

## A CRITICAL REVIEW OF GARDNER'S AND DORNYEI'S MOTIVATIONAL ORIENTATIONS

Af'idatul Husniyah

Prodi Bahasa Inggris, Politeknik Negeri Malang  
afidatul@polinema.ac.id

### ABSTRACT

Motivation has been long regarded as one of the prominent factors affecting second language acquisition. Numerous studies have been conducted to see what plays the most important role in learning a language over the years (Dornyei, 1994, p.273). The studies of L2 motivation were mostly inspired by the works of two psychologists, Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert, with their socio-psychological approach (ibid). This paper will focus on the notions of integrative and instrumental motivational approach in accordance with Gardner's and Dornyei's view, their relevance in today's society, and empirical studies being conducted within this field. It appears that each study in L2 motivation offers different result and each researcher offers different theoretical framework in which it portrays the nature of motivation as being dynamic and not restricted (Dornyei, 2006). However, it can be argued that the notion of integrative and instrumental motivation contribute a huge influence on L2 motivation research over the past decades. With the development of L2 motivation research, it is expected that more practical guidelines in improving learners' motivation in classroom context will be uncovered.

**Key words:** *motivational orientation, instrumental motivation, integrative motivation*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Motivation has been long regarded as one of the prominent factors affecting second language acquisition. Numerous studies have been conducted to see what plays the most important role in learning a language over the years (Dornyei, 1994). The studies of L2 motivation were mostly inspired by the works of two psychologists, Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert, with their socio-psychological approach (ibid). This paper will focus on the notions of integrative and instrumental motivational approach in accordance with Gardner's and Dornyei's view, their relevance in today's society, and empirical studies being conducted within this field.

#### ***Integrative and instrumental motivation***

The notions of "integrative" and "instrumental" motivational orientations were first introduced in the late 50s by Gardner and Lambert (Lamb, 2004, p.4). Under the socio-psychological framework, Gardner proposed these two notions to understand different motivation language learners typically have. Learners are said to be 'integratively motivated' when they learn a language because of a personal interest towards particular people and culture being represented by this particular language group, such as learning English due to one's personal interest in British culture (Gardner and MacIntre, 1991). Meanwhile, instrumental motivational orientation is defined as 'practical advantages and values' when someone learns a new language (Lambert

1974), such as learning English to pass an exam or simply to get a higher salary (Ghanea, et.al., 2011).

In Gardner and Lambert's earlier work (1959, 1972), these two notions were said to be good predictors of second language learners' achievement, and that integrative motivational orientation would be a better predictor than instrumental motivational orientation. The justification is based on the fact that learning language is different from learning Math or other subjects, in which one needs to be involved not only in cognitive and linguistic capacity, but also social, historical, emotional, and cultural aspect of the language being learned (Kramsch, 2001) or as what Gardner claims as taking 'behavioral characteristics of another language group' (Gardner, 2001).

Although this framework received a huge attention from the researchers and influenced the studies within this field (Dornyei, 1994), it is seen to be too dominant in which alternative approaches have not been seriously considered, and therefore, provides an 'unbalanced picture' of motivation research (Crookes and Smith, 1991, p.502). Only in the 1980s, some marking shifts emerged. Au (1988), through her work, revealed that integrative motivation lacks generalisity, and not empirically supported. Other studies revealed a contrast result where instrumental orientation predicts second language achievements as well or better than integrative orientation (Lukmani, 1972; Chihara and Oller, 1978; Oller, Hudson, & Liu, 1977). Gardner's framework is also seen as insufficient to generate practical guidelines in foreign language classroom since it focused more on general motivational components instead of foreign language context (Dornyei, 1994). Although the ideas of socio-psychological approach generated in Canada, some Canadian researchers also questioned the precise definition of integrative motivation in certain context (Clement et.al., 1994). Others view integrative motivation fits only in ESL context and not to be applied in EFL context, where learners have limited access to L2 communities (Dornyei, 1990).

Concerning these issues, Gardner and MacIntre (1991) propose a change in their views of integrative and instrumental motivational orientation, in which they state that motivation is dynamic and that the old representation of integrative and instrumental orientations are restricted and too static. They also highlight the difference between orientations and motivation. Orientations refer to reasons for learning a second language, and the motivation refers to efforts to learn the language. They conclude that both integrative and instrumental motivation can affect L2 learning, and that integrative and instrumental orientations will not necessarily influence the learning process (ibid, p.70). From this point onwards, sociocultural model widened the research agenda. Second language learners' motivation is seen in different light with the emergence of less static views on motivation. Motivation does not only reside in the individual but also in the interaction happens between individuals and the environment, hence, socio-cultural environment may affect learners' motivation in learning a new language (Hickey, 1997).

Subsequently, Dornyei (2005) proposed 'L2 Motivational Self System' as an attempt to understand L2 motivation in which he set out different perspectives to view integrative and instrumental motivation into three components; Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, and L2 Learning Experience. The notion 'ideal L2 self' refers to L2 specific aspect of 'ideal self' representing any attributes one would like to possess (Dornyei and Csizer, 2006, p.16). For example, ideal self in the context of mastery of L2 is someone who is competent in L2 which can also be described – using Gardner's term- as having 'integrative' disposition. In addition to integrative motivation, internalised instrumental motivation also belongs to this dimension. L2 ideal self is seen as a powerful driving force because of the desire to lessen the gap between the actual self to ideal self. Another self-dimension proposed in this framework is 'L2 Ought-to L2 Self' which refers to more extrinsic instrumental motivation. This notion correlates with Higgins' ought-to self that concerns with 'one ought to possess to avoid

negative outcomes and meet expectations', such as obligations and duties. The last self-dimension is called 'L2 Learning Experience' which regards to executive motives for immediate learning experience and environment, L2 learning experience relates to the impact of curriculum, teacher, peer group, and also one's past success (Dornyei and Csizer, 2006, p.29).

As mentioned above, there are some notable differences in the way Gardner and Dornyei define interactive and instrumental motivation. First, Dornyei equates what has been typically addressed as integrative motivation with the 'ideal L2 self', a term which is previously brought by Higgins (1987), instead of sticking with Gardner's view. Second, Dornyei also divides instrumental motivation into two types and puts it into different self-dimension; a) instrumental motives with promotion focus, such as learning English to get a higher salary, correlates with ideal L2 self, meanwhile, b) instrumental motives with prevention focus, such as learning English in order not to fail an exam, correlates with ought-to L2 self. By this interpretation, Dornyei elaborates the meaning of these notions without contradicting relevant empirical studies in the past years (Dornyei and Csizer, 2001, p.456).

### ***Relevance to today's globalised society***

There have been some major changes from the moment the notions of integrative and instrumental motivational orientations were born. The ideas to clearly identify language being associated with particular culture or communities seemed relevant as English was used only by particular communities and, therefore, the status of language and how much contact between the groups are considered as necessary (Clement and Kruidenier, 1983; Gardner, 2001).

However, given the context of today's globalised society, these two notions are likely irrelevant. Since the users of English has increased rapidly toward a probable two billion with less than fifth of the total using it as their first language, the uses and functions of English become unrelated to the speaker's nationality (Crystal, 1985). Warschauer (2000,

p.512) highlights that globalization has brought English to a new paradigm where it is shared amongst a group of non-native speakers and no longer dominated by British or Americans. With the emergence of Global/World Englishes, English is no longer seen as particular communities' language, instead as a medium for an international communication (Dornyei and Csizer, 2006). It is very likely that English learners may not associate it with particular geographical or cultural communities, but with spreading English as the main language in international business, world travel, technological innovation, and other aspects of globalization (Lamb, 2004).

For example, in a study conducted in Jordania, Kaylani (1996) found it difficult to find the integrative motivation among his average male students. Rather than associating English or American culture, they identified themselves as part of international English-speaking communities. Another study of Japanese university students by Yashima (2002) found similar results where the students are motivated to learn English since English is symbolised as the language of the world. A question raised; is the term integrative motivation untenable for World Englishes speakers?

Regarding this matter, Coetzee-van Rooy (2006) states that based on findings of empirical studies and review of theoretical criticisms, integrative motivation/ integrativeness is untenable for World Englishes' learners. Therefore, Dornyei and Csizer (2002) point out the need to re-examine the term 'integrativeness' in accordance with the uses and functions of today's globalised English by referring to their work of L2 Motivational Self System which they consider as more dynamic and are able to accommodate World Englishes' speakers.

### ***Empirical studies on integrative and instrumental motivation***

Gardner's and Lambert's integrative and instrumental motivation has become one of influential theoretical frameworks within L2 motivation research. The popularity of this framework may partly due to its 'simplicity', its

'intuitively convincing' character, and also the fact that these two notions did emerge in numerous empirical studies of L2 motivation (Dornyei, 1994, p.274). The initial research was conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1959) on 11 Canadians learning French in Montreal in search of the relationship between language aptitude, attitudinal and, motivational characteristics towards learners' achievement. The study indicates that learners' achievement corresponds with the willingness to communicate for being able to communicate better with French communities.

Several studies using this framework have been conducted afterwards in Canadian context (Gardner and Smytk, 1975; Smythe, Stengett and Feenstra, 1972; Feenstra and Gardner, 1968) and in American context (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Through these studies, Gardner found that students' success and failures in their second language achievement are related to whether they want to become part of French culture or not. Similar studies focusing on other languages were also conducted, such as Gardner and Santos (1970) who investigates the relationship between high school students' attitudes and achievement in English in the Philippines, and Anisfeld and Lambert (1961) who explores the relationship between attitudes and learners' achievement in learning Hebrew in Montreal. These studies demonstrate a correspondence between integrative and instrumental motivation and second language outcomes, even though the pattern resulted in Gardner and Lambert's first study does not always emerge.

These studies also include the development of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) which resulted in a revised model which is termed as socio-educational model (Gardner, 1978). This model contains five elements; (1) cultural beliefs from a social milieu, (2) motivation as a source of individual differences, (3) formal and informal learning situations, and (4) linguistic and nonlinguistic outcomes. Au (1988) offers five hypotheses towards this model. First, an integrative motive associates positively with L2 learners' achievement (the integrative motive

hyposthesis). Secondly, the development of integrative motive is influenced by learners' cultural beliefs as well as the degree of correspondence between integrative motive and learners' achievement (the cultural belief hypothesis). Thirdly, learners with integrative motives are successful as they are active learners (the active learners' hypothesis). Fourth, integrative motivation is seen as a cause, while L2 achievement is an effect (the causality hypothesis). And, lastly, integrative motivation and aptitude are independent aspects of L2 learning (the two-process hypothesis).

Three empirical studies conducted by Au (1988), Gardner (1985), and Oller (1981) to support these hypotheses found controversial results, mainly in the causality hypothesis and the integrative motive hyposthesis. Oller (1981) points out the unstable non-linear functions that differs among contexts, individuals, and learning tasks. Regarding this criticism, Gardner no longer emphasises the superiority of integrative motivation towards instrumental motivation or other types of motivation, but states that integratively motivated learners may be more successful than those who are not motivated (Gardner, 1988, p.106).

With the inconsistent findings of studies of integrative and instrumental motivation, Dornyei highlights the need to re-examine these two notions in the field of L2 motivation research. Dornyei conducted a large-scale study which involves 13,391 eighth graders, in which he proposed L2 Motivational Self System in conditions where any integration or identification to L2 communities is not desirable (Dornyei and Csizer, 2006). Dornyei also conducted a research on 200 Hungarian EFL learners which resulted in three types of motivation constructs among the learners; integrative motivation which is similar to Gardner's framework, linguistic self-confidence which correlates with previous study conducted by Clement et.al., (1994), and appraisal of the classroom environment –a novel finding- which supports the existence of pedagogical extension in motivation research (Dornyei and Csizer, 2008).

### Conclusion

It appears that each study in L2 motivation offers different result and each researcher offers different theoretical framework in which it portrays the nature of motivation as being dynamic and not restricted (Dörnyei, 2006). However, it can be argued that the notion of integrative and instrumental motivation contributes a huge influence on L2 motivation research over the past decades. With the development of L2 motivation research, it is expected that more practical guidelines in improving learners' motivation in classroom context will be uncovered.

### REFERENCES

- Technique Used to Translate Metaphors in Laskar Pelangi into the Rainbow Troops* (the 5th ELTLT International Conference Proceedings, October 2016). UNNES
- Anisfeld, M. and Lambert, W.E., 1961. Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63(3).
- Au, S.Y., 1988. A Critical Appraisal of Gardner's Social-Psychological Theory of Second-Language (L2) Learning. *Language learning*, 38(1).
- Chihara, I., & Oller, J. W. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning*, 28.
- Clement, R., Dörnyei, Z., Noels, K.A., 1994. Self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B.G., 1985. Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model. *Journal of language and Social Psychology*, 4(1).
- Coetzee-Van Rooy, S., 2006. Integrativeness: untenable for world Englishes learners?. *World Englishes*, 25(3-4).
- Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R.W., 1991. Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language learning*, 41(4).
- Crystal, D., 1985. How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today*, 1(01).
- Dörnyei, Z., 1994. Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The modern language journal*, 78(3).
- Dörnyei, Z., 1990. Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K., 2002. Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied linguistics*, 23(4).
- Dörnyei, Z. and Csizér, K., 2006. *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective* (Vol. 18). Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., and Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2.
- Feenstra, H.J. and Gardner, R.C. 1968. Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second-language acquisition. *Research Bulletin No. 10 1*, University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R.C. and MacIntyre, P.D., 1991. An instrumental motivation in language study. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 13(01).
- Gardner, R., 2001. Language learning motivation: the student, the teacher and the researcher. Key-note Address to the Texas Foreign Language Education Conference, University of Texas, Austin.
- Gardner, R.C., and Smythe, P.C. 1975. Second language acquisition: A social psychological approach. *Research Bulletin No. 332*, University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E., 1972. Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning.
- Gardner, R.C. and Smythe, P.C., 1975. Motivation and second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(3).
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E., 1959.

- Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie*, 13(4).
- Ghanea, M. ; Pisheh, H. ; Ghanea, M., 2011. 'The Relationship between Learners-Motivation (Integrative and Instrumental) and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL Learners', *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Science Index* 59, *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 5(11).
- Gardner, R.C. and Santos, E.H., 1970. *Motivational variables in second-language acquisition: A Philippine investigation*. Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario.
- Hickey, D.T., 1997. Motivation and contemporary socio-constructivist instructional perspectives. *Educational Psychologist*, 32.
- Higgins, E.T., 1987. Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological review*, 94(3).
- Kaylani, C.T. (1996). *The influence of gender and motivation on the language learning strategy use of successful and unsuccessful English language learners in Jordan*. Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/58318636?accountid=10382>.
- Kramsch, C., 2001. Beyond the second vs foreign language dichotomy: The subjective dimensions of language learning. Paper presented at the conference on Unity and Diversity in Language Use, University of Reading.
- Lamb, M., 2004. Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System*, 32(1).
- Lambert, W.E., 1973. Culture and language as factors in learning and education.
- Lukmani, M., 1972. Motivation to learn a second language and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 7.
- Oller, J.W., 1981. Research on the measurement of affective variables: Some remaining questions. *New dimensions in second language acquisition research*.
- Oller, J.W., Hudson, A.J. and Liu, P.F., 1977. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. *Language learning*, 27(1).
- Yashima, T., 2002. Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1).
- Smythe, P.C., Stennett, R.G., and Feenstra, HJ. 1972. Attitude, aptitude and type of instructional program in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 4.
- Warschauer, M., 2000. The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*, 34(3).