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THE EARLY 1990S BROUGHT ALONG A renewed interest in L2 motivation with researchers exploring various directions in which the social psychological construct of L2 motivation associated with the work of Robert Gardner and his associates could be developed (1:3; 5; 8; 20-24). In a paper in the last issue of The Modern Language Journal (7), I attempted to elaborate on the educational aspect of L2 motivation by bringing together classroom-specific motives in a three-level construct, and concluded the article by stating that it was “intended to be part of a discussion that will hopefully result in a more clearly defined and elaborate model of motivation in foreign language learning” (p. 283). It was therefore a very pleasant surprise to see in the same issue a response article by Gardner and Tremblay, in which the authors responded to three recent papers on L2 motivation, by Crookes and Schmidt, Oxford and Shearin, and myself. I am grateful to Professor Gardner for joining the discussion; I feel it is a particular honour to have my work commented on by him in such detail.

The purpose of writing this response is to take the unique opportunity to reassess and summarise some new initiatives in L2 motivation research in the light of the evaluation of the field’s foremost researcher. A second purpose is to highlight and discuss some problem areas in the hopes that this will help synthesise different approaches.

WHY EXPAND GARDNER’S THEORY?

Gardner and Tremblay understood the general message of the three articles they responded to as emphasising “the limited and limiting approach used by Gardner and his associates” accompanied by the odd “faint praise” (p. 273). I can see that the ambivalent mixture of recognition of “old values” while calling for “new values” could be viewed as the compulsory doing honour to someone whose ideas we were about to throw out of the window. However, I would like to stress that this was not the case here; my real motives were quite different and the praise was sincere.

It appears to me that the authors of all the three papers were in a somewhat similar, ambivalent position in regards to Gardner’s theory. On one side of the coin there was the feeling that the existing social psychological construct is not as applicable in some areas of the L2 learning process as in some others; in certain educational contexts—or as Crookes and Schmidt put it, “in the real world domain of the SL classroom” (p. 470)—traditional motivational categories did not appear to have high enough explanatory and predictive value with regard to actual student behaviours. In Oxford and Shearin’s words:

Gardner states that: “The source of motivating impetus is relatively unimportant provided that motivation is aroused” (11: p. 169). However, while this conclusion might be true for researchers, quite possibly the source of motivation is very important in a practical sense to teachers who want to stimulate students’ motivation. Without knowing where the roots of motivation lie, how can teachers water those roots? (p. 15)

This concern for educational implications was also coupled with the recognition that the last fifteen years have brought along a major shift in mainstream psychological and educational psychological theories of motivation, which—the authors of the three papers felt—could and should be reflected in L2 motivation theories as well.

The other side of the coin was that in the L2
field there exists an extremely well developed, researched, and tested motivation theory associated with Professor Gardner and his associates (11-13; 15). This theory is self-contained and consistent to such an extent that there are no real gaps or openings in it which could have offered obvious directions for improvements or further developments. Thus, in a way, the above three papers were not written “against” Gardner’s theory but were rather intended to complement it, listing an inventory of theories from the psychological literature and discussing their potential relevance to L2 learning, without actually relating these theories to the Gardenerian tradition. I believe that the critical overtones of the response article by Gardner and Tremblay were motivated to a large extent by this failure to integrate “old” and “new,” which makes it difficult to decide how many of the areas covered by the suggested new approaches could have been covered using the established framework. As Gardner and Tremblay conclude:

There seems to be general agreement among the authors of the three reviews discussed here, as well as ourselves, that motivation plays a major role in second language learning. Disagreement arises, however, when we try and capture the essence of the motivation construct. One of the problems is that researchers often differ in the language they use to explain the same phenomenon. When working with latent constructs such as motivation, substantial effort needs to be directed toward construct validation. This step cannot be bypassed if we want to explain the big picture rather than remote and often redundant segments of motivation (p. 366).

I propose to go back first to the foundations of Gardner’s motivation theory and examine the construct of the integrative motive in some detail. I believe that this is necessary to put us into a position to reflect meaningfully on issues raised by Gardner and Tremblay as well as to analyse the innovations and shortcomings of recent attempts to expand the socio-educational model.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF GARDNER’S MOTIVATION THEORY AND THE INTEGRATIVE MOTIVE

Before launching into an analysis, it must be emphasised that the fact that it is possible to comment in such detail on Gardner’s theory is a demonstration of the high level of elaboration of his model. Weiner points out that “motivational theories are deficient” (p. 288) in that they are typically not built upon reliable and replicable empirical relationships. Gardner and his associates’ work, however, is a valuable exception since their theory was formulated in an empirically grounded, explicit, and testable manner.

The starting point in Gardner’s (11) motivation theory is in accordance with traditional and widely accepted conceptions of motivation, namely that motivation concerns “those factors that energize behaviour and give it direction” (19: p. 281). In other words, motivation is usually conceived of as having a qualitative dimension, goal-directedness, and a quantitative dimension, intensity. Gardner postulates two more principal components to explain the complex of motivation: the desire or “want” for the goal in question, and favourable attitudes toward L2 learning. Thus, according to Gardner, motivation to learn a foreign language is seen as referring to the extent to which the individual strives to learn the L2 because of a desire to achieve a goal and the satisfaction experienced in this activity.

The integrative motive is a key element of Gardner’s theory. Figure I provides a schematic representation of its components based on Gardner’s earlier work (11; 15) and the Gardner and Tremblay response article. As can be seen, the integrative motivation construct contains three main components, Motivation, Integrativeness, and Attitudes towards the Learning Situation, which are further broken down to sub-components. The model is very clear, with the components explicitly defined, and they are operationalised in Gardner and his associates’ motivation test, “The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery” (AMTB; see 10, for the latest version).

I propose to discuss three aspects of the construct, focusing on terminological, measurement, and conceptual issues.

Terminology. Terminological issues are more than mere technical questions; the labelling of key terms and the use of certain metaphors are at the core of any theory, significantly affecting its interpretations and applications. In fact, one of the starting points of Crookes and Schmidt’s paper specifically concerned the different use of the term “motivation” by L2 researchers and L2 teachers, that is, the discrepancy between the face and content validity of the term. As far as I can see, the construct in Figure I contains two areas where confusion might occur. There are three components at three different levels in the model that carry the term “integrative” (integrative motive/motivation, integrativeness, and integrative orientation). Unfortunately, these are easily interchangeable and
have indeed often been interchanged in the L2 literature, a problem Oxford and Shearin also drew attention to: “Motivation itself takes on the same terminology (integrative and instrumental) as that used for motivational orientation—a situation that causes confusion for some consumers of research findings” (p. 14).

A second terminology-based source of difficulty for me has been the fact that “motivation” is a sub-component of the integrative motivation construct; that is, in Gardner’s conceptualisation, “motivation” is part of the “integrative motive.” This is a relationship that I have found difficult to grasp because to me “motivation” appears to be the broader term and therefore the relationship should be reversed, with the “integrative motive” being part of “motivation.” It must also be noted that Gardner’s general discussion of the nature of L2 motivation described briefly earlier concerns only the lower-order “motivation” sub-component in the Figure and not integrative motivation itself.

**Measurement issues.** As I pointed out before, Gardner and his associates’ motivation theory is empirically-based with all the key elements and their relationships either emerging from or verified by extensive field research. Measurement issues are therefore central to the theory; in fact, the actual L2 motivation construct is so closely associated with the motivation test battery developed to measure it—AMTB—that a recent summary of the theory by Gardner and MacIntyre (15) actually discusses the model through the categories of the test as an organising framework.

To start with a basic issue, Gardner’s conceptualisation of L2 motivation includes “effortful behaviour” (11: p. 50) as a cardinal component, and thus the “Motivational Intensity” section of the AMTB contains items that involve self-report behavioural measures (e.g., 3. When it comes to French homework, I: a) put some effort into it, but not as much as I could; b) work very carefully, making sure I understand everything; c) just skim over it.) The inclusion of such items certainly increases the predictive capacity of a motivation test since self-report behavioural measures are likely to correlate with motivated behaviour. On the other hand, from a theoretical point of view, I have found it difficult to place the L2 motiva-
tion measured by the AMTB in the “motivation-causes-behaviour-causes-achievement” chain. Gass and Selinker have pointed out recently that an alternative approach in motivational psychology views motivation as a complex of affects and/or cognitions which causes effortful behaviour instead of including it. This is a fundamental difference that must be born in mind when we want to integrate various motivation theories with the social psychological tradition in L2 research.

A second measurement-related question concerns the separation of the three constituents of the “motivation” component in Figure I—desire to learn the L2, motivational intensity, and attitudes towards L2 learning—as represented in the AMTB. Each component is measured by a ten-item scale but if we mixed the thirty items, it would be rather difficult to re-construct the three scales.

The “Desire to Learn French” scale in the AMTB contains two items (Nos. 3 and 6) concerning the attitude toward learning French (e.g., “3. Compared to my other courses, I like French: a) the most; b) the same as all the others; c) least of all.”) and eight items focusing on intended behavioural measures describing what the learner would do (e.g., “8. If I had the opportunity to see a French play, I would: a) go only if I had nothing else to do; b) definitely go; c) not go.”).

The “Motivational Intensity” scale contains three items related to intended behaviour (Nos. 2, 6, 9) similar to the one above (e.g., “9. If there were a local French TV station, I would: a) never watch it; b) turn it on occasionally; c) try to watch it often.”) and seven self-report behavioural measures focusing on the learner’s account of what he/she actually does (e.g., “8. When I am in French class, I: a) volunteer answers as much as possible; b) answer only the easier questions; c) never say anything.”).

The Likert-type items constituting the “Attitudes toward Learning French” contain seven attitude items (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9) measuring an affective tendency towards the L2 learning process (e.g., “1. Learning French is really great.”) and three intended behavioural measures (Nos. 4, 7, 10) (e.g., “4. I plan to learn as much French as possible.”).

Thus, the actual items in the AMTB do not coincide exactly with clearcut content specifications of “desire,” “intensity,” and “attitudes” but rather concern a mixture of intended and actual L2 learning behavioural measures as well as general attitudes toward L2 learning. This lack of a clear content structure does not reduce the efficiency of the AMTB or invalidate the more general component of “motivation” because in actual research, aggregates of the three scales are usually used. On the other hand, it does raise the issue of whether the components in question should be redefined theoretically.

Conceptual issues. A major recurring conceptual issue concerns the relationship between “motivation” and “orientation.” Gardner (11) has stated quite explicitly that the goal, or, as he terms it, the individual’s orientation, is separate from motivation:

although the goal is a stimulus which gives rise to motivation, individual differences in motivation itself are reflected in the latter three aspects listed above, effort expended to achieve the goal, desire to achieve the goal and attitudes toward the activity involved in achieving the goal (pp. 50-51). . . . Orientation refers to a class of reasons for learning a second language. Motivation refers to a complex of three characteristics which may or may not be related to any particular orientation (p. 54).

Yet, in spite of this straightforward conceptual separation, orientations and motivation are often interchanged in the L2 literature (which, as I will argue below, is one source of the integrative/instrumental controversy). This may be due to at least two reasons:

1) Whereas orientations in the Gardenerian sense are separate from the “motivation” component of Figure I, they are not independent of integrative motivation, for integrative motivation actually includes integrative orientation. This separation thus concerns “motivation” as a technical term defined by Gardner and not motivation in the broader sense, referring to the total sum of one’s motives and behavioural intent/commitment. (This issue goes back to the terminological issue discussed earlier.)

2) Goals have been often seen as a central element of motivation in motivational psychology (c.f., the standard definition quoted before: motivation concerns “those factors that energize behaviour and give it direction” 19: p. 281), and indeed the face validity of “orientation” is closely related to motivation (e.g., someone’s “motivation to do something” is often understood in everyday speech as the person’s “reasons for doing something”). As a consequence of this and the previous point, it is easy to understand how confusion arises.

A second issue concerns the question of whether Gardner’s conceptualisation of “motivation” is restricted to the integrative motive or can be generalised to other motives as well. Would “instrumental motivation,” for example,
also include “motivation” and “attitudes to the learning situation,” similarly to the integrative motive? If it did, then these latter components—which are not integrative/instrumental-specific—would be “shared” by more than one motive; can this happen?

ON THE VALIDITY OF THE INTEGRATIVE MOTIVE

My intention in raising the above issues was not to imply that the construct of the integrative motive is not valid. Perhaps, at the micro level, some aspects of the construct and some items in the test battery could be reconsidered (I suspect that an exploratory factor analysis of all the items in the AMTB would not come up with the exact scales the test contains), but it is not a mere coincidence that close variations of the integrative motive construct do emerge consistently in various learning contexts. Let me provide two recent examples from research I have conducted in Hungary, a strikingly different learning environment from the Montreal area where the construct was originally formulated.

In a study of Hungarian secondary school learners of English (aged 17-18), Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels found a factor that included indices of “Attitudes towards the Anglophones,” “Motivational Intensity,” “Need for achievement,” and “Identification Orientation.” The resemblance with the Gardnerian construct was so apparent that this factor was unambiguously identified as the Integrative Motive, even though the “attitudes towards the learning situation” component was absent (it actually formed an independent factor labelled “Evaluation of the Learning Environment”).

In another study that has just been completed (9) and involved over 4,700 Hungarian primary school pupils (ages 13-14) while focusing on five different target languages (English, German, Russian, French, and Italian), a very similar factor emerged with all five languages, including “Motivational Intensity,” “Attitudes towards the Foreign Language,” “Integrative Orientation,” and “Sociocultural Orientation.” This factor, again, has been identified as the Integrative Motive.

Thus, the question for me is not whether the integrative motive exists (I believe it does) but rather how we define its basic constituents and how these constituents are interconnected. We will need very elaborate and precise answers to be able to relate the components of the socio-educational model to other motives and motivational components.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION

Having looked into Gardner’s motivation construct, let me reflect on some concrete issues raised by Gardner and Tremblay. The section in my paper focusing on the relationship between attitudes and motivation could be understood as saying that we should not mix attitudes and motivation because it is not usually “done” in the psychological literature. The point I wanted to make, however, was just the opposite, and I am sorry for the imprecise wording. I believe that due to the multifaceted nature and role of language (i.e., the fact that it is at the same time a communication coding system, an integral part of the individual’s identity, and the most important channel of social organisation), the motivational background of L2 learning involves a unique and necessarily eclectic construct where “motivational” and “attitudinal” approaches should meet.

Indeed, I believe that the most important milestone in the history of L2 motivation research has been Gardner and Lambert’s (13; 14) discovery that success in L2 learning is a function of the learner’s attitudes towards the linguistic-cultural community of the target language, thus adding a social dimension to the study of motivation to learn a L2. Having been familiar with the Gardnerian approach for a long time, we may not always be conscious of how much of a “breakthrough” this recognition was; one which rightfully influenced the motivation research of the next decades. By combining motivation theory with social psychological theory and the long tradition of attitude measurement, the model of L2 motivation that Gardner and Lambert developed was more elaborate and advanced than many contemporary mainstream psychological models of motivation in that it was empirically testable and did indeed explain a considerable amount of variance in student motivation and achievement.

INTEGRATIVENESS/INSTRUMENTALITY

A second issue raised by Gardner and Tremblay concerned the recurring misconception of the integrative-instrumental dichotomy. In my paper I stated: “It must be noted . . . that Gardner’s theory and test battery are more complex and reach beyond the instrumental/integrative
dichotomy” (p. 274); I then, however, went on to analyse why the integrative-instrumental myth prevailed in the L2 profession (and not in the Gardnerian theory), which could be misunderstood as my claiming that this distinction was valid. It is not. Gardner and Tremblay are quite right in pointing out that research has shown that these two motivational components are not antagonistic counterparts but are often positively related, and are, in fact, not even the only components of L2 motivation. In a study already mentioned, Clément et al. found that the integrative motive was associated with a number of orientations, including one identified as “instrumental-knowledge.” We concluded: “It is to be hoped that this latter result, coupled with Gardner’s (1985) extensive discussion, will put an end to the misleading use of a simplistic integrative-instrumental dichotomy” (in press).

Still, an interesting question is why this false dichotomy has prevailed so consistently in the L2 literature. One main reason, I believe, is its simple and yet comprehensive nature. Even so, this would not have been enough in itself to maintain the integrative-instrumental popularity for decades. There are, in my opinion, at least two further reasons to account for the misconception.

The first is that broadly defined “cultural-affective” and “pragmatic-instrumental” dimensions often emerge in empirical studies of motivation (see, for example, 8 and the references there). In argument with this claim, Gardner and Tremblay pointed out that with respect to factor analytical research conducted by Gardner and his associates, this assertion is incorrect since there is typically no pragmatic-instrumental factor in these studies. This is true. I originally assumed that this absence was due to the difference between second language acquisition and foreign language learning contexts (in the former there is some contact with the L2 speakers, whereas in the latter the L2 is a school subject with pupils having very little contact with the L2 community), but in a recent study (3) we have failed to find a powerful instrumental factor in a typical foreign language learning environment either. This suggests that it may not be due to factors related to the context but rather to the actual subject samples that in some studies instrumentality is featured while in some others it is not.

I believe that instrumental motivation is a central component of L2 motivation where it is relevant, that is, where relatively short-term pragmatic, utilitarian benefits are actually available for the learners. If by such benefits we mean job or salary-related motives, instrumental motivation is actually very often not too relevant to school children. As Clément et al. explain why instrumental and knowledge orientations clustered together in their study, “for these secondary school students, pragmatic rewards may appear quite remote, the wish to prepare for a bright career is related to getting higher qualifications, and thus to obtaining knowledge” (in press). Gardner and his associates’ subjects were typically school learners rather than young adult learners, which may at least partly explain the lack of a strong instrumental component. I assume that the motivational background of, for example, Anglophone civil servants studying French because it is a job requirement would show a different pattern even in a Canadian context.

It is, of course, possible to think of potential short-term benefits for young school children as well, for example grades and praise. Such extrinsic motives, however, have usually not been included in motivation batteries, so they can’t have emerged as independent factors. Their inclusion in future research paradigms would make it necessary to think it over how extrinsic motives known from the general psychological literature relate to instrumental motives known from the L2 literature. This is an issue more complex than simply assuming the tempting correspondence between instrumental and extrinsic, and integrative and intrinsic motives, particularly because recent theories divide extrinsic motives into several sub-categories based on their degree of internalisation (see 6, for an overview). It must be added that an interesting study by Gardner and MacIntyre (16) has already attempted to broaden the scope of instrumental motivation by focusing on the impact of immediate financial rewards ($10 for completing a learning task) on the rate of learning success.

The second possible reason for the integrative-instrumental popularity, I believe, lies in the fact that an integrative/instrumental dichotomy does exist in Gardner’s motivation test with regard to orientations. Even though Gardner never fails to point out that orientations other than integrative and instrumental do also exist (cf., also 4), the fact that he never elaborated on those or included them in his motivation test does suggest a certain prioritisation.

It is necessary to repeat hastily that Gardner has consistently separated the integrative and
instrumental orientations from motivation. In Gardner and Tremblay’s words, “it has been explicitly stated on a number of occasions that these are orientations (i.e., a class of reasons for studying the language), not motivations” (p. 361). As we have seen, however, this separation of goals and motivation is not an unambiguous issue, which may explain why it has been so often ignored in the L2 literature, and why the two central orientations in Gardner’s theory and test battery have been seen to reflect two types of motivation.

HOW TO GO ON?

As I said at the beginning, the three articles commented on by Gardner and Tremblay did not integrate the suggested new approaches sufficiently into the Gardnerian tradition. The authors of these papers, however, maintained that the theories presented were not in contradiction to the social psychological approach but were compatible with it in a complementary sense. Fortunately, Gardner and Tremblay agreed with this claim. It was also reassuring to see that Professor Gardner actively supports efforts to elaborate the construct of L2 motivation or his graduate student, Paul Tremblay, would not be engaged in research looking into the role of causal attributions, goal-related measures, performance expectancy, attention, etc., that is, into measures traditionally not covered by Gardner and his associates.

As far as I can ascertain from Gardner and Tremblay’s evaluation, the attempts of the authors of the three “reform” articles to expand our understanding of L2 motivation have two main shortcomings: the lack of sufficient elaboration of the ideas and the lack of supporting empirical evidence. The lack of sufficient elaboration. Gardner’s integrative motive demonstrates how detailed a testable motivation construct needs to be, and, by comparison, the alternative/complementary theories suggested fall short of the mark in terms of precision and elaboration of the constituent components. They often involve approaches rather than well-specified constructs. In my paper I presented a model of L2 classroom motivation, consisting of three levels: the Language Level, the Learner Level, and the Learning Situation Level. Although I believe that this division is useful and valid, and it has some empirical basis, we must also realise that the components mentioned in the model were of diverse character (which was acknowledged by referring to some of them as motivational subsystems, processes or conditions rather than motives), and that no attempt was made to propose any links between the various components other than dividing them into the three levels. Similarly, Oxford and Shearin also claim that they “have not presented a fully articulated model of L2 learning motivation, because such a model will demand further debate and development among many experts” (p. 23).

Thus, an important task of future L2 motivation research should be to conceptualise alternative or modified motivational constructs in concrete terms, by specifying the exact constituents and their interrelationships, including the direction of the relationships, and then to try and connect them to the knowledge that has already been gathered and empirically verified. Gardner and Tremblay propose to make a distinction in the future between state and trait motivation in order to be able to connect situation-specific and person-specific motivational components. This does indeed seem a very useful and vital distinction and Julkunen’s (20; 21) pioneering results using a state/trait paradigm in L2 motivation research are most interesting and promising.

The lack of supporting empirical evidence. Gardner and Tremblay have another valid point in stating that “we also advocate the exploration of other motivational theories as a way of expanding the motivation construct but recognize that such endeavour is of no value in the absence of pertinent empirical research” (p. 366). The strength of past L2 motivation research has been that researchers have always tried to keep their concepts on firm empirical ground. Theoretical papers calling for new directions have their importance as a first step in theory-building, but I agree with Gardner and Tremblay (and I assume that the authors of the other theoretical papers would also concur) that a theoretical discussion should be followed by putting the suggested new components to the test.

Empirical research using extended research paradigms would also help integrate old and new variables. Since I believe that most of the traditionally used motivational variables are valid, they are likely to emerge in these empirical studies and thus the new variables could be defined and specified in relation to them. This was indeed the case with the empirical classroom study carried out by Clément et al., whose results formed the basis of the three-level model proposed in my study. Gardner and Tremblay,
on the other hand, are absolutely right in drawing attention to the difficulties inherent in conducting research in order to evaluate hypotheses such as the motivational strategies offered by Oxford and Shearin or myself. The methodological discussion concluding Gardner and Tremblay’s paper is a useful pointer to possible pitfalls to avoid.

I therefore believe that we can foresee in future L2 motivation research a dynamic interplay of established motivational concepts grounded in a social psychological approach and constructs rooted in other psychological fields and approaches. In practical terms this may result in an elaboration at a microlevel of the socio-educational model, adding further “boxes” to the schematic representation, while keeping the established main relationships. Perhaps as a first task, it would be useful to decide how motivational components already discussed in the L2 literature (and in some cases measured by the AMTB) but not included in Figure 1 relate to the ones included. Where should we place “instrumental orientation?” Would it be outside the construct, affecting only the “motivation” component? What about other orientations identified in the literature (e.g. knowledge, travel; see 4) or components like “self-confidence,” “need for achievement,” or “parental support?” How would they relate to the integrative motive and the “motivation” sub-component, and how could they fit into the socio-educational model? How can an extended socio-educational model integrate other motivational components of a more diverse nature, for example cognitively-based constructs? Thus, questions abound, providing ample topics for future research projects.

CONCLUSION

L2 motivation research has undoubtedly gained new momentum in the last few years as demonstrated by renewed research interest and attempts to expand research paradigms. To use a metaphor from group dynamics, in such a period it is natural to have a “storming phase” in which somewhat conflicting ideas emerge. My impression is that this stage is slowly blowing over: a number of new ideas have been suggested and first reactions to these have been expressed. What we need now, as Gardner and Tremblay conclude, is “construct validation” and “pertinent empirical research,” which would bring about consolidation and integration. The purpose of my current response has been to help clarify some basic issues in order to facilitate this integration process.
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