The Motivational Foundation of Learning Languages Other Than Global English: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions

ZOLTÁN DÖRNYEI[1] and ALI H. AL-HOORIE[2,3] iD

[1]*University of Nottingham, School of English, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom*
Email: zoltan.dornyei@nottingham.ac.uk
[2]*University of Nottingham, School of English, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom*
Email: hoorie_a@jic.edu.sa
[3]*Jubail Industrial College, The English Language Institute, P.O. Box 10099, Jubail Industrial City, 31961, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

The theoretical paradigms of second language (L2) learning motivation developed over the past 25 years have been largely based on the study of English as a target language, which raises the question as to whether they are equally applicable to the understanding of the motivation to learn languages other than English (LOTEs). It is suggested in this article that current conceptualizations of L2 motivation display certain subtle characteristics that may not do full justice to the understanding of the motivation underlying LOTEs, either by downplaying certain important features or by providing an insufficiently nuanced representation of areas where the motivation to learn English and LOTEs diverges. The discussion addresses five such aspects: (a) the confounding interaction of English- and LOTE-related self-images, (b) the individualistic focus of the ideal L2 self, (c) the different nature/role of the ought-to self associated with languages with substantial versus marginal social support, (d) the different nature of goals in the learning of English and LOTEs, and (e) the differing role of unconscious motives in the study of English and LOTEs.

Keywords: L2 motivational self system; language globalization; ideal L2 self; ought-to L2 self; Global English; unconscious motivation

THE FIELD OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUI-sition (SLA) has been characterized by a long-standing and deep-seated tension: Although SLA concerns, by definition, the learning of any "additional language, including second, foreign, indigenous, minority, or heritage languages" (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 19), the undisputed hegemony of Global English has overshadowed the study of languages other than English (LOTEs). In this special issue, Ushioda (2017) provides an in-depth analysis of this emerging imbalance, so for the current arti-

cle it is sufficient to submit that—as we shall subsequently illustrate—the process of language globalization has not left the field of second/foreign language (L2) motivation research unaffected either. Despite powerful voices and arguments foregrounding the notion of multiculturalism in the field (see, e.g., May, 2014), Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan's (2015) survey of L2 motivation research conducted between 2005 and 2014 found that during this period the study of the motivation to learn English was predominant: Over 70% of all empirical investigations were conducted to examine motivation related to this single language, with the gap between English and LOTEs steadily increasing. This finding is corroborated by Comanaru and Noels's (2009) observation regarding heritage language learning, namely that

very little work has been done to investigate the motivational and affective profiles of such learners.

The English–LOTE imbalance raises several important issues. First, it generates a reductionist picture, as it ignores a significant proportion of the existing forms of language attainment worldwide. It also overlooks a powerful process in the 21st century: the unprecedented surge in human mobility, involving large-scale immigration to both English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. According to the Migration and Remittances Team (2015), for example, by 2015 the number of international migrants living outside of their countries of birth had exceeded 250 million, and according to their forecast, migration pressures are likely to increase over the next decades due to demographic forces, globalization, and climate change. Second, the Global English bias also foregrounds a profound theoretical question: Can we be certain that the theoretical paradigms developed over the past 25 years, which have been almost entirely based on the study of English, are applicable to the understanding of the motivation to learn LOTEs? This article addresses the latter issue from a number of different angles, and the following discussion will (hopefully) demonstrate that a focus on LOTEs is a valid and fruitful research direction to enrich the notion of L2 motivation.

MOTIVATION TO LEARN ENGLISH AND THE L2 MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM

In one of the most extensive large-scale longitudinal investigations of language learning motivation—involving over 13,000 learners over a period of 12 years (1993–2004) and focusing on five target languages (English, German, French, Italian, and Russian) in Hungary—Dörnyei, Csizér, and Németh (2006) observed a fundamental restructuring of the different L2 learning dispositions during the observed period. While Global English maintained its high profile in terms of the learners' language attitudes, the results revealed that the study of the other targeted languages became an increasingly specialized domain of interest. Even the former *lingua franca* of the region, German, gradually became limited to being the favored L2 of a selected few. Furthermore, Global English also displayed a marked shift over the decade: Although its popularity remained as strong as ever, the correlational link between motivation and the choice of English for language learning decreased, which indicated that people in Hungary tended to take

up the study of English increasingly as a routine part of education rather than driven by an L2-specific motivated decision. In other words, even in a part of the world where German has had a dominant role for centuries—consider for example the legacy of the Austro-Hungarian Empire of the Habsburgs or the fact that the region's uncontested economic power is Germany—English has become the default option of L2 choice, with the energy invested in its study forming a class of its own relative to other languages examined.

The specific relevance of the motivational restructuring of language learning in Hungary to the current article is that—as described by Dörnyei (2010)—this investigation has been central to the conceptualization of the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009), which is currently the most commonly applied research paradigm in the field of L2 motivation (see Boo et al., 2015). The survey instrument used in the Hungarian longitudinal study was originally developed on the basis of Gardner's (1985) classical motivation theory, in which *integrative motivation* plays a prominent role. Integrative motivation refers to the desire to learn an L2 of a valued community so that one can communicate with its members and sometimes even to become like them. In the Hungarian study, this factor emerged as the principal motivational variable. However, this finding did not make any obvious theoretical sense: Most of the respondents did not have any direct contact with members of English-speaking communities and therefore the concepts of 'integrating' or 'becoming similar' were not overtly meaningful in their cases. This lack of clarity signaled the need to replace 'integrativeness' with a more holistic concept, and a synthesis of Markus and Nurius's (1986) possible self theory with four strands in L2 motivation research—by Gardner (1985), Dörnyei (1994), Noels (2001), and Ushioda (2001)—led to the formation of the L2 Motivational Self System. This construct consists of three primary constituents as well as a number of conditions that need to be in place for these constituents to have sufficient motivational potency. The three principal components are as follows (see Dörnyei, 2009, for more details): (a) The *ideal L2 self*, which concerns a desirable self-image of the kind of L2 user one would ideally like to be in the future. If people see a discrepancy between this and their current state, they may be motivated to learn a new language or further develop their proficiency in an existing one, (b) The *ought-to L2 self*, which reflects the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet the expectations of others and to

avoid possible negative outcomes in the process of L2 learning. It may bear little resemblance to one's own hopes or desires since these represent someone else's vision for the L2 learner in question and thus they concern an 'imported' image of the future that the learner will then internalize to some extent, (c) The *L2 learning experience*, which focuses on the learner's present experience, covering a range of situated, 'executive' motives related to the immediate learning environment (e.g., the impact of the L2 teacher, the curriculum, the peer group, and the experience of success).

Thus, the theory suggests that there are three primary sources of the motivation to learn a foreign/second language: the learner's internal desire to become an effective L2 user; social pressures coming from the learner's environment to master the L2; and the actual experience of being engaged in the L2 learning process. Boo et al.'s (2015) literature survey shows that this parsimonious division resonated with the research community and became widely applied in empirical studies worldwide. It is thus not unreasonable to conclude that the model does not show any blatant bias toward English learning motivation, but, as we shall see, there are some more subtle aspects of the construct that may not do full justice to the understanding of the motivation underlying LOTEs, either by downplaying certain important features or by providing an insufficiently nuanced representation of areas where the motivation to learn English and LOTEs considerably diverges. In this article we address five such aspects: (a) the confounding interaction of English- and LOTE-related self-images, (b) the individualistic focus of the ideal L2 self, (c) the different nature/role of the ought-to self associated with languages with substantial versus marginal social support, (d) the different nature of goals in the learning of English and LOTEs, and (e) the differing role of unconscious motives in the study of English and LOTEs.

ENGLISH INTERFERENCE

Ortega (e.g., 2014, 2015), among others, underlines the fact that the field of SLA has traditionally been dominated by a monolingual bias (cf. Cook, 1997). Although this claim might sound curious regarding a discipline that is by definition concerned with the acquisition of languages *in addition* to one's mother tongue, Ortega argues that the basic organizing principle of the field has been taking as prototypical a native speaker of a *single* language who sets out to

add to it an L2 by acquiring a *monolingual-like* command of it, resulting in a paradigm that typically ignores the highly frequent phenomenon of bi/multilingualism along with its theoretical underpinnings. In agreement with this argument, we must note that the study of L2 motivation is a case in point. While literally hundreds of studies have been conducted over the past decade to examine what motivates someone to learn an additional language, it has been by and large ignored how the motivational set-up might change when a person studies more than one language at a time. Henry (2010) was one of the first motivation researchers to highlight this situation:

> Research into L2 motivation, irrespective of its conceptual anchoring (i.e. whether in social or personality psychology) has, in theoretical terms, largely concerned itself with situations where monolingual learners are engaged in learning a single L2. Whilst convenient in terms of the delivery of scientific insights into motivational processes, due to both geopolitical (globalization and increasing migration) as well as sociopolitical factors (e.g. the promotion of plurilingualism in Europe), such ideal conditions are increasingly less likely to be found on the ground. (p. 151)

The particular relevance of this issue to the question of LOTEs is that in the vast majority of cases when multiple languages are studied in a parallel manner, these languages include Global English as one of the target languages (provided, of course, that the learners are not members of an English-speaking community, which poses its own unique issues that are outside the scope of this paper). That is, LOTE learning almost always occurs in conjunction with the learning of Global English, and the learning of this metaphorical Goliath, then, is likely to impact on the study of its lower-profile, nonglobal counterparts. Accordingly, to put it broadly, arguably the most important unique characteristic of the motivation to learn LOTEs is the fact that the process typically takes place in the shadow of Global English. Of course, this is a broad generalization that needs to be qualified by many situational factors as well as by the common observation that—as one of the anonymous reviewers helpfully pointed out—the command of Global English is often rather superficial, limited to basic survival skills; indeed, the oft-heard witticism that the primary world language is not English but rather 'broken English' does carry a great deal of truth.

The limited research that is available on this topic is consistent with the assumption that there is considerable confounding interaction

between ideal self-images related to the vision of learning English and LOTEs. Initial results in this regard were obtained by a cluster analytical study by Csizér and colleagues (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei et al., 2006), suggesting that being motivated to learn more than one L2 at the same time causes interference in that positive attitudes toward one language can go at the expense of another. That is, there is 'competition' among the various target languages, and the results indicated that in this competition the likely winner is Global English. Findings by Henry (2010, 2011) also show that learners of different languages seem to possess separate self-concepts and that the English self-concept functions as a normative referent for the other L2 self-concepts. For example, this "referential yardstick" (Henry, 2010, p. 159) can potentially qualify the impact of the other self-images if the latter are seen as inferior in one way or another. In a subsequent theoretical analysis of the dynamics of the self-concept, Henry (2015) further explains that the multidimensional structure of the self-concept is in a constant process of change because not all of the self-concepts will be cognitively active at any given time (see also Henry's conceptual analysis in this special issue). This highlights the role of the *working self-concept*—the "active ingredient" (Henry, 2015, p. 90)—as the target of all the self-images that compete for recognition in this limited mental space.

These results and considerations thus imply that the motivation to learn English could deplete the limited capacity of the working self-concept, thus disadvantaging LOTEs. This is consistent with one of the primary conditions of the effectiveness of ideal selves in Dörnyei's (2009) model, namely that possible selves only become relevant for behavior when they are recruited into the working self-concept, and for this to happen they need to be regularly activated (e.g., by various reminders and self-relevant events). This suggests that, for LOTEs, such activation may be a double necessity, as they compete not only for a place in the limited capacity of the working self-concept but also against the pervasive representation of Global English within the self-concept.

Finally, Dörnyei and Chan (2013) have revisited the question of coexisting ideal self-images and found evidence that suggested that the self-images associated with different target languages are distinct. This in turn implies that they can interfere with each other both in a positive way (e.g., transferable linguistic confidence from one language experience to the other) or in a negative, demotivating manner (e.g., competition for space in the working self-concept). Although past research has usually focused only on the latter, impeding direction of this confounding influence, and usually identified Global English as the culprit that negatively influences LOTEs (hence the 'in the shadow of English' metaphor), we should note that there may be circumstances where the course or the actual value of the impact is reversed (for a detailed theoretical discussion of this question, see Henry, 2017). For example, recent findings by Siridetkoon and Dewaele (2017) suggest that in some cases learners turn to a third language (L3) because of their self-perceived lack of competence in L2 English, while others may choose a LOTE as an L3 exactly because everybody seems to speak English—and thus it "seems to lose its premium value" (p. 12)—whereas the L3 might provide them with a competitive edge in the job market. Accordingly, these authors conclude, "English is not necessarily the bogeyman that dampens interest in other FLs [foreign languages]" (p. 14). Interestingly, Csizér and Lukács (2010) further submit that even the chronological order of starting to learn different languages might shape their overall motivational tenor. In their study, these researchers found that Global English only exerted its full power when it was the first foreign language learned by a student rather than preceded by another foreign language (in their case German). Finally, Henry (2011) rightly points out that some learners might be able to consciously counteract the overpowering effects of Global English by tuning in self-knowledge that can reaffirm their L3 self-concept.

THE SCOPE OF THE IDEAL L2 SELF

One reason why Gardner's concept of integrative motivation has fallen out of favor is the fact that it was seen by many to be linked to the learners' attitudes toward the target language community, whereas such a direct link could not be maintained with regard to Global English associated with "a nonspecific global community of English language users" (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2009, p. 3). Therefore, Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) reasoned that the process of identification underlying the concept of integrativeness might be better explained as an internal process of identification with a projected future image *within* the person's self-concept, rather than identification with an external reference group such as the L2 community. This illustrates the fact that a major factor facilitating the shift from integrativeness to the ideal L2 self was directly linked to the impact of Global English in the sense that scholars were looking for

a paradigm that could accommodate the special, universal status of learning this language.

One may, however, also argue that this shift did not only produce benefits but also incurred costs. The emerging individualistic—that is, learner-internal and L2-community-independent—perspective of the L2 Motivational Self System did not favor LOTEs, as the latter can usually be associated with a specific community that speaks (or esteems) the L2 and can thus be considered the 'owner' of that language. For example, we have already mentioned briefly the powerful 21st century process of migration, which is resulting in millions of people deciding to take up studying a certain LOTE for the simple reason that they find themselves in the specific geographical area where the language in question is spoken (or because they plan to move there). Likewise, the metaphorical 'ownership' of a LOTE by a speech community is also evident in heritage language learning, which is motivated by ancestral ties, suggesting that here, too, L2 motivation will have closer ties with the disposition toward a specific population than with the image of becoming a global citizen. It may therefore be argued that not accounting for these specific ties directly may diminish the explanatory power of an L2 motivation theory regarding the study of LOTEs, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that a reconsideration of the attitudinal link between the learner and the respective community would be beneficial for doing the motivation of LOTE learning full justice.

Finally, the individualistic flavor of the ideal L2 image—in the sense that it represents a specific future image of a single person using a single L2—may also be responsible for concealing a further potentially important motivational disposition that involves a learner having an image of him/herself as a language user who commands more than one foreign language. From the perspective of the current version of the L2 Motivational Self System, such a 'multilingual self' does not lend itself easily to actual visualization, because the visionary aspect of the theory has mostly been operationalized as imagining oneself using one L2 in a concrete situation. This practice (perhaps unintentionally) shifts the conception of future self-images into a monolingual track, even though a multilingual disposition might be a core motivational foundation for many learners who are not content with the knowledge of Global English only.

To sum up this section, we have highlighted two interrelated biases potentially affecting the conception of the ideal L2 self, an individualistic bias

that originates from the somewhat decontextualized nature of Global English and a monolingual bias that has been a feature of the field of SLA in general. It may be useful to note at this point that the individualistic versus more communal conflict associated with the conceptualization of future self-images ties in with a broader issue in social psychology concerning the role of *context*, as manifested most clearly in the person–context debates (e.g., McAdams, 2001) contrasting a more *individualistic* and a more *societal* perspective: The former, whose epitome is social cognitive theory, views the complexity of the social environment through the individual's eyes, that is, as the world's complexity is reflected in the individual's mental processes and the ensuing attitudes, beliefs, and values; in contrast, the contextual/ societal perspective places more emphasis on accounting for the influence of broader social processes and macrocontextual factors, such as sociocultural norms, traditions, and processes, as illustrated best by social identity theory (see, e.g., Abrams & Hogg, 1999). The understanding of individual-level motivation with regard to such an inherently social phenomenon as language learning has always involved having to find some compromise between the two perspectives, and it is interesting to see that two articles in this special issue, by MacIntyre, Baker, and Sparling (2017) and Henry (2017), introduce two intriguing new concepts that might offer to bridge the existing gap between the two perspectives, the *'Rooted L2 Self'* and the *'Ideal Multilingual Self,'* respectively:

Rooted L2 Self

In examining the motivational characteristics of heritage language learning in Cape Breton, Canada, MacIntyre et al. (2017) observed a strong community-level motive that differed 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—most notably music and dance—of the heritage community (in their case, Gaelic). As the authors emphasize, this conceptualization is in line with Ushioda's (2009) person-in-context relational model, which perceives the foundations of motivation organically evolving from the close interaction between individuals and their cultural and historical contexts. Although the motive identified by MacIntyre et al. is similar to ideal self-images in that individuals with a rooted L2 self see themselves embedded in the community in the long run—thus presenting an extension in the future—it foregrounds collective properties

rather than, as the authors summarize, "within-person motivational processes." The introduction of a new term to describe this added emphasis is warranted by the salience of the underlying phenomenon, the power of the surrounding sociocultural traditions, which also explains the unique position of the ought-to self in relation to the construct: As the authors expound, within this rooted self perspective "the ought-to self does not necessarily reflect unwanted obligation to learn the language of an outside group, but rather a welcome (albeit challenging) obligation to continue the Gaelic traditions into which they were born" (pp. 513).

Ideal Multilingual Self

In their Hungarian study, Dörnyei et al. (2006) noticed that some particularly motivated students displayed a wide interest in foreign languages in general, and this broader cosmopolitan disposition appeared to have resulted in more established and salient ideal L2 selves. Likewise, Gardner's integrative motive also contained a component labeled 'interest in foreign languages,' which concerned a general disposition that was unrelated to any specific target language. Consistent with these antecedents, Henry (2017) introduces the concept of the "ideal multilingual self" involving a person's "aspirations to be/become multilingual," and argues that it 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. Furthermore, as Henry submits, the ideal multilingual self also has the capability to create increased stability and cohesion within the identity of the multilingual person by helping to align the ideal L2 and L3 selves with each other. In his conceptualization, the ideal multilingual self emerges through the dynamic interplay of components of the learner's self-concept, and by embedding the notion in a dynamic systems framework, Henry provides a robust theoretical foundation for future elaboration. (It is important to note here that the idea of a multilingual/plurilingual future self-image has also been discussed by two other contributions to this special issue, Busse, 2017, and Ushioda, 2017.)

THE SCOPE OF THE OUGHT-TO L2 SELF

A consideration of the status of LOTEs within the overall picture of L2 motivation highlights certain issues with regard to the scope of the ought-to L2 self as well. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the explanatory power of the ought-to dimension of the L2 Motivational Self System has been limited compared to the impact of the ideal L2 self (see, e.g., Dörnyei & Chan, 2013; You, Dörnyei, & Csizér, 2016), with the main reason suggested being that because ought-to self-images are externally sourced, they are less internalized than their ideal counterparts; thus, although they may play a role in shaping the learners' motivational mindset, in many language contexts they lack the energizing capacity to make a difference in actual learning behaviors. While this may be a valid observation, You et al. (2016) have still maintained about the ought-to L2 self that "The theoretical position about this self-guide is straightforward; in most respects, it is similar to the Ideal L2 Self" (p. 97). That is, it has been suggested that the chief theoretical difference between someone's ideal and ought-to self-images concerns the source where the image was originally initiated. One may wonder, however, whether this assumption, which was based primarily on investigations of Global English, is equally true of LOTEs?

Regarding Global English, it seems justifiable to conceive a fairly homogenous ought-to self-image—which is thus not unlike the ideal self-image—because the societal support surrounding the learning of English is often relatively even and unchanging. Does this, however, also characterize the learning of LOTEs, which attracts support from some social circles, indifference from others, and perhaps even discouraging attitudes from certain authority figures who see LOTEs as mere distractions? Would it not be a more realistic position, instead, to state that the ought-to L2 self of LOTE learners is more *fragmented,* and that in some situations this fragmentation might reach such a degree that it cannot be considered a unified self-dimension anymore? Let us look at this matter more closely.

Already Dörnyei's (2009) original proposal of the L2 Motivational Self System contained a key condition, namely that the future self-image should be in harmony, or at least should not clash, with the expectations of the learner's family, peers, and other elements of the social environment. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) further explain, perceived social/group norms that are incongruent with one's self-image are obviously counterproductive, and so are ideal and ought-to self-images that are in conflict with each other. Yet, previous discussions have usually focused only on the last aspect of this condition, namely on the clash between the ideal and the

ought-to selves, without elaborating on any potential conflicts *within* the ought-to self. With regard to LOTEs, however, this latter consideration is unavoidable, which raises the fundamental question as to whether it still makes sense to speak about *the* ought-to L2 self in the case of LOTE learning, or whether it would be more useful to assume the existence of several, potentially conflicting disparate ought-to L2 self-images in this respect.

This issue becomes particularly acute when we also adopt a multilingual perspective, because, as Dörnyei and Chan (2013) have found, when multiple languages are studied simultaneously, a powerful confounding variable is the source of the external stimulus, which can override the specific nature of the target language:

> … while some language impact was clearly detectable in the expectations coming from authority figures, this was confounded by another categorization principle, the division of the external images according to their source. This makes intuitive sense because foreign language proficiency is often referred to in a collective manner by external sources (e.g., by the media), which weakens and can even diminish the boundaries between L2-specific visions. (p. 456)

Consequently, Dörnyei and Chan (2013) concluded that it would be enlightening to study situations where the societal support for different target languages is imbalanced (unlike the institutional support for English in Mandarin that characterized their research venue, Hong Kong). In Indonesia, for example, Sugiharto (2015) reports that despite long-standing official policies aiming to preserve the local languages and to promote the spirit of nationalism, many Indonesians generally disregard these policies and continue using English in daily communication, ignoring possible sanctions from the state. In fact, even state officials and politicians violate these policies by saturating their speeches with loan words and code-switching, thereby communicating to the public the value of English over their local languages. Accordingly, one would assume that the ought-to L2 self dimension in a country like Indonesia would be radically different from the relatively straightforward picture concerning the ought-to Global English self in some other parts of the world. This is clearly an area that warrants further research.

Reactance and the Anti-Ought-to Self

A special, and highly intriguing, aspect of the ought-to L2 self dimension of LOTE learning concerns a scenario whereby the powerful influence of English might have a reverse effect, especially for individuals high in *psychological reactance* (Brehm & Brehm, 1981). Psychological reactance is "a motivational state [that] possesses energizing properties that drive individuals to engage in freedom-restoration behaviors" (Miron & Brehm, 2006, p. 10). When they perceive their freedom to be constrained, individuals high in psychological reactance tend to behave in an oppositional way—sometimes unconsciously—in an attempt to preserve their autonomy (Chartrand, Dalton, & Fitzsimons, 2007). To illustrate the concept of reactance, Miron and Brehm (2006) give the example of the Broadway musical *The Fantasticks*, in which two fathers plan to make their children fall in love with each other. However, rather than encouraging them, the fathers build a fence between their properties, which the youth perceive as an intrusion upon their freedom to meet each other whenever they want to. Consequently, they contrive to restore their sense of autonomy by seeing each other, and, guess what, they eventually fall in love.

Since in almost all cases learning English is societally valued and institutionally encouraged far more than LOTEs, some people high in reactance may (perhaps unconsciously) resist learning it, while some others might 'fall in love' with a LOTE that is not encouraged, or even explicitly discouraged, by authority figures. In line with this, Thompson and Vásquez (2015) report a case study of Alex, an American learner of Chinese, who was told by his Chinese teacher early on that he was no good at this language and therefore he should choose another language to study. However, Alex decided to persist in order to prove himself, and later explicitly stated in an interview that these doubts actually *motivated* him to study Chinese. Thompson and Vásquez have attributed this source of motivation to the existence of an *anti-ought-to L2 self* (see also Thompson, 2017, in this special issue). In a similar vein, Lanvers (2016) describes the *rebellious profile* of learners who reject other-imposed selves that clash with their own actual or ideal L2 selves, while Oakes (2013) reports on English learners of LOTEs rejecting the so-called 'monoglot culture' (i.e., the prevalence of inadequate foreign language skills in the UK). Finally, Dörnyei, Henry, and Muir (2016) also present the stories of several L2 learners for whom a negative external expectation has triggered an intensive motivational drive (i.e., a Directed Motivational Current). We must note, however, that most of this literature comes from individual case studies, and so only future research would tell how generalizable these findings are.

THE SPECIFICITY OF GOALS AND VISIONS WHEN LEARNING LOTES

It has been mentioned earlier that one of the main results of Dörnyei et al.'s (2006) longitudinal investigation in Hungary was the observation that although during the examined period the popularity of Global English remained as strong as ever, the correlational link between motivation and the choice of English for language learning decreased. This indicated that people tended to take up the study of English increasingly as a self-evident part of education rather than as driven by an L2-specific motivational decision. Indeed, given the pervasive presence of the English language in films, on television, and on the Internet, a growing proportion of the population of the 'global village' have come to view the mastery of English as a basic requirement not unlike the literacy to read and write or use computers and other digital devices (the latter of which has also been considered by more and more people as a life necessity). Thus, despite the fact that not everybody will become a competent user of English, a characteristic feature of learning Global English worldwide is that it does not require any special justification—that is, it is the default or 'unmarked' option of language choice. Indeed, finding out about, say, a Hungarian that she has acquired good English but has not studied Spanish or German or any other foreign language might seem perfectly normal; contrast this, however, with discovering that the same person has actually mastered advanced-level Spanish but has never studied English! For many people, the latter would be a curious scenario, with the obvious question arising: *why*. In answer to this question, one would expect to hear a rather individualized reason or story that would justify making the nontrivial investment of time and effort into a LOTE rather than Global English.

This example touches upon a defining feature of LOTE learning: A high level of LOTE proficiency is normally associated with highly specific and personalized reasons on the part of the learner. In the previous sections we have already addressed some aspects of this individualized disposition when discussing, for example, the rooted L2 self (for heritage learners), the ideal multilingual L2 self or the anti-ought-to L2 self. Here we may add that learning a language for religious purposes would also fall under this category because, as Watt and Fairfield (2008) conclude, "a highly specific ideology of language will emerge among religious practitioners" (p. 355). Significantly in this respect, in reviewing a cluster of motivation studies (Chan, 2013; Ding, 2013; Lepp–Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013) in an anthology on Christian faith and SLA (Wong, Kristjansson, & Dörnyei, 2013), Ushioda (2013a) observed that "when language learning motivation is intimately bound up with one's Christian faith or sense of Christian vocation, this motivation becomes very powerful and sustaining" (pp. 224–225).

It is interesting to note that with such faith-based motivation the individualistic focus of the L2 Motivational Self System may turn out to be an analytical asset, rather than a constraint, because, as Ushioda (2013a) continues, "the L2 Motivational Self System is theorized in terms of the individual's self-related beliefs, visions, and aspirations and, hence, conceptually speaking, it can accommodate personal beliefs in divine sources of motivation and religious ideals" (p. 225). The relevance of the religious dimension of motivation to the current discussion concerning LOTEs lies in the fact that many religions today require a certain amount of linguistic ritual for the purpose of faith development (Keane, 1997). In fact, there is a tendency among followers of certain religions to prefer the original ancient language associated with the sacred writings of the religion in question, "as authenticity tolls loudest when rung out by ancient syllables" (Watt & Fairfield, 2008, pp. 359–360), with examples including Sanskrit in Hinduism, Hebrew in Judaism, Classical Arabic in Islam, Greek and Latin in Christianity, and Pali in Buddhism.

Coming back to the general question of the specificity of purpose when learning LOTEs, Dörnyei and Chan (2013) state that "in light of the ambiguities that have surfaced with regard to the ought-to self, it would have been better to apply more elaborate scales targeting different types of external pressures separately … instead of using a single ought-to self scale" (p. 456). It appears that, in view of the previous considerations, there is a need to account for the increased specificity of LOTE learning: In order to understand the underlying motivation to master LOTEs fully, researchers may need to employ more finely tuned instruments and procedures than the ones that have been applied for surveying motivation to learn Global English. Recent scholarship, for example, has highlighted the significant role of the learners' 'narrative identity' (Dörnyei, 2017; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015) as a component of their personalities, and it is evident from the above that LOTE learners will have particularly unique and often unusual stories to tell. The practical implication of this recognition is that long-term LOTE learning may only be successful if students

have had the opportunity to construct aspects of their narrative identities that support their unique language-learning enterprise. This is, of course, also relevant to learning Global English to some extent, but without the large-scale and multifaceted global backing that Global English enjoys, the significance of this principle may be increasingly true of attaining LOTEs.

UNCONSCIOUS MOTIVATION

In 1968, psychologist Robert Zajonc demonstrated that being exposed to a stimulus repeatedly leads to a more favorable attitude toward that stimulus. This came to be known as the *mere exposure effect,* indicating that, generally speaking, the more familiar individuals become with a certain social object, and the more they are exposed to it, the more they tend to prefer it. Subsequent research has shown that this is a robust and reliable phenomenon that cannot be explained away simply by recognition memory or perceptual fluency (Zajonc, 2001), and it was also demonstrated that, whether this stimulus is presented supraliminally (i.e., in a consciously perceptible manner) or subliminally (i.e., in a consciously not perceptible way), its impact still occurs without the participant's awareness of the link between the exposure and their preferences—in other words, the core process operates *unconsciously* (see Bargh, 2016). The exposure effect is highly relevant to Global English because, as the world's *lingua franca* it receives significantly more exposure than LOTEs, a trend that has been amplified by technology in multiple spheres (including the entertainment industry, academia, and more generally the media and advertisements); furthermore, among young people in particular, the Internet has facilitated an unprecedented amount of access to social media, chat rooms, and digital gaming, all of which involve real-time communication and interaction with others in English (Henry, 2013; Richards, 2015).

Zajonc's (1968) classical study is a powerful illustration of the fact that the psychological dimension of SLA cannot be fully understood without accounting for the unconscious level of motivation, particularly in an era of language globalization. Even though unconscious attitudes and motives have been largely ignored in psychology since the outset of the cognitive revolution in the 1970s, the past decade has brought about a marked change in this respect: As Ryan and Legate (2012) summarize in the conclusion of the *Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation* (Ryan, 2012), the notion that the human mind contains two distinct processing channels—explicit and implicit—that can have differential effects on motivation is currently the single most widely cited area with regard to the future of mainstream motivation research.

In the study of L2 motivation, the idea of an unconscious agency driving human behavior has been highlighted by Al-Hoorie (2015), who has argued that the conscious-biased view of human motivation might be at best incomplete, and at worst misguided. In an attempt to examine the implicit attitudes of language learners, Al-Hoorie (2016a) employed the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) to compare the impact of explicit and implicit attitudes toward L2 speakers. The results showed that accounting for the learners' level of implicit attitudes had substantial effects on the explanatory power of the results; for example, students with harmoniously positive explicit and implicit attitudes were more open to the L2 group than those who reported a positive explicit disposition but held negative implicit attitudes. The importance of the harmony versus discrepancy of conscious/unconscious attitudes was further corroborated in a follow-up study by Al-Hoorie (2016b), which additionally included academic achievement as a criterion measure.

Regarding the motivation to learn Global English and LOTEs, there are good reasons to suspect that there may be marked differences in the unconscious domains associated with the two learning types, with each domain having unique issues in this respect. For example, past discussions have highlighted an area of significant contention concerning the unstoppable spread of English, contrasting the utility of a globalized *lingua franca* with the extensive damage it may cause. Indeed, language globalization has sometimes been described as 'linguistic genocide'—most famously by Skutnabb–Kangas (2000)—and it is safe to conclude that the conflicting views about this matter inevitably leave unconscious undercurrents in many L2 learners. Japan, for example, can be seen as a prime example of a learning environment that is characterized by a deep-seated discrepancy between the high-profile discourse of internationalization through the promotion of English, and the society's subtle and often unconscious resistance to language globalization, resulting in a marked incongruity between the efforts and resources invested and the rate of success observed in English language learning (see, e.g., Apple, Da Silva, & Fellner, 2013).

With regard to LOTEs, a unique area of conscious/unconscious divergence might concern

the ambiguous societal status of these languages in many countries as well as the learners' potentially conflicting relationship with the 'ownership group' of the LOTE in question (e.g., a heritage group or a faith community). A further area of conflict is likely to result from conscious and unconscious comparisons made between aspects of LOTEs and Global English, a subject that we have already discussed in the first half of this article under the rubric of English interference. Finally, the fact that the instruction of LOTEs is often hindered by inadequate institutional support, detrimental policy restrictions, and financial cutbacks (Leeman & King, 2015) is also bound to evoke conflicting attitudes not only at the conscious but also the unconscious level.

A particularly fertile environment for the emergence of powerful unconscious attitudes involves multilingual communities characterized by *diglossia* (Ferguson, 1959), a situation whereby within a multilingual society one language is considered more prestigious and used in public, while the other language is viewed as inferior and used only at home or in informal communication. Individuals in diglossic societies may develop negative attitudes toward the language of the lower status, and this might negatively affect its maintenance, revitalization efforts, and passing it to offspring. In this regard, Sarkar and Metallic (2009) describe a 'three-generation cycle' in which the first monolingual generation is followed by a second bilingual generation (with English typically being the L2) who in turn raise a third monolingual generation speaking the dominant language (English). Significantly, many of these third-generation speakers may feel shame and insecurity about their original language (Leeman & King, 2015), and we would expect some important attitudinal judgments in these situations to occur at the unconscious level.

To conclude this section on the unconscious sphere of motivation, let us mention an intriguing psychological phenomenon that might be heavily involved in the unconscious determination of human agency, the *post-priming misattribution process* (see, e.g., Bar-Anan, Wilson, & Hassin, 2010). In laboratory studies participants were unconsciously primed with a goal whose achievement required them to select one particular option out of a number of alternatives. Interestingly, after they made the 'right' choice and were asked in retrospect about the cause of their behavior, the unconsciously primed participants tended to misattribute their behaviors to some internal state, such as permanent dispositions or temporary preferences, resulting in a striking se-

quence: (a) a primed goal can influence people's behavior, (b) people then fail to recognize the effect of the prime, (c) they therefore misattribute their behavior to their internal state, and (d) this 'confabulated' internal state is then often incorporated into their self-concept, thereby influencing subsequent behavior. This last point manifests the downstream effect of post-priming misattribution that can lead to a long-lasting impact of the erroneously inferred self-knowledge.

Undoubtedly, further research is needed to establish the extent to which such unconscious processes shape L2 motivation, but it seems evident to us that this uncharted area has a great deal to offer to the clarification of why people learn—or perhaps more importantly, do *not* learn—LOTEs. Furthermore, the above considerations also have clear bearings on measurement issues in the study of motivation. In many situations, it may be wise to start reconsidering the overreliance on simple self-report questionnaires and interviews, as these techniques make findings prone to what the participant might "rationalize retrospectively" (Ushioda, 2013b, p. 236). Accordingly, Ushioda has advocated "developing a more richly grounded and multidimensional *in situ* analysis of how processes of motivation evolve through particular classroom events, interactions and practices" (p. 236), and over the past decades psychologists in general have also shown a keen interest in circumventing direct self-reports by devising a number of indirect measures (for reviews, see Nosek, Hawkins, & Frazier, 2011; Petty, Fazio, & Briñol, 2009).

CONCLUSION

The starting point of our article was the recognition that the past two decades of L2 motivation research have been defined by efforts to develop models and constructs that could accommodate the unique characteristics of Global English as the target language. We have argued that even if the resulting theories may not display any obvious bias toward English learning motivation, they may still feature certain subtle aspects that do not do full justice to the understanding of the motivation underlying learning LOTEs. We have addressed several potential issues in this regard and have identified a number of areas where the motivation to learn Global English and LOTEs diverges. Arguably, the most salient aspect of the motivation associated with LOTE learning is the fact that it typically takes place in conjunction with the study of English, which may incur comparisons both at the conscious and

unconscious levels. These comparisons often—but not always—favor English, which implies that a prerequisite to the successful mastery of LOTEs is not only an incentive to attain the L2 in question but also the resilience required to be able to learn it in the shadow of Global English, as ideal LOTE self-images need to compete for a place in the limited capacity of the working self-concept in the face of the pervasive representation of Global English.

While a comparison with Global English is usually construed as a handicap, we have argued that the motivation to learn LOTEs has two potential characteristics that can be utilized to overcome this impediment. First, unlike English, LOTEs are usually associated with a specific community that 'owns' the L2, and the generation of positive attitudes toward this community may be facilitative to fostering the motivation to learn their language. It was noted, however, that at a theoretical level the L2 Motivational Self System is not sensitive to this aspect, which underlines MacIntyre et al.'s (2017) proposal for a new, community-based addition to the motivational dimension of the self-concept, the 'Rooted L2 Self.' Second, unlike the 'default-like' nature of the universal desire to master Global English, a high level of LOTE proficiency is normally associated with very specific and personalized reasons on the part of the learner, such as motives associated with learning a heritage language or studying a language for religious or immigration purposes. This recognition has considerable practical implications in that a fruitful avenue for motivating LOTE learners is to give them the opportunity to construct their narrative identity in a way that buttresses their unique language-learning enterprise.

A third feature of the motivational basis of LOTE learning that differs from that of Global English is the fact that the former can gain support from what Henry (2017) has termed the 'Ideal Multilingual Self' (see also Busse's, 2017, notion of the 'plurilingual future self' and Ushioda, 2017, for a further discussion of the significance of the ideal multilingual self-image): Learners who have successfully developed this self-guide can draw additional strength from it and the ideal multilingual self also has a stabilizing effect within the various L2-specific self-images in the overall self-concept. On the other hand, with regard to another self-dimension, the ought-to L2 self, not only are LOTEs disadvantaged by the typically lower level of social support available relative to Global English, but we have also argued that the ought-to L2 self of LOTE learners is often so fragmented that it is hardly more than a collec-

tion of several, potentially conflicting disparate ought-to L2 self-images sourced by different segments of the social world surrounding the learner. However, an intriguing self-guide in this respect may actually work in favor of LOTEs: Individuals high in psychological reactance might choose to study an L2 exactly because it goes against the grain of social expectations, a phenomenon which Thompson and Vásquez (2015; Thompson, 2017) have labeled the *anti-ought-to L2 self*.

Finally, we have raised the question of the extent to which unconscious attitudes and motives might shape L2 motivation. The limited evidence available suggests that the impact of implicit, not-fully-conscious factors might play a stronger role in language attainment than formerly believed, and we have highlighted several aspects of the learning of Global English versus LOTEs where one might expect to find conflicting patterns of underlying conscious and unconscious motives. Currently, this is a largely uncharted area in the study of L2 motivation, but in the light of the amount of cutting-edge research directed at this matter in mainstream motivational psychology, it is safe to predict that this direction of inquiry is likely to gain momentum over the next decade. Given the controversial nature and evaluations of language globalization, understanding the unconscious dimension of the disparate views held by people in this respect has potentially a great deal to offer to further our understanding of the motivational differences underlying the Global English–LOTE contrast. Moreover, it was argued that this issue has considerable research methodological implications, a point that also applies more generally to the whole study of motivation to learn LOTEs.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1999). *Social identity and social cognition*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2015). Human agency: Does the beach ball have free will? In Z. Dörnyei, P. 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, 423–454.

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016b). Unconscious motivation. Part II: Implicit attitudes and L2 achievement. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 619–649.

Apple, M. T., Da Silva, D., & Fellner, T. (Eds.). (2013). *Language learning motivation in Japan.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bar-Anan, Y., Wilson, T. D., & Hassin, R. R. (2010). Inaccurate self-knowledge formation as a result of automatic behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 884–894.

Bargh, J. A. (2016). Awareness of the prime versus awareness of its influence: Implications for the real-world scope of unconscious higher mental processes. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 12,* 49–52.

Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005–2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System, 55,* 145–157.

Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control.* New York: Academic Press.

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.

Chan, L. (2013). Christian Language Professionals (CLPs) and integrated vision: The stories of four educators. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjansson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 206–222). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Chartrand, T. L, Dalton, A. N., & Fitzsimons, G. J. (2007). Nonconscious relationship reactance: When significant others prime opposing goals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43,* 719–726.

Comanaru, R., & Noels, K. A. (2009). Self-Determination, motivation, and the learning of Chinese as a heritage language. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66,* 131–158.

Cook, V. (1997). Monolingual bias in second language acquisition. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34,* 35–49.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning, 55,* 613–659.

Csizér, K., & Lukács, G. (2010). The comparative analysis of motivation, attitudes and selves: The case of English and German in Hungary. *System, 38,* 1–13.

Ding, P. (2013). Cosmopolitanism, Christianity, and the contemporary Chinese context: Impacts upon second language motivation. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjansson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 189–205). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). 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. (2010). Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. In S. Hunston & D. Oakey (Eds.), *Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts and skills* (pp. 74–83). London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

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.* Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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,* 437–462.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics, 23,* 421–462.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, U. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal, 100* (Supplement 2016), 19–47.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15,* 325–340.

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

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1464–1480.

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,* 149–162.

Henry, A. (2011). Examining the impact of L2 English on L3 selves: A case study. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8,* 235–255.

Henry, A. (2013). Digital games and ELT: Bridging the authenticity gap. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), *International perspectives on motivation: Language learning and professional challenges* (pp. 133–155). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Henry, A. (2015). The dynamics of possible selves. In Z. Dörnyei, P. 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*, 548–565.

Keane, W. (1997). Religious language. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 26*, 47–71.

Lanvers, U. (2016). Lots of Selves, some rebellious: Developing the Self Discrepancy Model for Language Learners. *System, 60*, 79–92.

Leeman, J., & King, K. A. (2015). Heritage language education: Minority language speakers, second language instruction, and monolingual schooling. In M. Bigelow & J. Ennser-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 210–223). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Lepp–Kaethler, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). The role of sacred texts in enhancing motivation and living the vision in second language acquisition. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjansson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 171–188). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

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*, 501–516.

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

May, S. (2014). Introducing the "multilingual turn." In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 1–6). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

McAdams, D. P. (2001). *The person: An integrated introduction to personality psychology* (3rd ed.). London: Harcourt College.

Migration and Remittances Team. (2015). *Migration and development brief 24*. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROSPECTS/Resources/334934–1288990760745/MigrationandDevelopmentBrief24.pdf

Miron, A. M., & Brehm, J. W. (2006). Reactance theory—40 years later. *Social Psychology* (formerly *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*), *37*, 9–18.

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

Nosek, B. A., Hawkins, C. B., & Frazier, R. S. (2011). Implicit social cognition: From measures to mechanisms. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 15*, 152–159.

Oakes, L. (2013). Foreign language learning in a 'monoglot culture': Motivational variables among students of French and Spanish at an English university. *System, 41*, 178–191.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–53). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Ortega, L. (2015). Second language learning explained? SLA across 10 contemporary theories. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 245–272). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Petty, R. E., Fazio, R. H., & Briñol, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures.* New York: Psychology Press.

Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom. *RELC Journal, 46*, 5–22.

Ryan, R. M. (Ed.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of human motivation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Legate, N. (2012). Through a fly's eye: Multiple yet overlapping perspectives on future directions for human motivation research. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 554–564). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sarkar, M., & Metallic, M. A. (2009). Indigenizing the structural syllabus: The challenge of revitalizing Mi'gmaq in Listuguj. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*, 49–71.

Siridetkoon, P., & Dewaele, J.–M. (2017). Ideal self and ought-to self of simultaneous learners of multiple foreign languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* Early View, 25 February 2017. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1293063

Skutnabb–Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—Or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sugiharto, S. (2015). Disentangling linguistic imperialism in English language education: The Indonesian context. In M. Bigelow & J. Ennser–Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 224–236). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Thompson, A. S. (2017). Language learning motivation in the United States: An examination of language choice and multilingualism. *Modern Language Journal, 101*, 483–500.

Thompson, A. S., & Vásquez, C. (2015). Exploring motivational profiles through language learning narratives. *Modern Language Journal, 99*, 158–174.

Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93–125, Technical Report #123). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Mánoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2013a). Christian faith, motivation and L2 learning: Personal, social and research perspectives. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjansson, & Z.

Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 223–229). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Ushioda, E. (2013b). Motivation and ELT: Looking ahead to the future. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), *International perspectives on motivation: Language learning and professional challenges* (pp. 233–239). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ushioda, E. (2017). The impact of Global English on motivation to learn other languages: Toward an ideal multilingual self. *Modern Language Journal, 101*, 469–482.

Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: A theoretical overview. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 1–8). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Watt, J. M., & Fairfield, S. L. (2008). Religious and sacred literacies. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 355–366). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wong, M. S., Kristjansson, C., & Dörnyei, Z. (Eds.). (2013). *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

You, C., Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2016). Motivation, vision, and gender: A survey of learners of English in China. *Language Learning, 66*, 94–123.

Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Series, 9* (2, Pt. 2), 1–27.

Zajonc, R. B. (2001). Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10*, 224–228.