2013-04-26

Facilitating Language Learner Motivation: Teacher Motivational Practice and Teacher Motivational Training

Shelby Werner Thayne
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Linguistics Commons

Facilitating Language Learner Motivation: Teacher Motivational Practice

and Teacher Motivational Training

Shelby Werner Thayne

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Neil J Anderson, Chair
Dan P. Dewey
Jennifer Bown

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Brigham Young University

April 2013

ABSTRACT

Facilitating Language Learner Motivation: Teacher Motivational Practice
and Teacher Motivational Training

Shelby Werner Thayne
Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU
Master of Arts

This study investigated the connection between teacher use of motivational strategies and observable learner motivated behavior in an adult Intensive English Program (IEP) in the United States. The question of whether teachers would find value in being specifically trained in the use of motivational strategies as part of teacher educations programs was examined. Eight teachers and 117 students were observed over the course of 24 classes using a classroom observation instrument, the motivation orientation of language teaching (MOLT), originally developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) and modified by the current researchers. The MOLT observation scheme allowed for real-time coding of observable learner motivated behaviors and teacher motivational behaviors based on Dörnyei's (2001) motivational strategy framework for foreign language classrooms. Postlesson teacher evaluations completed by both the observer and the teacher formed part of the measure of teacher motivational practice. Additionally, teachers attended up to two training sessions, responded to postlesson interview questions and completed a feedback survey. The results validate the previous findings that teacher motivational practice is strongly related to learner motivated behavior. Additionally, results show that teachers find value in motivational strategy training.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Table of Contents

Index of Tables

Introduction

Motivation is often used to explain the success or failure of human endeavors, with language learning being no exception. Dörnyei (2005) even claims that research shows that "motivational factors can override the aptitude effect" in language learning (p. 65). Language teachers frequently describe their students along a continuum of motivated to unmotivated, using these characteristics to explain successful and unsuccessful students. This conceptualization highlights the underlying assumption that motivated students achieve more than unmotivated students. Furthermore, as language teachers have the responsibility to facilitate learner achievement teachers should presumably be on the front lines of addressing learner motivation.

Literature Review

Establishing a Teacher-Friendly Research Agenda

Beginning in the 1990s scholars began to push for a greater focus on the pedagogical application of language motivation research (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei 1994; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Crookes and Schmidt (1991) criticized the dominant social psychological model established by Gardner and colleagues (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985) while also advocating that fellow researchers broaden their perspectives on language motivation to include insights from research in education. They implied that research and theory from such fields as education may better address the pragmatic concerns of language teachers, and would therefore provide more pedagogical applications than previous motivation research in second language acquisition (SLA). Oxford and Shearin (1994) followed this with a discussion about the implications of different theories from educational and mainstream psychology that they hoped would be the "start of an expanded model that enhances and enlarges the current L2 learning motivation theory in useful ways" (p. 23). They also

brought motivational ideas to the teacher by describing several practical applications for teachers to consider when addressing learners' motivation.

Dörnyei (1994) added to the discussion by calling for a greater focus on the pedagogical implications that L2 motivational research could and should provide. Specifically, he asserted that the previous research agenda for L2 motivation had not focused enough on how to motivate learners. He suggested that researchers approach motivation as a set of techniques that teachers could use to facilitate learner motivation. Using a motivational framework comprised of language, learner, and learning situation levels, Dörnyei outlined 30 potential strategies that educators could employ to facilitate their students' language learning motivation. Later discussions called for empirical research to validate the use of such techniques and to improve the validity of previously reported investigations (see Gardner & Tremblay, 1994).

Initial empirical research on motivational strategies was pioneered by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) in a Hungarian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context and was followed up by Cheng & Dörnyei (2007) in Taiwan, Alrabai (2011) in Saudi Arabia, Ruesch, Bown, and Dewey (2012) in the United States, and Guilloteaux (2013) in South Korea. These studies generally followed the same methodological framework which included using surveys to explore the perceived importance language teachers attach to certain motivational strategies as well as their self-reported use of the same strategies. Combined, these studies have helped to move the teacher-friendly research agenda forward by (a) providing empirical evidence supporting the importance and use of motivational strategies, (b) demonstrating that some strategies are perceived similarly across different cultural contexts, (c) demonstrating that some strategies are perceived differently across different cultural contexts, and (d) indicating that many motivational strategies are underutilized compared to their perceived importance (see Alrabai, 2011; Cheng &

Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Guilloteaux, 2013; Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012).

These studies have provided critical evidence for the growing foundation of empirical, teacher-friendly research on language learning motivation; however, they have been limited in their reliance solely on self-report data. For this reason, scholars began searching for ways to research actual classroom practice.

Classroom-Oriented Language Learning Motivation Research

With the growing emphasis on developing the teacher-friendly research agenda, language learning motivation literature was in need of actual classroom data. In order to improve upon the previous self-report survey data, Guilloteaux & Dörnyei (2008) designed and published an innovative, classroom-oriented study on the relationship between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior in a Korean EFL context. The researchers developed and employed an observation scheme specifically for the purpose of coding real-time teacher and learner motivated behaviors throughout a given lesson. They used this scheme to observe 27 Korean teachers of 1,381 EFL junior high students in a variety of institutional contexts Two additional instruments, a student motivational state questionnaire, and a postlesson teacher evaluation scale were used to corroborate the observational data. The student motivational state questionnaire scores were shown to have a moderate significant correlation ($r = .31$) with teacher motivational practice, suggesting that teacher practice affects general student motivational dispositions. The postlesson teacher evaluation ratings correlated with the teacher motivational practices scores and were thus combined into one index for teacher motivational practice which showed a significant correlation ($r = .60$) with learner motivated behavior. Overall, these results confirmed that what teachers do in terms of their motivational practice does affect their learners'

situation-specific motivation. Ultimately, this study established a promising direction for future studies on language learning motivation that is both classroom-oriented and teacher-friendly.

In a response to Guilloteaux & Dörnyei (2008), Ellis (2009) praised the innovation of the study while also expressing a few concerns. First, he questioned some of the terminology and the choice of the three specific learner motivated behaviors. Additionally, he highlighted an underlying assumption driving motivation research; namely, that teachers' motivational practices can influence learner motivated behavior and therefore indirectly influence L2 learning. He also called for a more robust theoretical and empirical basis justifying this assumption and specifying "which aspects of students' motivated behavior are predictive of L2 learning" (p. 108). Guilloteaux & Dörnyei (2009) acknowledged the usefulness of Ellis' terminological suggestions, and explained their choice of the three learner motivated behaviors, while agreeing that more research is necessary to address the underlying assumptions that specific aspects of learner motivated behavior are predictive of language learning success.

Thus far, one follow-up partial replication study to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) has been published. Papi and Abdollahzadeh (2012) investigated the relationship between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behaviors using the same observational methodology as Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), but this time in an Iranian all-male EFL context. Additionally, they connected their investigation to a more recent model of motivation referred to as the L2 Motivational Self-System (see Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). Results of this study also showed a significant correlation ($r = .72$) between the two measures of teacher motivational practices and learner motivated behaviors. The fact that these investigations were carried out in very different cultural contexts, and that both showed significant correlations, helped to support the generalizability of these findings. Future research in new contexts is needed to validate these

findings in additional contexts, such as adult ESL contexts, which the present study is designed to accomplish.

Developing Teacher Motivational Practice

Another result of the growing focus in SLA research on learner motivation was updated models conceptualizing the construct. Dörnyei & Ottó (1998) proposed a process-oriented model of motivation that accounted for temporal shifts in learner motivation. The major innovation with this and similar models was that they represented motivation as a dynamic, or changing, element of the learning process. Additionally, process-oriented models suggest that motivation, in being susceptible to change, may also be susceptible to deliberate interventions. In other words, teachers may be able to intervene in the degree of their students' motivation through the deliberate use of motivational strategies, where motivational strategies refer to "instructional interventions applied by the teacher to elicit and stimulate student motivation" (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008, p. 57).

In 2001, Dörnyei published a book for language educators focusing on what motivational strategies are, how they fit into the realities of the classroom, and how to implement them. In it, he expanded upon his process-oriented model to create a more comprehensive framework for conceptualizing motivation in the language classroom. This framework for motivational teaching practice consisted of four parts representing different phases of the motivational process: (1) creating the basic motivational conditions, (2) generating initial motivation, (3) maintaining and protecting motivation, and (4) encouraging positive retrospective evaluation. Using this framework as a foundation, he then enumerated 35 macrostrategies with corresponding sub-strategies for a total of 102 specific motivational strategies that educators could apply to facilitate learner motivation. Thus, Dörnyei encouraged teachers to incorporate motivation into their

normal teaching practices through deliberately employing specific motivational strategies to address all four components of the framework from establishing a safe learning environment to initiating, sustaining, and reflecting on learning activities.

Despite the progress of the teacher-friendly research agenda in developing ways for teachers to access and apply L2 motivation research, there is limited intentional support for language teachers in their motivational pursuits. Specifically, as Dörnyei (2001) has pointed out, motivation is not included in teacher training programs because

> by-and-large, promoting learner motivation is nobody's responsibility. Teachers are supposed to teach the curriculum rather than motivate learners, and the fact that the former cannot happen without the latter is often ignored. For example, I am not aware of a single L2 teacher training programme worldwide in which the development of skills in motivating learners would be a key component of the curriculum. (p. 27)

Since the publication of this statement, few things appear to have changed. However, two recent studies have attempted to address the issue of incorporating motivation into teacher training as part of research studies. First, Kubanyiova (2006) worked with eight EFL teachers in Slovakia teaching in different programs to try to improve their motivational teaching practices. She based her training on Dörnyei's (2001) framework, along with research from group dynamics and educational psychology. Unfortunately, she found that despite initial enthusiasm for the training, no teachers made significant changes in their teaching practices as a result. Based on interviews with teachers, she suggested that teachers' motivations for teaching and professional development along with institution-wide support for motivational training were two underlying factors influencing teachers' resistance to change.

More recently, an innovative study was carried out by Moskovsky, Alrabai, Paolini and Ratcheva (2013) in Saudi Arabia. This quasi-experimental design involved two groups of teachers, one of which received a training packet describing 10 motivational strategies with instructions for how to implement them the classroom. Motivation pre- and post-tests administered to the students showed significant differences in change in motivational levels between students whose teachers incorporated motivational strategies and those whose teachers did not. The authors conclude that their results "leave little doubt that the teachers' enhanced motivational behaviors in the experimental group were responsible for a significant increase in learner motivation along a range of motivational dimensions at" (p. 55). Although minimal, the teacher training incorporated into this study had a significant impact on learner motivation, further highlighting the importance of specific training in this area.

Although these two studies indicate positive steps forward, more research is necessary to truly take up Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2008) call to develop "a theoretically sound and empirically tested teacher education model that focuses on the teacher's motivational practice" (p. 73). For this reason, the current study sought to not only replicate the observational design of the original study, but also to investigate the benefit of including motivational training as a deliberate component of teacher education.

Research Context and Questions

Like Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), this study sought to examine the reality of classroom motivation through classroom observations. We employed the same observation scheme which was developed for the original study, but with some modifications which will be described later. As in the original study, a postlesson teacher evaluation was completed for supplementary data.

Additionally, several differences exist between our study and the original study, which we hope will serve to expand upon the current knowledge and applicability of motivation research for language teachers. First, whereas Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) completed their study in a Korean EFL junior high context and Papi and Abdollahzadeh (2012) completed their study in an Iranian EFL all-male junior high context, this study was carried out in a North American Intensive English Program associated with a large university. Participating students represented a wide variety of cultural backgrounds and proficiency levels, and were all college age and older. This new context will help generalize the results to broader learning situations.

Second, as Ellis (2009) suggested, we also analyzed the effect of teacher motivational practice on learner motivated behaviors as both an overall score including each of the three components of learner motivated behavior and for each component individually. Considering these components analytically provides a more nuanced understanding of the role that teacher motivational practice plays in learner motivated behavior.

Third, and unique to the current study, we sought to investigate the value of incorporating motivation as a component of in-service language teacher training. This was done by providing the eight participating teachers with two training sessions covering Dörnyei's (2001) model of motivational teaching practice and extensive list of motivational strategies. In order to address issues of motivational training, each teacher was observed three times throughout one semester and each provided feedback on their experience through postlesson self-evaluations and a final feedback survey.

The research questions guiding this study are the following:

1. How does the teacher's motivational teaching practice affect the students' classroom motivation in terms of the overall level of their alertness, participation, and volunteering?

2. What is the relationship between teachers' motivational practice and each separate measure of the L2 motivated behavior—namely, alertness, participation, and volunteering?

3. Would teachers find value in receiving specific training in the use of motivational strategies as part of an in-service teacher education program?

Methodology

Participating Program, Students, and Teachers

This investigation was carried out at the English Language Center (ELC) at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, USA. The ELC is an Intensive English Program in which students take four 65-minute skills-based classes four days a week in fourteen-week semesters. Typical enrollment for a given semester is 230 students who are assigned to one of 17 sections across eight levels with an average of 13.5 students per class. Students study in one of two tracks—the Foundations track for lower proficiency students, and the Academic track for higher proficiency students—with three levels per track and two additional preparation levels for a total of eight proficiency levels. The classes taught correspond to the following skills: Reading (Rdg), Writing (Wrt), Grammar (Grm) and Listening and Speaking (L/S). Teachers have one of three employment statuses— part-time graduate student teachers (GS), part-time non-student teachers (PT), and full-time ELC staff (FT). They teach between one and three classes per semester. During the semester that this study was carried out 43 teachers (10 male and 33 female) were teaching 68 classes.

In recruiting participants, the primary objective was to obtain a balanced sample of teachers in terms of class proficiency level, class skill area, and employment status; the time at which the class was taught and teacher gender were also considered. Ultimately, eight teachers (5

female and 3 male) were recruited via email and agreed to participate. Their years of teaching

experience ranged from 0.5 to 13 (M = 5.64). Two teachers taught at each of four levels in the

program. The levels correspond approximately to proficiency levels for the Oral Proficiency

Interview (OPI) ratings determined by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign

Languages (ACTFL). Level three represents a novice high (NH) level, level four an intermediate

low (IL) level, level six an intermediate mid (IM) level, and level seven an intermediate high

(IH) level (Cox & Davies, 2012). While five of the teachers were teaching two sections of the

same class, only one section being observed for the purposes of this study. Classes in the

program were held at 8:15am, 9:30am, 12:15pm or 1:30pm; however, no classes were observed

at 1:30pm due to scheduling constraints. Table 1 displays the distribution of characteristics for

the eight participating teachers and associated classes.

Table 1

Participating Teacher and Class Demographics for Main Study

	Foundations Track				Academic Track			
Level	3 (NH)		4 (IL)		6 (IM)		7 (IH)	
Skill area	Wrt	Rdg	Grm	L/S	Wrt	L/S	Rdg	Grm
Employment	FT	PT	PT	GS	GS	GS	FT	PT
Gender	F	M	F	M	F	F	F	M
Time[c]	12:15	8:15	9:30	9:30	12:15	8:15	8:15	12:15
Students	15	16	15	16	15	16	12	11

Note. Wrt = writing; Rdg = reading; Grm = grammar; L/S = listening and speaking; FT = full-time;
PT = part-time non-student; GS = part-time graduate student.

During the academic term when the observations took place, 242 students were enrolled

in 17 different sections in the program. Of the total student enrollment, 117 (50 male and 67

female) were students in the eight sections observed for this study. Their ages ranged from 17 to

62 (*M* = 24.9) and they spoke the following 15 native languages (L1): Arabic (1), Armenian (1),

Chinese (20), French (2), Italian (1), Japanese (5), Korean (15), Portuguese (15), Quechua (1), Russian (3), Spanish (48), Swedish (1), Turkish (1), Ukrainian (1), and Urdu (1).

Instruments

Four instruments were used to investigate teacher motivational practice, learner motivated behavior, and teacher training: (a) the MOLT observation scheme, (b) a postlesson teacher evaluation, (c) a postlesson teacher interview and (d) a teacher survey on motivational training. Each will be discussed briefly.

The MOLT classroom observation scheme and modifications. The Motivation Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) observation scheme developed by Guilloteaux & Dörnyei (2008) utilized two important frameworks: Dörnyei's (2001) process-oriented model of motivational teacher practice and Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) communicative orientation of language teaching (COLT) classroom observation scheme. In order to record the necessary information during an observation, the original MOLT consisted of two sections, one for learner motivated behavior subdivided into three categories (attention, engagement, and volunteering), and one for teacher motivated practice subdivided into four areas (encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation, activity design, participation structure, and teacher discourse) and 25 sub-categories (for a full description of the original MOLT see Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008).

Following Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), learner motivated behavior and teacher motivational practices were recorded every sixty seconds during the observation by marking the box that corresponded to that minute of class and that motivational behavior or practice. Learner motivated behavior was recorded based on the percentage of students showing a particular behavior. Thus, in a given minute of class, if two-thirds or more of the students were showing general attending behavior, such as looking at the speaker and not being disruptive or inattentive,

then the box for *attentive* was marked for that minute. If two-thirds or more of the students were actively participating in an activity, then the box for *engagement* was marked, and if one-third or more of the students were volunteering answers or comments to class discussions without the teacher coaxing them, then the box for *eager volunteering* was marked. Teacher motivational behaviors included on the MOLT were based on Dörnyei's (2001) comprehensive model of motivational teaching practice described previously. Coding for both sections followed Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) primary coding convention in which events were recorded only when they took up the majority of the minute time frame. This was true for all categories except for activity design because many motivational practices can be built into a single activity. In contrast, a teacher cannot simultaneously explain the utility of an activity and engage the students in social chat unrelated to the lesson.

The present study modified the original MOLT in two ways (see Appendix A). First, the label *attention* for learner motivated behavior was replaced by the more appropriate label *alertness* following concerns expressed by Ellis' (2009) and the response by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2009). Second, fourteen categories were added to the teacher motivational practice section, based on the researchers' own piloting and use of the MOLT. These categories were added by Anderson based on his experience using the instrument as part of a research study in Guatemala, in which he found many motivational practices exhibited by teachers but with no place to record them within the original MOLT's categories (personal communication, April 1, 2012). The added categories are presented in Table 2. Recording of observations was carried out identically to the original study.

Table 2

Fourteen Added Observational Variables of Teachers' Motivational Practices

Variables	Description
Achievement feedback	Attributing a student's or class' success or failure to achievement (e.g. You did really well on this assignment)
Effort Feedback	Attributing a student's or class' success or failure to effort (e.g. You must have studied hard for that quiz to do so well.)
Ability Feedback	Attributing a student's or class' success or failure to natural ability (e.g. I can tell you are smart because of how well you did on our quiz.)
Easy tasks for successful learning experience	Providing learners with an easy task with the purpose of giving them an opportunity to experience success.
Vary the normal routine and/or channel of communication	Using a technique, activity or material that is different from what is typical in the classroom routine.
Begins the lesson with a warm-up/review activity	Beginning the class with a review of previously covered material or a warm-up activity to engage the students initially.
Individual work	The students are working individually to complete a task (simultaneously or presenting to the whole class).
Using humor as part of the lesson	Using humorous materials or examples, and telling jokes as part of the lesson.
Teacher models enthusiasm for teaching, relationships	The teacher clearly identifies personal reasons for being invested in the topic or language learning and shares those reasons with students. The teacher showing students that she values L2 learning as a meaningful experience which produces satisfaction and enriches her life (see Dörnyei, 2001, pp. 31-40).
Promoting individual and class goals, motivating strategies	Pointing out the class goals or reminding students of their individual goals for the class or language learning generally. Instructing on and encouraging students to regulate their motivation by using self-motivating learner strategies including commitment control strategies, metacognitive control strategies, satiation control strategies, emotion control strategies, and environmental control strategies (see Dörnyei, 2001, pp. 109-116)
Supportive/pleasant atmosphere free from embarrassment	Establishing a norm of tolerance and making clear to learners that mistakes are a natural part of learning. Encouraging learners to take risks by making it apparent that they will not be embarrassed or criticized if they make a mistake (see Dörnyei, 2001, pp. 40-42)
Explicit strategy instruction	Explicitly instructing on learning or skill strategies students can and should use to accomplish language tasks (e.g., graphic organizers as a tool for improving reading comprehension).
Importance of communication over grammar	Emphasizing the importance of communication above grammar for a particular task or for language communication generally.
Teacher monitoring	Walking around and monitoring group, pair, or individual work.

Postlesson teacher evaluation. To improve reliability of the measure of teacher motivational practice by providing a holistic evaluation of teacher motivational practice, a postlesson teacher evaluation was also used (see Appendix B). The evaluation was developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) and partially based off of Gardner's (1985) *attitudes toward the L2 teacher scale*. It included nine motivation-specific descriptors such as L2 competence, clarity of instructions, level of enthusiasm, and degree of creativity and risk-taking, which were rated by both the observer and the teacher on a scale of 1 (*incompetent*) to 6 (*competent*) for each observation. In the original study, only the observer completed these evaluations. In the present study, in addition to observer ratings, teachers also self-evaluated themselves after each observation. This provided the researchers with additional information about teachers' perceptions of their own motivational teaching practices, which contributed to further discussions on the value of teacher training.

Postlesson teacher interview questions. Four postlesson teacher interview questions (see Appendix C) were developed specifically for the present study as a way to investigate teacher beliefs about their own motivational teaching practice. Teachers responded to these questions either orally or in writing after each observation. The questions investigated the overall impression the teacher had of the class, how well the teacher followed his or her plan for motivational moments, how well the teacher perceived that the planned motivational moments worked, and what, if anything, the teacher would change in terms of motivational practice if there were a chance to repeat the lesson. Responses were either recorded by the researcher or written by the teachers themselves.

Teacher feedback survey. In order to more comprehensively investigate the importance and viability of incorporating training on motivation into in-service teacher training, we designed

a survey (see Appendix D) for teachers to provide feedback about their experience with motivational teaching during their participation in the study. Questions generally related to the teacher's use of motivational strategies during the semester in which the observations took place, the teacher's interest in receiving additional training on motivation, how beneficial teachers believed the training to be and why, and suggestions the teachers would have for integrating motivational training into teacher training for the entire program.

Teacher Training

In order to understand how valuable in-service teacher training on language learning motivation is, teacher training was an integral component of the research design. Teachers were invited to attend two teacher training sessions led by the primary researcher, one prior to any observations and one between the second and third observations. Because of scheduling conflicts not every teacher was able to attend both trainings. For the first training, four teachers attended the group session, and the remaining teachers met with the primary investigator individually to cover the training material. The second session was attended by four teachers, and no individual meetings were held for the remaining four. The first training introduced Dörnyei's (2001) model of motivational teaching practice and list of 102 motivational strategies. We asked the participating teachers to plan four motivational strategies into each 65-minute lessons, preferably one from each of the four sections of Dörnyei's model. We encouraged teachers to think of these as *motivational moments*, or deliberate moments in the classroom no more than 60-seconds long in which they consciously try to facilitate learner motivation using a specific strategy. They were asked to provide a lesson plan to the observer prior to each observation with motivational moments included. Such pre-planning was intended to help encourage teachers to really try

implementing motivational moments and to allow for experiences to reflect upon in the follow-up interviews after each observation.

The second motivational teacher training occurred between the second and third observations. It involved a brief review of motivational strategies and discussions about teachers' experiences, concerns, and questions. The main component of this training was role play situations for the teachers to practice and to provide feedback to one another.

Procedures

The primary researcher completed ten observations at the ELC during the Summer 2012 semester in order to become familiar with the intensive nature of coding using the MOLT observation scheme. During this time the primary researcher refined a description of each category on the modified MOLT with examples to use as a reference to increase the reliability of the coding. Six proficiency levels and all skill areas were observed to provide a strong sample of observed teachers.

For the main study, the primary researcher conducted each of the 24 observations. Unique to the present study, and in order to address the issue of teacher training, each of the eight teachers were observed three times, in contrast to the 40 classes observed once in the Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) study. These observations took place between September and November of 2012, during regular ELC classes. The number of class days between observations one and two ranged from 10 to 15 ($M = 13.4$) and between observations two and three from 10 to 14 ($M = 12.6$). The differences in class days between observations were the result of scheduling issues with different classes, but the guiding principle followed was to keep the length of time between observations approximately the same for all teachers and between each observation.

Prior to each observation, the participating teachers provided the primary researcher with a copy of their lesson plans with motivational moments highlighted. However, for several observations, teachers did not complete this component of the training because of limited schedules or timing. Following each observation, the primary investigator rated each teacher using the postlesson teacher evaluation, without the knowledge of the teacher. This was done in order to prevent the teachers from feeling specifically judged by the observer, which was particularly important because the observer returned multiple times. Each teacher also self-evaluated his or her own teaching of the lesson using the same instrument after the observation. After the teacher completed the self-evaluation, the researcher completed the postlesson teacher interview in order to understand the teacher's use of motivational strategies and to clarify any classroom events if necessary. In four instances, a teacher's schedule did not allow for an interview directly after class so they answered the interview questions on their own time and returned the sheet to the primary researcher. After all of the 24 observations were completed, the participating teachers were then asked to complete the Teacher Feedback Survey online.

Data Analysis

In order to answer the proposed research questions, all of the data were organized first at the observation level and second at the teacher level. For those measures that were the same between Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) and the current study (i.e., MOLT observational data and observer postlesson teacher evaluations), the analysis followed the procedures explained in the original study. For those methods and measures which were unique to this study (i.e., three observations for each teacher, teacher self-ratings on teaching performance, the use of postlesson teacher interview questions, teacher training sessions, and a teacher feedback survey) analyses were conducted which best answered the research questions.

The MOLT observational data was combined with results from the nine item postlesson teacher evaluations to create three indices—two related to teacher motivational practice and one related to learner motivated behavior. Each index was first calculated separately for each observation, for a total of three indices for each observation. One observation was missing the postlesson teacher evaluation observer ratings, and thus was excluded from the correlational analyses, meaning there were 23 observation data points and 8 teacher data points used throughout the analyses. Next, the scores for each of the eight teachers' three observations were summed and averaged and identical analyses were completed at the teacher level for the eight teachers. Finally, correlational analyses were used to determine the strength of the relationship between measures of teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behaviors. Observation and teacher level results are presented side-by-side for comparison throughout this paper.

Investigation of the value of teacher training on motivational strategies was aided by the postlesson teacher evaluations, interview questions, and feedback survey. A comparison of the observer and teacher postlesson evaluations was done with descriptive and correlational statistics. Responses to interview questions and the feedback survey were analyzed for patterns or noteworthy insights relating to the value teachers perceived there to be in the two teacher trainings and using motivational moments in their teaching. When possible, such as for Likert-scale items on the feedback survey, descriptive statistics were also calculated in order to illustrate relevant trends regarding the final research question.

Results and Discussion

Teacher Motivational Practice Indices

The two teacher motivational practice indices were calculated using observational data from the MOLT combined with data from the postlesson teacher evaluation ratings. The process

of calculating these indices and the results received are explained here according to the respective instruments.

MOLT observational data. The first step in analyzing the data was to record the observational data from the MOLT. This was done by adding up the tally marks indicating the number of minutes each motivational behavior or activity occurred during each lesson. Because some classes began or ended early or late, these frequencies were divided by the actual number of minutes of each class and then multiplied by 100 in order to establish comparable frequencies (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991). These were the then entered into an SPSS file for analysis. Table 3 shows the frequency data for each teacher-related motivational behavior, standardized for a 65-minute class. Two variables—classroom applause and promoting integrative values—did not occur during the observations. While classroom applause did occur a few times, it was never for more than a few seconds, and thus was not recorded on the MOLT.

For each observation, the average frequency for each teacher motivational behavior was calculated, and then these averages were summed to obtain a composite score, for a total of 24 composite scores representing observed teacher motivational behavior. These scores were then converted to standardized z-scores and were later combined with standardized z-scores representing the observer and teacher postlesson teacher evaluation ratings.

Table 3

Observed Frequencies for MOLT Variables Organized by Frequency

Variable	Range (mins)*	Mean	Variable	Range (mins)*	Mean
Learner Motivated Behaviors			*Teacher Motivational Practices (continued from column 1)*		
Alertness**	11.35 - 50.00	33.63	Stating communicative purpose/utility of activity	0 - 7.11	1.32
Engagement**	0 - 33.48	16.22	Signposting	0 - 4.26	0.88
Volunteering**	0 - 4.00	0.57	Supportive/pleasant atmosphere	0 - 7.88	0.83
Teacher Motivational Practices			Easy tasks for successful learning experience	0 - 8.25	0.79
Individual work	0 - 44.32	13.41	Referential questions	0 – 6.50	.63
Intellectual challenge	0 - 42.35	10.57	Team competition	0 – 14.00	.61
Teacher monitoring	0 - 39.39	10.28	Effective praise	0 - 5.00	0.54
Begins the lesson with a warm-up/review activity	0 - 21.31	8.39	Promoting individual and class goals, motivating strategies	0 - 6.19	0.53
Group work	0 - 28.00	8.18	Explicit strategy instruction	0 - 7.22	0.53
Scaffolding	0 - 24.00	8.16	Achievement feedback	0 - 7.46	0.5
Personalization	0 - 27.70	7.89	Teacher model enthusiasm for teaching	0 - 3.05	0.4
Vary the normal routine and/or channel of communication	0 - 25.61	6.13	Promoting autonomy	0 - 1.97	0.35
Arousing curiosity or attention	0.98 - 11.00	4.99	Using humor as part of the lesson	0 - 2.03	0.27
Tangible task product	0 - 33.48	4.83	Promoting cooperation	0 - 2.00	0.26
Individual competition	0 - 30.26	4.45	Process feedback session	0 - 2.17	0.18
Creative/interesting/fantasy element	0 - 17.27	4.44	Ability feedback	0 - 2.00	0.17
Pair work	0 - 28.56	3.06	Promoting instrumental values	0 - 1.97	0.13
Elicitation of self/peer correction session	0 - 19.70	2.41	Effort feedback	0 - 2.00	0.09
Establishing relevance	0 - 19.30	2.4	Importance of communication over grammar	0 - 1.00	0.04
Neutral feedback session	0 - 7.22	2.16	Class applause	0 - 0	0
Tangible reward	0 - 32.50	2.02	Promoting integrative values	0 - 0	0
Social chat (unrelated to the lesson)	0 - 12.33	1.47	Promoting integrative values	0 - 0	0

* Ranges were adjusted for a standard lesson length of 65 minutes; variations in start and end time resulted in values that are not always whole numbers.

Postlesson teacher evaluations. In the previous two studies, the nine-item postlesson teacher evaluations were rated only by the observer. However, in this study, both the observer and teacher provided postlesson ratings on teacher performance. The addition of teacher self-evaluations provided a valuable opportunity to investigate how well teachers' beliefs about their classroom performance correspond with observational data. In order to account for this, the following analyses were computed separately for both sets of ratings. First, ratings for each item for each observation were entered into a spreadsheet for analysis. Table 4 shows that the ranges and averages for both rating sets were nearly identical. In order to confirm that the nine items were related to the same construct, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated. Both sets of data showed high internal consistency, with coefficients of .87 for observer ratings and .84 for the teacher self-ratings based on 24 ratings each. At the teacher level the Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .89 and .84 respectively, based on eight ratings each. Next, mean scores of ratings for each observation were computed, and a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for the two sets—observer and teacher—of means. Interestingly, no significant correlation was found between the two, indicating that while they were reliable independently they were not related in a way that would permit merging the two sets. Closer inspection of the data points showed that while some teachers underestimated their performance relative to the observational data, others overestimated their performance. Moreover, while some teachers consistently under- or overestimated their performance, others varied depending on the observation. Finally, standardized z-scores were determined, so that these data could be combined with the MOLT observational data.

Table 4

Observer and Teacher Ratings for Postlesson Teacher Evaluations

Motivational teaching qualities	Observer Ratings			Teacher Self Ratings		
	Range	M	SD	Range	M	SD
Linguistically competent	4 – 6	4.77	.53	3 – 6	5.09	.90
Focused/Task-oriented	2 – 6	4.78	.90	2 – 6	4.78	1.09
Increases expectancy of success	3 – 6	4.74	.96	2 – 6	4.65	.93
Clear instructions	2 – 6	4.39	1.16	2 – 6	4.41	1.18
Kind and caring	4 – 6	5.35	.78	3 – 6	5.39	.78
Radiates enthusiasm	4 – 6	4.87	.76	3 – 6	5.09	.85
Humorous/light-hearted	2 – 6	4.52	.90	3 – 6	4.96	.88
Encouraging	3 – 6	5.26	.92	3 – 6	5.17	.89
Creative/Takes risks	2 – 6	4.91	.87	2 – 6	4.35	1.11
Overall teacher evaluation score	3.56 –5.78	4.84	.60	3.56 – 5.78	4.88	.63

Before combining the observational and postlesson data, a Pearson product-moment correlation was run between the MOLT teacher-related observational data and the postlesson teacher evaluation ratings in order to determine if the measures were related. Table 5 shows that a significant positive correlation was found between observed teacher motivational behavior and the observer ratings at the observation level, but not with the teacher ratings, nor for either rating at the teacher level. It should be remembered that with only eight data points at the teacher level, there simply may not be enough data to show significant correlations. Ultimately, we determined that the observer ratings at the observation level could safely be combined with the observational data to form the *teacher motivational practice (TMP) – observer* index. Despite the non-significant correlation with the teacher self-ratings and on the teacher level, composite scores were still computed and analyses completed to further elucidate the discrepancies between the two sets of ratings and the two levels.

Table 5

Correlations between Postlesson Observer and Teacher Ratings and MOLT Teacher-Related Observational Data at the Observation and Teacher Levels

	Observation Level[a]		Teacher Level[b]	
	Observer Ratings	Teacher Self-Ratings	Observer Ratings	Teacher Self-Ratings
MOLT Teacher Data	.467*	.088	.668	-.310

[a]Number of classes = 23. [b]Number of teachers = 8.
*$p < .05$, two-tailed.

Learner Motivated Behavior Index

In order to calculate an index of learner motivated behavior, frequencies of alertness, participation, and volunteering measured on the MOLT were totaled and averaged. This average served as the *learner motivated behavior (LMB)* index for each observation. Because each of the three variables was thought to measure the same construct, namely learner motivated behavior, a strong relationship was expected between them. Surprisingly, as Table 6 indicates, a Pearson product-moment correlation did not confirm this expectation at either the observation or teacher level. However, both alertness and participation correlated significantly with the overall LMB index at the observation level, providing evidence for the validity of the measurement in this context.

The absence of significant correlations at the teacher level is likely explained by two things. First, at the teacher level there were only eight data points, compared with 24 at the observation level. Second, aggregating the data at the teacher level may have removed some of the situational nuances of a given class. For example, one teacher may have been more motivational during one observation and less motivational during the next. In this case, the general motivational disposition of students may have moderated the effect that teacher motivational practice had on any one lesson. Consider that, as Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008)

reported, student self-reported motivation also accounted for some of the variance between teacher motivational practice and learner motivation. Although the current study did not include a questionnaire to measure student self-reported motivation, it is reasonable to assume that such student motivational levels may have affected the aggregate results described here.

Table 6

Correlations between Individual Measures of Learners' Motivated Behavior and Overall Learner Motivated Behavior Index at the Observation and Teacher Levels

	Observation Level[a]			Teacher Level[b]		
	Alertness	Participation	Volunteering	Alertness	Participation	Volunteering
Participation	-.327	--	--	-.038	--	
Volunteering	-.065	.090	--	.178	.322	--
LMB	.608**	.545**	.122	.443	.653	-.114

[a]Number of classes = 24. [b]Number of teachers = 8
**$p < .01$, two-tailed.

Correlational Analysis

In order to determine the relationship between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior, the indices representing these two measures were submitted to correlational analyses. As with the previous analyses, this was done on both the observation and teacher levels. Results presented in Table 7 indicate a strong significant correlation between the observer-based index of teacher motivational practice and the overall learner motivated behavior index ($r = .67$, $p < .01$), explaining 45% of the variance. This confirms results from the two earlier studies showing that there is a strong relationship between what teachers do in terms of their motivational practices and the extent of learners' motivated behaviors during class. However, when it came to the three individual measures of learner motivated behaviors, the only

significant correlation found was between learner participation and the observer-based index of teacher motivational practice.

The strong link found between teacher motivational practice and engagement was not surprising. Learner engagement was high during activities that required the students to work on a task rather than listen to a teacher lecture. The teachers in this study consistently designed classroom tasks that followed multiple motivational activity designs. For example, one teacher assigned students a task where they had to find and describe information about their own country (personalization) that would then be synthesized into a poster format that would be displayed on the walls of the school (tangible task product). Thus, for every minute in which students were working on this task, those two categories were marked, along with *individual work* and occasionally *teacher monitoring* variables. This pattern repeated itself throughout the observations.

Another important issue to consider when looking at the correlational results is the context in which the research took place. First, the average class size for the eight classes in the current study was only 13.8 students, which is considerably smaller than Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's (2008) average of 34.5 students and Papi and Abdollahzadeh's (2012) average of 28.5 students. Moreover, the classes were taught in small rooms where students' desks lined up in one row around the perimeter of the class. The teacher was never more than a few feet away from any student at a given time. This resulted in a 'monitoring effect' where students who were not displaying alert behaviors would be easily noticed. Furthermore, the current study looked at adult learners who had made the timely and costly decision to pursue their English education in the United States, rather than adolescent learners taking English classes as part of their standard school curriculum with limited personal choice in the issue. Similarly, the IEP investigated in

this study aims at preparing students for academic and professional opportunities in English language settings, so the high-stakes' test may also have affected student motivation. It is likely that the current study is affected by the generally higher level of student motivation and personal investment in learning. This conclusion is corroborated by the high level of learner alertness across observations ($M = 33.63$ minutes).

Contrary to the high frequency of learner alertness, there were very few instances of eager student volunteering over the course of the observations ($M = .57$ minutes). It is unclear why this is; however, it seemed that while there were instances of volunteering that happened during the observations, they rarely extended beyond one minute and even less frequently involved more than one-third of the students. Ultimately, the few instances of student volunteering recorded made it impossible to obtain significant correlations with the rest of the data.

Table 7

Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice Indices and Measures of Learner Motivated Behavior at the Observation and Teacher Levels

	LMB	Alertness	Participation	Volunteering
	Observation Level[a]			
TMP – Observer	.671**	.168	.590**	.337
TMP – Teacher	.088	-.287	.384	.235
	Teacher Level[b]			
TMP – Observer	.508	.161	.735*	.625
TMP – Teacher	-.106	-.436	.221	.143

[a]Number of classes = 23. [b]Number of teachers = 8.
*$p < .05$, two-tailed. **$p < .01$, two-tailed.

Post Lesson Teacher Interview Questions

Following, each observation teachers were asked four brief questions about their class which were designed to encourage reflection on the overall success of the lesson as well as their

use of motivational moments. Table 8 displays summarized responses from each of these questions. Open-ended responses were categorized based on that answer they most closely represented, and only those responses that provided relevant answers were included in the summary. Teachers' responses indicated general satisfaction with the majority of observed lessons, although a few instances were recorded of teachers who felt that their observed class did not go according to plan nor as well as they had hoped. Additionally, for every observation where teachers thought about motivational moments as part of their planning process, they reported that they either partially or completely followed their plan for including motivational moments in the lesson. Furthermore, for 19 of the 24 observations, teachers provided suggestions for how they would improve the motivation in their lessons if they could repeat the lesson. Each of these teacher-provided suggestions maps to one or more of Dörnyei's (2001) list of motivational strategies, suggesting that teachers do have a good sense of what types of teacher behaviors, activity designs, and lesson structures are motivating for students.

While the majority of teachers were positive about the use of motivational moments, during a couple of interviews teachers expressed sentiments similar to this one: "I feel like I'm not doing anything different with motivational moments. I feel like my motivational moments are more like motivational rationale for my lesson plan [rather than actual techniques to motivate learners]." In other words, a couple of teachers felt like they were simply adding motivational moments to their lessons in order to satisfy the expectations of the observer, rather than as a proactive step in their planning process. They seemed to feel that they already had a set motivational teaching practice and did not see the need to be deliberate in this practice.

Table 8

Summarized Responses to Postlesson Teacher Interview Questions

Questions	Responses	Additional comments
How did you feel about your class today?	1) Good (13) 2) Okay (7) 3) Bad (4)	
Did you follow your plan for motivational moments?	1) Yes (9) 2) Partially (7) 3) No (2) 4) Didn't plan (2) 5) No answer (4)	*Reasons provided for not following the plan:* 1) Forgot (1) 2) Changed plan to be more effective (1) 3) Not enough time (4)
Did you think your motivational moments were successful?	1) Yes (9) 2) Somewhat (5) 3) No (1) 4) No answer (5)	*Specific examples of success:* 1) Students saw progress (2) 2) Perked students' interests (1) 3) Encouraged them to do better by re-writing a quiz (1)
If you could repeat the lesson, what would you do different in terms of motivation?	1) Scaffold/model more (3) 2) Modify student interaction (3) 3) Modify timing and number of activities (3) 4) Clarify instructions/more task preparation (2) 5) Provide more feedback (1) 6) Make information relevant to students' lives (1) 7) Plan motivation (1)	

Teacher Feedback Survey

Seven of eight teachers who participated in the research responded to the teacher

feedback survey administered at the completion of all of the observations. Each of these teachers

indicated that he or she had deliberately planned motivational moments into lessons at least once

a week. They were also asked to provide responses to a number of items, including six Likert

scale responses ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). The results for these

items are presented in Table 9. As can be seen, all teachers expressed agreement to some degree

with each of the statements. These unanimously positive responses support the idea that teachers in this context perceive specific training on motivational teaching practices as beneficial.

In addition to Likert scale items, teachers responded to four open-ended questions about the perceived benefit of the training sessions, their suggestions for including motivational training as part of program teacher education opportunities, in what ways the specific program could provide support for teachers starting to use motivation in their classes, and any additional comments they might have had regarding the study, training, or future directions. These items and summarized teacher responses are displayed Table 10. Notably, each teacher stated that the training sessions were beneficial in one way or another for them. One teacher stated

> going through the lists of different motivational strategies was really helpful. It
>
> opened up many new avenues of thought for potential ways to work motivation
>
> into my class. Dörnyei's cyclical model of motivation was also enlightening, and
>
> served as a good reminder that motivation shouldn't be something to be checked
>
> off our lists, but should pervade the whole structure of the class.

Other teachers perceived a benefit from increased awareness of available motivational strategies and how these can impact a class, as well as appreciation for opportunities to practice such strategies during training sessions. Another teacher stated that the "insights and list of motivational approaches really helped me realize that we could potentially achieve greater success in our classes." Overall, teacher feedback provided evidence that teachers did find value in the in-service teacher training in which they participated.

Table 9

Responses to Likert-Scale Items on Teacher Feedback Survey

Item	Range	Mean
I feel comfortable using motivational strategies as part of my teaching.	4 – 5	4.86
I have made changes in my teaching practice this semester because of the motivational training I received.	4 – 6	4.71
I think that deliberately planning motivational strategies into my teaching has positively affected my students' motivation this semester.	3 – 6	4.57
My interest in motivation as a teacher has increased since participating in this research project.	5 – 5	5.00
I would be interested in receiving further training on how to help motivate students.	4 – 6	5.00
I would recommend that other teachers at the ELC receive training on motivational teaching practice.	5 – 6	5.29

Table 10

Responses to Open-Ended Items on Teacher Feedback Survey

Questions	Summarized Responses (number of similar responses)
In what ways were the training sessions beneficial or not beneficial to you?	Introduced ideas for how to incorporate motivation into instruction (4). Raised awareness of the importance of motivation in teaching (3). Allowed us to practice motivational moments (2). No response (1).
What suggestions would you have for helping the ELC to curricularize motivation training in upcoming semesters?	Incorporate motivational training at the general pre-semester teacher trainings or during lunch training session throughout the semester (3). Have supervisors check for motivational teaching practices during their semester observations (2). Use of shorter list of motivational strategies (1). Encourage reflection on motivational teaching practices through the use of a weekly reflective journal (1). No response (2).
How could the ELC help support you in helping learners better understand their own responsibility in regulating learning motivation?	Create specific materials to support teachers in introducing the topic in their classes (1). Teach students about principles of self-regulation (1). The program can't do much. This is an issue between students and teachers and the environment they create (1). No response (4).
Do you have any other comments or suggestions about this research or motivational teaching at this time?	It's very important because it is good to think of motivational strategies that we haven't used before (1). Your insights and list of motivational approaches really helped me realize that we could potentially achieve greater success in our classes (1). Very well thought-out (1). No or no response (4).

Conclusion and Implications

This study was a modified replication of the work of Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), in that it examined the relationship between teacher motivational practice and student classroom motivation using a classroom-based research design pioneered by the original authors. Furthermore, it sought to take up Guilloteaux & Dörnyei's (2008) call to "assess the teachability of motivational strategies in general and to explore the specific ways by which these strategies can be taught in particular" (p. 73). Specifically, this study investigated the need for and potential value of in-service teacher training on motivational teaching practices through the inclusion of training sessions, teacher postlesson self-ratings and interview questions, and a teacher feedback survey.

The strong positive correlation between the observer-based teacher motivational practice index and the learner motivated behavior index at the observation level confirmed the results of the original study as well as those seen in the follow-up study conducted by Papi and Abdollahzadeh (2012). Importantly, all three studies were carried out in different cultural and educational contexts. Thus, results of the current study validate those of the original and follow-up studies, demonstrating that teacher motivational practice strongly relates to learners' motivated behaviors of alertness, participation, and volunteering. While the direction of the relationship cannot be determined based on correlation alone, we expect that future experimental research will demonstrate a causal link between teacher practice and learner behavior (see Moskovsky et al., 2013).

Nevertheless, some differences remain between the original and follow-up studies and the current study, specifically lack of correlation between teacher motivational practice and individual measures of learner motivated behavior. Several possibilities have been presented to

explain these differences, including the differences in class size, underlying student motivation, student age, and frequencies of the three learner motivated behaviors. We hope that future classroom-based studies will help clarify these issues as well as continue to validate the results and claims already made.

The teacher training component of the research design was unique to this study. Teachers' self-ratings, responses to interview questions, and final feedback indicated that teachers found the training valuable. They explained that the training was helpful because, among other things, it raised their awareness of the role of motivation in the classroom and in the possibility of modifying their own teaching practices through the use of motivational strategies. Furthermore, each teacher who completed the final survey agreed or strongly agreed that other teachers in their same context would benefit from similar training.

In addition to teachers' own perspectives, data from postlesson teacher evaluations provided another perspective on the importance of teacher training. When comparing teacher postlesson self-evaluations with actual observational data, we found that there was no correlation between the two measures. In other words, teachers in our study were not accurate judges of their own motivational teaching performance. However, we argue that teachers will be more likely to improve their motivational teaching practices if they are more aware of how they are actually performing in the classroom and how their learners are responding to the learning environment. While our teaching training did not specifically focus on how teachers could better self-evaluate, evidence from the teacher self-evaluations did indicate that teachers would benefit if this was included in future training opportunities.

Limitations

With only eight participating teachers, the conclusions and generalizability of issues related to teacher training are limited. Nonetheless, as one of the only studies we are aware of that includes an explicit teacher training component, we feel that the results related to teacher training are valuable for establishing a starting point for future training modules.

While the MOLT instrument was a useful tool for investigating teacher and learner motivation, it was unable to capture some of the subtleties of motivation within a classroom. For instance, some motivational strategies that occurred for thirty seconds or less were not recorded, even though these motivational practices may very well have affected the overall motivational flow and disposition of learners. For example, as observations were carried out, it seemed that short moments of social chat, encouragement, humor, or class applause, spread throughout a lesson likely had a cumulative effect on general student motivation and engagement.

Furthermore, the MOLT required coding of the presence of motivational strategies without regard for the quality of such strategies. Throughout the observations, the observer recognized that the quality of the motivational strategies used affected learner investment in the classroom more than simply the inclusion of a motivational strategy by a teacher. For example, during the same week of observations, two similar classes were observed (level 3 writing and level 4 grammar). Both teachers planned a lesson with a great deal of scaffolding. However, one of the teachers executed the lesson with enthusiasm and encouraged student involvement, while the other did not. The latter teacher's students, though somewhat alert, did not have the opportunity to engage in the material despite the fact that scaffolding was employed. This example serves to illustrate what we believe to be an important conclusion from our study: the *quality* of motivational strategies must be taken into account when considering the impact of

such practices on learners. Employing specific teaching practices alone is not enough; teachers must be trained in and aware of the *quality* of their motivational teaching practices.

Pedagogical Implications

The results from this study have many implications for language teaching pedagogy. First, they further confirm that what teachers do in the classroom matters for learners in terms of motivation. Second, they show that teachers find value in training focused on motivational practices. Based on the researchers' experience with this teacher training set-up combined with responses to the teacher interview questions and feedback survey, the following suggestions can be made regarding the initial "development of a theoretically sound and empirically tested teacher education module that focuses on the teacher's motivational practice" (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008, p. 73):

- Emphasize quality over quantity (see Dörnyei, 2001, p. 3). One way to do this would be to focus on helping teachers understand the four overarching components of Dörnyei's (2001) motivational teaching practice, rather than each of the more than 100 microstrategies. One teacher in the current study provided the following advice for doing more training in the future: "Select a shorter list of motivational strategies and provide it to all the teachers to consider for their teaching."

- Raise teachers' awareness about the importance of monitoring their learners' responses to classroom instruction, activities and events in order to more accurately self-evaluate their own teaching performance. Provide self-assessment tools and feedback to help teachers in this process.

- Encourage regular reflection on the success of motivational practices. One teacher stated "it was hard for me to remember to include motivational moments in my teaching

everyday or even once a week. I think it would help if you did a similar study or training, but have teachers keep a weekly reflective journal. I would be much more conscious of it if I was reflecting more."

- Differentiate between weaving motivational moments into a lesson and relying on the teachers' natural personalities. A couple of teachers indicated that they rely wholly on their personalities as their motivational teaching practice. Encourage deliberate practice in addition to routine and natural behaviors.

- Make motivational teaching practices a program priority by involving supervisors and providing training opportunities for anyone interested. This also incorporates a greater degree of accountability into the training by having supervisors watch for motivational practices during observations or interviews with fellow teachers.

- Create opportunities for practicing and sharing ideas on the execution of motivational strategies with fellow teachers.

These suggestions will undoubtedly need to be modified and added upon for different circumstances. Regardless of these differences, we believe these represent a good foundation for strengthening motivational teaching practices in any program.

Implications for Future Research

Several directions for future research arise from this study. First, additional classroom-oriented studies carried out in a greater variety of ESL contexts will continue to help validate and generalize these findings. Second, future studies should help determine how teachers' abilities to self-evaluate their performance affects their motivational teaching practice, as well as how to incorporate an element of teacher self-evaluation into teacher trainings. Third, quasi-experimental designs, such as those employed by Moskovsky et. al. (2013) should be utilized to

determine the direction of the relationship between teacher motivational practices and learner motivated behaviors. Fourth, such a design could be modified to investigate the impact of increased learner motivation on learner achievement, as well as the influence of teacher training in motivational practices on actual teacher practices. Fifth, additional research should help determine how to best train teachers in motivational practices, using the suggesting in this paper as a starting point.

References

Alrabai, F.A., 2011. Motivational instruction in practice: do EFL instructors at King Khalid

University motivate their students to learn English as a foreign language? *Arab World*

English Journal 2(4): 257-285. Retrieved from http://www.awej.org/

Cheng, H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction:

The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *International Journal of Innovation in Language*

Learning and Teaching, 1(1), 153-174. doi: 10.2167/illt048.0

Cox, T. & Davies, R. (2012). Using automatic speech recognition technology with elicited oral

response testing. *CALICO Journal, 29,* 601-618. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.11139/cj.29.4.601-618

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language*

Learning, 41, 469-512.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern*

Language Journal 78, 273-284. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom* [Kindle Reader version].

Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com

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

language acquisition. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.),

Motivation, language identity and the L2 self (pp. 9–42). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual

Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results

of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*, 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z. & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London), 4,* 43-69.

Ellis, R. (2009). A reader responds to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's "Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation." *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 105–109. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00229.x

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

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

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 359-369. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02050.x

Guilloteaux, M. J., (2013). Motivational strategies for the language classroom: Perceptions of Korean secondary school English teachers. *System, 41*, 3-14. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.12.002

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*, 55-77. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The authors reply. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 109-111. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00230.x

Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kubanyiova, M., (2006). Developing a motivational teaching practice in EFL teachers in

    Slovakia: Challenges of promoting teacher change in EFL contexts. *TESL-EJ 10*(2): 1-17.

    Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org

Moskovsky, C., Alrabai, F., Paolini, S. and Ratcheva, S. (2013). The effects of teachers'

    motivational strategies on learners' motivation: A controlled investigation of second

    language acquisition. *Language Learning, 63*, 34–62. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-

    9922.2012.00717.x

Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical

    framework. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 12-28. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-

    4781.1994.tb02011.x

Papi, M., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2012). Teacher Motivational Practice, Student Motivation, and

    Possible L2 Selves: An Examination in the Iranian EFL Context. *Language Learning*, *62*,

    571-294. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00632.x

Ruesch, A., Bown, J., & Dewey, D. P. (2012). Student and teacher perceptions of motivational

    strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and*

    Teaching, 6, 15-27. doi: 10.1080/17501229.2011.562510

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching*

    Observation Scheme: Coding Conventions and Applications. Sydney, Australia:

    Macquarie University, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Appendix A

Extract from the MOLT Classroom Observation Scheme
Adapted from Guilloteaux & Dörynei (2008)

Minutes		1	2	3
Learner Motivated Behaviors	Eager volunteering (>1/3 of the class)			
	Engagement (>2/3 of the class)			
	Alertness (>2/3 of the class)			
Teacher Motivational Practice — Generating, maintaining, and protecting situation-specific task motivation — Encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation	Class applause			
	Effective praise			
	Elicitation of self/peer correction session			
	Achievement feedback*			
	Effort feedback*			
	Ability feedback*			
	Process feedback session			
	Neutral feedback session			
Activity Design	+ team competition			
	+ individual competition			
	+ tangible task product			
	+ intellectual challenge			
	+ creative/interesting/fantasy element			
	+ personalization			
	+ easy tasks for successful learning experience*			
	+ vary the normal routine and/or channel of communication *			
	+ begins the lesson with a warm-up/review activity*			
	+ tangible reward			
P.S.[a]	Group work			
	Pair work			
	Individual work*			
Teacher Discourse	Referential questions			
	Promoting autonomy			
	Promoting cooperation			
	Scaffolding			
	Arousing curiosity or attention			
	Promoting instrumental values			
	Promoting integrative values			
	Establishing relevance			

Appendix A

Extract from the MOLT Classroom Observation Scheme
Adapted from Guilloteaux & Dörynei (2008)
(continued from pg. 40)

			Minutes	1	2	3
Teacher's Motivational Practice	Generating, maintaining, and protecting situation-specific task motivation	Teacher Discourse	Stating communicative purpose / utility of activity			
			Signposting			
			Using humor as part of the lesson*			
			Teacher models enthusiasm for teaching, relationships*			
			Promoting individual and class goals, motivating strategies*			
			Supportive/pleasant atmosphere free from embarrassment*			
			Explicit strategy instruction*			
			Importance of communication over grammar*			
			Social chat (unrelated to the lesson)			
			+Teacher monitoring*			

Note. [a]P.S. = Participation structure. +Indicates categories that do not follow the primary coding convention, meaning more than one of these specific categories can be coded within a larger category (i.e. activity design) for a single minute. *Indicates categories which were added to the original MOLT.

Appendix B

Postlesson Teacher Evaluation Scale
From Guilloteaux & Dörynei (2008)

Motivation-specific teacher qualities		
Linguistically incompetent	1 ↔ 6	Linguistically competent
Unfocused/Wastes time	1 ↔ 6	Focused/Task-oriented
Increases students' expectancy of failure (e.g., missed steps in lesson)	1 ↔ 6	Increases students' expectancy of success (e.g., makes sure that Ss receive sufficient preparation)
Confusing instructions and explanations	1 ↔ 6	Clear instructions and explanations
Unkind, uncaring: creates an unpleasant atmosphere	1 ↔ 6	Kind, caring: creates a pleasant atmosphere
Unenthusiastic	1 ↔ 6	Radiates enthusiasm
Dry style	1 ↔ 6	Humorous/light-hearted style
Not encouraging	1 ↔ 6	Encouraging
Uncreative/Does not take risks	1 ↔ 6	Creative/Takes risks

Appendix C

Postlesson Teacher Interview Questions

1. How did you feel about your class today?
2. Did you follow your plan for weaving motivational moments into the lesson?
3. Do you think your motivational moments were successful in this lesson?
4. If you could go back and repeat this lesson, what would you do differently in terms of motivating learners?

Appendix D

Teacher Feedback Survey Questions

6-point Likert-scale questions (strongly disagree ←→strongly agree)

---

1. I feel comfortable using motivational strategies as part of my teaching.
2. I have made changes in my teaching practice this semester because of the motivational training I received.
3. I think that deliberately planning motivational strategies into my teaching has positively affected my students' motivation this semester.
4. My interest in motivation as a teacher has increased since participating in this research project.
5. I would be interested in receiving further training on how to help motivated students.
6. I would recommend that other teachers at the ELC receive training on motivational teaching practice.

Training questions

---

7. Which of the two training sessions did you attend this semester? (Mark all that apply.)
8. How beneficial were the motivational training sessions for you this semester? (Mark *very beneficial*, *somewhat beneficial*, or *not beneficial*.)
9. In what ways were the training sessions beneficial or not beneficial to you?
10. What suggestions would you have for helping the ELC to curricularize motivation training for teachers in upcoming semesters?
11. How could the ELC help support you in helping learners better understand their own responsibility in regulating learning motivation?
12. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about this research or motivational teaching in general at this time?