CONTEMPORARY MOTIVATION THEORIES IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING: AN OVERVIEW

Elçin Ölmezer Öztürk

School of Foreign Languages, Afyon Kocatepe University, Turkey
Email:elcinolmezer@yahoo.com

Abstract

In all kinds of educational settings, motivation is admitted as one of the most prominent affective factors, and numerous studies in the literature have demonstrated the effect of it on teaching and learning process. Because of this remarkable effect, several theories on the definition of it and motivation types have been presented by the scholars. This study provides an overview regarding the contemporary motivational theories in educational psychology and language learning which have theoretically illustrated the research studies on motivation.

Keyword: Motivation, motivational theories.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation has been the core of many studies up to now,and a significant number of researchers have been researching the term "motivation". Hence, what does the term "motivation" mean? One technical definition describes motivation as "the extent to which certain stimuli, objects, or events affect the occurrence or non-occurrence of the behavior in question" (Usova and Gibson, 1986; cited in Crump, 1996: 5). Crookes and Schmidt (1991) describe motivation as the learner's orientation in relation to the goal of learning a second language. According to Steers and Porter (1991: 6), "motivation can be characterized as follows: needs or expectations, behavior, goals and some form of feedback".

Ryan and Deci (2000: 54) state that "to be motivated means to be moved to do something". Dörnyei (2001a) explains that human behavior has two dimensions – direction and magnitude (intensity). Motivation is related to these concepts, and "it is responsible for the choice of a particular action and the effort expended on it and the persistence with it." (Dörnyei, 2001a: 7)

Along with these definitions, Gardner (2001b) proposes that motivation, along with the language aptitude, is a main element which determines success in learning another

language in the classroom setting. Dörnyei (2001a: 7) also states that "motivation explains why people decide to do something, how hard they are going to pursue it and how long they are willing to sustain the activity".

2. CONTEMPORARY MOTIVATION THEORIES IN PSYCHOLOGY

Motivational psychologists investigate what triggers people to move and why people do what they do (Pintrich,2003; Weiner, 1992) More specifically "motivational psychologists want to examine what the individual is doing, or the *choice* of behavior; how long it takes before an individual initiates the activity, or the *latency* of behavior; how hard the person actually works at activity, or the *intensity* of behavior; how long the individual is willing to remain at the activity, or the *persistence* of behavior; and what the individual is thinking and feeling while engaged in the activity, or the *cognitions and emotional reactions* accompanying the behavior." (Graham and Weiner, 1996: 1). In the past, drives, needs and reinforcements were put forward to explain the primary sources of motivation (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002). However, current theories and

research studies on motivation focus more on individuals' beliefs,values and goals as the primary sources of motivation (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). The following are the most influential current theories in psychology (Wigfield, Eccles, Roeser, and Schiefele, 2009).

2.1. Expectancy- Value Theory

Expectancy of success has been researched for the last decades, because it is for sure that "we do the things best if we believe we can succeed" (Dörnyei, 2001a: 57).

Expectancy of success is not sufficient if it is not followed by positive values. Expectancy of success and values are inseparable and they go hand in hand, so motivation theories based on these two terms are called "expectancy-value

theories" (Dörnyei, 2001a). Modern expectancy-value theories are based on Atkinson's (1957, 1964) original expectancy-value model in which "they link achievement performance,persistence, and choice most directly to individuals' expectancy-related and task-value beliefs" (cited

in Wigfield, Eccles, Roeser, and Schiefele, 2009:4). Expectancy-value theories depend on two key factors; the

first one is the individual's *expectancy of success* and the other is the *value* the individual gives on that task or activity. Eccles-Parsons et al. (1983) define expectancies for success as "individuals' beliefs about how well they will do on upcoming tasks, and ability beliefs about how good one is", and values are defined "with respect to how important, interesting, or useful a given task or activity is to the individual (cited in Wigfield, Eccles, Roeser, and Schiefele, 2009: 4). This theory suggests that individuals are interested in activities instrumental in attaining some valued outcome."They emphasize cognition and the process by which an individual answers the question, "Should I expend the energy or not?" It emphasizes the individual's expectation of getting a valued reward" (Oxford and Shearin, 1994: 18). In other words, "what behavior is undertaken depends on the perceived likelihood that the behavior will lead to the goal,and the subjective value of that goal" (Graham

and Weiner,1996: 89). A good way to motivate learners is to increase their expectancies by consciously organizing the conditions in which they are more positive and hopeful (Dörnyei, 2001a).

2.2. Achievement Motivation Theory

Achievement motivation theory was initially uttered by Atkinson in 1957. This theory is based on the importance of individuals' experiences and their struggles to achieve a good performance (Madrid, 2002). Atkinson's theory focuses on three factors which are the need for achievement or the motive for success, the probability that one will be successful at the task, and the incentive value of success results in the tendency to approach an achievement-related goal (Graham and Weiner, 1996). Atkinson points out that "engagement in achievement-oriented behaviors is a function not only of the motivation for success, but also of the probability of success (expectancy) and the incentive value of success" (Oxford and Shearin, 1994: 8). "Achievement motivation is determined

by conflicting approach and avoidance tendencies" (Dörnyei,2001a: 10). Expectancy of success, value given to a specific task and need for achievement are the positive influences (Dörnyei, 2001a). As for need for achievement, Dörnyei(1994a: 6) emphasizes that: "Need for achievement is a relatively stable personality trait that is considered to affect a person's behavior in every facet of life, including language learning.

Individuals with a high need for achievement are interested in excellence for its own sake, tend to initiate achievement activities, work with heightened intensity at these tasks, and persist in the face of failure" The opposite side of this success is the failure. An individual experiencing a failure before tends to avoid failure by selecting easy tasks so that s/he cannot fail (Oxford and Shearin, 1994).

2.3. Self-Efficacy Theory

Self-efficacy theory was introduced by Bandura (1977) who defines self-efficacy as "individuals' confidence in their ability to organize and execute a given course of action to solve a problem or accomplish a task" (cited in Graham and Weiner,

1996: 2), and also as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over events that affect their lives (Bandura, 1989: 1175). Pintrich et al. (1991) also define self-efficacy as a self-appraisal of one's ability to perform a task, and it contains one's belief and confidence in oneself to achieve that specific task (Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and McKeachie, 1991). "Bandura (1977; cited in Eccles and Wigfield, 2002: 3) proposes that individuals' self-efficacy expectations are the major determinants of goal setting, activity choices, willingness to expend effort, and persistence." Their sense of efficacy affects their selection of activities, and how much effort they give (Dörnyei, 2001a).

Attribution of past accomplishments is crucial in developing self-efficacy. When individuals develop a strong sense of efficacy, the effect of failure on the individual decreases (Dörnyei, 1994a).Bandura (1997) identifies self-efficacy as a multidimensional construct which can differ in strength (i.e.positive or negative), generality (i.e. relating to many situations or only a few), and level of difficulty (i.e. feeling efficacious for all tasks or only easy tasks) (cited in Graham and Weiner, 1996). Oxford and Shearin (1994) emphasize that most students do not have an idea in their self-efficacy at first; hence, teachers should help them develop a strong sense of self-efficacy by giving meaningful and achievable tasks. Dörnyei (2001a) states that people whose self-efficacy is high are more self-confident than people whose self-efficacy is low. These self-confident individuals approach threatening
situations with confidence instead of giving up, and even if they face failure they maintain a task and heighten and sustain effort. On the other hand, people whose self-efficacy is low in a given domain take challenging tasks as personal threats; they concentrate more on their inabilities or deficiencies than how to achieve this task in a successful manner. As a result, they tend to give up the task easily instead of making effort because they easily lose their faith in their capabilities (Dörnyei, 2001a).

2.4. Attribution Theory
Attribution theory was first mentioned in the writings of Frits Helder (1958) and the subsequent contributions of Harold Kelly (1967,1971) and Bernard Weiner (1985,1986)(cited in Graham and Weiner, 1996), and it was largely influential in the 1980s (Dörnyei, 2003). Dörnyei (2003: 12) points out that "our past actions, and particularly the way we interpret our past successes and failures, determine our current and future behavior". This theory relates individual's achievements to past experiences through causal attributions as the mediating link (Keblawi, 2006). According to Graham and Weiner (1996), causal search determines the causes of success and failure. When unexpected and important events such as a low grade given to a student results in failure, this search is most likely to be activated. Weiner (1986) identifies three dimensions of causality: locus, stability, and controllability. "Locus refers to the location of a cause as internal or external to the individual; stability connotes the invariance of a cause over time; and controllability concerns the extent to which the cause is subject to volitional alteration. Hence, for example, aptitude is considered internal to the actor, stable over time, and uncontrollable, whereas chance or luck typically is external to the actor, variable and also uncontrollable." (cited in Graham and Weiner,1996: 71)

The locus dimension of causality determines if selfesteem and pride are influenced after success or failure. Internal attributions cause enhanced self-esteem following success and decreased self-esteem following failure, whereas external causes do not influence success or failure. The stability dimension of causality affects subjective expectancy of success. If an individual ascribes a positive outcome to a stable cause such as aptitude, then this individual expects success. Similarly, negative outcomes attributed to stable causes result in inferences that future success is unlikely. The controllability dimension of causality is related to a lot of effects with motivational implications such as anger, guilt, and pity (Weiner, 1986). On controllability dimension of causality, Graham and Weiner (1996:

10) state that: "Specifically, if one is prevented from success by factors that others could have controlled (e.g., noise, bias), then anger is experienced; guilt is felt when one fails or breaks a social contract because of internally controllable causes, such as lack of effort of negligence; pity and sympathy are expressed toward others who do not attain their goals because of uncontrollable causes, including lack of ability or a physical handicap; and shame (humiliation, embarrassment) is a dominant reaction when one fails because of internally controllable causes such as low ability " Williams and Burden (1997) state that this theory is not interested in all the experiences an individual goes through, but how this individual perceives these experiences. Oxford and Shearin (1994: 21) state that "higher satisfaction occurs when success is self-attributed than when success is attributed to external factors. When people believe they -rather than luck, fate, the teachers, or an easy test- have created the successful performance, they are happier with themselves".

Attribution theory helps teachers understand the reasons of some utterances of students such as "I am stupid, I can't do it", so that teachers can help the students to get rid of these negative attitudes (Dörnyei, 2001a).

2.5. Self-Worth Theory

Self-worth theory was developed by Covington (1992), and according to Covington (1992), having a sense of personal value and worth, especially when an individual takes risks and fails, is a vital human need. Covington (1992) states that the ability of self-perception is the key element in selfworth theory. Dörnyei (2003) states that people get very motivated to behave in ways that increase their sense of personal value and worth. When these perceptions are threatened, they struggle desperately to protect them, and as a result, lots of face-saving behaviors come up. When individuals face some problems, they make use of certain face-saving strategies to protect themselves. Covington et al. (1992) have listed a number of self-protective strategies which students make use of in order to maintain positiveacademic self-regard. Covington (1984) states that as a group

these strategies look for changing the personal reasons of outside factors beyond the individual's control.

The strategies can be;
a) setting unrealistic goals, so that the failure can be attributed
as a result of task difficulty instead of lack of ability;
b) using self-handicapping techniques such as not studying;
c) excuse-giving, that is, attributing failure to uncontrollable factors such as poor teaching (Graham and Weiner, 1996).

2.6. Goal Setting Theory

Goal setting theory was mainly developed by Locke and Latham (1990). This theory implies that people must have goals to act because purposes trigger actions, and there should be goals and these goals should be pursued by choice for action to take place (cited in Dörnyei, 1998). Locke and Latham (2002) state that a goal is the aim of an action or task that a person consciously desires to achieve or obtain. Goal setting involves the conscious process of setting levels of performance so as to get desired results. O'Neil and Drillings (1994) stress that "the goal setting theory was based on the premise that much human action is purposeful, in that it is directed by conscious goals" (p.14). Dörnyei (2002) states that goal-setting is mainly an easy planning process that all individuals can learn without difficulty. The important thing is that learners should be shown how to break tasks and assignments into smaller tasks, and how to determine due dates to these tasks and assignments, and finally how to have a control on their own learning process. The goal-setting theory suggests that there are three basic features of goals which cause them to differ: difficulty, specificity and commitment. The research studies till now have indicated that these different features have certain relations among themselves which help individuals' motivation increase:

☐ The more difficult the goal, the greater the achievement,

☐ The more specific or explicit the goal, the more precisely

performance is regulated,

☐ The highest performance is yielded when the goals are

both specific and difficult,

☐ Commitment to goals is most critical when they are specific and difficult (commitment to general or vague goals is easy since general goals do not require much commitment and vague ones can be "manipulated" to accommodate low performance),

☐ High commitment to goals is attained when the individual is convinced (a) the goal is important and (b) attainable. (Locke, 1996: 118-119) Locke and Latham (2002: 706-707) determine four mechanisms by which goals influence an individual's performance;

☐ Goals serve a directive function as they direct attention and effort toward goal-relevant activities and away from irrelevant activities,

☐ Goals have an energising function and they help individuals regulate their effort to the difficulty of the task,

☐ Goals positively affect persistence,

☐ Goals affect action indirectly by leading to the arousal, discovery, and /or use of task-relevant knowledge and strategies. McCombs and Pope (1994) come up with four suggestions to teach learners. These are the "ABCD" of goals. A goal should be;

☐ Achieveable (appropriate for the age and level of the students),

☐ Believable (students need to believe to achieve it),

☐ Conceivable (clear and measurable),

☐ Desirable (students want it very much).

Lastly, goal-setting gives teachers a chance to look at the tasks from reluctant and demotivated students' eyes, and "create an immediate purpose in their eyes" (Dörnyei, 2001a:84).

2.7. Goal-orientation Theory

Goal-orientation theory was introduced by Ames (1992).According to Ames (1992), goals serve as a mechanism or a filter which determine the process and interpretation of the incoming information. Unlike the goal-setting theory, the goal-orientation theory was developed in a classroom context to give an explanation to students' learning and performance (Dörnyei, 2001: 27). Goal-orientation is related to the student's perception of the causes why she is interested in learning a task (Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and McKeachie,1991). According to goal-orientation theory, individual's performance and her / his accepted goals are interrelated.

There are two types of goal-orientation: performance and mastery (or learning) orientations (Ames and Archer,1988; Ames, 1992). Learners having the first orientation are mainly interested in looking good and capable, whereas those having the second are more interested in enhancing their knowledge and being capable (Keblawi, 2006). Dweck (1985; cited in William and Burden, 1997: 131) states that "with performance goals, an individual aims to look smart, whereas with the learning goals, the individual aims to become smarter".

2.8. Self-Determination Theory

The self-determination theory, which was introduced by Deci and Ryan (2000), is one of the most influential theories in motivational psychology (Dörnyei, 2003). According to the theory, "to be self-determining means to experience a sense of choice in initiating and regulating one's own actions" (Deci, Connell, and Ryan, 1989: 580). "Self-determination is seen as a prerequisite for any behavior to be intrinsically rewarding" (Dörnyei, 1994a). The theory divides motivation into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, and also a state of a motivation. Intrinsic motivation is the result of an interest in the subject. In other words, it is the joy and satisfaction gained from doing something (Littlejohn, 2008). Extrinsic motivation results from some extrinsic rewards such as good grades or to avoid punishment (Dörnyei, 1994a). Many studies conducted by Deci et al. (1991: 342) indicate that "self-determination leads to desired educational outcomes that help both individuals and society". Amotivation is the state of lacking intention to act. It is owing to the fact that the individual does not value the activity (Ryan, 1985), does not feel competent (Deci, 1975), or thinks that the activity is unfeasible (Seligman, 1975;

cited in Madrid, 2002). In the light of this theory, extrinsic motivation has been classified into four types between self-determined and controlled forms of motivation. These are;

External regulation: External regulation refers to the least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. External regulation refers to the actions resulting from external sources such as rewards and threats. It is the least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. (Madrid, 2002)

Introjected regulation: It refers to the activities an individual performs owing to some external reasons, however in this type, the individual has incorporated this external pressure into the self. An example for this can be the individuals who learn a language just not to be ashamed in front of the other people. This is still not a self-determined activity, because the individual is still affected by more external reasons than internal ones (Keblawi, 2006), and "it is still quite controlling because people perform such actions with the feeling of pressure in order to avoid guilt and anxiety to attain ego enhancements or pride" (Ryan and Deci, 2000: 62)

Identification: It represents more autonomous form of extrinsic motivation. It occurs when the individual thinks that it is beneficial for her / himself, and accepts the process. "The individual identifies and appreciates the importance of a behavior and accepts his / her self regulation." (Madrid, 2002: 28).

Integration: It is the most autonomous and self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. It has certain common points with intrinsic motivation (Bandura,1982). However, it is still extrinsic since "behavior motivated by integrated regulation is done for its instrumental value with respect to some outcome that is separate from the behavior" (Ryan and Deci, 2000: 62).

2.3.9. Theory of Planned Behavior
The theory of planned behavior, which was proposed by Icek Ajzen (1988), is a theory about the link between attitudes and behavior. It is designed to predict and explain human behavior in specific contexts. Ajzen's model uses three variables that are behavior, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control, and Ajzen asserts that these variables have a direct influence on behavioral intention. (cited in Ajzen, 1991). Ajzen (1991: 1) states that "intentions to perform behaviors of different kinds can be predicted with high accuracy from attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and the perceived behavioral control; and these intentions, together with perceptions of behavioral control, account for considerable variance in actual behavior".

In other words, theory of planned behavior states that individual behavior is shaped by behavioral intentions in which behavioral intentions are a function of an individual's attitude toward the behavior, the subjective norms surrounding the performance of the behavior, and the individual's perception of the ease with which the behavior can be performed (behavioral control). Attitude toward the behavior is an individual's positive or negative feelings about performing a behavior. An evaluation of one's beliefs related to the results arising from a behavior and an assessment of the desirability of these results shape the attitude toward the behavior. Subjective norm can be defined as whether the individual perceives the behavior as important and whether this behavior should be performed by this individual. Perceived behavioral control is an individual's perception of difficulty of performing a behavior (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993).Ajzen (1991) states that perceived behavioral control is related to available resources, skills, and opportunities and also the individual's own perception towards the importance of achieving the results. Intentions play a great role for the individual when performing a given behavior. Intentions are considered to affect motivational factors that have an effect on a behavior, and intentions show how hard people are eager to try, of how much effort they are planning to exert so as to perform the behavior. In general terms, "the stronger the intention to engage in a behavior, the more likely should be its performance" (Ajzen, 1991: 3). Dörnyei (2001: 20) states that "our personal likes and dislikes, i.e. attitudes, play an important role in deciding what

we will do and what we won't". Dörnyei (2001) also states that attitudes have a direct effect on behavior since an individual's attitude towards a target affect the overall pattern of the person's responses to the target. An individual's subjective norms (perceived social pressure) and perceived behavioral control (perceived ease or difficulty of performing a behavior) modify their effect.

3. MOTIVATIONAL THEORIES IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

3.1. Gardner's Motivation Theory

There have been many motivation theories till now in the language field. The most influential motivation theory was considered to be established by Robert Gardner (Dörnyei, 2001a). Gardner (1985) states that motivation to learn a foreign language is a mixture of elements including effort, desire and a positive attitude toward the language at hand.

Gardner (1979) states that foreign language is not only an educational issue; it is also a representative of the cultural heritage of the people speaking that language. Hence, teaching a language can be seen as "imposing elements of another culture into the students' own life space" (Dörnyei,2001a: 14).
With this in mind, it is assumed that language learners'goals are divided into two broad categories as integrative motivation and instrumental motivation (Dörnyei, 2001a).Gardner (1985: 11) states that "integrative and instrumental motivation represent the ultimate goals for achieving the more immediate goal of learning the second or foreign language".
Lukmani (1972) notes that some learners want to learn the language to become part of a new social group, and others want to learn the language for career purposes, for reading
texts in the original language or for trade purposes, etc.Hence, the type of motivation explains the reason why learners are studying that specific language. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), learners having integrative motivation learn a language owing to their desire to learn the language in order to integrate themselves with the target culture; whereas

learners having instrumental motivation learn a language for practical and utilitarian purposes such as to get a better job or higher salary.

Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) conducted a study to look into the effects of integrative and instrumental motivation on the learning of French / English vocabulary. The study was carried out with Canadian psychology students. Integrative motivation was measured by means of self-report questionnaires while instrumental motivation was assessed by means of monetary reward for students who provided certain number of correct answers. The results indicated that both types of motivation facilitated learning. However, instrumental motivation disappeared when the financial reward was removed; so, it was concluded that instrumental motivation is not as permanent as integrative motivation. However, as Dörnyei (1994a) states, Gardner's theory is more complex and beyond the integrative and instrumental duality.

As Gardner and MacIntyre (1991: 4) state, "The important point is that motivation itself is dynamic. The old characterization of motivation in terms of integrative vs. instrumental orientation is too static and restricted". This division is widely used by many people because of its simplicity; however, indeed, Gardner's theory includes four areas;
• Integrative motive
• Socio-educational model
• Attitude / Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)
• Tremblay and Gardner's revised model

Gardner (2001b: 9) defines integrative motivation as "a complex of attitudinal goal-directed, and motivational attributes". Integrative motivation includes three components: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation. Masgoret and Gardner (2003: 8) state that the integratively motivated student is "one who is motivated to learn the second language, has an openness to identification with the other language community, and has favorable attitudes toward the learning situation". Gardner states that integrativeness is the genuine interest in learning a

second language so as to get closer psychologically to the other language community. A low level of interest means no interest with the group, while a high level of interest shows significant interest with the group. In other words, integrativeness includes emotional identification with the other language group. Individuals who wish to identify with the other language group will be more motivated to learn the language than the individuals who do not.

Attitudes toward the learning situation refer to the individual's reaction to the things related to the context in which the language is taught. These are the attitudes of an individual. In the school context, these attitudes could be towards the teacher, the course materials, one's classmates, etc. (Gardner and Tremblay, 1994). Motivation refers to goal-directed behavior and the driving force in all situations. "The motivated individual expends effort, is persistent and attentive to the task at hand, has goals, desires, and aspirations, enjoys the activity, experiences reinforcement from success and disappointment from failure, makes attributions concerning success and / or failure, is aroused, and makes use strategies to aid in achieving goals" (Masgoret and Gardner, 2003: 7) Dörnyei (2001b) states that socio-educational model is related to the role of individual differences in the learning of second language. It divides the learning process into four segments: antecedent factors (which can be biological or experiential such as gender or learning history), learner variables (intelligence, language attitudes, language learning strategies), language acquisition contexts and learning outcomes (cited in Vural, 2007).

As a third component of Gardner's theory, attitude / motivation test battery was developed by Smythe and Gardner (1981) to evaluate the major affective factors involved in the learning of a second language (Dörnyei and Schmidt, 2001). It is multi-component motivation test including more than 130 items. As a main constituent of Gardner's theory, AMTB also includes language anxiety measure (L2 class anxiety and L2 use anxiety) as well as an index of parental encouragement. Adaptations of this test have been used in several data-based studies of L2 motivation all over the world (Liu, 2005).

The last part of Gardner's theory is Tremblay and Gardner's revised model. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) proposed an extended socio-educational model, in which there are new elements from expectancy-value and goal theories. The novel element in this model is the presence of three mediating variables between attitudes and behavior: goal salience, valence and self-efficacy. Hence, the model combines Gardner's earlier socially grounded construct and current cognitive motivational theories (Liu, 2005).

3.2. Dörnyei's Motivational Framework of L2 Motivation

Dörnyei (1994a) conceptualized a general framework of L2 motivation. This framework includes three levels: the Language Level, the Learner Level, and the Learning Situation Level. Dörnyei (1994a) states that the Language Level is the most general level of the construct. The Language Level focuses on orientations and motives associated with different aspects of the L2, such as the culture it conveys, the community in which it is spoken, and the potential usefulness of proficiency in it. These general motives result in basic learning goals. The Learner Level is the second level of this construct. It includes a complex of effects and cognitions which form personal traits. There are two motivational components at this level; need for achievement and self-confidence. The third level is the Learning Situation Level, which is composed of intrinsic and extrinsic motives and motivational conditions related to three areas. Within this level, there are three main types of motivational sources.

1. *Course-specific motivational components*: These are associated with the syllabus, the teaching materials, the teaching method and the learning tasks. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) suggested a framework of four motivational conditions. These are; "interest (intrinsic motivation centered around the individuals' inherent curiosity and desire to know more about themselves and their environment), relevance (the

extent to which the students feels that the instruction is connected to important personal needs, values or goals), expectancy (perceived likelihood of success) and satisfaction (the outcome of an activity, referring to the combination of extrinsic rewards such as praise or good marks, and to intrinsic rewards such as enjoyment and pride)" (Dörnyei and Csizer, 1998: 207).

2. *Teacher-specific motivational components*: These are related to the teacher's behavior, personality and teaching style, and include the affiliative motive to please the teacher, authority type and direct socialization of student motivation (modelling, task presentation and feedback).

3. *Group-specific motivational components*: These are associated with the group dynamics of the learner group and contain goal-orientedness, the norm and reward system, group cohesion and classroom goal structure (competitive, cooperative or individualistic).

3.3. Williams and Burden's Framework of L2 Motivation

Williams and Burden (1997) present a framework of L2 motivation. They approach the framework from different perspectives of factors that affect L2 learner motivation, and divide them into two broad parts: internal and external factors. In this framework, internal factors include intrinsic interest of activity, perceived value of activity, sense of agency, mastery, self-concept, attitudes, and other affective states; whereas external factors include significant others, the nature of interaction with significant others, the learning environment, and society expectations and attitudes.

3.4. Dörnyei and Otto's Process Model of L2 Motivation

Istvan Otto and Zoltan Dörnyei have devised a model of student motivation which goes through from the initial desires to the completion of action and the subsequent retrospective assessment (Dörnyei and Otto, 1998; Dörnyei, 2000). Dörnyei (2000: 6) states that "this model attempts to synthesize different

influential conceptualizations of motivation in a systematic process-oriented framework." Dörnyei and Otto (1998) explained how motivation evolves over time, and the dynamic nature of motivation, in other words, this model views L2 learner motivation not being stable but continuously changing along with the long process of motivation for the L2 learning. Dörnyei (2000), in his article "Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualization of student motivation", states that the main strength of a process-oriented approach is that it offers a fruitful method of interpreting and integrating the manifold motivational factors that influence the student's learning behavior in classroom settings. According to Dörnyei and Otto (1998), the model includes two parts: Action Sequence and Motivational Influences.

Action sequence represents "the behavioral process whereby initial wishes, hopes, and desires are first transformed into goals, then into intentions, leading eventually to action and, hopefully, to the accomplishment of the goals, after which the process is submitted to final evaluation" (Dörnyei and Otto, 1998: 5). On the other hand, motivational influences contain the whole energy sources and motivational forces which feed the behavioral process. Action sequence is comprised of three stages: pre-actional, actional and post-actional stage (Dörnyei, 2000). Each stage can be affected both by the learner and the environment external to the learner that contain the classroom environment and all that it entails (classroom peers, classroom implementations or state mandates, parents, textbooks, teachers, etc.) (Winke, 2005). According to Dörnyei (2000), the stages are;

Pre-actional stage: First, motivation needs to be generated. The generated motivation aids the student to choose a goal or task to follow and move the student into action. The student's first goals, values and attitudes related to the learning process, perception of success and the support the student gets from the others all affect this stage (Dörnyei, 2005). This stage includes three sub-phases that are goal setting, intention formation, and the initiation of intention enactment. Goal setting has three

antecedents which are wishes / hopes, desires and opportunities (Dörnyei, 2000). This is the "choice motivation that precedes any action" (Chen, Warden, and Chang, 2005: 3).

Actional stage: The motivation needs to be sustained and protected. The quality of the learning experience, nature of the classroom environment, teachers, peers, parents, student her / himself should maintain and protect motivation during a specific action. This has a crucial importance in situations where a student is affected negatively by the factors such as anxiety, competing interests or physical conditions. "During the actional phase, there are three processes that are subtask generation and implementation, a complex ongoing appraisal process, and the application of a variety of action control mechanisms. The first of these refers to learning behaviors proper" (Dörnyei, 2000: 8). Action initiation begins with implementing subtasks that were specified by the action plan; however, action plans go on during the action because the person continuously generates subtasks / sub goals. Appraisal is the second ongoing process. The individual assesses the input coming from the environment continuously. "The important point is that a person's appraisal of one level can easily be transferred to a broader or narrower level" (Dörnyei, 2000: 9). For instance, a failure in just a task can be generalized into the whole task or even the language, and one can say "I am not good at languages", or the negative attitudes about the whole thing can be specified into the parts in this thing. Third process is action control which Corno (1993: 16) describes as "a dynamic system of psychological control processes that protect concentration and directed effort in the face of personal and / or environmental distractions, and so aid learning and performance." This phase is "the executive motivation that influences the level of language effort" (cited in Chen ,Warden, and Chang, 2005:3).

Post-action stage: This stage begins after the action stage is completed. At this stage, "the student retrospectively evaluates how things went to help determine the type and quality of activities s/he will be motivated to pursue next" (Winke, 2005: 3). Dörnyei (2005) notes that grades and / or feedback obtained from teachers, parents or peers, and student's own sense are in this stage. This stage is "the critical introspection after action is completed" (Chen, Warden, and Chang, 2005: 3). Dörnyei and Otto's process model have crucial practical implications in two areas;

(a) Teachers can apply motivational strategies to generate and sustain motivation in their learners,

(b) Learners can apply action control or self-motivating strategies in order to take personal control of the affective conditions and experiences. (Dörnyei, 2000: 14).

3.5. Dörnyei's Framework of L2 Self-System

According to this theory, "possible selves represent individuals' ideas of "what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming", and so provide a conceptual link between the self-concept and motivation" (Markus and Nurius, 1987: 157). Hence, Dörnyei's (2005, cited in Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2009) theory "L2 Motivational Self-System" builds on possible selves to develop a novel description of L2 motivation. L2 motivational self-system is comprised of three components;

(1) The ideal self is the central concept in this selfsystem, and it "refers to the representation of the attributes that someone would ideally like to possess (i.e. a representation of personal hopes, aspirations or wishes). It is the L2-specific facet of one's "ideal self": if the person we would like to become speaks an L2, the "ideal L2 self" is a powerful motivator to learn the L2 because of the desire to reduce the discrepancy between our actual and ideal selves. Traditional integrative and internalized instrumental motives would typically belong to this component."

(2) A complementary self-guide is the "ought-to self". In this theory, Dörnyei links L2 to the

individual's personal "core", and it forms an important part of one's identity. "It concerns the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and to avoid possible negative outcomes. This dimension corresponds to ought-to self and thus to the more extrinsic types of instrumental motives."

(3) L2 Learning Experience "concerns situated, "executive" motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience (e.g. the impact of the teacher, the curriculum, the peer group, the experience of success)" (p.29).

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50, 179-211.

Ames, C., and Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation process. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80 (3), 260-267.

Ames, C.A. (1990). Motivation: What teachers need to know. Teachers College Record, 91 (3), 409-421.

Ames, C. (1992). Classroom goals, structures and student motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84 (3), 261-271.

Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory.American Psychologist, 44, 1175-1184.

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

Chen, J. F., Warden, C. A., and Chang, H. (2005). Motivators
that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and
the influence of culture on motivation. TESOL Quarterly, 39,

609 -633.

Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R.W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. Language Learning, 41, 469
– 512.

Covington, M.V. (1984). The self-worth theory of achievement motivation: Findings and implications. Elementary School Journal, 85, 5-20.

Covington, M. (1992). Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crump, C. (1996). Motivating students: A teacher's challenge. Norman, OK: Annual Sooner Communication Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED387840)

Deci, E.L., Connell, J.P., and Ryan, R.M. (1989). Selfdetermination in a work organization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 580-590.

Deci, E., Vallerand, R., Pelletier, L., Ryan, R. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. Educational Psychologist, 26(4), 325-346.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. Language Learning, 40, 46-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! The Modern Language Journal, 78 (4), 515-523.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In R. Oxford (Ed.),Language learning motivation: The new century (71-80). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

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

Dörnyei, Z., and Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. Language Teaching Research, 2, 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z., and Otto, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 4, 43-69.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Toward a process oriented conceptualization of student motivation. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 519- 538.

Dörnyei, Z. and Schmidt, R. (2001). Motivation and second language acquisition. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). Motivational strategies in the language classroom. UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In Peter Robinson (Ed.), Individual differences in second language acquisition (137-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing. Mahway, NJ: Lawrance Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. New York: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (2009). Motivation, language identity and the L2 self. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. Eagly, A.H. and Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Eccles, J.S., and Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values and goals. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 109-132.

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gardner, R.C., and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitude and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

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

Gardner, R.C., Lalonde, R.N., and Moorcroft, R. (1985). The role of attitudes and motivation in second language learning: Correlational and experimental considerations. Language Learning, 35, 207-227.

Gardner, R.C., and MacIntyre, P.D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: Who says it isn't effective? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13, 57-72.

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

Gardner, R. (2001b) Language learning motivation: The student, the teacher and the researcher. Key-note address to the Texas Foreign Language Education Conference, University of Texas, Austin.

Graham, S., and Weiner, B. (1996). Theories and principles of motivation. In Handbook of Educational Psychology, ed. David C. Berliner and Robert C. Calfee. New York: Macmillan.

Hoostein, E.W. (1994). Motivating students to learn. The Clearing House, 67(4), 213-216.

Keblawi, F. (2006). Orientations, attitudes and demotivation:A case study of muslim Arab learners of English in public schools in Northern Israel. Unpublished PhD study.University of Aberdeen, Scotland.

Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. The American Psychologist, 57 (9), 705-717.

Littlejohn, A. (2008). The tip of the iceberg: Factors affecting learner motivation. RELC Journal, 39(2), 214-225.

Liu, J. (2005). The mode of promoting learner autonomy for non-English majors through classroom instruction. US-China Education Review 2, 46-52.

Locke, E. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 5, 117-123.

Lukmani, Y.M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. Language Learning, 22 (2), 261- 273.

Markus, H., and Nurius, P. (1987). Possible selves: The interface between motivation and the self-concept. In K. Yardley and T. Honess (Eds.), Self and Identity: Psychosocial Perspectives (157-172). New York: J. Wiley and Sons.

Masgoret, A.M., and Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. Language Learning, 53(1), 123-163.

McCombs, B.L. and Pope, J.E. (1994). Motivating hard to reach students. In Psychology in the Classroom Series. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

O'Neil, H.F., and Drillings, Jr. M. (1994). Motivation ;Theory and research. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates.

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

Palmer, P. (1998). The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T., and McKeachie, W.J. (1991). A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning Project on Instructional Processes and Educational
Outcomes., University of Michigan.

Pintrich, P.R., and Schunk, D. H. (2002). Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pintrich, P.R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. Journal of Educational Psychology,95, 667-686.

Roger, S. (1995). How effective communication can enhance teaching at the college level. The Internet TESL Journal,16(1).

Ryan, R.M., and Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25 (1), 54-67.

Scarcella, R.C., and Oxford, R.L. (1992). The tapestry of language learning: the individual in the communicative classroom. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Scheidecker, D. and Freeman, W. (1999). Bringing out the best in students: How legendary teachers motivate kids.Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Steers, R.M., and Porter, L.W. (1991). Motivation and work behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.Inc. Lincoln.

Tremblay, P. F., and Gardner, R.C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. The Modern Language Journal, 79 (4), 505–520.

Vural, S. (2007). Teachers' and students' perceptions of teacher motivational behavior. Unpublished master thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.

Warden, C., and Lin, H.J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in Asian EFL setting. Foreign Language Annals, 33(5), 535- 547.

Weiner, B. (1986). An Attributional Theory of Motivation and Emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.

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

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J.S., Roeser, R., and Schiefele, U.(2009). Development of achievement motivation. In W.Damon and R. M. Lerner (Eds.), Developmental Psychology:An Advanced Coursebook. New York: Wiley.

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

Winke, P.M. (2005). Promoting motivation in the foreign language classroom. Center for Language Education and Research, 9 (2), 2- 11.