The Impact of Intrinsic Motivation on Second / Foreign Language Learning

Mei-yu Kao

Lecturer, Language Center, National Ilan University

Abstract

Motivation has been recognized as a key factor in many fields of learning, especially in language study. Motivating students in learning and sustaining their motivation over an extended period is considered one of the biggest challenges for second/foreign (L2) language teachers. This paper explores the topic of learner motivation, especially intrinsic motivation, and its influence on L2 learning. After a review of the dichotomy of integrative and instrumental orientations and related research findings, this paper reviews the current research on intrinsic motivation, its underlying principle of self-determination theory, and the related issues of language learners, the role of teachers, the correlation between learners' intrinsic motivation and teachers' instructional strategies, and the impact of learners' autonomy on their motivation to learn. This paper concludes with a restatement of the importance of activating learners' intrinsic motivation in the second/ foreign language classroom. It also calls for more research on the dynamic influence of various motivational orientations on L2 learning outcomes, as explored in different socio-cultural contexts. It is suggested here that a more comprehensive dossier of qualitative data will provide researchers a more accurate insight into L2 learners' behaviors that sustain motivation toward the fulfillment of learning goals.

Keywords: motivation, intrinsic motivation, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, self-determination theory, learners' autonomy, second/foreign language learning

內在動機對第二語或
外語學習之影響

高美玉

國立宜蘭大學語言中心講師

摘　要

　　動機被公認是影響任何學習領域的一個關鍵因素，特別是語言學習方面。 如何激發學生的學習動機並讓此動機持久不墜，則是第二語或外語教師們最大的挑戰課題之一。本文旨在探索學習者的動機，特別是內在動機，及其對第二語或外語學習的影響。除了回顧研究文獻中針對二分法所謂綜合性導向及工具性導向動機之研究發現外，本文亦探討當今對於學習動機的研究主題：包括內在動機與其理論基礎所謂自我決定原理的關係，及其他相關議題如語言學習者、教師角色、學習者的內在動機與教師的教學策略之關聯性及學習者自治力對於其學習動機之影響等。本文結論除重申在第二語或外語的學習課堂裡，提升學習者內在動機的重要性外，並期冀更多的研究投入，探索在不同的文化背景下，不同的動機導向對第二語或外語學習成果的影響。本文首要建議即為收集質性研究資料，以針對第二語或外語學習者如何維持其學習動機而達成其學習目標之作為有更精確的了解。

關鍵詞：動機、內在動機、綜合性動機、工具性動機、自我決定原理、
　　　　學習者自治力、第二語/外語學習

通訊作者：高美玉，宜蘭大學語言中心　　260宜蘭市神農路一段一號
通訊電話：（03）9357400轉382　　　　E-mail: mykao@niu.edu.tw

I. Introduction

Motivation has been recognized as a key factor in successful second or foreign language (L2) learning. The way L2 teachers and researchers have typically conceptualized 'motivation', however, varies. In research inquiry where individual L2 learner variables are explored, motivation is perceived to constitute one of the most fully researched areas of individual differences (Ellis, 1994). Ellis starts his review of the literature on motivation with a display of Skehan's (1989) four hypotheses regarding the study of motivation in SLA research: The Intrinsic Hypothesis, the Resultative Hypothesis, the Internal Cause Hypothesis, and the Carrot and Stick Hypothesis. Among them, the Internal Cause Hypothesis, which corresponds with integrative motivation, has received the most detailed discussion. Only until recently have SLA researchers and language teaching practitioners had an interest in the Intrinsic Hypothesis, which is more related to language teachers and classroom pedagogy (Brown, 2001; Crooks & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994; Dornyei, 2001; Noels, Clement, & Pelletier, 1999, 2001; Noels, Pelletier, Clement, & Vallerand, 2000; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). According to a few earlier studies, the notion of intrinsic motivation refers to the learners' motivation to feel nurtured, primarily by the classroom teacher, in receiving opportunities for communication and self-direction or self-determination (autonomy) in the learning situation (Bachman, 1964; Dickinson, 1987; McNamara, 1973; Rossier, 1975; as cited in Ellis, 1994).

Ellis (1994) argues that in addition to its narrow focus on integrative and instrumental motivation, the bulk of the motivation

research relies almost exclusively on self-report questionnaires and correlation research designs. On the other hand, little research has paid attention to the effect of motivation on the process of learning.

II. Integrative and Instrumental Orientations

A. Orientation versus Motivation

In their early formation of L2 motivation theory, Gardner and his associate (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1980, 1985) suggested that individuals with an integrative orientation would demonstrate greater motivational effort in learning an L2 and, thus, would achieve greater L2 competence. According to Gardner (1985), orientation, however, is not identical with motivation. The former refers to the underlying reasons for studying an L2, whereas the latter refers to the directed effort individual learners make to learn the language. While criticizing L2 research that focuses minimally on the role of orientation, Gardner (1985) argues that the effects of learners' orientations are mediated by their motivation, which is, thus, more directly related to L2 achievement. Given this distinction, two classes of orientations are identified. An integrative orientation refers to a desire or an interest in learning the L2 in order to have connection with the people and the culture from the L2 community, whereas an instrumental orientation refers to a desire to learn the L2 to achieve some practical values and advantages.

B. Integrative Orientation and L2 Outcomes

Although different operational definitions of the concept

'integrative motivation' have been provided by Gardner and his associate (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1980, 1985) in different studies, this formulation has still inspired a considerable amount of research, the results of which have been inconsistent. Some early studies (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972) upheld the importance of integrative orientation. Others did not support the model, however, either because instrumental orientation predicted L2 outcomes as well as, or even better than, the integrative orientation, or because integrative orientation was found to have a negative correlation with L2 achievement. In a series of studies on Anglophone Canadians learning French, Gardner and his associate (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1980, 1985) found a consistent correlation between integrative orientation and L2 achievement. He argues that whereas instrumental orientation may also emerge as a significant factor in some studies, the integrative orientation was considered to be a more powerful predictor of L2 achievement. For example, in a survey of seven different geographical areas in Canada, Gardner (1985) maintained that a 'remarkably strong' relationship was found between learners' Attitude Motivation Index (AMI) scores and their grades in French.

C. Instrumental and Other Orientations and L2 Achievement

Researchers acknowledged that both integrative and instrumental orientations (motivation is used by the researchers) can have positive effects on L2 learning achievement. Muchnick and Wolfe (1982) suggested that, for these learners, it was impossible to separate these two kinds of motivation, as they found that measures of learning motivation for 377 students taking Spanish in American high schools

loaded on the same factor. Ely (1986) also found evidence of both strong integrative and instrumental motivation in first-year university students taking Spanish in the United States. Some studies, however, found a negative relationship between integrative orientation and L2 achievement (Oller, Baca, & Vigil, 1977; Oller & Perkins, 1978, as cited in Ellis, 1994).

The fact that integrative motivation is not the only kind of internal motivation involved in L2 learning is manifested in several studies done by Clement and his colleagues (Clement, 1986; Clement & Kruidenier, 1983, 1985). Having investigated 293 francophone students in Ottowa, Canada who were divided into majority and minority groups, Clement (1986) found that it was not integrativeness, but self-confidence, that proved to be the best predictor of language proficiency. Clement points out that the rather different results he obtained might reflect the greater maturity and autonomy of his university subjects, as they typically used English on a daily basis, mainly outside the classroom. It is further suggested that, for such learners, frequent contact and the concomitant self-confidence might be more pertinent to their L2 achievement than other factors. In another study of language learners in Quebec (Kruidenier & Clement, 1986, as cited in Ellis, 1994), no evidence was found to support Gardner's integrative orientation. Instead, they found evidence of a number of different orientations (e.g., friendship, travel, knowledge, and instrumental), with different groups being influenced by different orientations (e.g., a travel orientation with the Spanish group versus francophone learners of English with a friendship orientation). In a replication of Kruidenier and Clement's study, Belmechri and

Hummel (1998) found that orientations demonstrated by their ESL high school students in Quebec City were travel, understanding/school (instrumental), friendship, self-understanding, and career (instrumental). They have demonstrated that instrumental motivation could also have a positive impact on L2 learning. They further pointed out that motivation is determined by a set of orientations whose definitions are context-bound. Despite the incongruent research results, Dornyei (1990), however, argues that these various orientations are possibly all part of a general integrative orientation, with different groups of learners focusing on different constituents.

While having been only a weak predictor of L2 achievement in several Canadian studies, instrumental orientation appears to be much more powerful in other contexts (e.g., EFL or ESL in outer circle countries), as seen in Tagalog learners of L2 English in the Philippines (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) and in non-westernized female learners of L2 English in Bombay (Lukmani, 1972, as cited in Ellis, 1994). It is argued that the social situation helps to determine not only what kind of orientation learners have, but also what kind is more relevant to language learning.

Few studies have been done to investigate the direct effect of an instrumental motivation, or the provision of some kind of incentive to learn, on L2 achievement. Gardener and MacIntyre (1991) reported that students who were offered the reward of $10 for their success in a paired-associate vocabulary test did significantly better than those who were not. However, it was interesting to find that, although the rewarded group spent more time checking the pairs of words in some trials, they tended not to do so in others when the reward was not

offered. This result is seen as a major disadvantage of instrumental motivation: learners may stop applying extra effort once the opportunity to receive a reward is eliminated.

III. Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination Theory

A. Motivation as Intrinsic Interest

The notion of intrinsic motivation (IM) was developed as an alternative to goal-oriented motivation that emphasizes the role of extrinsic rewards and punishments (Ellis, 1994). 'Interest' is identified as one of the major elements of intrinsic motivation, which is defined as a positive response to stimuli for which learners' curiosity is aroused and sustained. According to Crookes and Schmidt (1991), students are considered motivated if they become productively engaged in learning tasks provided in the classroom and sustain that engagement without further encouragement or direction. Therefore, teachers view it as their primary job to motivate students by engaging their interest in classroom activities.

In their study of the effects of two kinds of instructional programs on French learners, Gardner, Ginsberg, and Smythe (1976) reported evidence that self-direction is important to learners. Students who experienced the traditional (lockstep) teaching indicated that they were more likely to withdraw and had a more negative view of their teacher. Those who experienced the innovative program reported a strong desire to excel and a more positive attitude toward learning French. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) also suggested a number of other ways for classroom teachers to foster students' intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic

motivation (IM) are based on the following criteria: providing the learning tasks with a reasonable challenge, providing opportunities for group work, providing tasks which meet learners' needs and wants, providing a variety of classroom activities, and keeping a good rapport with their students.

B. Motivation and Self-determination Theory

According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000), different types of motivation vary according to how much a learner engages in a task or activity for personal decision or choice. These types of motivation can be broadly defined as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is not categorized as a true dichotomy, but rather lies along a continuum of self-determination. Intrinsic motivation (IM) refers to learners' motivation to perform classroom tasks or activities simply for the pleasure and satisfaction inherent in the activity or task itself, without any other external rewards provided. These feelings of pleasure originate from a desire to fulfill innate needs for competence and self-determination. People who are intrinsically motivated take the activity they are doing as a challenge to their existing competencies, and it requires them to use their potential capabilities. On the continuum, IM is considered to be highly self-determined in the sense that it stems solely from the learner's individual positive feeling while performing the task.

In the context of L2 learning, extrinsic motivation (EM) includes three sub-types (see Noels & Clement & Pelletier, 1999, 2000). External regulation, which refers to a student's effort to learn an L2, stems from some social pressure or reward such as job advancement

or a course grade. Introjected regulation refers to the more internalized effort that students put into acquiring an L2 so as to avoid feelings of guilt or shame for not having performed well. Identified regulation is the most self-determined type of EM, as the learner decides to perform a behavior because the activity has value for his/her chosen goal. For example, a student who feels that culture is important may view language learning very positively because language learning helps support the valued goal (Noels et al., 1999). The final motivational concept proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) is amotivation. Amotivation arises when a learner does not have any goal for learning a language. Lacking learning objective will cause the learner to quit performing the activity.

In investigating the relationship between L2 learners' achievement and their motivation to learn, researchers in social psychology and education have found that certain affective variables such as attitude, orientation, anxiety, and motivation serve as factors at least as important as language aptitude for predicting the success of L2 learning (Noels et al., 1999). In response to L2 researchers' call for exploring models of L2 motivation (e.g., Crools & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994, Oxford & Shearin, 1994), Noels and his colleagues from psychology started to examine types of motivation and the four orientations discussed by Clement and Kruidenier (1983) (i.e., the Travel, Knowledge, and Friendship and Instrumental orientations). The results of their examination of Anglo-Canadians learning French and Anglo-Americans learning Spanish (Noels et al., 1999, 2000) suggest that learner motivation can be validly assessed by using intrinsic and extrinsic subtypes of motivation, as addressed in Deci

and Ryan's (1985) Self-determination Theory. On a self-determination continuum, the correlations between subscales suggest a distinction between amotivation, less self-determined types of motivation (external and introjected regulation), and more self-determined types of motivation (identified regulation and IM). They also found that more self-determined forms of motivation (i.e., identified regulation and IM) were related to perceptions of the non-controlling environment and were predictive of lower anxiety and the intention to continue the L2 learning.

Noels and his colleagues' studies are instrumental to shedding light on the implications of language teaching. According to Noels et al. (1999), students' perceptions of their teachers' communicative style are related to intrinsic motivation such that the more controlling and the less informative students perceived the teachers to be, the lower was students' intrinsic motivation. Moreover, feelings of intrinsic motivation were related to positive language learning outcomes, including greater motivational intensity and self-evaluations of competence and lower anxiety.

In another study, Noels et al. (2000) found that IM, although related to EM, lies on a continuum separate from EM. This result might suggest that students' L2 learning enjoyment may not guarantee their actual involvement in the learning process. The researchers argued that language teachers may not be able to convince majority groups who are learning a minority language that language learning is interesting and enjoyable over the long term. To foster sustained learning, teachers need to persuade these students that learning is also personally relevant. Brophy (1987) has already made a sensible

distinction between strategies for supplying intrinsic motivation versus those that supply motivation to learn, stating that even for academic activities, intrinsic motivation "does not necessarily imply motivation to learn" (p. 41). Brophy further explained, "Students may enjoy participating in an educational game without trying to derive any academic benefit from it" (1987, p. 41). In synthesizing strategies for stimulating student motivation to learn, Brophy pointed out that the suggested strategies should be able to stimulate students to take academic activities seriously and to acquire the knowledge or skills the learners are supposed to develop. The above implications highlight the relationship between intrinsic motivation (or motivation) and learner autonomy, as reviewed in the next section.

C. Intrinsic Motivation and Learner Autonomy

In recent years, researchers on effective foreign language learning have extensively discussed the importance of learner autonomy (Dickinson, 1995; Holec, 1981; Little, 1995; Littlewood, 1999; Noels et al., 2001). Learner autonomy is a theoretical construct in which students take greater control over the content and methods of learning (Holec, 1981). Researchers also generally considered it to be one of the most influential factors in sustained learning that facilitates long-term success (Little, 1999). Learners are perceived as decision-makers who have or will develop their self-determination to choose from among available learning tools and resources to create what is required for the task (Dickinson, 1995; Holec, 1981; Little 1995). According to Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-determination Theory, autonomy-supportive social contexts provide students with the learner's sense of self-initiation and self-regulation in performing actions. Therefore,

developing positive attitudes towards learner autonomy and its necessary skills is essential to facilitate the development of learner autonomy (Chan, 2003). Additionally, autonomy-supportive teachers tend to enhance students' intrinsic motivation, while controlling teachers decrease it (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1987). Hence, to cultivate learners' autonomy and to promote their intrinsic motivation to sustain their learning interests, language teachers and their pedagogy play a crucial role (Chan, 2003; Yang, 1998).

Since researchers have identified student interest as an important variable that enhances learning, it is crucial to discover ways to stimulate curiosity and motivation to learn (Wu, 2002). In Wu's study, 176 college students in Taiwan perceived that their motivation to learn English could benefit greatly from teaching techniques that create a pleasant and productive environment for students (e.g., games, songs, and films). Yang (1998) described how the course requirement –the language learning project—is of great help in guiding students through the process of self-assessment, goal-setting, planning, monitoring, and evaluating their own language learning. Chen (2000) investigated the correlation between student intrinsic motivation and their perception of teaching styles by using a combination of data including survey, students' learning journal and essay writing. The result of a significantly positive correlation suggested that in order to promote genuine interest in English learning, teachers should use instructional strategies that encourage student autonomy, such as providing choices, inviting students for decision making, etc.

As Ho and Crookall (1995) contended, "it is through concrete actions of taking responsibility that autonomy is learned" (p. 235), teachers should be aware that their students, who were not used

to autonomous learning due to the inherent learning environment, needed to start with the training for autonomous learning and teachers should provide more time for consultation with students regarding their learning along with the independent learning process (Huang, 1999). Furthermore, in order to sustain learners' motivation to learn and foster their learning autonomy, teachers play an important role. Data from teachers' perspectives are also crucially relevant. Caution should be taken in drawing research implications. In Chan's study (2003), although in classroom setting teachers generally perceived themselves to be more responsible for their teaching methodologies, for motivating their students to be more responsible for assessing and evaluating their own learning, no teachers reported that they ever asked students to choose their own materials, activities, or learning objectives. Chan claims, "Teachers who want to help students to function autonomously have to learn to 'let go'" (p. 49). She further states that it is necessary to develop a flexible teaching culture in which the partnership of the teacher and students serves to enhance the practice of learner autonomy. By the same token, Brown also reminded us that all the enthusiasm for intrinsic motivation should not lure language teachers to think that they have "a catchall concept that will explain everything about teaching and learning" (2001, p. 82). Other factors including native language ability, age, context of learning, learning styles, background experience and qualifications, their available time and effort, and the quality of input are all constituents for fulfilling the teaching goals and, hence, affecting the learning outcomes.

IV. Conclusion and Implication

It is undeniable that motivation plays a crucial role in human behavior, as people use it widely in a variety of everyday and professional contexts. When the target is L2 achievement, however, the issue becomes more complex. Given that language is socially and culturally bound, the mastery of an L2 is not merely an issue of school learning. It is also an intricate social event that incorporates a wide range of L2 cultural elements (Dornyei, 2001). Motivation accelerates the active personal involvement in L2 learning. Conversely, unmotivated students are less involved and, therefore, are unable to develop their potential L2 skills. Ellis's (1994) review chapter has informed how the pioneering researchers defined motivation and determined how learning orientation correlates with motivation in acquiring an L2. Integrative motivation, combined with instrumental motivation, has been considered to be closely related to L2 achievement. Given that motivation is the key to L2 achievement, the most salient point is then not to focus on how to enhance a certain type of motivation, but, rather, the key is that the teachers should focus on activating their students' motivation to learn, regardless of their type. This has grave implications for current research paradigms and classroom instruction.

A. Implications for Research Paradigms

Research limitations extend beyond the above-mentioned problems regarding confusing definitions of motivation types and the limited data that self-report questionnaires generate. Additional weaknesses exist in relation to the research paradigms reported in the previous research

agenda. The areas that are either omitted or that are not fully explored by the pioneering studies require further research attention. For example, what is still in the 'Pandora's Box' is the question of how motivation affects the learning process or how the development of motivation coincides with the learning process. It is important to investigate what learners will do once motivation arises so as to sustain it in fulfilling their learning goals. Data collected qualitatively might be more accurate in reflecting students' learning behaviors.

Recently, researchers have increased discussion about the nature of language learning motivation (e.g., Dorneyei, 1990, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994), and some L2 scholars are considering alternative motivation models (e.g., Brown, 2001; Crooks & Schmidt, 1991; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Wen, 1997). One formulation that has received the attention of several L2 researchers and practitioners is the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (e.g., Brown, 2001; Dickinson, 1995; Dornyei, 1994). The role of intrinsic motivation, which is more salient to classroom teachers, calls for more of our attention and research.

B. Implications for Classroom Instruction

What a teacher can do in the classroom to stimulate students' intrinsic motivation has currently been addressed in the literature. According to Brown (2001), learners who are given an opportunity to 'do' language for their own personal reasons of achieving competence and autonomy will have a better chance of succeeding in achieving an L2 than when they are just dependent on external rewards for their motivation. He further provided a checklist to help L2 classroom teachers determine whether something they are doing in the classroom

is contributing to their students' intrinsic motivation. Likewise, based on a survey of Hungarian foreign language teachers, Dornyei and Csizer (1998) offered a set of "ten commandments" for motivating learners (p. 215):

1. Set a personal example with your own behavior.
2. Create a pleasant, relaxed atmosphere in the classroom.
3. Present the tasks properly.
4. Develop a good relationship with the learners.
5. Increase the learners' linguistic self-confidence.
6. Make the language classes interesting.
7. Promote learner autonomy.
8. Personalize the learning process.
9. Increase the learners' goal-orientedness.
10. Familiarize learners with the target culture.

These 10 guidelines, coming directly from teachers 'out there' in the 'arena', are worth our careful consideration. In addition, in an earlier synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn, Brophy (1987) posits, "Students are more likely to want to learn when they appreciate the value of classroom activities and when they believe they will succeed if they apply reasonable effort" (p. 40). She argues that strategies for stimulating motivation to learn differ from strategies for providing extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation. For example, Intrinsic Motivation, which refers to liking for, or enjoyment of, an activity may not definitely imply motivation to learn, and vice versa. It appears that her theory of 'motivation to learn' encompasses almost all the motivational orientations discussed in this

paper. Moreover, the recommended strategies are not only suitable for use by teachers during academic activities as the researcher contends, but they are also comprehensive principles for foreign language teaching.

As previously pointed out, mastery of L2 is a complex issue. When any issue about language teaching and learning is discussed, cultural differences should contribute to the main thrust of the research. Previous studies, as reviewed by Ellis (1994), showed that different groups of learners revealed different dominant orientations, depending on their learning settings. According to Dornyei (1990), integrative motivation might be far less relevant to EFL students, as opposed to those who learn a second language within the L2 environment and who must learn to live in the target culture and communicate fluently in the target language. EFL learners, who rarely have sufficient experience with that target language community, will probably not devote themselves to integrating with the target culture. In many Asian countries such as Taiwan, Japan, Korea, and China, far more students are studying English because it is a core requirement at all colleges and universities. However, in most cases, English is not typically used as the medium of everyday communication; learners also rarely have the opportunity to use English because they are surrounded by their own native languages.

A recent study (e.g., Warden & Lin, 2001), which investigated the existence of distinctive motivational groups within a population of college Taiwanese EFL learners, reported that integrative motivation is not as important to these students as is required motivation or instrumental motivation. Since the instrumental and required

motivational groups clearly loaded on different factors, the authors assumed that the required motivational group might perceive English as only having a goal of fulfilling graduation, entrance exam, or job exam requirements. In this case, many EFL learners in Taiwan may see English as being useful for their career development, but it does not absolutely follow that everyone will then study English or take advantage of their opportunities. That is, given that there are many paths to career improvement, "this one may not be sufficiently rewarding for students to actually sacrifice their time and effort" (Warden & Lin, 2001, p. 542). As EFL teachers, we should be very cautious when choosing the teaching material and the way we teach, in that EFL instruction is still highly informed by imported ESL theory and western-based research findings. In addition, teachers returning from ESL education and training in the West may actually overlook the central orientations of their students. Therefore, it is crucial to better understand what exactly motivates EFL students in order to improve educational results, reduce misdirected effort, and decrease frustration felt by both students and teachers.

As previously argued, intrinsic motivation is more pertinent to L2 instruction in the classroom setting, and, thus, it is a more convincing determinant of L2 achievement in an EFL setting where most learning takes place in the classroom conducted by the classroom teacher. How to motivate students to learn in an optimal classroom environment requires the teacher's enthusiasm and effort. Last but not least, while it is a regret for a teacher to find 'amotivation', i.e., the absence of motivation, on the part of the students, it is even worse to find learners' 'demotivation', as happens when someone who was once motivated

loses his or her commitment or interest for some reason. According to Dornyei (2001), many reported sources of demotivation were "teacher-owned," that is, "the lack of motivation was attributed to what the teacher had done or had been responsible for" (p. 145). Dornyei claims that demotivation is a salient phenomenon in L2 studies, and teachers have a considerable responsibility to safeguard against it. In the EFL setting, therefore, the issue of 'demotivation' deserves even more attention from the teachers, along with their realization of the importance of motivating students towards attaining L2 learning goals.

In conclusion, most fields of learning share a consensus that motivation is essential to learning success. As suggested in the bulk of the pioneering studies on the effects of types of motivation on L2 learning outcomes, integrative orientation, combined with instrumental orientation, has been found to be a powerful predictor of L2 learning motivation and its achievement. However, learners from bilingual areas might be influenced more by other factors such as self-confidence or friendship. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation, arising from within the learners as enjoyment of the learning process itself or as a desire to make themselves feel better, has a long–term influence on learners' interests in L2 learning and is currently considered remarkably important for encouraging success in language learning. Finally, while 'amotivation' on the part of the students attracts L2 teachers' attention and care, the issue of students' 'demotivation,' which, as reported in the literature, was often attributed to teacher-owned factors, undoubtedly deserves even more awareness from L2 teachers, especially from those are in the EFL setting. In a nutshell, research on Intrinsic Motivation has not yet been fully explored. More

studies are also required to investigate the potential effect of learning experience on students' motivation and the effect of motivation on the learning process. More quantitative and qualitative research data obtained from students and teachers will enable educators to develop new teaching roles and strategies which promote greater learner autonomy over the long term.

References

Brophy, J. (1987). Synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn. *Educational Leadership, 45*, 40-48.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chan, V. (2003). Autonomous language learning: The teachers' perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education, 8*(1), 33-54.

Chen, Y. L. E. (2000). Autonomy-supportive instruction and students' intrinsic motivation in an EFL classroom. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp. 210-219). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.

Clement, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5*, 271-290.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning, 44*, 417-448.

Clement, R., & Kruidenier, B. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: The effects of ethnicity, milieu and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning, 33,* 273-291.

Clement, R., & Kruidenier, B. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4*, 21-38.

Crooks, G.., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*, 469-512.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy, and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1024-1037.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G.., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in education: The self-determination perspective. *The Educational Psychologists, 26*, 325-346.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System, 23*, 325-346.

Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 46-78.

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 482-493.

Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. England: Pearson Educational Limited.

Dornyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*, 203-229.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ely, C. M. (1986). Language learning motivation: A descriptive and causal analysis.

Modern Language Journal, 70, 28-35.

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

Gardner, R. C., Ginsberg, R., & Smythe, P. (1976). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning: Course related change. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 32*, 243-266.

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

Gardner, R., & MacIntyre, P. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: Who says it isn't effective? *Language Teaching, 25*, 211-220.

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical perspectives. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 359-368.

Ho, J., & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: Learner autonomy in English language teaching. *System, 23*(2), 235-243.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Huang, S. C. (1999). Learning toward learner autonomy: An example from an English class. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on English Teaching. R. O. C.* (pp.375-383). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175-181.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asia contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 20*, 71-94.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 23-34.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 424-442.

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

Oxford, R. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 512-514.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expending the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 12-28.

Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 505-518.

Warden, C. A., & Lin, H. J. (2001). Existence of integrative motivation in an EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*, 535-547.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 235-251.

Wu, H. Y. (2002). Teaching techniques that keep university students interested in English learning. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium on English Teaching, R. O. C./Fourth Pan-Asian Conference* (pp. 565-571). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.