A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF THE KEY SHIFTS IN THE MAINSTREAM L2 MOTIVATION RESEARCH: HIGHLIGHTING SOME POSSIBLE FUTURE PATHWAYS

Özge Gümüş

Adiyaman University, School of Foreign Languages, Adiyaman, Turkey

ogumus@adiyaman.edu.tr

Biodata(s):

Özge Gümüş is an Assistant Professor at Adiyaman University, School of Foreign Languages. Her areas of interest include L2 motivation, directed motivational currents (DMCs), complex dynamic systems perspective, motivational dynamics.

A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF THE KEY SHIFTS IN THE MAINSTREAM L2 MOTIVATION RESEARCH: HIGHLIGHTING SOME POSSIBLE FUTURE PATHWAYS

Özge Gümüş

ogumus@adiyaman.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to overview the field of mainstream L2 motivation research historically, to outline key shifts that the field has gone through and primary theories that underpin the development of the field, and lay out some possible future pathways based on the insights offered on the changing landscape of the field. These future pathways highlighted in the paper unavoidably are demonstrative of the scope and development of future research potential in the field of L2 motivation research. The discussion starts with the definition of motivation, then early L2 motivation research, goes on with the educational shift, and f the current period of L2 motivation study. The study continues with the discussion of the most promising future pathways to be made about the directions of the future research in our field.

Keywords: L2 language learning/learner motivation, educational shift, complex dynamic systems perspective, long-term motivation

1. Introduction

For the past several decades, many L2 scholars/professionals have been interested in studying motivation, widely acknowledged as one of the determinants and so-called individual difference factors that could have a crucial contribution to L2 learning attainment (Al-Hoorie, 2017; Al-Hoorie & MacIntyre, 2020). For this reason, since the development of the motivational construct in 1990s, the crucial role of motivation -among a number of individual differences- in the success and achievement of L2 learning has been accepted as a truism (e.g., Boo et al., 2015, Dörnyei, 1994a, Oxford & Shearin, 1994). This common knowledge has been strengthened by those who stated "without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals, and neither are appropriate curricular and good teaching enough to ensure student achievement" (Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998, p. 203). Individuals, after English having emerged as the lingua franca as a result of globalization, have a variety of reasons to strive for learning English in diverse contexts. Thus, understanding L2 learning motivation from diverse theoretical perspectives has been increasingly attracting L2 professionals from a wide variety of educational contexts. So, especially for the past decades with the significant incline on the number of the studies the field has expanded rapidly. On the current research agenda, the prominent position of the mainstream L2 motivation research has been due to witnessed developments through various stages resulting from the focus from broad social to individual contexts, from situation specific to more complex, dynamic view of motivation, leading the mainstream L2 motivation research to be the most developed area in SLA. These developments have inevitably influenced the field and lead the theoretical landscape of L2 motivation research to expand its boundaries from its genesis to the present day. By noting that "[o]f all the constructs covered in this book, motivation is the one that has been subject to the most thorough theoretical overhaul" (p. 72),

Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) thereby confirmed the unique status of the field of L2 motivation research.

This paper does not aim to present a comprehensive account of the field of L2 learning motivation research or the evolving understanding of the notion of motivation over the years (for a detailed overview see e.g., Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Ushioda, 2013). The aim is to highlight some of the key shifts in thinking about this field that seem to hold potential for future motivation research by looking at the underlying factors drawing researchers to L2 learning motivation field and outlining current directions and suggesting some possible future pathways in the field. Simply put, I intend to provide an empirical understanding of these shifts through examining the crucial features of theoretical and methodological trends and challenges in the field especially over the last decade. For these reasons, certain constructs which are of primary importance are emphasized, leading the account to be inevitably selective.

2. What is Motivation?

Though the term 'motivation' is encountered in all walks of life and intuitively known by us, it seems challenging to provide a broad, comprehensive definition to compromise different understandings of this multifaceted construct. Researchers in various fields, especially the educational psychology, the mainstream psychology and some other social science disciplines have provided different definitions of the term. So, to begin with the derivation of the terminology seems easier and more comfortable at this point. The term derives from the verb 'movere' meaning 'to move' in Latin. For these reasons, general psychology researchers have asked such simple questions to what moves an individual to expend time and effort and to strive for, to engage in, and sustain action, leading to the generation of a wealth of research and theory. Motivation is "the process of starting, directing, and maintaining physical and psychological activities; includes mechanisms involved in preferences for one activity over another and the vigor and persistence of responses" according to the APA glossary of psychological terms. Though this definition seems precise and comprehensive, it becomes inadequate when the various factors behind any human activity is thought in concrete terms. For this reason, as Walker and Symons (1997) stated, APA once considered to remove the term from its database. Dörnyei (1998) stressed the problematic nature of its definition by noting that "although 'motivation' is a term frequently used in both educational and research contexts, it is rather surprising how little agreement there is in the literature with regard to the exact meaning of the concept" (p. 117). So, it becomes easier to understand why the term is interpreted by some researchers in regards to other related constructs. To put it another way, they "view… it as no more than an absolute umbrella that hosts a wide range of concepts that do not have much in common" (Dörnyei, 2001a, p. 7). Despite all these challenges encountered by L2 motivation researchers, Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) enunciate that motivation "provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long, often tedious learning process" (p. 72). Though such an understanding of motivation makes the study of L2 motivation problematic since the factors initiating L2 learning and also those maintaining the strivings can be very different, this academic enterprise, the study of L2 motivation, is fascinating.

Therefore, initially to offer and found a comprehensive and integrative account of the notion of motivation functioning a 'supertheory' seems unforeseeable and unrealistic as stated by Dörnyei (2019). Let us explore some of the key shifts in L2 motivation research with a focus on changing thinking about the notion of motivation by providing the sequential developments of the field of L2 motivation.

3. Early L2 Motivation Research

Having about more than fifty years of ongoing history, the description of the development of L2 motivation theory as a field of inquiry is often categorized in three different phases; a social-psychological period; a period of educational shift; the current period affected by cognitive theories and the increasing focus on specific learning contexts dubbed as "the socio-dynamic period" by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) (Al-Hoorie, 2017; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Dörnyei, 2005). In order to understand the current period affected by the developments within the mainstream L2 motivation research, the present study will briefly present some knowledge of the specifics of theoretical models of these three phases, will not go into too much detail but the focus will be on the knowledge essential for us to understand the key shifts and then the current period. Namely, the direction of the L2 motivation research from the early years to the current situation will be presented.

The crucial milestone to found the first sustained and systematic L2 motivation research, namely the modern field of L2 motivation research is the seminal article of Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1959) "Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition". As MacIntyre et al. (2009) clearly expressed, this line of research developed by Gardner and Lambert (1959) "opened the field of second language learning to a distinctly social psychological perspective, with a focus on attitudes, affect, intergroup relationships and motives" (p. 44). Thus, it seems obvious that the root of the most accepted assumption that because of the social entity L2 learning includes, motivation of L2 learning is different from motivation to learn other school subjects was unveiled at that time (Okumuş-Ceylan & Saka, 2022, p. 416). Prior to the pioneering study of Gardner and Lambert (1959), the L2 achievement had been explained in terms of linguistic aptitude, however, they explored the effect of language aptitude, attitudes, motivation, and verbal intelligence on the success of L2 learning. As a result of their study, the integrative and instrumental motivational orientations were introduced. They explained that when "the aim in language study is to learn more about the language group, or to meet more and different people", learners have integrative motivational orientations; when "the reasons reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement", then they have instrumental orientations (p. 267). In the conceptualization of motivation, the key component in their work was integrativeness which has been central to many further theories of motivation. The proposition of the socio-educational model based on the hypothesis that L2 language learning is affected by motivation and attitudes as these promote learners to seek opportunities to interact led many further studies to investigate the relationships between language achievement and L2 language learners' characteristics such as motivation, intelligence, language aptitude, anxiety, learning strategies, and attitudes (Gardner, 1985; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). In the L2 motivation research, the notion of integrative-instrumental distinction has been backed by an impressive body of research, thus leading this model to be one of the most researched areas of the field. For this reason, unquestionably, the model being the most influential paradigm pf this period has significantly contributed to the development of this field of inquiry. However, other frameworks including Giles and Byrne's (1982) intergroup model, Schumann's (1978) acculturation model, and Clement's (1980) social context model were also proposed in this social-psychological period. The common theme was stated to be shared by these models, according to Dörnyei and Ryan (2015), is macro-level analyses of the relations between contextual factors and social groups (Dörnyei, 2009b). The educational applications, or more classroom-oriented research were not in the radar of the researchers in this period.

Gardners' theory of integrative motivation has been criticized by many scholars who have asserted that the realities of actual classrooms could not be captured by the model though it views learners as social individuals. Also, many scholars (e.g., Dörnyei, 1990; Lamb, 2004)

questioned the relevance of integrative motivation in EFL contexts through the empirical evidence, further leading to think it as not appropriate in EFL contexts. Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) summarized this problematic issue by stating that "it is not easy to explain this superior position in the context of the present study where not only was any real integration into the L2 community impossible, but even direct communication with members of the L2 community was an unrealistic expectation for most respondents" (p. 28). One another criticism of Gardner's theory of integrative motivation has been the notion of integrative motivation's being used interchangeably with the other terms as 'integrative orientation', 'integrativeness', 'integrative motivation', and 'the integrative motive' that lead to misconceptions. Dörnyei (2003) recognized this problem and referred to it as an enigma. To clarify such misconceptions, Gardner and Tremblay (1994) suggested to view the integrative and instrumental motivation dichotomy as "two ends of a continuum". However, Clément et al. (1994) stated that such an understanding created extra confusion. For this reason, the focus of further studies in the L2 motivation research goes beyond understanding L2 motivation only through these two motivational orientations. Such orientations international, sociocultural travel, knowledge, and friendship have also started to be used in the further L2 motivation research (Muir, 2016).

Briefly, in this period, motivation was seen as a fixed, stable and measurable individual difference characteristic. Thus, the dominant methodology used to analyse the data through quantitative measures was conducted through correlational analysis, factor analysis or structural equation modelling. The direction of L2 motivation from the early L2 motivation research to the educational shift can be regarded as a shift towards individualism (Dörnyei, 2019). This shift laid the groundwork for further individual contribution of the learner to be featured on the research agenda or in other words learner-centred theories began to show up in L2 motivation research.

4. The Educational Shift in L2 Motivation Research

From the social-psychological point of view, the perception of motivation has been increasingly criticized as it had little to do with building a link between education and motivation and then there has been calls for "reopening the research agenda" later referred to as a "motivational renaissance" (Gardner & Tremblay, 1994a). In line with these calls, Crookes and Schmidt's (1991) article on "Motivation: Reopening the research agenda", namely the flagship paper of this new paradigm, highlighted the problem of the prior period by stating that the integrative motivational model of Gardner was "so dominant that alternative concepts have not been seriously considered" (p. 501) and in their work they also emphasized the need for new education-friendly approaches "congruent with the concept of motivation that teachers are convinced is critical for SL [second language] success" (p. 502). A new motivational approach which was proposed by Crookes and Schmidt (1991) was the extension of Keller's study (1983). Four key factors (expectancy, outcomes, relevance, and interest) at four levels (micro, classroom, syllabus, a broader level representing "considerations relevant to informal, out of-class, and long-term factors" (p. 483)) were included in this more generalizable L2 motivational research agenda. Thus, their study fueled the radical change in the L2 motivation research in that the focus in much of the further studies on L2 motivation started to be on more cognitive aspects of it, L2 learners' attitudes and their classroom contexts. They explicated that "when teachers say that a student is motivated, they are not usually concerning themselves with the student's reasons for studying, but are observing that the student does study" (p. 480). Similar concerns were also raised by some other professionals from a wide range of educational contexts (e.g., Au, 1988; Brown, 1990). So, the reformers at the turn of the 1990s began to be concerned with L2 learners' lived experiences of learning an L2 in specific language classrooms with specific learners, thus having an education centered, more-situated interest in

the L2 motivation research. Thus, the scope of the early paradigm of L2 motivation research has been expanded. Then, in this new paradigm called as the "cognitive-situated period" or the "micro" perspective (Dörnyei, 2009b, 2005), the focus shifted from investigating the motivational disposition of the broader language communities (or the social context) into the dynamics of L2 language classrooms. In short, the developments of this new period were noted to be affected by two broad trends by Dörnyei and Ryan (2015). Firstly, in order to align L2 motivation research, several recent psychological constructs occurring in the mainstream educational psychology needed to be adopted into L2 motivation research models. In the latter half of the twentieth century, in educational psychology, many significant developments explaining motivation through cognitive perspective in relation to goals, expectancies, and attributions emerged, however, so far L2 motivation research had developed in isolation and also no immediate similarity was found between any other psychological constructs in the mainstream educational psychology and integrativeness (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005). Secondly, the calls were put forward from macro to micro perspectives of L2 motivation to "sharpen the focus on a more situated analysis of motivation in specific learning contexts" (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 46).

In this period of 'micro-perspective', one other milestone is Modern Language Journal's 1994 issue where Dörnyei (1994a, 1994b), Gardner and Tremblay (1994a, 1994b), and Oxford (1994) and Oxford and Shearin (1994) debated much of the cognitive theories of motivation proposed in the mainstream educational psychology research. In the study of Oxford and Shearin (1994), a basis for further studies to build an expanded motivational theory was suggested by emphasizing the significance of theories of need, equity, social cognition and cognitive development, and expectancy-value. Dörnyei (1994), in this issue, proposed a new motivational framework containing three levels (a learner, a language, and a learning situation level). Though the learner and language levels were the extension of Gardner and his Canadian associates' previous work, the third level included the role of teachers, the learner characteristics, the content of the L2 class, namely a number of aspects functioning as motivational sources. Incorporating some of these influential concepts of educational psychology has started to energize the field and to expand its outlook and outreach. Hence, at that crucial juncture these six articles in MLJ were commemorated as a representative summary of this period (Dörnyei, 2019). One of these concepts, perhaps the most influential one in constituting a genuine field has been Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2017). The construct with its twin conceptual pillars as extrinsic and intrinsic motivation were applied to L2 language learning in the early studies (e.g., Noels et al., 1999, 2000, 2001). Other leading educational psychology theories (e.g., Williams and Burden's attribution theory (1997) by Weiner, (1992, 2010), self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977), Covington's self-worth theory (1984)) were also adopted to L2 language learning motivation. This process has, then, brought about a great number of empirical research and theorizing on the field (e.g., for a detailed information about perhaps one of the milestones of this transformational impact of the cognitive turn, see Tremblay and Gardner's proposed model of L2 motivation (1995) in which Gardner's original model was expanded by integrating crucial concepts, self-efficacy, valence, goal salience). In line with this type of innovation continuing to realign L2 motivation research with educational psychology, there have been needs to expand the methodological repertoire. As this line of research was so concerned with classroom processes, a number of qualitative investigations started to be used (Boo et al., 2015). In the next section, Ushioda's call for "researching language learning motivation 'through a small lens' will be explained.

4.1. The Focus on Motivational Strategies

In this period of 'educational shift', a great deal of knowledge of the mainstream educational psychology research has been transferred and adopted to L2 motivation research; however, the problem of this period was that "there has been disproportionately little research linking motivation to the actual cognitive subprocesses involved in the mastery of an L2 such as attaining specific L2 skills (e.g. listening comprehension) or acquiring concrete aspects or the L2 (e.g. lexis)" (Dörnyei, 2019, p. 44). Ushioda's (2016) recent paper has also pointed out this problem by stating:

> this tendency to adopt a fairly broad perspective on L2 learning has meant that our research has had relatively little to say about how motivation interacts with the specific cognitive, metacognitive and psycholinguistic processes of language learning, or with the acquisition of particular features of the target language. (p. 574)

Thus, it is clear that though the professionals in this period have accumulated the basic knowledge about the nature of motivational teaching practice, they do not have a good understanding to provide detailed instructional frameworks for L2 teachers or specialists regarding the ways to make their L2 classrooms more motivating. Thus, the calls for more pedagogically minded interest in the research landscape have not yet been issued, so it is clearly understood that there has been an emerging need to hearken to Ushioda's call for "researching language learning motivation 'through a small lens' to counteract our tendency in the L2 motivation field to concern ourselves with language learning and teaching at a rather general level only" (pp. 573–574). Though Dörnyei's MLJ article (1994a) suggested 30 motivational techniques listed for L2 teachers to motivate their students, only a small number of publications aimed to examine the instructional practices to generate learner motivation (e.g., Chamber, 1999; Williams & Burden, 1997). Following that, Dörnyei's (2001b) book-length summary of motivational strategies initiated a similar line of research exploring how motivational instructional practices can positively affect L2 learners' motivation. Thus, the existing gap has started to be filled by receiving this collection of motivational strategies. The reason behind such line of research in 1990s were to improve the educational relevance of L2 motivation research. The evidence of this lasting relevance has been instantiated by the systematic review study of L2 motivation research carried out between 2005 and 2014 by Boo et al. (2015) who found that almost one third of the reviewed articles aimed at investigating the motivational strategies to enhance learners' motivation. The pursuit of this subject goes on to be a crucial L2 motivation research stream by the recent interesting and influential additions collected under the following directions; the L2 vision concept which has been used to design motivational techniques (e.g. Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014), the demotivation paradigm (see e.g. Kim & Kim, 2013; Dörnyei, 2001a) also including the exploration of re-motivation with the desire to enhance L2 learners' motivation (e.g. Falout et al., 2013; Song & Kim, 2017), the concept of mindsets (see, Lou & Noels, 2017), the group dynamics (Dörnyei & Muir, 2019; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

5. Recent L2 Motivation Research

5.1. The L2 Motivational Self System

Until the first decade of this millennium, the dissatisfaction with the L2 motivation theories by the L2 motivation researchers have started to grow, paving the way for the foundation of "the L2 Motivational Self-System (L2MSS)" by Dörnyei (2005, 2009a) (see Norton, 1995). This construct has brought about a major shift in the development of L2 motivation research and theory. Dörnyei formed the L2MSS after the attempts to reframe Gardner's integrativeness

in the cognitive light through adapting the conceptual content of possible selves theory and self-discrepancy theory (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Higgins, 1987). Dörnyei uncovered the cognitive underpinnings of by putting the "self" at the heart of L2 learners' motivation, not presenting it as an outcome of language acquisition as clearly understood in Gardner's (2010) argument that "acquisition involves making the language part of the self" (p. 7). This influential theoretical model is crucial as it has provided a useful landmark for grasping a better understanding the effect of it on the further research agenda of the field, thus it also allowed to observe the other -side-line of research.

The aim of this paper is not to discuss the L2MMS which included three core components; the Ideal L2 Self; the Ought-to L2 Self; and the L2 Learning Experience (for detailed accounts of the theory, you can see Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011 and Dörnyei, 2009b), but the focus in this section is on the impact of it on the further development of the field. In line with the aims of the present study, it is enough to say that this theory was based on the premise that the way L2 learners ideally desire be in the future is instrumental in motivating them in the present. Based on the interplay of these components, the broad framework put, at the centre of the L2MSS, the ideal L2 self which is described as L2 learners' desirable positive self-image. Ought-to L2 self is described as "attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes" (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106). The L2 Learning Experience consists a range of situation specific factors associated with the immediate learning experience and context. The foundation of the L2MSS in the period regarded as a realignment between mainstream educational psychology and L2 motivation research has signalled the spot in which the theory and research of L2 motivation keep in step with the educational psychology (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). In the L2 motivation research, this theory accommodating novel theoretical perspectives has established an innovative new research agenda formed on the building blocks of theoretical, methodological development, practical value and interdisciplinarity and this theory thus has served as a springboard for future theories (Boo et al., 2015).

5.2. Motivation as Process

The significance of the temporal dimension or more specifically the dynamic nature of it has been started to be understood and addressed unavoidably right after the period in which there were a great deal of imports from cognitive theories and the focus was on immediate learning environment. This period "characterized by an interest in motivational change" was called as process-oriented (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 40). Until this period, L2 professionals recognized motivation as a stable individual difference variable. However, when the focus shifted towards investigating motivation with regard to specific learner behaviors and classroom process, it became easier to understand that "within the context of institutionalized learning especially, the common experience would seem to be motivational flux rather than stability" (Ushioda, 1996, p. 241). Thus, it is fair to conclude that such an understanding of the notion of motivation has led to a proliferation of studies that examine the turns and twists of L2 learning motivation by adopting a process-oriented approach.

Heckhausen and Kuhl (1985) founded the relevant psychological model of this period," action control theory" in that within a motivated behavioral process, separate sequentially ordered phases were recognized by introducing a "temporal perspective that begins with the awakening of a person's wishes prior to goal setting and continues through the evaluative thoughts entertained after goal striving has ended" (Gollwitzer, 1990, p. 55). Inspired by this model, Dörnyei and Otto (1998) devised the most fully proposed model, a process model of motivation (see also Dörnyei, 2000). As clarified by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), "a basic first step in analyzing motivation from a temporal perspective is to clarify the conceptual distinction

between motivation for engagement (choices, reasons, wishes, intentions, decisions), and motivation during engagement (how one feels, behaves and responds during the course of learning)" (pp. 60-61). In their process model of motivation, these two factors were taken into consideration and highlighted. Also, in this model the dynamic aspect of time was in accordance with the other researchers' developing thoughts (e.g., Ushioda, 1996, 2001; Williams & Burden, 1997). At this point, it is worth noting that Ushioda's reasoning to develop understanding of the dynamic nature of motivation with the use of qualitative research methods suited well to the needs of this period. She directed her attention to the changes in learners' goal orientations both when they were generated and also as they developed over time, her perspective emphasized the significance of understanding the L2 learning experience and the L2 context fully (Ushioda, 2001). In line with the aims of this paper, it is crucial to emphasize that such a developing understanding obtained in the process-oriented period came across as a transitional phase paving way for the further developments in the field, and then giving rise to the field to adopt a complex dynamic systems perspective (CDSP).

5.3. Motivation as Complex

In the previous section, the aim was to provide the direction of L2 motivation research, more specifically how the situated perspective has changed the conceptualization of L2 motivation within a process-oriented paradigm, thus leading it to be viewed as ever changing. Later, it was understood that the process-oriented models were based on cause-effect relationships and thus the realistic account of everyday experience of L2 learning could not be understood via a flow-chart diagram showing the linear progression of the motivational phenomena (Dörnyei, 2019). Thus, the focus on cause-effect relationships simply could not do justice to the complex conceptualization of motivation and make inroads into different stages of the motivational process (Dörnyei, 2019). At this point, with the increasing attention on the complexity of various factors at play in L2 learning process, there has been an emerging need to reframe the conceptualization of motivation with the adoption of CDSP, which was adopted in the field of SLA (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008) in line in parallel with the other social sciences fields. In the meantime, Ellis (2007, p. 23) also appreciated the adoption of CDSP which led to a more radical conceptualization compared with the one in process-oriented period by dubbing it as "the coming of the age of SLA research". As such a view of L2 motivation has corresponded more to the real-life experiences of L2 language learning, a proliferation of studies has started to reflect this promising and influential perspective within the field of L2 motivation (Dörnyei et al., 2015) and also within some other lines of the SLA such as self-concept, willingness to communicate, L2 anxiety, and L2 writing (Henry, 2015; Muir, 2016). The official inauguration of the adoption of CDSP in the L2 motivation field may be attributed to Dörnyei et al.'s (2015) recent analogy including several papers adopting the CDSP to examine the motivational dynamics by using idiodynamic, trajectory equifinality analysis, and latent growth model. Though they have acknowledged that the absence of easy-follow qualitative research template makes it difficult for researchers to examine the dynamic aspects of L2 learning motivation adopting this new approach, it has been anticipated to keep the mainstream L2 motivation researchers busy for the next decade (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; for overviews, see e.g., Dörnyei et al., 2015).

5.4. Motivation as Unconscious

To date, unconscious attitudes and motives have been neglected as a great number of studies of this field has postulated that L2 learner is able-minded to recognize what drives his or her behavior (Al-Hoorie, 2016a). This neglected line of research which came to be known as one of the final areas of the motivational dynamics was conceptualized by Al-Hoorie in his thought-

provoking paper where he identified the significant role of implicit attitudes towards L2 speakers on their overall motivation (Al-Hoorie, 2016a, 2016b). Hereupon, the results of these empirical investigations and others carried out on this subject in motivational psychology predicted a resurgence in the interest in this line of research over the next decade (Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017; also see e.g., Ryan, 2012) that is line with Ryan and Legate's (2012) analysis that showed the interface between unconscious and conscious as the one line of research which will probably receive many citations leading to opening up numerous potential pathways for further studies in the mainstream L2 motivational research. Also, Boo et al. (2015) have pointed out that "our field is ready to expand into exploring these areas because it seems evident that language globalization has created a linguistic landscape that is characterized by both powerful positive trends and strong negative undercurrents" (p. 156). Thus, it seems fair to conclude that such line of research may enrich the field (the focus on "the other side" of the constructs) and hold potential for many pathways for future L2 motivation research (Al-Hoorie, 2017).

5.5. Motivation as Long-term and Sustained

The current paper has so far traced the sequential direction and development of the field of L2 motivation research within key shifts corresponding to the developmental phases (in Dörnyei and Ushioda's (2011) terms, social psychological period, cognitive situated period, process-oriented period and socio dynamic period) from its genesis to this time. While doing so, the focus of the paper is to provide the justification of the key shifts in the evolution of the L2 motivation research and theory and to highlight the recent understanding of it to offer some possible future pathways. As discussed in the previous section, the L2 motivation research has shifted towards a 'dynamic turn' with the adoption of the CDSP (de Bot et al., 2007). Such a perception of L2 motivation has foregrounded a long-term perspective which has been under-researched and under-theorized line of inquiry. L2 motivation scholars within a 'dynamic turn' have started to be concerned about what can maintain L2 motivation long enough to obtain L2 achievement, which may be one of the most fruitful research pathways in the future. The most recent construct- Directed Motivational Currents (DMC)- has been proposed by Muir and Dörnyei (2013) in their theoretical paper titled as "Directed Motivational Currents: Using vision to create effective motivational pathways". This construct in line with the current strands of L2 motivation was asserted to manage to deflect the field into a step forward in understanding L2 learning motivation. DMC, proposed as a natural extension of the concepts of possible selves and vision, is described "as a prolonged process of engagement in a series of tasks which are rewarding primarily because they transport the individual towards a highly valued end" (Dörnyei et al., 2015, p. 98) and "an intense motivational drive - or surge - which is capable of stimulating and supporting long-term behavior, such as learning a foreign/second language (L2)" (Dörnyei et al., 2014, p. 9). Further, it was asserted that DMCs "have the capacity to align diverse factors that are simultaneously at work in a complex system, thereby acting as a regulatory force" (Dörnyei, 2016, p. 96). Thus, it is fair to conclude that the DMC construct was firmly established within the 'dynamic turn' thinking of motivation. Hence, this recent development unavoidably promises a pivotal L2 motivation research line within the field of L2 motivation research. Also, "the motivational basis of a DMC is made up of the same building blocks as the motivational basis of long-term behaviors in general" (Dörnyei, 2016, p. 33) though DMCs represent "the optimal from of engagement with an extended project" (Dörnyei et al., 2016, p. 33). Due to its link to long-term motivation, the understanding of DMC construct for this reason can provide useful insights into understanding the sustained long-term action. The future research in this line of research would be welcome to reach a better understanding of the nature of the long-term, sustained motivational experiences and also their potential and effectiveness to work as a motivational framework that could be used by L2

teachers to improve their students' motivation. The operative power of the DMC construct for this reason is crucial to be understood.

6. Interim Summary

So far, the present paper has attempted to offer the sequential development of the L2 motivation field with a focus on three key shifts that the field has gone through. L2 motivation is now mainstream and it is clear that the field of L2 motivation research is now directing towards a period of maturity and prominence, then professionals in this field are most probably to cast about for a more considered approach instead of searching for "the innovative zeal" (Ryan, 2019). The paper has so far indicated that the key shifts in our field are not instantaneous, so in the following section, the future trajectories of the field will be provided based on the data obtained in the current millennium enabling us to make about some projections.

7. Some Suggested Possible Future Directions for L2 Motivation

In this section, some ideas about what the future years may hold will be offered in order to allow for projections about the further directions of the field of mainstream L2 motivation research. Also, the present paper will lay out some more specific future avenues for researchers to start investigating, will highlight specific research gaps and suggest the scope for development. The current paper has already mentioned that the development of L2 motivation research within the current paradigm shift towards CDSP has led to the conceptualization of L2 learning motivation as complex and dynamic, more recently with a focus on long-term motivation. In this conception, numerous factors are at interplay with each other and they are not independent from each other. So, after all the phases that the field has been through, the traditional view of L2 motivation as a stable attribute generalized across time and situations has become outmoded. The L2 motivation research now stands at a crossroads as scholars' resources have been focused on the considerations of the complex dynamic long-term account of L2 learning motivation with reference to the whole person (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Mercer et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2015). In order to better understand motivation as long-term, further investigations into L2 learning perseverance would be welcome. Such a line of research was also suggested by Dörnyei (2019) in that he called this line of research as "a debt that motivation researchers— both in mainstream psychology and in the field of applied linguistics— still owe to the teaching profession" (p. 61). This is because it is a neglected area of research and Grant and Shin (2012) also mentioned this line of research in that "compared to research on the direction and intensity of effort, few theoretical models and empirical studies have focused on the maintenance or persistence of effort" (p. 514).The value of understanding L2 learners' persistence/perseverance required for the L2 attainment lies in the potential to provide fruitful information about how and why they sustain learning behaviors, thus leading L2 scholars to offer a more effective toolkit to purposefully induce and promote L2 learners' long-term sustained motivation and behaviors. Potential launching pad for such line of inquiry would be to start with the notions of student engagement, DMCs, vision, and emotion all of which have started to take L2 researchers' attention lately. Research on the concept of engagement described as "the holy grail of learning" by Sinatra et al. (2015, p. 1) has remained a relatively a minor focus of the L2 motivation research, future research in this context can productively contribute to the understanding of the other concepts related to long-term sustained motivation, more specifically the notion of DMCs. The two recent theoretical concepts, DMCs and L2 vision might continue to carry the theory of future self-guides forward (e.g., Dörnyei & Chan, 2013; Dörnyei et al., 2014, 2015). In this respect, research on these new

theoretical concepts has started to provide detailed practical recommendations for future research (e.g., Chan, 2014; Mackay, 2014; Başöz & Gümüş, 2022; Muir & Gümüş, 2020; Selcuk & Erten, 2017; Gümüş & Başöz, 2021). The development of such a line of research would offer a valuable starting point for research in relation to DMCs; in other words, focus on tracing the development of student engagement in relation to long-term sustained motivational experiences like DMCs would be one of the fruitful areas of study to understand the operative power of such motivational experiences. Investigating the effect of contextual factors on student engagement while experiencing DMCs in instructed settings would be another fruitful avenue. Classrooms observations may be a productive tool to obtain data on students' in-class engagement prior to and during an individual DMC experience to support the understanding of the behavioral outworking of long-term motivational experiences like DMCs. Focus has so far tended to center on motive aspects of it, but also research on the behavioral outworking of long-term motivational experiences will undoubtfully facilitate the discussion of practical approaches to facilitate the potential of long-term motivational experiences. Other fruitful areas of study in this vein would be the investigation of vision in relation to student engagement in students experiencing long-term motivational experiences. Issues of interest may include the effect of vision in students' increased engagement in long-term motivational experiences. The ways of using visionary techniques to support students' receptivity to the engagement opportunities may again offer productive, practical inroads.

Connecting such notions to motivation would enable to form an approach in line with the recent calls to understand the whole person, long-term motivation, and the complexity and dynamicity of L2 learning motivation. When the current paradigm shift 'CDSP' taken into consideration, it seems logical to assume that the exploration of distinct individual difference variables are meaningless as cognitive, affective, and contextual processes interact with one another, leading the L2 learning system to adapt, restructure and evolve as a whole. Then, viewing them as dynamic subsystems, much closer integration of these subsystems (motivation, emotion, cognition and the L2 learning context) that act as wholes would be welcome and thus such a systematic approach unavoidably promises an exciting and hopefully productive research line in the future (Dörnyei, 2019). A wide range of motivational, emotional, cognitive and contextual factors in instructed language classrooms are likely to enhance and impair students' L2 learning. Fruitful areas of inquiry may therefore center around building on initial work to productively investigate comprehensive and multi-faceted constructs rather than DMCs to account for students' intricate lived experiences of L2 learning. The exploration of such an eclectic model in the field of L2 motivation has also been suggested by Dörnyei (2001b) in that he stated "to enable us to describe student motivation with a precision that can be used as a basis for practical measures, we need a detailed and most likely eclectic model that represents multiple perspectives" (p. 12). Thus, such issues of interest will be central to gaining a more holistic understanding of students' lived experiences in the current paradigm shift towards the CDSP. The adoption of CDSP perspective into the field of L2 motivation research has already begun to forge this path. The proposition of DMC construct is the result of this increased interest. The search for a comprehensive and systematic approach will thus continue and the future years will bring about almost unceasing theoretical development with such efforts to find "a comprehensive and systematic approach". Thus, it seems fair to conclude that thus L2 motivation professionals tend to seek for more sophisticated lines of research and also look out for more innovative and creative research templates in order to perceive the lived reality of different layers and levels of factors affecting motivation. Adopting a dynamic framework necessitates not to favor those traditional methods for data collection and analysis and also traditional research designs. A list of innovative methods has started to be proposed by some scholars (e.g., in Dörnyei et al. (2015)' study, Q methodology, idiodynamics, and retrodictive qualitative modelling, p. 426). One of the expected further

theoretical developments concerns this new channel, described as a "new transdisciplinary theme for applied linguistics" (Larsen-Freeman, 2012). The need behind such line of research through the CDSP was summed up by MacIntyre et al. (2015) who stated that "we do not see the CDS [complex dynamic systems] perspective as a theory in a strict sense, but rather a way of thinking about the world and a way of addressing questions that differs from traditional approaches", and we emphasized about the approach that "even in its incompleteness it has important implications for understanding language learning and development" (p. 428).

Another research line which has received crucial calls by some scholars (e.g., Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015) is exploration of language learning motivation within the multilingual turn. They have highlighted the need to study language learning motivation in this turn as "motivation researchers will no longer speak the same language and that the emerging methodological multilingualism might introduce a degree of fragmentation" (2015, p. 102). Following years most probably witness a trend toward multi-languages learning motivation (e.g., Henry, 2017; Kormos et al., 2014). It seems obvious that our field is ready to expand into investigating the dynamics of multilinguals' language learning motivation as this line of research warrants future research in this decade that is characterized by excessive amount of human mobility and growing globalization.

Reflecting the importance of the understanding of the subconscious motivational processes, dedicated exploration of this novel theoretical angle is needed to build on initial work as in mainstream L2 motivation research, the specific functioning or characteristics of such motivational processes are little known (Ryan, 2012; Al-Hoorie, 2017). With a view to understanding the motivational conditions and components and better construct motivational frameworks and techniques in order to provide teachers to use in their classes to boost students' motivational experiences, further research on the subconscious dimension of motivation may provide practical and productive inroads. Further research might productively explore the characteristics of implicit or automatic goals, or their effect on subconscious motivational processes, the conflict and relation between conscious and subconscious attitudes and/or behaviors. Focus may also be directed towards commonalities and differences between conscious and subconscious motivational processes, or the specific emotions these motivational processes elicit and how this affects the overall motivational experience. The cumulative understanding of such line of research may be able to cut through the complexity of the notion of motivation and motivational processes.

I feel that our field is ready to expand into investigating these lines of research influenced by the current trends and theoretical perspectives both in the field of mainstream L2 motivation research and also in the field of mainstream educational psychology.

8. Conclusion

This paper has addressed the key shifts in the L2 motivation field by offering their interim summaries and has concluded with some future line of research in the L2 motivation research. A final conclusion here does not go beyond alliterating why L2 learning motivation is hard to understand and complex. The collection of why the L2 motivation research has evolved led to the conclusion that the notion of motivation is of high importance in the mainstream L2 motivation research and the field of educational psychology. The key shifts in the field of L2 research in three decades were provided to make the scope of the subject more understandable and nonintimidating for future L2 motivation researchers, by suggesting a more comprehensive and multifaceted approach with the combination of multiple perspectives.

References

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016a). Unconscious motivation. Part I: Implicit attitudes toward L2 speakers. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 6(3), 423–454.

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016b). Unconscious motivation. Part II: Implicit attitudes and L2 achievement. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 6(4), 619–649.

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Sixty years of language motivation research. SAGE Open, 7(1).

Al-Hoorie, A. H. & MacIntyre, P. D. (Eds.). (2020). Contemporary language motivation theory—60 years since Gardner and Lambert (1959). Multilingual Matters.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second-language (L2) learning. Language Learning, 38, 75–100.

Başöz, T. & Gümüş, Ö. (2022). Directed motivational currents in L2: A focus on triggering factors, initial conditions, and (non)defining features. System, 110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102920

Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005–2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. System, 55, 145–157.

Brown, H. D. (1990). M&Ms for language classrooms? Another look at motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics (pp. 383–393). Georgetown University Press.

Chambers, G. N. (1999). Motivating language learners. Multilingual Matters.

Chan, L. (2014). Effects of an imagery training strategy on Chinese university students' possible second language selves and learning experiences. In K. Csizer, & M. Magid (Eds.), The impact of self-concept on language learning (pp. 357-376). Multilingual Matters.

Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson & P.M. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social Psychological Perspectives (pp. 147-154). Pergamon.

Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. Language Learning, 44(3), 417-448.

Covington, M. V. (1984). The motive for self-Worth. In Ames, R. & Ames, C. (Eds.), Research on Motivation in Education, vol. 1 (pp. 77–113). Academic Press.

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

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(1), 19-36.

de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 10(1), 7–21.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. Language Learning, 40, 46–78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 78, 273-284.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x

Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! The Modern Language Journal, 78, 515-523. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02071.x

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. Language Teaching, 31(3), 117-135.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). Teaching and researching motivation. Longman.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. In Z. Dörnyei (Ed.), Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language learning (pp. 3-32). Blackwell.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009a). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), Motivation, language identity and the L2 self (pp. 9-42). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). The psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). From integrative motivation to directed motivational currents: The evolution of the understanding of L2 motivation over three decades. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry & S. Ryan (Eds.), The palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28380-3_3

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. Language Teaching Research, 2, 203–29.

Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). The motivational foundation of learning languages other than global English: Theoretical issues and research directions. The Modern Language Journal, 101(3), 455–468.

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., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom. Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2019). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In X. A. Gao (Ed.), Second handbook of English language teaching. Springer.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). Group dynamics in the language classroom. Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). The psychology of the language learner revisited. Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.). Longman.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions. Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D., & Henry, A. (Eds.). (2015). Motivational dynamics in language learning. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., Muir, C., & Ibrahim, Z. (2014). Directed Motivational Currents: Energising language learning through creating intense motivational pathways. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice (pp. 9–29). John Benjamins

Ellis, N. C. (2007). Dynamic systems and SLA: The wood and the trees. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 10(1), 23-25.

Falout, J., Murphey, T., Fukuda, T., & Trovela, M. (2013). Japanese EFL learners' remotivation strategies. In M. Cortazzi & L. Jin (Eds.), Researching cultures of learning (pp. 328–349). Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). Motivation and second language acquisition: The socioeducational model. Peter Lang.

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994a). On motivation, research agendas and theoretical frameworks. The Modern Language Journal, 78, 359–368.

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994b). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations. The Modern Language Journal, 78, 524–527.

Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13, 266–72.

Giles, H. & Byrne, J.L. (1982). An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 3, 17–40.

Gollwitzer, P. M. (1990). Action phases and mind-sets. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behaviour (Vol. 2, pp. 53–92). Guilford Press.

Grant, A. M., & Shin, J. (2012). Work motivation: Directing, energizing, and maintaining effort (and research). In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of human motivation (pp. 505–519). Oxford University Press.

Gümüş, Ö., & Başöz, T. (2021). Exploring motivational surges among tertiary level l2 learners: directed motivational currents in focus. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-EJ), 25(3),1-21.

Heckhausen, H., & Kuhl, J. (1985). From wishes to action: The dead ends and shortcuts on the long way to action. In M. Frese & J. Sabini (Eds.), Goal-directed behaviour: The concept of action in psychology (pp. 134–160). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Henry, A. (2017). L2 motivation and multilingual identities. Modern Language Journal, 101(3), 548–565.

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

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models (pp. 386-433). Erlbaum.

Kim, Y.-K., & Kim, T.-Y. (2013). English learning demotivation studies in the EFL contexts: State of the art. Modern English Education, 14(1), 77–102.

Kormos, J., Csizér, K., & Iwaniec, J. (2014). A mixed-method study of language-learning motivation and intercultural contact of international students. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35(2), 151–166.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). Complex systems and applied linguistics. Oxford University Press.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. (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.

MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., & Henry, A. (2015). Conclusion: Hot enough to be cool: The promise of dynamic systems research. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), Motivational dynamics in language learning (pp. 419–429). Multilingual Matters.

MacIntyre, P.D., Mackinnon, S.P., & Clément, R. (2009). The baby, the bathwater, and the future of language learning motivation research. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), Motivation, language identity and the L2 Self (pp.43-45). Multilingual Matters.

Mackay, J. (2014). Applications and implications of the L2 motivational self-system in a Catalan EFL context. In M. Magid & K. Csizér (Eds.), The impact of self-concept on language learning (pp. 377–402). Multilingual Matters.

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

Mercer, S., Ryan, S., & Williams, M. (Eds.) (2012). Psychology in language learning: Insights from theory and research. Palgrave Macmillan.

Muir, C. (2016). The dynamics of intense long-term motivation in language learning: Directed motivational currents in theory and practice. [Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham].

Muir, C., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). Directed motivational currents: Using vision to create effective motivational pathways. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 3(3), 357–375.

Muir, C., & Gümüş, Ö. (2020). Directed motivational currents: An agenda for future research. Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6, 501–519.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Modern Language Journal, 83, 23-44.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. Canadian Language Modern Language Review, 424-444.

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

Norton, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 9 31.

Okumuş-Ceylan, N. & Saka, E. (2022). Does awareness on the principles of brain-based learning have any effect on students' academic achievement? International Journal of Education, Technology and Science (IJETS), 2(4), 415–428.

Oxford, R. L. (1994). Where are we with language learning motivation? The Modern Language Journal, 78, 512–514.

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

Ryan, R. M. (Ed.). (2012). The Oxford handbook of human motivation. Oxford University Press.

Ryan, R. M. (Ed.). (2012). The Oxford handbook of human motivation. Oxford University Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. Guilford Publishing.

Ryan, R. M., & Legate, N. (2012). Through a fly's eye: Multiple yet overlapping perspectives on future directions for human motivation research. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of human motivation (pp. 554-564). Oxford University Press.

Ryan, S. (2019). Language Learner Motivation: What Motivates Motivation Researchers? In J. Schwieter & A. Benati (Eds.), The Cambridge Handbook of Language Learnin (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics (pp. 409-429). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108333603.018

Schumann, J.H. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (Ed.), Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching (pp. 27–107). Center for Applied Linguistics.

Selçuk, Ö. & Erten, İ. H. (2017). A display of patterns of change in learners' motivation: Dynamics perspective. Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 11(2), 128–141.

Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. Educational Psychologist, 50(1), 1–13.

Song, B., & Kim, T.-Y. (2017). The dynamics of demotivation and remotivation among Korean high school EFL students. System, 65, 90–103.

Tremblay, P.F. & Gardner, R.C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. The Modern Language Journal, 79, 505–20.

Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of motivation. In T. J. Hickey (Ed.), Language, education and society in a changing world (pp. 239–245). Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), Motivation and second language learning (pp. 91–124). University of Hawaii Press.

Ushioda, E. (2013). Motivation and ELT: Looking ahead to the future. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), International perspectives on motivation: Language learning and professional challenges (pp. 233-239). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ushioda, E. (2016). Language learning motivation through a small lens: A research agenda. Language Teaching, 49(4), 564–577.

Walker, C. J., & Symons, C. (1997). The meaning of human motivation. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Teaching well and liking it: Motivating faculty to teach effectively (pp. 3–18). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Weiner, B. (1992). Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research. Sage.

Weiner, B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory motivation: A history of ideas. Educational Psychologist, 45(1), 28–36.

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

Williams, M., Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2015). Exploring psychology in language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press.