners to take personal control of the affective conditions and experiences that shape their subjective involvement in learning, and (c) the study of teacher motivation. The description of these themes is followed by a final section that examines how the newly proposed L2 Motivational Self System can enrich our understanding of the practical aspects of L2 motivation.

Devising Motivational Strategies

Given the widespread problems observed with regard to the insufficient commitment and enthusiasm of language learners, as well as the high rate of language learning failure, L2 teachers have traditionally been on the lookout for techniques they can apply to enhance student motivation. In 2001, I felt the time was ripe to summarize the relevant developments within both the L2 field and educational psychology, and the richness of what I found was frankly astonishing: There is a wealth of materials that classroom practitioners can apply to promote their motivational teaching practice and to create a motivating classroom environment (Dörnyei, 2001a, in press). Therefore, an unexpected new challenge arose: the need to organize the possible motivational strategies in a structure that offers a wide range of options for teachers to choose from yet which avoids being daunting and making readers feel how complex the domain is and how much they are not doing. The final framework I came up with was based on the Dörnyei-Ottó process model described earlier and consisted of four main dimensions (see Fig. 4.5):

1. creating the basic motivational conditions,
2. generating initial student motivation,
3. maintaining and protecting motivation,
4. encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation.
In Dörnyei (2001a) these motivational facets are further broken down to concrete motivational strategies and techniques, covering a wide range of areas from ‘Making the teaching materials relevant to the learners’ through ‘Setting specific learner goals’ to ‘Increasing learner satisfaction.’ In the concluding chapter of that book I proposed a selective and stepwise approach to broadening one’s motivational repertoire: It was argued that in developing a motivation-sensitive teaching practice it is not the quantity but the quality of the selected strategies that matters. Accordingly, we should aim at becoming good enough motivators rather than striving unreasonably to achieve ‘Supermotivator’ status. A few well-chosen strategies that suit both the teacher and the learners might take one beyond the motivational threshold, creating an overall positive motivational climate in the classroom. Some of the most motivating teachers often rely only on a few basic techniques.

Devising Action Control and Self-Motivating Strategies

The bottom box in Figure 4.5 contains a strategic area, ‘Promoting self-motivating strategies,’ which is different from the other motivational scaffolding techniques in that it passes the ownership of motivation from the teacher to the students: By applying self-motivating strategies, learners assume responsibility and regulatory control of their own motivational disposition. Because contemporary learning theories in educational psychology presume an active contribution of the learner as an agent in constructing knowledge (cf. McGroarty, 1998, 2001), a shift toward a conception of motivation that is at least partly owned by the learner makes intuitive sense. It is important to realize, however, that learners will not automatically take ownership of their motivational disposition but need to be supported in this process. In particular, their awareness needs to be raised about the variety of the potential mental reinforcers they can apply.

How can we describe the possible self-motivating strategies? Most psychological investigations in this area go back to Kuhl’s (1985) pioneering conceptualization of action control mechanisms, which constituted a subclass of self-regulatory strategies concerning the learners’ motivational regulatory function (see chapt. 6). Based on Corno (1993), Corno and Kanfer (1993), and Kuhl (1987), I divided self-motivating strategies into five main classes (Dörnyei, 2001a):
FIG. 4.5. The Components of Motivational L2 Teaching Practice.
1. **Commitment control strategies** for helping to preserve or increase the learners’ original goal commitment (e.g., keeping in mind favorable expectations or positive incentives and rewards; focusing on what would happen if the original intention failed).

2. **Metacognitive control strategies** for monitoring and controlling concentration, and for curtailing unnecessary procrastination (e.g., identifying recurring distractions and developing defensive routines; focusing on the first steps to take in a course of action).

3. **Satiation control strategies** for eliminating boredom and adding extra attraction or interest to the task (e.g., adding a twist to the task; using one’s fantasy to liven up the task).

4. **Emotion control strategies** for managing disruptive emotional states or moods, and for generating emotions that are conducive to implementing one’s intentions (e.g., self-encouragement; using relaxation and meditation techniques).

5. **Environmental control strategies** for eliminating negative environmental influences and exploiting positive environmental influences by making the environment an ally in the pursuit of a difficult goal (e.g., eliminating distractions; asking friends to help one not to allow to do something).

Chapter 6 presents an instrument developed by Tseng, Dörnyei, and Schmitt (in press) to measure students’ self-regulatory capacity in the area of vocabulary learning following the taxonomy just discussed, and the results of the validation of this scale provided empirical confirmation of the soundness of the system.

Recently, Wolters (2003) offered a different system of macrostrategies for the regulation of motivation. This taxonomy, which is an extension of his earlier work (Wolters, 1999), is not exhaustive but, as the author argued, is merely intended to substantiate the motivational self-regulatory process. Wolters identified eight key strategic ways in which students can regulate their motivation:

- **Self-Consequating**: Identifying and administering self-provided extrinsic rewards or punishments for reinforcing one’s desire to reach particular goals associated with completing an academic task. The rewards can be concrete such as buying an ice-cream or more subtle such as making self-praising verbal statements.

- **Goal-Oriented Self-Talk**: Using subvocal statements or thoughts designed to increase one’s desire to complete a task. This self-talk is simi-
lar to the self-reinforcing verbal statements mentioned above but the content goes beyond mere praises. Instead, students intensify their focus by elaborating on or making salient various reasons for persisting with the task, thereby ‘talking themselves into’ increased performance.

- **Interest Enhancement**: Increasing one’s intrinsic motivation by using strategies that promote the immediate enjoyment or situational interest of an activity, for example by turning the task into a game.

- **Environmental Structuring**: Decreasing the possibility of off-task behavior by reducing the probability of encountering distractions or reducing the intensity of distractions.

- **Self-Handicapping**: Manufacturing obstructions before or during a task to make the task more difficult. By doing so, students in effect create a kind of ‘win-win’ situation for themselves because if they fail, they can use the obstacle as a mitigating circumstance, and if they succeed against the odds, that puts them in a particularly good light.

- **Attribution Control**: As Wolters (2003) points out, self-handicapping entails the students’ *a priori* manipulation of the causal attributions that they can make once the outcome of an academic task has been obtained. Causal attributions, however, can also be manipulated after task completion in a way that they positively impact motivation by the purposeful selection of causal explanations that put students in a positive light.

- **Efficacy Management**: Monitoring, evaluating, and purposefully controlling one’s own self-efficacy for tasks by applying one of three methods: (a) *proximal goal-setting*—that is, breaking complex tasks into simpler and more easily completed segments, associated with straightforward, specific, and short-term goals, (b) *defensive pessimism*—highlighting one’s level of unpreparedness or lack of ability in order to increase anxiety that will strategically increase one’s effort to prepare, and (c) *efficacy self-talk*—engaging in thoughts or subvocal statements, such as “You can do it!” to increase one’s perceived self-efficacy.

- **Emotion Regulation**: Regulating one’s emotional experience in a constructive way, for example by reducing negative affective response or using wishful thinking.

It is obvious that the two taxonomies outlined above overlap. For example, Wolters’ ‘Interest enhancement’ appears to be akin to my ‘Satiation control,’ and his concepts of ‘Environmental structuring’ and ‘Emotion regulation’ seem to correspond closely to my ‘Environmental control’ and ‘Emotion control.’ This shows that, similarly to learning strategies, the key
issue in this domain is not necessarily the exact list or taxonomy of the relevant mechanisms but rather the underlying capacity that leads learners to apply such mechanisms. This selection and internalization process can be scaffolded by using the same approaches as described with learning strategies (see chapt. 6).

**Teacher Motivation**

The increased shift toward examining classroom-based motivation in the 1990s drew attention to a rather overlooked motivational area, the *motivational characteristics of the language teacher*. There is no doubt that teacher motivation is an important factor in understanding the affective basis of instructed SLA, since the teacher’s motivation has significant bearings on the students’ motivational disposition and, more generally, on their learning achievement. Furthermore, the study of teacher motivation can help us understand a looming crisis in the field of education in general: the growing disillusionment of teachers of all subject matters and the growing rate of their leaving the profession in many parts of the world. For example, a recent survey in England that involved more than 70,000 practicing teachers (GTCfE, 2002) found that 34% of them did not expect to be a teacher in five years’ time and 56% claimed that their level of morale/motivation was lower than when they first became teachers. Not surprisingly, then, only 50% of the sample said that they would consider a career in teaching if they had the choice again. These figures reflect a broad, worldwide tendency and the situation of language teachers is in no way better than that of their colleagues in other subject areas (cf. Dörnyei, 2001c; Pennington, 1995).

Prompted by these considerations, in my 2001 monograph on motivation (Dörnyei, 2001c) I devoted a whole chapter to the question of *teacher motivation*. I stated there that very little work had been done on the topic in the L2 field and that this was also true of educational psychology in general. During the past few years we have conducted extensive research on the topic at the University of Nottingham, which also included comprehensive literature searches (see, for example, Gheralis-Roussos, 2003; Shoaib, 2004). These confirmed that there is indeed very little published work on the motivation of language teachers (for valuable exceptions, see Doyle & Kim, 1999; Jacques, 2001; Kassabgy, Boraie, & Schmidt, 2001; Kimura, 2003; Pennington, 1992, 1995; Pennington & Ho, 1995), and only a limited amount of rigorous scientific research has been conducted in educational psychology on the topic. However, as we have found, there is a large body of relevant work that is hovering somewhere in between research, teaching
methodology, and popular educational non-fiction. Although these studies may not meet standard research requirements, in their multitude they add up to a fairly consistent overall picture about the factors that motivate and demotivate teachers. What we need now is empirical L2-specific research that examines in a systematic way which aspects mentioned in these studies are valid and reliable characteristics of language educators. This is clearly a fertile ground for future investigations.

**Practical Implications Related to the L2 Motivational Self System**

The conceptualization of L2 motivation from a self perspective opens up a whole new avenue for promoting student motivation by means of increasing the elaborateness and vividness of self-relevant imagery in the students. This is, in fact, similar to promoting commitment control strategies just described, but our more detailed understanding of the nature of possible selves offers a rich and systematic source of motivational ideas. According to past theorizing by Markus and her colleagues (Markus & Nurosis, 1986; Markus & Ruvolo, 1989; Ruvolo & Markus, 1992; Oyserman & Markus, 1990), the following conditions can be seen to increase the motivational power of a possible self:

- *The possible self needs to exist.* Not everyone can easily generate a highly successful possible self and therefore the strength of the motivation resulting from the desire to reduce the discrepancy between one’s actual and ideal L2 self will be dependent on the learner’s ability to develop a salient vision of oneself as an attractive, competent, and successful L2 user.

- *The possible self needs to be primed.* Each individual has a number of different self-representations concerning different content areas as well as different types of hopes and fears, and the working self-concept, which is the accessible and functional self-concept of the moment, is a “biased sample from the universe of one’s self-representations” (Ruvolo & Markus, 1992, p. 98). For a particular self-representation such as the Ideal L2 Self to become active, it needs to be triggered by some relevant event or needs to be consciously invoked by the individual as a response to an event.

- *The possible self needs to be associated with relevant procedural knowledge.* A desired end-state will have an impact on behavior only if the individual can personalize it by building a bridge of self-representations between one’s current self and the hoped-for self. That is, the more
elaborate a possible self is in terms of concrete and relevant action plans, scripts, and strategies, the more effectively it can function as a regulator of instrumental action.

- The possible self should be offset by a countervailing possible self in the same domain. Positive expected selves will be maximally effective if they are linked with representations of what could happen if the desired state was not realized.

These four principles can serve as general guidelines for the development of specific classroom techniques. A recent study by Oyserman et al. (2002) provided empirical evidence that it is possible to design an intervention that promotes the development of detailed and academically focused possible selves in school learners which, in turn, increase their engagement in school. With regard to L2 learning, several motivational strategies identified in the literature (cf. Dörnyei, 2001a) can be fitted into the self framework, but Murphey’s (1998, chapt. 15) unique analysis of “Passion, vision, and action” shows that by focusing on the vision aspect we can design some powerful novel motivational practices. It also seems highly likely that if we approach the promotion of a motivational teaching practice from a self perspective, the importance of social mediation—either as a result of the teacher’s explicit modeling function or of the more indirect role of the peer group—will gain particular prominence (cf. Dörnyei, 2001c; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Ushioda, 2003).

CONCLUSION

What kind of conclusion can be drawn about the state of the art of L2 motivation research? A rather mixed one. On the one hand, the past 15 years have revitalized the field both in terms of theoretical content and research volume: The paradigm shift from the macro- to the microperspective had a liberating effect on L2 motivation research, leading to an unprecedented boom in the field, with almost 100 new studies published in the 1990s alone. On the other hand, with regard to the main question as to whether the field can accommodate the concept of motivation in its psychological richness, the jury is still out. Not unlike the situation during the 1960 through 1990 period, when the main advances originated from a few, mainly Canadian research laboratories, we find today that a limited number of research centers are pushing the field forward. It may, unfortunately, not be an exaggeration to say that the majority of applied linguists still think of L2 motivation as the sum of integrative and instrumental motivation. We must,
of course, quickly add that because of the broad domain of L2 studies and applied linguistics and because of the relatively low number of academic departments and positions specialized in this field worldwide, except for a few lucky subareas the whole field is rather thinly covered by research.

In this chapter I took a broad-angled perspective on the field of L2 motivation research, trying to describe where it came from and which direction it is moving in. In this final summary let me highlight two trends that I personally find the most promising. First, similarly to several other ID factors, recent developments in L2 motivation research have offered the possibility of a closer and more organic integration with other areas of the study of SLA. Thus, I can foresee several studies in the future investigating various applied linguistic areas using motivational factors and profiles as meaningful independent background variables, and similarly there is likely to be many more motivational studies that use elaborate SLA processes as reference points or criterion measures.

Second, as Cantor (1990) so clearly summarized, recent advances in personality psychology have successfully charted the major and stable dimensions of personality (e.g., the Big Five model—see chapt. 2) and these efforts to establish the structural basis of individual differences have paved the way for a new shift in the field, characterized by an emphasis on process, more specifically on the ‘doing’ side of personality. This new shift has resulted in an increased convergence of the concepts of personality and motivation, as both are now seen as active antecedents of behavior. The L2 Motivational Self System outlined in this chapter is in accordance with this new development and, I believe, it offers increased explanatory power with regard to variations in L2 learning. It seems to me that ‘World English learning’ is becoming a prominent and distinct subarea in human education, and due to the all-encompassing relevance of World English in a globalized world, the success of this process will be a function of the language aspect of the individual’s global identity. Thus, whether or not we are motivated to learn English—and if we do, how much—is becoming increasingly a personality issue that can be captured by the proposed self perspective.

This latter point also concerns a more general question: In the light of the global status that English has attained, it may be reasonable to consider the usefulness of introducing a two-tier approach to L2 motivation, focusing on world-language-learning versus non-world-language-learning separately (cf. Dörnyei & Csizér & 2002). It may well be the case that the proposed L2 Motivational Self System is more relevant to the understanding of the former than the latter process, but there is clearly a need for further research before we can draw any firm conclusions in this respect.