Review Article

A Discussion and Comparison of Gardner and Dörnyei in Relation to Their Theories of Motivation in Second Language Learning

Gardner ve Dörnyei'nin İkinci Dil Öğreniminde Motivasyon Teorilerine İlişkin Bir Tartışma ve Karşılaştırma

Zeynep Butun Ikwuegbu [1]

[1] Ins. Dr., Kahramanmaraş Sutçü İmam University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Motivation has drawn considerable attention in learning as it plays a key role whether students stay committed and resilient throughout the learning process. In second language (L2) learning as well, the role of motivation has been researched widely, and scholars have proposed various theories to explain how motivation plays a role in learning an L2. This paper reviews Garder`s (1985) Socio-Educational Model and Dörnyei`s (2005) L2 Motivational Self System, explains the similarities and differences between them, and discusses and compares them with regards to their relevance to L2 learning in today`s world. Lastly, it presents empirical studies from around the world, which have been carried out by using Garder`s (1985) Socio-Educational Model and Dörnyei`s (2005) L2 Motivational Self System. The paper concludes with emphasising the importance of giving motivation enough attention in L2 learning, and therefore researching ways to enhance learners` motivation with regards to learning an L2.

Keywords: Second Language Learning, Motivation, Socio-Educational Model, L2 Motivational Self System

ÖZET

Motivasyon, öğrencilerin öğrenme süreci boyunca kararlı ve dirençli kalıp kalmamalarında önemli bir rol oynadığından büyük ilgi görmüştür. İkinci dil (L2) öğreniminde de motivasyonun rolü geniş çapta araştırılmıştır ve araştırmacılar motivasyonun bir L2 öğrenmede nasıl bir rol oynadığını açıklamak için çeşitli teoriler önermişlerdir. Bu makale Garder'ın (1985) Sosyo-Eğitimsel Modeli ve Dörnyei'nin (2005) L2 Motivasyonel Benlik Sistemini gözden geçirmekte, aralarındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları açıklamakta ve bunların ikinci dil öğreniminde günümüz dünyasında nasıl bir yeri olduğunu incelemektedir. Son olarak, Garder'ın (1985) Sosyo-Eğitim Modeli ve Dörnyei'nin (2005) L2 Motivasyonel Benlik Sistemi kullanılarak gerçekleştirilen dünyanın dört bir yanından ampirik çalışmaları sunmaktadır. Makale, ikinci dil öğreniminde motivasyona yeterince dikkat edilmesinin önemini vurgulayarak ve bu nedenle öğrencilerin ikinci dil öğrenimine ilişkin motivasyonunu artırmanın yollarını araştırmakla sona ermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İkinci Dil Öğrenimi, Motivasyon, Sosyo-Eğitim Modeli, L2 Motivasyonel Benlik Sistemi

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation is regarded as a difficult term to define, as it is quite abstract. Nevertheless, there have been attempts to define it. According to Mitchell (1982), motivation is a measurement of the degree of effort an individual puts into a particular task, which Moiinvaziri (2007) strongly agrees with, stating that motivation refers to the intensity of an individual's willingness to learn. In addition to these definitions, Oroujlou and Vahedi (2011) claim that it is more useful to think in terms of a "motivated learner" which they define as an individual who is willing to invest effort in tasks to make progress through the learning process. Therefore, it can be inferred that the role of motivation is quite important in one's learning process since it impacts on achievement (Mitchell, 1982; Ortega, 2009; Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011; Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011; Murray et al. 2011; Burns & Richards, 2012; Nayan et al., 2014; Jang et al. 2015).

Rifai (2010) and Oroujlou and Vahedi (2011) indicate that motivation includes the learners' reasons to acquire a second language (L2), and these reasons, according to Ghazvini and Khajehpour (2011), affect both the rate and the success of L2 learning. There have been several theories on L2 motivation throughout the years following the recognition of motivation as an important individual disposition which is believed to explain the underlying reasons why some learners are more successful than others at language learning (Ortega, 2009; Murray et al. 2011; Burns & Richards, 2012).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Gardner`s (1985) Socio-Educational Model

Previously, success in language learning was attributed to individual differences associated with cognitive factors such as aptitude and intelligence (Gardner et al., 1992). However, Lambert (1955) suggested that affective factors

such as one's identification with the other language community might have an impact on L2 learning. Based on Lambert's (1955) claim, Gardner and Lambert (1959) carried out a study and found that the success in L2 learning was related to social motivation as an affective factor as well as language aptitude (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

Gardner (1985) believes that language learning and motivation are directly linked to each other, and he defines L2 motivation as "the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (p.10). His definition includes three components: a) intensity of motivation, b) desire to learn the language, c) attitude towards learning the language (Gardner, 1985; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model focuses on the role of individual differences in the process of L2 learning, and he claims that learning an L2 is different from learning other subjects since the former requires learning the skills or specific behaviours that are characteristics of the target community. Consequently, learner's attitudes towards the target community and openness to taking on salient features of that community are believed to impact on the success in learning a second or foreign language (Gardner, 1985; 2010).

In the Socio-Educational Model, two major orientations, namely integrative and instrumental orientations, are believed to function to increase motivation. It is claimed that learners who have positive attitudes towards both speakers and culture of the target language, who like to communicate in the target language, and who wish to represent the target community, are the most successful ones while learning an L2; and this type of motivation is defined as integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985). Instrumental motivation, however, is characterised by the desire to gain pragmatic benefits such as having a good social status, a successful academic life and a good job with a high salary through knowing an L2 (Gardner, 1985; Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011; Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011). However, this distinction between the types of motivation does not require choosing only one of them since both types are quite important in L2 learning (Gardner, 1985; Gardner et al., 1992; Gardner, 2010; Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011; Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011). Although instrumental motivation is not viewed as strong as integrative motivation (Gardner, 2010), Crook (1991) claims that a learner may learn an L2 just as well through an instrumental motivation as with an integrative motivation. To be able to provide a scientific basis for measuring individual differences such as motivation, integrativeness and attitudes towards the learning situation, Gardner (1985) uses AMTB, namely the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, which is a Likert-scale questionnaire made up of over 130 items.

Gardner's theory (1985) has contributed greatly to the research on L2 motivation and been supported by many scholars. Giles and Byrne (1982) emphasise the importance of integrative motivation by stating that it facilitates second language acquisition. Finegan (1999, p.568) theorises that "integrative motivation typically underlies successful acquisition of a wide range of registers and a native-like pronunciation". Moreover, Benson (1991) indicates that integrative motivation represents the desire to become bilingual as well as bicultural through the process of adding the target language, along with the target culture, to one's identity.

However, the Socio-Educational Model has come under serious criticism for being narrow and unresponsive to developments in psychology (Dörnyei, 1994, 2005; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009, 2011). Gardner is claimed to disregard all contexts other than Canada, which according to Dörnyei (1994, 2005), Ortega (2009), Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009, 2011) and Murray et al. (2011) compromises his notion of integrativeness and the Socio-Educational model in general. Moreover, Gardner's (1985) notion of integrative motivation has also been claimed to be irrelevant to today's modern globalised world (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

2.2. Dörnyei `s (2005) L2 Motivational Self System

Dörnyei and Otto (1998) claim that L2 motivation should be regarded as a lifelong process (rather than a linear one) since it is a complex and dynamic phenomenon that is subject to change over time. They suggest adopting a process-oriented approach that can facilitate tracking ups and downs in the intensity of individuals' motivation. The Process Model of L2 Motivation (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998) is grounded on the idea that motivational behavior has antecedents and consequences. It divides the motivational behaviour into three distinct phases such as pre-actional (choosing the goal or the task), actional (acting according to the choice), and post-actional phases (assessing the performance of the activity). However, Dörnyei (2005) himself states that there are two shortcomings of the process model; the first is the impossibility of understanding the exact time when a learning process begins and ends in classrooms, the second is the fact that learning can not be isolated from other ongoing activities that individuals are engaged in.

Dörnyei (2005) claims that there is a need for a more *radical reformulation,* and that L2 is a part of individual's identity, therefore he re-theorises motivation in the concepts of self and identity by claiming that L2 motivation should be approached from a whole-person perspective. In 2005, Dörnyei proposed the "L2 Motivational Self System", which aims to integrate affective and emotional factors with cognition (Ryan and Dörnyei, 2013).

Dörnyei's framework incorporates "ideal self", "ought-to self" and "L2 learning experience". Ideal self, which is *the L2-specific facet of one's ideal self*, is regarded as a powerful motivator since it represents both the ideal image that one wishes to be in the future and the desire to reduce the gap between one's actual self and ideal self (Dörnyei, 2005). Ought-to self, however, is concerned with the attributes that someone believes he/she ought to possess, obligations and responsibilities, in order to stay away from possible negative outcomes (Dörnyei, 2005). Dörnyei (2005) states that L2 learning experience, the third component, is characterised by the situation-specific motives that are related to the actual learning environment and the experience, such as teachers, learner's peers, the language curriculum and the experience of achievement.

Dörnyei (2005) indicates that the L2 Motivational Self System builds on the Socio-Educational Model since they are both centred on the notions of identity and integrativeness. However, stating that global Englishes is regarded as an international language now, and there is neither a specific target community representing it nor an "owner" of the L2, Dörnyei (2005) feels the need to reinterpret the notion of integrativeness. He suggests that integrativeness refer to a drive for identification of an individual with oneself to reduce the gap between the actual self and ideal self, rather than a drive for identification of an individual with the target community and language. Therefore, according to the reinterpreted version of integrativeness, if an individual would like to be a proficient L2 user, he/she can be claimed to have integrative motivation in Gardner's terminology (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009, 2011). Gardner's (1985) instrumental motivation is claimed to mix up the ideal and ought-to selves (Dörnyei, 2005). Dörnyei (2005) indicates that the ideal self has a promotion focus that is concerned with success, hopes, desires and wishes while the ought-to self has a prevention focus that is concerned with obligations, safety and responsibilities. Therefore, in a situation when someone idealises himself/herself as a person who is professionally successful, then instrumental motives are related to the ideal L2 self. In contrast, in a situation when one studies an L2 to avoid failing an exam (with a prevention motive), then instrumental motives are related to the ought-to self (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). As such, dividing the instrumental motivation into two types, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009, 2011) state that "instrumentality-promotion" is associated with the ideal self, while "instrumentality-prevention" is associated with the ought-to self. Unlike Gardner who carries out quantitative research methods while investigating L2 motivation, Boo et al. (2015) and Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) indicate that qualitative and innovative methods for data collection can contribute to the findings in terms of balance and reliability.

Gardner's interpretation of integrativeness regards the learners as motivated if they want to learn a language by entering into a specific, clearly defined target community (Ryan, 2006). Although this interpretation may work in Canada since it is a bilingual environment which provides individuals with a target community to integrate themselves in, it may not work in contexts where individuals do not have any opportunity to access to the target community (Sung, 2013). Warschauer (2000) states that, with globalisation, a new society has come out where English is shared by many non-native speakers rather than dominated or owned by native speakers. Now, English is widely regarded as a lingua franca for an L2 learner to communicate with other people in the world, and as a language that belongs to whoever uses it, therefore it is hard to claim that English still represents the culture or the language of specific English-speaking countries (Sung, 2013). As such, language learners should identify themselves with the international community by constructing bi-cultural global identity that represents an English-speaking globally involved version of themselves as either their ideal self or ought-to self (Lamb, 2004; Ushioda, 2011; Sung, 2013). Developing a global identity gives the learners not only a feeling of belonging to worldwide culture but also the opportunity to keep their L1-speaking self (Lamb, 2004).

2.3. Empirical Studies Focusing on Motivation in L2

Motivation, as a key factor in L2 learning, has been the subject of numerous studies that have been conducted in different contexts and therefore had different findings. For example, Gardner, Day and MacIntyre (1992) looked at integrative motivation and anxiety in acquiring computerised vocabulary and found that participants who had higher integrative motivation were better in vocabulary acquisition than the ones whose integrative motivation was lower. In Gardner, Lalonde and Moorcroft's study in 1985, it was found that the performances of participants` who were highly integrative motivated were similar to the performances of the ones who had lower levels of integrative motivation on the first trial to learn English equivalents of rare French words, however the former group was faster in learning during the subsequent trials.

Ghazvini and Khajehpour (2011) investigated Iranian students' motivation and attitudes towards learning English through a questionnaire. The findings showed that girls were more integrative motivated while boys were more instrumental motivated to learn English. The findings also indicated that there were major instrumental factors in girls' being integrative motivated. Mun (2004) investigated the relationship between learners' English proficiency levels and their integrative and instrumental motivation. The findings indicated that the motivational orientation

among the learners whose levels were low, average and high were similar to each other since they all had instrumental motivation to learn English. Moreover, the findings indicated that more proficient learners were the ones who had integrative motivation to learn the language.

Dörnyei and Chan (2013) investigated the relationship between the future L2 self- guides (namely ideal and ought-to L2 selves) and success in learning two target languages (Mandarin and English), and they found that there was a positive relationship between the L2 self guides and the learners' effort and success in L2 learning, but they emphasized the possibility of different languages' being associated with distinct ideal language selves. In a study of college students` learning English as a second language and French, Japanese, German or Korean as a third language in Taiwan, Huang et al. (2015) found that the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 elf, cultural interest and identification with social role obligations were predictors for targeted learning behaviours. They found that while the ought-to L2 self had a quite important role while predicting the learning efforts for three of the languages: English, German and Japanese; the ideal L2 self played a decisive role in learning French and Korean. Based on the results of the last two studies, it can be inferred that the role of the self-guides may change according to the target language.

3. CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly, motivation has a critical role in learners' language learning process. Different theories of motivation have been derived throughout the years, although they have used different frameworks, they all have emphasized the importance of motivation as an individual difference. Now, there is a consensus among the scholars that L2 motivation is a dynamic phenomenon since it is directly related with the learner and his/her identity (Ryan, 2006; Sung, 2014). Therefore, the findings and the implications of the studies of L2 motivation should be used for enhancing the learners' motivation and helping them to acquire necessary skills to be able to construct global identities.

REFERENCES

1. Benson, M. J. (1991). "Attitudes and motivation towards English: A survey of Japanese freshmen." RELC Journal, 22(1), 34-48.

2. Boo, Z.; Dornyei, Z. & Ryan, S. (2015). "L2 Motivation research 2005- 2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape." ELSEVIER, 55, 145-157.

3. Burns, A. & Richards, J. C. (2012). The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, USA.

4. Cook, V. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. Edward Arnold, London.

5. Dörnyei, Z. (1994). "Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning." Language Learning, 40, 45–78.

6. Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., USA.

7. Dörnyei, Z. & Ottó, I. (1998). "Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation." Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 4, 43–69.

8. Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2009). Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self. MPG Books Ltd., GB.

9. Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2011). Teaching and Researching Motivation, 2nd edn. Pearson Education Limited, GB.

10. Dörnyei, Z. & Chan, L. (2013). "Motivation and Vision: An Analysis of Future L2 Self Images, Sensory Styles, and Imagery Capacity Across Two Target Languages." Language Learning, 63 (3), 437-462.

11. Finegan, E. (1999). Language: Its structure and use, 3rd edn. Harcourt Brace.

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

13. Gardner, R. C. (1988). "Attitudes and Motivation." Applied Linguistics, 9, 135-148.

14. Gardner, R. C.; Day, J. B. & Maclntyre, P. D. (1992). "Integrative Motivation, Induced

15. Anxiety, And Language Learning in A Controlled Environment." SSLA, 14, 197-214.

16. Gardner, R. C. (2010). Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The Socio- Educational Model. Germany: Peter Lang Publishing.

17. Gardner, R. C.; Lalonde, R. N., & Moorcroft, R. (1985). "The Role of Attitudes and

18. Motivation in Second Language Learning: Correlational and Experimental Considerations." Language Learning, 35 (2), 207-227.

19. Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1959). "Motivational variables in second language acquisition." Journal of psychology, 13(4), 266–272.

20. Ghazvini, S. D. & Khajehpour, M. (2011). "Attitudes and Motivation in Learning English as Second Language in High School Students." Social and Behavioural Sciences, 15, 1209-1213.

21. Giles, H. & Byrne, J. L. (1982). "An intergroup approach to second language acquisition." Journal of multilingual and multicultural development. 1(1), 17–40.

22. Huang, H. T.; Hsu, C. C. & Chen, S. W. (2015). "Identification with social role obligations, possible selves, and L2 motivation in foreign language learning." ELSEVIER, 51, 28-38.

23. Jang, B. G.; Conradi, K.; McKenna, M. C., & Jones, J. S. (2015). "Motivation: Approaching an Elusive Concept Through the Factors That Shape It." The Reading Teacher, 69 (2), 239-247.

24. Lamb, M. (2004). "Integrative motivation in a globalizing world." ELSEVIER, 32, 3-19.

25. Lambert, W. E. (1955). "Measurement of the linguistic dominance of bilinguals." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50, 197-200.

26. Mitchell, T. R. (1982). "New Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice." The Academy of Management Review, 7 (1), 80-88.

27. Moiinvaziri, M. A. M (2007). "Motivational orientation in English language learning. Summary: A study of Iranian undergraduate students' motivational orientation in English language learning." Retrieved from https://www.usingenglish.com/teachers/articles/motivational-orientation-in-english-language-learning.html

28. Mun, Y. S. (2004). "Motivation as a contributing factor in English language learning: a comparison between different English language proficiency UTM undergraduates." Unpublished undergraduate thesis, UTM Malaysia.

29. Murray, G.; Gao, X. & Lamb, T. (2011). Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Language Learning. Short Run Press Ltd., GB.

30. Nayan, S.; Krishnasamy, H. N. & Shafie, L. A. (2014). "A Cross- National Study of Motivation in Language Learning." International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 4 (2), 194-197.

31. Oroujlou, N. & Vahedi, M. (2011). "Motivation, Attitude, and Language Learning." Social and Behavioural Sciences, 29, 994-1000.

32. Ortega, L. (2009). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Routledge, NY.

33. Rifai, N. A. (2010). "Attitude, Motivation, and Difficulties Involved in Learning the English Language and Factors That Affect Motivation in Learning It." Social and Behavioural Sciences, 2, 5216-5227.

34. Ryan, S. (2006). "Language Learning Motivation within the Context of Globalisation: An L2 Self within an Imagined Global Community." Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3(1), 23-45.

35. Ryan, S. & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). "The long- term evolution of language motivation and the L2 self." (Ed. A. Berndt), Fremdsprachen in der Perspektive lebenslangen Lernens, pp. 89- 100, Peter Lang, Framkfurt.

36. Sung, C. C. M. (2013). "Learning English as an L2 in the Global Context: Changing English, Changing Motivation." Changing English, 20(4), 377-387.

37. Sung, C. C. M. (2014). "Global, local or glocal? Identities of L2 learners in English as a

38. Lingua Franca communication." Language, Culture and Curriculum, 27(1), 43-57.

39. Tremblay, P. F & Gardner, R. C. (1995). "Expanding the Motivation Construct in

40. Language Learning." The Modern Language Journal, 79, 505-520.

41. Ushioda, E. (2011). "Language learning motivation, self and identity: current theoretical perspectives." Computer Assisted Language Learning, 24(3), 199-210.

42. Warschauer, M. (2000). "The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching." TESOL Quarterly, 34, 511-535.