LANGUAGE LEARNING
A Journal of Research in Language Studies

Language Learning ISSN 0023-8333

Teacher Motivational Practice, Student Motivation, and Possible L2 Selves: An Examination in the Iranian EFL Context

Mostafa Papi

Iran University of Science & Technology

Esmaeel Abdollahzadeh

Iran University of Science & Technology

The present study aims to provide observational evidence on the relationship between teachers' use of motivational strategies and students' motivated behavior in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context of Iran. To this end, 741 male learners of English from 26 secondary school classes taught by 17 teachers participated in the study. The teachers' use of motivational strategies and the students' motivated behavioral codes were measured using a classroom observation instrument originally developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). Furthermore, the participating students completed a questionnaire that consisted of both situation-specific and general-motivational scales. Finally, a post hoc rating scale was employed to evaluate the teachers' overall motivational practice. The results showed that the teachers' motivational practice is significantly related to the students' motivated behavior. Further, while no differences were found between high-motivation and low-motivation learner groups in terms of their ideal second language (L2) selves, the low-motivation group had stronger ought-to L2 selves. The results will be discussed with reference to the socio-educational context of Iran.

Keywords motivation; L2 motivational strategies; ideal L2 self; ought-to L2 self; English as a foreign language

Introduction

Insufficient motivation on the part of second-language (L2) learners is one of the most challenging problems in the eyes of language teachers and educators

We are sincerely thankful to Zoltan Dörnyei for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mostafa Papi, Department of Foreign Languages, Iran University of Science & Technology, Naarmak, Tehran, Iran. Internet: M.papi1983@gmail.com

DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00632.x

in the state-run educational system of Iran. Students often attend English as a foreign language (EFL) classes without the sufficient enthusiasm required to succeed in such a challenging task as learning a foreign language. To make up for this inadequate student motivation, some teachers may employ behavioral practices that they have learned from experience to be useful in making students more interested in language learning, and others may become frustrated by their unmotivated students and their teaching quality may diminish as a consequence. They might have become aware that the students who are not motivated enough to accomplish such a long-term goal as learning an L2 may not be able to do so no matter how talented they are, how appropriate the relevant curricula are, or how high the quality of teaching is (Dörnyei, 2005). That is why language teachers often see lack of motivation as a chronic problem and feel the need for a systematic solution to it. Accordingly, they may go to great pains to increase the quantity and quality of their students' engagement in classroom activities and consequently help them improve their L2 proficiency. The present research sought to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers' use of motivational strategies and students' motivation in the context of Iran. It follows and expands on Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) by examining the relationship between teachers' motivational practice and the individual components of students' motivated behavior along three distinct dimensions: alertness, participation, and volunteering. The current study is unique in that it further examines the possible relations between the observed motivated behavior of language learners and their future L2 self-guides based on Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) recent model of the L2 Motivational Self System.

Theoretical Innovations in L2 Motivational Strategies Research

In order to shed light on this rather underresearched area, L2 motivation researchers have recently begun opening a new line of inquiry. This shifts attention from the theoretical issues involved in the study of motivation to the investigation of practical strategies that may contribute to students' language learning motivation. This new trend is based on a dynamic perspective toward L2 motivation, an area that had almost gone unnoticed in the classic models of L2 motivation. It was only after the "cognitive movement" that this shortcoming led a number of researchers to develop models that highlighted this feature of L2 motivation (see Dörnyei, 2003). Williams and Burden (1997) and Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) were among those who grasped the importance of the dynamic nature of motivation and proposed new models that focused on this shortcoming. Williams and Burden distinguished three stages of motivation in their proposed

model: reasons for doing something → deciding to do something → sustaining the effort or persisting. They argued that the first two stages are more concerned with initiating motivation, whereas the last stage refers to sustaining motivation. Dörnyei and Ottó synthesized different conceptualizations of L2 motivation to propose the Process-Oriented Model of Student Motivation, which is similar to but more sophisticated than William and Burden's model. This framework divides action sequence into three main phases: preactional phase, actional phase, and postactional phase. According to Dörnyei (2000), the preactional phase is the starting point of motivated behavior, when goals are set, intention is formed, and initiation of action is enacted. The actional phase specifically deals with the actual implementation of action. In this stage, learning subtasks are generated and implemented, a learner's progress toward the intended outcome of the action is continuously appraised, and self-regulatory mechanisms are called into force to enhance, scaffold, or protect learning-specific action. The postactional phase begins after the attainment of the goal or the termination (or long interruption) of the action, and it entails the evaluation of the outcome of the accomplished action and the contemplation of possible inferences to be drawn for future actions.

Based on these models, a number of attempts have been made to conceptualize sets of strategies that can make real contributions to learners' motivation to learn an L2 or foreign language (e.g., Dörnyei, 2001, 2006, 2008; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Williams & Burden, 1997). Among the proposed frameworks, Dörnyei's (2001) framework of motivational strategies is believed to be a comprehensive and systematic one. This framework, which is the basis of the present study, contains several strategies classified into four major categories. The first category concerns creating the basic motivational conditions through adopting appropriate teacher behaviors, providing a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere, and forming a cohesive learner group with appropriate group norms. The second category involves generating initial motivation by enhancing learners' language-related values and attitudes, increasing learners' expectancy of success and goal-orientedness, making teaching materials relevant, and creating realistic learner beliefs. The third category involves maintaining and protecting motivation by making learning enjoyable, presenting tasks in a motivating way, setting specific learner-goals, improving learners' self-confidence, and, finally, promoting cooperation, autonomy, and self-motivating strategies among learners. The fourth category focuses on encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation through promoting motivational attributions, providing motivational feedback, increasing learner satisfaction, and offering rewards and grades in a motivating manner.

More recently, Dörnyei (2008) proposed a new framework of motivational strategies, which was rooted in his theory of the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). Emphasizing the relevance of generating a vision of learners' ideal L2 self to language learning motivation, he outlined a motivational program with six components: (a) construction of the ideal L2 self, which concerns creating an L2-related vision of one's future self; (b) imagery enhancement or strengthening the desired self-image; (c) making the ideal L2 self plausible or perceived by learners' to be possible and within reach in their particular circumstances; (d) developing an action plan to operationalize the vision; (e) activating the ideal L2 self or keeping the vision alive; and (f) considering failure or offsetting the ideal L2 self by the feared self (see Dörnyei, 2008, for a full review).

Empirical Studies on L2 Motivational Strategies

The motivational strategies reported in the L2 motivation literature have usually been developed on rich theoretical grounds. Nonetheless, there has been little research so far on validating the proposed techniques in language classrooms. At the time of writing this article, only a few empirical studies have been conducted in this area (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008; Madrid, 2002), which will be discussed below.

Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) asked 200 Hungarian teachers of English how important they considered a list of 51 motivational strategies and how frequently they used them in their teaching practice. They came up with 10 major macrostrategies and called them "ten commandments for motivating language learners." Arguing that there is no reason to assume the ten commandments as absolutely valid in any cultural, ethnolinguistic, and institutional setting, Cheng and Dörnyei (2007) conducted a similar follow-up study in a different socioeducational context—Taiwan. Their study showed that aside from some culture-specific aspects of these strategies, there was a consistent pattern regarding some of the most important motivational strategies. They concluded that certain motivational classroom practices may transcend specific cultures and can thus be treated as universally influential motivational strategies.

Similarly, Bernaus and Gardner (2008) investigated the use of 26 motivational strategies as perceived by 31 teachers and 694 students of EFL in Spain. They found that although both the teachers and the students agreed on the relative frequency of some strategies, only the students' perceptions were related to the students' attitudes and motivation, with the latter (i.e., the students'

perceptions of the impacts of the motivational strategies) emerging as a significant predictor of English achievement.

Using the same data collected by Bernaus and Gardner (2008), Bernaus, Wilson, and Gardner (2009) investigated the relationships among measures of attitudes, motivation, language anxiety, English achievement, and the students' perceptions of their teachers' use of L2 motivational strategies, on one hand, and the teachers' motivation and perceived use of the strategies, on the other hand. Overall, they found that teachers' perceived use of motivational strategies was positively related to teachers' motivation, students' motivation, and students' achievement.

In a survey study in Spain, Madrid (2002) asked 319 students and 18 teachers from primary and secondary schools how powerful they considered the impacts of a list of 18 motivational strategies on the students' perceived motivation. The results showed that the use of audiovisual resources and new technologies, group work, satisfying the students' needs and interests, student participation in class, good grades, fulfillment of students' success expectations, and praises and rewards were the most powerful motivational strategies. Meanwhile, factors such as lack of participation (listening passively), working individually, and using the L2 in class were the weakest ones. The author concluded that teachers should not only promote the motivational strategies that were found to increase the students' interest, attention, and satisfaction but also consider using the L2 in class as an unpopular but necessary strategy.

A common feature of the above-reported studies is their reliance on teacher and student reports on the use and/or importance of the examined motivational strategies without considering the actual record of the participants' behaviors. As a reaction to this shortcoming, Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) conducted an observational investigation of teachers' motivational practice and students' language learning motivation in a large-scale investigation of 40 EFL classrooms in South Korea involving 27 teachers and 1,381 learners. They used three types of instruments: (a) a classroom observation scheme to document the learners' motivated behavior and the teachers' motivational teaching practice, (b) a student motivation questionnaire, and (c) a postlesson scale to evaluate the teachers' overall motivational practice. A strong positive correlation was found between the teachers' motivational practice and the students' motivated behavior observed during class activities. The researchers argued that this significant positive relationship indicates that language teachers can make a real difference in boosting their students' motivation by applying various motivational techniques and strategies.

The L2 Motivational Self System

The L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009), which is an innovative reformation of the previous L2 motivation theories, reframes language learning motivation within the individual's concept of one's self. This theory was developed based on several theoretical paradigms and a solid body of empirical evidence from both motivational psychology and L2 motivation research. Current studies show that unlike the previous models, the L2 Motivational Self System (a) transcends national and culture-specific boundaries (e.g., Al-Shehri, 2009; Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009); (b) is sufficiently compatible with the emerging conceptualizations of identity, especially at the current age of globalization (e.g., Lamb, 2009; Segalowitz, Gatbonton, & Trofimovich, 2009; Yashima, 2009); (c) is congruent with other major second language acquisition and L2 motivation theories (Dörnyei, 2009; Kim, 2009); (d) has the capacity to explain emotional constructs involved in the L2 learning process (Papi, 2010); and (e) builds on major frameworks in general motivational psychology, especially Markus and Nurius's (1986) theory of possible selves and Higgins's (1987) self-discrepancy theory.

The L2 Motivational Self System has three main dimensions: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience. The ideal L2 self represents an ideal image of the kind of L2 user one aspires to be in the future (Dörnyei, 2009). Recent studies have shown that this dimension of the L2 Motivational Self System explains a noticeable portion of variance in learners' intended effort (e.g., Csizér & Lukács, 2010; Papi, 2010; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi et al., 2009) and significantly reduces learners' English anxiety (Papi, 2010). The ought-to L2 self refers to the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., various duties, obligations, or responsibilities). In a comparative study conducted by Taguchi and his associates (2009) in Japan, China, and Iran, it was found that the overall impact of the ought-to L2 self on learners' motivated behavior was considerably less than that of the ideal L2 self. This variable has been found to increase English anxiety (Papi, 2010). The L2 learning experience concerns learners' attitudes toward learning English and can be affected by situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience (e.g., curriculum, teacher, peer group, materials). Among the constituent variables of the L2 Motivational Self System, English learning experience has been found to have the strongest impact on motivated learning behavior (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Papi, 2010; Taguchi et al., 2009).

EFL Instruction in Iran

The English teaching curriculum promoted by the Iranian Ministry of Education seems to have been developed in a top-down manner in which the learners' and teachers' ideas concerning key issues such as teaching methods, materials, environment, and teaching time have not been adequately taken into account. The formal instruction of EFL in Iran starts in the first year of junior high school around the age of 12 and students in public schools take English classes 3–4 hours a week. Teachers are required to teach a predetermined textbook from the first to the last page, and the teaching methodology is a composite of the Grammar Translation and Audiolingual methods. In a typical English class (normally around 30 students), the teacher starts by reading some short sentences in the textbook with new vocabulary items underlined. The students then listen to their teacher reading and translating a reading text. Then they either volunteer or are asked to answer the relevant reading comprehension questions. This is followed by the explicit teaching of grammatical rules, based on which the students do different drills and exercises. The remaining exercises are finally assigned as homework.

There has been a dearth of research on the level of student classroom motivation in this teacher-directed and essentially traditional EFL context. Further, the role of the language teacher as a main agent in this syllabus has gained considerable momentum and cannot be ignored. Consequently, an examination of the motivational strategies employed by language teachers and students' reactions to the teachers' practice seems warranted in the Iranian EFL classrooms.

Objectives and Research Questions

Despite the significant contribution of the research we have reviewed to our understanding of the role of L2 motivational strategies, the evidence provided is scant and limited to a few contexts—namely, Hungary, Taiwan, South Korea, and Spain. More importantly, except for Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), all of these studies have only been based on the perceived, not actual, use and effectiveness of a number of motivational strategies. Consequently, stronger evidence is required to shed light on the nature and role of teachers' motivational practice in instructed second language acquisition, including the investigation of the applicability of the various recommended strategies across different cultures and the possible links between the use of such strategies and other motivational dispositions of language learners. Following Guilloteaux

and Dörnyei, the present research purports to investigate the relationship between teachers' use of motivational strategies and students' motivation in the EFL context of Iran. In addition, we try to examine two unexplored features missing in Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's study. One is examining the relationship between teachers' motivational practice and the individual components of students' motivated behavior (i.e., alertness, participation, and volunteering) and the other is investigating the relationship between students' motivated behavior during class activities and their future L2 self-guides (i.e., ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self) in Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) recent model of the L2 Motivational Self System.

The primary objective of the study is to investigate the relationship between L2 teachers' instructional practice and their students' English learning motivation. For this purpose, we employed behavioral measures of teachers' motivational practice and students' motivated behavior to obtain a clearer picture of the hypothesized link. Teachers' motivational behaviors were examined in terms of their use of a set of motivational strategies, and learners' behavioral engagement in classroom activities was documented in terms of the extent of their alertness, participation, and volunteering during class activities. Following Ellis's (2009) critique, we used the label "alertness" in place of "attention" (which was originally used in Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008) as a component of students' motivated behavior. As Ellis argued, because "attention" refers to a psycholinguistic construct concerning learners' engagement in mental noticing when confronted with L2 input, it cannot be attached to a behavioral measure. Alertness, on the other hand, is a behavioral variable and refers to passive academic responding or a general readiness to deal with incoming stimuli (Ellis, 2009). For the latter two measures (i.e., participation and volunteering), we used Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2008) terminology.

Our second objective is to examine the relationship between teachers' motivational practice and the individual components of students' motivated behavior (i.e., alertness, participation, and volunteering), as recommended by Ellis (2009). Such an investigation can help us discover the potential connection between teachers' use of motivational strategies and each specific aspect of students' motivated behavior, thereby discovering whether these measures truly represent student classroom motivation.

Our third objective is to see how the observed motivated behavior is connected to the self-reported student motivation. The motivated behavior is a composite of alertness, participation, and volunteering measures; and students' self-reported motivation comprises three situation-specific motivational variables—namely, linguistic self-confidence, motivational intensity, and English learning

attitudes. It can be helpful to know whether the language learners' self-reported motivation accords with what they actually show in their classroom activities.

Finally, the fourth objective involves examining the relationship between students' overall motivated behavior and their future L2 self-guides (i.e., the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self). In other words, we attempt to discover whether students with different levels of ideal and ought-to L2 selves show different levels of motivated behavior in their classes. This dimension of the study is in fact an unexplored area in L2 motivation research on how students' possible L2 selves are realized in actual classroom environments.

The following research questions were formulated to achieve the objectives of the study:

1. What is the relationship between L2 teachers' motivational practice and their students' motivated behavior?
2. What is the relationship between students' L2 motivated behavior and their self-reported level of L2 motivation?
3. What is the relationship between teachers' motivational practice and each separate measure of L2 motivated behavior—namely, alertness, participation, and volunteering?
4. Are there any significant differences between high-motivation and low-motivation EFL learners in their ideal and ought-to L2 selves?

Method

Participants

Snowball sampling was employed to select the participating schools. We used all possible connections to contact potential participants, who themselves became our next links to contact other participants. To keep the diversity of the sample as high as possible, the schools, which were all public, were chosen from different educational districts ranging from the northern parts of the capital, Tehran, to the rural areas of Khorramabad, a city about 500 km away from the capital. The schools were approached and asked for cooperation with an official letter from the educational office of the related district. After obtaining agreement from both the school principals and English teachers, preliminary arrangements were made and dates were set. Due to administrative hurdles, we could only include male participants in the study. In the end, a total number of 741 male students from 26 classes (from 10 secondary schools) taught by 17 teachers with 5–29 (mean = 12) years of teaching experience took part in the study. Eighteen of the 26 participating classes were taught by nine teachers (each teacher taught 2 classes) and the remaining classes were each taught by a

Table 1 Distribution of the participants of the study

High school level	Junior	Junior	Junior	Senior
Grade	First	Second	Third	First
Number (percent)	54 (7.3%)	204 (27%)	382 (52%)	101 (13.7%)

different teacher. The participating students' age ranged from 11 to 16, with an average of 13.7. The high-stakes national university entrance exam, which is taken after the fourth grade of high school (i.e., preuniversity grade) in Iran can result in a substantial washback effect, thereby arousing considerable amount of motivation of any type among the preuniversity student population and the other grades close to this exam. Therefore, to remove this effect, from the senior high school population only the first-grade students were included in the study; the rest were junior high school students. Table 1 demonstrates the distribution of the participants.

Instruments

Three instruments were used to provide appropriate responses to our research questions: (a) the Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching classroom observation scheme (MOLT), (b) the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale, and (c) the Student Motivational State questionnaire (SMS). The first two instruments were adapted from Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), and the last one was developed based on scales adapted from other studies. A description of each instrument is presented here.

The Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching Classroom Observation Scheme

In order to document the teachers' motivational practice and the students' motivated behavior, the MOLT was utilized (for the original instrument, see Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008.). The MOLT has been constructed based on two established frameworks: Dörnyei's (2001) framework of motivational strategies and Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) classroom observation scheme, the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching. The MOLT has two major sections; one section is used to document teacher's use of 25 motivational strategies and the other consists of the three student-motivated behavior measures described earlier (i.e., alertness, participation, and volunteering). The 28 variables have been developed in terms of whether they lend themselves to an objective definition and observation through the real-time observation scheme.

The 25 motivational variables are grouped into four categories: Teacher Discourse, Participation Structure, Encouraging Positive Retrospective

Self-Evaluation, and Activity Design. Teacher Discourse involves whether teachers have informal social chats with students, explicitly express the objectives of the lesson or the retrospective summaries of the progress made toward the objectives, state the communicative purpose or utility of the activities, arouse students' curiosity or attention, provide appropriate strategies and/or models to help students complete an activity successfully, and the like. Participation Structure concerns whether students work in groups or in pairs. To encourage positive retrospective self-evaluation, teachers should go over the answers of an exercise with the class without communicating any expression of imitation or personal criticism, focus on what can be learned from the mistakes, persuade the students to correct their own mistakes, revise their own work, or review/correct their peers' work, and the like. Activity Design concerns whether the activity creates opportunities for students to express personal meaning, contains elements of interest, creativity or fantasy, presents an intellectual challenge, ends in the production of a tangible outcome, and involves elements of individual and team competition.

The student motivated behavior measure includes alertness, participation, and volunteering. The students are considered alert when at least two thirds of them are looking at the teacher and following his/her movements, looking at visual stimuli, turning to watch another student who is contributing to the task, making appropriate nonverbal responses, and are not displaying any inattentive or disruptive behavior. They are considered to be participating whenever at least two thirds of them are actively taking part in classroom interaction or working on assigned activities. A volunteering box would be checked if in a 1-minute time segment at least one third of the students are volunteering without the teacher having to coax them in any way. (For a full description of the MOLT, see Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008.)

The MOLT follows a time sampling format, whereby the relevant classroom events are recorded in an ongoing manner as every minute passes on the timer. Moreover, in completing the sheet, Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) concept of the primary focus coding convention was followed, whereby whenever two or more events belonging to the same category occur within a 1-minute time segment, the event that takes up the larger portion of the 1-minute segment is recorded. However, as for the Activity Design category, because the variables in this category demonstrate a variety of motivational elements to the basic design of a task, they did not fall under this coding convention, and whenever more than one task-related element took place within a 1-minute time segment, all of the elements were recorded.

The Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation Scale

The Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale is composed of nine semantic differential items and was used to increase the reliability of the MOLT. (For the original instrument, see Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008.) This scale was developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) based on Gardner's (1985) attitudes toward L2 teacher scale. The items include nine bipolar adjectives describing the motivational qualities of L2 teachers' practice—namely, whether they are L2-competent or L2-incompetent, radiate enthusiasm or are unenthusiastic, are humorous and light-hearted or dry in style, and so forth. The items are rated on a scale from 1 (showing a low quality) to 6 (showing a high quality). This scale together with the researcher's minute-by-minute observational evaluation of the teachers' practice comprises a general teacher index to get a more reliable picture of teachers' overall motivational practice.

The Student Motivational State Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by the present researchers using scales from two previous studies (i.e., Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008; Taguchi et al., 2009) and comprised two major parts. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of items measuring both situation-specific motivational dispositions of language learners and their general attitudinal and motivational characteristics. The situation-specific portion of the questionnaire included linguistic self-confidence, motivational intensity, and attitudes toward learning English. The first two scales were adapted from Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) and the last one was adapted from Taguchi et al. (2009). The general dispositional section, on the other hand, consisted of the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self, which were also adapted from Taguchi et al. As described in an earlier section, the two attitudinal scales (the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self) together with L2 learning experience are the constituent variables of the L2 Motivational Self System. The questionnaire grouped-items and the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the specific scales have been provided in the Appendix.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of questions about the learners' background information (e.g., age, nationality, native English teacher experience, overseas experience, and self-rated English proficiency levels).

The questionnaire was first translated into Persian. Then three of our colleagues were asked to translate the Persian questionnaire back into English. All of the three versions were compared with the original one. In the case of any discrepancy, wordings of the items underwent modification. Finally, the Persian version of the questionnaire was piloted on students similar to the target sample.

After piloting and revising the translated questionnaire, the final version included 35 statement- and question-type items. The statement-type items were on 6-point Likert scales in which 6 indicated *strongly agree* and 1 indicated *strongly disagree*, and the question-type items used 6-point rating scales with 1 showing *not at all* and 6 showing *very much* anchoring each end of the scale. The five variables included in this instrument were as follows:

1. ideal English self representing an ideal image of the kind of English user one aspires to be in the future;
2. ought-to English self measuring the English-related attributes that one believes one should or ought to possess as a result of perceived duties, obligations, or responsibilities;
3. English learning experience assessing the situation-specific motives related to English learning immediate environment and experience;
4. linguistic self-confidence representing the learner's confident and anxiety-free belief that the mastery of an L2 is well within his/her means (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005).
5. motivational intensity measuring the amount of effort learners are ready to put into learning English.

Procedure

In order to observe and interpret a wide range of behaviors, including even minor nonverbal ones in the classes under observation, a high level of preparation was required. This necessitated piloting the observation scheme to ensure the validity and reliability of the measures.

In the pilot stage of the study, two different single-sex male classes including 64 secondary school students (aged from 12 to 15, with a mean of 13.7) were observed using the MOLT and the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale. The newly developed questionnaire (i.e., the SMS) was also administered at the end of each session. While students were filling out the questionnaires, their comments regarding the wordings, ordering, or ambiguities of the items were sought. In addition, the observed teachers were consulted to ensure that the marking of the observational items matched the actual classroom behaviors. Consequently, some of the items in the questionnaire were modified and the teachers' ideas helped fine-tune the questionnaire and the observation scheme. For instance, items related to the ideal L2-self scale beginning with "*I can imagine myself. . .*" were translated as "*I imagine myself. . .*" Because some students took these statements as questions about their potential ability rather than what they actually do.

For the main study, the observation of the 26 classes took place during October and November of the 2008–2009 academic year. All the classes were observed by the first author. The teachers were notified that the study aimed to investigate their students' behaviors during class activities regardless of what the activities were and how they were performed. It was emphasized that teachers' behavior was not the focus of the study and that we were interested in their students' actions. The observer assured them that they did not need to worry about their teaching quality and they were encouraged to do what they normally did in their classes. The questionnaire was administered at the end of the classes after completing the observation sheets by the researcher. The completion of the questionnaires lasted about 10 minutes and the standard class time was 90 minutes. Finally, the observer individually completed the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale right after each teaching session.

Data Analysis

Initially, the frequency of occurrence of each behavioral code during the observations was measured by summing up the tally marks on the MOLT observation sheets. The scores were then divided by the actual length of each lesson in minutes and multiplied by 100 to obtain comparable proportionate rates (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991). The scores were then inserted in an SPSS (Version 16) data file. Furthermore, because the scores obtained in the study were measured on different scales, they were all standardized to establish a common metric. The standardized scores were then used to compute composite scores and conduct relevant analyses.

In order to examine the relationship patterns among the three variables—namely, the teachers' classroom motivational practice, the students' observed motivated behavior, and the students' self-reported motivation—three composite variables were computed: (a) Teacher Motivational Practice, (b) Student Motivated Behavior, and (c) Student Motivational State. These are briefly described below.

The Teacher Motivational Practice Index

This index is the sum of two measures: (a) the observational data based on the minute-by-minute record of the teachers' behaviors during class time obtained through the MOLT and (b) the retrospective evaluation of the teachers' professional qualities, performed right after each observed session obtained with the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale (both done by the first author).

The generation of the Teacher Motivational Practice index involved four steps. First, mean scores were computed for each of the 25 motivational strategies that teachers used in each observed class; then the 25 mean scores were

Table 2 Correlations between the learners' motivated behavior measures

	Alertness	Participation
Participation	.91**	—
Volunteering	.56**	.62**

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level; number of classes = 26.

summed up to form a composite score for each class (i.e., 26 composite scores for the 26 classes). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the teacher-related measure of the MOLT was .53, which was expected, as the 25 constituents of this measure dealt with different behavioral codes (see Dörnyei, 2007). Second, using the data obtained from the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation scale, the mean scores of the nine bipolar items comprising this scale were computed (Cronbach alpha = .93) for each separate class in order to compute another set of composite scores (i.e., 26 composite scores for the 26 classes) and make the data comparable with the observational data collected through the MOLT. Accordingly, we had two sets of composite scores (each including 26 scores for the 26 classes) obtained through the MOLT and the Post-Lesson Teacher Evaluation sheets. Third, in order to see if the two composite scores can be summed up to form the Teacher Motivational Practice index, we submitted them to Pearson product-moment correlation analysis and a significant and positive correlation was obtained ($r = .54, p < .01$). Consequently, after computing the Z-scores for the two sets of composite scores, we summed them up to produce the Teacher Motivational Practice index.

The Student Motivated Behavior Index

In order to gauge the learners' motivated behavior in terms of alertness, participation, and volunteering, another composite measure was computed using the data obtained through the MOLT. To compute this composite score, first a Pearson product-moment correlation was run among the three measures making up this variable, which demonstrated highly significant positive correlations (see Table 2). This confirmed that the three learner measures serve the same purpose (i.e., measuring the students' classroom motivated behavior). The mean score of the three variables for each class was then computed to form the Student Motivated Behavior index, which finally included 26 mean scores for the 26 classes.

The Student Motivational State Index

Students reported their situated motivational dispositions on three scales of the SMS (i.e., linguistic self-confidence, motivational intensity, and English

learning attitudes). To compute an overall index, the three multi-item variables were submitted to factor analysis (Maximum Likelihood with Oblique rotation). A one-factor solution emerged, which was subsequently used as a single index representing the Student Motivational State. Finally, class-level means were computed for the data constituting the index, which resulted in another set of composite scores (which included 26 class-level means). This made it possible to run the relevant correlation analyses described below.

Results and Discussion

In order to answer the first research question concerning the relationship between Teacher Motivational Practice and Student Motivated Behavior and the second question concerning the relationship between Student Motivated Behavior and Student Motivational State, a Pearson product-moment correlation was run. With the aim of answering the third research question (i.e., whether this relationship is consistent across each separate measure of Student Motivated Behavior: alertness, participation, and volunteering), the data for the three measures and Teacher Motivational Practice were submitted to another Pearson product-moment correlation analysis. In order to answer the fourth research question concerning the differences between high-motivation and low-motivation EFL learners in terms of their ideal and ought-to L2 selves, the classes were ordered from the highest to the lowest motivation groups based on their level of motivated behavior obtained through the MOLT. The top one third (8 classes), the middle one third (10 classes), and the bottom one third (8 classes) groups were distinguished and labeled the high-motivation, moderate-motivation, and low-motivation groups, respectively. In order to see if the classification is reliable and the specified groups represent truly different motivation groups, we ran an independent samples *t*-test. The result of the analysis strongly confirmed a significant difference in the mean scores for the high-motivation ($M = 30$, $SD = 7.6$) and the low-motivation learner groups ($M = 6.6$, $SD = 2.2$), $t(14) = 8.3$, $p < .001$, and the magnitude of the difference was larger than moderate ($\eta^2 = .83$). Our aim in this phase was to see whether high-motivation students differ from low-motivation ones in terms of their future L2 self-guides (i.e., the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self).

The results of the correlation analysis on Teacher Motivational Practice and Student Motivated Behavior, presented in Table 3, demonstrated that the two factors have a strong relationship, sharing about 52% of the variance. The strong correlation between Teacher Motivational Practice and Student Motivated Behavior confirms Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2008) findings and shows

Table 3 Correlations among the final composite scores

	Teacher Motivational Practice Index	Students Motivated Behavior Index
Students Motivated Behavior Index	.720**	—
Students' Self-reported Motivational State	−.113	.079

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Table 4 Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice and Student Motivated Behavior measures

	Alertness	Participation	Volunteering
Teacher Motivational Practice	.726**	.647**	.529**

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

that the observed link between teacher practice and student motivation can be generalized beyond national boundaries. In addition, the correlation results, presented in Table 4, confirmed the existence of strong associations between Teacher Motivational Practice and each of the three measures, indicating that this link is consistent across the subcomponents, thereby confirming the validity of the selection of these variables as reliable indicators of L2 classroom motivated behavior. Nonetheless, it cannot be decided on the basis of our results whether the teachers' motivational practice impacts their students' motivated behavior or the other way round.

Contrary to our expectations, the correlation between Student Motivated Behavior and the self-reported Student Motivational State turned out to be nonsignificant (Table 3). This can be related to the fact that these measures of L2 motivation represent two different contextual levels; that is, the students' motivated behavior represents the actual behavior at the immediate classroom level, whereas their self-reported motivation represents their more general and perceived propensities about L2 learning.

Another potential explanation for the mismatch between the students' self-reported motivation and their actual motivated behavior might be found in the Iranian context—namely, it might be that the learners' beliefs and perceptions of successful learning can be attributed to the exam-oriented system of assessment that defines achievement in terms of success in midterm and final paper-and-pencil tests of vocabulary, structure, and reading comprehension. Considering their own achievements in the tests, the students might perceive themselves as "*making progress in English this semester*," "*good at learning English*,"

Table 5 Independent samples *t*-test comparing the high-motivation versus low-motivation students

	N	Mean	*SD*	*df*	*t*	η^2
Ideal L2 self				458	0.91	.002
High motivation	226	4.65	1			
Low motivation	234	4.56	1.1			
Ought-to L2 self				458	−2.24*	.01
High motivation	226	3.74	1.1			
Low motivation	234	3.96	1			

N = Number of learners.
*$p < .05$.

and the like as demonstrated by their agreement with the questionnaire items (see the Appendix), whereas they may be passive through most EFL learning practices and not engage actively in classroom learning activities.

The results of the independent samples *t*-test (Table 5) indicated that there was no significant difference between the high-motivation and low-motivation learners concerning their ideal L2 self. This finding suggests that the learners' ideal image of their future self does not have much impact on their motivated behavior in English language classrooms or vice versa; that is, regardless of how well-developed the students' ideal L2 self is, their actual motivated behavior in classroom activities will remain unaffected, and regardless of how motivated the students are in class, their ideal L2 selves will remain unchanged. This finding can bear out the claim in educational psychology that the possible future selves do not necessarily result in motivation unless they are perceived as "available" and "accessible" through specific learning channels (Norman & Aron, 2003). In other words, future self-guides need to be equipped with appropriate behavioral strategies in order to facilitate goal attainment (Dörnyei, 2009; Oyserman, 2008; Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006). However, as the present state-run EFL teaching enterprise in Iran, especially at the secondary school level, does not provide the learners with the optimal conditions that are needed for the motivational dispositions to be actualized or manifested in actual classroom environments, the students' ideal L2 selves have remained essentially at the level of imagination and are thus far from being realized. Or simply, the possible L2 selves might be related to deeper levels of motivated behavior (e.g., self-regulatory capacity) than the surface classroom measure (which is mostly influenced by teacher's motivational practice) and the quality rather than the quantity of the motivational engagement in the learning process.

The *t*-test results also showed that the difference between the high-motivation and the low-motivation learner groups in terms of the ought-to L2 self was statistically significant, although the effect size estimation (η^2) for the magnitude of the difference was small (Table 5). This result might contribute to our understanding of the self system. The inverse pattern displayed by the data—that the low-motivation learners obtained higher scores in the ought-to L2 self than their high-motivation counterparts—seems understandable if we consider the research background on the relationship between the two variable of motivation and ought-to self. The ought-to self concerns attributes that one believes one ought to possess as a result of perceived duties, obligations, or responsibilities and is known as a less internalized future self-guide (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). This others-directed variable has been shown to have a positive relationship with anxiety (Carver, Lawrence, & Scheier, 1999; Higgins, 1987; Leary, 2007; Papi, 2010). In addition, L2 anxiety has been found to be negatively related to L2 motivation (e.g., Gardner & Lalonde, 1983; Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997; Hashimoto, 2002). Thus, it can be speculated that the anxiety associated with the ought-to L2 self-driven learners might have diminished their motivation to take part in class activities. This explanation is in line with the general assumption in the L2 motivation literature that the more self-internalized the motivational forms through which students are motivated, the higher the intensity of their motivation to continue their studies and the less anxiety they experience (Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999).

Conclusion

The participants in this study were male subjects from public secondary schools; therefore, the generalization of the findings would be strengthened by conducting similar research with male and female participants studying English at private language institutes, where learning tasks and on-task behaviors are more common.

Despite this limitation, the present study furthers our understanding of the use of L2 motivational strategies in the context of foreign language learning by examining the relationships between (a) teachers' use of motivational strategies and students' motivated behavior, (b) students' motivated behavior and their self-reported level of motivation, and (c) students' motivated behavior and their future L2 self-guides within the framework of the L2 Motivational Self System. The main finding of the study is that the teachers' motivational practice is strongly related to the students' motivated behavior, confirming Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2008) finding in a different foreign language learning context.

However, the students' ideal L2 selves did not seem to be related to their actual motivated behavior. It appears that only having an imaginary picture of one's desired L2 self cannot result in actual motivated behavior unless conditions are met and decisive steps are taken to facilitate realizing the ideal L2 selves, thereby enhancing learners' motivated behavior (Dörnyei, 2008). The Iranian secondary schools do not seem to meet these basic conditions, and the motivation the students demonstrate during their class activities can merely be generated from other motivational sources, including teachers' motivational practice. Yet, it is noteworthy that even within the obvious motivational constraints in this particular learning environment, the teachers' motivational practice was found to go hand in hand with the students' motivated behavioral response. Given these encouraging results, we hope other researchers will pursue more investigations of teacher L2 motivational strategies that can further enhance our understanding of the teacher-student motivational dynamics.

Revised version accepted 26 October 2010

References

Al-Shehri, A. S. (2009). Motivation and vision: The relation between the ideal L2 self, imagination and visual style. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 164–171). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. (2008). Teacher motivational strategies, student perceptions, motivation, and English achievement. *Modern Language Journal, 92*, 387–401.

Bernaus, M., Wilson, A., & Gardner, R. (2009). Teachers' motivation, classroom strategy use, students' motivation and second language achievement. *Porta Linguarum, 12,* 25–36.

Carver, C. S., Lawrence, J. W., & Scheier, M. F. (1999). Self-discrepancies and affect: Incorporating the role of feared self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 783–792.

Cheng, H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovations in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*, 153–174.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 19–36.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation,*

language identity and the L2 self (pp. 98–119). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Csizér, K., & Lukács, G. (2010). The comparative analysis of motivation, attitudes and selves: The case of English and German in Hungary. *System, 38*, 1–13.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 519–538.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning, 51*, 3–33.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2006). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *Handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 719–732). New York: Springer.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2008). New ways of motivating foreign language learners: Generating vision. *Links, 38*(Winter), 3–4.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London), 4*, 43–69. Retrieved August 11, 2006, from http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/archive/00000039/00/Motivation_in_action.pdf

Ellis, R. (2009). A reader responds to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's "Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation." *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 105–109.

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

Gardner, R. C., & Lalonde, R. N. (1983). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: An investigation using LISREL causal modeling. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 2*, 1–15.

Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret A-M. (1997). Toward a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 344–362.

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*, 55–77.

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2 use: The Japanese context. *Second Language Studies, 20*(2), 29–70.

Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguists*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*, 319–340.

Kim, T. Y. (2009). The sociocultural interface between ideal self and ought-to self: A case study of two Korean students' ESL motivation. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 274–294). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 229–247). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 317–344.

Madrid, D. (2002). The power of the FL teacher's motivational strategies. *Cauce, 25*, 369–422.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41*, 954–969.

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

Norman, C. C., & Aron, A. (2003). Aspects of possible self that predict motivation to achieve or avoid it. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 500–507.

Oyserman, D. (2008). Possible selves, identity based motivation, and school success. In H. W. Marsh, R. G. Craven, & D. M. McInerney (Eds.), *Self-processes, learning, and enabling human potential: Dynamic new approaches* (pp. 269–288). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Oyserman, D., Bybee, D., & Terry, K. (2006). Possible selves and academic outcomes: How and when possible selves impel action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 188–204.

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System, 38*, 467–479.

Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 120–143). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Segalowitz, N., Gatbonton, E., & Trofimovich, P. (2009). Links between ethnolinguistic affiliation, self-related motivation and second language fluency: Are they mediated by psycholinguistic variables? In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 172–192). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney: Macquarie University National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system amongst Chinese, Japanese, and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66–97). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144–163). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix
The English Version of the Student Motivational State Questionnaire With the Related Reliability Indexes ($n = 741$)

Ideal L2 Self Scale (8 items, Cronbach alpha = .79)

I can imagine myself living abroad and using English effectively for communicating with the locals.
I imagine myself speaking English as if I were a native speaker of English.
I imagine myself speaking English with international friends or colleagues.
Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.
I imagine myself studying in a university where all my courses are taught in English.
I imagine myself writing English e-mails fluently.
I imagine myself being a person known as a fluent speaker of English.
I imagine myself living and making friends in a modern community, using English.

Ought-to Self Scale (8 items, Cronbach alpha = .78)

If I fail to learn English, I'll be letting other people down.
I study English because close friends of mine think it is important.
Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I have the knowledge of English.
I consider learning English important because the people I respect think that I should do it.

Studying English is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.
Learning English is necessary because people surrounding me expect me to do so.
I have to learn English or else people's image of me as a smart student may become negative.
I should learn English or else people may think that I am a poor learner.

English Learning Experience Scale (6 items, Cronbach alpha = .76)

Do you like the atmosphere of your English classes?
Do you really enjoy learning English?
Do you think time passes faster while studying English?
Do you always look forward to English classes?
Would you like to have more English lessons at school?
Do you find learning English really interesting?

Motivational Intensity Scale (6 items, Cronbach alpha = .72)

When I am in English class, I volunteer answers as much as possible.
If English were not taught in school, I would pick up English in everyday situations (i.e., watch English films, read English books and newspapers, try to speak it whenever possible, etc.).
When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in English class, I immediately ask the teacher for help.
When it comes to English homework, I work very carefully, making sure I understand everything.
If my teacher wanted someone to do an extra English assignment, I would definitely volunteer.
I actively think about what I have learned in my English class.

Linguistic Self-Confidence Scale (7 items, Cronbach alpha = .82)

I feel I am making progress in English this semester.
I often volunteer to do speaking presentations in English lessons.
I often experience a feeling of success in my English lessons this semester.
I am sure that one day I will be able to speak English.
In English lessons this semester, I usually understand what to do and how to do it.
This semester, I think I am good at learning English.
I believe I will receive good grades in English this semester.