John Benjamins Publishing Company

This is a contribution from *Researching L2 Task Performance and Pedagogy. In honour of Peter Skehan*.
Edited by Zhisheng (Edward) Wen and Mohammad Javad Ahmadian.

CHAPTER 3

Task motivation

What makes an L2 task engaging?

Zoltán Dörnyei
University of Nottingham / Beijing Normal University

Any cognitive benefit from an instructional activity requires that the participants engage with the learning process, and yet the study of 'task motivation' has not been a featured theme in research on either L2 motivation or on L2 tasks. This chapter begins with a discussion of the possible causes of this limited interest in the topic, followed by an overview of past theorizing on how motivation unfolds in specific behavioural segments such as learning tasks. It is then argued that recent research on 'directed motivational currents' (DMCs) offers a new angle for the understanding of task engagement, as it considers in a unified construct a person's initial motivation (goal/vision) and its manifestation in the individual's actual action, that is, in task participation. This integration of a motive and the ensuing task behaviour is believed to offer a fruitful framework to explore task motivation afresh, and the chapter concludes by addressing the question of what makes an L2 task engaging.

Introduction

One of the defining periods of my professional life occurred at the end of the 1990s when I was part of Peter Skehan's SLA research lab at Thames Valley University, London. This period coincided with the "golden age" of task research, as scholars had increasingly recognised the significance of the language learning task as the basic conceptual unit to analyse learning behaviours, student performance and the ensuing L2 acquisition (e.g., Bygate, 1999; Crookes & Gass, 1993a, 1993b; Foster, 1998; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan, 1998a, 1998b; Skehan & Foster, 1997, 1999). Of course – as this volume so clearly demonstrates – Peter played a central role in spearheading this research interest, and together with his close associate, Pauline Foster, he published influential empirical studies that set task research on a new trajectory (e.g., by applying the famous trio of accuracy, complexity and fluency to analysing task performance). I still remember a conversation Peter and I had at that

https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.13.04dor

time (in the car park of Thames Valley University, of all places), discussing the multiple variables determining the quality and quantity of students' task achievement: We speculated that the predominantly cognitive approach to understanding task performance could perhaps be fruitfully complemented by adding an "individual learner difference" dimension. Although we did start a research project in this area by summarising what we considered to be the crucial learner characteristics to be taken into account (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003), life took us to different parts of the world soon afterwards (Peter to Hong Kong and me to Nottingham) and we never returned to the initial "car park" scheme. Over the next decade, Judit Kormos, Wen-ta Tseng and I published a few papers on task motivation (e.g. Dörnyei, 2002; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Dörnyei & Tseng, 2009; Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004), but for a number of reasons this line of inquiry gradually ground to a halt. Therefore, I am grateful for the opportunity to revisit the topic of task motivation, and it is fitting that this "visit" should take place within a volume dedicated to Peter, to whom I will always be grateful.

The cognitive dominance in task research

In a pioneering study on task motivation in educational psychology, Winne and Marx (1989) highlighted the predominantly cognitive character of research on learning tasks. Regarding the marked imbalance in the study of cognition and affect in this line of inquiry, they concluded that researchers had traditionally viewed the key factor in task performance to be the "students' *capability* to exercise cognition rather than the selection, temperament, or persistence of cognition" (p. 227). This cognitive dominance was partly due to the governing cognitive perspective in psychology at that time, and it also had to do with the fact that task performance lent itself to be analysed in cognitive terms. This was well illustrated, for example, by a study by Dörnyei and Tseng (2009), in which we focused primarily on cognitive factors when discussing L2 task motivation, such as the learners' appraisal, noticing capacity and the ongoing process of "action control", that is, engagement with various self-regulatory mechanisms that are called into force in order to enhance, scaffold or protect learning-specific action. Yet, while the prevailing zeitgeist of the time clearly helped to generate a supportive environment for cognitive research, it did not fully explain the surprising paucity of motivational studies in explaining task performance, particularly in view of the fact that motivation research was thriving in examining other aspects of student achievement in SLA (e.g., Dörnyei, 2001b; Boo, Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). I would suggest that there was one further important factor that can explain the scant attention devoted to the role of motivation in task completion: the "learning mode" (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000, p. 293)

that is typically adopted by students when pursuing instructional tasks. Let us look at this concept more closely.

Based on empirical data collected for a language task performed both in the students' L1 and L2, Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) argued that a peculiar feature of language classes is the fact that because of accepting the tenet that 'practice makes perfect', students are willing to participate in rather bizarre interactions with little or no real communicative meaning (e.g. certain drills or "What colour is this pen?" kind of dialogues), whereas in authentic, real life communication they would be unlikely to take such meaningless exchanges seriously. In the specific study we conducted, when learners repeated the L2 task in their L1, the difference in their performance did not merely involve an increased ease of speech but also a clear indication of "the suspension of the 'learning mode'" (p. 294): As learners performed the task in their mother tongue, they reactivated several important determinants of human communication (e.g., the impact of the relationship with the interlocutor or the interest in the topic) that were almost completely overridden in the L2 version. The main lesson of these findings for the current discussion is that when learners are in an 'L2 task pursuit mode', their performance is largely defined by their capability, which means that as long as students take the research task seriously – that is, as long as they are ready to adopt the 'learning mode' – cognitive and task-structure variables will explain a significant proportion of the variance in the participants' performance. Laboratory studies of task performance tend to guarantee the necessary level of student cooperation by their very nature (as learners typically volunteer or are paid for their participation), and even in classroom-based studies students are usually brought 'motivationally on board', so to speak, by the time of the data collection through the kind of preparation of the field study that research methods books typically underline as a prerequisite.

As a result, in most investigations into L2 tasks the learners' motivational filter is sufficiently down to allow for meaningful cognitive patterns to emerge without including motivational variables in task research designs. Indeed, in examining the range of factors that influence the level of L2 task performance, the bulk of past empirical investigations have focused on task characteristics such as task structure, task conditions (e.g., pre-task planning, various during-task and post-task implementation conditions), the cognitive demands of a task and, more generally, task difficulty (e.g., Ellis, 2017; Skehan, 2014, 2016), without foregrounding any variables concerning attitudinal/motivational aspects. This practice, however, has had an unintended negative consequence: The emerging research-based evidence about L2 task performance had rather limited ecological validity for real-life settings, because – similar to L2 learning behaviours in general – in task-based language learning student cooperation cannot be taken for granted. One of the main challenges of applying any language teaching methodology is exactly how to find

ways to ensure sufficient student engagement, without which the method cannot succeed. This warrants redressing the cognitive/motivational balance in future task research by addressing the motivational character of learning tasks in a more salient manner.

Traditional conceptions of task motivation

The behaviour of language learners in various communicative tasks is determined by a wide range of variables, and therefore task motivation is a complex construct, involving the intricate interaction of factors such as *learner-specific factors* (e.g., cognitive, motivational and emotional factors; level of L2 competence; personality traits; parental support); *learning situational factors* (e.g., teacher, class size, composition of the learner group, school ethos, norms and regulations); *task-related factors* (e.g., task content, task structure, expected task outcome, task participants, the availability of support structures); *other factors* (e.g., various time/timing-related issues, different types of distractions and disruptions). Motivation research has traditionally tried to explain the essence of the ensuing motivational energy by conceptualising task motivation as the sum of *trait* and *state motivation*, with the former referring to stable and enduring motivational dispositions that are largely task-independent, while state motivation concerns largely task-dependent, situation-specific motives that are thus transitory and temporary motivational responses or conditions (Julkunen, 1989; Tremblay, Goldberg, & Gardner, 1995). This view was extended by Dörnyei (2002), who highlighted the fact that on-task behaviour is embedded in a series of 'actional contexts' (e.g., taking up the study of a particular L2, going to a specific school, attending a particular class), each of which exerts a certain amount of unique motivational influence. It was suggested, then, that pursuing a specific task activates a number of different motivational contingencies, resulting in dynamic motivational processes underlying task completion.

The move from a relatively simple 'trait + state' construct to a more complex understanding of task motivation that involves dynamically interacting layers mirrored the general evolution of L2 motivation research (Dörnyei, MacIntyre, & Henry, 2015), but a downside of this increasing complexity has been that it became hard to offer a straightforward research template that would describe how to add a motivational dimension to task research. While it is indeed the case that task behaviour – similar to any other aspects of human behaviour – is determined by a complex network of interacting influences, unless we can offer a robust way of capturing a significant proportion of the relevant motivational variance by means of a parsimonious construct, the conceptualisation of task motivation will defeat its purpose as it will not be implementable. In the rest of this paper I would like to

present two attempts to produce a manageable conception of task motivation: (a) a systemic account of task motivation that I proposed in 2009 at the 3rd Biennial International Conference on Task-Based Language Teaching in Lancaster; and (b) a further development of this account that draws on recent theorising on directed motivational currents (DMCs) and student engagement.

Towards a systemic account of task motivation

In an attempt to put forward a researchable construct of task motivation that is compatible with a dynamic systems perspective, at the 3rd Biennial International Conference on Task-Based Language Teaching I focused on identifying higher-order *motivation conglomerates* that subsume a range of constituent parts and act as 'wholes' (Dörnyei, 2009). This approach differs from the traditional way of understanding the nature of motivation, which used to break the construct down to distinct constituent components that were then seen as building blocks for all motivational phenomena, and whose operation was largely examined in isolation. Instead, the new objective was to identify *optimal combinations* of learner characteristics that operate as *integrated units* in directing and energising task behaviour (for more details, see Dörnyei, 2014b), so that such robust and coherent clusters could be seen to "cut through" – and thus neutralise to some extent – the complex interference of the multitude of relevant factors. I listed in the talk four motivational conglomerates that could be seen to make significant contributions to task motivation: *interest*, *productive learner roles*, *motivational flow* and *vision*:

- *Interest* is a prime example of a motivational conglomerate in that it integrates motivational, cognitive and affective elements: Besides its obvious motivational quality (e.g., "I am interested in engineering as a future career"), interest also involves a salient cognitive aspect – the curiosity in and engagement with a specific domain – as well as a prominent emotional dimension concerning the joy associated with the engagement with a topic/activity that one is interested in. As Renninger, Bachrach and Posey (2008, p. 463) summarise, "Interest … describes both a state of heightened affect and a developing predisposition to reengage work with particular domain content (e.g., music, science). Interest is identified based on learner's feelings, principled knowledge, and value for particular domain content…"
- *Productive learner roles*: 'Role' as a technical term comes from sociology and refers to the socially shared expectation of how an individual should behave in a certain situation or context. In education, student roles can be understood as basic building blocks for successful class performance: If a student is cast in

the right role, he/she will become a useful member of the task team and will perform necessary and complementary functions. In this sense, a productive learner role becomes a powerful motivational conduit, not only by helping to release energy in a productive channel but also by helping to coordinate the behaviour of multiple participants in a task.

– *Motivational flow* (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988) refers to a state of intensive involvement in, and focused concentration on, a task that feels so absorbing that people often compare it to being outside everyday reality. It happens when, faced with a challenging but also engaging activity, people are fully aware of what needs to be done and how, and at the same time they are confident that the task is doable and their skills are sufficient to succeed. Thus, flow can be seen as a heightened level of motivated task engagement. In many ways it is the optimal task experience. Egbert (2003) found that the task conditions under which flow occurs can be organized along four dimensions: (1) there is a perceived balance of task challenge and participant skills during the task; (2) the task offers opportunities for intense concentration and the participants' attention is focused on the pursuit of clear task goals; (3) the participants find the task intrinsically interesting or authentic; (4) the participants perceive a sense of control over the task process and outcomes. These underlying dimensions display a balanced mixture of motivational, cognitive and affective constituents. The intrinsic motivation generated by the enjoyment (i.e., affect) of the task is dependent on a number of cognitive factors such as the appraisal of the challenge of the activity; the self-appraisal of the level of the individual's skills and competence involved in the activity; a firm sense of control over the completion of the task; clarity about the task goals; and focussed attention.
– *Vision* is a notion that has been used widely in a variety of professional contexts – from politics and psychology to business management and education – because it has been seen as an effective tool for promoting human motivation and performance in diverse areas such as psychotherapy and sports. It has also been utilised for understanding motivation in SLA (Dörnyei, 2014a; Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014) in an attempt to conceptualise a higher-order factor which is able to explain sustained motivation. While the day-to-day reality of one's L2 learning experience is determined by a myriad of situation-specific forces pulling and pushing learners in different directions, the vivid mental image of the experience of effectively accomplishing a future goal and the self-image of being a successful L2 speaker/user seems to be one of the most reliable predictors of long-term commitment and effort. That is, vision helps to keep learners' eyes focused on the bigger picture, thereby underpinning the overall persistence necessary to lead one to ultimate language attainment. An effective vision needs to come as part of a 'package', consisting of a mental imagery

component that activates appropriate emotions and that is cued to a variety of appropriate cognitive plans, scripts and self-regulatory strategies.

Unfortunately, while all the four conglomerates are useful for describing certain aspects of human behaviour, their application to understanding the motivational basis of specific learning tasks is not completely straightforward. For example, is "interest" related to the topic and the instructional materials that make up the task – which Ellis (2017, p. 108) refers to as "task-as-workplan" – or rather to the activity that transpires when learners perform the task, "the task-as-process" (ibid). There is also some ambiguity about what makes a learner role 'productive', first, because the term might refer to several different aspects of the task outcome (e.g., the amount of language use, the smooth accomplishment of the task goal, the pleasant nature of the collaboration between the class participants or some other satisfaction gained from task participation), and second, because the extent to which a particular role works in a certain task will inevitably depend, at least to some extent, on the other task participants' contribution. The advantage of the concept of flow is that it has been specifically developed in relation to tasks and it can therefore be relatively easily applied to L2 learning activities, but the problem with the notion is that learners in a typical language learning environment hardly ever experience full-blown flow (i.e., when they are absorbed in the task to such an extent that they forget about time) and it is questionable how meaningful it is to speak about 'partial flow' experiences. Finally, with vision being a 'macro-concept' in the sense that it concerns major life goals and ambitions, applying it to a relatively short L2 task with an often rather mundane outcome (e.g., filling in a sheet) is less than straightforward.

In sum, while the assessment of how much participants are interested in a task, how satisfying they find the role they play in a task, to what degree they experience flow and finally, how much the goals of the task coincide with their language-specific vision is likely to provide useful insights into the learners' motivational disposition while completing a task, the 2009 list of four conglomerates did not provide sufficient specifications to constitute a clear-cut task motivation construct. The following section, which presents an engagement-specific perspective on task motivation, is intended to build on this list and offer further considerations in this respect.

Task motivation from an engagement-specific perspective

In the rest of this chapter I propose another possible avenue to conceptualising task motivation which utilises the notion of 'engagement', that is, active participation and involvement in certain behaviours (cf. Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). 'Student engagement,' which refers to engagement in school-related activities and

academic tasks, has recently been hailed as "the holy grail of learning" (Sinatra, Heddy, & Lombardi, 2015, p. 1), and, accordingly, it has been "one of the hottest research topics in the field of educational psychology" (ibid). The reason for the emerging popularity of the notion is easy to understand: it highlights meaningful learning accompanied by active participation in school life at a time when modern educational theories increasingly stipulate such active student involvement in the learning process to be a prerequisite for any instructional success. It requires little justification that student engagement is equally important in the field of SLA, because the automatization of L2 skills requires an extended practice period of practice that involves meaningful learner participation. Indeed, the 'learning-through-doing' tenet has been a key principle of communicative language learning in general and task-based language learning in particular.

What are the possible gains of introducing the notion of engagement in a task motivation paradigm? As Mercer and Dörnyei (in press) argue, the concept offers one crucial advantage over the notion of motivation and other related learner characteristics, namely its *direct link* to concrete classroom behaviours. We must realise that motivation does not become manifest in a student's task pursuit automatically – it only indicates the person's *potential* for successful learning, rather than how this potential is actually realised. This is 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. This is particularly so in the educational and social landscape of the contemporary classroom, because in today's globalised, digital age, young people are continuously bombarded with information and communications through multiple channels, all intended to captivate their attention, and the pace of social life has been intensified by social media in an unprecedented manner. Consequently, there are simply too many competing influences on a student's mind at any time, and it may therefore be insufficient to merely create a facilitative learning environment for students to take advantage of – we need to also ensure that the students' positive disposition is *realised in action,* without being hijacked by the plethora of other pressing and salient distractions. To be sure, motivation is undoubtedly necessary for 'preparing the deal', but engagement is indispensable for *sealing the deal*.

On the basis of these considerations, the main benefit of focusing on the notion of 'engagement' over motivation is that it allows researchers to address both the motive and its manifestation together, in a *unified* concept: when students are 'engaged', they are inevitably fuelled by some motivation that gives direction to their action, but the fact that they are engaged also means that this motivational drive has succeeded in cutting through the complexity of the surrounding multitude of distractions, temptations and alternatives.

Identifying the characteristics of an engaging task

How can we describe in concrete terms the motivated behavioural sequence that task engagement involves? We may find a useful theoretical toolkit for this purpose in the recent study of 'directed motivational currents' (DMCs) (see e.g. Dörnyei, Henry, & Muir, 2015). DMCs are, essentially, long-term motivational surges that, while they last, dominate one's life to such an extent that they can be likened to an all-consuming preoccupation around which all other activities in an individual's life are somehow accommodated. Henry (in press) defines a DMC as:

> A unique motivational state [which is experienced] whenever a personal goal of great importance is matched with a structured pathway of action within which the energy generated by pursuit of the goal is amplified to a degree that goal-oriented actions are automatized, and experienced as effortless and enjoyable.

A DMC therefore constitutes full and intensive engagement with a task, and in this respect it is not unlike the flow experience described above. There is, however, a crucial distinguishing factor between these two heightened states of task involvement, namely the *source of the satisfaction* gained by the task participants: a flow state is held together by a task's intrinsically rewarding nature (i.e., the pleasure derived from doing the actual activity), while in a DMC sequence the enjoyment is derived from the joy associated with achieving the target goal. To offer an illustration, when I was 18 and was eager to obtain a driving license, I still remember enjoying every second of preparing for the theory part of the driving test, not because memorising the various details of the highway code itself gave me any pleasure – which would have been an example of a flow – but because the activity took me closer and closer to the cherished end-result, the ability to drive a car on my own. It was unmistakably a DMC that I will never forget.

The reason for turning to DMCs for a better understanding of the nature of task engagement is not because engagement with L2 learning activities typically reaches the intensity of a DMC; in fact, proper DMCs are admittedly rare. Rather, DMCs are relevant because they represent an *optimal form of engagement* with a project, one which occurs when all the necessary conditions and components of motivated action are present and act as a harmonious whole. Accordingly, understanding how and why a DMC occurs will allow us to identify the principal building blocks of motivated behaviour, and even when these elements do not all come together in an entirely complementary manner, they are still capable of fuelling long-term action – in fact, it may be no exaggeration to regard almost any form of long-term, sustained motivation as a *partial realization* of a DMC. Using a science fiction analogy, a DMC can be likened to a spacecraft shifting from normal drive into 'hyperdrive' (Star Wars) or 'warp drive' (Star Trek), thereby allowing space travel to

occur at a speed much greater than normal. The suggestion, then, is that in the field of motivation a DMC can be seen as a metaphorical hyperdrive, which is fuelled by the same motivational factors as any long-term motivation, with the difference that in a DMC mode the factors achieve a state of optimal interaction and cooperation.

What are the main components of a DMC? According to Dörnyei et al. (2015), they include:

- a powerful goal/vision to give the motivational surge direction;
- a sense of ownership and control of the task process on the part of the task participants, and a perceived balance of their skills and the challenges posed by the task;
- specific triggering factors and launch to set the process in motion;
- certain behavioural routines adopted for task completion to act like a 'motivational autopilot';
- concrete subgoals to map out a clear pathway for the task along which motivational energy can be channelled;
- regular progress checks to make the participants' move towards the envisaged goal salient and thus to generate satisfaction;
- affirmative feedback to offer positive progress appraisal;
- a tenor of overall positive emotionality radiated by the desired target.

On the basis of this list as well as the four conglomerates discussed earlier, it is possible to formulate a number guidelines for delineating the character of an engaging task:

- *Task presentation*. An engaging task is introduced in a way that learners can see clearly how it contributes to reaching their overall L2 goals/vision. Dörnyei (2001a) lists three strategies to be applied in task instructions that might help to achieve this purpose: (a) explaining where the activity fits in within a sequence or bigger picture; (b) describing the specific purpose of the activity and what this implies with regard to how students should respond to it; (c) making a connection between the task and the students' personal daily life, and pointing out how the skills learnt will be useful in enabling students to achieve their real-life agendas.
- *Task goals*. Although typical educational activities rarely have outcomes that are comparable to the targets of a vision in terms of their personal significance, the level of student engagement with a task increases if the task goal concerns issues that are in some way meaningful and of value to the students and for their personal learning. Linking such a goal to a finished product or a tangible outcome (e.g., preparing a poster/display, a class presentation, a student newsletter, a radio/video programme or a piece of artwork) further increases task engagement.

- *Task content.* Not even the best task presentation or the most tangible task goal will make the task engaging if the content is not attractive to the students – that is, if the task is boring. Having a content area that is both relevant and real to students, and which allows them to act in ways that they experience as authentic to whom they are is half the battle (see Dörnyei et al., 2015, for more details); the other half can be achieved by adding to the content elements of challenge, competition, novelty, intrigue, fantasy or exotic interest (see Dörnyei, 2001b) – that is, the kind of entertaining ingredient that people enjoy when watching TV for relaxation, for example..
- *Task ownership and challenges–skills balance.* The level of task engagement is directly associated with the degree of 'ownership' that students feel of the task process and its outcome, that is, with the degree of control they perceive to be able to exercise over every aspect of the activity. We should also note that this sense of ownership can only exist if an individual believes that his/her skills match the demands of the task, which was found to play a crucial role in experiencing flow (see above).
- *Task structure.* An engaging task has a clear structure: students need to know exactly how to start, what roles to adopt (see above), what activities are involved in the completion of the task, and what the final outcome is (including the success criteria for it). What makes a structure particularly effective is when the task pursuit process comprises distinct subphases, whose completion provides students with a clear sense of their progress as they approach the target. A pathway made up of a clear set of subgoals can also create opportunities for regular affirmative feedback.
- *Positive emotional tenor of task completion.* We saw earlier that the positive emotionality of a DMC stems from the positive affect associated with the overall vision, and it would be overoptimistic to expect that many educational objectives possess such an arousing quality. Instead, in an engaging task the fun element usually comes from a different source, the 'social wellbeing' experienced in a cooperative group (Dörnyei et al., 2015). This requires healthy group dynamics in the class with a general sense of acceptance and cohesiveness amongst the students (see e.g. Dörnyei, 2007).

Conclusion

The main assumption underlying this chapter has been the belief that we cannot account for the effectiveness of a language learning task fully without taking into consideration its capacity to engage students. Therefore, this paper has been concerned not so much with how to assess task motivation as with the examination

of the task characteristics which can ensure the level of student engagement that is required for the operation of the various cognitive factors involved in learning through tasks. Because talking about tasks always concerns a behavioural sequence, the notion of task engagement was conceptualised in this chapter in terms of how various task characteristics affect the unfolding task completion process. It was argued that recent research on directed motivational currents (DMCs) can inform the delineation of a task engagement construct because it offers an integrated account of motivational factors and how they are realised in action. The concluding discussion of the relevant task features was organised along six aspects of L2 tasks: task presentation; task goals; task content; task ownership and challenges–skills balance; task structure; and the positive emotional tenor of task completion. Hopefully the motivational considerations proposed above can be combined with the cognitive areas of task performance that are discussed in the various chapters of this volume, thereby achieving a balance of cognition and motivation in task-based language teaching and research.

References

Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005–2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System*, *55*, 147–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.10.006

Bygate, M. (1999). Task as context for the framing, reframing and unframing of language. *System*, *27*, 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(98)00048-7

Crookes, G., & Gass, S. M. (1993a). *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crookes, G., & Gass, S. M. (1993b). *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988). The flow experience and its significance for human psychology. In M. Csikszentmihalyi & I. S. Csikszentmihalyi (Eds.), *Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness* (pp. 15–35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621956.002

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667343

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

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 719–731). New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8_47

Dörnyei, Z. (2009, September). The antecedents of task behaviour: A dynamic systems account of task motivation. Invited plenary talk at the 3rd Biennial International Conference on Task-Based Language Teaching, Lancaster, UK.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014a). Future self-guides and vision. In K. Csizér & M. Magid (Eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning* (pp. 7–18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092383-003

Dörnyei, Z. (2014b). Researching complex dynamic systems: 'Retrodictive qualitative modelling' in the language classroom. *Language Teaching*, *47*(1), 80–91.

Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*, 275–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400305

Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). *Individual differences in second language learning*. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589–630). Oxford: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch18

Dörnyei, Z., & Tseng, W.-T. (2009). Motivational processing in interactional tasks. In A. Mackey & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass* (pp. 117–134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2015a). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315772714

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D., & Henry, A. (Eds.). (2015b). *Motivational dynamics in language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Egbert, J. (2003). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *87*(4), 499–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00204

Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108–125). New York, NY: Routledge.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.1.1

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning on performance on performance in task-based learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 299–324. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100015047

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. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Henry, A. (in press). Directed motivational currents. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation for Language Learning*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Kormos, J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2004). The interaction of linguistic and motivational variables in second language task performance. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht [Online]*, *9*(2), 19.

Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (in press). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renninger, K. A., Bachrach, J. E., & Posey, S. K. E. (2008). Learner interest and achievement motivation. In M. L. Maehr, S. A. Karabenick & T. C. Urdan (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement, 15: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 461–491). Bingley: Emerald.

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.1002924

Skehan, P. (1998a). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998b). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *18*, 268–289. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500003585

Skehan, P. (2014). The context for researching a processing perspective on task performance. In P. Skehan (Ed.), *Processing perspectives on task performance* (pp. 1–26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.5.01ske

Skehan, P. (2016). Tasks versus conditions: Two perspectives on task research and their implications for pedagogy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *36*, 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000100

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research*, *1*, 185–211. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889700100302

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning*, *49*, 93–120.

Tremblay, P. F., Goldberg, M. P., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Trait and state motivation and the acquisition of Hebrew vocabulary. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *27*, 356–370. https://doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.356

Winne, P. H., & Marx, R. W. (1989). A cognitive-processing analysis of motivation within classroom tasks. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, Vol. 3: Goals and cognitions* (pp. 223–257). New York, NY: Academic Press.