Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2001) **21**, 43 59. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2001 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/01 $9.50

3. NEW THEMES AND APPROACHES IN SECOND LANGUAGE MOTIVATION RESEARCH

Zoltán Dörnyei

The study of L2 motivation has reached an exciting turning point in the 1990s, with a variety of new models and approaches proposed in the literature, resulting in what Gardner and Tremblay (1994) have called a motivational renaissance. In this chapter I provide an overview of some of the current themes and research directions that I find particularly novel or forward-looking. The summary is divided into three sections: theoretical advances, new approaches in research methodology, and emerging new motivational themes. I argue that the initial research inspiration and standard-setting empirical work on L2 motivation originating from Canada has borne fruit by educating a new generation of international scholars who, together with the pioneers of the field, have applied their expertise in diverse contexts and in creative ways, thereby creating a colorful mixture of approaches comparable to the multi-faceted arena of mainstream motivational psychology.

The first three decades of L2 motivation research until about the early 1990s was largely inspired and fuelled by the pioneering work of social psychologists in Canada, most notably Robert Gardner, Wallace Lambert, Richard Clément, and their associates. Applying versions of a standardized motivation test developed by Robert Gardner s research group at the University of Western Ontario, the *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (AMTB; for a complete version, see Gardner, 1985), a great deal of empirical research during this period was directed at measuring the association between various aspects of motivation and L2 learning achievement. The emerging body of research studies established motivation as a principal determinant of second language acquisition,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

comparable in its impact to another well-researched learner variable, language aptitude.

During these first decades of research, motivation was primarily seen as a relatively stable learner trait that was, to a large extent, a function of (a) the learner's social perceptions of the L2 and its speakers, as reflected by various language attitudes; (b) generalized attitudes toward the L2 learning situation, such as the appraisal of the course or the teacher; and (c) interethnic contact and the resulting degree of linguistic self-confidence. The 1990s extended this conception by adding a number of cognitive and situation-specific variables to the existing paradigm (e.g., attributions and group cohesiveness), and there was a shift by some toward viewing motivation as a more dynamic factor that is in a continuous process of evolution and change according to the various internal and external influences the learner is exposed to (for a recent review, see Dörnyei, 2001). The traditional approach of computing correlations between motivational and achievement factors gradually gave way to more complex, often qualitative, analyses of motivational antecedents and consequences, resulting in a colorful spectrum of new research directions. This chapter is intended to survey these recent developments and highlight some potentially fruitful areas for future research. First I summarize some general theoretical and research methodological advances, then I describe a number of novel motivational themes emerging in the literature.

Theoretical Advances

The 1990s brought an extraordinary boom in L2 motivation research: Dörnyei (1998a) reviewed over 80 relevant L2 studies from the period, including more than ten newly designed theoretical motivation constructs. The extent of the shift in thinking is probably best characterized by the fact that a new motivation model developed by Robert Gardner's research laboratory (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) in response to calls for the "adoption of a wider vision of motivation" (p. 505), did not actually include Gardner's best known motivational component, the "integrative motive." Approaching the new millennium, the boundaries of L2 motivation were pushed even further, with researchers adopting varied and increasingly complex perspectives. A good cross-section of the emerging new wave of motivational thinking was provided by a colloquium at the annual conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics in March, 2000 (Vancouver), and by an edited volume—partly based on the colloquium proceedings—which contains 20 chapters written by researchers from over ten different countries in Asia, Europe, and the Americas (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001).

From the point of view of their theoretical novelty, the following five motivational areas appear particularly interesting: social motivation;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

motivation from a process-oriented perspective; the neurobiological basis of motivation (see also Schumann, this volume); L2 motivation and self-determination theory; and task motivation.

Social Motivation

In an article deliberating upon the future of applied linguistics, McGroarty (1998) has argued that in order to be able to address the most intellectually challenging and practically significant aspects of language learning and teaching (p. 592), applied linguists need to understand better how the *social contexts* surrounding language acquisition affect the learning process. This view accords with the recent emergence of a broader perspective in the whole of the social sciences sometimes referred to as an ongoing second cognitive revolution (Hickey, 1997, p. 183) that emphasizes the sociocultural roots of learning and cognition in general. Motivational psychology has not remained immune to the new spirit: in a pioneering article, Bernard Weiner (1994) set out to conceptualize *social motivation,* involving the complex of motivational influences that stem from the sociocultural environment rather than from the individual. During the past five years, social goals have been the subject of a great deal of research in psychology (cf., Juvonen & Nishina, 1997; Wentzel, 1999).

Because of the inherently social nature of L2 acquisition, the study of the linguistic impact of various sociocultural factors has, in fact, had a relatively long history in the L2 field. In addition to Gardner s motivation theory, social determinants of L2 learning were the focus of Giles and Byrne s (1982) intergroup model, Schumann s (1978) acculturation theory, and Clément and Noels s (1992; Noels & Clément, 1996) situated language identity theory, although these theories were not always expressed explicitly in motivational terms. In the light of the increasing social awareness in motivational psychology, this line of inquiry is of particular significance and, as emphasized by Clément and Gardner (in press), Dörnyei (in press-a), and McGroarty (2001), L2 motivation as a *situated construct* will undoubtedly be one of the main targets of future motivation research.

Motivation from a Process-Oriented Perspective

A recent line of investigation that I have been actively involved in has examined the *temporal dimension* of motivation, that is, the way in which motivational processes happen in time. This question is, I believe, particularly important when the target of interest is a sustained learning process, such as the mastery of an L2, that can take several years to be successfully accomplished. During the course of such a lengthy process, student motivation does not remain constant but undergoes continuous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

changes; as Ushioda (1996, p. 240) summarizes, within the context of institutionalized learning especially, the common experience would seem to be motivational flux rather than stability. In view of this, the study of the dynamics of motivational change and the identification of typical sequential patterns and developmental aspects is likely to be a fruitful area for future research. Examples of a process-oriented conception in L2 motivation research include the separation of the *initiation of motivation* from the process of *sustaining motivation* by Williams and Burden (1997) and Ushioda's (1998, 2001) analysis of how new motivational orientations evolve while the learner is engaged in the L2 learning process.

The most complex process-oriented construct in the L2 field has been put forward by Dörnyei and Ottó (1998; cf. also Dörnyei, 2001), who devised a *process model of L2 motivation* which organizes the various motivational influences along a sequence of discrete actional events in the chain of instigating and enacting motivated behavior. The model details how initial wishes and desires are first transformed into goals and then into operationalized intentions, which are seen as the immediate antecedents of action; after action has been initiated, an appraisal and an action control process mediate executive motivation, leading (hopefully) to the accomplishment of the goal and concluded by the final evaluation of the process. In a recent paper summarizing theoretical and practical implications of the process-oriented approach, I have argued (Dörnyei, 2000) that focusing on the temporal aspect of motivation is particularly useful because it allows researchers to discuss both preactional choice motivation (i.e., the motives leading to selecting goals and forming intentions) and volitional/executive factors during the actional phase (i.e., motives affecting ongoing learning behaviors) in a unified framework. Although this research perspective is still relatively new, during the past decade it has been adopted by a growing number of scholars within the field of educational psychology (cf., Snow, Corno, & Jackson, 1996), partly driven by recognition that, by accounting for the dynamic evolution of motivation, we can fully accommodate the learner's active role in controlling and shaping the affective foundation of the learning process. This perspective fits in well with the recent emphasis placed on the study of student self-regulation.

A Neurobiological Explanation of Motivation

A novel line of research that has the potential to revolutionarize the study of L2 motivation has been pursued by John Schumann (1998, 1999, this volume), who has examined second language acquisition from a neurobiological perspective. This work has been one of the first attempts in the L2 field to incorporate the findings of neuroscience and to link the study of language to this particularly dynamically developing discipline

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

within cognitive sciences. The key constituent of Schumann s theory is *stimulus appraisal,* which occurs in the brain along five dimensions: *novelty* (degree of unexpectedness/familiarity); *pleasantness* (attractiveness); *goal/need significance* (whether the stimulus is instrumental in satisfying needs or achieving goals); *coping potential* (whether the individual expects to be able to cope with the event); and *self and social image* (whether the event is compatible with social norms and the individual s self-concept). These appraisals become part of the person s overall value system through a special memory for value and are largely responsible for providing the affective foundation of human action. Recently, Schumann (2001) has broadened his theory by outlining a conception of learning as a form of *mental foraging* (i.e., foraging for knowledge), which engages the same neural systems as the ones used by organisms when foraging to feed or mate, and which is generated by an incentive motive and potentiated by the stimulus appraisal system.

Motivation and Self-Determination Theory

One of the most influential paradigms in mainstream motivational psychology has been offered by *self-determination theory* (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Vallerand, 1997), which includes the well-known distinction between *intrinsic motivation* (i.e., performing a behavior for its own sake in order to experience pleasure and satisfaction such as the joy of doing a particular activity or satisfying one s curiosity) and *extrinsic motivation* (i.e., performing a behavior as a means to an end, that is, to receive some extrinsic reward such as good grades or a raise in salary, or alternatively to avoid punishment). The theory places the various types of regulations on a continuum between self-determined (intrinsic) and controlled (extrinsic) forms of motivation, depending on how internalized they are, that is, how much the regulation has been transferred from outside to inside the individual. Five distinct categories along this continuum have been identified: *external regulation* (i.e., motivation coming entirely from external sources such as rewards or threats); *introjected regulation* (i.e., externally imposed rules that students accept as norms they should follow in order not to feel guilty); *identified regulation* (i.e., engaging in an activity because the individual highly values it and sees its usefulness); *integrated regulation* (i.e., involving choiceful behavior that is fully assimilated with the individual s other values, needs, and identity); and pure *intrinsic regulation*.

Because learning an L2 almost always contains a combination of external and internal regulatory factors, Noels and her colleagues (Noels, 2001; Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000) set out to explore how the orientations proposed by self-determination theory relate to various orientations that have traditionally

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

been identified in the L2 field (e.g., instrumental and integrative orientations). Noels argues that applying the intrinsic/extrinsic continuum can be helpful in organizing language learning goals systematically; she notes, further, that the paradigm is particularly useful for analyzing the classroom climate and the L2 teacher in terms of how much they promote either control or autonomy, a dimension of contrast which has immediate practical implications for educating autonomous, self-regulated L2 learners.

Task Motivation

While it is true that certain motivational perceptions and attributes are generalized across learning situations and remain fairly fixed once established, it is also clear that other motivational factors show considerable variation according to the particular learning event with which they are associated, as evidenced by the varying degrees of interest and commitment students demonstrate toward different *learning tasks*. This duality of generalized and situation-specific motives was explicitly addressed by Tremblay, Goldberg, and Gardner (1995) when they distinguished *trait* and *state motivation*, the former involving stable and enduring dispositions, the latter transitory and temporary responses or conditions. The potential usefulness of such a distinction lies in its capacity to explain learners' situational and task preferences. Indeed, from a pedagogical point of view, it would be very beneficial to identify components of *task motivation*, because it would allow curriculum designers and language teachers to systematically select and administer tasks in a motivating manner, thus increasing learner engagement.

In a recent theoretical discussion of task motivation, Julkunen (2001) argues that students' task behavior is fuelled by a combination of generalized and situation-specific motives according to the specific task characteristics, a position in line with Tremblay et al.'s (1995) conclusion that trait motivation influences state motivation. In a study focusing on the motivational background of student engagement in communicative L2 tasks, Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) found that the learner's overall disposition toward task performance has at least three distinct layers: (a) generalized motives (e.g., integrativeness), (b) course-specific motives (i.e., the appraisal of the L2 course), and (c) task-specific motives (i.e., attitudes toward the particular task). The need to distinguish between the latter two aspects which have traditionally been lumped together under the 'situation-specific' category was highlighted by the finding that, among the learners in our study who displayed low task-attitudes, those who had a favorable disposition toward the course in general participated more actively than those who had unfavorable attitudes toward both the course and the task. Furthermore, in discussing task motivation from a process-oriented perspective, I have argued elsewhere (Dörnyei, 2000) that in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many learning situations there are various levels of increasingly focused task engagement (e.g., taking up studies in general, enrolling in a particular course, attending a particular lesson or carrying out a particular learning task) and that the resulting action-oriented contingencies, or mind sets, interact with each other in an as yet unspecified manner.

Finally, a further feature of task motivation which makes it a particularly intriguing research domain is the fact tha thet motivation of task participants is not independent of each other. It is easy to see that if one is paired up with a highly motivated or unmotivated partner, this pairing affects the person s own disposition toward the task; in other words, task motivation is *co-constructed* by the participants. I have found two sources of empirical evidence to support this claim in a follow-up to the Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) study (Dörnyei, in press-b): First, students with low task attitudes performed significantly better when their partner demonstrated high task attitudes. Second, correlations of the individual students attitudes toward the course and the task with their task engagement index were .32 and .39, respectively, whereas the same correlations computed for the dyads joint performance were .59 and .52, respectively. That is, when the two task participants merged motivational and performance indices were correlated, the positive association was significantly higher.

New Approaches in Research Methodology

L2 motivation research has traditionally followed the principles of quantitative social psychology, making extensive use of the various rating scales developed for the measurement of attitudes. Data obtained by such scales have been typically processed by means of inferential statistical procedures, such as correlation or factor analysis. While this research tradition is still strong and some particularly large scale investigations have been reported on recently (e.g., Dörnyei & Clément, 2001: 4,765 primary school pupils in Hungary; Schmidt & Watanabe, 2001: 2,089 university students in Hawaii; Inbar, Donitsa-Schmidt, & Shohamy, 2001: 1,690 secondary school students in Israel), I consider it a significant step in motivation research that traditional quantitative research methodologies have been increasingly complemented by qualitative approaches. Interpretive techniques such as in-depth interviews or case studies are in many ways better suited to explore the internal dynamics of the intricate and multilevel construct of student motivation than quantitative methods, and the richness of qualitative data may also provide new slants on old questions (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). The potential of qualitative research methodology is well evidenced by a series of recent studies in this vein by Ushioda (1998, 2001), Williams and Burden and colleagues (1999, 2001), Nikolov (1999, 2001), and Syed (2001), focusing on issues

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as diverse as attributions, motivational development, classroom motives, self-motivation, and the motivational impact of the learner s self-concept.

Quantitative research methodology has not remained unchanged either: the most significant advance in this area has probably been the increasing application of structural equation modeling (SEM) to interpret large, multivariate datasets. Although LISREL models have been used in L2 motivation research since the early 1980s, the past five years have seen an increase in the utilization of the procedure, partly because SEM programs have become easier to handle and more readily available (e.g., as part of SPSS). Recent studies employing SEM techniques include Gardner, Masgoret and Tremblay (1999), Gardner, Tremblay, and Masgoret (1997), Laine (1995), Masgoret and Gardner (1999), and Yamashiro & McLaughlin (2000). Paul Tremblay (2001) offers a very useful methodological overview of how to apply the procedure to best effect.

Emerging New Motivational Themes

In the final section of this chapter, I would like to highlight a number of particularly interesting new research topics that have received attention during the past few years. This selection is necessarily subjective and the coverage of the various topics will be brief.

Teacher Motivation

Although there is ample indirect evidence that the teacher s own level of motivation is infectious, that is, it has a significant impact on the students learning commitment, hardly any research has been done in the past to explore this relationship. Recently, however, a number of theoretical and empirical studies have addressed the issue, providing a firm foundation for future research. Drawing largely on the (limited) work in mainstream psychology and the pioneering research in the L2 field by Pennington (1995) and Doyle and Kim (1999), I devoted a whole chapter in my general overview of L2 motivation (Dörnyei, 2001) conceptualizing and analyzing *teacher motivation*. During the past 18 months, some further data-based studies have contributed to our understanding of what makes teachers motivated and how this motivation is reflected in their students achievement in work by Jacques (2001), Kassabgy, Boraie, and Schmidt (2001), and Masgoret, Bernaus, and Gardner (2000).

Motivation and Learning Strategy Use

The relationship between learning strategy use and student motivation has been an issue of interest in educational psychology for a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decade. Learning strategies are techniques that students apply of their own free will to enhance the effectiveness of their learning; in this sense, strategy use, by definition, constitutes instances of motivated learning behavior. This close relationship between learning strategies and student motivation has been reflected by the fact that a well-known motivation test in educational psychology, the *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire* (*MSLQ*; Pintrich, Smith, & McKeachie, 1989) provides a combined measure of university students motivational orientations and their use of different learning strategies. Recently Brown, Cunha, Frota, and Ferreira (2001) have produced a Portuguese version of the test for the purpose of administering it in Brazil. In the L2 field, the systematic study of the interrelationship between motivation and learning strategy use was initiated in the mid-1990s by Schmidt, MacIntyre, and colleagues (e.g., MacIntyre & Noels, 1996; Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996); building on these results, Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) have recently further investigated the topic by obtaining data from over 2,000 university students.

Demotivation

Motivation research typically conceptualizes a motive as a kind of inducement, that is, as a positive force whose strength ranges on a continuum from zero to strong. However, very little is usually said about motivational influences that have a detrimental rather than a positive effect on motivation, that is, which instead of energizing action, de-energize it. This gap is all the more surprising because in educational contexts demotivation is a regrettably common phenomenon. In a review of the few relevant L2 studies available (Chambers, 1993; Dörnyei, 1998b; Oxford, 1998; and Ushioda, 1998), I have concluded that demotivation is a salient phenomenon in L2 learning and that teachers have a considerable responsibility in this respect (Dörnyei, 2001). Of course, when interpreting demotivated student responses, we need to bear in mind Chambers s warning that we are living in an age when it is not cool for students to show enthusiasm for anything and Boredom is in (p. 14). In any case, much further research is needed to do this important motivational factor justice.

Willingness To Communicate (WTC)

A recent extension of motivation research with both theoretical and practical potential involves the study of the L2 speakers *willingness* to engage in the act of L2 communication. Originally inspired by research in L1 communication studies (e.g., McCroskey & Richmond, 1991), MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) have attempttd to conceptualize *willingness to communicate* (WTC) in the L2, thereby explaining the individual s readiness to enter into discourse at a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2 (p. 547). The L2 WTC construct we have conceived is made up of several layers and subsumes a range of linguistic and psychological variables, including linguistic self confidence (both state and trait); the desire to affiliate with a person; interpersonal motivation; intergroup attitudes, motivation and climate; parameters of the social situation; communicative competence and experience; and various personality traits. Thus, the model attempts to draw together a host of learner variables that have been well established as influences on second language acquisition/use, resulting in a construct in which psychological and linguistic factors are integrated in an organic manner. This line of inquiry may well have important educational implications in that generating a willingness to communicate in the foreign language is arguably a central if not *the* most central objective of modern L2 pedagogy. The study of the nature of WTC is an ongoing research effort (cf. e.g., MacIntyre, Babin, & Clément, 1999), and the WTC construct has also been successfully integrated as a predictor variable accounting for a very significant proportion of the variance in learner performance in the Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) study already mentioned.

Motivating Language Learners

From a practicing teacher s point of view, the most pressing question related to motivation is not *what* motivation is but rather *how* it can be increased. It is an unflattering indication of the detachment of research from classroom practice that very little work has been done in the L2 field to devise and test motivational strategies systematically. To be fair, some practical recommendations have been offered by Alison (1993), Brown (1994), Chambers (1999), Dörnyei (1994), Oxford and Shearin (1994), and Williams and Burden (1997), but largely without any firm theoretical or empirical basis. The neglect of the study of motivational strategies is due in part to the fact that the experimental research required to test the effectiveness of a strategy is rather labor-intensive, and as Gardner and Tremblay (1994) summarize, offers many methodological pitfalls. The only published empirical study on motivational strategies that I am aware of in the L2 field is a teacher survey that I conducted with a colleague (Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998) in which we asked 200 teachers to rate the importance of a set of 51 strategies and to estimate how often they used the strategies in their own practice. As a result, we compiled a list of Ten commandments for motivating language learners. In addition, I have recently completed a systematic overview of all the major motivational strategies that have been documented in the educational psychological and second-language literature and summarized the findings in a teacher s handbook (Dörnyei, in press-c).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are two further areas related to the question of how to motivate learners: the issues of *motivational change* and *motivational self-regulation*. With regard to the former, there have been a number of empirical studies in L2 motivation research investigating the motivational effects of bicultural excursion programs, methodological interventions, intensive language programs, and study trips abroad (for reviews, see Gardner, 1985: Ch. 5; MacFarlane & Wesche, 1995; Morgan, 1993). Two recent large-scale investigations conducted in this vein are Inbar, Shohamy, and Donitsa-Schmidt (1999) and Inbar, Donitsa-Schmidt, and Shohamy (2001), both examining how the teaching of spoken Arabic affects the attitudinal/motivational disposition of Israeli school children.

Motivational self-regulation, or *self-motivation*, is an intriguing new area within motivational psychology, exploring ways by which we can endow learners with appropriate knowledge and skills to motivate themselves. Evidence that this idea is not completely naïve has been provided by the fact that in certain classrooms, even under adverse conditions and without any teacher assistance, some learners are more successful in keeping up their goal commitment than others. How do they do it? The only answer is that they apply certain self-management skills to overcome environmental distraction or competing/distracting emotional or physical needs/states. Ushioda (1997, 2001) analyzes several of the positive motivational thinking patterns that help someone to keep going. Based on Kuhl's (1987) and Corno and Kanfer's (1993) pioneering taxonomies, I have suggested (Dörnyei, in press-c) that self-motivating strategies are of five main types: commitment control strategies, metacognitive control strategies, satiation control strategies, emotion control strategies, and environmental control strategies. Some of the actual strategies listed under these categories are, in fact, very similar to the affective learning strategies conceptualized by Oxford (1990) and O'Malley and Chamot (1990).

Conclusion

This brief and necessarily sketchy overview has hopefully demonstrated that L2 motivation research is currently flourishing. The pioneers of the field have been joined by a new generation of international scholars and the scope of motivation research has been extended to cover a variety of related issues. As a result, we now have a vibrant mixture of approaches to the understanding of L2 motivation, comparable on a smaller scale to the multi-faceted motivational arena in psychology generally. The renewed interest in L2 motivation is at the same time indicative of a more general trend in applied linguistics whereby an increasing number of scholars combine psychological/psycholinguistic and linguistic approaches in order to better understand the complex mental processes involved in second language acquisition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clément, R., & Gardner, R. C. (In press). Second language mastery. In H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gardner and Clément s chapter in the first edition of *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* provided an excellent summary of the social psychological perspectives on second language acquisition, and the authors have now completely revised their chapter for the second edition.

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

This book offers an up-do-date overview of L2 motivation research from three broad perspectives: (a) theoretical approaches (both in mainstream psychology and in L2 studies); (b) pedagogical implications (including motivational strategies, demotivation, and teacher motivation); and (c) research methodology. It also contains a section offering a variety of resources such as lists of relevant databases and actual motivation questionnaire items successfully used in the past.

Dörnyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.) (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical report #23). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

This edited volume, containing 20 newly written chapters, offers a representative cross-section of contemporary motivation research in the L2 field. Authors include some of the field s most established researchers from over ten different countries in Asia, Europe, and the Americas.

Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A. & Schiefele, A. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.) *Handbook of child psychology* (5th ed.), *Vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1017 1095). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

This is a very thorough review of the most recent literature in mainstream motivational psychology, also covering a number of cutting-edge research directions, particularly within the area of social motivation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

This authoritative summary of research on motivation to learn by two of the leading American experts is a must for anyone interested in motivation on any sort of professional basis.

Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.) *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 91 124). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

This extensive paper provides evidence of the richness of data that a qualitative study on motivation can offer. The author presents some groundbreaking insights into the dynamics of motivational processes over time as well as into language learners self-motivating capacity.

UNANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alison, J. (1993). *Not bothered? Motivating reluctant language learners in Key Stage 4*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, J. D., Cunha, M. I. A., Frota, S. F. N., & Ferreira, A. B. F. (2001). The development and validation of a Portuguese version of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 259 272). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Chambers, G. N. (1993). Talking the de out of demotivation. *Language Learning Journal,* 7, 13 16.

Chambers, G. N. (1999). *Motivating language learners*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1992). Toward a situated approach to ethnolinguistic identity: The effects of status on individuals and groups. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 11,* 203 232.

Corno, L., & Kanfer, R. (1993). The role of volition in learning and performance. *Review of Research in Education, 19*, 301 341.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 273–84.
Dörnyei, Z. (1998a). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, *31*, 117–135.
Dörnyei, Z. (1998b). *Demotivation in foreign language learning*. Paper presented at TESOL '98 Conference, Seattle, WA.
Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Toward a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 519–538.
Dörnyei, Z. (in press-a). Motivation. In J. Verschueren, J-O. Östmann, J. Blommaert, & C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Dörnyei, Z. (in press-b). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In P. Robinson & P. Skehan (Eds.), *Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Dörnyei, Z. (in press-c). *Motivational strategies: Creating and maintaining student motivation in the foreign language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dörnyei, Z., & Clément, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 395–430). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*, 203–229.
Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research, 4*, 275–300.
Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London)*, *4,* 43–69
Doyle, T., & Kim, Y. M. (1999). Teacher motivation and satisfaction in the United States and Korea. *MEXTESOL Journal, 23*, 35–48.
Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.
Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A-M., & Tremblay, P. F. (1999). Home background characteristics and second language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*, 419–37.
Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 524–527.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A-M. (1997). Toward a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 344–62.

Giles, H., & Byrne, J. L. (1982). An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *3*, 17–40.

Hickey, D. T. (1997). Motivation and contemporary socio-constructivist instructional perspectives. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 175–193.

Inbar, O., Shohamy, E., & Donitsa-Schmidt, S. (1999, March). The effect of teaching spoken Arabic on students' attitudes and motivation. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics Conference, Stamford, CT.

Inbar, O., Donitsa-Schmidt, S., & Shohamy, E. (2001). Students' motivation as a function of language learning: The teaching of Arabic in Israel. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 292–308). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Jacques, S. R. (2001). Preferences for instructional activities and motivation: A comparison of student and teacher perspectives. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 187–214). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Julkunen, K., (2001). Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 29–42). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Juvonen, J., & Nishina, A. (1997). Social motivation in the classroom: Attributional accounts and developmental analysis. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, *10*, 181–211.

Kassabgy, O., Boraie, D., & Schmidt, R. (2001). Values, rewards, and job satisfaction in ESL/EFL. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 215–240). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kuhl, J. (1987). Action control: The maintenance of motivational states. In F. Halish & J. Kuhl (Eds.), *Motivation, intention and volition* (pp. 279–291). Berlin: Springer.

Laine, E. J. (1995) *Learning second national languages: A research report*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

MacFarlane, A., & Wesche, M. B. (1995). Immersion outcomes: Beyond language proficiency. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 51*, 250–274.

MacIntyre, P., Babin, P. A., & Clément, R. (1999). Willingness to communicate: Antecedents and consequences. *Communication Quarterly, 47,* 215–229.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situated model of confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 545 562.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using social-psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 373 386.

Masgoret, A-M., Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2000, July). *The influence of instructor variables in foreign language acquisition*. Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Language and Social Psychology, Cardiff.

Masgoret, A-M., & Gardner R. C., (1999). A causal model of Spanish immigrant adaptation in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 20,* 216 36.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.), *Communication, cognition and anxiety* (pp. 19-37). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McGroarty, M. (1998). Constructive and constructivist challenges for applied linguistics. *Language Learning, 48*, 591 622.

McGroarty, M. (2001). Situating second language motivation. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 69 90). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Morgan, C. (1993). Attitude change and foreign language culture learning. *Language Teaching*, *26*, 63 75.

Nikolov, M. (1999). Why do you learn English? Because the teacher is short. A study of Hungarian children s foreign language learning motivation. *Language Teaching Research, 3*, 33 56.

Nikolov, M. (2001). A study of unsuccessful language learners. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 147 172). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

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

Noels, K. A., & Clément, R. (1996). Communication across cultures: Social determinants and acculturative consequences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 28*, 214 28.

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 23 34.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

O Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (1998, March). *The unravelling tapestry: Teacher and course characteristics associated with demotivation in the language classroom*. Paper presented at TESOL 98 Conference, Seattle, WA.

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

Pennington, M. C. (1995) *Work satisfaction, motivation and commitment in teaching English as a second language*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404850).

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

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., & McKeachie, W. J. (1989a). *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)*. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan.

Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 9 70). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 309 356). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27 107). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

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

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

Schumann, J. H. (2001). Learning as foraging. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 21 28). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schuman, J. H. (This volume). Appraisal psychology, neurobiology, and language.

Snow, R. E., Corno, L., & Jackson, D. N. (1996). Individual differences in affective and conative functions. In D C. Berliner & R C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 243 310). New York: Macmillan.

Syed, Z. (2001). Notions of self in foreign language learning: A qualitative analysis. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 125 146). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Tremblay, P. F. (2001). Research in second language learning motivation: Psychometric and research design considerations. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 241 258). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 505 520.

Tremblay, P. F., Goldberg, M. P., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Trait and state motivation and the acquisition of Hebrew vocabulary. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 27*, 356 70.

Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of motivation. In T. Hickey & J. Williams (Eds.), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239 245). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (1997). The role of motivational thinking in autonomous language learning. In D. Little & B. Voss (Eds.), *Language centres: Planning for the new millennium* (pp. 39 50). Plymouth, England: University of Plymouth, Centre for Modern Languages.

Ushioda, E. (1998). Effective motivational thinking: A cognitive theoretical approach to the study of language learning motivation. In E. A. Soler & V. C. Espurz (Eds.), *Current issues in English language methodology*, (pp. 77 89). Castelló de la Plana, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *29*, 271 360.

Weiner. B. (1994) Integrating social and personal theories of achievement motivation. *Review of Educational Research*, *64*, 557 573.

Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 76 97.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, *83*, 193–201.

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

Yamashiro, A. D., & McLaughlin, J. (2000). Relationships among attitudes, motivation, anxiety, and English language proficiency in Japanese college students. In S. Cornwell & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Individual differences in foreign language learning: Effects of aptitude, intelligence, and motivation* (pp. 9–26). Tokyo: Aoyama Gakuin University.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034 Published online by Cambridge University Press