Trajectory of L2 Motivation Theories Development: Transition from the Social Psychological Views to the Socio-dynamic Perspectives

Saeed Safdari
Department of English, Chalous Branch, Islamic Azad University, Chalous, Iran
saeed_safdari@iauc.ac.ir

Abstract

This article reports on an attempt to investigate the developmental trajectory and route of L2 motivation theories from the early social psychological period to the current socio-dynamic perspective. While in the early days the individuals' desire and tendency to integrate within the target language community was considered the most powerful motivating factor, the current global perspectives advocate a totally different stance and involve a variety of other cognitive, social, and contextual factors. The new views have brought about novel conceptualizations and unprecedented research methods. This theoretical shift is the outcome of decades of scientific endeavor and research that were continually empowered and supplied by the innovations of psychological motivation research. Four distinct periods of L2 motivation research are recognized with their own specific theoretical and methodological characteristics. In the present article, in addition to describing the developmental periods and their outputs in detail, the links and interconnections between them are discussed.

Keywords: L2 motivation, social psychological period, cognitive-situated period, process-oriented period, socio-dynamic period

Introduction

L2 motivation, as an independent research agenda, has a long record since the late 1950s and has witnessed extensive evolutions and advancements. Stages of L2 motivation research could be divided into four phases: the social psychological period (1959-1990); the cognitive-situated period (during the 1990s); the process-oriented period (late 1990s); and the socio-dynamic period (since 2000). These stages could be identified by considering their definition of L2 motivation and the motivational dimensions they have focused on. Several psychological, sociological and methodological issues have affected the agenda and shifted its route. This ultimately led to gradual transitions from one stage to the next.

The Social Psychological Period: Commencement of the Agenda

The social psychological period of L2 motivation research began in 1959 and continued for the next three decades. This period of research is associated with the work of the Canadian social psychologist, Robert Gardner and his colleagues (Gardner, 1985, 2001; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995, among others). An important contribution of Gardner was his argument that second language learning is basically different from learning other subjects. It involves more than learning new linguistic information and includes "acquiring symbolic elements of a different ethnolinguistic community" (Gardner, 1979, p. 193). The central tenet of this approach is expressed by Gardner (1985) as he stated "students' attitudes toward the specific language group are bound to influence how successful they will be in incorporating aspects of that language" (p. 6). Gardner's theory contends that integratively motivated learners achieve better results than other L2 learners (Gardner, 1985, 2001; Gardner & Lambert, 1972).

Gardner's motivation theory was presented in his socio-educational model of second language acquisition. According to Gardner (1985), integrative motivation is the key construct and is itself composed of three main components:

1. Integrativeness which includes integrative orientation, interest, attitudes toward the L2 community.
2. Attitudes toward the learning situation which comprises attitudes toward the language teacher and the L2 course.
3. Motivation that refers to, effort, desire, and attitude toward language learning.

Due to frequent use of the terms integrativeness and motivation to denote various notions, there is a terminological confusion in the model which was criticized by Dörnyei (1994, 2005).

Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) extended the model of L2 motivation. Their model suggests that an individual's L2 motivation is socially grounded and includes cognitive and affective components leading to motivated behavior, which in turn leads to L2 achievement. Elements from expectancy-value theory and goal theories were adopted to mediate the effect of attitudinal factors on motivation and achievement.

Gardner's theory has been known for two aspects: first, the concept of integrativeness, and second, instrumentality. It is interesting that instrumental orientation has never been part of the theory and is ascribed to misinterpretation of Gardner's model (Dörnyei, 2005). Initially, Gardner & Trembley (1994) questioned the existence of an integrative/instrumental dichotomy. Later, Gardner (2001) addressed this issue by incorporating the concept within the model: "there can be other supports for motivation not directly associated with integrative motivation. Thus, there may be instrumental factors contributing to motivation, and we could label this combination of instrumental factors and Motivation as Instrumental Motivation" (p. 7).

Their major instrument for measuring motivation is The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, 1985). It contains more than 130 items and seems to possess acceptable psychometric characteristics (Gardner & MacIntyre,1993).

There are a few limitations to Gardner's theory of L2 motivation. First, it seems inapplicable to EFL context where there is no access to L2 community and its speakers (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Also, in an era when English is viewed as an international language or the lingua franca of the world, the concept of integrativeness and attitude to L2 community is losing ground. Therefore, motivation can hardly be explained by resorting to such issues as proposed by Gardner (Stockwell, 2013; Yashima, 2002).

The Cognitive-Situated Period: Motivation in Pedagogical Contexts

The beginning of the cognitive-situated period is marked by Crookes & Schmidt (1991) who called for a micro-perspective to L2 motivation that could focus on situated classroom motivation. During the 1980s, the social psychological theory was heavily criticized for its shortcomings and impracticality for foreign language settings. Motivational research gradually paid more attention to educational contexts and classroom language learning (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2012). In addition, several cognitive theories were introduced to the realm of educational psychology which necessitated a shift in approach to L2 motivation research as well. These factors gave rise to the cognitive-situated period (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). As a result, two major changes occurred in the research agenda: the adoption of psychological cognitive theories, and a more situated analysis of motivation in classrooms (Dörnyei, 2005).

During this stage, researchers adopted variables from cognitive theories of motivation. For instance, concepts from expectancy-value and goal theories were imported by Trembley and Gardner (1995) in a revision of their socio-educational model. Attribution theory affected Ushioda (1996) and Williams and Burden (1997). self-determination theory, too, influenced Noels Pelletier, Clement, & Vallerand (2000).

Dörnyei's (1994) Framework

As an earliest manifestation of the new period, Dörnyei (1994) introduced his L2 motivation framework. This framework comprises three levels: the *language level*, the *learner level*, and the *learning situation level*. The language level is the broadest level and is related to different aspects of L2 such as the culture and community. and. Also, it draws on the integrative/instrumental distinction of the Gardnerian approach to identify the associated pragmatic benefits and values of language learning and use (Dörnyei, 1994). The learner level involves the individual characteristics and personality traits that the learners bring to the learning process including need for achievement, self-confidence, attribution of past experiences, anxiety, perceived L2 competence and self-efficacy. The third level, the learning situation level, deals with the L2 learning situation. It consists of course-specific motivational components (syllabus, materials, teaching methods, and learning tasks), teacher-specific motivational components (authority, feedback, modelling, task presentation), and group-specific motivational components (goal-orientedness, reward system, group cohesion, and classroom goal structure) (Dörnyei, 1994, p. 280).

Formulation of this framework took place as a desire to construct a comprehensive model that encompasses a large number of elements and components. Consequently, the framework turned out to be thought-provoking and seminal by broadening the field and offering refreshing ideas. Nevertheless, the relationship between the levels and their interdependence could not be substantiated well (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

The Effect of Self-Determination Theory

As one of the most notable theories in educational psychology, self-determination theory caught the interest of several researchers who attempted to incorporate its elements in L2 motivation research. The most systematic of these has been the works of Noels and her associates (Noels, 2003, 2009; Noels, Clement, & Pelletier, 1999, 2001; Noels et al., 2000). Their research pursued two main objectives: to inspect the relationship between intrinsic/extrinsic motivation (in psychology) and integrative/instrumental reasons (in L2 research), and to examine the effect of classroom practices on students' intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and their autonomy.

Regarding the first objective, Noels et al. (2000, 2001) suggested that integrative orientation is closely related to more self-determined forms of motivation (intrinsic/self-determined regulation), whereas instrumental orientation is associated with less self-determined forms (extrinsic/external regulation). Noels et al. (2000) designed a scale to measure all levels of motivation based on the sources that regulate it. The instrument is called the Language Learning Orientations Scale, and illustrates levels of motivation in the following continuum (starting from least self-determined through to most self-determined):

1. Amotivation
2. External Regulation
3. Introjected Regulation
4. Identified Regulation
5. Intrinsic Motivation: Knowledge

6. Intrinsic Motivation: Accomplishment
7. Intrinsic Motivation: Stimulation

Noels (2003) postulated that there are three orientations of L2 motivation: intrinsic reasons (enjoyment and pleasure of the learning), extrinsic reasons (external pressures to learn), and integrative reasons (positive contacts with and attitudes towards the L2 community).

Considering the second objective, Noels (2001) highlighted the importance of the way teachers interact with their students. The results demonstrated that teachers' style have a positive effect on students' intrinsic motivation. In addition, this study showed that students' motivation improves when the teacher is less controlling and gives way to learner autonomy (Noels, 2001, 2003). This indicates the importance of learner autonomy to promote motivation, as already characterized in self-determination theory.

The Effect of Attribution Theory

According to Dörnyei and Ryan (2015), Because of the high frequency of language learning failure worldwide, attributional processes are likely to play an important motivational role in L2 motivation studies. This trend brought about two significant developments. First, the temporal nature of motivation was highlighted, and second, qualitative inquiry into L2 motivation gained ground. Ushioda's (1996) qualitative study confirmed Weiner's theory by concluding that positive motivational thinking involves two attributional patterns: attributing positive L2 outcomes to personal ability, and attributing negative L2 outcomes to unstable and temporary shortcomings. Williams and Burden (1999) found different attributional patterns in children aged 10-15. They concluded that teachers have a significant role in developing learners sense of attribution. In a related study, Williams, Burden and Al-Baharna (2001) discovered that patterns of attributions may change over time. While younger learners ascribe the outcomes to their internal characteristics, older ones demonstrate a sense of externality in their attributions (Williams et al., 2001, p.174).

The major studies conducted during this period (Ushioda, 1996, 2001; Williams and Burden, 1997, 1999; Williams, et al., 2001) suggested that teachers play a very important role in the learner's attribution patterns and subsequently their expectations of success and failure in language learning. The way teachers teach, teachers' teaching style, aims and beliefs about learning and the nature of education can affect learners' attribution extensively.

The Process-Oriented Period: The Dynamic Nature of Motivation

During the late 1990s, soon after the appearance of socio-cognitive models, a new trend emerged which ended up in the process-oriented period. The dynamic character and temporal variation of motivation received more attention (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2012). It was noted that unlike what previous models assumed, motivation is not a static state and changes over time (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Language learning is a lengthy process which tends to extend over a period of time, so, L2 learners' motivation fluctuates over time spans. Consequently, scholars began to look for various motivational phases during the learning process, so that they could find better explanations for the ups and downs in motivation level and its temporal dimension. This new line of enquiry was marked by the works of Williams and Burden (1997), Ushioda (1998, 2001), and Dörnyei and Otto (1998).

William and Burden's Model

Williams and Burden's (1997) presented their social constructivist model of motivation with a focus on individual-context relationship and temporal dimensions. They paid specific attention to the conceptual discrepancy between motivation for engagement (wishes, decisions,

choices, reasons), and motivation during engagement (feelings, behaviors, and reactions in the course of learning). They insisted that for teachers, it is not enough to spark interest. They must be concerned with the development of motivation during the action. Their motivational model depicts a process that goes through three successive stages: *reasons to do something, deciding to do something, sustaining the effort*. The first two stages reflect initiating motivation and the last stage is concerned with sustaining motivation (by maintaining effort and persistence).

Ushioda's Framework

Ushioda (1998, 2001) showed that in educational contexts the common experience appears to be motivational dynamicity rather than stability, which indicates that motivational thinking depends on temporal variations. She believed that exploring the complicated and multi-faceted construct of motivation demands more sophisticated methods and instruments which enable researchers to delve more deeply into the issue and gain a more thorough understanding of it (Ushioda, 1996).

Based on her qualitative study on Irish learners of French, Ushioda (1998) formed a temporal framework of motivation which illustrates the evolution of learning. Initially, learners are less goal-oriented and more affected by their learning experience. Gradually, as personal goals crystallize, the learners become more goal-oriented and less influenced by their learning experience.

Dörnyei and Otto's Model

The most prominent models of L2 motivation within this trend was offered by Dörnyei and Otto (1998). Quite like their contemporary attempts, they were striving to introduce a theoretically sound process-oriented model to make up for the inadequacies of the previous product-oriented models. Their model was founded on Kuhl's (1985) and Heckhausen's (1991) concept of *action control theory*. Action control theory suggests that motivated behavior undergoes two phases: the pre-decisional phase, and the post-decisional phase. The former phase involves forming intentions and the latter includes taking action and maintaining effort (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998).

The process model of L2 motivation, according to Dörnyei (2005) characterized the motivational process as a progressive combination of several discrete temporal segments, describing how initial *wishes* and *desires* are transformed into *goals* and then into *intentions*, and how the intentions are *enacted*, ending up in the completion or abortion of the goal entailed by the final *evaluation* of the process. Dörnyei and Otto's (1998) model divides motivated behavior into three distinct phases, summarized below.

1. Preactional stage (choice motivation) which refers to the initial formation of wishes/desires/goals and transforming them into intentions.
2. Actional stage (executive motivation) which is concerned with the active maintenance and protection of the generated motivation during the action.
3. Post-actional stage (motivational retrospection) that follows the completion or termination of action and is deals with the examination and evaluation of the behavior. Retrospective evaluation will determine future activities and decisions. This stage has three sub-components: forming causal attributions, elaborating strategies, and dismissing intentions and further planning.

The Socio-Dynamic Period: Age of complexities and intricacies

Dörnyei (2005) referred to the stage following the cognitive-situated period as the *process-oriented period*, reflecting a prominent interest in motivation as a process rather than a

state. In a later comprehensive book, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) reported that process-oriented period of L2 motivation research was "evolving into (or perhaps merging with) a new phase" that they "christened the *socio-dynamic period*" (p. 69). However, in the latest historical review, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) pronounced that the process-oriented period was a precursor or early manifestation of a broader approach on "L2 motivation, highlighting the concept's *dynamic character* and *temporal variation*" (p. 84).

The socio-dynamic period, which is still developing and shaping, began as a reaction to a number of shortcomings and needs. First of all, Dörnyei (2005) highlighted the inadequacy of the process model (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998) in explaining L2 motivation within complex settings like language classrooms where a multitude of process might be at work simultaneously. Furthermore, the process model assumes clear-cut cause-effect relationships that render it too simplistic for explaining the intricacies of dynamic nature of motivation (Dörnyei, 2009a).

Secondly, research in motivational psychology grew to integrate the concepts of self and context to investigate the emergence and development of motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). In line with such holistic views, Norton (2000) criticized the language acquisition theories for isolating the individual learner from his/her historical, social, temporal, and spatial context. According to Norton (2000), a comprehensive theory or model must characterize learners as identity owners who should be studied with reference to their relationships with the social context.

The third cause of the shift towards socio-dynamic period was the rise of English as a lingua franca or a global language. In the current context of globalization, it has become less clear who really owns the English language (Dörnyei, Csizér, & Németh, 2006; Holliday, 2005; Lamb, 2004; Norton, 2001). The significant implication of the new situation is that no specific community of English speakers the ideal models. In addition, learners of English may never need to come into direct contact with the Western communities of English users (e.g., USA, UK, Australia). Consequently, the Gardnerian concepts of integrativeness and attitude to L2 speakers and culture begin to lose meaning (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). In fact, instead of the Anglo-American community, there is a desire in learners of English to get the membership of an international community, while living in their own countries (Yashima, 2009). They are looking for global identity and international posture (Csizér & Kormos, 2009).

To make a long story short, the growing attention to complexity of L2 motivation and the urge to using more sophisticated research methods, the interaction of L2 motivation with various social, contextual and cognitive factors, in addition to the complexities of the modern globalized world initiated the move towards the "more socially grounded, dynamic and complex interacting systems in the analysis of L2 motivation" that is labeled the socio-dynamic period (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 72).

Within this new era, three novel conceptual approaches to L2 motivation appeared which are drastically different from their older counterparts. These include:

1. A person-in-context relational view of motivation (Ushioda, 2009, 2012)
2. Motivation from a complex dynamic systems perspective (Dörnyei, 2009b)
3. The L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009a)

A Person-in-Context Relational View of Motivation

As mentioned earlier in this review, with the advent of the process-oriented period, the temporal dimension of motivation and its dynamic nature were emphasized (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998; Ushioda, 1996; Williams & Burden, 1997). When the socio-dynamic approach

dominated the field, the research agenda became even more complicated by putting the dynamic construct of L2 motivation in a learning context for further examination. This is the core issue in a person-in-context relational view proposed by Ushioda (2009, 2012).

This new approach calls for replacement of oversimplified linear cause-effect thinking with a more sophisticated system of thinking where more attention is paid to context of learning (the broad social context and the specific learning environment), and the individual learner is seen as a real person rather than a pile of characteristics (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). If this approach is to be followed, cross-sectional quantitative studies would not be sufficient for delving into this complex phenomenon. As Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011) expressed, "linear models provide only a selective partial account of motivation and do not do justice to its complex reality" (p. 76).

Complex Dynamic Systems Perspective (CDS)

Applied Linguists in general and L2 motivation researchers in specific have recently demonstrated a tendency to turn away from traditional methodologies of studying linear cause-effect relationships between isolated variables and instead have shown interest in examining phenomena as dynamic, nonlinear interactions between ever-changing and unpredictable variables (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Waninge, Dörnyei & de Bot, 2014). The idea of studying L2 motivation from a CDS perspective has been proposed by Dörnyei (2009b). A complex dynamic system is regarded as the interlinked cooperation and interaction of a number of components, conditions and factors, the operation of which is difficult to predict as it is impossible to foresee how the various factors will interact with one another (Chan, Dörnyei & Henry, 2015).

The application of such a perspective requires innovative methods which generally fall within the realm of in-depth qualitative paradigms or a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Ushioda, 2009). One of the novel methods was introduced by Chan et al. (2015) which is called Retrodictive Qualitative Modelling (RQM). RQM reverses the traditional way by first identifying the end-states (or outcomes) and then working backwards in a retrospective manner to uncover the developmental trajectories that led to those settled states.

L2 Motivational Self System

The most notable offspring of the current period in L2 motivation research is the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) which was established by Dörnyei (2005, 2009a). His new model synthesizes previous research in L2 motivation and combines it with some *self* concepts adopted from research in motivational psychology. L2MSS introduced a tripartite model consisting of ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and language learning experience. Dörnyei (2009a) explained how he drew upon psychological self theories and the concept of integrativeness to devise his novel model. The model rests upon individuals' future-oriented visions which let them see their own possible selves as (un)successful language users. The vision of an (un)successful self is thought to be potentially effective in motivating the L2 learners to invest more time and energy on the language learning activity. Besides, the positive language learning elements (context, teacher. Peers, materials, etc.) can increase L2 learners' motivation by adding more enjoyment and pleasure to the learning experience (Dörnyei, 2009a).

Conclusion

The aim of this article was to review the development of L2 motivation research through decades. It is evident that, just like any other discipline, L2 motivation research began with simple motives and gradually turned into a huge and bulky agenda with its own specific

theories, models, and frameworks. From almost simplistic and linear views, scholar have moved to take a much more sophisticated position that takes many other individual, social, and contextual variables into consideration. New concepts entering the field are accompanied by novel research methodologies and analytical instruments. Therefore, L2 motivation still remains a hot issue for further scrutiny.

References

Chan, L., Dörnyei, Z., & Henry, A. (2015). Learner archetypes and signature dynamics in the language classroom: A retrodictive qualitative modelling approach to studying L2 motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, P. MacIntyre & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 238-259). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behavior: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 98-119). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, *41*(4), 469-512. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00690.x

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 273- 84. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009a). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009b) *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

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

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Gardner, R. C. (1979) Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (193-220)*. Oxford, Blackwell.

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

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language learning* (pp. 1-20). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Gardner, R. C. (2007). Motivation and second language acquisition. *Porta Linguarum*, *8*, 9-20.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model.* New York: Peter Lang.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of psychology*, *13*(4), 266-272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0083787

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, *26*(1), 1-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800000045

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 359-368. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02050.x

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action.* New York: Springer.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuhl, J. (1985). Volitional mediators of cognition-behavior consistency: Self-regulatory processes and action versus state orientation. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behavior.* New York: Springer.

Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, *32*, 3-19. DOI:10.1016/j.system.2003.04.002

Noels, K. A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Toward a contextual model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 43-68). Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Noels, K. A. (2003). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. In Z. Dörnyei (Ed.), *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning* (pp. 97-136). Oxford: Blackwell.

Noels, K. A. (2009). The internalization of language learning into the self and social identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 43-65). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 83*(1), 23-34. DOI: 10.1111/0026-7902.00003

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 424-444. DOI:10.3138/cmlr.57.3.424

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50*(S1), 57-85. DOI:10.1111/0023-8333.00111

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman.

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159-171). Harlow: Longman.

Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*(1), 12-28. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02011.x

Stockwell, G. (2013). Technology and motivation in English-language teaching and learning. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), *International perspectives on motivation, language learning and professional challenges* (pp.156-175). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tremblay, P., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 79*(4), 505-518. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05451.x

Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of L2 motivation. In T. Hickey & J. Williams (Eds), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239-245). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (1998). Effective motivational thinking: A cognitive theoretical approach to the study of language learning motivation. In E. A. Soler & V. C. Espurz (Eds.), *Current issues in English language methodology* (pp. 77-89). Castelló de la Plana, Spain: Universitat Jaume.

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. 91-124). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

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: Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2012). Motivation: L2 learning as a special case? In S. Mercer, S. Ryan & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning: Insights from theory, research and practice* (pp. 58-73). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2012). Motivation. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 396-409). New York: Routledge.

Waninge, F., Dörnyei, Z., & de Bot, K. (2014). Motivational dynamics in language learning: Change, stability, and context. *Modern language Journal*, *98*(3), 704-723. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12118.x

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, *83*(2), 193-201. DOI:10.1111/0026-7902.00015

Williams, M., Burden, R., & Al-Baharna, S. (2001). Making sense of success and failure: The role of the individual in motivation theory. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 173-186). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal*, *86*(1), 54-66. DOI:10.1111/1540-4781.00136

Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self: Second language acquisition.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Elicitative Psycholinguistic Tasks for EFL/ESL Research: A Literature Review

Sedigheh Golmohammadi
Department of Language Teaching and Translation Studies, Rahman Institute for Higher Education, Ramsar, Iran. Email: golmohammadisedigheh@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-3988-0928

Abstract

Research in the fields of applied linguistics including language teaching and translation studies has for long been controversial at least in terms of methodology and instrumentation in particular. For instance, Gass & Mackey (2000-2009) elaborated on stimulated recall methodology, or Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) discussed their instrumentations and methodologies for analyzing learners' language. The impetus of the current report came from their focus on the methods and instruments in SLA research plus the tasks mentioned in Komatsu (1994) collection of research studies in cognitive psychology. Attempts were made in this article to present a list of applicable psycholinguistic tasks used in SLA. Each task underwent elaboration, and was clarified by mentioning at least one study in which the task had been used. The result of this review may have two benefits: first, many of such tasks are still practical i.e. they can still be used by researchers in linguistic and psycholinguistic fields. Second, the list of psycholinguistic tasks gives a sort of familiarity to those readers or researchers who may be at their beginning way of making their studies and conducting their experiments.

Key Words
Psycholinguistics, SLA Methodology, Elicitation, TBLT

Introduction

Whenever the issue of scientific study is under discussion, two crucial terms must be taken into account: **theory** and **practice**. Theory is the inseparable part of science because nearly all of what has been attained by scholars and researchers may be converted to enigmatic and in vain postulations in the absence of theoretical backgrounds and bases. Furthermore, scientists need to objectify the results of their findings; otherwise, what they achieve may be easily rejectable because of the lack of strengthened foundations.

On the other hand, the scientific study, or the research study the researcher is doing can be impossible if there is little or no practice in it. Practice, in fact, includes the real application of principles or rules created or arbitrated by related theories. It can range from simple observations to complicated experiments that lead researchers to more logical results. However, the question rises here is that how language learners come to practices or, more clearly speaking, experiments that have been done beforehand in order to think about them critically or do their own replications, variations or extensions of them. Textbooks also rarely convey the dispute and attractiveness to be found in the process of formulating research questions and designing, conducting and analysing experiments that address those questions.

Language studies enjoy at least three types of studies: historical, descriptive and finally, experimental studies. The last type of study is more common in psycholinguistic studies as well as research studies in cognitive science. Inasmuch as language programs include traits of both, this paper tries to present the most common tasks used in the experiments made in psycholinguistics and cognitive