Motivation in Second Language Acquisition: A State of the Art Article

By

[1]Gholamreza Zareian and [2]Hojat Jodaei
[1]Department of English Language and Literature, School of Humanities,
Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran.
[2]Department of English Language and Literature, School of Humanities,
Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran.

Abstract

Success in second language learning is often related to the concept of 'motivation'. Motivation is the most used concept for explaining the failure or success of a language learner. This paper collected and reviewed the literature of motivation in second language acquisition (SLA) form prominent journals in the field. The role of motivation as one of the most important constructs of individual differences (IDs) in foreign language learning and their relationships with second/foreign language learning are investigated. The wider concluding argument of this paper is that motivation and its constructs are context dependent and, therefore, any language learning situation has its own unique motivational model.

Keywords: *Motivation; Integrativeness; Individual differences; learning context; motivation model*

1 Introduction

Language is an integral system of an individual's thought. Most thoughts involve language, and much of our behavior is influenced by the language we speak and think. We interact with others or even ourselves via language. Then, learning a second language influences language learner's thoughts and behavior. In learning another language, the learner tries to incorporate speech sounds, grammatical structure, behavioral patterns, and cultural specification of the target language. Gardner (2001) and Dörnyei (2003) mention that learning another language is different from much another learning that takes place in school. Other school subjects such as mathematics, history, and geography are generally all part of the student's local or national culture but "learning another language involves making something foreign a part of one's self" (Gardner, 2001, p.3). As such, this new individual 'self' influences the second or foreign language learning and willingness to change the old individual "self."

Gardner (2001), arguing the role of learning another language in the modification of the 'self', mentions three important phases during the process of 'modification of the self' in second/ foreign language learning: *past*, *present*, and *future*. In one interpretation for the notion of the past within the context of second/foreign language learning, he refers to the fact that individual's past experience, family, and cultural backgrounds are considered important to learning a second language. That is, "when the student enters the classroom, he or she brings a lot of emotional and cognitive baggage that influence learning experience" (Gardner, 2001, p.4). If a language learner comes from the culture that values multilingualism, the expectation is that he will be a successful language learner. The notion of the present is meant to indicate that the present situation influences learning. The teacher presents materials, makes demands, requests, and the student responds to these stimuli. These responses are situation-dependent, i.e. they are moderated by language learner's thoughts, needs, recent experience, and his or her perceptions. Therefore, the notion of the present focuses on the student's current experience in the classroom, teacher's behavior and pedagogical procedures each of which has its influence on language learning. Finally, the notion of the future refers to the use of the language immediately after current language experience, i.e. after finishing a particular course.

Definition of Motivation

Motivation is a multifaceted construct and different researchers in psychology and other social science disciplines define it in many different ways. Dörnyei (1998) argues on the exact definition of 'motivation'. He comments, "Although 'motivation' is a term frequently used in both educational and research contexts, it is rather surprising how little agreement there is in the literature with regard to the exact meaning of the concept" (p.117). Some researchers interpret it in relation to about the other concepts related to motivation, in other words, "viewing it as no more than an absolute umbrella that hosts a wide range of concepts that do not have much in common" (Dörnyei, 2001a, p. 7). Sometimes the discrepancy in results of the conducted studies can be attributed to the different interpretations of the concept of motivation and the constructs that relate to it.

Within the behavioristic framework, the effort was to understand 'what moved a resting organism into a dynamic state'. In so doing, this approach generalized the results of the conducted studies on animals to humans. Reward system was the key in this approach to motivate individuals to reach the goal. Later, the definition of motivation was influenced by the cognitive shift. Motivation in *cognitive development theory* developed by Piaget is perceived as " a built-in unconscious striving towards more complex and differential development of individual's mental structure (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p.23).The shift of interests from behavioristic to cognitive theories influenced the focus from 'what' to 'why'. Influenced by this shift, the concepts like *stimulus, drive, and aspiration* in behavioristic terms were replaced by *instrumentality, interactiveness, orientation* in cognitive theories, each of which becomes an important construct in individual difference's research. The modern definitions of motivation consider these constructs in their definitions.

Gardner's (1985) statement about the concept of motivation is related to effort, want, desire, reason of behaviors and the affectivity that associated with learning a second language and has a close link with language learning. That is; motivation in SLA refers to the extent to which the language learner strives to achieve a particular goal (*instrumental motivation*) or to become an indistinguishable member of the target community (*integrative motivation*). Having the desire to achieve a predetermined goal and making effort to achieve this goal are prerequisite factors of motivation. We cannot say that a person who likes to learn a second language is motivated, but when he/she tries to learn a second language and makes an effort to do so, it will be possible to say that the individual is motivated in foreign language learning. Therefore, the concept of 'motivation' is not a simple construct and cannot be measured only by one measure, for instance, just by likes or dislikes.

Gardner (1985) considers *effort and desire* as the prerequisites to call an individual a *motivated person*. Within current L2 motivation research, the tendency is to define motivation, as a cumulative force of motives that is "on a continuum from zero to strong" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.89). On the significance of considering motivation as a cumulative force, Dörnyei (2009) argues that instead of conceptualizing learner characteristics in a modular manner (i.e., in terms of distinct ID factors), further research should try to take a systematic approach by identifying higher-level amalgams of collections of cognition, effect and motivation that act as 'wholes'. An example of such composite integration of distinct factors in SLA research is Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) concept of 'ideal' and 'ought to selves'. Dörnyei (2009), proposing a broad construct of L2 motivation introduces a new L2 *Motivational Self-System*. This new interpretation of motivation consists of three dimensions:

1. *Ideal L2 Self* that is a powerful motivator to learn the second language to become a competent L2 speaker through reducing the discrepancy between actual and ideal selves.
2. *Ought-to Self*, which refers to the possible self or 'outcome self' that the leaner want to achieve. This can be "various duties, obligations, and responsibilities" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.105).
3. *L2 Learning Experience*, which concerns the immediate learning context and language learner experience.

Motivation vs. Motivating

It is worth noting that *motivation* is different from *motivating* in many different ways. While the initial studies were more concerned with the former, more recent studies emphasize the latter. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) consider motivating students as one of the new research agenda items. *Motivating* is something that can be done with self and others, i.e. teachers and peers, and deal with the question of how an individual can be motivated? Gardner's view of the construct concerns *motivation* and that of Dörnyei is *motivating*, nevertheless, both view motivation as a construct of individual differences. We can rarely see Gardner's comment on motivating. For Gardner motivating is equal to making students' attitude favorable "in the language learning situation, if the students "attitudes are favorable, it is reasonable to predict, other things being equal, that experience with the language will be pleasant, and the students will be encouraged to continue" (Gardner, 1985, p.8).

Drawing on this research (i.e. how teachers can motivate their students?); Dörnyei (2001b) proposes a number of strategies for a language classroom. Although the affectivity of these strategies should be confirmed by experimental research, Dörnyei states "there is no doubt that student motivation can be consciously increased by using creative techniques" (p.144). Considering the educational implications of *motivation,* Dörnyei (2005) discusses areas where recent advances have generated material that can promote the effectiveness of unstructured SLA. The first one concerns the development of *motivational strategies,* which provides a wealth of materials that teachers can apply to create a motivational situation in a classroom environment. The second area involves teachers and peers to help to develop *self-motivating strategies* that enable the learners to take personal control of the affective conditions and experience that shape their subjective involvement of learning. Here, motivating becomes the responsibility of language learners, not teachers or peers. However, in developing self-motivating strategies we should remember that "it is important to realize that learners will not automatically take ownership of their motivational disposition but need to be supported in this process" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.112).The final area is the study of *teacher motivation,* which was "a rather overlooked motivational area" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.115). This includes the study of teacher behavior and motivational strategies used by them in the classroom and also how they can be both motivating and motivated simultaneously. Dörnyei (2001a) devoted a whole chapter to the question of teacher motivation. Dörnyei (2005) states that "very little work had been conducted on the topic in the L2 field and that this was also true of educational psychology in general" (p.115). The author comments, as a classroom practitioner, is that *Motivating* is the pedagogical implication of *motivation* and the former is more important than the latter. In language classroom, it is the implication of motivation that results in better learning, not the motivation as an abstract concept.

Significance of Motivation in SLA

Ellis (2008) states "no single individual differences factor in language learning has received as much attention as MOTIVATION" (p. 677). On the importance of motivation for researchers, Dörnyei (2005) claims that there were almost 100 studies published in 1990s. In a meta-analysis of Gardner and his college's studies on the role of attitude, motivation, and orientation in learning a second language, Masgoret and Gardner (2003) cited 75 independent studies involving more than 10,000 participants. Gardner (1985) identifies motivation as the single most influential factor in learning a new language.

Different researchers argue for the importance of motivation in very different ways. It seems motivated students are more likely to enroll in language classes. In other words, students who are highly motivated take part in classroom activity and make the motivated students do so. Pulvermuller and Schumann (1994) argue that full knowledge of a language can only be achieved if two conditions are met-the learner is motivated to learn the language, and the learner possesses the ability to acquire grammatical knowledge. In his final comment on motivation, Ellis (2008) considers these two constructs as 'two big' (i.e. language aptitude and motivation) and suggests that they have been confirmed as the main psychological factors contributing to individual differences in learning a second language. Since aptitude

as a trait is not changeable, we can consider motivation as the most influential factor of IDs, which affect SLA, other things being equal.

As one of the leading attitude researchers of our time, on the significance of motivation over aptitude, Dörnyei (2005) states "motivation provides the primarily 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" (p.65). That is, regardless of aptitude differences, many learners seem to master an L2 and without sufficient motivation, even students with the most remarkable abilities cannot achieve long-term goals. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies in L2 learning. These deficiencies can be due to language aptitude or the situation in which the individual is learning a second language. On the significance of motivation, Rost (2006) argues that "a great deal of research has been conducted in the area of motivation, and why it is so fundamental to second language learning. The underlying issue related to motivation is complex, but it is clear that every person's motivation to learn is flexible rather fixed" (p. 4).

Motivation Theories in SLA

Abundance of motivational theoretical frameworks makes it difficult to explain the role of motivation in SLA. However, as Dörnyei (2003) points out the long history of research into language learning motivation did not bring an end to the confusion surrounding it, and our knowledge of the subject remains uneven and inconsistent. The history of motivation in SLA can be separated into three stages. The early studies are represented by a social, macro-perspective, and mostly use product-oriented approach, in which the outcome was the base of the research. In 1990s, in line with the cognitive shift, the focus was on micro perspective, and the studies concentrated on the situation and context of learning where "the significance of situation-specific factors such as classroom learning situation was examined" (Ellis, 2008, p. 677). Recently, the shift of interest towards more process-oriented approach and toward macro/micro perspective is seminal in works of the researchers like Dörnyei. The shift from 'what' to 'how' shows shift of interests on exploration the changes and processes in motivation (motivation change), and the role that this process plays in L2 learning.

Gardner's socio-educational Model

Second language learning is a social-psychological phenomenon, and it is important to consider the conditions under which it takes place. The socio-educational model was an attempt to determine these conditions in SLA. The socio-educational model was first proposed by Gardner and Smyth (1975). The model has been redefined several times after the first proposal (Gardner, 1985, 1988, 2000, 2005; Gardner & Trembly, 1994), but the main constructs of it remain more or less the same. It was the dominant theory in early motivation research for more than 30 years. Gardner (2005) claims, "the socio-educational model is a paradigm that is completely compatible with many of the new research agendas that have developed" (p. 3). This model is a schematic presentation of the factors that influence second language achievement. Figure 1 is the representation of the model. Considering these findings, Gardner (2005) claims that there is ample evidence supporting the applicability of the socio-educational model in SLA. In the application of these models on research, sometimes the attention is directed to the individual scales (e.g., attitude toward learning situation, motivational intensity, etc.) and sometimes, the focus is on the aggregated components (e.g. score on Integrativeness, Attitudes toward the Learning Situation, and/or Motivation) to obtain a total score of integrative motivation.

Integrativeness

Integrative motivation is the key construct of the Gardner's socio-educational model which is made up of three main sub-constructs, each of which is further broken down to sub components, namely, integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation. Figure 2 is a schematic representation of Gardner's (1985) conceptualization of the integrative motive.

Integrative motivation is the main focus of many motivational researches in SLA. This shows the increasing attention to the concept of 'integrative motivation'. However, as Gardner (2005) suggests, different people have different conceptualization of the term because they do not distinguish integrative orientation, integrative motivation, and integrative motive. Gardner's (1985) conceptualization of the integrative motivation is that it includes orientation (i.e. a class of reasons for learning a second language), motivation (i.e. attitudes toward learning the language, plus desire plus motivational intensity) and a number of other attitudinal variables. Integrative motivation occurs once a learner tries to, or has a desire to integrate himself/herself with the culture of the L2 group. It characterizes the students who study an L2 because of their interest in the values and cultural issues of the target community.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) imply that "integrative motivation is defined with positive attitudes toward the target language group and the potential for integrating into the group, or at least an interest in meeting and interacting with members of the target language group" (p.472). In most of Gardner's studies of Canadian English speakers learning French, Integrativeness is measured by three measures: Integrative Orientation, Attitudes towards French Canadians, and Interest in Foreign Languages.

In a reinterpretation of the concept of *integrativeness,* Gardner (2002) refers to the notion of past, present, and future. "Integrative motivation addresses all three of these aspects as they apply to the individual and that this distinguishes it from other motivational concepts in the area of second language acquisition" (p.3). That is; integrative motivation is a broader concept and encompasses language learners' background, interest and concerns over and above the classroom activity at a particular time, and the learner's existence after the language course. Thus "the concept of integrative motive is much more complex than simply expressing an integrative orientation in language study" (Gardner, 2000, p.5). Later, Gardner (2005) concludes that "integrative motivation refers to a constellation of attributes" (p.20), and that it is not a distinctive construct but a collection of related constructs. It is not something that some people do have and others do not. For Dörnyei (2005), integrative motivation in a broad term, concerns a "positive interpersonal/ affective disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community" (p.5). It implies openness to and respect for the other cultural community, their values, identities and ways of life.

Czizer and Dörnyei (2005) propose a definition of integrativeness focusing on a cognitive representation. Czizer and Dornyei (2005) state "our proposed interpretation equates integrativeness with the Ideal L2 Self, referring to the L2-specific dimension of the learner's ideal self" (p.30). The construct of 'Ideal Language Self' describes the attributes that a person would ideally like to possess. Thus, "From this perspective integrativeness can be reconceptualized as an L2 facet of one's ideal self" (Ellis, 2008, p.690). For example, if a learner's ideal self, wants to become a proficient L2 speaker, then this indicates an integrative disposition. However, their definition not only made the enigma less complex but as Gardner (2005) states, "it certainly will make communication about integrativeness difficult" (p.8).

Overall, considering the definitions of the concept of integrative motivation it is suggested that that it is important to define the integrative motivation according to the context in which the L2 learning is taking place. It is the nature of context that determines the interpretation of integrative motive. That is; integrative motivation as a construct of IDs is context dependent, so its interpretation should be in the context in which it is operationalized.

Instrumental Motivation
Instrumental motivation is another construct of Gardner's socio-educational model. Gardner (2001) refers to the following reasons as instrumental reasons: *I want to learn the language in order to get a job,* or *I want to learn the language because it will be important for my future career,* or *I want to learn the language so that I will be better educated.* Thus, instrumental motivation concerns the benefits, which second language learning may bring to a language learner.

In his definition of *instrumentality,* Dörnyei (2005) *refers* to "perceived pragmatic benefits of L2 proficiency" (p.6). In Dörnyei (2005), 'ideal language self' "instrumentalities are divided into two types: promotion vs. prevention. "Instrumental motivation 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 parts of the ought self" (p.103). As this distinction suggests, the focus of these two types of instrumentality is the utilitarian value despite having different goals. That is; it is the goal of learning that determines the type of instrumentality.

Inseparability of Integrative and Instrumental Motivation
It is possible that the learner might have *mixed motives* in the sense that he or she can have both integrative motivation and instrumental motive at the same time. Therefore, different types of motivation lie on a continuum and the concern is the degree of intensity. This is in line with Dörnyei's (2005) claim, which conceptualizes different types of motivation lying on a continuum from amotivation through extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation, which are discussed later. On the other hand, the language leaner might have neither type of motivation. One possible situation could be when a person learns a language in order to go abroad both for working and living. Gardner (2001) exemplifies a person who cannot be considered neither integratively motivated nor instrumentally. It means that when somebody learns an L2 because of good grade, this is just a reason for learning and cannot be categorized as any kind of motivated individual.

Challenges to Gardner's Socio-educational Model
Despite the significant role of the socio-educational model in the mainstream of SLA research, the model was subject to both theoretical and methodological aspects by many researchers (e.g. Dörnyei, 1990, 1994, 2005; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Oxford, 1996). The first criticism is against the content validity of the AMTB (Attitude Motivation Test Battery). Dörnyei (2005) argues that the items in the motivation subcomponents conflate the mental phenomenon of being motivated with behaviors. That is "it assesses both motivation and motivated behavior" (Ellis, 2008, p.681). As a result "it is not easy to decide the exact nature of the underlying trait that the instruments target" (ibid). That is; the construct in consideration might not measure what it intends to.

The second criticism raised by some researcher is that, the AMTB is appropriate for Canada, as a bilingual country. In a sense, the research is concerned with second language learning rather than foreign language learning; therefore, it is not appropriate to foreign language learning. Reasons for this are "either that the language is not readily available" (Oxford, 1996) and/or that "it lacks political importance in the community" (Dörnyei, 2001a). In response to this criticism Gardener, and his colleagues mention that the conducted researches in a number of countries in which L2 learning is considered as foreign language learning indicate that the AMTB is clearly appropriate to those countries.

The third criticism is related to terminological misunderstandings. Dörnyei (1994, 2005) mentions two sources of difficulties. The first one is related to the interpretation of Integrative Motive. That is, Gardner has three different but very closely related concepts of integrativeness (i.e. integrative orientation, integrativeness, and integrative motive/motivation), i.e. terminological difficulty "makes it difficult to decide what is meant when Gardner talks about 'motivation' in his writing L2 motivation in general. Integrative motivation? Alternatively, the specific 'Motivation' subcomponent of the integrative motive?" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.69). Surprisingly, Gardner (2001) agrees with this criticism in the sense that "the term is used frequently in the literature though close inspection will reveal that it has different meanings to many different individuals" (Gardner, 2001, p.1).

The fourth criticism is the division of 'motivation' as 'Integrative and Instrumental' separately by many researchers in Gardner's socio-educational model. Dörnyei (2005) mentions that many manuscripts submitted to international journals start out by conceptualizing motivation purely (and poorly) along the instrumental-integrative dichotomy. That is, the psychological aspect of human nature does not allow

such purely separation, and, therefore, considering motivation as the sum of integrativeness and instrumentality is a reductionist view. Gardner and Macintyre (2002) have already replied to this criticism in a sense that motivation itself is dynamic, and the old categorization of motivation in terms of integrative vs. instrumental motivation is too static and restricted. Other researchers have more or less the same criticism to this distinction. For example, McClelland (2000) calling for a definition of 'integrativeness' focus on "integration with the global community rather than assimilation with native speakers" (p.109) and highlights "need to reappraise Gardner's concept of integrativeness to fit a perception of English as an international language" (ibid).

The fifth criticism which is considered an 'enigma' by Dörnyei (2005), though the importance of it, is that "it has no obvious parallels in any areas of mainstream motivational psychology, and its exact nature is difficult to define" (p.5).This resembles Gardner's (2001) conclusions that the "term is used frequently in the literature, though close inspection will reveal that it has slightly different meaning to many different individuals" (Gardner, 2001, p.1). Dörnyei (2005) agrees that still an 'integrative motive' component has consistently emerged in empirical studies even in different contexts, which show its significance in the learning process; However, Dörnyei (2005) does not explain what would happen if it had obvious parallels in mainstream motivational psychology or what problems and difficulties this lack cause.

The last criticism coming from a constructivist approach downgrades the importance of integrative component. The concept of integrative motive can be seriously hazardous to individuals' identities as it implies that, in the extreme view, successful L2 learners are those who wish to integrate with target community and, therefore, relinquish their identity. Webb (2003) puts this in other words and state "in this context, the cultural identity of the second language learner is conceptualized as hazardous in the second language learning process" (63).

Overall, these criticisms lead to a paradigm shift from macro to the micro perspective, and rise of the other models on the role of motivation in second language learning. Nevertheless, as Dörnyei (2005) states, "different- or however, contradicting- theories do not necessarily exclude one another but may simply be related to different phases of the motivated behavioral process" (p.18), it should be mentioned that at this stage, the scholars (e.g. Dörnyei, 1990; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Oxford, 1996) call for expanding and redefying socio -educational model rather than degrading or eliminating it. This redefinition of the model by scholars resulted in a new perspective on the role of motivation in SLA.

Cognitive Shifts
The starting point of the cognitive shift in motivation research is seen in Crookes and Schmidt's (1991) article. In that paper, they have argued that work to that date on the topic of motivation in SLA had been limited in two senses: "it has been almost exclusively social-psychological in approach, and it has failed to distinguish between the concept of attitude, especially attitude toward the target language culture, and motivation." (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991, p. 501). Several other studies were conducted by many other researchers in the late 1980s (e.g. Julkunen, 1989; Skehan, 1989), and early 1990s (e.g. Brown, 1990; Skehan, 1991) are related to this shift.

Considering motivation in the immediate context rather than motivation in whole intercultural communities, viewing it as a dynamic entity rather than static concept, and focusing upon the process rather than the product were the main focuses of the cognitive shift. The shift of macro-perspective to micro-perspective motivated researchers to catch up with mainstream educational psychological theories such as *Self-determination theory, Attribution theory, Goal theory, Classroom Friendly models,* and *the Neurobiology of L2 Motivation.*

Self-determination Theory
Self-determination theory distinguishes two types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Dörnyei (2005) states, "it has been one of the most influential approaches in motivational psychology, and several

attempts have been made to the L2 field to incorporate certain elements from the theory to explain L2 motivation" (p.76). In the late 1990s, Noels and his colleagues (e.g. MacIntosh & Noels, 2004; Noels, 2001a, 2001b; Noels, Clement & Pelletier, 1999, 2000, 2001), in line with the general thrust of the cognitive situated period, developed a systematic research program "(a) to relate the various intrinsic/extrinsic components established in educational psychology to orientations developed in l2 research, and (b) to examine how the learners' level of self-determination is affected by various classroom practices" (cited in Dörnyei, 2005, p.77).

Noels (2001) examines the relationship between classroom practices and self-determination and concludes that motivation consisted of three main elements: *intrinsic orientation*, *extrinsic orientation* and *amotivation* which lie along a continuum from self –determination to non-self-determination. An individual with high level of self-determination is likely to demonstrate autonomy in his or her learning and lead to higher achievement.

According to Deci and Ryan (2008), *Self-determination theory* "addresses such basic issues as personality development, self-regulation, universal psychological needs, life goal and aspiration, energy and vitality, non-conscious processes, the relationship of culture to motivation and the impact of social environment on motivation, affect, behavior, and well-being" (p.183).

Intrinsic Motivation
Intrinsic motivation is a type of motivation that derives from internal satisfaction and enjoyment. Intrinsic motivation comes from within language learners and relates to learner's identity and sense of well-being. According to Noels et.al. (2000) Intrinsic motivation as a sub-scale of the self-determination theory, is of three kinds: a) *intrinsic motivation knowledge* (i.e. the pleasure of knowing new things), *intrinsic motivation accomplishment* (the pleasure of accomplishing goals), and *intrinsic motivation stimulation* (the pleasure in doing the task). Ehrman, Leaver, and Oxford (2003) state that intrinsically motivated learners find the reward in the enjoyment of learning activity itself and achieve a feeling of competence in doing the task. In other words, intrinsically motivated individuals are mostly internally driven rather than externally driven.

Extrinsic Motivation
Extrinsic motivation refers to "actions carried out to achieve some instrumental end such as earning reward or avoiding a punishment" (Deci & Ryan, 1985, p.39). In contrast to intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation lies along the continuum from non-self-determination to self-determination. In other words, Motivation in self-determination theory is classified into three categories on a continuum, from unwillingness, to passive compliance, to active personal commitment. *External regulation*, which refers to the learner's attempts and actions to reach the external rewards and benefits of doing the task, i.e. the learners' behaviors are performed to satisfy an external demand or obtain an externally imposed reward contingency. The *introjected regulation* "which refers to a partial internalization in which external regulations are taken by the individual but are not accepted as his or her own" (Black & Deci, 2000). The performed measures here are due to some external pressure (e.g. a person who learns the language in order not to feel ashamed if he does not know it). *Identified regulation* refers to the regulation driven by personally relevant reasons, such as that the activity is important for achieving a valued goal (e.g. individuals who learn an L2 because they think it is important for their educational development). Identified regulated individual take part in the process of learning because of the internal values and goodness which it entails.

Amotivation
Amotivation in the self-determination theory refers to "lack of motivation resulting from realizing that there is no point" (Dörnyei 2001a, p. 143). It is independent of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) define amotivation as "the relative absence of motivation that is not caused by a lack of initial interest but rather by the individual's experiencing feelings of incompetence and helplessness when

faced with the activity" (cited in Dornyei, 2001a, p. 144). Vallerand (1997) mentions four major types of amotivation. First, amotivation can result from a *capacity-ability belief,* i.e. an individual may have amotivation because of lack of self-confidence; the second type is *strategy beliefs,* i.e*.,* amotivation i.e. an individual may think that the undesired outcome may result from strategy misuse. The third type of amotivation, *capacity-effort belief*, results from this perception that the task is too demanding to do. The fourth type of amotivation, a *helplessness belief*, result from this perception that effort is inconsequential, and it cannot be of any help.

Criticisms of Self-determination Theory
The existence of the self-determination continuum is not well established. Vandergrift (2005) examined the relationship between motivation and proficiency with the self-determination theory; he found that no distinct simple pattern, reflecting a continuum of increasing self-determination was apparent and concludes that the self-determination framework as developed by Noels and colleagues cannot be generalized for adolescent learners. In an experimental study on college students, Vohs *et.al.* (2008) found that offering too many choices to individuals may lead to negative effects on self-regulation. That is, this may lead to less self-regulation, less willingness to engage in an activity and less persistence in performance.

Some scholars see no differences between *intrinsic/extrinsic* motivation from self-determination theory and *integrative/instrumental* motivation from Gardner's socio-educational model. Intrinsically motivated individuals enjoy doing the task of language learning; on the other hand, as Gardner (2009; 2010) notes, integratively motivated students show greater satisfaction with the class. Extrinsically motivated individuals do the learning because of instrumental reasons; it derives from instrumental influences such as earning a reward or avoiding punishment while instrumentally motivated individuals do learning because of the benefits of learning, for example, getting a job. In short, sometimes the distinction between *integrative* with *intrinsic* motivation and *instrumental* with *extrinsic* motivation become blurred. Still, however, the similarity between the *extrinsic* and *instrumental* is more evident than those between *intrinsic* and *integrative*.

Goal Theories
"Goals have always been a central feature of L2 motivation research" (Dörnyei, 2005, p.9). Originally, goal theories come from educational psychology. Goal refers to the reasons or purposes that an individual has in learning process. Overall, goals affect individuals' performance in the sense that they:
- Concentrate the attention toward a particular activity;
- Motivate individual to make effort;
- Affect individuals to continue a particular task;
- Affects the strategy use by different learners.

As noted by Locke and Latham (2002), the two influential goal theories in motivational studies are *goal-setting theory* and the *goal orientation theory.*
According to Locke (1996), among other things *goal-setting* and *performances* are related. That is; goals affect the performance, the effort paid to reach that goal, the strategies used and its persistence. Motivational research is mainly concerned with *goal orientation theory.* Dörnyei (2005) states that "language learning goals have been typically referred to as orientations" (p. 9). However, 'orientations' as defined by Gardner and Trembly (1994), had not been explicitly linked to various goal theories that had become popular in the educational psychology.

Unlike the *goal-setting theory, goal orientation theory* was developed in a classroom context in order to explain children's learning and performance (Dörnyei, 2001a, p.27). Pintrich and Schunk (2002; cited in Dörnyei, 2005, p. 9) states "currently, it is probably the most active area of research on student motivation in classrooms, and it has direct implications for students and teachers." This theory hypothesized that an individual's performance is closely related to his or her perceived goals. Ames and

Archer (1988) commenting on the contribution to the theory, distinguish between two types of *goal orientation*: *Performance* vs. *Mastery* orientations. Performance oriented learners are primarily concerned looking good and capable whereas mastery oriented learners are more concerned with increasing their knowledge and being capable.

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986, 1992, 2000) has got a special attention among contemporary motivation theories in psychology. Attribution theory was the dominant theory in research on student motivation in the 1980s. The theory to the SLA research is important since many cases of language-learning failure can be explained by it. Attribution is also important in a sense that, as Williams, Burden, and Al-Baharna (2001) note, it plays an important role in shaping learner motivation.

Some Scholars in the field of SLA motivation research (Weiner, 1986, 1992, 2000; Dörnyei, 2001b; Slavin, 2003) explain attribution theory in terms of four factors: *ability*, *effort, perceived difficulty of a task* and *luck*. Brown (2007) considers ability /effort as internal factors and luck and /task difficulty as external factors. The theory links future achievements and successes to these factors and considers this link as a *causal attribution (*e.g. effort causes achievement or ability results in achievement). Dörnyei (2005) clarifying this point states "If, for example, we ascribe past failure in a particular task to low ability in 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" (p.79). That is language cleaners' background plays an important role in future achievement and can be an attributed reason of achievement. Attributions are culturally bound and learners with different cultural background attribute their success or failure to different factors. In a qualitative study, Williams et al. (2001) found that, in the case of Arab students' perception of their learning, factors such as 'luck' are never mentioned or the factor 'ability' was cited rarely by participants. In other words, they mentioned that language learning is attributed to the class environment, circumstances, exposure to the language, interest, strategy use, and support from others.

The concept of attribution is closely related to *self-efficacy* (*believe in self*). "A high sense of self-efficacy, an appropriate degree of effort may be devoted to achieving success" (Brown, 2007, p.156). Conversely, "a learner with low self-efficacy may quite easily attribute failure to external factors" (ibid). In short, we can think over *self-efficacy* as the pedagogical implication from the attribution theory and one of the teachers' responsibility is to encourage high self –efficacy in their students..

The Neurobiology of L2 Motivation

Influenced by recent high-tech methods of brain studies, the neurobiological studies of motivation were introduced by Schumann (1989, 1999). In this approach brain mechanism and neurological reactions that happen during a particular process are investigated. Dörnyei (2005), comments that this new line of research has the potentiality to revolutionize the motivational studies within the field of SLA research.

According to Schumann (2001), the implication of this model for the study of L2 motivation is that motivation can be a pattern of stimulus appraisal. In other words, the five appraisal dimensions (novelty, *pleasantness*, *coping potential, self/social image)* constitute motivation. Furthermore, this model considering instrumental/integrative motive of Gardner and intrinsic/extrinsic motive of Deci and Ryan, comments that there might not be the best motivation.

Process -oriented Approach To motivation

In Motivational studies, the concept of attitude change has been attended from the very beginning of motivational study. Gardner (1985) mentions, "attitude change is viewed by Lambert as a direct consequence of becoming proficient in a second language" (p.84). However, in comparison to other motivational studies, studies on the process of motivation in SLA are rare. Dörnyei (2005) states "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" (p.87). The process-oriented approach to motivation emerged from the cognitive situated period in the l990s, and it is going to be the dominant theory in recent motivational psychology. The key slogan of this approach to motivation studies in SLA is that 'motivation changes over time'. The focus of this view of L2 motivation is on change rather than variables, and the related studies tend to be longitudinal rather than cross-sectional. Dörnyei (2005) as the pioneer developer of the model mentions that, in the context of SLA, which takes place over several years, "motivation is expected to go through rather diverse phases" (p.83). In other words, motivation in the process of L2 learning, like L2 learning itself, is not a static attribute rather dynamic one; therefore, it is subject to fluctuations.

Ellis (2008) states, "Researchers are increasingly acknowledging that propensity factors (for example, motivation, learning style, anxiety) are situated and dynamic rather than trait- like" (p.721). That is, "they operate differently in different social contexts and they fluctuate as a result of learner internal and external factors "(ibid). Scholars in the field of process oriented-approach to motivation (e.g. Williams & Burden, 1997; Dörnyei, 2000, 2001; Dörnyei and Otto; 1998) divide the stages of the motivation process on a continuum. Williams and Burden (1997) distinguish three motivational phases: a) reasons for doing something, (b) deciding to do something, and (c) sustaining the effort or persisting. Similarly, Dörnyei and Otto (1998) and Dörnyei (2000, 2001a) developed a process model of L2 motivation to specify the components and mechanisms making up the L2 motivation process. The model explains the process of motivation on a continuum from initial *wishes* and *desires to the* final *evaluation* of the process.

The process oriented model to motivation is concerned with motivation change over time. Ellis (2008) mentions that these models can incorporate other motivational models. For instance, "the Preactional stage incorporates such constructs as integrative motivation, the actional stage incorporates instrumental motivation and intrinsic motivation, and the postactional stage incorporates attribution theory" (Ellis, 2008, p.688). Incorporating different theories into one is advantageous of the process-oriented approach to motivation. Since the model benefits from positive outcomes of other models and neglect the negative side of those models.

Although, the process-oriented approach has a revolutionary role in the motivation studies, it is subject to some criticisms. Firstly, the operationalizing actional stage is not clear. Dörnyei (2005) mentions "the model implies that the actional process in question is well-definable and has clear cut boundaries" (p.86). Secondly, it should be mentioned that the stages in the process-oriented approaches should be simultaneously taken into account, but it is not clear how to operationalize this consideration.

Conclusion

This paper as a state of art article presented the role motivation as one of the most important constructs of IDs in SLA. Different scholars defined the term in many different ways some of which are presented here. The definition of the term suggested that motivation is context dependent, therefore, based on the context there may be numerous interpretation of the term. Hence, before conducting any research in the related field the term should be operationally defined. The most significant theoretical frameworks, furthermore, was investigated. In so doing, Gardner *socio-educational model*, Deci & Ryan *self-determination theory, goal theories,* Weiner *attribution theory,* the Neurobiology of L2 motivation, and the process-oriented approach to motivation was reviewed.

References

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement Goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 261-271.

Black, A. E., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory perspective. *Science Education, 84,*740-756.

Brown, H. D. (1990). M & Ms for language classroom? Another look at motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on language and linguistics* (pp. 383-393). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5 ed.). New Jersey 07632: Prentice Hall. Inc. Englewood Cliffs.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reporting the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*(4), 469-512.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3), 173-178.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31(3),* 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 43-59.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientation, and motivation in language learning: advances in theory, research, and application. *Language Learning, 53*, 3-32.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Individual Differences: Interplay of Learner Characteristics and Learning Environment. *Language Learning, 59*(1), 230-248.

Ehrman, M., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System, 31*, 313-330.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of second language acquisition.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. C., (1988). The socio-educational model of second language learning: Assumptions, findings and issues. *Language Learning, 38*, 101-126.

Gardner, R. C., (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation and second language acquisition *Canadian Psychology, 41*, 10-24.

Gardner, R. C., & Smyth, P. (1975). *Second language acquisition: a social-psychological approach*. Psychology. University of Western Ontario. London, Canada.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual consideration. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 524-527.

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation: Past, present and future. Retrieved January, 2012. from publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs.

Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. Canadian Psychology, 41, 10-24.

Gardner, R. C. (2009). *Gardner and Lambert (1959): Fifty Years and Doubting*. Paper presented at the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics Symposium presentation, Ottawa, publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation in second language acquisition: The socio-educational model.*New York: Peter Lang.

Julkunen, K. (1989). *Situation-and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning and teaching* Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Locke, E. A., (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting: *Applied and Preventive psychology* 5, 117-123.

Loke, E., & Latham, J. (2002). Building a particularly useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*(90), 705-717.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed), Individual differences in second language acquisition (pp. 45-68). Amsterdam: Benjmins.

Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning, 53*,167-210.

McClelland, N. (2000). Goal orientations in Japanese college students learning EFL. In S. Cornwell & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Individual differences in foreign language learning: Effects of aptitude, intelligence, and motivation*. Tokyo: Japanese Association for Language Teaching.

Noels, K. A. (2001a). Learning Spanish as a second language: learners' orientations and perceptions of their teacher's communication style. *Language Learning, 51*, 107-144.

Noels, K. A. (2001b). New orientations in language learning motivation: Toward a contextual model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation In D. Z & R. Shmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 43-68). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 23-44.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Language Modern Language Review*, 424-444.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50*, 57-85.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 12-28.

Oxford, R. (1996). New pathways of language learning motivation. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: The new century* (pp. 1-9). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Pulvermuller, F., & Schumann, J. (1994). Neurobiological mechanisms of language acquisition. *Language Learning, 44*(681-734).

Rost, M. (2006). Generating student motivation. Retrieved January, 2012, from www.pearsonlongman.com/ ae/worldview/motivation.pdf

Schumann, J. H. (1998). *The neurobiology of affect in language*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Schumann, J. H. (1999). A neurobiological perspective on the affect and methodology in second language learning. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect and methodology in second language learning* (pp. 28-42). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schumann, J. H. (2001). Appraisal psychology, neurobiology, and language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 23-42.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differnces in second language learning ability.* London: Edward Arnold.

Slavin, R. (2003). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Vallerand, R. J. (Ed.). (1997). *Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation*. New York: Academic Press.

Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 70-89.

Vohs, K., Baumeister, B., Jean, M., Twenge, J., Nelson, N., & Tice, D. (2008). Making Choices impairs subsequent self-control: A limited resource of account of decision making, self-Regulation, and active initiative. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(5), 883-898.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 12*, 1-14.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, M., Burden, R., & Al-Baharna, S. (2001). Making sense of success and failure: The role of individual in motivation theory. In Dorneyi. Z & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 173-186). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.