

7

MOTIVATION

Mostafa Papi and Phil Hiver

Background

Second language (L2) learning is fundamentally a motivational pursuit. Learning a second language to any degree of proficiency is the goal that variably motivates learners to invest in this process. This goal might entail learning how to speak a second language in the way first language users of the language speak it. It could be mastering a basic portion of the language to help one get by while traveling where the target language is spoken. It could be knowing enough of the grammar of the language to be able to pass a traditional foreign language exam in high school. Or it could be preparing for a more high-stakes standardized assessment of the target language. These are all different variations of language learning goals that can lead to different quantities and qualities of engagement in the learning process. The initial value and motive are not the only determining motivational factors though. The process of L2 learning could itself play a major role in how the learners pursue and succeed in learning the language. Learners' motivation and persistence can also be affected by virtually every element that is involved in the learning process. These include, but are not limited to, the instructional methods and techniques used, the quality of relationships between teachers and students, the learning atmosphere, the quality of learning materials, and available learning resources.

Even with everything in place, the learning path could be anything but straightforward. Learners experience different negative emotional states due to setbacks, failures, unpleasant interactions, the risk involved in using a new language, and the shame and embarrassment they might feel due to making mistakes and getting corrected or ridiculed. Learners react differently though to these potentially challenging situations depending on their personality, motives, and belief systems. Some may discontinue their learning efforts in response while others may feel even more energized to face the challenges and even use them as opportunities to succeed. Learners may also experience more pleasant emotions such as joy, excitement, pride, and confidence due to their success in learning the language, which can further energize them to continue learning the language they might not have initially intended to master. The whole endeavor of second language learning, therefore, is a motivational process that depends on how the learner perceives the value and the experience of learning a second language. Therefore, motivation can be defined as a phenomenon that explains the direction, vigor, and persistence of actions in the learning process. In other words, it explains why we do or do not take a certain course of action versus others, the intensity at which we pursue the action, and the length of time we stay involved in the action.

Many L2 motivation theories have been proposed in the half-century history of research in this area. Each theory has attracted the attention of some researchers but not others. The reason for the lack of even approximate agreement among motivation researchers on a single theory seems to be that each motivation theory looks at the phenomenon of motivation from a different angle. For instance, Gardner's (1985) instrumental and integrative orientations represented end-states; self-determination theory (Noels, 2001) is concerned with the degree of control over one's own learning behavior; in Dörnyei's (2009) L2 motivational self system, future selves (see also Papi et al., 2019a) represent desired end-states whereas the L2 learning experience is about the process of learning; mindsets (Lou & Noels, 2017; Mercer & Ryan, 2010) reflect learners' beliefs about their ability to control the learning process; and self-efficacy (Torres & Turner, 2016) is about the perceived ability to perform. In addition, constructs such as willingness to communicate in a second language (MacIntyre et al., 1998), L2 grit/persistence (Teimouri et al., in press), directed motivational currents (Dörnyei et al., 2015), and feedback-seeking behavior (Papi et al., 2019b) refer to different types of motivated behaviors or states. The sheer number of motivation theories and constructs proposed reflect the complex reality of the construct of motivation (Hiver & Papi, 2019), which at the same time has led to divergent understandings of motivation.

In an ambitious attempt to overcome this historical problem in the science of motivation, which itself has grappled with the same issue, and integrate all these theories under one broad but unified understanding of motivation, Higgins (2012) proposed a conceptual classification. The basic tenet of this framework is that the underlying motivation for all behaviors is the desire to be effective with reference to three dimensions: *value*, *truth*, and *control*. The value dimension of motivation refers to the goals and outcomes of language learning. The control dimension concerns the experience and process of language learning. Finally, the truth aspect involves pursuing a goal for the sake of curiosity and learning the truth of a matter. These three dimensions are represented to different degrees in the different theories of motivation, which can provide a useful framework for understanding various dimensions of motivation. Therefore, in this chapter we will use this framework to present a unified and comprehensive understanding of language learning motivation (see also Papi & Hiver, 2020).

Gardner's Theory of Motivation

Gardner's (1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972) classic theory of motivation has been the traditional way of understanding motivation for learning languages. Gardner and Lambert (1972) made a well-known distinction between an instrumental orientation and an integrative orientation. The instrumental orientation refers to the pragmatic or utilitarian benefits of learning a second language, such as finding a good job and gaining others' approval and respect. The integrative orientation, on the other hand, concerns interest in meeting, conversing, and even identifying with the target language community. According to Gardner (1985), "the integrative and instrumental orientations represent ultimate goals for achieving the more immediate goal of learning the second language" (1985, p. 11). These orientations, thus, seem to reflect the end-states or the outcomes that, Gardner believed, determined the level of learners' motivation, and can be categorized under the value dimension of Higgins' framework. Even though Gardner (1985) believed that "both the integrative and instrumental orientations are extrinsic in that they indicate that the language is being learned in order to satisfy some goals not simply because of an intrinsic interest in the language itself" (p. 12), some aspects of the integrative orientation—which concerned genuine curiosity and interest in meeting, conversing and even identifying with the target language community—can fall under the truth dimension.

The L2 Motivational Self System

The L2 motivational self system (L2MSS; Dörnyei, 2009) is based on the idea that learners' drive to reduce the perceived discrepancy between their here-and-now (actual) L2 selves and their future

L2 selves provides the necessary motivation for language learning. The L2MSS places emphasis on the learner's "personal core" and centers the whole person within L2 learning motivation research. The model has three main dimensions: *ideal L2 self*, *ought-to L2 self*, and *language learning experience*. The ideal L2 self represents an ideal image of the kind of L2 user one aspires to be in the future. The ought-to L2 self represents the duties, expectations, and obligations that people meet to avoid negative consequences. The ideal and ought-to L2 self are concerned with end-states and are thus value-related motives. The L2 learning experience, on the other hand, reflects interest in the process of learning the target language and falls under the control dimension of motivation.

Papi et al. (2019a; see also Teimouri, 2017) have recently refined and bifurcated the self-guides outlined in the L2MSS based on their regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention; Higgins, 1997) and the standpoint of the source of the self-guide (own vs. others; Higgins, 1987). In other words, they made a distinction between a learner's own ideal L2 self and the ideal L2 self that a learner's important others would like them to reach. Likewise, they distinguished the obligations and duties that the person perceives they need to meet to avoid negative consequences from the obligations that important others require or expect the learner to meet. Papi and associates (2019a) also argued that the ideal selves (own and others) have a promotion focus, concerned with moving from the status quo to a more desirable state, whereas the ought-to selves (own and other) have a prevention focus, concerned with maintaining the status quo and avoiding a less desirable state. According to the authors (2019a; also Papi & Khajavy, 2021; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021), the new model lays out theoretical predictions in terms of learner emotions, behaviors, and learning outcomes. Learners who succeed in approaching ideal selves are expected to experience elation-related emotions (e.g., enjoyment) whereas those who fail to do so experience dejection-related emotions (e.g., sadness). On the other hand, those who succeed in meeting ought-to selves experience quiescence-related emotions (e.g., calmness) while those who fail to do so experience agitation-related emotions (e.g., anxiety). In terms of strategies, learners who pursue ideal selves tend to employ eager strategies involving maximal use of opportunities to learn and use the target language; by contrast, those who seek to meet oughts, use vigilant strategies which involve minimal and cautious use of L2 and learning opportunities. Given the eager-versus-vigilant distinction in the behavioral tendencies of students motivated by ideals versus those motivated by oughts, it is expected that learners show qualitative differences in their L2 use (e.g., fluency, accuracy, and complexity).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, originating in Bandura's (1982) social cognitive theory, emphasizes the importance of agency through which individuals can make decisions about and exercise control over what they do. Learners' self-efficacy beliefs are the judgments they make about how effectively they can accomplish tasks set for them and learn (Mills, 2014). As such, self-efficacy has a direct bearing on learners' choice of activities and expenditure of effort in learning (Pajares, 2006). Positive appraisals of situation-specific capabilities are important to a learner's motivation for many reasons. Among other things, these positive self-efficacy beliefs are associated with enthusiasm and confidence, positive emotions, and engagement, as well as attention, effort, and persistence (Bandura, 2006).

Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) is based on the idea that supporting a learner's psychological needs for *autonomy*, *competence*, and *relatedness* leads to the learner's adoption of more internalized and self-determined goals, which in turn contributes to the learner's adaptive motivation, performance, and well-being. According to Ryan and Deci (2020), autonomy refers to the feeling of ownership in one's decisions and actions, competence refers to a sense of mastery and the ability to succeed in a certain area, and relatedness concerns a sense of belonging and connect-

edness. Given the emphasis on these three elements as sources of motivation, self-determination theory can be classified under the control dimension of human motivation. The theory outlines an *intrinsic motivation* along with four types of *extrinsic motivations* which vary in terms of how internalized or self-determined they are. Intrinsic motivation represents motivation to engage in an activity for the sake of enjoyment experienced in its completion. The four types of extrinsic motivations include *external regulation*, representing behaviors motivated by the rewards and punishment; *introjected regulation*, which represents partially internalized extrinsic motivation that is motivated by the feeling of self-esteem on the positive side and the feelings of anxiety, shame, and guilt on the negative side; *identified regulation*, which drives behaviors that the person values and identifies with, and thus are to some extent volitional; and *integrated regulation*, which is the most internalized type of extrinsic motivation and represents behaviors that the learner not only identifies with but also finds congruent with his or her core values and interests.

Mindsets

Dweck and colleagues (e.g., Dweck & Legget, 1988) proposed the theory of mindsets (also called the *implicit theories of intelligence*) based on their observations that learners who pursued learning goals (concerned with increasing competence) tended to believe in the malleability of intelligence through appropriate effort whereas those who pursued performance goals (concerned with displaying performance) endorsed the belief that their intelligence was a fixed entity that cannot change. The former group was proposed to have a growth mindset about intelligence whereas the latter was considered to have a fixed mindset. The mindsets create two semantic worlds in which goals, challenge, effort, failure, and success have different meanings to the individual (see Lou & Zarrinabadi, Chapter 8, this volume). Due to their belief about the malleability of intelligence, learners with a growth mindset set learning goals to develop their competence, attribute failure and success to the quality or quantity of their efforts, seek and perceive challenging tasks and feedback as opportunities for learning, and show higher levels of motivation, persistence, and achievement. Those who endorse a fixed mindset, on the other hand, value performance goals for the purpose of validating their abilities, see effort as a sign of low intelligence, attribute success and failure to their inborn abilities, avoid challenging tasks, view feedback as a sign of failure, and show lower levels of motivation, persistence, and achievement (Dweck, 1999). Due to their focus on the competence aspect of human motivation, mindsets can fall under the control aspect of motivation.

Research

Evidence

Gardner's Theory of Motivation

Even though leading L2 motivation researchers in the field have moved beyond Gardner's dichotomy, and publications using this theory have almost disappeared from major applied linguistics journals, the theory is still being used in smaller-scale studies in different parts of the world, perhaps due to the perceived relevance of the notion of attitudes especially in contexts where relatively more specific cultures and communities associated with the languages exist. For instance, Widodo et al. (2018) examined the link between attitudes and motivation among university students learning a local language in Indonesia. In another study, Acheson et al. (2015) examined the effects of explicit training in intercultural competence on attitudes toward both European Spanish speakers and US Hispanics as well as motivation (integrative and instrumental) among learners of Spanish in the context of the US. Regardless, Gardner's contributions to the field have been immense; he built the foundations for the study of L2 motivation and developed psychometric instruments for

Motivation

measuring motivational constructs. It is therefore not surprising that some researchers still show interest in continuing his research tradition.

The L2MSS

Numerous studies have used the L2MSS to examine language learning motivation. Ideal L2 self and L2 learning experience have been found to strongly predict motivated learning behaviors (e.g., Khajavy & Ghonsooly, 2017; Kormos & Csizér, 2014; Papi, 2010; Taguchi et al., 2009; Teimouri, 2017; You & Dörnyei, 2016), achievement (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013), and proficiency (Lamb, 2012). Ought-to L2 self, on the other hand, has either emerged as a weak predictor of motivated behavior (e.g., Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Papi & Teimouri, 2012, 2014; Taguchi et al., 2009; Teimouri, 2017; You & Dörnyei, 2016), a statistically non-significant predictor (e.g., Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Papi & Teimouri, 2012), or even a variable with questionable construct validity (Csizér & Lukács, 2010; Kormos & Csizér, 2008). The construct has recently been left out in recent L2MSS studies, many of which now seem to exclusively focus on the ideal L2 self (e.g., Henry & Cliffordson, 2017; Hiver & Al-Hoorie, 2020). Papi et al. (2019a) attributed the asymmetric findings to issues in conceptualization and measurement of future selves in the L2MSS, issues which were addressed by Papi et al. (2019a) in their development of the 2×2 model of L2 self-guides.

More recent studies, especially those using the 2×2 model, have shown that different future self-guides lead to both quantitative and qualitative differences in the motivational, emotional, behavioral, and linguistic patterns of learners, confirming the theoretical predictions outlined by Papi and his colleagues. These studies show that ideal L2 selves lead to more adaptive psychological patterns such as positive emotions (Papi & Khajavy, 2021; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021; Teimouri, 2017), willingness to communicate in a second language (e.g., Khajavy & Ghonsooly, 2017; Teimouri, 2017), positive attitudes towards the importance of L2 pronunciation (Zhou, 2019), eagerness in L2 use (Papi et al., 2019a; Papi & Khajavy, 2021; Teimouri, 2017), persistence in L2 learning (Feng & Papi, 2020), higher pronunciation fluency (Kermad, 2018), and achievement (Papi & Khajavy, 2021). Ought selves, on the other hand, have been negatively associated with the perceived importance of pronunciation (Zhou, 2019) and have contributed to the experience of anxiety (Jiang & Papi, 2021; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021) and the vigilant use of the target language, which in turn negatively predicts L2 achievement (Papi & Khajavy, 2021).

Mindsets

Several studies have been conducted on the theory of mindsets in language learning (see Lou, Chapter 8, this volume). Mercer and Ryan (2010) were the first researchers who proposed that mindsets could be domain specific. A growth language mindset has been found to be associated with L2 learning goals (e.g., Lou & Noels, 2017; Papi et al., 2019b), motivation (Waller & Papi, 2017) higher perceived value of corrective feedback (Papi et al., 2020), preference for the more explicit types of corrective feedback (Papi et al., 2021), more feedback-seeking behavior (Papi et al., 2019b, 2020), a sense of autonomy and competence (e.g., Lou & Noels, 2020) and L2 achievement (Khajavy et al., in press). Learners with a fixed-language mindset, on the other hand, have been found to pursue performance goals (e.g., Lou & Noels, 2017; Papi et al., 2019b), be concerned with the self-presentation cost of feedback seeking (Papi et al., 2020), prefer implicit types or even the absence of corrective feedback (Papi et al., 2021), avoid feedback seeking (Papi et al., 2019b, 2020), be more anxious in L2 use (Lou & Noels, 2019), and show low levels of motivation (Waller & Papi, 2017). In addition, intervention studies to change L2 learners' mindsets have been shown to be effective in enhancing learning goals, the intention to continue learning (Lou & Noels, 2020), and learners' response to challenges (Molway & Mutton, 2020), and reducing the learner's anxiety in interaction with native speakers (Lou & Noels, 2019).

Self-Efficacy Theory

As suggested in the reviews of studies on language learners' self-efficacy beliefs (e.g., Mills, 2014; Wyatt, Chapter 13, this volume), self-efficacy is associated with learners' development and performance in speaking (e.g., Zhang & Ardasheva, 2019), listening (e.g., Wang et al., 2013), reading (e.g., McLean & Poulshock, 2018), and writing (e.g., Han & Hiver, 2018). There is also evidence that individuals with greater self-efficacy engage in self-regulated learning and have the tendency to employ learning strategies more often, in more effective combinations, and with better results for learning (e.g., Kim et al., 2015). The consensus in the field is that the power of self-efficacy for individuals to desire and enact greater control over their behavior stems from individuals' past experiences of success and failure, social comparative influences, and other individuals' perspectives and persuasions about one's own capacity to learn and use a new language.

Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory has benefited from over two decades of sustained empirical work in language education (see McEown & Oga-Baldwin, 2019). Early work indicated that individuals who reported learning languages for more self-determined reasons generally displayed greater motivational intensity, a heightened desire for their L2 learning, more positive attitudes towards L2 study, and higher L2 achievement (e.g., Noels et al., 2000). Since these first studies, many more have corroborated the explanatory power of self-determination theory and its associated constructs in various cultural, linguistic, and educational contexts (e.g., Noels et al., 2019). The accumulating evidence suggests that the effects of more autonomous forms of motivation on learning are stronger and more desirable, and this remains robust across multiple languages and educational contexts (e.g., González-Becerra, 2019; Parrish & Lanvers, 2019). On the other hand, while some external forms of regulation can be productive, they are generally of lower quality, are more ephemeral, and accompany lower achievement.

For example, McEown et al. (2014) found that Canadian learners of Japanese with more self-determined reasons for studying were more likely to express a greater sense of control and to persist in learning. This finding has been extended in studies demonstrating that autonomously motivated language learners were able to positively reappraise their goals (*Canada*; Chaffee et al., 2014), engaged more deeply and achieved better language outcomes (*Japan*; Oga-Baldwin & Nakata, 2017), overcame challenges as they sustained effortful behavior (*Sweden*; Henry, 2017), displayed lower levels of anxiety and counteracted the effects of anxiety on performance in high-stakes tests (*China*; Cheng et al., 2014), and attained more target-like features of the language being learned (*Turkey*; Polat & Schallert, 2013). In more specific L2 learning domains, self-determined motivation has demonstrated a reliably strong relationship with L2 vocabulary learning (Tanaka, 2017), willingness to communicate (Joe, Hiver, & Al-Hoorie, 2017), reading (Tanaka, 2013), and pronunciation development (Polat, 2011).

The other well-established aspects of self-determination theory, researched in a variety of contexts, are the core needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (see also Turner et al., Chapter 9, this volume). For example, in her study of over 500 Japanese elementary school students' L2 motivational orientations, Carreira (2012) reported that core need satisfaction played a key role in learners' success. Alamer and Lee's (2019) study of over 400 Saudi learners of English returned a similar pattern of results. Not only was the satisfaction of psychological needs directly linked to students' motivational orientations, these in turn predicted learners' goal-setting approach and emotional states in the language classroom. In their investigation of the value of a supportive learning environment on these core needs, Oga-Baldwin and Nakata (2015) showed that a combination of autonomy support and structure promoted need satisfaction for Japanese elementary school students. In another study, Joe et al. (2017) demonstrated that a positive social climate supported learners' competence needs, which in turn led to stronger self-determined motivation and more

desirable L2 communication behaviors. And, taking a more developmental lens, Noels et al. (2019) reported that promoting need satisfaction could reinforce learners' voluntary and self-relevant activities and their L2 learning enjoyment.

Data Elicitation

Motivation describes a state of mind with cognitive (e.g., goals), emotional (e.g., desires and fears), and behavioral (e.g., working hard) manifestations. The cognitive and emotional aspects of the motivation process cannot be directly observed even though they can be inferred from behavior. To investigate these issues, therefore, researchers rely heavily on student self-report using different tools (e.g., questionnaires, interviews, and diary journals). In the field of L2 motivation, questionnaire instruments have been developed to measure attitudes (Gardner, 2004), future selves (e.g., Papi et al., 2019a; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021), self-efficacy (Torres & Turner, 2016), mindsets in the context of speaking (Papi et al., 2019b; Lou & Noels, 2017) and writing (Waller & Papi, 2017), and extrinsic and intrinsic motives (Noels et al., 2000). In addition, interview protocols have also been developed for researching L2 motivation from a retrospective lens (Papi & Hiver, 2020) or using longitudinal narratives (Hiver et al., 2020).

A distinction between motives and motivated behaviors is critical in our understanding of how motivation works. Motives refer to what motivates language learners and include the sources of their motivation, such as their future selves, goals, personality, and beliefs which are the subject of the present chapter. Motivated behaviors, on the other hand, represent the behavioral manifestations or outcomes of motivation that are expected to lead to L2 learning and performance outcomes. Two types of motivated behaviors have commonly been examined in L2 motivation research. These include intended behaviors and reported behaviors. The former includes the behaviors that the learner intends or expects to show, such as intended effort (Taguchi et al., 2009) and willingness to communicate (Khajavy & Ghonsooly, 2017), whereas the latter consists of constructs such as motivated learning behaviors (e.g., Papi et al., 2019a), L2 use strategic inclinations (Papi & Khajavy, 2021), persistence or grit (e.g., Feng & Papi, 2020; Teimouri et al., in press), engagement (Hiver et al., 2020), and feedback-seeking behavior (Papi et al., 2019b, 2020). For instance, whereas using the intended behaviors before the start of an instructional program can be useful in determining initial motivation, to examine students' current or past learning behaviors, the use of reported learning behaviors is more logical.

One of the points our review of the evidence above makes clear is that across all various models and theories of L2 motivation, characteristics of research methodology tend to be homogenous. This homogeneity in designs results in similar types of data elicitation instruments being applied. Consequently, experimental designs are hard to find, and theory-driven hypothesis testing remains rare. There is a clear need to experimentally examine causal links between motivational variables and interventions on one hand, and indicators of language development and performance on the other hand (for similar calls, see Hiver & Al-Hoorie, 2020; Papi, 2018).

Practical Applications

In this section, we describe what implications the research findings have for practitioners and policy makers.

Attitudes

Gardner's theory of motivation is a socially oriented one with indirect relevance to foreign language contexts. However, the theory can still be useful for understanding intergroup attitudes in many second language contexts, especially where there is more contact between language learners

and the target language community. Creating opportunities for students to experience and learn about the target culture, for instance through study abroad or virtual exchange, can influence students' cultural awareness and attitudes (e.g., Polisca, 2011) as well as their willingness to communicate in the target language (Lee, 2018).

Future Self-Guides

Enhancing the ideal L2 selves seems to lead to more adaptive motivational, emotional, and behavioral language learning patterns. Enhancement techniques, which have been empirically shown to have potential positive motivational consequences (e.g., Magid, 2011; Magid & Chan, 2012; Munezane, 2015; Sato, 2020), can easily be integrated into L2 classroom activities. The first step in such interventions is to identify what each student's ideal L2 self is. Given that L2 learners might have different visions of their ideal L2 self, having students visualize and write about the kind of L2 user they would ideally like to become can help identify a clear and personal picture of the students' ideal selves. Next, students can elaborate on this by writing about the professional, personal, and social aspects of their future self including their jobs, relationships, and lifestyles (Magid & Chan, 2012). Finally, students can be asked to develop timelines and action plans that delineate the steps they need to take in order to realize their ideal L2 selves. The researchers who have conducted these studies reported that such interventions led to positive outcomes such as willingness to communicate (Munezane, 2015) and even vocabulary learning and oral proficiency (Magid, 2011). It must be noted that in the absence of true experimental designs, as was the case in the studies reviewed above, it is difficult to attribute these outcomes to the interventions with sufficient certainty.

The ideal and ought selves, however, have been employed in the field of social psychology to induce temporary promotion versus prevention regulatory focus (e.g., Higgins et al., 2001). A promotion regulatory focus is concerned with the presence and absence of positive outcomes and can result in an eager strategic tendency in decision making and behavior. A prevention regulatory focus, on the other hand, is concerned with the presence or absence of negative outcomes and leads to a vigilant strategic tendency. Having students write about their ideal self can thus induce or prime a temporary promotion regulatory focus that may result in students taking more risks, trying creative solutions, and using the language more eagerly in classroom contexts (Papi et al., 2019a). Inducing a temporary prevention focus through having students write about their oughts, on the other hand, can help them be more careful in activities such as error correction, which demand higher attention to language forms (Papi et al., 2019a).

Mindsets

As discussed above (see also Lou, Chapter 8, this volume), mindsets are fundamental beliefs that create different worldviews in relation to goals, motivation, effort, learning tasks, success, and failure. In other words, mindsets can basically shape an individual's personality in learning situations. Changing one's mindsets can therefore have a domino effect on a range of cognitive, motivational, affective, behavioral, and learning patterns that students show across learning contexts. Mindset interventions can be simple and easy to integrate into language lessons. Students can be asked to read articles about how effort and hard work can increase one's learning abilities (Lou & Noels, 2016). Teachers can bring in stories and research that enhances such beliefs. Students can be asked to discuss the topic in class and form groups to prepare a presentation on how language learning ability can grow. They can write a letter to an imaginary pen pal with a fixed mindset and explain how they can change their abilities (e.g., Aronson et al., 2002). Teachers can also adopt a growth mindset (Bai et al., 2021) and mastery orientation in their teaching, with a focus on the process of learning, using L2 errors and students' weaknesses as opportunities for learners to develop their language learning intelligence.

Self-Efficacy Theory

Language learners with low self-efficacy tend to doubt their capabilities and have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue (Usher & Pajares, 2008). The lower students' self-efficacy, the more they may tend to regard L2 learning as difficult and see challenging tasks as personal threats. This can result in a vicious cycle of beliefs about one's performance leading to actual poor performance and thereby reinforcing those beliefs as accurate (Mills & Péron, 2008). To break such a cycle, however, enactive mastery experiences can be employed. Direct experiences of success in language learning can help learners to reorient their task appraisals, establish positive task-specific self-beliefs, develop an increased expectancy for success, and push themselves out of their comfort zone. Enactive mastery experiences are clearly one of the more reliable sources of information about learners' ability to act in ways that will lead to successful performance (Pajares & Urdan, 2006). Language learning that features thoughtful sequencing of tasks can provide explicit structure and support that builds students' beliefs in their ability through direct mastery experiences (Zhang & Ardasheva, 2019). Additionally, the verbal persuasion that comes through interaction and collaboration with others while learning a language (e.g., feedback, reassurance, and encouragement from credible or expert sources) and the vicarious experiences that come with the opportunity to observe the successes and capabilities of others (e.g., peers' progress at similar proficiency and competence levels) engaged in a task can contribute in important ways to students' expectations of their own future success and to how these individuals exert more influence on their own actions. Thus, a more virtuous cycle is one in which language learners are positively influenced by the collaboration and interaction and when learners' growing self-efficacy beliefs push them to seek out further verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences.

Self-Determination Theory

Motivated action can be either self-determined or controlled, and to the extent that it is action a learner engages in because they want to, it fits the prototype of self-determined behavior. Many of the practical applications related to self-determination theory (SDT) are based on the idea that language learning should emphasize activities that learners find interesting or enjoyable so that they engage in these activities willingly and autonomously without pressure from extrinsic incentives. Language learning that targets self-determined motivation also relies on making the content of learning relevant to learners, providing meaningful choice, encouraging learners to connect and apply what they are learning to their own interests. It also provides explicit links between learning content and students' experiences, and gradually leads students to understand that the motivation to learn comes from within themselves. Some characteristics of language learning (e.g., mandated curricula, emphasis on performance goals, competitive grading, and high-stakes assessments) make it unrealistic to assume that students' learning can be fully self-determined or that learners can maintain intrinsic motivation exclusively. However, it is certainly possible to spark a stronger interest or willingness to engage with a topic or activity and to help learners appreciate and discover the value of such topics and activities for themselves.

Other ways SDT provides "lessons" for practical application include its treatment of core needs and their link to the social context and learning activity (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Learners are driven to feel they belong and are connected to others within a social milieu, want to function effectively in that milieu, and desire to feel a sense of personal initiative while acting. Learning environments and activities can promote self-determined motivation through need satisfaction and prevent the loss of motivation and engagement by avoiding need frustration. Rethinking the characteristics of instructed L2 settings that might result in learners experiencing pressure toward specific behaviors or outcomes can help minimize need frustration and maximize learners' sense of self-determination in deciding what to do and how to do it (autonomy), what skills to develop and use to better

control their learning environment (competence), and what kinds of interpersonal involvement and prosocial relationships to engage in (relatedness). Although the application of notions such as basic psychological needs in varied cultural settings requires nuance, such core principles appear to tap into some universals of human functioning (McEown & Oga-Baldwin, 2019).

Future Directions

Attitudes

Attitudes and identification with the target language can still be important research topics in L2 motivation especially in contexts where there is direct contact with the target language community. Such attitudes and identification can have important implications for individuals' motivation to learn a second language (see Polat & Schallert, 2013). Using culture-based intervention techniques to influence learners' cultural awareness and attitudes (e.g., Ducate & Steckenbiller, 2017) could be an important research direction with particular significance in English-speaking contexts such as the US, where motivation for foreign language learning is not as promising as in other countries. In addition, examining how cultural in-person or virtual exchange experiences (e.g., Polisca, 2011) can influence learner attitudes could be another important research direction.

Future L2 Selves

Developing ideal L2 selves can be a useful pedagogical technique, as shown in the studies reviewed above. However, researchers need to move beyond enhancing the ideal L2 self for the sake of enhancing the ideal L2 self and explore how such enhancement or activation leads to immediate and long-term changes in L2 learning behaviors and outcomes. For instance, the ideal L2 self/own can lead to enjoyment, eager use of the target language, and foreign language achievement (Papi et al., 2019a; Papi & Khajavy, 2021). Given the promotion focus of an ideal L2 self, it can result in higher levels of risk taking, creativity, and language learning. Exploring whether enhancing an ideal L2 self would have similar effects on learning behavior and outcomes could be an interesting research venue. It would also be interesting to see if learners motivated by different future self-guides develop L2 characteristics of different qualities (e.g., fluency vs. accuracy). For this purpose, we need more robust research studies with larger samples of participants, control groups, pre-tests, immediate and delayed post-tests, and participant blindness to the purpose of the study.

Mindsets

Mindsets have mostly been applied to general language learning. Applying the role of mindsets in the specific language skills and components (e.g., Waller & Papi, 2017) could further our understanding. It would be interesting to look at how mindsets are related to other motivational dispositions such as self-efficacy, future selves, and attitudes, as well as learners' emotional responses to success and failure. Mindsets can be investigated in relation to L2 learning processes and outcomes such as task engagement, seeking and processing corrective feedback, frequency of L2 use, as well as their L2 production characteristics such as linguistic complexity, fluency, and accuracy. Investigating how the learning context and teachers' mindsets also influence learners' mindsets, teachers' instructional practice and classroom management, the learning atmosphere, and classroom dynamics might also be interesting future directions.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy in educational settings is linked to task choice, effort, and persistence. Yet within these broad associations there remain many interesting avenues for further work. Exploring the

links between self-efficacy and other motivational dispositions such as mindsets, future selves, and achievement goals could further our understanding of this construct. The perceived capabilities of a group, team, or larger social unit can also have an important impact on success in learning (Bandura, 1997). Another area for exploration is the issue of calibration, which refers to how well a learner's self-efficacy relates to actual performance on the corresponding tasks. Still too little is known about how and why mismatches between learners' appraisals of task demands and self-beliefs develop (Schunk & Pajares, 2009). The accuracy with which these calibrate has important implications for learners with inflated, underrated, or otherwise imprecise perceptions of their capacity to develop and to get actively involved in language learning. Students who underestimate what they can do may be reluctant to try a task and this can diminish their learning overall. On the other hand, recurring overestimation can lead to continued failure and result in disengagement and demoralization.

Self-Determination Theory

Whereas intervention research has been a mainstay of SDT studies in general education, few studies of this kind feature in language learning. Such a line of SDT research might investigate whether and how certain tasks or classroom practices have a proximal influence on students' degree of self-determination. Intervention studies can also examine the extent to which teachers, classroom materials, and learning tasks can be made more need-supportive. For example, intervention studies in which teachers use instructional practices that support student autonomy (as well as other core needs) can be used to study the effects of such need-supportive practices on students' intrinsic goals, choice of learning activity, and sense of control. If the literally hundreds of studies in non-language learning contexts are any benchmark (e.g., Lazowski & Hulleman, 2016), such interventions should prove extremely cost effective, produce relatively strong effects ($d = 0.7$), and be flexible enough to implement across different types of L2 learning contexts.

More substantively, the varied settings that language learners of the 21st century will find themselves in should also be studied to establish whether they provide the necessary conditions that are critical for self-determined motivation and engaged learning. Given the strong evidence that more autonomous motivation enhances learning outcomes, investigating new modes of learning languages through educational media, e-learning, and remote classrooms could shed new light on how to create choice, interest, and enjoyment for language learning. It is no accident that the voluntary adoption of language learning apps, for example, has skyrocketed in the past few years (e.g., Duolingo estimates over 300 million total users). Looking more closely at language learning outside the classroom—using flipped models or technology-mediated communication—can increase our understanding of how to capture the attention of students and foster more self-determined forms of motivation (see Peters et al., 2018).

References

Acheson, K., Nelson, M., & Luna, K. (2015). Measuring the impact of instruction in intercultural communication on secondary Spanish learners' attitudes and motivation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(2), 203–217.

Alamer, A., & Lee, J. (2019). A motivational process model explaining L2 Saudi students' achievement of English. *System*, 87, 102–133.

Aronson, J., Fried, C. B., & Good, C. (2002). Reducing the effects of stereotype threat on African American college students by shaping theories of intelligence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 113–125.

Bai, B., Wang, J., & Chai, C. S. (2021). Understanding Hong Kong primary school English teachers' continuance intention to teach with ICT. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(4), 528–551.

Bandura, A. (1982). The assessment and predictive generality of self-percepts of efficacy. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 13(3), 195–199.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. *Self-efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*, 5(1), 307–337.

Carreira, J. M. (2012). Motivational orientations and psychological needs in EFL learning among elementary school students in Japan. *System*, 40(2), 191–202.

Chaffee, K. E., Noels, K., & McEown, S. (2014). Learning from authoritarian teachers: Controlling the situation or controlling yourself can sustain motivation. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 355–387.

Cheng, L., Klinger, D., Fox, J., Doe, C., Jin, Y., & Wu, J. (2014). Motivation and test anxiety in test performance across three testing contexts: The CAEL, CET, and GEPT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 300–330.

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*. Clevedon: 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), 1–13.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 437–462.

Dörnyei, Z., Ibrahim, Z., & Muir, C. (2016). Directed motivational currents: Regulating complex dynamic systems through motivational surges. In Z. Dörnyei, P. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning*, (95–105). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ducate, L., & Steckenbiller, C. (2017). Toward a better understanding of culture: Wikis in the beginning German classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(2), 202–219.

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. New York: Psychology Press.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256.

Feng, L., & Papi, M. (2020). Persistence in language learning: The role of grit and future self-guides. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 81, 101904.

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

Gardner, R. C. (2004). *Attitude/motivation test battery: International AMTB research project*. Canada: The University of Western Ontario.

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

González-Becerra, I. (2019). Language learning among STEM students: Motivational profile and attitudes of undergraduates in a UK institution. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(3), 385–401.

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 40, 44–59.

Henry, A. (2017). Rewarding foreign language learning: Effects of the Swedish grade point average enhancement initiative on students' motivation to learn French. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 301–315.

Henry, A., & Cliffordson, C. (2017). The impact of out-of-school factors on motivation to learn English: Self-discrepancies, beliefs, and experiences of self-authenticity. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(5), 713–736.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319–340.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280.

Higgins, E. T. (2012). *Beyond pleasure and pain: How motivation works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(1), 3–23.

Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2020). Reexamining the role of vision in second language motivation: A preregistered conceptual replication of You, Dörnyei, and Csizer (2016). *Language Learning*, 70, 48–102.

Hiver, P., & Papi, M. (2019). Complexity theory and L2 motivation. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 117–137). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hiver, P., Zhou, A., Tahmouresi, S., Sang, Y., & Papi, M. (2020). Why stories matter: Exploring learner engagement and metacognition through narratives of the L2 learning experience. *System*, 91, 102260.

Jiang, C., & Papi, M. (in press). The motivation-anxiety interface in language learning: A regulatory focus perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.

Joe, H. K., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Classroom social climate, self-determined motivation, willingness to communicate, and achievement: A study of structural relationships in instructed second language settings. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 53, 133–144.

Kermad, A. (2018). *Speaker and listener variability in the perception of non-native speech* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Arizona University, Arizona.

Khajavy, G. H., & Ghonsooly, B. (2017). Predictors of willingness to read in English: Testing a model based on possible selves and self-confidence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 871–885.

Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Hariri, J. A. (in press). Closer look at grit and language mindset as predictors of foreign language achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 43(2), 379–402.

Kim, D. H., Wang, C., Ahn, H. S., & Bong, M. (2015). English language learners' self-efficacy profiles and relationship with self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 38, 136–142.

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 327–355.

Kormos, J., & Csizer, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 275–299.

Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 997–1023.

Lazowski, R. A., & Hulleman, C. S. (2016). Motivation interventions in education: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 602–640.

Lee, J. H. (2018). The effects of short-term study abroad on L2 anxiety, international posture, and L2 willingness to communicate. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(8), 703–714.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2016). Changing language mindsets: Implications for goal orientations and responses to failure in and outside the second language classroom. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 46, 22–33.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2017). Measuring language mindsets and modeling their relations with goal orientations and emotional and behavioral responses in failure situations. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(1), 214–243.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2019). Sensitivity to language-based rejection in intercultural communication: The role of language mindsets and implications for migrants' cross-cultural adaptation. *Applied Linguistics*, 40(3), 478–505.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2020). "Does my teacher believe I can improve?": The role of meta-lay theories in ESL learners' mindsets and need satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1417.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.

Magid, M. (2011, July). A validation and application of the L2 motivational self system among Chinese learners of English. [Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Nottingham].

Magid, M., & Chan, L. (2012). Motivating English learners by helping them visualise their Ideal L2 Self: Lessons from two motivational programmes. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 113–125.

McEown, M. S., & Oga-Baldwin, W. Q. (2019). Self-determination for all language learners: New applications for formal language education. *System*, 86, 102–124.

McEown, M. S., Noels, K. A., & Saumure, K. D. (2014). Students' self-determined and integrative orientations and teachers' motivational support in a Japanese as a foreign language context. *System*, 45, 227–241.

McLean, S., & Poulsom, J. (2018). Increasing reading self-efficacy and reading amount in EFL learners with word-targets. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 30(1), 76–91.

Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2010). A mindset for EFL: Learners' beliefs about the role of natural talent. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 436–444.

Mills, N. (2014). 2. Self-efficacy in second language acquisition. In S. Mercer, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SLA* (pp. 6–22). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.

Mills, N., & Péron, M. (2008). Global simulation and writing self-beliefs of intermediate French students. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156(1), 239–273.

Molway, L., & Mutton, T. (2020). Changing mindsets in the modern foreign languages classroom: An intervention combining intelligence theories and reading strategies. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(5), 598–612.

Munezane, Y. (2015). Enhancing willingness to communicate: Relative effects of visualization and goal setting. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 175–191.

Noels, K. A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, 23, 43–68.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57–85.

Noels, K. A., Lou, N. M., Lascano, D. I. V., Chaffee, K. E., Dincer, A., Zhang, Y. S. D., & Zhang, X. (2019). Self-determination and motivated engagement in language learning. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning* (pp. 95–115). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2015). Structure also supports autonomy: Measuring and defining autonomy-supportive teaching in Japanese elementary foreign language classes. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 57(3), 167–179.

Oga-Baldwin, W. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2017). Engagement, gender, and motivation: A predictive model for Japanese young language learners. *System*, 65, 151–163.

Pajares, F. (2006). Self-efficacy during childhood and adolescence. *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*, 5, 339–367.

Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Adolescence and education. Vol. 5: Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self-system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, 38(3), 467–479.

Papi, M. (2018). Motivation as quality: Regulatory fit effects on incidental vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 40(4), 707–730.

Papi, M., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2012). Teacher motivational practice, student motivation, and possible L2 selves: An examination in the Iranian EFL context. *Language learning*, 62(2), 571–594.

Papi, M., & Hiver, P. (2020). Language learning motivation as a complex dynamic system: A global perspective of truth, control, and value. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(1), 209–232.

Papi, M., & Khajavy, G. H. (2021). Motivational mechanisms underlying second language achievement: A regulatory focus perspective. *Language Learning*, 71(2), 537–572.

Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2012). Dynamics of selves and motivation: A cross-sectional study in the EFL context of Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(3), 287–309.

Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2014). Language learner motivational types: A cluster analysis study. *Language Learning*, 64(3), 493–525.

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2019a). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2×2 model of L2 self-guides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 337–361.

Papi, M., Rios, A., Pelt, H., & Ozdemir, E. (2019b). Feedback-seeking behavior in language learning: Basic components and motivational antecedents. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(1), 205–226.

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Wawire, B., Jiang, C., & Zhou, S. (2020). Feedback-seeking behavior in second language writing: Motivational mechanisms. *Reading and Writing*, 33(2), 485–505.

Papi, M., Wolff, D., Nakatsukasa, K., & Bellwoar, E. (2021). Motivational factors underlying learner preferences for corrective feedback: Language mindsets and achievement goals. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(6), 858–877.

Parrish, A., & Lanvers, U. (2019). Student motivation, school policy choices and modern language study in England. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(3), 281–298.

Peters, D., Calvo, R. A., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Designing for motivation, engagement and wellbeing in digital experience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 797–797.

Polat, N. (2011). Gender differences in motivation and L2 accent attainment: An investigation of young Kurdish learners of Turkish. *Language Learning Journal*, 39(1), 19–41.

Polat, N., & Schallert, D. L. (2013). Kurdish adolescents acquiring Turkish: Their self-determined motivation and identification with L1 and L2 communities as predictors of L2 accent attainment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 745–763.

Polisca, E. (2011). Language learning and the raising of cultural awareness through Internet telephony: A case study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 39(3), 329–343.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860.

Sato, M. (2020). Generating a roadmap for possible selves via a vision intervention: Alignment of second language motivation and classroom behavior. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(2), 427–457.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. R. Wentzel, & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 35–53). New York: Routledge.

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: Multilingual Matters.

Tahmouresi, S., & Papi, M. (2021). Future selves, enjoyment and anxiety as predictors of L2 writing achievement. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53, 100837.

Tanaka, M. (2013). Examining kanji learning motivation using self-determination theory. *System*, 41(3), 804–816.

Tanaka, M. (2017). Examining EFL vocabulary learning motivation in a demotivating learning environment. *System*, 65, 130–138.

Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(4), 681–709.

Teimouri, Y., Plonsky, L., & Tabandeh, F. (in press). L2 grit: Passion and perseverance for second-language learning. *Language Teaching Research*.

Torres, K. M., & Turner, J. E. (2016). Students' foreign language anxiety and self-efficacy beliefs across different levels of university foreign language coursework. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 3(1), 57–73.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Self-efficacy for self-regulated learning: A validation study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(3), 443–463.

Waller, L., & Papi, M. (2017). Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 35, 54–65.

Wang, C., Schwab, G., Fenn, P., & Chang, M. (2013). Self-efficacy and self-regulated learning strategies for English language learners: Comparison between Chinese and German college students. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3(1), 173.

Widodo, M., Ariyani, F., & Setiyadi, A. B. (2018). Attitude and motivation in learning a local language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(1), 105–112.

You, C. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2016). Language learning motivation in China: Results of a large-scale stratified survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 495–519.

Zhang, X., & Ardasheva, Y. (2019). Sources of college EFL learners' self-efficacy in the English public speaking domain. *English for Specific Purposes*, 53, 47–59.

Zhou, Y. (2019). How motivation as quality influence ESL learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6, 33–51.