



3

From Integrative Motivation to Directed Motivational Currents: The Evolution of the Understanding of L2 Motivation over Three Decades

Zoltán Dörnyei

As a fresh PhD student in the mid-1980s, I became fascinated with the theory of language learning motivation (henceforward L2 motivation) proposed by Canadian social psychologist Robert Gardner (e.g. Gardner, 1985, 2010, this volume). It confirmed my intuitive belief that the psychological dimension of second language acquisition (SLA) is a pronounced aspect of language learning success, and it helped me to consciously focus on strategies to improve the quality of my teaching by motivating learners. Gardner's motivation paradigm also impressed me with its rigorous scientific nature. He and his colleagues not only drew on firm theoretical principles in social psychology (most notably concerning the role of attitudes), but they also proposed research instruments (primarily questionnaires) with testable psychometric parameters. My main purpose for embarking on PhD studies was to add a professional research layer to my evolving language teacher identity (see Dörnyei, 2016, for a personal account), and the world of L2 motivation that I discovered in the 1980s helped me to realise this desire fully.

As it happened, I was part of an emerging new generation of scholars who had grown up absorbing Gardner's teaching, but who, significantly, also had a background that was markedly different to that of the Canadian pioneers. Gardner and his colleagues were psychologists interested in SLA, while the authors of the best-known reform publications of the time—such as Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Julkunen (1989), Oxford and Shearin (1994) Skehan

Z. Dörnyei (✉)

University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

e-mail: Zoltan.Dornyei@nottingham.ac.uk

(1989), Ushioda (1996), and Williams (1994)—were all SLA researchers interested in psychology not unlike myself. The difference in background and professional identity had far-reaching consequences: the new wave of scholars represented novel interests, curiosities and experiences, and their appearance on the scene of L2 motivation research opened up novel research avenues and resulted in new research approaches. In this chapter I summarise the ensuing advances centred around four principal developmental drives, the desire (a) to increase the educational relevance of L2 motivation research; (b) to synchronise L2 motivation research with advances in educational and motivational psychology; (c) to view L2 motivation from a holistic, dynamic perspective; and (d) to understand long-term motivation and sustained motivated behaviour. Of course, I will not be able to provide a systematic literature review of such a vast period, and therefore the following summary will inevitably rely on my own personal views and experiences—hopefully, however, the comprehensive nature of the collection of papers offered in this anthology will be able to offset this subjective bias.

Developmental Drive 1: The Desire to Increase the Educational Relevance of L2 Motivation Research

The desire to be more *educationally relevant* originated directly from the composition of the new wave of L2 motivation researchers at the turn of the 1990s: because most of us were applied linguistics interested in instructed SLA, we were keen to go beyond a broad social psychological focus that involved analysing the attitudinal/motivational disposition of whole language communities along the lines set by Gardner and his colleagues. Instead, we were mostly concerned with what went on in specific language classrooms and with specific learners. Therefore we introduced a more situated, education-centred interest in the research landscape of the day that was not characterised by such a pedagogically minded inquisitiveness; for example, as Gardner himself explained about his theory,

the model and the associated measurement operations (the AMTB) ... is not intended to provide explanations to individual teachers as to why or why not some of their students are more or less successful than others, or to give teachers advice on how to motivate their students... (Gardner, 2010, p. 26)

Setting the Agenda by Crookes and Schmidt (1991) and the Modern Language Journal Debate (1994)

It is fitting to start the exploration of the ‘educational turn’ in L2 motivation research with the flagship paper of the period, Graham Crookes and Dick Schmidt’s (1991) article on “Motivation: Reopening the research agenda”, in which the authors offered a curious explanation of what they thought was the main problem with Gardner’s social psychological approach: it was *too influential*, that is, “so dominant that alternative concepts have not been seriously considered” (p. 501). They captured the zeitgeist when they called for new, education-friendly approaches that were “congruent with the concept of motivation that teachers are convinced is critical for SL [second language] success” (p. 502). In order to provide a framework within which learning-situation-specific motives could be studied, Crookes and Schmidt distinguished between various layers of motivation and motivated learning—micro, classroom, syllabus/curriculum and extracurricular levels—thereby highlighting several pathways along which subsequent research could meaningfully proceed.

This multi-layered approach was taken up by Dörnyei (1994a), who conceived L2 motivation within a framework of three relatively distinct levels related to the language, the learner and the learning situation. The first two levels were largely based on the previous work of Gardner and his Canadian associates (most notably Richard Clément), while the third and most elaborate dimension encompassed motivational sources associated with various aspects of the L2 classroom, such as the L2 course content, the teacher’s role and the composition and character of the learner group. The paper elicited responses both from Robert Gardner and Rebecca Oxford, adding up to what has often been referred to as ‘The Modern Language Journal debate’ (Dörnyei, 1994a, 1994b; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994a, 1994b; Oxford, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Because the six articles addressed a wide variety of theoretical and measurement issues associated with the new movement, they came to be seen as a representative summary of L2 motivation research at that important juncture.

Focus on Motivational Strategies and Demotivation

Based on the theoretical considerations presented in the first part of the Dörnyei (1994a) article, the second part of the same paper listed 30 motivational techniques that were intended to help language teachers to motivate

their students in the L2 classroom, thereby joining a number of other publications that addressed the question of how to generate student motivation (e.g. Alison, 1993; Chambers, 1999; Williams & Burden, 1997). On the back of this momentum, I compiled a book-length summary of motivational strategies (Dörnyei, 2001a), comprising four main classes: (a) creating the basic motivational conditions, (b) generating initial motivation, (c) maintaining and protecting motivation, and (d) rounding off the learning experience by encouraging positive self-evaluation. This collection filled an existing gap in the literature and was well received by classroom practitioners. It also initiated a growing body of research investigating how a motivational teaching practice can have a significant positive impact on student motivation (for a comprehensive recent overview, see Lamb, 2017, and this volume).

Thus, the development and validation of motivational strategies was at the heart of the desire to increase the educational relevance of L2 motivation research in the 1990s, and the ongoing relevance of this direction has been evidenced by Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan's (2015) review of L2 motivation articles between 2005 and 2014: we found that papers geared at increasing the learners' motivation in some practically minded manner made up roughly one-third of the total examined corpus. Within this stream, a recent study by Henry, Korp, Sundqvist, and Thorsen (2018) has been particularly noteworthy as it offers a new organisational framework specifically developed for the teaching of Global English; the authors argue that in contexts such as Sweden, where the pervasive presence of English has made this language 'an important social literacy', students benefit most from activities that they experience as *authentic*, an important motivational theme that has also been explored in a book-length analysis by Pinner (2016). Another novel direction of designing motivational techniques has been opened up by the conceptualization of *L2 vision* (to be discussed later), because mental imagery is an important internal resource that can be intentionally harnessed (e.g. Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014).

Finally, the desire to increase the motivational quality of L2 instruction went hand in hand with attempts to reduce the manifold *demotivating* influences that may exist in an L2 classroom. The study of L2 demotivation goes back to an initial exploratory study in Hungary in 1998 (published as part of Dörnyei, 2001b) that mapped, ranked and clustered various demotivational antecedents, and due to the high level of language learning failure experienced worldwide, the pursuit of this subject continues to be an important strand in L2 motivation research (see e.g. Kim & Kim, 2013; Thorner & Kikuchi, this volume). Two interesting recent additions to the established demotivation paradigm have included the exploration of *re-motivation* (e.g. Falout, Murphey, Fukuda, & Trovela, 2013; Song & Kim, 2017) and the study of

how different *mindsets* (i.e. beliefs about whether a person's characteristics are changeable or fixed; see Lou & Noels, this volume) might help some learners to bounce back after a demotivating episode while others completely lose interest, thereby adding a dynamic element to the issue of demotivation.

Motivation and Group Dynamics

It has often been overlooked in L2 motivation studies that classroom motivation is shaped by the broad social context in general and by the learner group in particular. When a teacher faces a motivationally challenging classroom situation—such as, for example, general lethargy or disinterest—it may not be enough to cater for the individual learners' motivational needs as part of the trouble-shooting efforts, because the learner group as a whole can have such a powerful influence over the members that it can override their personal preferences and commitment. Therefore, motivation needs to be tackled also at the *group level*, which explains the relevance of group dynamics to classroom motivation. Consistent with this recognition, there have been a few publications in the past that have demonstrated that an awareness of the principles of group dynamics can make classroom events less threatening to teachers, can help them develop more efficient methods of classroom management, and can thus consciously facilitate the development of conducive group structures that constitute the basic motivational conditions (e.g. Chang, 2010; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; see also Fukada et al., this volume).

Dörnyei and Muir (2019) argue that the two areas of group dynamics that concern the learners' (i.e. group members') motivational state most are *group cohesiveness* and *group norms*: the former refers to the strength of the relationships linking group members to one another and to the group itself, the latter to the implicit and explicit rules of conduct in the classroom that regulate the life of the learner group and that make joint learning possible. While there is ample evidence for the positive role of these factors in organisational and sports psychology, their normative influence still needs further empirical verification in the field of SLA. An important recent study by Sasaki, Kozaki, and Ross (2017) has gone some way towards providing relevant evidence in this respect and it has also introduced novel research methodology to study this matter: using a mixed methods approach that included multi-level modelling, these scholars found that the class norms/ethos that was shared by class members had considerable explanatory power regarding the students' individual L2 proficiency growth, with the students' perception of their classmates' career aspirations explaining particularly substantial variation.

Interim Summary: Ushioda's Call for a 'Small Lens' Approach

As a result of the 'educational shift' of the 1990s, L2 motivation research has accumulated a great deal of knowledge of the motivational dimension of language learning environments, but it is fair to conclude that it has fallen somewhat short of the mark in one crucial aspect: there has been disproportionately little research linking motivation to the actual cognitive subprocesses involved in the mastery of an L2 such as attaining specific L2 skills (e.g. listening comprehension) or acquiring concrete aspects of the L2 (e.g. lexis). This problem has been highlighted by Ema Ushioda (2016) in a recent position paper about the state of the art of L2 motivation research:

this tendency to adopt a fairly broad perspective on L2 learning has meant that our research has had relatively little to say about how motivation interacts with the specific cognitive, metacognitive and psycholinguistic processes of language learning, or with the acquisition of particular features of the target language. (p. 574)

As a result, while specialists now have a good understanding of the nature of a motivational teaching practice in general, they are not in a strong position to give detailed educational guidelines on how to make the teaching of concrete subject matter areas more motivating. Thus, we cannot consider the educational objective of L2 motivation research as yet accomplished, and we need to heed Ushioda's call for "researching language learning motivation 'through a small lens' to counteract our tendency in the L2 motivation field to concern ourselves with language learning and teaching at a rather general level only" (pp. 573–574).

Developmental Drive 2: The Desire to Synchronise L2 Motivation Research with Advances in Educational and Motivational Psychology

Applied linguistics and SLA have traditionally relied on importing relevant research findings and theoretical paradigms from a number of 'feeder disciplines' in the social sciences, most notably from linguistics, education and psychology. This has been particularly true of L2 motivation research, which, as we saw, was founded by social psychologists drawing on attitude

measurement theory, and when the reformers of the 1990s set out to expand the scope of the social psychological paradigm of L2 motivation, they, too, adopted several psychological constructs in order to align L2 motivation research with cognitive theories that had come to dominate mainstream psychology.

The Impact of Cognitive Theories

The so-called ‘cognitive revolution’ in psychology brought about a boom in motivation research in the 1970s, as scholars started to decode the main *cognitive facets* of human behaviour and consequently identified a plethora of factors with potential relevance to how and why humans act as they do. The richness of the emerging concepts in cognitive psychology meant that the ultimate challenge for motivational psychologists was the creation of greater conceptual clarity by mapping the vast array of motivational factors onto a smaller number of theoretical constructs:

- *expectancy-value theories* assumed that the motivation to perform various tasks is the product of two key factors, the individual’s expectancy of success in a given task and the value the individual attaches to success in that task;
- *attribution theory* places the emphasis on how a learner processes past achievement experiences (successes and particularly failures);
- *self-efficacy theory* refers to people’s judgement of their capabilities to carry out certain specific tasks;
- *self-worth theory* claims that the highest human priority is the need for self-acceptance and to maintain a positive face;
- *goal theories* propose that human action is triggered by a sense of purpose, and for action to take place, goals have to be set and pursued by choice; accordingly, their key concern involved various goal properties;
- *self-determination theory* and the accompanying *intrinsic* versus *extrinsic* dichotomy are based on the belief that the desire to be self-initiating and self-regulating is a prerequisite for any human behaviour to be intrinsically rewarding, and therefore the essence of motivated action is a sense of autonomy.

These theoretical developments did not go unnoticed amongst L2 motivation researchers, and as the chapters of this Handbook demonstrate, several scholars in various parts of the world set out to achieve increased convergence

with these advances (see e.g. Kormos & Wilby's chapter on task motivation and the chapter by Noels et al. on self-determination theory). This, in turn, engendered a flourish of empirical research and theorising on L2 motivation, and the transformational impact of the cognitive turn is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that even Robert Gardner—together with his student, Paul Tremblay—proposed a model of L2 motivation (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) which integrated important cognitive concepts such as goal salience, valence (i.e. incentive value) and self-efficacy into Gardner's original model as mediating variables between language attitudes and motivational behaviour, and which also subsumed attributions about past learning experiences.

Motivation and Neurobiology

Cognitive psychology was not the only source of influence on what Gardner and Tremblay (1994b) expressively called the 'motivational renaissance' of the 1990s. Following a radically different research agenda at UCLA, John Schumann (1997) developed a model for the affective foundation of L2 acquisition from a *neurobiological perspective*, which posits that motivation consists of various permutations and patterns of stimulus appraisal processes (see also Schumann et al., 2004). After an auspicious start, however, as Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) summarise, this promising direction stalled somewhat (though see Schumann, 2017, and Thorner & Kikuchi, this volume), partly because neurobiological investigations require special training and neuroimaging facilities that are rarely available within applied linguistics institutions, and partly because of the existence of a great deal of uncertainty in the field of cognitive neuroscience about how to examine the neurobiology of individual difference issues (see e.g. Braver et al., 2010; Hariri, 2009).

Motivation and the Sociocultural Context

Yet another perspective on L2 motivation was inspired by a growing awareness in psychology of social issues relevant to motivation constructs in the mid-1990s. Human action is always embedded in a number of physical and psychological settings of varying breadth and abstraction, and in an influential paper Weiner (1994) referred to the complex of motives that are directly linked to the individual's social environment as *social motivation*; in a similar vein, Rueda and Dembo (1995, p. 267) argued that motivation could no longer be conceived as a characteristic of an individual, but rather of the

“individual-in-action within specific contexts” (for a more recent analysis of contextual variation, see e.g. Wosnitzer & Beltman, 2012). Within L2 motivation research, this approach was championed by Ema Ushioda, who proposed a ‘person-in-context relational view of motivation’ (Ushioda, 2009), which was centred on the interaction of the learner as a “self-reflective intentional agent, and the fluid and complex system of social relations, activities, experiences and multiple micro- and macro-contexts in which the person is embedded, moves, and is inherently part of” (p. 220).

Because of the situated nature of the educational shift (discussed earlier), the field of L2 motivation was open to a call for incorporating the properties of the learning environment, and Ushioda’s views not only resonated with a growing number of scholars but were also compatible with an emerging dynamic systems approach that blurred the distinction between the agent and its context (Ushioda, 2015; see also Dörnyei, 2009c); we shall return to this matter below when we examine the desire to view L2 motivation from a dynamic perspective. Yi, Clément, and MacIntyre (this volume) offer a detailed and insightful overview of the role of contexts within SLA motivation, organising their discussion along the various connections of ideologies and situational variations.

The L2 Motivational Self System

In the first decade of the new millennium, social psychology shaped the field of L2 motivation research once again through the adaptation of Markus and Nurius’s (1986) possible selves theory and Higgins’s (1987) self-discrepancy theory, leading to the formation of Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009b) *L2 Motivational Self System*. This approach is based on the premise that the way in which people imagine themselves in the future plays an important role in energising them in the present, and understanding L2 motivation in such self-related terms held two attractions for me. First, it involved the learner’s *whole identity*, which coincided with my belief that learning a foreign language is more than a mere educational activity targeting a specific subject matter as it involves adding a new L2 dimension to one’s self. Second, future self-images as conceptualised by Markus and Nurius were not merely abstract notions but involved *mental imagery*: someone with a developed ideal self could visualise him/herself in the future in vivid terms, which made the ideal future self-image similar to the concept of *vision* (which will be further discussed in a separate section).

The L2 Motivational Self System that has emerged from these considerations as well as from empirical studies conducted in Hungary with Kata Csizér is described in a separate chapter (Csizér, this volume), so let me highlight here only two issues related to it. First, the L2 Learning Experience component of the model has admittedly been rather undertheorised and is perhaps not sufficiently compatible with the other two self-based dimensions (see Dörnyei, 2019), an issue that has recently been addressed by Csizér and Kálmán (2019) in a Special Issue of *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Second, although the model has been useful for explaining L2 motivation in many learning contexts, particularly in foreign language learning situations where the L2 is primarily learnt as a school subject (and where Gardner's notion of integrative motivation often did not make much sense; see e.g. Lamb, 2004), in some other types of learning environment, and especially when the target language is not English, the theory may not do full justice to all the relevant motivational forces (see e.g. Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017; Ushioda, 2017). Furthermore, as Lamb (2009) warns us, even in the case of the learning of Global English there are considerable contextual influences on the formation and operation of L2 selves, and the value of L2 self guides will be “much enhanced if we also explore their origins in, and impact on, the social settings and situated activity of language learning” (p. 245).

Consistent with the above claim, in examining the motivational characteristics of *heritage language learning* in Cape Breton, Canada, MacIntyre, Baker, and Sparling (2017) observed a strong community-level motive—which they labelled as the ‘rooted L2 self’—that differs both from integrativeness and the ideal L2 self in that it represents a collective mindset that is rooted in the shared geography, history and cultural practices of the community. A further extension of the L2 Motivation Self System was offered by Henry (2017) when he introduced the concept of the ‘ideal multilingual self’ involving a person's aspirations to become multilingual (see also Ushioda, 2017; as well as Busse's, 2017, notion of the ‘plurilingual future self’); he argued that this is a potent factor that can generate motivational energy *in addition* to that created by the desire to speak the specific languages the learner is simultaneously engaging with. This extension may be particularly important in the light of Henry and Cliffordson's (2017) recent observation that in highly globalised settings there is *insufficient* difference between the learner's actual and ideal English-speaking selves, and given this limited discrepancy, the English-specific future self-guide “lacks the power to align motivated behaviour in a manner consistently demonstrated in other contexts”. Finally, an intriguing new extension of the ought-to self has been Thompson's notion of an ‘anti-ought-to self’ (Thompson, 2017; Thompson & Vásquez, 2015), which concerns a counterreactionary

desire to go against the grain of existing social pressures (e.g. by learning a language that is not encouraged by the social milieu).

The Temporal Dimension of Motivation

The adoption of a more situated approach in L2 motivation research in the 1990s soon drew attention to the significance of the *temporal dimension* of motivation. When motivation was examined in relation to specific learner behaviours and classroom processes, one could not fail to notice the considerable fluctuation in learners' motivational dispositions exhibited on an almost day-to-day business (see e.g. Lamb's, 2007, nuanced analysis of changes in Indonesian adolescents' dispositions over a period of 20 months), which highlighted the need to adopt a *process-oriented approach* that could account for the 'ups and downs' of motivation to learn. The best relevant psychological model of the time was proposed by Heckhausen and Kuhl (e.g. Heckhausen, 1991; Heckhausen & Kuhl, 1985; Kuhl, 1992), who distinguished separate, sequentially ordered phases within a motivated behavioural process, introducing a "temporal perspective that begins with the awakening of a person's wishes prior to goal setting and continues through the evaluative thoughts entertained after goal striving has ended" (Gollwitzer, 1990, p. 55).

Inspired by these German psychologists' approach, István Ottó and I devised a complex process model of L2 motivation (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998; see also Dörnyei, 2000), which described how initial wishes and desires are first transformed into goals and then into operationalised intentions, and how these intentions are enacted, leading (hopefully) to the accomplishment of the goal and concluded by the final evaluation of the process. As we shall see below, the process-oriented understanding turned out to be only a transitional phase, leading to a complex dynamic systems perspective, but its significance was more than merely paving the way for subsequent developments; it highlighted the fact that viewing motivation as a stable trait representing a relatively fixed part of an individual's personality does not do the concept justice.

Interim Summary: The Search for Relevant Theoretical Paradigms Continues

The paradigm-seeking efforts of the 'motivational renaissance' of the 1990s left one enduring lesson: it became clear that there was no single perfect motivation theory underlying student learning in classroom settings. This led to the conclusion at the turn of the century that only comprehensive and

multi-faceted constructs can account for the intricate motivational life of a language classroom: “To enable us to describe student motivation with a precision that can be used as a basis for practical measures, we need a detailed and most likely eclectic model that represents multiple perspectives” (Dörnyei, 2001b, p. 12). Yet, in a seeming contradiction, the emerging new motivation paradigm, the L2 Motivational Self System, was intended to offer a single, parsimonious construct that synthesised several previous lines of research. However, as Boo et al. (2015) demonstrate, while the new construct was generally welcomed by the field, its positive perception was to a large extent due to the fact that it offered a broad platform for innovation that was capable of accommodating novel theoretical perspectives and which served as a springboard for new approaches.

A good example of how the self-based model could be expanded was Kormos, Kiddle, and Csizér’s (2011) study of L2 learners in Chile, which added goals and social contextual factors to Dörnyei’s self-guides, and also highlighted the reciprocal relations between the constituents of the construct, thereby pointing forward to a dynamic conception (to be discussed in the next section). In a further extension of the model, Kormos and Csizér (2014) incorporated self-regulatory strategies in the overall paradigm so that they could focus on L2 learners’ autonomous learning behaviours, and Papi (2010) integrated L2 anxiety in the self-construct. The forward-pointing character of the L2 Motivational Self System was also manifested in my own research, because the concepts of *vision*, DMCs and *student engagement* (to be described later) both grew out of this theory and can be considered in many ways extensions of it. Thus, the search for relevant theoretical perspectives never stopped and the last two decades have brought about almost unceasing theoretical development, characterised by emerging novel motivation paradigms and innovative approaches. These will be reviewed in the second half of this chapter, with a special emphasis on two central themes: (a) the holistic and dynamic nature of motivation; and (b) long-term motivation and sustained motivated behaviour.

Developmental Drive 3: The Desire to View L2 Motivation from a Holistic and Dynamic Perspective

The previous section described how the situated perspective adopted in the 1990s reframed motivation as an ever-changing, cumulative arousal in a person, leading to a conceptualisation of L2 motivation within a process-oriented

paradigm. It soon became clear, however, that process models that were based on cause-effect relationships failed to offer a realistic account of the motivational phenomena observed in real-life situations; the linear progression implied by a flow-chart diagram simply could not do justice to the complex and often circular interrelationships involving seemingly randomly iterative processes that many learners described. Therefore, as Dörnyei (2009c) stated, it was only a matter of time before researchers started to look for a more radical conceptualisation. This perceived need for a fundamental reformulation led many scholars to start experimenting with the adoption of a complex dynamic systems perspective that had started to gain recognition both in the social sciences in general (e.g. Byrne & Callaghan, 2014) and in the field of SLA in particular (e.g. de Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008; Ortega & Han, 2017). The current discussion cannot offer a summary of the principles of this theory but will focus, instead, on some of the theoretical issues underlying the adoption of a dynamic approach in L2 motivation research (for overviews, see e.g. Dörnyei, MacIntyre, & Henry, 2015; Hiver & Papi, this volume).

The Impact of Complex Dynamic Systems Theory on the Understanding of Individual Differences

In a book examining SLA from a psychological vantage point (Dörnyei, 2009c), I argued that upon closer scrutiny, individual learner characteristics appear to be rather different from the meaning we tend to assign to them in everyday parlance or in traditional professional discourse: they are not stable—as we often treat them, for example when saying, “I have a low language aptitude” or “Hugo is highly motivated”—but show salient temporal and situational variation, and neither are they monolithic—which is suggested by the use of robust terms such as ‘motivation’ or ‘learning style’—but constitute complex constellations that interact with each other and the environment synchronically and diachronically. This being the case—that is, if the tapestry of human mental characteristics is an interwoven and fluid system—does it still make sense to keep speaking about any subsets of these learner characteristics (such as motivational or cognitive factors) as distinct individual difference entities?

The answer I have given was a qualified yes, because there is at least one point of view from which some subdivision of learner characteristics is justifiable: the *phenomenological* (i.e., experiential) perspective. Motivation and cognition can be differentiated from each other because they ‘feel’ different: if we

want or intend to do something, we have the distinct experience of ‘wanting’, and this experience is gradable in terms of its strength (e.g. I can hardly wait ... or I really-really-really want it!); in contrast, cognition/thoughts have a different feel, revealed in the phrase ‘cold intellect’, which captures a key feature of cognition, namely that it has no valence (i.e. it is not gradable in terms of intensity either in the positive or negative directions). In addition to these two basic types of mental functions (i.e. cognition and motivation), we can also identify a third salient phenomenological category, emotions or affect (e.g. fear, anger, distress or joy), that again is clearly distinguishable from the previous two, thereby adding up to a tripartite framework (see also MacIntyre, Ross, & Clément’s summary of emotions and Ryan’s overview of individual differences, both in this volume).

Each of the three mental dimensions—motivation, cognition and affect—can be viewed as dynamic subsystems themselves that have continuous and complex interaction with each other and which cannot exist in isolation from one another; as Buck (2005, p. 198) has famously put it, “In their fully articulated forms, emotions imply cognitions imply motives imply emotions, and so on”. On the basis of such a dynamic understanding, I suggested in 2009 (Dörnyei, 2009a) that one potentially fruitful approach to conceptualising motivation is through identifying viable *constellations* in which the three subsystems of the human mind cooperate in a constructive manner. Examples of such motivational amalgams would be hybrid notions such as ‘interest’, ‘flow’ and even ‘future self-guides’, each of which have both cognitive and emotional aspects besides the dominant motivational function (see Dörnyei, 2009c; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; as well as Piniel and Albert’s analysis of flow in this volume).

A Dynamic Framework of Motivational Traits, Motivational Adaptations and Motivational Narratives

A salient shortcoming of a dynamic understanding of L2 learner characteristics has been the absence of an adequate theory of individual differences and personality characteristics within the field of SLA that could meaningfully accommodate the dynamic interaction of the various learner attributes. In response to this challenge, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015; see also Dörnyei, 2017) turned to a new theory of personality in psychology, Dan McAdams’s “New Big Five” model (e.g. McAdams & Pals, 2006), which offers a broad theoretical framework that can be used to explain contextual and temporal variation accompanied by dynamic interactions at various levels. McAdams’s full model

includes five layers, of which the middle three are of particular interest for our current purpose. These constitute a three-tier framework of personality: (a) *dispositional traits*, referring to relatively stable and decontextualized broad dimensions of individual differences; (b) *characteristic adaptations*, referring to constructs that are highly contextualised in time, place and/or social role, and which include “motives, goals, plans, strivings, strategies, values, virtues, schemas, self-images, mental representations of significant others, developmental tasks, and many other aspects of human individuality” (p. 208); and (c) *integrative life narratives*, referring to “internalized and evolving life stories that reconstruct the past and imagine the future to provide a person’s life with identity (unity, purpose, meaning)” (p. 212).

The above descriptions shows that the common understanding of L2 motivation is most closely related to the second level of personality—and can therefore be labelled *motivational adaptations*—but the three-tier framework also allows us to conceptualise more stable motivational features—or *motivational traits*—as well as certain *motivational narratives*. Motivational narratives have not been subject to much research in the field yet, although self-motivational narratives and vision-specific scripts (see Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Ryan & Irie, 2014) would be good examples of this level of motivation. On the other hand, motivational traits have long been known in psychology (e.g. achievement-related traits such as need for achievement; see e.g. Donovan, Bateman, & Heggestad, 2013; Heggestad & Kanfer, 2000), and recently two trait-related issues have received increased attention in L2 motivation research: motivational dispositions associated with *language mindsets* (e.g. Lou & Noels, 2017, this volume; Mercer & Ryan, 2010; Ryan & Mercer, 2012; Waller & Papi, 2017) and motivational inclinations related to a *promotion or prevention-specific regulatory focus* (e.g. Han & McDonough, 2018; Papi, 2018; Papi & Teimouri, 2014). Adopting such a dynamic framework is a novel and admittedly uncharted perspective in L2 motivation, but it offers the potential advantage of not only being able to describe links amongst the different layers of motivation but also between motivation and different levels of cognitive and emotional factors.

The Dynamics of the L2 Self-system and Multilingualism

The tripartite framework of the main dimensions of the L2 Motivational Self System might suggest a relatively fixed and static construct that is not compatible with a dynamic systems perspective, and indeed, much discussion in this area “has tended to ‘freeze’ current and ideal selves, presenting them as photo-

graphic stills rather than moving pictures” (Henry, 2015, p. 126). This understanding of future self-guides as static targets that learners aim for has been, however, questioned by Henry (2015) and You and Chan (2015), who highlighted the fact that far from being unchanging, these structures are affected by at least three dynamic processes: (a) the up- and downward revisions of the ideal and ought-to self-dimensions; (b) changes triggered by their interaction with other self-concepts; and (c) other qualitative and quantitative changes in the imagery that underlies possible L2 selves (for more discussion, see Csizér, this volume). A recent study by Thorsen, Henry, and Cliffordson (*in press*) has further investigated the role of the size of self-discrepancy in L2 learners, and came to the conclusion that the inclusion of a variable in research paradigms measuring the *current L2 self* could potentially provide important insights into self-discrepancy trajectories, thereby facilitating the investigation of motivational dynamics. Also focusing on L2 self-discrepancies and self-congruences, Teimouri (2017) found that the *type* of one’s self-guides interacted with the person’s regulatory focus (prevention vs. promotion), resulting in markedly different emotional reactions (anxiety, joy and shame).

The dynamics inherent to the L2 Motivational Self System is further amplified when people study more than one language at a time, because their motivational set-up is often affected by the *multilingual experience* (see e.g. Henry, 2010, who first raised this issue, and Thompson, this volume). Indeed, the initial conceptualisation of future L2 self-guides left it open as to whether learners who study multiple languages have one generic ideal language self-image or separate self-images associated with the different target languages. In an examination of this question amongst Hong Kong students learning both English and Mandarin, Dörnyei and Chan (2013) found evidence of distinct language-specific self-images, and argued accordingly that these images may interfere with each other both in a positive way (e.g. transferable linguistic confidence from one language experience to another) or in a negative, demotivating manner (e.g. making unfavourable comparisons between the two languages). Such dynamic interferences are particularly likely when people learn languages other than English (LOTEs): LOTE learning almost always occurs in conjunction with the learning of Global English—after all, would anyone (other than an immigrant) realistically choose to learn, say, Italian as a foreign language while having never studied English?—and therefore, as Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) conclude, one of the unique characteristics of the motivation to learn LOTEs is that it is overshadowed by one’s dispositions towards Global English.

Reflecting on the dynamics of multilinguals’ language learning motivation, Henry (2017) argues that the motivational systems linked to a multilingual

learner's different languages can be understood as constituting a higher-level *multilingual motivational self system* that is part of an "ecology of interconnected and interpenetrating systems" (p. 548). This important issue obviously warrants further research in an era which is characterised both by increased globalisation and an unprecedented surge in human mobility, including large-scale immigration to both English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. The significance of intercultural factors has been also underlined in a study of international students by Kormos, Csizér, and Iwaniec (2014), which demonstrated that cross-cultural contact experiences and socio-environmental factors interact dynamically with each other and with learner-internal variables as they collectively shape the learners' L2 experiences.

The Unconscious Dimension of Motivation

A final area of dynamics inherent to the understanding of L2 motivation that has only recently been identified concerns *unconscious attitudes* and *motives*. In a thought-provoking paper, Al-Hoorie (2015) argues that the traditional view of L2 motivation has been consciousness-biased in the sense that the role of *unconscious agency* driving human behaviour has been neglected. To provide empirical evidence of the significance of this dimension, he conducted two empirical investigations (Al-Hoorie, 2016a, 2016b) to compare the impact of explicit and implicit attitudes towards L2 speakers on the learners' overall motivation, and confirmed his initial hypothesis that implicit attitudes have substantial explanatory power (see Al-Hoorie, this volume). Based on these results as well as on the extensive research directed at this subject in mainstream motivational psychology (see e.g. Ryan, 2012), Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) predicted that this line of inquiry is likely to gain momentum over the next decade. Al-Hoorie (this volume) emphasises in this respect that a focus on unconscious motivation does not have to be at odds with the current frameworks in the field. For example, as he points out, in their pioneering paper on possible selves Markus and Nurius (1986) already discussed the possibility of the unconscious activation of both positive and negative self-guides, and Higgins' (1987) self-discrepancy theory also accommodates unconscious processes, as it does not assume that people are aware of either the availability or the accessibility of their self-discrepancies. Finally, we should also note that the issue of unconscious attitudes and motives has considerable research methodological implications, because most available motivation batteries focus only on conscious appraisal and thus measure only one aspect of the overall motivation complex (see Al-Hoorie, this volume).

Interim Summary: How Useful Is a Holistic, Dynamic Perspective?

A team of us (Peter MacIntyre, Alastair Henry and I) spent roughly 3 years pursuing a project whose sole aim was to test how feasible and sustainable it is for L2 motivation researchers to apply dynamic principles to their investigations. The Conclusion of the edited volume that was the outcome of this enterprise (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, & Henry, 2015) provides a summary of our somewhat mixed experiences. On the negative side, we mentioned that the novel perspective introduced a new type of conceptual and methodological language—including several (arguably imperfect) metaphors adopted from the natural sciences—that does not connect easily to more familiar concepts in this research area; consequently, even we found it rather difficult at times to adopt a dynamically oriented mindset. Thus, we accepted that a complex dynamic systems approach “is more difficult to apply than traditional methods of data collection and analysis” (p. 428; see also MacIntyre, MacKay, Ross, & Abel, 2017).

On the other hand, we also pointed out that whether we like it or not, the social world around us *is* dynamic. Once a researcher has realised this there is simply no turning back because he/she will be constantly aware of the shortcuts and the half-truths that tend to accompany more traditional research designs. The way we came to terms with these conflicting standpoints was summed up in the following statement: “We do not see the CDS [complex dynamic systems] perspective as a theory in a strict sense, but rather a way of thinking about the world and a way of addressing questions that differs from traditional approaches”, and we emphasised about the approach that “even in its incompleteness it has important implications for understanding language learning and development” (MacIntyre et al., 2015, p. 428).

Let me elaborate on the last point, namely on the relevance of a dynamic perspective for the understanding of *learning* and *development*, because for me this constituted the most convincing argument when I first came across dynamic systems theory. I have come to believe that traditional quantitative methods—that are associated with group-based data and linear cause-effect relationships—simply cannot provide an accurate analysis of personal development. This was famously demonstrated by Diane Larsen-Freeman (2006), who investigated the L2 development of a group of Chinese learners and showed that none of the individual developmental trajectories coincided with the group trajectory that was computed on the basis of the group means. A recent paper by Lowie, van Dijk, Chan, and Verspoor (2017) provides further

evidence in this respect: in a highly enlightening study, these scholars explored the English development of two *identical twins* in Taiwan “who can be expected to be highly similar in all respects, from their environment to their level of English proficiency, to their exposure to English, and to their individual differences” (p. 128). Yet, what the researchers found was contrary to these expectations: not only was the twins’ progress rather different, but their developmental patterns for spoken and written language “even showed opposite tendencies” (*ibid*).

In reflecting on their findings, Lowie et al. (2017) argue that the challenge of understanding the key to successful L2 learning is to account for the dynamic and often nonlinear cooperation between learner-internal influences on the developmental trajectory over time and the impacts of external states, events or factors, because “All these dynamically interrelated factors may cause any part of the learner’s language system to fluctuate from one moment to the next” (p. 133). Perceiving reality in such a complex manner means, however, that in many studies we will not be able to rely on established research templates and traditions; instead, we shall have to experiment with creative, innovative solutions to the puzzle of how to describe the bigger picture of the world around us without ignoring the unique patterns of variability that characterise this world’s texture.

Developmental Drive 4: The Desire to Understand Long-Term Motivation and Sustained Motivated Behaviour

A dynamic perception of L2 development discussed in the previous section foregrounds a long-term perspective on SLA that considers development over time, and I believe that one of the most fruitful directions for L2 motivation research in the future lies in this under-researched and under-theorised area. The ultimate question for motivation scholars is not only to understand what generates language learning motivation but also to explain what can *sustain* this motivation long enough for the relatively slow process of SLA to produce usable L2 proficiency. In the following, I will briefly introduce three notions—*vision*, *directed motivational currents* and *student engagement*—which are associated with long-term motivational trajectories that can cut through the constant dynamic pulls and pushes of the myriad intervening factors presented by everyday life.

Concordant Goals and Vision

Motivated human behaviour is purpose driven, and therefore the notion of *goal* has always been at the forefront of motivation research: most scholars would agree that goals give meaning and direction to a particular action, or to put in another way, for action to take place, goals have to be set and pursued by choice. It requires little justification that sustained behaviour requires particularly potent goals, and two effective ways of achieving this increased strength is by adding to the goal content a strong personal element, resulting in a *self-concordant goal*, or a sensory/imagery component, resulting in a *vision*:

- *Self-concordant goals*. According to Sheldon and his colleagues (e.g. Sheldon & Elliot, 1999), for goals to have a strong and lasting motivational capacity, they need to represent a person's enduring interests and passions, and his/her core values and beliefs. They call such deep-seated, identity-relevant goals self-concordant goals, a term which captures the way in which these goals "belong to the self in a deeper sense" (p. 494; for a more detailed discussion, see Dörnyei, Henry, & Muir, 2016, Chap. 3).
- *Vision*. Similar to self-concordant goals, a vision is also a highly personalized goal (see e.g. Markus & Ruvolo, 1989), but in this case the added component also includes a vivid mental image of the experience of successfully accomplishing the goal. Dörnyei and Kubanyiova (2014) have argued that people's vision of who they would like to become as L2 users seems to be one of the most reliable predictors of their long-term intended effort, because by keeping one's eyes focused on the bigger picture, a vision helps to underpin one's overall persistence (see also Csizér, this volume, for further discussion).

The conceptualization of L2 motivation in terms of vision has had considerable practical implications, and Dörnyei and Kubanyiova (2014) have designed a *visionary training programme* to intentionally harness the power of imagery and visualisation. The components of this programme correspond to the main conditions for the effectiveness of future self-guides: (a) *creating the vision* (helping learners to construct images of who they could become as L2 users and what knowing an L2 could add to their lives); (b) *strengthening the vision* (helping learners to see their desired language selves with more clarity and intensity); (c) *substantiating the vision* (helping learners to anchor their desired language selves in a sense of realistic expectations); (d) *transforming the vision into action* (helping learners to attach to their desired language selves a

set of concrete action plans); (e) *keeping the vision alive* (helping learners to activate their desired self-images regularly so that those do not get squeezed out by other life concerns); (f) *counterbalancing the vision* (reminding learners of the undesired consequences of not achieving their vision). Over the past decade, several intervention studies have been conducted worldwide to examine how visionary thinking can be fostered in L2 learners (e.g. Fukuda, Fukuda, Falout, & Murphey, 2011; Mackay, 2014, 2019; Magid & Chan, 2012; Sampson, 2012), typically converging on the conclusion that such training can indeed increase various aspects of the participants' motivation.

Directed Motivational Currents (DMCs)

Anyone who has been absorbed by a project to the extent that they could not get it out of their mind and kept thinking of it day and night has most likely experienced a *directed motivational current* (DMC). The term refers to a powerful motivational drive which unfolds over time and impacts its participants in a significant way. Henry (this volume) offers a detailed description of the main features of this heightened level of motivational state, so here I would like to highlight only three points that concern how DMCs fit in the evolution of L2 motivation research: their link to (a) concordant goals and vision, (b) complex dynamic systems and (c) long-term motivation.

- *Link to concordant goals and vision.* A DMC is always goal-related, and for such a strong motivational surge to occur, the goal needs to be particularly potent in the way described in the previous section (i.e. having either a strong personal or a sensory component). A DMC then captures the power of a self-concordant goal or vision, and transfers it through its unique structure into sustained motivated behaviour.
- *Link to complex dynamic systems.* The initial idea of the notion of DMCs coincided with the dynamic turn in SLA and L2 motivation research, and one reason for its positive reception has been the fact that it offers an interesting phenomenon from a dynamic systems perspective: a DMC has the capacity to *align* diverse factors and to *channel* behaviour into a single, goal-specific course of action, thereby *overriding* the complexity and chaos of the surrounding world. Indeed, as Dörnyei, Muir, and Ibrahim (2014) argued in their pioneering paper on the subject, a DMC involves a powerful regulatory process whose course and end-state are, to a large extent, predictable and thus researchable.

- *Link to long-term motivation.* DMCs can be viewed as a key to understanding sustained action in the sense that the motivational basis of a DMC is made up of the same building blocks as the motivational basis of long-term behaviours in general. The primary difference between the two motivational setups is that within a fully-fledged DMC the various motivational factors and conditions reach an *optimal* level of cooperation, thereby causing a motivational surge. Accordingly, DMCs can be viewed as representing the *optimal form of engagement* with an extended project, and it may be no exaggeration to claim that almost any form of long-term, sustained motivation is in fact a partial realisation of a DMC.

Student Engagement

‘Engagement’ in the educational psychological sense refers to active participation and involvement in certain behaviours (cf. Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004), and ‘student engagement’ therefore concerns involvement in school-related activities and academic tasks. Engagement has recently been hailed as “the holy grail of learning” (Sinatra, Heddy, & Lombardi, 2015, p. 1), because the notion offers both theoretical and practical insights into how we can generate active student involvement in the learning process at a time when the pace of social life has been intensified by social media in an unprecedented manner and young people are continuously bombarded with information and communications through multiple channels, all intended to captivate their attention.

As Mercer and Dörnyei (2020) explain, the concept of student engagement offers a crucial advantage over the notion of motivation, namely its *direct link* to concrete classroom behaviours. Motivation does not manifest in task pursuit automatically, because although a motivated student is likely to do well at school, this cannot be taken for granted, because various distractions and obstacles can cancel out or put on hold even relatively strong motivational commitments. There are simply too many competing influences on a student’s mind in our current age, and for motivated learning behaviour to occur, we must ensure that the students’ positive disposition is *not* hijacked by the plethora of other pressing and ever salient distractions. As Mercer and Dörnyei conclude, “motivation is undoubtedly necessary for ‘preparing the deal’, but engagement is indispensable for *sealing the deal*” (p. 6). In this sense, engagement can be seen as closely related to DMCs, because both concepts involve an integrated form of motive and its behavioural outworking; in other words, DMCs and engagement do not merely concern learner potentials but rather *realised* learner potentials.

Interim Summary: Towards Understanding L2 Learning Perseverance

Motivation, by definition, concerns the choice and direction of a particular action, the effort expended on it and the persistence with it. While most scholars would agree with this conceptualisation, the curious fact is that one of the motivational dimensions—persistence—has received far less attention in past research than the other components; indeed, as Grant and Shin (2012) explain in *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, “Compared to research on the direction and intensity of effort, few theoretical models and empirical studies have focused on the maintenance or persistence of effort” (p. 514). This imbalance is in contrast with the perception of classroom practitioners, who know all too well that student motivation is not constant but displays continuous ebbs and flows as well as a steady ‘leak’, that is, a tendency to peter out with time. For these reasons, a better understanding of the nature of student perseverance would be crucial for promoting sustained learning behaviours that are required for the mastery of an L2. In some sense, therefore, the exploration of L2 learning perseverance is a debt that motivation researchers—both in mainstream psychology and in the field of applied linguistics—still owe to the teaching profession. This being the case, the notions of concordant goals, vision, DMCs and student engagement offer a potential launching pad for this exploration.

Conclusion

Having addressed a wide range of issues and having offered interim summaries throughout, a final conclusion has little to add beyond reiterating that the reason why motivation is such a complex and elusive notion and why the history of L2 motivation research has displayed so many twists and turns is the fact that motivation is an immensely important concept, comprising one of the grand themes of psychology. Motivation affects all of us, all the time, both as individuals and as group members, and therefore it is complicated. But it is, at the same time, enormously intriguing, and the topic of L2 motivation is one whose study can yield both theoretical and practical findings in equal measure. This Handbook represents the full richness of the material associated with the motivational dimension of SLA, and the description of three decades of L2 motivation research in this chapter was intended to offer a supportive framework so that the scope of the subject does not become too daunting.

References

- Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2015). Human agency: Does the beach ball have free will? In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 55–72). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016a). Unconscious motivation. Part I: Implicit attitudes toward L2 speakers. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 423–454.
- Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016b). Unconscious motivation. Part II: Implicit attitudes and L2 achievement. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(4), 619–649.
- Alison, J. (1993). *Not bothered? Motivating reluctant language learners in Key Stage 4*. London: CILT.
- Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 Motivation research 2005–2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System*, 55, 147–157.
- Braver, T. S., Yarkoni, T., Gruszka, A., Hampshire, A., Owen, A. M., Jaušovec, N., et al. (2010). Individual differences in cognition from a neurophysiological perspective: The commentaries. In A. Gruszka, G. Matthews, & B. Szymura (Eds.), *The handbook of individual differences in cognition* (pp. 169–180). New York, NY: Springer.
- Buck, R. (2005). Adding ingredients to the self-organizing dynamic system stew: Motivation, communication, and higher-level emotions—and don't forget the genes! *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 28(2), 197–198.
- Busse, V. (2017). Plurilingualism in Europe: Exploring attitudes towards English and other European languages among adolescents in Bulgaria, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. *Modern Language Journal*, 101, 566–582.
- Byrne, D., & Callaghan, G. (2014). *Complexity theory and the social sciences: The state of the art*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Chambers, G. N. (1999). *Motivating language learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chang, L. Y.-H. (2010). Group processes and EFL learners' motivation: A study of group dynamics in EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(1), 129–154.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469–512.
- Csizér, K., & Kálmán, C. S. (Eds.). (2019). Language learning experience: The neglected element in L2 motivation research (Special Issue). *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1).
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7–21.
- Donovan, J. J., Bateman, T., & Heggstad, E. D. (2013). Individual differences in work motivation: Current directions and future needs. In N. Christiansen & R. Tett (Eds.), *Handbook of personality at work* (pp. 101–128). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding second language motivation: On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 515–523.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 519–538.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009a). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. In N. C. Ellis & D. Larsen-Freeman (Eds.), *Language as a complex adaptive system* (pp. 230–248). Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009c). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2016). From English language teaching to psycholinguistics: A story of three decades. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Becoming and being an applied linguist: The life histories of some applied linguists* (pp. 119–135). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Conceptualizing L2 learner characteristics in a complex, dynamic world. In L. Ortega & Z. Han (Eds.), *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (pp. 79–96). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 motivational self system. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19–30.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). The motivational foundation of learning languages other than global English: Theoretical issues and research directions. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 455–468.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 437–462.
- Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D., & Henry, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Motivational dynamics in language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2019). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In X. A. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Dörnyei, Z., Muir, C., & Ibrahim, Z. (2014). Directed motivational currents: Energising language learning through creating intense motivational pathways. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice* (pp. 9–29). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Falout, J., Murphey, T., Fukuda, T., & Trovela, M. (2013). Japanese EFL learners' remotivation strategies. In M. Cortazzi & L. Jin (Eds.), *Researching cultures of learning* (pp. 328–349). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109.
- Fukada, Y., Fukuda, T., Falout, J., & Murphey, T. (2011). Increasing motivation with possible selves. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT 2010 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 337–349). Tokyo: JALT.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational mode*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994a). On motivation, research agendas and theoretical frameworks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 359–368.
- Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994b). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 524–527.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1990). Action phases and mind-sets. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behaviour* (Vol. 2, pp. 53–92). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Grant, A. M., & Shin, J. (2012). Work motivation: Directing, energizing, and maintaining effort (and research). In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 505–519). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Han, Y., & McDonough, K. (2018). Korean L2 speakers' regulatory focus and oral task performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 56(2), 181–203.

- Hariri, A. R. (2009). The neurobiology of individual differences in complex behavioral traits. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 32, 225–247.
- Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Heckhausen, H., & Kuhl, J. (1985). From wishes to action: The dead ends and short cuts on the long way to action. In M. Frese & J. Sabini (Eds.), *Goal-directed behaviour: The concept of action in psychology* (pp. 134–160). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heggstad, E. D., & Kanfer, R. (2000). Individual differences in trait motivation: Development of the Motivational Trait Questionnaire. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 751–776.
- Henry, A. (2010). Contexts of possibility in simultaneous language learning: Using the L2 motivational self system to assess the impact of global English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(2), 149–162.
- Henry, A. (2015). The dynamics of possible selves. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 83–94). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Henry, A. (2017). L2 motivation and multilingual identities. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 548–565.
- Henry, A., & Cliffordson, C. (2017). The impact of out-of-school factors on motivation to learn English: Self-discrepancies, beliefs, and experiences of self-authenticity. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(5), 688–712.
- Henry, A., Korp, H., Sundqvist, P., & Thorsen, C. (2018). Motivational strategies and the reframing of English: Activity design and challenges for teachers in contexts of extensive extramural encounters. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(2), 247–273.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319–340.
- Julkunen, K. (1989). *Situation-and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning and teaching*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Kim, Y.-K., & Kim, T.-Y. (2013). English learning demotivation studies in the EFL contexts: State of the art. *Modern English Education*, 14(1), 77–102.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 275–299.
- Kormos, J., Csizér, K., & Iwaniec, J. (2014). A mixed-method study of language-learning motivation and intercultural contact of international students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(2), 151–166.
- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self-related beliefs in second-language-learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 495–516.
- Kuhl, J. (1992). A theory of self-regulation: Action versus state orientation, self-discrimination, and some applications. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 41, 97–129.
- Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32, 3–19.

- Lamb, M. (2007). The impact of school on EFL learning motivation: An Indonesian case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 757–780.
- Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 229–247). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lamb, M. (2017). The motivational dimension of language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 50(3), 301–346.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 590–619.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. (2017). Measuring language mindsets and modeling their relations with goal orientations and emotional and behavioral responses in failure situations. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(1), 214–243.
- Lowie, W., van Dijk, M., Chan, H., & Verspoor, M. (2017). Finding the key to successful L2 learning in groups and individuals. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 127–148.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., & Sparling, H. (2017). Heritage passions, heritage convictions, and the rooted L2 self: Music and Gaelic language learning in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 501–516.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., & Henry, A. (2015). Conclusion: Hot enough to be cool: The promise of dynamic systems research. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 419–429). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P. D., MacKay, E., Ross, J., & Abel, E. (2017). The emerging need for methods appropriate to study dynamic systems: Individual differences in motivational dynamics. In L. Ortega & Z. Han (Eds.), *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (pp. 97–122). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Mackay, J. (2014). Applications and implications of the L2 motivational self-system in a Catalan EFL context. In M. Magid & K. Csizér (Eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning* (pp. 377–402). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mackay, J. (2019). An ideal second language self intervention: Development of possible selves in an English as a Foreign Language classroom context. *System*, 81, 50–62.
- Magid, M., & Chan, L. H. (2012). Motivating English learners by helping them visualise their ideal L2 self: Lessons from two motivational programmes. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 113–125.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954–969.
- Markus, H., & Ruvolo, A. (1989). Possible selves: Personalized representations of goals. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology* (pp. 211–241). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, *61*(3), 204–217.
- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging students in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2010). A mindset for EFL: Learners' beliefs about the role of natural talent. *ELT Journal*, *64*(4), 436–444.
- Ortega, L., & Han, Z. (Eds.). (2017). *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Oxford, R. L. (1994). Where are we with language learning motivation? *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 512–514.
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 12–28.
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, *38*, 467–479.
- Papi, M. (2018). Motivation as quality: Regulatory fit effects on incidental vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *40*, 707–730.
- Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2014). Language learner motivational types: A cluster analysis study. *Language Learning*, *64*(3), 493–525.
- Pinner, R. S. (2016). *Reconceptualising authenticity for English as a global language*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Rueda, R., & Dembo, M. H. (1995). Motivational processes in learning: A comparative analysis of cognitive and sociocultural frameworks. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, *9*, 255–289.
- Ryan, R. M. (Ed.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of human motivation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ryan, S., & Irie, K. (2014). Imagined and possible selves: Stories we tell ourselves about ourselves. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 109–126). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ryan, S., & Mercer, S. (2012). Implicit theories: Language learning mindsets. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning* (pp. 74–89). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sampson, R. (2012). The language-learning self, self-enhancement activities, and self-perceptual change. *Language Teaching Research*, *16*, 317–335.
- Sasaki, M., Kozaki, Y., & Ross, S. J. (2017). The impact of normative environments on learner motivation and L2 reading ability growth. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(1), 163–178.
- Schumann, J. H. (1997). *The neurobiology of affect in language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schumann, J. H. (2017). Neural complexity meets lexical complexity: An issue both in language and in neuroscience. In L. Ortega & Z. Han (Eds.), *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (pp. 59–78). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

- Schumann, J. H., Crowell, S. E., Jones, N. E., Lee, N., Schuchert, S. A., & Wood, L. A. (2004). *The neurobiology of learning: Perspectives from second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(3), 482–497.
- Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(1), 1–13.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second language learning*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Song, B., & Kim, T.-Y. (2017). The dynamics of demotivation and remotivation among Korean high school EFL students. *System*, 65, 90–103.
- Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(4), 681–709.
- Thompson, A. S. (2017). Language learning motivation in the United States: An examination of language choice and multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 483–500.
- Thompson, A. S., & Vásquez, C. (2015). Exploring motivational profiles through language learning narratives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 158–174.
- Thorsen, C., Henry, A., & Cliffordson, C. (in press). The case of a missing person? The current L2 self and the L2 motivational self system. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*
- Tremblay, P., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 505–518.
- Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of motivation. In T. J. Hickey (Ed.), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239–245). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. (2015). Context and dynamic systems theory. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 47–54). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. (2016). Language learning motivation through a small lens: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 564–577.
- Ushioda, E. (2017). The impact of Global English on motivation to learn other languages: Toward an ideal multilingual self. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 469–482.
- Waller, L., & Papi, M. (2017). Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 35, 54–65.

- Weiner, B. (1994). Integrating social and personal theories of achievement motivation. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 557–573.
- Williams, M. (1994). Motivation in foreign and second language learning: An interactive perspective. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 11, 77–84.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wosnitza, M., & Beltman, S. (2012). Learning and motivation in multiple contexts: The development of a heuristic framework. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 27(2), 177–193.
- You, C. J., & Chan, L. (2015). The dynamics of L2 imagery in future motivational self-guides. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 397–418). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.