

This is a repository copy of *The Motivational Dimension of Language Teaching*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/105502/

Version: Accepted Version

## Article:

Lamb, M orcid.org/0000-0003-2899-6877 (2017) The Motivational Dimension of Language Teaching. Language Teaching, 50 (3). pp. 301-346. ISSN 0261-4448

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000088

© 2017, Cambridge University Press. This is an author produced version of a paper published in Language Teaching. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

## Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

## **Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



TABLE 1 Studies of language teachers' motivational strategy (MotS) use, based on Dörnyei's 2001 framework

| STUDY         | SETTING &          | RESEARCH AIMS                   | METHOD OF                 | MAIN FINDINGS                            |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
|               | POPULATION         |                                 | INVESTIGATION             |  |
|               |                    |                                 |                           |  |
| Cheng &       | TAIWAN             | 'Modified replication' of       | Used expanded             | Certain MotS are probably universally    |
| Dörnyei       | 387 teachers of    | original Dörnyei & Csizér       | questionnaire based on    | popular and applicable                   |
| (2007)        | English at various | (1998) research. Aimed to find  | Dörnyei (2001) containing | • Other MotS are probably culture-       |
|               | levels from        | out:                            | 48 MotS, statistically    | specific, in terms of teacher preference |
|               | Elementary to      | 1. Teachers' perceptions of     | forming 10 clusters of    | and/or applicability to local curriculum |
|               | University in      | importance of MotS              | 'macrostrategies'         | and educational culture                  |
|               | Taiwan             | 2. Reported frequency of use    |                           |  |
| Guilloteaux & | KOREA              | To investigate the link between | Used 3 specially          | The teacher's motivational practice has  |
| Dörnyei       | 40 learner groups  | teachers' observed use of MotS  | developed instruments:    | higher correlation $(r = 0.61)$ with     |
| (2008)        | (>1300 learners),  | and learners':                  | (a) classroom observation | learners' classroom engagement than      |
|               | 27 teachers of     | 1. classroom engagement         | scheme termed             | their self-reported L2 motivation (r     |

|               | English, in state | (attention, participation,      | 'motivation orientation of | = .35)                                  |
|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
|               | junior high       | volunteering)                   | language teaching'         | Big differences found among teachers    |
|               | schools.          | 2. self-reported L2 motivation  | (MOLT) (b) learner         | motivational practice even in the same  |
|               |                   | and teacher's post-lesson       | questionnaire, and (c) a   | school                                  |
|               |                   | evaluation                      | post-lesson teacher        |   |
|               |                   |                                 | evaluation scale.          |   |
| Papi &        | IRAN              | Replication of Guilloteaux &    | As above, but 'b' included | Confirms main finding of Guilloteaux    |
| Abdollahzadeh | 26 learner groups | Dörnyei (2008), with additional | measures of components     | & Dörnyei (2008).                       |
| (2012)        | (741 learners)    | focus on relationship between   | of L2 motivational self-   | No significant relationship found       |
|               | taught by 17      | learners' motivated behaviour   | system (Dörnyei 2009)      | between strength of Ideal L2 self and   |
|               | teachers in state | and future L2 self-guides.      |                            | classroom engagement.                   |
|               | secondary schools |                                 |                            |   |
|               | (aged 11-16)      |                                 |                            |   |
| Moskovsky,    | SAUDI ARABIA      | To directly test the causal     | Quasi-experimental         | The use of 10 MotS by specially trained |
| Alrabai,      | 14 teachers, 296  | influence of a set of           | design: experimental       | teachers increased the L2 motivation of |
| Paolini &     | male learners of  | contextually-appropriate MotS   | groups exposed to 10       | learners in the experimental groups;    |

| Ratcheva    | diverse             | on learners' trait and state   | preselected MotS for 8         | increase was greater in state than trait |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| (2013)      | backgrounds and     | motivation (e.g. vary learning | weeks; control groups          | motivational variables                   |
|             | ages from 12 to     | tasks; show learners you care  | receive traditional teaching   |  |
|             | adult.              | about them; increase use Engli | sh                             |  |
|             |                     | in class)                      |                                |  |
| Sugita      | JAPAN               | To examine the correlation     | Learners did initial L2        | • Some MotS (e.g. 'starting class on     |
| McEown &    | 222 university      | between frequency of use of    | proficiency tests and          | time') correlate with learner motivation |
| Takeuchi    | learners of         | particular MotS and learners'  | motivational intensity         | throughout course while some only        |
| (2014)      | English taught by   | motivation during one          | surveys, then data was         | correlate at particular times. Others    |
|             | one instructor in 5 | semester, comparing learners   | collected 4 times on:          | show no correlation with learner         |
|             | classes             | with different starting        | 1. Teachers' self-reported use | motivation despite frequent use          |
|             |                     | proficiency and motivational   | of 17 targeted MotS            | • Some MotS vary in effectiveness        |
|             |                     | intensity                      | 2. Learners' evaluation of     | according to learners' pre-existing      |
|             |                     |                                | motivational effect of each    | motivation and proficiency               |
|             |                     |                                | MotS                           |  |
| Wong (2014) | CHINA               | 1. To find out what MotS       | Phase 1 - initial teacher      | • Only 6 of 25 MotS found to be used in  |

|             | Teachers of        |    | Chinese EFL teachers      | survey and interviews to      | Chinese school classrooms were            |
|-------------|--------------------|----|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
|             | English in         |    | typically employ          | identify MotS used by         | recognized as effective by teachers,      |
|             | Chinese (Hong      | 2. | To judge their            | Chinese teachers; Phase 2 -   | learners and researcher (e.g. 'offering   |
|             | Kong) secondary    |    | effectiveness in          | 1. Lessons observed using     | rewards'; 'ensuring learners are          |
|             | schools (phase 1,  |    | motivating learners       | MOLT-like scale               | prepared well for tasks')                 |
|             | n = 80; phase 2, n |    |                           | 2. Teacher self-rated survey  | • These MotS are not all valued highly by |
|             | = 30)              |    |                           | 3. Selected learners complete | teachers in other contexts                |
|             |                    |    |                           | survey after lessons          |   |
| Alrabai (in | SAUDI ARABIA       | 1. | To identify most popular  | Quasi-experimental design:    | • Experimental group teachers' use of six |
| press)      | Phase 1: 204 EFL   |    | MotS among Saudi          | 1. Teachers in experimental   | MotS shown to produce greater             |
|             | school/university  |    | teachers of EFL (phase 1) | groups trained to implement   | increases in learner motivation – as      |
|             | teachers           | 2. | To test whether use of    | six MotS (identified in       | evidenced in class behaviour and          |
|             | Phase 2: 437 male  |    | these MotS increases      | Phase 1) during 10 week       | survey responses – over control group     |
|             | learners aged 15-  |    | learner motivation and    | course.                       | teachers using traditional methodology    |
|             | 25 & 14 teachers   |    | results in higher L2      | 2. Lessons observed using     | • Increased learner motivation leads to   |
|             | in 5 schools       |    | achievement (phase 2)     | MOLT-like scale               | higher L2 achievement                     |

| /universities | 3. Learners do motivation   |  |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--|
|               | survey at beginning and end |  |
|               | of course.                  |  |

TABLE 2 Teachers' views of importance of motivational macro-strategies in five different national contexts

| MOTIVATIONAL MACRO-STRATEGY                                    | Hungary   | Taiwan        | USA        | Korea        | Saudi    |
|--|-----------|---------------|------------|--------------|----------|
|  | (school)  | (school)      | (univ)     | (school)     | Arabia   |
|  | (Csizér & | (Cheng &      | (Ruesch et | (Guilloteaux | (univ)   |
|  | Dörnyei   | Dörnyei       | al. 2012)  | 2013)        | (Alrabai |
|  | 1998)     | 2007)         |            |              | 2014)    |
| Set a personal example with your behaviour                     | 1         | 1             | 2          | 1            |          |
| Create a pleasant atmosphere in the classroom / cohesive group | 2         | 4             | 4          | 9            |          |
| Present tasks properly   | 3         | 5             | 10         | 4            | 5        |
| Develop a good relationship with learners                      | 4         | (incl. in #1) | 1          |              | 1        |
| Promote learners' self-confidence / positive retrospective     | 5         | 3             | 5          | 2            | 3        |
| evaluation   |           |               |            |              |          |
| Make the language class interesting/learning tasks stimulating | 6         | 7             | 9          |              | 4        |
| Promote learner autonomy                                       | 7         | 10            | 8          |              | 8        |
| Personalize the learning process                               | 8         |               |            |              |          |

| Increase the learners' goal-orientedness /helping learners to set | 9  | 6 |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|---|----|---|
| goals   |    |   |   |    |   |
| Familiarize learners with the target language culture/L2-related  | 10 | 8 |   | 10 | 2 |
| values  |    |   |   |    |   |
| Recognize learners' efforts and celebrate their success           |    | 2 |   |    |   |
| Promote group cohesiveness and set group norms                    |    | 9 |   |    | 6 |
| Avoid comparing learners to one another                           |    |   | 3 |    |   |
| Help learners realize the importance of effort                    |    |   | 6 | 3  |   |
| Emphasize usefulness of the L2                                    |    |   | 7 | 5= |   |
| Reduce learner anxiety  |    |   |   |    | 7 |
| Act naturally in front of learners*                               |    |   |   | 5= |   |
| Teach learning strategies*  |    |   |   | 7  |   |
| Help learners design individual study plans*                      |    |   |   | 8  |   |

<sup>\*</sup>being based on single items in surveys, these should be considered micro- rather than macro- strategies

TABLE 3 Prominent theories of motivation applied to language education

| THEORY (with   | PEDAGOGICAL                    | PRACTICAL EXEMPLARS                     |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---|
| originator)    | IMPLICATIONS                   |   |
| Self-          | Learners will tend to study    | Autonomy                                |
| determination  | best when they are             | 'Foster relevance, allow criticism,     |
| theory (Deci & | intrinsically motivated or     | provide choice' (Noels 2013: 27)        |
| Ryan 1985)     | have a more internalized       | See Benson (2011) for review of         |
|                | kind of motive.                | empirical studies claiming the          |
|                | To enhance learners'           | successful promotion of autonomy.       |
|                | intrinsic motivation,          | Competence                              |
|                | educators need to provide      | Teachers who are perceived as active    |
|                | stimulating, satisfying tasks. | participants in class, providing useful |
|                | To help internalize learners'  | & encouraging feedback, promote         |
|                | motivation, they should        | learners' sense of competence (Noels    |
|                | provide classroom              | et al. 1999, Noels 2001).               |

|                 | environments that support    | Relatedness                           |
|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                 | their basic need for a sense | Express involvement, immediacy        |
|                 | of autonomy, competence      | and interest (Noels 2013). Develop    |
|                 | and relatedness (Noels       | positive group dynamics (cf. Dörnyei  |
|                 | 2013).                       | & Murphey 2003).                      |
| L2 Motivational | Learners can be motivated    | 3-4 months programmes shown to be     |
| Self System     | to study an L2 if they       | effective, including:                 |
| (Dörnyei 2009)  | develop strong and           | Goal setting, guided imagery          |
|                 | elaborate visions of         | tasks (Magid 2014)                    |
|                 | themselves as future users   | • 'Ideal L2 self Tree', visualization |
|                 | of the L2 (future self-      | exercises, counselling sessions       |
|                 | guides), as long as they are | (Chan 2014)                           |
|                 | plausible, accompanied by    | • Imaginary class reunion 10 years    |
|                 | action plans, regularly      | on (Fukada et al. 2011)               |
|                 | activated and offset by a    | Building imagined communities         |
|                 | fear of less desired futures | (Murray 2013; Yashima 2013)           |
|                 |                              |                                       |

|                  | (Dörnyei 2009).              |                                     |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Social cognitive | Whether learners feel        | Focussed strategy instruction in L2 |
| theory (Bandura  | capable of doing classroom   | listening (Graham & Macaro 2008),   |
| 1997)            | tasks and mastering          | L2 writing (Mills & Peron 2009), L2 |
|                  | different features of the L2 | reading (Matsumoto et al. 2013),    |
|                  | will affect their motivation | shown to promote learners' self-    |
|                  | to study. Teachers can       | efficacy.                           |
|                  | enhance learners' self-      | Also see Erler & Macaro (2011)      |
|                  | efficacy through             | below.                              |
|                  | maximizing the chances of    |                                     |
|                  | success in L2 tasks and      |                                     |
|                  | providing an emotionally     |                                     |
|                  | rewarding classroom          |                                     |
|                  | environment (Mills 2014).    |                                     |
|                  |                              |                                     |
| Attribution      | The reasons (attributions)   | No intervention studies known in L2 |

| theory (Weiner | learners give for their        | education, but large-scale 3-year      |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 1986)          | failures and successes can     | cross-sectional study (Erler &         |
|                | determine how motivated        | Macaro 2011) shows poor decoding       |
|                | they will be to continue       | ability in French is associated with   |
|                | study. To promote their        | maladaptive attributions and low       |
|                | learners' motivation,          | self-efficacy in UK school pupils.     |
|                | teachers need to encourage     |  |
|                | attributions that are internal | In general education, see Wentzel &    |
|                | and amenable to change by      | Brophy (2014) for descriptions of      |
|                | the learner (e.g. effort,      | successful attribution retraining e.g. |
|                | learning strategy, attention). | where learners are shown how to        |
|                | Attributional beliefs may      | increase concentration on tasks        |
|                | also be culturally             | rather than worrying about failure,    |
|                | conditioned, and correlate     | cope with failure through analysis of  |
|                | with L2 achievement (Erten     | performance and avoid attributions     |
|                | & Burden 2014).                | of failure to lack of ability.         |

| Mindsets (Dweck | Individuals tend to believe    | Experiment in Lou & Noels (2016)    |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1999)           | either that                    | shows adult learners primed towards |
|                 | intelligence/ability is fixed  | incremental mindset show more       |
|                 | (entity mindset) or            | adaptive goals and intended effort. |
|                 | malleable (growth mindset).    | In general education, see Dweck     |
|                 | This varies by domain.         | (1999) on how learners can be       |
|                 | Language learners are          | guided towards a growth mindset     |
|                 | particularly prone to a belief | through (e.g.):                     |
|                 | that L2 aptitude is fixed, and | • Careful use of praise &           |
|                 | this may undermine effort to   | feedback                            |
|                 | learn, especially when faced   | • Enhancing learners'               |
|                 | with cognitive challenges      | metacognitive awareness             |
|                 | (Ryan & Mercer 2012).          | • Giving learners a sense of        |
|                 |                                | progress                            |
|                 |                                |                                     |

| Flow theory       | When academic tasks          | Tasks involving email and chatting |
|-------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (Csikszentmihalyi | provide the optimal level of | induced 'flow' in a majority of    |
| 1990)             | challenge and interest and   | Spanish language learners in a US  |
|                   | allow a degree of learner    | secondary school (Egbert 2003).    |
|                   | control they can induce a    |                                    |
|                   | sense of 'flow' (=           | See Dörnyei, Henry & Muir (2016)   |
|                   | enjoyment and intense        | on concept of 'group flow' and     |
|                   | engagement, often            | project work in language classes.  |
|                   | unconscious) which may       |                                    |
|                   | over time produce enhanced   |                                    |
|                   | motivation and performance   |                                    |
|                   | (Egbert 2003).               |                                    |
|                   |                              |                                    |

TABLE 4 A selection of demotivating aspects of L2 classroom teaching

| DEMOTIVATING FACTORS IN THE                | STUDY             | CONTEXT                 |  |  |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| CLASSROOM                                  |                   |                         |  |  |
|  |                   |                         |  |  |
| Being too controlling, thus diminishing    | Littlejohn (2008) | Italian school children |  |  |
| learners' sense of control of class events |                   |                         |  |  |
| To the Park of the Park                    | 0.5.1(2001)       | TTC 11 1                |  |  |
| Exercising too little control, suggesting  | Oxford (2001)     | US college language     |  |  |
| disinterest                                |                   | students                |  |  |
|  |                   |                         |  |  |
| Not appearing friendly or approachable     | Yi Tsang (2012)   | US college students of  |  |  |
|  |                   | Japanese                |  |  |
|  |                   |                         |  |  |
| Providing monotonous learning activities   | Falout et al.     | Japanese school pupils  |  |  |
| (e.g. grammar-translation)                 | (2009)            |                         |  |  |
|  |                   |                         |  |  |
| Giving over-corrective written feedback,   | Busse (2013)      | Students of German in   |  |  |
| or too negative feedback                   |                   | UK universities         |  |  |
|  |                   |                         |  |  |

| Neglecting learners' broader identity as    | Norton (2001)   | Adult immigrants in   |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
| persons                                     |                 | Canada                |
|   |                 |                       |
| Neglecting learners' goals and              | Lantolf &       | Adult learner of      |
| methodological preferences                  | Genung (2002)   | Chinese in USA        |
|   |                 |                       |
| Not establishing appropriate boundaries for | Farrell (2015)  | Canadian ESL college  |
| teacher-student relationships               |                 |                       |
|   |                 |                       |
| Not demonstrating mastery of the subject    | Trang & Baldauf | Vietnamese university |
|   | (2007)          | students              |
|   |                 |                       |