2020

Student Motivation and Achievement in Second Language Learning

Nathan D. Laseter
Bethel University

STUDENT MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

A MASTER'S THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY

NATHAN D. LASETER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

AUGUST 2020

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

STUDENT MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

NATHAN D. LASETER

AUGUST 2020

APPROVED

Advisor's Name: Lisa M. Silmser, Ed. D.

Program Director's Name: Lisa M. Silmser, Ed. D.

Abstract

There are many variables that affect students' motivation to learn another language. Studies have found a variety of methods and theories used to measure and explain students' motivation to learn another language. These measurements also show the effects that motivation can have on achievement in the language learning classroom. The theories that have gained the most attention and recognition include the socio-educational model, the motivational self-system, and self-determination theory. Each theory sheds light on the different factors that have an effect on second-language learners' motivation to learn a language, while also providing extensive quantitative and qualitative research supporting each theory.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Language acquisition teachers around the world, no matter the language or the location, have noticed a common feature among students. That is, some students are highly motivated to learn and others are not. In our globalizing world this has become a more obvious and prevalent occurrence. Which begs the question, what is motivation and how can it affect academic performance in language learning?

There are many different facets to this observation, linked to both sociology and human psychology, which will be discussed in this thesis. Theories and research studies that will be summarized are primarily grounded in the Socio-Educational Model, the Motivational Self-System, and the Self-Determination Theory. Each of these theoretical models offers a slightly different view of what student motivation looks like, however they also share many similarities in conceptualizing motivation. Each model will also be important to the scope of this thesis because there is extensive research found for each model within the realm of second language learning.

The History of Motivational Research

Before looking at these three theoretical models for learner motivation, it is important to first look at the research in motivation that led to the creation of these models. Weiner (1991) wrote an article that briefly summarized the different focuses of motivational research beginning in the 1940s. From 1940 to 1960, the main research topics regarding education were praise and reproof, success and failure, knowledge of results, cooperation and competition, and reward and punishment. At the time, these areas of study were detached from the mainstream motivational research that looked at basic needs in rats, such as deprivation and homeostasis, and viewed human behavior as too complex to study directly. This continued with training rats using food incentives. However, the findings were

not appropriate for educational psychology since it reinforced something that was already known rather than motivating the subject to engage in something new. Weiner (1991) also summarizes a study by Marx (1960) that linked motivation with energy and drive level, which drew particular focus to the idea of motivation being conceptualized as machine-like learning.

From 1960s there was a shift from mechanical motivation toward cognition. This change was primarily portrayed in cognitive theory (Atkinson, 1964). The goal with this new area of research was to focus on human behaviors that could then inform other species' behaviors, rather than the opposite which was seen before when animal behavior was being researched and applied to human behavior. Examples of this are in the studies of goals that one is striving for, success and failure, and choosing between achievement-related tasks of differing levels of difficulty. During this time, motivation began to shift toward achievement motivation research that was closely related to the educational context, bringing more focus to educational psychology at the same time. There was also another line of research that came from this change to cognition, seen in later motivational theories. That is, the focus on individual differences such as high/low achievement needs, high/low anxiety, and high/low internal control. This allowed researchers to specify individual difference variables selected from motivational theories that could then be measured, rather than using broad personality structures to classify differences. Several new motivational variables came from this new line of research that are discussed in this thesis, including achievement needs, anxiety, and locus of control (Weiner, 1969).

In the 1970s, there was a continued trend in the study of motivation related to cognition and a deeper focus on human behavior. This was shown by the continued study of individual differences in achievement needs, anxiety about failure, and perceptions of

control. During the 1970s there were also the beginnings of studies related to the role of

"self" in motivation. This can be seen in Bandura's (1977) research of self-efficacy that is

later built upon by other researchers.

Finally, continuing with the 1980s up to when Weiner (1991) wrote the summary of

motivational research, there was continued focus on achievement strivings. A new approach

at that time that was gaining dominance was goal theory. This approach focused on ego-

involvement, competitive reward structures, and social comparison as an indicator of

success and ability. At the same time, this was contrasted with the study of task-

involvement, cooperative structure, and self-comparison as an indicator of success and

effort. There was also a stronger emphasis on the role of emotions in motivation. For

example, causal ascriptions and perceptions of helplessness were linked with a variety of

emotional reactions such as pride or frustration. This idea was continued by further

developments in the theory of "self," which was later expanded on by Dornyei (2005) in

regard to the language learning context. Areas of research regarding the "self" that were of

particular importance in the 1980s included self-actualization, self-concept, self-

determination, and self-esteem. These variables also proved to be linked to emotional

reactions, primarily pride, shame, and guilt.

With the continued growth in motivational research and the change to cognitive,

human-centered variables, Weiner (1991) raised three issues with the research up to 1990.

The first was the focus on motivational studies linked to learning and the need for more

studies of non-learning related motivational variables. However, since this thesis is focused

on language learning, this does not apply towards the current context. The second issue was

the lack of cross-situational generality. Weiner's (1991) example of this was "if an individual

has high achievement strivings in sports but not academics, and this individual is classified

as high in achievement needs, then predictions will be upheld in one situation but disconfirmed in the other" (p. 621). The third issue was the recent focus on the self. He pointed out that in many contexts researchers must consider frameworks larger than the self that are embedded in the social context of the learner. An example of this is if a person was particularly interested in sports, but not interested in other school-related concerns, they may be viewed as unmotivated by teachers. However, if they were a professional basketball player with the same attitude they would be viewed as highly motivated. This portrays the importance of social context in perceiving individual motivation. These issues will be seen in much of the research being summarized in chapter two, but there will also be an expansion over time to address these and other related problems with the research.

Motivation in Education Applied to Language Learning

In the three theories being discussed in this thesis, many of the attributes for motivation in education are applied to the field of language learning. Researchers therefore began to define the kind of motivation that applied to this specific context. Gardner (1985) defines motivation to learn an L2, a second or other language besides the language learner's native language, as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (p. 10). Dornyei and Csizer (1998) add to this definition by saying, "…it provides the primary impetus to initiate learning the L2 and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process" (p. 203). From these two definitions we see that motivation plays an important role in beginning the desired language learning process as well as sustaining it over time. Motivation is like adding fuel to a car before a long journey. If you add plenty of fuel at the beginning you can travel quite far, but if you forget to add more fuel as you go your car will eventually stall.

Scope and Guiding Questions

An important note regarding the scope of this paper is that the focus will be placed on the research of second language learning in general, rather than only English language learning. This was done to show the universality of the research towards all language acquisition situations and to highlight similar key features of human psychology around the world. However, research touching on cultural differences of language learning will also be presented to show how specific situations can also alter views of language acquisition and affect student motivation and academic performance.

In order to consolidate research for L2 learning motivation, the following research questions were used, "What factors affect student motivation when learning another language?" and "How does motivation affect academic performance?" By narrowing research to these two guiding questions, we can better understand what influences a language learner's motivation and what the impact of that influence would be, either positive or negative relative to the educational setting.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Motivation in Language Learning

In order to locate theories and research regarding the scope of this thesis, searches of Google Scholar, Education Journals, ERIC, JSTOR, and EBSCO were conducted for publications from 1970 to 2019. Search results were chosen based on their use of evidence-based studies, a clear hypothesis, and an application of research to the field of language learning. The key words that were used to search for these studies were "student motivation," "second language learners," "student self-efficacy," "L2 self," and "motivation in second language learning." In this chapter, studies regarding three of the most pervasive theories in student motivation will be reviewed and compared, also showing their recorded effects on student academic performance. They are the socio-educational model, the motivational self-system, and self-determination theory.

Socio-Educational Model

Initial research and testing of L2 motivation regarding the Socio-Educational model was originally published by R.C. Gardner and W.E. Lambert (1972), who have since done much more research regarding the theory in a variety of cultural contexts, including Canada, Spain, Croatia, Poland, Romania, Brazil and Japan. The theory applies to human psychology at the micro level, looking at two specific concepts that Gardner believes to be the driving forces for why people learn another language (Gardner, 1985). These are integrative motivation and attitudes toward the learning situation. However, with further research in the field of language learning motivation, Gardner continued to study other variables that might have a noticeable effect on student motivation. In researching additional variables, we see an expansion of the Socio-Educational Model over time (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

First, this thesis will outline Gardner's original model. Then, it will summarize the specific research studies that show additional variables being added to the model.

As previously mentioned, Gardner (1985) posits two primary aspects of second language motivation. The first concept, integrative motivation, argues that second language learners are motivated by becoming a part of, or being immersed in, a culture whose native language is the learner's target language. By being immersed in a culture other than their own, the language learner is motivated by their current environment to study and improve their L2 capability so that they can interact in meaningful ways within the cultural setting. Gardner states that there are three measures for integrativeness, which are attitudes towards the target language group, interest in foreign languages, and integrative orientation (Gardner, 1985).

The second concept, attitudes toward the learning situation, argues that second language learners are also motivated by the environment of the language learning situation. This includes their attitude towards the language course as well as the language teacher. This concept can be either positive or negative. An example of a positive attitude would be an interest in the methods implemented by the teacher or the teacher's enthusiasm while presenting the material. A negative attitude might be anxiety toward the class setting or being asked to perform an action using target content (Gardner, 1985).

Gardner (2007) later adds to his theory the existence of two different contexts for language learning motivation, educational context and cultural context. While students usually learn a language in an academic setting, it is different than other subjects in that languages often involve taking on elements of another culture. Thus, we have two different contexts within which the language learner must develop motivation. These two contexts

reflect Gardner's earlier research and theories of integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation.

The cultural context can refer to a student's motivation to adopt new cultural aspects in line with the concept of integrativeness. However, it can also refer to the culture that a student is a part being expressed differently in ways that affect language learning motivation. "In the individual, this cultural context is expressed in terms of ones attitudes, beliefs, personality characteristics, ideals, expectations, etc.…the individual will have various attitudes that might apply to language learning…" (p. 13). The learner is influenced by both their native culture as well as that of the L2 they are learning.

The Educational context applies to language learning primarily in areas related to the education system and teacher interaction. Some examples of this would include the curriculum, quality of teaching resources and materials, teacher enthusiasm, and class atmosphere. It is also important to note that although these two contexts refer to different aspects of the language learning environment, they coexist and ultimately influence each other. Meaning cultural context can affect a student's reaction to the school environment and educational context can also affect a learner's level of integrativeness.

Looking at research studies conducted by Gardner and his associates, we can see the level to which his motivational model holds true for second language learners as well as areas where it needed to be expanded.

Expansion of the Motivational Construct

After Gardner and Lambert (1972) published their findings and established a more polished version of the Socio-Educational Model, discussions and research regarding the motivations of second language learners expanded. Research by others in the education field both supported and conflicted with the research done by Gardner and Lambert. In

many ways the Socio-Educational Model lacked depth and specificity, which led other researchers to begin creating newer models that could fill the gaps (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Dornyei, 1990; McDonough, 1981).

The realization that there were gaps in the Socio-Educational Model led Gardner to begin conducting research in other elements of language learning motivation in order to expand the scope of his model. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) first decided to separate motivation into 2 categories for testing purposes. These categories were labeled motivational behavior and motivational antecedents. Motivational behavior refers to behaviors that can be viewed by others, while motivational antecedents are more difficult for others to observe, but can be self-reported by individuals. In this study, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) added new measures of motivation to be tested, including performance expectancy, valence, causal attributions and goal specificity. They also related these measures to individual achievement through the use of an ungraded essay that was checked by a graduate student and senior investigator using five items of assessment.

Tremblay and Gardner (1995) used a questionnaire with a variety of measures, including measures of attitude (including integrative orientation and instrumental orientation), motivation, anxiety, attention and persistence, and other areas mentioned above. Their results showed that three "mediators," variables mediating the relationship between language attitudes and motivational behavior, stood out. They were goal setting, valence, and self-efficacy.

By having specific goals and continually referring to said goals, students showed increased levels of motivational behavior. However, they also found that goal setting was influenced by language attitudes. Language attitudes that were measured in this study include attitudes toward French Canadians, interest in foreign languages, integrative

orientation, instrumental orientation, motivational intensity, desire to learn French, attitudes toward learning French, attitudes toward the French teacher, attitudes toward the French class, and French use/class anxiety. They explain their reasoning for why language attitudes had an impact on goal setting by saying "…positive language attitudes will orient students to develop specific language learning goals. Students who have negative attitudes are more likely not to give much consideration to what they would like to achieve in the French course" (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995, p. 515).

Valence also had a noticeable impact on attitude/motivational behavior. In this study, Tremblay and Gardner use the term valence to refer to one's desire to learn a language and the satisfaction that comes with learning the language. The results found that when the learning was valued by the student, as measured with valence, there were higher levels of motivation shown.

The final mediator, self-efficacy, was also shown to be influenced by language attitudes, and in turn effected motivational behavior. Their results were linked to those found by Clement (1980), and replicated findings that showed self-confidence is one of the most important influencers of motivation in language learning.

In another research study, Gardner (2007) revisited the constructs of Integrativeness and Attitudes toward the Learning Situation, language anxiety, and instrumental orientation, while adding a test category for parental encouragement in school aged language learners. An earlier project, Gardner applied previous findings in Canada to more cultural contexts, including Spain, Croatia, Poland, Romania, Brazil, and Japan. In this study, he presents the results from Spain.

The results found in Spain showed data very similar to his findings in Canada. First, they found that motivation had the most impact on student grades in their English class.

Students with a higher level of motivation showed a higher grade than those with less motivation. The second variable with the most impact was language anxiety, which was a negative variable. The more anxiety a student had the lower their grade was in the class. The third highest variable was integrativeness. Students with an openness or good attitude toward English speaking communities had a higher grade in English. This was followed by instrumental orientation. Those who saw practical value in learning English also scored higher than those that did not, although this variable had a much smaller impact based on the results. The variable that scored the lowest was parental encouragement, but it should be noted that the results come from a survey regarding the child's perspective (Gardner, 2007).

A surprising finding in this study was that attitudes toward the learning situation also scored relatively low. Gardner also mentions that this finding has been common in many of their studies, using grades as well as other measurements of achievement. It is expected that in a language learning classroom that focuses on cooperative learning students would have a more positive attitude towards learning, which would in turn lead to higher academic performance. However, Gardner does note that although these results show a low correlation between attitudes toward the learning situation and grades, he personally believes that what the teacher does or uses in class, and the students' evaluations of what is done or used, influences motivation and learning.

Ultimately, the findings of this study show that all of the variables tested in this study have an impact on motivation and academic performance. Gardner also shows links between the variables to show that they can be interconnected. For example, parental encouragement can lead to improved attitudes toward the learning situation. Also, negative attitudes toward the learning situation could lead to a higher level of language anxiety. In

this way, no one variable is the ultimate motivator. They must all be viewed together, each with its own purpose.

The following year, Bernaus and Gardner (2008) published a study researching the connections between teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions of those strategies, student motivation, and student achievement in English. While the study revisited similar elements of student motivation and achievement, it now took into account the variety of strategies that could be used by a teacher in an academic setting. This would help to address results from Gardner's (2007) earlier study showing that student attitudes toward the learning situation scored relatively low in motivation. The attitudes toward the learning situation could then be separated out based on the kinds of activities or teaching styles being implemented in the classroom. For kinds of activities, the study also categorized teaching methods as being traditional or innovative. Traditional methods refer to activities involving written or individual work while innovative methods usually involve group work or more active work with others in the classroom. The study also separated how teachers perceive the strategies they use in the classroom and how the students perceive them while using the class grades as a measurement of achievement.

The results of this study showed three things. The first was that for over half of the strategies, primarily traditional, that teachers reported using in class, the students were also aware of the strategies and how often they were used. However, for many of the other strategies that were reported by the teachers, such as small-group work, students were not aware of a change in frequency. A second observation that resulted from the first result was that when students perceived a difference in strategy use it affected the class motivation and achievement. However, when the teacher defined strategy use, it did not show evidence of affecting the class motivation and achievement. This means that when students

were not aware of a change in strategy use, it did not have a large impact on classroom performance. A third finding was that the students perceived differences in the traditional strategies more often than the innovative ones. One possible explanation for this is that they were more aware of the traditional strategies and less aware of the innovative strategies when they were used in the classroom.

As a summation, Bernaus and Gardner (2008) found that Motivation and Attitudes toward the Learning Situation had a direct influence on English Achievement. Also, the effect of Motivation on English Achievement is greater when students perceive frequent use of teaching strategies by their teachers. Ultimately, it is not the use of teaching strategies that makes an impact on motivation and achievement, but rather the students' perceived strategy use that makes an impact. However, this does not mean that unperceived strategies are not of value to the students. It only shows that unperceived strategies do not affect students' attitudes and motivation toward the subject.

Effects on Academic Performance

In the studies mentioned previously (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Gardner, 2007) there are select variables that showed an impact on student achievement using a class grade or other graded measurement. They include student perception of motivational and traditional teaching strategies, attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, language anxiety, instrumental orientation, parental encouragement, and motivation. The variables listed above also showed both positive and negative correlations with student achievement.

Gardner (2007) did a study in Spain where he used students' course grades as a measurement of achievement. He found that the highest correlating variable with student achievement was motivation. The next highest correlate was language anxiety, which correlated negatively with student achievement. This shows that the more anxiety a student

has, the lower their academic performance will be. He also found that other variables such as integrativeness, attitudes towards the learning situation, and parental encouragement showed a positive correlation with student achievement because they positively influenced motivation. This means that while they showed lower correlations with student achievement than motivation, they directly influenced student motivation in a positive way which in turn affected academic performance.

Bernaus and Gardner (2008) had similar results as Gardner in 2007. In this study, they gathered 31 teachers and their 694 students in the final year of secondary school. Fifty percent of the sample came from public schools and fifty percent came from private schools. The subjects completed a questionnaire designed to identify strategies used by teachers in the EFL classroom and measure students' language attitudes, motivation, and language anxiety. They found supporting evidence showing that attitudes towards the learning situation, when linked to motivation, showed a positive correlation. However, when attitudes towards the learning situation did not affect motivation it showed a negative correlation. This supports Gardner's (2007) previous findings that some variables only have a positive correlation with student achievement when linked to motivation. In this study, they also showed that student perception of teaching strategies used in class plays an important role in achievement because it is linked to motivation. When the teacher used strategies that students were unaware of, there was no impact on motivation and therefore no positive correlation in student achievement. However, when students perceived strategies used by the teachers, it had a direct impact on motivation and student achievement.

Process Model

A second influential theory regarding student motivation in language learning is a theory posited by Dornyei and Otto (1998) that they named the Process Model. This model was created not only to define motivation and show what it looks like in the language learning classroom, but also to find ways of applying teaching methods practically to support language learners. While previous research had done a good job at identifying different motivators and outlining the effects they had on language learners, "the amount of psychological research devoted to analyzing *how* to motivate language learners has been rather meagre relative to the amount of research conducted on *what* motivation is…" (p. 44). Their goal was to create a practical set of guidelines that could be used to ensure student motivation and success in the language learning classroom.

Key areas where Dornyei and Otto (1998) looked to improve on previous research regarding motivation in second language learning included a comprehensive summary of motivational influences on classroom behavior, a focus on motivational sources of executing goal-directed behavior, and viewing motivation as a dynamically evolving entity over time. They chose these areas due to the fact that previous research had taken a psychological standpoint in order to find out what motivation is but had very little research showing how to motivate language learners in a practical methodological manner.

To address the first problem, a comprehensive summary of motivational influences on classroom behavior, Dornyei and Otto (1998) considered a large list of theories that had been developing overtime. Some of these include self-efficacy, goal theories, self-determination theory, and social psychology regarding attitudes. Each of these theories focuses on a single aspect of human psychology that affects one's motivation to learn. Ultimately, they concur with Weiner (1984) that any single concept dealing with classroom

activity is insufficient. To truly understand motivation one must consider every aspect and variable that might have an influence.

Regarding the second area of research, a focus on motivational sources of executing goal-directed behavior, Dornyei and Otto (1998) refer to Kanfer's (1996) research that separates short-term and long-term learning tasks in their effects on motivation. In short-term learning tasks the goal is reached quickly, which provides a strong motivational force. However, in long-term learning tasks the student must maintain the motivation to acquire the incentive over a much longer time period. Language learning would therefore fall into the long-term category. The focus of motivation is then on action during goal implementation rather than the initial choice to pursue a goal. They use Heckhausen's (1991) terms to refer to these 2 different kinds of motivation, choice motivation and executive motivation. Since, in an educational setting, decisions and goals are often imposed on the learner, this limits the choice motivation. Thus, Dornyei and Otto (1998) decided to focus on executive motivation in this study.

Addressing the final area of research, viewing motivation as a dynamically evolving entity over time, Dornyei and Otto (1998) believe that since language learning is a long-term activity and motivation can often fluctuate on a day-to-day basis, it is important to focus on the different decision-making processes that are relevant to motivation. They develop their theory by building on research done by Heckhausen and Kuhl (1985) called the Theory of Action Control. In this theory, Heckhausen and Kuhl (1985) posit that motivation has two primary phases, forming intentions and implementing them. The first phase is where Dornyei and Otto believe most research in L2 motivation has been focused, dealing with initial goal-setting process and evaluation of wishes and desires. The second phase is where motivation has a tendency to fluctuate and need more maintenance. In the Theory of Action

Control, there is an observation that people do not always behave according to their expectation or intentions. This is the domain that Dornyei and Otto (1998) planned to shed more light on through research of how to maintain motivation in long-term learning.

From these initial areas of research, Dornyei and Otto (1998) created their Process Model. They split their model into three phases: preactional phase, actional phase, and postactional phase. The preactional phase involves goal setting, forming intentions, initiating intention enactment. In defining these terms, Dornyei and Otto (1998) separated goals from intentions by defining goals as the "first concrete mental representations of a desired end state" (p.49) and intentions as goals that have been committed to and are expected to be carried out. This phase of the process model involves the imagination and creation of a goal that turns into an intended action and plan. In order to turn the intention into action, it is sometimes necessary to have the means or a specific condition, which is why the initiating intention enactment sub-phase is included in the preactional phase.

The actional phase involves subtask generation and implementation, an ongoing appraisal process, and application of action control mechanisms. The actional phase can also be seen as a transition from choice motivation to executive motivation meaning the individual is now concerned with how to implement their actions on a day-to-day basis. In this phase, an individual implements subtasks that were specified in the action plan. However, during the course of action new subtasks are continuously created, showing the need for continuous appraisal. Along with appraising the need for new subtasks, the individual is also evaluating external stimuli to gauge progress and compare actual outcomes with predicted or alternative outcomes. The appraisal process can also become more complicated since an appraisal of one aspect of the action can easily transfer to another aspect. For example, if a student fails at accomplishing a single task in the language

classroom, it can easily be generalized to the language classroom or language learning. Finally, action control mechanisms are used to "protect a current intention from being replaced should one of the competing tendencies increase in strength before the intended action is completed" (Kuhl, 1994, p. 102). This could take the form of keeping concentration when there are environmental distractions or, when faced with a failed action, modifying strategies and subtasks.

The postactional phase consists of evaluating the accomplished action outcome. This phase takes place when the action has been completed, terminated or interrupted for a long period of time. The individual is no longer involved in the action, giving them a broader view of the motivated behavioral process and its effects. They compare initial plans of action with their results. By doing this, they internalize experience, standards and strategies to help create an identity as a successful learner.

From this research, Dornyei and Csizer (1998) were able to create a set of methodology that could be implemented practically by teachers in the language learning classroom. They base the connection of motivation and classroom methodology on previous research by Clement et al. (1994) that showed three important motivating factors in the language classroom: integrative motivation, linguistic self-confidence, and the appraisal of the classroom environment. This last category shows the importance of teaching methods for motivating language learners.

In order to find which teaching methods aligned with the previous summary of language learning motivational components, Dornyei and Csizer (1998) surveyed 200 English teachers in Hungary on how important they found different motivational strategies and how frequently they were used. Out of 51 strategies, they chose the ones that ranked in the top 10 to include as their "Ten commandments." All of these methods correlate to different

areas of research in the field of motivation for language learners, with Dornyei and Csizer (1998) providing research to support the finalized list of effective methods for motivating students.

The first method, "set a personal example with your own behavior", is supported by research on the effect of role models and their influence on students (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). The second method, "create a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom", has roots in Gardner's (1985) model, labeled "attitudes toward the learning situation", that was discussed earlier in this thesis. The third method, "present tasks properly", helps to both raise student interest and increase the expectancy of task fulfillment by setting goals and providing effective strategies to reach these goals, which is supported by Dornyei and Otto (1998). The fourth method, "develop a good relationship with the learners", is supported by research showing the motivating factor of pleasing the teacher that is built on good rapport and is used to support student-centered learning (e.g. Rogers, 1983). The Fifth method, "increase the learners' linguistic self-confidence", reflects research that shows one's perceptions of their own competence or ability determines whether or not they will engage in a goal-directed action (Clément et al., 1994). The sixth method, "make language classes interesting", is a general observation that is supported by many research studies (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Gardner, 1985). The seventh method, "promote learner autonomy", was a relatively new area being examined around the time that this study was published, but was reinforced by research from Ushioda (1996) and later expanded on by Dornyei (2005). The eighth method, "personalize the learning process", promotes peer relations and group development in the classroom. The ninth method, "increase the learners' goal-orientedness", reflects the importance of goal-setting that is reflected by many research studies (Dornyei & Otto, 1998; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). The final method, "familiarize

learners with the target language culture", is heavily supported by Gardner's (1985) theory of instrumental and integrative motivation.

From these two research studies, Dornyei was able to begin creating a large consortium of language learning motivation research to continue building his own model. From this time, there is a shift in Dornyei's work to focus more on student's self-confidence and sense of self and the effect it has on learner autonomy. This continued research gives rise to an improved version of the Process Model that will be discussed in the next section.

Motivational Self-System

The Process Model was also adapted over time, with the addition of further research, to later become the Motivational Self-System, similar to the expansion of Gardner's Socio-Educational Model. The purpose of expanding the theoretical construct was to broaden the scope of L2 motivation research by combining motivational elements from both the field of education and the field of psychology (Dornyei, 2009). The Motivational Self-System builds on the previous research mentioned in this thesis but adds to it the concepts of possible selves and future self-guides found in motivational psychology. Possible selves represent ideas of what people could become, want to become, and are afraid of becoming (Markus & Nurius, 1986). They all refer to future self-states that have yet to be realized and often can be used to show how or why a certain change has occurred over time. Future self-guide refers to possible selves that have a guiding role. Usually, this consists of what people want to become and are afraid of becoming while excluding selves that they might become given certain circumstances (Dornyei, 2009). This temporal element of aligned very well with Dornyei's concept of motivational changes in the Process Model. With this new model, both educational and psychological elements play an important role in producing three key

components to student motivation in language learning. These include the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience.

The ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self originate from research by Higgins et al. (1985) that is adapted to fit the realm of language learning motivation. Higgins et al. (1985) define the ideal self as the representation of attributes that one would ideally like to possess. The ought-to self is the representation of attributes that others believe the individual should possess, but these views may not align with the individuals own desires or wishes. There are also elements of external motives being internalized by an individual through socialization or other outside forces, which tends to blur the lines between the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. This observation is also supported by Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory that will be discussed later in this thesis.

The L2 learning experience refers to 'executive' motives, meaning the actions learners engage in while trying to achieve their goals, in relation to the learning environment and experience. This includes many of the elements of L2 motivation research in general, such as the impact of the teacher, the curriculum, and the social situation. While this aspect of the Motivational Self-System model is very important, it is placed at a different level from the 2 self-guides which draw the focus of Dornyei's (2009) current research.

One of the primary implications of Dornyei's model is that it allows for new avenues of research that are both internal and external to the student while still allowing a component that complements previous areas of research in language learning motivation, namely the L2 learning experience. It has also shown to be an effective motivator when it meets a few basic criteria. These criteria include the learner having a desired future self that is elaborate, is plausible, adheres to outside pressures, is regularly activated in the learner's

working self-concept, is accompanied by procedural strategies, and contains information about negative consequences of failure. Dornyei continues by outlining each of these criteria and how it can be met by the learner.

In order to implement the self-system in language learning, the first step is to create a vision of one's ideal L2 self. This process involves raising the learner's awareness and selection of aspirations they may have had in the past. These aspirations would have become imagined possible selves that come from several different avenues, including views held by others that influence them, social pressure, and observations of society. Thus, the process does not necessarily involve the actual creation of a possible self, rather it increases their mindfulness toward the significance of having an ideal self, guides them through a number of possible selves, and provides strong role models (Dornyei, 2009). Once a vision is created, it must be strengthened in order to be effectively used by the language learner. Dornyei cites research in psychology that supports imagery training that has been used in sport research and psychotherapy in the past. Imagery training involves a spectrum of exercises from simple detail imagination to more complex manipulation of image sequences. By reviewing these techniques used in content areas, there is potential for applying similar methods toward L2 language learning.

Even after a strong vision of the ideal L2 self has been created, there are still important elements to consider in order to "keep the vision alive". Dornyei (2009) believes that this is an area where classroom teachers play a very important role. One example of this is reinforcement in the classroom through activities such as inviting outside role models or experts, playing movies or music, and engaging in cultural activities. Another example is to support the vision with a clear action plan. This will include a variety of strategies that can be used by the language learner such as goal-setting, study plans, and methodological

instruction. Finally, we must consider how the learner can react when experiencing failure and how they can counterbalance the vision. This is where the concept of a "feared self" joins the mix. With both an ideal and a feared self the learner engages in activities both because they want to and because they do not want to experience the undesired results of not doing it. Acknowledging both the positive and the negative consequences helps to highlight the obligations that the learner has committed to.

Al-Shehri (2009) also conducted further research showing the need for the use of imagination in creating a strong L2 ideal self. However, he also added one more element that he believes to be important to creating a strong vision, which is 'visual style preference'. This term refers to learners that rely on visual elements for processing and internalizing information, such as pictures, charts, modelling, etc. In this study, Al-Shehri (2009) wanted to research whether or not visual learners would have a better capacity to imagine a strong ideal L2 self, which in turn would positively affect their language learning motivation. Al-Shehri (2009) found that the ideal L2 self had a major impact on student motivation, supporting Dornyei's concept of a Motivational Self-System using possible selves to improve motivation in language learning. He also found that there was a strong correlation between visual style, ideal L2 self, and imagination. This proved his hypothesis that visual learners were able to engage in imagination based activities and more likely to form a strong vision of the ideal L2 self, which would improve language learning motivation.

Ryan (2009) provided further supporting evidence for the Motivational Self-System's impact on L2 motivation of students in Japan. This study had three main goals. The first was to see if Dornyei's (2005) findings in Hungary regarding the use of an ideal L2 self as a source of motivation in language learning. The second goal was to compare Gardner's (1985) concept of integrativeness with Dornyei's (2009) concept of an ideal L2 self by looking at

their relative strengths. His final goal was to compare the effectiveness of these two concepts to see if either showed greater effectiveness at motivating language learners.

The results of this study found that integrativeness and the ideal L2 self had a strong correlation, suggesting they both involve similar feelings from the learners towards values of the language and its speakers. However, Ryan also found that the ideal L2 self scored higher in student motivation than integrativeness at all educational levels, most significantly in university students and slightly in secondary school students, which shows that integrativeness is just one manifestation of a more complex concept for student motivation in language and "…that it is the ideal L2 self that has a more direct relationship with motivated behavior" (p. 127). This finding also showed that the ideal L2 self was a better measure of separating kinds of motivated behavior with the separation of English major university students, scoring very high in motivation, and non-English major university students as well as secondary students, scoring much lower. He also found that there was a significant gap between genders with females scoring much higher than males in this study, but this was expected from previous studies showing a perception of language learning as a female subject.

Effects on Academic Performance

Csizér and Kormos (2009) conducted a study to further test the applicability of the L2 self-system. They investigated the impact of the ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience on Hungarian secondary school and university students' motivation and academic achievement. They found that in both secondary school and university students, motivated learning behavior was partly determined by the ideal L2 self. Another important determinant of language learning motivation was the language learning experiences. The language learning experience was found to impact motivation more than the ideal L2 self in

secondary school students, while for university students the ideal L2 self and language learning experiences played an equally important role. This finding highlights the importance of motivational factors originating in the classroom and the importance of motivational teaching practices in motivation and academic achievement in language learning. The ought-to L2 self was found to only be significant in university students. It was also constructed socially by parental encouragement. While this study shows that the L2 self-system does have meaningful impacts on students' motivation and performance, it also showed that the extent of the impact varies with age and therefore varies in its effectiveness.

Self-Determination Theory

The third theory of language learning motivation that will be discussed in this thesis comes from Edward Deci and Richard Ryan (1980), who take a psychological standpoint when looking at motivation. They believe that behavior, and in this case motivation, is influenced by both the person and the environment. They first separated variables that affect the person into two categories, mechanistic and phenomenological. Mechanistic variables refer to things that are done non-consciously, while phenomenological variables are conscious processes that can be influenced by the person. These two variables for the person became the foundation for their self-determination theory. In this theory, there are self-determined (phenomenological) behaviors based on intrinsic or extrinsic needs, and there are automatic (mechanistic) behaviors that are not consciously chosen. Therefore, their theory took into account these different kinds of variables and the role they play in language learning motivation.

To explain self-determined behaviors, Deci and Ryan (1980) first looked at how the brain processes information and establishes wants or needs. The first step is actively

selecting information from the environment based on one's needs. The perceived

information may or may not enter conscious awareness, but the information that does is

referred to as conscious motives or representations of future satisfying states, similar to

Markus and Nurius' (1986) theory on possible selves. Based on these conscious motives,

people then choose behaviors that provide the greatest satisfaction. While there may be

many possible motives, they cannot all be satisfied at one time. Therefore people must

choose the one that provides the greatest motive satisfaction and suspend motives that

cannot be satisfied at the time.

From this need to establish conscious motives and to achieve motive satisfaction,

Deci and Ryan (1980) further develop their theory by connecting it to three subsystems:

intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation is based on

the need for achievement and has no reward outside the experience and its accompanying

effect. Extrinsic motivation is based on acquiring external needs outside of one's own

accomplishment, such as money or status. These two types of motivation can be clearly

separated as being based on the behavior itself or being a reward to be gained as a result of

the behavior. Amotivation, on the other hand, "involves a belief in a nonrelationship

between behaviors and outcomes" (Deci & Ryan, 1980, p. 39). Rather than having intrinsic

or extrinsic motivators that lead to a behavior and its result, amotivated behavior relies on

not acting due to a feeling of futility or hopelessness.

Deci and Ryan (1980) also draw particular focus on the effectiveness of intrinsic

motivation and how it is related to the brain processes mentioned previously. By making

choices that motivate behavior and sustaining alternate motives that cannot be presently

satisfied, there is an "active" function that requires an "energy source" or stimulator to

accomplish the function. Deci and Ryan posit that this energy source is primarily intrinsic

motivation. Two examples of how intrinsic motivation plays a role in stimulating behavior are in what they call "overt and covert activity". Overt activities would be visible to others and require intrinsic motivation, such as practicing a sport, while covert activities such as cognitive processes or choice of motives would be nonvisible to others and still require intrinsic motivation. From this theory, we see that even when a behavior is extrinsically motivated, for example a money-making activity, it still requires a level of intrinsic motivation to choose motives and behaviors to act on. The overt activities that often provide a clear extrinsic motivation still require the intrinsic motivation to think about and act on.

Furthermore, Deci and Ryan (1980) believe that people's experiences with their surroundings or environmental factors influence the intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivational subsystems. They call this theory the cognitive evaluation theory. They also mention two primary processes based on this theory that affect intrinsic motivation. The first is that when one believes the result of a behavior is internal and self-determined they will have more intrinsic motivation. If they believe the result of behavior is external and less self-determined they will have less intrinsic motivation. The second states when behavior is controlled externally and focused on extrinsic rewards, one will view results of behavior as external and less self-determined. If there are less external controls and rewards, one will view results of behavior to be more internal and self-determined. They also mention that information that implies incompetence tends to weaken intrinsic motivation and promote a shift to amotivation. Without a strong sense of competence and self-determination people shift to an amotivational state that begins to block many environmental stimuli and relies on automatic responses rather than self-determined ones.

Noels et al. (1999) engaged in a study to investigate the relationship between intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and language learning. Their results showed that amotivation was associated with greater language anxiety, lower motivational intensity, and less intent to continue studying the language. Higher extrinsic motivation was not found to be associated with language anxiety and motivational intensity. Students were also more likely to continue studying the language, at least until they achieved their external goal. However, higher intrinsic motivation was found to be associated with less language anxiety, higher motivation intensity, and intention to continue learning the language. They also found that students' self-evaluation of language competence was related to each motivation subtype, with lower competency ratings being linked with amotivation and higher competency ratings being linked to higher intrinsic motivation.

In a study in 1981, Deci, Nezlek and Sheinman researched the effects that control-oriented and autonomy-oriented teachers would have on student motivation in grades four through six. They also looked at how these two different kinds of teachers would use rewards as motivation. They hypothesized that the children's motivation would become more intrinsic as they worked with autonomy-oriented teachers and less intrinsic as they worked with control-oriented teachers. The results of the study showed that there is a clear relationship between teacher orientation and student intrinsic motivation and self-esteem, with autonomy-oriented teaching leading to increased intrinsic motivation. It also showed that students perceived the classroom environment as being more supportive of autonomy and had increased perception of competency in the subject matter. However, they found that the relationship between the teachers' characteristics and the children's motivation was established in the first six weeks and stayed relatively stable for the next seven months. This suggests that the teacher had a very important impact on student motivation within the

first six weeks, but soon the students adapted to the teacher and the situation remained constant. They also speculated that the schools had a traditional structure of periods, grading, breaks, and so on, creating a generally controlling environment with limits on the impact of the teachers.

In a later study, Noels et al. (1999) also measured the effects of teachers' communicative styles in relation to the motivational subtypes posited by Deci and Ryan (1980). They found that when students perceived greater control by the teacher they also showed greater feelings of amotivation. Extrinsic motivations were generally unrelated to teacher control, while intrinsic motivation was linked with lower perception of being controlled. Ultimately, when the teacher was perceived as controlling, students showed greater language anxiety, less motivational intensity, less intention to continue studying the language, and a lower self-assessment of language competence. When the teacher was perceived as informative and less controlling, students showed less language anxiety, greater motivational intensity, greater intention to study, and a higher self-assessment of language competence. Although these results show a strong effect of communicative styles on study perception and subsystems, these results were not associated to final grades in the class. The results of this study showed that any goal, whether extrinsic or intrinsic, is better than no goal. Lacking a goal or plan leads to amotivation and decreased motivation. This research also supports theories on goal-setting and self-orientation posited by other researchers (Deci & Ryan, 1980; Dornyei, 2005; Markus & Nurius, 1986).

The importance of intrinsic motivation in language learning was also supported by another study mentioned previously regarding the Motivational Self-System (Ryan, 2009). In that study, the researcher found that English majors in university had higher levels of achievement and a stronger positive reaction to the use of an ideal L2 self to support

language learning than non-English majors and secondary school students. He hypothesized that this was due to stronger intrinsic motivation to study the language in English majors, while the others had external motivations that are often see in academic settings with the use of course requirements or school policies to control student participation through extrinsic consequences. With the increased enjoyment and interest in learning a second language, they were more susceptible to the concept of an ideal L2 self.

In order to further expand their model to include more specific criteria in reference to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, Deci and Ryan (1985) added an additional theory called "Organismic Integration Theory". In this additional theory, they created more categories to separate out the kinds of extrinsic motivation that might be implemented in teaching and their effects on learners. They also put amotivation, extrinsic motivation and instrinsic motivation on a continuum showing the behavioral processes and the perceived cause of behavioral outcomes. Look at this new continuum, you will notice some of what was designated intrinsic motivation before has been categorized as more autonomous extrinsic motivation.

They separated extrinsic motivation into four categories: external regulation, introjection, identification, and integration. These categories move from amotivation toward intrinsic motivation respectively. External motivation is the least autonomous form of extrinsic motivation. It involves behaviors that are performed to satisfy an external demand or obtain an external reward, which is how extrinsic motivation was viewed in the original theory. Introjected regulation is when a person performs an act to maintain a feeling of worth. It is partially internal to the person, but there is outside pressure to achieve a desired state to avoid feelings of guilt or anxiety. The third category, identification, refers to when a person has identified the importance of a behavior, accepting it as their own. The

final and most autonomous category of extrinsic motivation is integrated regulation. This refers to when the identified behaviors have been fully assimilated by self-evaluation and correspondence with other values and needs. With the expansion of extrinsic motivations, the aspects of purely intrinsic motivations were reduced to include interest, enjoyment and inherent satisfaction.

Ryan and Connell (1989) conducted a research study to prove the reliability of this new theoretical model and continuum of motivation. They used the four types of extrinsic motivation to find if elementary students, grades four to six, could differentiate the categories and their effects in academic and prosocial behavior. They found that students could understand the difference between categories using a self-reporting method with "why" questions. Also, it reflected previous findings of the four extrinsic motivation categories being on a spectrum. This study showed that students with external and introjected extrinsic motivation related more closely in their results, and students with identification and integration extrinsic motivation were also paired closely in their results. These two pairs often showed opposite results. For example, external and introjected students were more likely to have amplified anxiety as a coping strategy, more cognitive anxiety, and show low amounts of effort and enjoyment. Identification and integration students, on the other hand, showed positive coping strategies, less cognitive anxiety, and higher amounts of effort and enjoyment.

Noels et al. (2003) further developed this theory by conducting a case study to further analyze the integrative orientation, which is the fourth category of extrinsic motivation closest to intrinsic motivation on the continuum discussed previously. In this study, they reported very low amotivation since it was a summer English course that the students chose to enroll in. Their findings were largely consistent with previous studies

indicating the results of autonomous and controlled learning in language acquisition (Noels et al., 1999). They also found that integrative orientation aligns with self-determined forms of motivation and is the most similar to intrinsic motivation. This finding supports previous studies in self-determination theory, but also contradicts Gardner's (1985) suggestion that integrative orientation is most similar to extrinsic motivation. In this study, students who enjoyed learning English also desired to interact with members of the English community. The larger the autonomy and competency in English, the more the students wished to interact with English speakers. However, the authors also admit that this could be a socio-political factor. Nevertheless, the study did show that that integrative orientation is related to communicative purposes and predicted relatively strong English achievement.

Effects on Academic Performance

Grolnick and Ryan (1987) conducted a study on ninety-one fifth grade students to test the effects of two directed learning contexts, one controlling and one non-controlling, and a third non-directed, spontaneous learning context. Each student took part in a two-session experiment wherein they first read a grade level text, rating their interest/enjoyment and feelings of pressure. They were then separated randomly within sex to each of the three experimental learning groups. To measure the effects of each of these groups they again read and rated a passage, followed by a summarized recall of the text, an essay format, and a vocabulary subtest. In the recall of the second passage, the non-controlling directed students were told they would be asked questions, but the questions would not be graded like a test and that it was just to see what they could remember. The controlling-directed students were told that they would be tested and graded on what they could remember. Finally, the non-directed students were told they would answer similar questions to the first passage.

The results of Grolnick and Ryan's (1987) study found that the method for all three groups resulted in learning, but each outcome resulted in different subjective responses. In the two directed groups, controlling and non-controlling, there was better accuracy of recall because of the greater attention to detail. However, subjects from the directed controlling group showed deteriorated recall over the extended eight day follow-up, which suggests that material learned with strong external pressure is less likely to be maintained. They also found that the conceptual learning followed a similar pattern, with non-controlling and non-directed groups being stronger relative to the directed controlling group. Grolnick and Ryan (1987) support this result with the students' from the directed controlling subgroup self-reporting that they were more pressured and slightly less interested than those in the other subgroups. They also found that the results differed by the students' individual differences. They found that the students with more self-determined styles correlated with greater conceptual learning across the subgroups. Ultimately, this study shows that directed learning results in better rote-memorization and the more autonomous styles of learning, non-directed and non-controlling, result in greater interest and conceptual learning.

Miserandino (1996) also performed a study to detect the impact of perceived competence and autonomy on engagement and performance in school. The lack of competency is related to Deci and Ryan's (1980) idea of amotivation in learning, while autonomy is related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This study was conducted on 77 above-average third and fourth grade students. Students were classified as above-average by scoring higher than the median on the Stanford Achievement Test. The students completed a questionnaire assessing their perceived competence, autonomy, and perceived engagement or disaffection in school. The results showed that students who were uncertain about their ability and students who felt controlled in school reported feeling anxious, angry,

and bored in school and reported avoiding, ignoring, and faking schoolwork. On the other hand, students who were certain of their abilities or who felt autonomy in school reported feeling curious while participating in, persisting at, and enjoying more school tasks. These results suggest that the lack of fulfillment in competence or autonomy associates with negative affect and avoidance behavior, similar to amotivation. This creates less involvement, more avoidance behaviors, feelings of boredom, and a lack of curiosity. It may also result in anger, anxiety, and less enjoyment which ultimately leads to a decline in academic performance. The results of the study also predict a magnified effect by showing changes in grade from the beginning to the end of the year based on perceived competence and autonomy. Children that have those needs met may develop skills and abilities and develop positive beliefs about themselves resulting in continual academic improvement, while those that do not have these needs met do not develop skills and abilities and often come to hold negative beliefs about themselves resulting in academic decline.

CHAPTER III: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Literature

In this thesis, an outline and summary was provided for studies and theoretical changes in the most influential concepts for L2 motivation, including the Socio-Educational Model, the Motivational Self-System, and Self-Determination Theory. In the first theory, the Socio-Educational Model, there was much more history involved, which led to new concepts being added to the model over time. The original concepts of integrative and instrumental motivation were combined with concepts from related research, including student attitudes toward the learning situation, language anxiety, and the teacher/parent influence (Gardner, 1985; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). This allowed for some of its foundational elements to be adapted to new findings as research in this field continued to grow. However, the two original concepts posited in this model, integrative and instrumental motivation, have continued to be adapted within many other theories regarding student motivation in language learning.

In the Motivational Self-System, there was a push to build off of previous research, including Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model, and combine these theories with further research from the field of psychology. This is first apparent in Dornyei and Otto's (1998) Process Model that views language learning as a dynamically evolving entity. They also applied Kanfer's (1996) concept of short-term and long-term learning tasks to explain the kind of motivation that is required in language learning, which is classified as a long-term learning task. This was also combined with the concepts of choice motivation/executive motivation (Heckhausen, 1991) and the Theory of Action Control (Heckhausen & Kuhl, 1985) to apply motivation to the academic setting by better establishing the kind of motivation affecting students and how they could maintain control

over goal-setting. Improvement and application of outside research was also portrayed with the adaptation of possible selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986) to the field of second language learning, which Dornyei (2009) called the L2-self system. The concept of possible selves fit together well with educational concepts such as goal-orientation and language anxiety, since these elements are included in the descriptions of different L2-selves and thinking about the future. It was also a strong fit with the idea of extrinsic and intrinsic variables in language learning that we saw in Deci and Ryan's (1980) research.

Finally, looking at Self-Determination Theory there were similar elements to the previous two theories, particularly in respect to the conscious awareness of environmental factors that relate to Markus and Nurius' (1986) concept of possible selves. There were also parallels between the Self-Determination Theory and the Motivational Self-System in respect to goal-orientation and self-orientation, as seen in the work by Noels et al. (1999). However, Deci and Ryan (1980) also add the concept of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational variables which play a deciding role in increased/decreased student motivation. In studies relating to these three aspects of motivation, researchers found that intrinsic motivation was often the more powerful motivator, but they also found that the classification of extrinsic motivation was a bit static (Noels et al., 1999; Ryan, 2009). This led to the creation of four subcategories, which were placed on a spectrum from less intrinsic to more intrinsic (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Along with research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, there were also studies looking at these elements in respect to control and autonomy of learning (Deci et al., 1981). This was also connected to student amotivation, with the study showing increased control led to increased amotivational factors. This parallel research has supported the importance of not only the methodology of classroom teaching, but also the implementation of methodology in the classroom.

Limitations of the Research

The research for the topic of student motivation in language learning was limited to studies that pertained to second or other language classrooms. It did not include specific research conducted for other content areas or non-academic settings. The research was also limited to the three main theories talked about in this thesis, the Socio-educational model, the L2-self System, and Self-Determination theory, as well as theories that were closely related or built upon in the three main theories. Other theories within language learning motivation exist, but were not covered within the scope of this thesis.

One of the largest limitations of validity regarding the research covered in this thesis was the reliability of self-reporting, which could be found throughout all of the research studies. For all of the studies included in this thesis the method for reporting different variables and changes that occurred during each individual experiment were based on a self-report from students of varying ages, many of them being primary school students. This creates a less objective measurement affected by outside variables, such as boredom with answering long questionnaires, lack of complete understanding of questions, etc. Of course, when looking at research for concepts linked to psychology and sociology, a lot of the changes that occur during an experiment happen within an individual's conscious or subconscious and therefore must rely on self-reporting to be understood and made quantifiable. There was also a sizeable amount of research related to student perception of a variety of methods that relied on student self-reporting.

In contrast to this limitation, several studies included teacher reporting, which helped to offset some of the unreliable results with the use of experts in their fields. Another element that also helped to offset the limitations of self-reporting was linking studies to achievement or competence in the classroom. This allowed for a graded

measurement that was universal for all participants and which showed clear results from the study. These academic measurements occurred in many forms such as ungraded assignments using the target language and student scores from the actual class over the course of a year.

Implications for Future Research

One area of research that comes out of Gardner's (1985) research is the importance of goal-orientedness. This has been expanded on by many different theories and research studies. For example, Dornyei's (2009) research also supports the importance of setting goals with the addition of a metacognitive aspect toward language learning. The importance for students to think reflectively about how they are learning, and not just the content of the class, has many different facets to be researched. There is potential for the study of particular teaching methods that help to support metacognitive learning in language acquisition. Deci and Ryan's (1995) work also showed the importance of guided learner autonomy. This could be explored further by looking at when autonomy is productive, or possibly counter-productive, and how student achievement and long-term learning is affected. There are many ways in which the concept of learner autonomy could be linked with metacognitive learning as well.

Implications for Professional Application

Many of the studies mentioned in this thesis discussed motivation in language learning from an academic perspective. This being the case, several of the studies also provided practical examples for how these theories could be applied in the classroom setting. One example of this was Bernaus and Gardner's (2008) study of teachers' classroom strategies and their effects on student motivation and achievement. The strategies being used included both traditional and innovative methods. The study found that when

strategies were perceived by students, either traditional or innovative, they would have a noticeable effect on student motivation and achievement, but when they were not perceived by students there were no noticeable effects. This finding supports the metacognitive approach of teaching students about their learning process as well as content knowledge which can be applied to classroom teaching as an additional support for the content knowledge.

In my own case, as a teacher of English language learners, I would use these findings through in-class reflection exercises to follow the use of specific teaching methods. In this way, students would engage in learning activities, then follow the activity by reflecting on the process they went through to gain the content knowledge. Over time, students would be more aware of different methods and activities as well as their intended effects. Instituting this form of teaching would reinforce student perception of the learning environment and also give them more control of their learning process.

Another example of theories in L2 motivation that can actively be applied in a professional context is Dornyei and Csizer's (1998) study, "Ten Commandments for Motivating Language Learners." They gave ten of the most common and most effective teaching strategies used by teachers in the language learning classroom and reinforced the strategies with empirical research showing their validity. The strategies mentioned in the study were also generalized so that they could apply to many different learning situations. They were supported by a variety of theoretical approaches toward motivation in a language learning classroom setting. Many of these strategies are quite common in the language learning classroom. In my own classroom, clear and simple instructions, building a relationship, building self-confidence through positive feedback, and selecting activities based on interest are often used to support language learning. Some of these methods were

also related to research findings by Gardner (1985), such as stimulating interest through cultural specific exercises that relate to integrative motivation.

Other applicable research for language learning motivation came from Grolnick and Ryan's (1987) study, with Self-Determination theory being rooted in how activities are carried out rather than the activities themselves. This allows for more flexibility in the classroom teacher's style of teaching and methodology while still providing evidence-based research that can be used to scaffold the learning. Another useful aspect of this theory was its universality that allows it to be used in many educational contexts, both inside and outside of language acquisition. In my own context, I could use the methods from this study to vary the level of control and guidance based on a variety of factors found in different classroom settings, such as student language proficiency, intended cognitive level, or the structure of the activity and intended effects.

Conclusion

In all of the studies reviewed in this thesis there was a primary goal. That is, how can teachers motivate students to learn? In this thesis, the goal was refined specifically to the realm of L2 language acquisition Researchers have found a variety of theoretical concepts and motivational variables, each with its own impact on student motivation. Some variables were found to stem from environmental factors and others were found within the students themselves. The one thing that is certain is that each of these variables has a direct impact on student motivation, and as a result an impact on academic achievement and learning. By better understanding and taking into account these variables, students can become highly motivated to achieve in learning another language.

References

Al-Shehri, A. S. (2009). Motivation and Vision: The Relation between the Ideal L2 Self,

Imagination and Visual Style. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self,* 164-171.

Atkinson, J. W. (1964). *An introduction to motivation*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral

change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.

Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2008). Teacher Motivation Strategies, Student Perceptions,

Student Motivation, and English Achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3),

387–401.

Clement, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1980). Social and individual factors in second

language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 12, 293-302.

Clement, R., & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The

effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language

Learning*, 33, 273-291.

Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, Self-confidence, and Group

Cohesion in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 417-448.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning Experiences, Selves and Motivated Learning

Behaviour: A Comparative Analysis of Structural Models for Hungarian Secondary

and University Learners of English. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self,* 98-

119.

Deci, E. L., Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic

motivation of the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(1), 1-10.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1980). Self-determination theory: When mind mediates

behavior. *Journal of Mind and Behavior, 1*(1), 33–43.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M.H. Kemis (Ed.), Efficacy, agency and self-esteem (pp. 31-48). New York: Plenum

Dimitroff, A., Dimitroff, A., & Alhashimi, R. (2018). Student Motivation: A Comparison and Investigation of ESL and EFL Environments. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 10(2), 1–13.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*, 203–229.

Dornyei, Z., & Otto, I. (1998). Motivation in Action: A Process Model of L2 Motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics,* 4, 43-69.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 45-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self,* 9-42.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Gardner, R. C. (2007). Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. *Porta Linguarum*, 8, 9–20.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in childrens learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 52(5), 890-898.

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and Action*. Springer.

Heckhausen, H., & Kuhl, J. (1985). From wishes to action: The dead ends and short cuts on the long way to action. *Goal-directed behaviour: The concept of action in psychology*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Higgins, E. T., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. *Social Cognition*, 3(1), 51-76.

Kanfer, R. (1996). Self-regulatory and other non-ability determinants of skill acquisition. *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior*, 404-423.

Kassem, Hassan M. (2018). The Impact of Student-Centered Instruction on EFL Learners' Affect and Achievement. *English Language Teaching,* 12(1), 134-153.

Markus, H. R., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969.

Miserandino, M. (1996). Children who do well in school: Individual differences in perceived competence and autonomy in above-average children. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 88(2), 203-214.

Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M.P. (2012). The impact of teacher self-efficacy on the students' motivation and achievement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 2(3)*,* 483-491.

Noels, K.A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L.G. (1999). Perceptions of teacher communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modem Language Journal, 83,* 23-3.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2003). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 589-607.

Pintrich, P., & Schunk, D. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications.* Prentice Hall.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 749–761.

Ryan, S. (2009). Self and Identity in L2 Motivation in Japan: The Ideal L2 Self and Japanese Learners of English. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, 98–119.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, 66–97.

Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*(4), 505-518.

Ushioda, E. (1996). *The role of motivation*. Authentik Language Learning Resources.

Weiner, B. (1969). Motivation. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 4, 878-888.

Weiner, B. (1984). Principles for a theory of student motivation and their application within an attributional framework. *Research on motivation in education: Student motivation*, 1, 15-38.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(4), 616-622.