

## Learning Spanish as a Second Language: Learners' Orientations and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Communication Style

*Kimberly A. Noels*  
*University of Alberta*

Students in lower-level Spanish classes ( $N = 322$ ) completed a questionnaire assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for learning Spanish, feelings of autonomy and competence regarding language learning, integrative orientation, and perceptions of teachers' communication style. The results of a path analysis showed that the more controlling the teacher was perceived to be, the less the students felt they were autonomous agents in the learning process, and the lower was students' intrinsic motivation. Integrative orientation was found to be related to intrinsic motivation, although it independently predicted effort and persistence and was the stronger predictor of various intergroup variables. The results are discussed in terms of their implications for multiple motivational substrates and the importance of teachers' communication style for students' motivation.

---

Kimberly A. Noels, Department of Psychology.

This project was supported financially by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and a research award from the Canada-United States Fulbright Program. The author would like to thank Kara Hunter for her valuable research assistance throughout all stages of this project, Grant Gillies for his assistance with data collection, as well as the Department of Communication of the University of California, Santa Barbara, for hosting her while this research was carried out. She is also grateful to Giorgio Perissinotto and the professors and students of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese of the University of California, Santa Barbara, who participated in the study.

Correspondence concerning this article may be sent to Dr. Kimberly Noels, Department of Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada, T6G 2E9, Internet: [knoels@ualberta.ca](mailto:knoels@ualberta.ca)

It has generally been acknowledged that motivation to learn a second language (L2) is at least as important as language aptitude for successful acquisition of that language (Gardner, 1985). Unlike aptitude, however, motivation is a particularly interesting concept for L2 teachers, administrators, and researchers, because it can presumably be enhanced in the appropriate social context. Scholarly interest in L2 motivation can be traced back well over forty years. Since that time, several models of language learning motivation have been proposed, each of which has extended understanding of L2 motivation (cf. Clément & Gardner, in press). As yet, however, few empirically tested models have offered suggestions as to how teachers might communicate with their students in ways that enhance motivation. The purpose of the present study is to examine one motivational framework that is useful for understanding the link between teachers' communication style and students' motivation for L2 learning, and to consider how this model may be linked to a commonly used framework for understanding L2 motivation.

### *Motivation and Language Learning*

In his influential definition of language learning motivation, Gardner describes motivation as "the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language" (1985, p. 10). Motivation is thus a complex set of variables, including the effort or energy expended in acquiring the language, as well as the reason for L2 learning, which serves as a goal to orient this effort. Several goals, or orientations, have been proposed, but two have received the most empirical attention. The first is the instrumental orientation, which refers to reasons for language learning that emphasize the pragmatic consequences of L2 learning, such as getting a job or becoming better educated. The second is the integrative orientation, which refers to reasons related to interaction and communication with members of the L2 community for social-emotional purposes.

In early formulations (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972), it was suggested that the integrative orientation might prove a better predictor of eventual L2 competence, because it was related to positive attitudes toward the L2 community. Subsequent research, however, did not necessarily support such a clear distinction between the two variables, in part owing to varying operational definitions (cf. Au, 1988; Gardner, 1988) and the different ethnolinguistic contexts in which the research took place (e.g., Belmechri & Hummel, 1998; Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 1990; Noels & Clément, 1989; Moïse, Clément, & Noels, 1990). Nonetheless, many motivational models have incorporated aspects of integrativeness (e.g., Clément, 1980; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Giles & Byrne, 1982; Schumann, 1978), recognizing the unique characteristic of language learning as an educational activity that is set within a particular sociopolitical context. As such, the dynamics among ethnolinguistic groups outside of the classroom may be as important for motivation as dynamics within the classroom (cf. MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

### *Self-Determination Theory*

An alternative motivational formulation has been forwarded recently by Noels and her colleagues (Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000). Following Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory (see also Deci & Ryan, 1995; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Rigby, Deci, Patrick, & Ryan, 1992; Vallerand, 1997), these researchers suggest that motivational orientations can be categorized according to the extent to which the goal for performing an activity is self-determined, that is, chosen freely by the individual.<sup>1</sup> *Intrinsic motivation* is the

---

<sup>1</sup>The language learning and self-determination motivational paradigms have developed as independent literatures, and hence the terminology differs across approaches. Based on the discussions of Deci and Ryan (e.g., 1985) and the constructs' operationalization by Vallerand (e.g., Vallerand et al., 1989), the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can be thought of as differing according to the the reasons why a person exerts effort at a

most highly self-determined type of motivation. When people are intrinsically motivated, they freely choose an activity because they view the activity as interesting and fun to do. These types of voluntary behaviors are enjoyable because they represent a challenge to individuals' existing competencies and require the use of their creative powers. They are considered to be fully self-determined, such that a person would be expected to engage in this action without any external coercion.

*Extrinsic motivation* refers to any type of motivational orientation that is not regulated by the pleasure of engaging in the challenging and competence-building activity per se, but rather by factors apart from the activity. These external contingencies may be more or less self-determined. The least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation is *external regulation*. When externally regulated, behavior is controlled by some source other than the individual, such as a tangible reward or punishment (e.g., monetary reward or arbitrary program requirements). Although individuals may exert a considerable amount of effort to achieve that reward, once the external contingency is removed, it is unlikely that they will continue that activity.

A more self-determined form of extrinsic motivation is *introjected regulation*, whereby individuals act because of some kind of pressure that they have internalized. Individuals perform a task because they think they should, perhaps to avoid feeling guilty (e.g., feeling guilty for disappointing a teacher or parent), or to self-aggrandize (e.g., feeling good because one can "out-do" another person on a language test). Although the pressure is internalized, the behavior is not considered to be voluntarily chosen by the individual.

---

task—that is, they are similar to orientations. For the present purposes, the terms "intrinsic motivation" and "extrinsic motivation" are used to introduce the constructs, but, in discussing the present study, the terms "intrinsic orientation" and "extrinsic orientation" are used in order to be consistent with the L2 nomenclature.

An even more self-determined form of extrinsic motivation is *identified regulation*. In this case, the individual performs a behavior because it is judged to be personally important. At this point the activity is incorporated into the self-concept, and the individual does the activity because it is consistent with what he or she values. The activity helps to achieve a goal that is meaningful for that person's sense of self.<sup>2</sup>

In their theory, Deci and Ryan (1985) include a third motivational category, termed *amotivation*. Individuals are described as amotivated when they believe there is no link between their actions and its consequences, but rather view factors outside of their control as the cause of what happens to them. It is similar to descriptions of "learned helplessness" (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). Amotivated individuals are not expected to exert much effort in performing an activity, and would likely quit as soon as it is feasible to do so.

Relatively recently, L2 researchers have turned to consider the potential role of autonomy and intrinsic motivation in language learning (e.g. Brown, 1990, 1994; Crooks & Schmidt, 1991; Dickinson, 1995; Dickinson & Wenden, 1995; Dörnyei, 1994, 1998; Kamada, 1986; Littlewood, 1996; Oxford, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Several studies have demonstrated the potential utility of the constructs for understanding language learning motivation. For instance, intrinsic motivation has been related to feelings of anxiety (negatively) and self-efficacy, language use, grammar sensitivity, speaking and reading proficiency, and teacher ratings of L2 competence (Ehrman, 1996), greater interest in English culture

---

<sup>2</sup>A fourth subtype of extrinsic motivation, "integrated regulation," is the most self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. Integrated regulation describes the instance in which a person has completely incorporated the activity into his or her sense of self, such that performing the activity is an expression of the self. It was not included in the present discussion because earlier studies of motivation in education suggested that it is not easily discernable from identified regulation (e.g., Vallerand, Blais, Brière, & Pelletier, 1989), especially for children or novices at a task, such as these first-year Spanish students.

and people and a desire to improve test scores (Tachibana, Matsukawa, & Zhong, 1996), preferences for certain kinds of learning strategies and instructional practices (Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996), and the decision to continue language study (Ramage, 1990). One limitation to these studies is that they have not taken into account the various subtypes of motivation described above. Research by Noels and her colleagues (1999) indicates that these nuances are well worth observing because the motivational subtypes differentially correlate with certain language learning outcomes, including anxiety in the classroom, effort expended in language learning, the intention to pursue language studies in the future, and indices of L2 competence (see also Noels et al., 2000). Moreover, by situating intrinsic motivation within the Self-Determination framework, it becomes evident how individuals in the learners' social environment can encourage or discourage learners' motivation.

#### *Students' Perceptions of the Teacher and L2 Motivation*

In the language learning context, many individuals have been suggested to affect language learners' motivation, including family members (Gardner, Masgoret, & Tremblay, 1999; Sung & Padilla, 1998), peers (MacIntyre & Clément, 1998), members of the L2 community (Genesee, Rogers, & Holobow, 1983; Leets & Giles, 1995). Of particular relevance to the present study is the L2 teacher. Some empirical research by Gardner and his colleagues has demonstrated that students' positive attitudes toward their L2 teacher are generally linked to motivation and achievement in the classroom (see Gardner, 1985). Elsewhere, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1994) found that students' evaluations of their teacher's rapport with the class were associated with students' linguistic self-confidence and anxiety. Some L2 scholars have offered hypotheses as to the specific aspects of teacher communicative style that influence students' motivational levels. For instance, Dörnyei (1994) suggests that teachers' affiliative drive, authority style, and manner of presenting tasks and providing feedback are associated with students' motivation. In their social

constructionist approach to language teaching, Williams and Burden (1997) maintain that the effective teacher communicates the goals of a learning task with a precise and clear set of instructions, while emphasizing the activity's value to the student personally, now and in the future. Although there has been some examination of the relations between perceptions of the teacher and motivational constructs (e.g., Julkunen, 1989; Noels et al., 1999; Schmidt et al., 1996), there is a need for more research on the precise aspects of communication style that are linked to motivation.

Although they did not address language teaching specifically, Deci and Ryan (1985) provide detailed suggestions as to the type of teacher communication style that enhances self-determination. Controlling styles, such as the use of threats or rewards, deadlines, or imposed goals, tend to undermine feelings of self-determination, and hence intrinsic motivation. In contrast, autonomy-supportive styles, such as providing choice about which activities to do and when to accomplish them, tend to sustain feelings of self-determination and intrinsic motivation. In addition, critical negative feedback undermines a sense of perceived competence to rise to new challenges and hence intrinsic motivation. In contrast, compassionate, positive feedback that provides information about how to improve competencies tends to enhance intrinsic motivation. Thus, both support for the students' autonomy and encouraging, informative feedback<sup>3</sup> are essential for enhancing feelings of self-determination and perceived competence, each of which is presumed to be linked with intrinsic motivation, sustained effort, and, ultimately, achievement in the task. In support of this proposition, Noels and her colleagues (1999) demonstrated that perceptions of the teacher as autonomy-supportive and as providing informative feedback were correlated with increased intrinsic motivation in a small group of English learners of French.

---

<sup>3</sup>Deci and Ryan (1985) use the term "informational feedback" for this construct. For the purposes of this article, the more idiosyncratic term "informative feedback" is used.

*Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation and the Instrumental/Integrative Orientations*

Although the Self-Determination Theory may be useful for understanding the role of intrinsic motivation in L2 learning, it does not address the issues of intergroup contact and ethnic identification subsumed by the integrative orientation. Gardner (1985; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; see also Stevick, 1976) emphasizes that the integrative and instrumental orientations, on the one hand, and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, are not parallel sets of constructs, as suggested by some scholars (e.g., Jakobovitz, 1970; Kelly, 1969; see also Dickinson, 1995). He argues that both the integrative and instrumental orientations are extrinsic in that the language is learned in order to satisfy some goal apart from enjoyment of the activity per se. In line with this possibility, some research by Noels and her colleagues (2000) demonstrated that the instrumental orientation is most strongly correlated with external regulation and less so with the other motivational subtypes.

Because there are several subtypes posited by Self-Determination Theory, the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic subtypes and the integrative orientation is less clear. The integrative orientation is similar to intrinsic motivation in that it refers to positive attitudes toward the learning situation and the learning process. At the same time, the integrative orientation also addresses attitudes toward the L2 community. From this point of view, it can be considered distinct from intrinsic motivation and more similar to self-determined forms of extrinsic motivation. Another possibility is that, although these orientations may be related, the integrative orientation represents a motivational issue distinct from either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. Thus, a second purpose of this study is to examine the relations between the integrative orientation and the intrinsic/extrinsic orientations outlined by Self-Determination Theory.

Given the possibility that intrinsic motivation and the integrative orientation represent different motivational substrates, it



might be expected that these two variables independently predict certain motivational variables. At least two sets of outcome variables might be postulated, including those related to the immediate learning context, including the amount of effort exerted in language learning, the intention to continue language learning, and affective reactions toward language learning. Considerable research has demonstrated a positive association among feelings of integrativeness, positive attitudes, motivational intensity, and behavioral intentions (see Gardner, 1985, for overview). Likewise, a substantial amount of research consistently shows a link among intrinsic motivation, positive affect, and engagement in an activity (see Deci & Ryan, 1985, for an overview).

Language learning variables have also been hypothesized to be related to a host of other nonlinguistic variables that are pertinent to the intergroup context (e.g., Gardner, 1985). For instance, Clément (1980) argues that integrativeness may be linked with increased quality and frequency of contact with the language community. Lambert (1974; see also Clément, 1980) maintains that learning another language may have implications for ethnic identity, affecting both feelings of belonging to the native language group and to the other language group. It would seem reasonable that, whereas notions of intrinsic motivation and the integrative orientations may both be important for the first class of language learning outcomes, the integrative orientation would be more relevant for the second class of outcomes. The differential predictive power of the two sets of constructs would underline the importance of incorporating both motivational substrates into models of language learning.

*The Present Study: Hypotheses (Hs) and Research Questions (RQs)*

The first purpose of the present study is to examine how the communicative style of the language teacher might be associated with intrinsic and extrinsic orientations. More specifically, it is hypothesized that

H1a. Perceptions of the teacher as autonomy-supportive and as providing positive and informative feedback are associated with generalized feelings of autonomy and competence.

H1b. Generalized feelings of autonomy and competence are positively and strongly associated with more self-determined orientations (i.e., identified regulation and intrinsic motivation).

H1c. Generalized feelings of autonomy and competence are weakly associated with less self-determined orientations (i.e., external and introjected regulation).

H1d. Generalized feelings of autonomy and competence are negatively associated with amotivation.

The second purpose is to consider the relations between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the integrative orientation. As very little research to date has considered the link among intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative reasons for language learning, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1. What are the relations between the integrative orientation and the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations?<sup>4</sup>

RQ2. Do these orientations differentially predict pertinent language learning variables, such as those relevant to the immediate learning situation and those related to the inter-group context?

---

<sup>4</sup>The instrumental orientation was not examined here because it has not been the focus of a great deal of research. In fact, Gardner and Tremblay (1994) point out that in the past 34 years, only one study by the Gardner group has dealt with the instrumental orientation. For the interested reader, an empirical analysis of the relations between the instrumental orientation and the motivational subtypes described by Self-Determination Theory is presented in Noels et al. (2000).

## Method

### *Participants*

The sample included 322 native English-speaking university students, of whom 63% were female, registered in first-year Spanish at a California university. Half were in their first quarter of Spanish study (50.8%), 31.8% were in their second quarter, and 17.1% were in their third quarter. They were relatively equally distributed across university levels, such that 22.8% were freshmen, 33.4% sophomores, 20.6% juniors, 14.7% seniors, and 8.4% were graduate students. They ranged in age from 17 years to 54 years with a mean age of 20.74 years ( $SD = 4.44$ ). They began learning Spanish between the ages of zero and 44 years, with a mean of 16.11 years ( $SD = 4.98$ ), and they indicated that they had been learning Spanish from zero to 38 years, with a mean of 3.20 years ( $SD = 2.94$ ).

### *Materials*

The instruments included in the present study are widely used by researchers in the areas of educational psychology, communication, and the social psychology of language learning. They were adapted to the Spanish language context. A description of the scales, with Cronbach alpha indices of internal consistency, follows.

### *Motivational Orientations*<sup>5</sup>

*Intrinsic and extrinsic orientations and amotivation* (adapted from Noels et al., 2000). Nineteen randomly ordered items assessed

---

<sup>5</sup>To examine the distinctiveness of the orientation subscales, a factor analysis of the 23 orientation items was conducted, using Maximum Likelihood extraction technique with oblique rotation. The results yielded six correlated factors, clearly distinguishing amotivation, the three extrinsic orientations, the intrinsic orientations, and the integrative orientation. All items in the

why students were learning Spanish. These included four items to assess intrinsic orientation (e.g., “For the satisfaction I feel as I get to know the language better”;  $\alpha = .90$ ), four items to assess identified regulation (e.g., “Because I think it is good for my personal development”;  $\alpha = .83$ ), four items to assess introjected regulation (e.g., “Because succeeding in Spanish makes me feel important”;  $\alpha = .82$ ), three items to assess external regulation (e.g., “Because it will help me to get a better paying job”;  $\alpha = .85$ ), and four items to assess amotivation (e.g., “I don’t know; I can’t come to understand what I am doing learning Spanish”;  $\alpha = .81$ ). Students were asked to indicate on a 7-point scale the extent to which a proposed reason for language learning corresponded with their reason for language learning, from “Does Not Correspond” to “Corresponds Exactly.” A high mean score indicates a high level of correspondence between the proposed reason and the student’s reason for language learning.

*Integrative orientation* (Gardner, 1985). Interspersed among the above items were four items that assessed students’ integrative orientation on the same 7-point scale (e.g., “Because knowing Spanish will help me to think and behave like a person from the Latino community”;  $\alpha = .79$ ). A high mean score suggests a strong integrative orientation.

#### *Hypothesized Antecedents of Intrinsic Motivation*

*Self-perceptions of Spanish competence.* On the basis of Clément’s (1988) measure, participants indicated, on a 7-point scale from “not at all” to “native-like,” the extent to which they could read, write, speak, and understand Spanish. A high mean

---

factor pattern matrix loaded on their respective factor at  $\geq |.30|$ , with the exception of one Identified Regulation item, which loaded on the Integrative orientation factor. As well, one Introjected Regulation item had a cross-loading of .31 on the Intrinsic Orientation factor. The factor correlation matrix indicated that the factor intercorrelations ranged from  $-.39$  to  $.54$ . Further details on this analysis can be obtained from the author.

score indicated strong perceptions of competence in Spanish ( $alpha = .87$ ).

*Self-perceptions of autonomy* (adapted from Noels et al., 1999). Five 7-point Likert items assessed learners' perceptions of the environment as supporting of learner autonomy. A high score indicated that the learner felt that the decision to learn the language was freely chosen (e.g., "I feel I am forced to learn Spanish" (reversed);  $alpha = .86$ ).

#### *L2 Variables Relevant to the Immediate Situation and the Intergroups Context*

*Motivational intensity* (Gardner, 1985). Ten multiple-choice items assessed students' effort when learning Spanish. Students chose one of three alternatives of varying intensity to describe the extent of their effort in language learning. A high score indicated a high level of effort in learning Spanish ( $alpha = .76$ ).

*Intention to continue learning Spanish* (Noels et al., 1999). One negative and two positive Likert-type items assessed students' intention to continue learning Spanish (e.g., "I want to keep on learning Spanish after I finish this course"). For each item, respondents indicated on a 7-point scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the items, from "1 = Strongly Disagree" to "7 = Strongly Agree." The negative item was reversed, such that a high score indicated a strong intention to continue learning Spanish ( $alpha = .81$ ).

*Attitudes toward learning Spanish* (Gardner, 1985). Four items assessed students' enjoyment of learning Spanish, such that a high score indicated a very positive attitude toward learning Spanish (e.g., "I enjoy learning Spanish";  $alpha = .88$ ).

*Frequency of contact with the Latino community*. A single item assessed how much contact participants had with Latinos outside of school during the past year. The scale ranged from 1 ("none at all") to 5 ("a lot").

*Quality of contact with the Latino community*. Four items adapted from Clément (1988) assessed the quality of contact

participants had with members of the Latino community on a 7-point Likert-type scale (e.g., “My contacts with Spanish-speaking people are generally pleasant”;  $\alpha = .75$ ). A high mean score indicates high quality of contact.

*Ethnic identity.* An adapted version of Clément and Noels’ (1992) situated ethnic identity scale was used to assess ethnic identification. Participants were presented with five scenarios (alone, among other students at school, using the mass media, with family, and in public) and asked to indicate the extent to which (a) they felt Anglo, and (b) felt Latino, on two separate scales. Each scale ranged from 1 (“not at all Anglo/Latino”) to 5 (“very Anglo/Latino”). The alpha for the Anglo scale was .94 and the alpha for the Latino scale was .91. A high mean score indicates a high degree of identification with that ethnolinguistic group.

#### *Students’ Perceptions of Their Teachers’ Communicative Style*

The items to assess students’ perceptions of their L2 teachers’ communicative style were drawn from Gorham’s (1988; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990) test of generalized immediacy. It was felt that this popular instrument included items reflecting not only students’ perceptions of teachers’ personal involvement in teaching, but also their perceptions of teachers’ control and feedback styles. Other items used by Noels and her colleagues (1999) were also included to ensure that there were sufficient items to assess perceptions of control and informative feedback. Students were presented with a description of teacher behavior and asked to indicate how frequently this behavior was observed, from 1 = “never” to 7 = “always.”

The results of factor analysis<sup>6</sup> of these items yielded four factors. Two subscales seemed to be consistent with Deci and

---

<sup>6</sup>To explore the underlying dimensions of the teacher perception items, a factor analysis was conducted, using Maximum Likelihood extraction technique with oblique rotation. The final results yielded four correlated factors, defined as Teacher Control, Teacher Negativity, Teacher Informative Feed-

Ryan's conceptualization of teacher "control" and "informative feedback." The *Control* scale consisted of four items (e.g., "My professor emphasizes that he/she is the one in control" and "My professor pressures me to do my work";  $\alpha = .63$ ), and *Informative Feedback* included 15 items (e.g., "My professor gives me good feedback on how I perform in my course work" and "My professor praises students' work, actions, or comments";  $\alpha = .85$ ). Two additional subscales were identified, including a 7-item subscale, *Congeniality* (e.g., "My professor uses personal examples or talks about experiences she/he has had outside of class" and "My professor uses humor in class";  $\alpha = .78$ ), and an 11-item *Negativity* subscale (e.g., "The feedback I get from my professor takes the form of useless criticisms" and "I feel as if my professor doesn't want students around";  $\alpha = .83$ ).

### *Procedure*

The questionnaires were distributed during regular class. On the cover page, participants were reminded that the study was voluntary and that their answers were completely confidential; no teachers would have access to their responses. They completed the questionnaire on their own time, and returned it to the researcher one week later. They earned 2 points of extra credit for their participation.

### Results

To assess the two objectives of the study, two sets of analyses were conducted. First, to examine the relation between perceptions of the teacher, self-perceptions of competence and control,

---

back, and Teacher Congeniality. Only the items with a pattern matrix loading of  $\geq |.30|$  were used in the computation of the subscale score. The factor correlation matrix indicated that the factor intercorrelations ranged from  $|.00|$  to  $|.29|$ . Further details on this analysis may be obtained from the author.

and intrinsic and extrinsic orientations, a path analysis using structural equation modelling was conducted. Second, to examine the relations between intrinsic and extrinsic orientations and the integrative orientation, correlational and multiple regression analyses were computed. In addition, multiple regression analyses were used to determine the relations between the orientations and language learning outcomes.

*Relations Between Teacher Perception Variables and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational Orientations*

To assess the relations between students' perceptions of the teacher, perceived autonomy and competence, and the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations, a path analysis was computed by using EQS 5.7 (Bentler, 1995). The means, standard deviations, and scale intercorrelations are presented in Table 1. In the hypothesized model, perceptions of the teacher were expected to be intercorrelated. Because they were intercorrelated, the initial model also predicted that all of the teacher perceptions could be related to the two types of self-perceptions. Of particular theoretical interest, perceptions of the teacher as controlling and as providing positive, constructive feedback were expected to be negatively related to self-perceptions of autonomy and competence, respectively. In addition, the self-perceptions of autonomy and competence were hypothesized to be more strongly related with the more self-determined orientations, less strongly associated with the less self-determined orientations, and positively related with amotivation. Because the different orientations were presumed to be interrelated, the errors of specification (i.e., residuals or disturbances) were allowed to intercorrelate (Bentler, 1995; Byrne, 1994).

The results of the initial analysis were statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 53.24$ ;  $df = 21$ ;  $p < .01$ ); however, the goodness-of-fit indices were all above the acceptable level of .90 (goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = .97; adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) = .91; Bentler–Bonnett normed fit index (BBI) = .96; comparison fit



Table 1

*Means (M), standard deviations (SD), and correlations between orientations, self-perceptions, and perceptions of teachers*

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Orientations, self-perceptions, and perceptions of teachers									
			2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Orientations												
1. Amotivation	1.57	1.04	-.20*	-.23*	-.45*	-.27*	-.28*	-.44*	.13*	.31*	-.09	-.18*
2. External	3.59	1.64		.40*	.45*	.24*	.22*	.16*	.05	.00	.03	.06
3. Introjected	3.02	1.44			.65*	.65*	.28*	.29*	.01	-.04	.05	.10
4. Identified	4.31	1.53				.68*	.35*	.54*	-.06	-.15*	.03	.13*
5. Intrinsic	3.04	1.54					.38*	.51*	-.07	-.08	.04	.14*
Self-Perceptions												
6. Competence	4.11	0.96						.27*	-.09	-.14*	.06	.16*
7. Autonomy	4.19	1.61							-.17*	-.15*	-.02	.06
Perceptions of Teachers												
8. Control	2.95	1.13								.34*	.02	-.06
9. Negativity	1.90	0.76									-.39*	-.50*
10. Congeniality	4.06	1.06										.61*
11. Feedback	4.71	0.81										

*Note:*  $N = 320$ ; the scale's range, theoretically, is from 1 to 7.

\*  $p < .05$ .

index (CFI) = .97; see Bentler, 1990, 1995; Byrne, 1994; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1996), suggesting that the model was a good fit to the data. Examination of the *t* values indicated several nonsignificant paths that could be dropped from the model. The results of the Wald multivariate test for dropping parameters indicated that 10 paths were not necessary. These were deleted accordingly. Although this revised model was statistically significant, the goodness-of-fit indices indicated that this more parsimonious model remained a good fit to the data ( $\chi^2 = 66.13$ ;  $df = 31$ ;  $p < .01$ ; GFI = .97; AGFI = .93; CFI = .97; BBI = .94).

The results showed that perceptions of the teacher as controlling significantly and negatively predicted self-perceptions of autonomy (see Figure 1). Perceptions of the teacher as informative predicted self-perceptions of competence. None of the other paths between teacher perceptions and self-perceptions was significant. This pattern at the bivariate level (see Table 1), however, indicates that whereas Teacher Congeniality is unrelated to the self-perceptions, Teacher Negativity is negatively related to these perceptions. It is important to note that the various perceptions of the teacher are intercorrelated: Teacher Control is positively associated with Teacher Negativity, Teacher Negativity is negatively associated with Teacher Congeniality and Teacher Informative Feedback, and Teacher Congeniality is positively associated with Teacher Informative Feedback. Thus, although some of the teacher perceptions are not directly linked to the self-perception variables in the path analysis, they are associated with other teacher perception variables that are, and hence indirectly relate to self-perceptions.

Perceptions of having choice about learning Spanish strongly predicted higher levels of the Intrinsic and Identified Regulation orientations at the bivariate level and in the path analysis. This sense of autonomy was associated with Introjected Regulation, but it did not significantly predict External Regulation in the path analysis, although there was a modest correlation at the bivariate level. Additionally, in both the correlational and the path analyses,



the greater the feeling of choice in learning Spanish, the less students felt amotivated. Greater self-perceptions of competence in Spanish were associated with increased Intrinsic Orientation, and to a lesser extent with the three extrinsic orientations. Also, the more the students felt competent with regard to their Spanish abilities, the less amotivated they felt.

*Interrelations Between Orientations and Their Relative Predictive Power*

*Relations between intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations and the integrative orientation.* Correlations between the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations and the integrative orientation were computed in order to examine these variables' interrelations (see Table 2). The Integrative Orientation was correlated with all of the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations, but most strongly associated with Intrinsic and Identified Regulation orientations. The correlations were weaker with the less self-determined orientations. The Integrative Orientation was negatively related with Amotivation.

A standard multiple regression analysis assessed the independent relations between the integrative orientation and the other orientations. By using standard multiple regression, it is possible to assess which of the self-determination orientations independently shares a portion of the variance with the integrative orientation, after the common variance among the self-determination orientations is partialled out (cf. Pedhauzer, 1997; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The Intrinsic Orientation, the Identified, Introjected, and External Regulation orientations, as well as Amotivation, were entered as a block to predict the Integrative Orientation. The equation was significant, and inspection of the coefficients, including the partial and semipartial correlations, indicated that both Intrinsic and Identified Regulation orientations were significantly associated with the Integrative Orientation, but the other orientations were not. Thus, the results of the correlational and regression analyses suggest that the integrative orientation is most similar to the more self-determined orientations, although the integrative orientation is somewhat associated with less self-determined orientations at the bivariate level.

Table 2

*Results of standard multiple regression analysis of the relations between the integrative orientation (dependent variable) and the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations (independent variables)*

Independent Variables	Equation		Coefficients				
	$R^2$	$F$	$\beta$	$t$	$r$	$pr$	$sr$
Intrinsic motivation	.47	55.24*	.37	6.10*	.63	.33	.25
Identified regulation			.36	5.30*	.62	.29	.22
Introjected regulation			.04	0.72	.50	.04	.03
External regulation			-.04	-0.86	.22	-.05	-.04
Amotivation			.02	0.40	-.25	.02	.02

*Note:*  $N = 320$ ; all zero-order correlations are significant at  $p < .01$ .

\*  $p < .01$ .

*Relations between orientations and L2 variables relevant to the immediate situation and the intergroup context.* To examine the predictive utility of the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations beyond the integrative orientation, two sets of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. This hierarchical regression is useful for understanding how well the self-determination variables contribute to the prediction of the L2 variable, once the integrative orientation has contributed its share to the prediction of that variable (cf. Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). For all of these analyses, the integrative orientation was entered in a first step to predict each L2 index. In a second step, the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations were entered as a block to predict the index. In all cases, the Integrative Orientation was a significant predictor of the criterion variable in the first step. Once the other orientations were included, the predictive power of the Integrative Orientation varied depending upon the class of L2 variable considered.

With regard to the variables pertaining to the immediate learning situation, the analyses showed the following results (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses of relations between orientations (independent variables) and variables relevant to the immediate learning situation (dependent variables)*

Variables	Equation				Coefficients				
	$R^2$	$F$	$\Delta R^2$	$\Delta F$	$\beta$	$t$	$r$	$pr$	$sr$
1. Motivational Intensity									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.19	74.93*	—	—	.44	8.66*	.44	.44	.44
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.41	36.83*	.22	23.83*	.14	2.36*	.44	.13	.10
Intrinsic motivation					.38	5.58*	.51	.30	.24
Identified regulation					.08	1.11	.48	.06	.05
Introjected regulation					-.16	-2.55*	.29	-.14	-.11
External regulation					.01	0.22	.17	.01	.01
Amotivation					-.34	-6.99*	-.48	-.37	-.30
2. Intention to Continue Learning Spanish									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.21	84.65*	—	—	.46	9.20*	.46	.46	.46
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.54	60.11*	.33	43.81*	.10	1.90	.46	.11	.07
Intrinsic motivation					.22	3.60*	.50	.20	.14
Identified regulation					.40	5.97*	.63	.32	.23

Table 3 (continued)

*Results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses of relations between orientations (independent variables) and variables relevant to the immediate learning situation (dependent variables)*

Variables	Equation				Coefficients				
	$R^2$	$F$	$\Delta R^2$	$\Delta F$	$\beta$	$t$	$r$	$pr$	$sr$
Introjected regulation					-.24	-4.28*	.31	-.24	-.17
External regulation					.05	1.21	.28	.07	.05
Amotivation					-.34	-7.90*	-.56	-.41	-.30
3. Attitudes Toward Learning Spanish									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.23	96.24*	—	—	.48	9.81*	.48	.48	.48
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.64	90.64*	.40	68.95*	-.01	-0.30	.48	-.02	-.01
Intrinsic motivation					.57	10.66*	.70	.52	.36
Identified regulation					.15	2.61*	.62	.15	.09
Introjected regulation					-.07	-1.46	.46	-.08	-.05
External regulation					-.04	-1.06	.20	-.06	-.04
Amotivation					-.34	-8.91*	-.54	-.45	-.30

Note:  $N = 320$ ; all zero-order correlations are significant at  $p < .01$ .

\* $p < .05$ .

For all three L2 indices of interest, the zero-order correlations between the orientations and the index were significant ( $p < .05$ ). The general pattern indicated that the indices were most strongly and positively correlated with the more self-determined orientations and the Integrative Orientation, less strongly positively correlated with Introjected and External Regulation orientations, and negatively correlated with Amotivation.

For all of the regression analyses, the Integrative Orientation significantly predicted the criterion variable at the first step. For Motivational Intensity, the regression equation at the second step was also significant, such that the Intrinsic and Integrative Orientations significantly predicted increased Motivational Intensity, and Introjected Regulation and Amotivation predicted decreased effort. Identified and External Regulation did not predict Motivational Intensity. In a somewhat similar manner, increased Integrative (marginally,  $p = .059$ ), Intrinsic, and Identified Regulation orientations were all associated with greater Intention to Continue Learning Spanish. More Introjected Regulation was associated with less intention, as was Amotivation. External Regulation did not significantly predict Intention. With regard to Attitudes toward Learning Spanish, although the Integrative Orientation predicted the criterion variable on the first step, when the other orientations were entered, the Integrative Orientation was no longer a significant predictor. Rather, Intrinsic and Identified Regulation orientations strongly predicted positive attitudes toward learning Spanish, and Amotivation predicted less positive affect.

With regard to the intergroup variables (see Table 4), the correlational analyses showed that the strongest correlations were generally those between the index and the integrative orientation. The correlations with the more self-determined orientations tended to be somewhat smaller, although Identified Regulation was generally a stronger correlate than Intrinsic Orientation. The less self-determined orientations tended to be more modestly related or unrelated to the index. Amotivation was



Table 4

*Results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses of relations between orientations (independent variables) and intergroup-related variables (dependent variables)*

Independent Variables	Equation				Coefficients				
	$R^2$	$F$	$\Delta R^2$	$\Delta F$	$\beta$	$t$	$r$	$pr$	$sr$
1. Frequency of Contact with Latino Community ( $N = 318$ )									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.07	22.34*	—	—	.26	4.73*	.26*	.26	.26
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.08	4.21*	.01	0.62	.25	3.35*	.26*	.19	.18
Intrinsic motivation					.04	0.41	.17*	.02	.02
Identified regulation					-.02	-0.19	.17*	-.01	-.01
Introjected regulation					-.07	-0.90	.11*	-.05	-.05
External regulation					.08	1.19	.12*	.07	.07
Amotivation					-.06	-0.98	-.12*	-.06	-.05
2. Quality of Contact with Latino Community ( $N = 320$ )									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.14	51.98*	—	—	.38	7.21*	.38*	.38	.38
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.20	13.26*	.06	4.88*	.28	4.07*	.38*	.22	.21
Intrinsic motivation					.03	0.33	.28*	.02	.02

Table 4 (continued)

*Results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses of relations between orientations (independent variables) and intergroup-related variables (dependent variables)*

Independent Variables	Equation				Coefficients				
	$R^2$	$F$	$\Delta R^2$	$\Delta F$	$\beta$	$t$	$r$	$pr$	$sr$
Identified regulation					.16	1.87	.34*	.11	.10
Introjected regulation					-.10	-1.39	.17*	-.08	-.07
External regulation					-.09	-1.47	.06	-.08	-.07
Amotivation					-.19	-3.38*	-.30*	-.19	-.17
3. Latino Identity ( $N = 299$ )									
<i>Step 1</i>									
Integrative orientation	.07	21.21*	—	—	.26	4.61*	.26*	.26	.26
<i>Step 2</i>									
Integrative orientation	.09	4.61*	.02	1.27	.34	4.50*	.26*	.25	.25
Intrinsic motivation					-.11	-1.30	.08	-.08	-.07
Identified regulation					.03	0.33	.11*	.02	.02
Introjected regulation					-.01	-0.17	.08	-.01	-.01
External regulation					.01	0.19	.05	.01	.01
Amotivation					.11	1.79	.05	.10	.10

Table 4 (continued)

4. Anglo Identity ( $N = 317$ )

*Step 1*

Integrative orientation	.10	33.70*	—	—	-.31	-5.81*	-.31*	-.31	-.31
-------------------------	-----	--------	---	---	------	--------	-------	------	------

*Step 2*

Integrative orientation	.14	8.34*	.04	3.05*	-.36	-4.92*	-.31*	-.27	-.26
Intrinsic motivation					.16	1.88	-.12*	.11	.10
Identified regulation					-.25	-2.71*	-.21*	-.15	-.14
Introjected regulation					.14	1.76	-.05	.10	.09
External regulation					.12	1.90	.02	.11	.10
Amotivation					-.02	-0.37	.08	-.02	-.02

---

\* $p < .05$

negatively related to the contact variables, and unrelated to the identity variables.

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses indicated that the Integrative Orientation was a significant predictor on the first step and remained a significant predictor on the second step (see Table 4). Thus, the Integrative Orientation predicted greater frequency and quality of contact with the Latino community, greater identification with the Latino community, and less identification with the Anglo community. The Intrinsic Orientation did not predict any of the criterion variables, although Amotivation predicted less Quality of Contact with the Latino community, and Identified Regulation predicted less identification with the Anglo community.

In summary, the integrative orientation and intrinsic motivation were consistent predictors of motivational intensity and intention to continue Spanish studies, suggesting that both make independent contributions to engagement in language learning. Intrinsic motivation was most consistently predictive of positive affect, but the integrative orientation was most consistently predictive of intergroup variables.

## Discussion

This study had two purposes: (1) to examine the relations between students' perceptions of their teachers' communication style and orientations for language learning, and (2) to investigate the relations between intrinsic and extrinsic orientations and the integrative orientation, and the relations between these orientations and other language learning variables. Correlation-based analyses tested the hypothesized relations among variables, and hence it must be noted that no clear causal direction among variables can be conclusively stated.

*Perceptions of Teachers' Communicative Style and Students' Motivation*

The results suggest that teachers' behaviors are linked with students' generalized feelings of autonomy and competence in learning Spanish in a manner consistent with Deci and Ryan's (1985) theoretical formulation and the findings reported by Noels et al. (1999). In the present case, the more the teacher was perceived as controlling, the less students felt they were learning Spanish of their own accord. The less students felt they had choices about learning, the less they felt they were learning the language because it was fun or because it was valuable to them. Perceptions of autonomy were less strongly associated with the feeling that one was learning the language because of an internal or external pressure, and also indicative of greater amotivation. In a similar manner, the more teachers were perceived as being actively involved in students' learning, by giving informative praise and encouragement to the students for their efforts, the more the students felt competent in learning Spanish. Greater perceptions of competence corresponded with the feeling that they were learning the language because it was fun, as well as for the various extrinsic reasons. They also indicated that they felt less amotivated. These results are in line with Deci and Ryan's claim, and also with the arguments of Williams and Burden (1997; see also Burden & Williams, 1998), that the teacher must provide feedback in a manner that is positive and uncritical, and also allow opportunities for independent learning, in order to enhance perceived competence and hence motivation.

It is interesting to note that students discern other dimensions to teachers' behaviors, but these are not necessarily the most important indicators of these self-perceptions. Perceptions of the teacher as controlling are correlated with a sense of the teacher as a critical and negative person. It is not, however, the negativity per se that undermines motivation in this model, but the controlling behavior; indeed, it is conceivable that a teacher could be perceived as well-intended, but still somewhat overbearing, and

this characteristic in itself would be sufficient to reduce intrinsic interest. In a similar manner, a friendly disposition toward students predicts neither perceptions of control nor of competence directly. Rather, the teacher must be viewed as an active participant in the learning process, who provides feedback in a positive and encouraging manner. This suggests that it is not necessary for teachers to disclose personal information or demonstrate their comedic wit to encourage motivation, but that it is essential for instructors to show that they are personally committed to the students' learning progress.

Although these results provide some practical suggestions for improving teaching practices and L2 programs, it is also clear that the correlations between perceptions of the teacher and self-perceptions are not particularly strong ( $r \leq |.17|$ ). These correlations are of the same magnitude as those reported by Noels et al. (1999), and in line with those reviewed by Gardner (1985). It is curious that perceptions of the teacher's behavior do not have a stronger association with motivation, since the teacher is likely to be the individual most actively involved in the student's learning (other than the student). One possibility is that these adult university students have already developed a strong sense of their own autonomy and competence and are less influenced by others around them than younger students might be. Another possibility is that these students do not have sufficient interaction with the teacher to develop a strong impression of the teacher's capacity for autonomy-support and informative feedback. The university in which the data were collected operates on a quarter system, such that the students have only 12 weeks of contact with their instructor before they are moved to a new class with, most likely, a new teacher. Given that the teacher's influence may be modest, it is important to also consider how perceptions of autonomy support and informative feedback from other people, including peers, family members, and members of the L2 community (cf. Noels, 1999; see also Guay & Vallerand, 1997), contribute to self-

perceptions of autonomy and competence, and ultimately intrinsic motivation.

*The Relations Among Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Integrative Orientations*

The results also suggest that the notions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are useful for predicting a variety of L2 variables in addition to the notion of integrativeness found in some other models (e.g., Gardner, 1988; Clément, 1980; Giles & Byrne, 1982). Consistent with Gardner's (1985) suggestion that the integrative orientation may be considered a form of extrinsic motivation, there were significant correlations between it and the varieties of extrinsic motivation proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985). At the same time, however, the integrative orientation would seem to be most strongly related with the more self-determined orientations. Thus, the more individuals wish to learn a language because it is interesting and enjoyable, and because the activity has value to them personally, the more they are likely to learn the language because they wish to have interactions with members of the Latino community. Thus, by fostering more self-determined reasons for language learning, it may be possible simultaneously to encourage language learning for the sake of intergroup contact and vice versa.

This is not to suggest that the intrinsic and integrative orientations are one and the same construct. Indeed, these orientations independently predict the intensity of L2 learners' efforts and the intention to sustain that effort. Moreover, the integrative orientation is the strongest predictor of intergroup variables: the more integrative the students are, the more they will engage with the Spanish community, view that interaction positively, and identify with the Spanish group. At the same time, they are likely to identify less strongly with the English group, suggesting a shift from one cultural allegiance to another (cf. integration or assimilation, Clément, 1980). Thus, it would appear that enjoying the challenge of language learning and desiring interaction with the

L2 community are orientations that speak to relatively separate issues, at least for these beginning language students who live in a context where the L2 community has relatively high vitality.

This distinctive predictive power supports the idea that there are at least two motivational substrates, one pertaining to the immediate learning situation, likely within the classroom setting, and the other relating to social relationships and intergroup issues in the broader society. This distinction is consistent with Gardner's original observations (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985) that learning a second language takes place not only in an educational context, but also in a particular sociopolitical context. It is also in line with much recent work in L2 motivation that emphasizes the operation of multiple motivational subsystems (e.g., Dörnyei, 1990). For instance, Dörnyei (1994) has argued for a distinction between a social (i.e., intergroup) dimension and a dimension that is specific to the learning situation. In their model of willingness to communicate, MacIntyre and his colleagues (1998) differentiated between interpersonal and intergroup motivational propensities. Future studies might well examine how such subsystems interact, perhaps by comparing different contexts where opportunities for interaction with members of the L2 community are more or less available (cf. Clément & Kruidenier, 1983).

#### *Limitations and Directions for Future Research*

Some limitations to the present study must be noted. First of all, the present analyses focused on students' perceptions of their language teachers and not on the teachers' behaviors per se. It is possible that the students do not accurately report teachers' behaviors, but may have biases depending upon their level of language competence, age, general liking of the teacher, and so on. Nonetheless, it would seem logical that student perceptions mediate the link between teacher behavior and student motivation, and thus it is an appropriate starting point for examinations of this kind. To develop better teaching strategies, however, it is essential



that observations of teachers' behaviors and teachers' self-reports be incorporated into this area of research.

As noted earlier, another limitation of this study is its correlational design. Like several other models of motivation (e.g., Gardner's [1985] socio-educational model or Clement's [1980] socio-contextual model), the theoretical model presented here maintains that the behavior of people in the learners' social context (in this case the language teacher, but possibly also other individuals) predicts endorsement of certain orientations that in turn predict effort and engagement and ultimately linguistic and nonlinguistic outcomes. Given the correlational nature of the analyses, however, it is also conceivable (among other possibilities) that students' behavior determines their orientation toward L2 study, and that the motivational orientation determines how the students perceive their teacher. Although the more rigorous technique of path analyses with EQS used in the present study provides a better test of the hypothesized causal relations than the correlational analyses used in earlier studies on this topic (e.g., Noels et al., 1999), it does not reduce the need for longitudinal and experimental studies to verify the proposed causal paths among these variables.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study support this intrinsic/extrinsic paradigm as a useful framework for understanding learners' motivational orientations. They also provide evidence of some psychological principles, namely perceived autonomy and perceived competence, by which motivation may be enhanced (cf. Williams & Burden, 1997). This framework is best seen as a complement to those that emphasize intergroup relations and ethnolinguistic identity issues. Certainly future research might well address how these two motivational substrates work in concert, taking into consideration the many different individuals who can influence learner motivation, and the many different social contexts in which language learning takes place.

## References

- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87*, 49–74.
- Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social psychological theory of second-language learning. *Language Learning, 38*, 75–100.
- Belmechri, F., & Hummel, K. (1998). Orientations and motivation in the acquisition of English as a second language among high school students in Québec City. *Language Learning, 48*, 219–244.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 238–246.
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS: Structural equations program manual* [software manual]. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (1990). M & Ms for language classrooms? Another look at motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on language and linguistics* (pp. 383–393). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Burden, B., & Williams, M. (1998). Language learners' perceptions of supportive classroom environments. *Language Learning Journal, 17*, 29–32.
- Byrne, B. M. (1994). *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows: Basic concepts, applications and programming*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Clément, R. (1988). *Échelles d'attitude et de motivation reliées aux rapports inter-ethniques* [Scales of attitude and motivation related to inter-ethnic relations] [Technical Report]. University of Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning, 44*, 417–448.
- Clément, R., & Gardner, R. C. (in press). Second language mastery. In H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Clément, R., & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning, 33*, 272–291.

- Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1992). Towards a situated approach to ethnic identification. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 11*, 203–232.
- Crooks, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*, 469–512.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency and self-esteem* (pp. 31–48). New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in education: The self-determination perspective. *The Educational Psychologist, 26*, 325–346.
- Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System, 23*, 165–174.
- Dickinson, L., & Wenden, A. (Eds.). (1995). Autonomy, self-direction and self access in language teaching and learning [Special issue]. *System, 23*.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 45–78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31*, 117–135.
- Ehrman, M. E. (1996). An exploration of adult language learner motivation, self-efficacy and anxiety. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 81–103). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i Second Language and Teaching Curriculum Center.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (1988). Attitudes and motivation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*, 135–148.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*, 266–272.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A.-M., & Tremblay, P. (1999). Home background characteristics of second language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*, 419–437.
- Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 359–368.
- Genesee, F., Rogers, P., & Holobow, N. (1983). The social psychology of second language learning: Another point of view. *Language Learning, 33*, 209–224.

- Giles, H., & Byrne, J. L. (1982). An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 3, 17–40.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 37, 40–53.
- Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. *Communication Education*, 39, 354–368.
- Guay, F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Social context, student's motivation and academic achievement: Toward a process model. *Social Psychology of Education*, 1, 35–58.
- Jakobovitz, I. A. (1970). *Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide* [software manual]. Chicago: Scientific Software International.
- Julkunen, K. (1989). *Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning and teaching*. Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.
- Kamada, L. D. (1986, November). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational learning process: Why Japanese can't speak English*. Paper presented at the Japan Association of Language Teachers' International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning, Seirei Gakuen, Hamamatsu, Japan.
- Kelly, L. G. (1969). *Description and measurement of bilingualism: An international seminar*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press/Canadian National Commission for UNESCO.
- Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud, & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education*. Bellingham, WA: Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning.
- Leets, L., & Giles, H. (1995). Dimensions of minority language survival/non-survival: Intergroup cognitions and communication climates. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, & S. Kroon (Eds.), *The state of minority languages* (pp. 37–71). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": An anatomy and a framework. *System*, 24, 427–435.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Clément, R. (1998, May). *Willingness to communicate and language learning orientations of immersion students*. Paper presented at the 59th Annual Convention of the Canadian Psychological Association, Edmonton, AB, Canada.
- 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. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545–562.

- Moïse, L. C., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1990). Aspects motivationnels de l'apprentissage de l'espagnol au niveau universitaire [Motivational aspects of learning Spanish at the university level]. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 689–705.
- Noels, K. A. (1999, May). *Intrinsic, extrinsic and integrative orientations for learning German: An examination of the role of others in supporting learners' motivation*. Paper presented in K. A. Noels and R. Clément's symposium *Language and social psychology: Current directions in Canadian research* at the Annual Convention of the Canadian Psychological Association, Halifax, NS, Canada.
- Noels, K. A., & Clément, R. (1989). Orientations to learning German: The effect of language heritage on second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 45, 245–257.
- Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teacher communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23–34.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and Self-Determination Theory. *Language Learning*, 50, 57–85.
- Oxford, R. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 512–514.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12–28.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Ramage, K. (1990). Motivational factors and persistence in foreign language study. *Language Learning*, 40, 189–219.
- Rigby, C. S., Deci, E. L., Patrick, B. C., & Ryan, R. M. (1992). Beyond the intrinsic–extrinsic dichotomy: Self-determination in motivation and learning. *Motivation and Emotion*, 16, 165–185.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 14–87). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Stevick, E. W. (1976). *Meaning, memory, and method: Some psychological perspectives on language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Sung, H., & Padilla, A.M. (1998). Student motivation, parental attitudes, and involvement in the learning of Asian languages in elementary and secondary schools. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 205–216.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Tachibana, Y., Matsukawa, R., & Zhong, Q. X. (1996). Attitudes and motivation for learning English: A cross-national comparison of Japanese and Chinese high school students. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 691–700.
- Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 271–360). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Vallerand, R. J., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1989). Construction et validation de l'échelle de motivation en éducation (EME) [Construction and validation of the Motivation Toward Education Scale]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 21(3), 323–349.
- Williams, M., & Burden, B. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.