English Applied Linguistics PhD Program

Graduate School of Linguistics

University of Szeged

The Use of Motivational Strategies in the EFL Classroom: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives in Tunisian Universities

PhD Dissertation

Bochra Kouraichi

Supervisor:

Dr. Márta Lesznyák

Szeged

2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION

Je dédie cette thèse à mes parents qui m'ont doté d'une éducation digne. Leur amour a fait de moi ce que je suis aujourd'hui.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This journey has been fraught with hurdles that I could only overcome through the love and support of very supportive members of my family, my friends, and my colleagues both near and far. It has also been a journey full of motivational strategies that I had to find and follow to be able to accomplish my academic goals. It has taught me to be perseverant, fight for my dreams and never surrender.

This thesis could never see the light without the support of my supervisor, Dr. Márta Lesznyák. Her guidance, which was combined with a great deal of patience, has been invaluable, not only in giving shape to this final work but, more importantly, in my development as a budding researcher.

I would like to extend special thanks to Dr Anna Fenyvesi, the director of our doctoral program, for her tremendous support both on the academic and personal levels, mainly during the harsh times of the pandemic. Her words of encouragements have had a huge impact on my psyche in hard times. Special thanks also go to my professors at the doctoral program: Dr. Erszebet Barát, Dr. Malgorzata Suszczyńska, and Dr Donald Peckham. I am also grateful for the support of my colleagues in the PhD program especially Hasnaa, Máté, Adrianna, and Winn.

I would also like to thank my former teachers of English and colleagues in Tunisia who volunteered to participate in this study and made this research possible. I would like to acknowledge the tremendous help of the late Dr Sofiene Mallouli. He was one of the participants of the present study. I am grateful that he was my first teacher of English and was later my MA supervisor.

I am lucky to have had the opportunity to present my work-in-progress at many local and international conferences. I would like to thank convenors and conference chairs who provided me with invaluable feedback to improve this work. I am honored to be part of IATEFL Hungary, the European Society for the Study of English, and the special interest group on motivation of the European Association of Research in Learning and Instruction.

I am grateful to have been received by Pr. Ema Ushioda at the university of Warwick in summer 2022 to discuss my research projects. I am equally indebted to the supporting community of PhD students from different parts of the world whom I was lucky to meet through the PhD

community in language psychology run by colleagues in the United Kingdom. Thank you, Denny, Katarina, Kathryn, Maha, and Zening!

Huge thanks go to my parents, my brother Mhammad, my sister Sana, my brother-in-law Saber, my sister-in-law Violetta, my nephews Zied and Amine, and my twin nieces Elissa and Sofia for their love, patience, and support despite the distance and the unconventional academic path that I chose to follow.

I am also grateful to my dear friends residing abroad but who made me feel so close to them through frequent calls and messages. Thanks Sameh Aicha, Maroua, Hejer, Ikram, Yosra, Eman, Tasneem, Emna, and Ahmed.

Living abroad could not get any better without the support of the nice people I met in Szeged. Special thanks to all my Hungarian and international friends in Szeged who made it feel like a second home. Thank you, Mahreen, Hanna, Sakaran, Carlos, Asli, Tayfun, László, Erika, and Shady.

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies suggest that motivation is important for foreign language learning. However, only a few studies have focused on the effective use of motivational strategies by EFL teachers. Keller's (2010) ARCS model addresses the gap between L2 motivation theories and classroom practice with a focus on four categories of motivation: attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction. The current research seeks to investigate Tunisian university teachers' use of motivational strategies (MotS) (Dörnyei 2001) and the extent to which their students find them effective. It also seeks to explore the relation between students' self-perception as speakers of English and their teacher's use of MotS. In addition, it will highlight any similarities or differences that emerge between teachers' reported use of MotS and their actual motivational practice. The following instruments were employed for the data collection to answer the research questions: (a) the Instructional Materials Motivational Survey (IMMS) questionnaire to students and teachers (Keller 2010), (b) the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) questionnaire (Dörnyei 2009), and (c) the Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) classroom observation scheme by (Guilloteaux and Dörnyei 2008). Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to analyze the data. The quantitative analysis was carried out with SPSS 24.0. Factor analysis was conducted, and the items with significant factor loadings were labelled under the ARCS categories. The reliability with Cronbach's alpha for each factor was checked for internal consistency. More statistical analyses were carried out to calculate descriptive statistics on the four categories of MotS for both students and teachers. Then, independent samples t-test were done to identify any significant difference between students' and teachers' perception of MotS. Correlation analyses were also conducted to identify the effect of the MotS used on students' future self-perception through the L2MSS model. The observation results were first analyzed qualitatively following the MOLT scheme. Then, z-scores were computed to compare observation results with teachers' questionnaire results. To make this comparison possible, the MOLT items were categorized according to the ARCS categories. The findings highlight a significant difference between teachers' reported use of MotS and students' perception of the MotS used. While teachers reported using confidence-building strategies the most, students perceived that relevance-producing strategies were used more often. Students' results were confirmed during the class observations. Moreover, correlations between the L2MSS and the IMMS categories could be explicated in light of the questionnaire results. The present study is expected to offer pedagogical contributions to the Tunisian higher education context.

Dissertation declaration

I declare that the present dissertation is my individual and original work under the supervision of Dr. Márta Lesznyák. I also state that I haven't submitted any part of this work for any other degree or award or any other qualification with my name at this university or any other institution. All previous studies were cited and referenced in this thesis. Apart from the due references, this dissertation is my own work. Some parts of this text shall appear in my publications that were done concurrently with my dissertation (Kouraichi in press).

I agree that this final version of my thesis is made available on the university's research repository, the research engines, and the university.

Szeged, 20-03-2023

Bochra Kouraichi

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CDS: complex dynamics system

DMC: directed motivational currents

EFA: exploratory factor analysis

EFL: English as a foreign language

ESP: English for specific purposes

ELT: English language teaching

ESOL: English to speakers of other languages

ID: individual differences

IMMS: instructional materials motivational survey

L1: first language

L2: second language

L2MSS: L2 Motivation Self System

L3: third language

MENA: middle east and north Africa

MHER: Ministry of higher education and research

MOLT: Motivational orientation of language teaching

MotS: motivational strategies

MSA: Modern standard Arabic

SDT: Self-Determination Theory

SLA: second language acquisition

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

STEM: science, technology, engineering, and math.

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

In this chapter, I will present the main drive behind conducting this research project, its goals, and its main contributions to the field of L2 motivation research. I will also briefly describe my personal motivation to start this study and my research goals. The primary research questions that this research aims to answer will equally be presented. At the end of the chapter, a brief overview of the outline of the present thesis will be provided.

2. Background to the Study

Research on language learning motivation has been very prolific and has offered numerous insights for L2 learners as well as L2 teachers. Csizér (2017) states that "motivation is a key ingredient to successful classroom learning" (428). In this context, Boo et al. (2015) pinpoint that there are two main categories of L2 motivation studies: studies focusing on theoretical accounts of learners' motivation and those throwing light on practical ways of motivating students. Boo et al. (2015) add that there is "a good balance between the theoretical and practical dimensions of L2 motivation research" (154). In his comprehensive article titled 'Looking back and looking forward', Al-Hoorie (2017) talks about the extent to which current developments in the field of L2 motivation research draw heavily on earlier conceptualizations of motivation. He later developed his project into a seminal book that involved established L2 motivation scholars; they presented an exhaustive review of trends in the field of established L2 motivation after sixty years (Al-Hoorie and MacIntyre 2020). In this book, Gardner (2020) contributed with a chapter also entitled 'Looking back and looking forward', thus acknowledging the complexity and interconnectedness of L2 motivation theories.

The pioneers of L2 motivation research were Lambert and Gardner who have paved the way for the socio-educational model (Gardner 1985). Their research started in Canada, a bilingual country where French and English are spoken. Learning English was a way to identify with and to integrate into the English-speaking community. The social psychologists were primarily interested in learners' attitudes towards the second language and its speakers, as well as their motives for learning it. However, the Gardnerian model was vehemently criticized with the rise of World English contexts since the notion of integrativeness became irrelevant (see section 2.5.1). In fact, the integrative-instrumental dimensions proved to be context-specific

rather than universal (Dörnyei 1994). The applicability of the concept of integrativeness with the global spread of English was also a controversial issue (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2009). At the turn of the decade, an influential theory was dominant, namely the self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan 1985). With its focus on teachers' practice and the learning environment, this period was also called 'the educational period' (Al-Hoorie 2017). Later on, the conceptualization of L2 motivation has changed from being viewed as a fixed personal trait to being theorized as a dynamic construct that is bound to temporal and contextual changes. Indeed, the first theories of L2 motivation (Gardner 1985, Deci and Ryan 1985) considered learners' L2 motivation as a static dichotomy of instrumental vs. integrative or intrinsic vs. extrinsic. These theories were built on quantitative studies which sought to identify a cause-and-effect relationship between learners' motivation and their motivated behavior. This perception has gradually shifted into a more dynamic view that involves complex systems of interaction. Another recent view of L2 motivation is the notion of 'self' (Dörnyei 2005, 2009; Ushioda 2009) that has been developed into the L2 motivational self system (L2MSS) model. The L2MSS model is composed of three categories, namely the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience. The latter component is described as "the impact of the L2 teacher, the curriculum, the peer group, and the experience of success" (Dörnyei and Ryan 2015, 88).

Despite these rapid developments in the field, Ushioda (2013b) urges L2 motivation researchers to focus more on "teacher- and classroom-focused empirical studies to investigate how teachers' instructional and interactional practices contribute to shaping processes of motivation in their classrooms" (237). This view was supported by Dörnyei's (2001) process view of motivational teaching that informs teachers on the motivational strategies (MotS) they could employ to enhance learners' motivation. Prominent longitudinal research in Hungary led to the theorization of this process-oriented view (Dörnyei 1994, Dörnyei and Ottó 1998, Dörnyei 2001). Ushioda (2013a) proposes that, because of its global status, English has gained, nowadays, a more privileged status in educational policy and in the job market. As a matter of fact, the issue of motivation is all the more present on the agenda of teachers and students alike. However, as pointed out by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), the L2 motivation research might lack "a level of sophistication that would allow scholars to translate research results into straightforward educational recommendations" (104).

3. Personal Motivation

My personal motivation to conduct this research project was initiated by my own professional experience as a novice teacher of English in Tunisia. It also relates to my personal experience, being an avid foreign language learner and fulfilling a childhood dream of becoming an English language teacher. I cannot deny the fact that growing up in an educational environment *par excellence* has helped me embrace such a dream and go the extra mile to fulfill it. Still, I owe my motivational drive to excel in English and to decide to pursue a graduate degree in English language, literature, and culture to my first teachers of English in middle school and later at high school.

As a teacher, I should admit that the most challenging teaching context I had to cope with was teaching at a middle school in a rural part of southern Tunisia. Just like Lamb (2009) compared students' motivation in different contexts in Indonesia, it is obvious that the social and geographical contexts impact the quality of education. I also experienced Veenman's (1984) claim that motivation, following discipline, is the most challenging construct in the classroom. Having taught English at secondary and tertiary levels in Tunisia, my main goal is to have a better understanding of students' motivation and of the ways through which teachers could enhance it. The motivational view of students will help teachers gain insight into ways that could sustain their motivational level and nurture their motivational drive. With this aim in mind, I started applying Keller's (2010) ARCS (attention, relevance, confidence, satisfaction) motivational strategies (MotS) in my own lesson plans. When I prepared a project for my pedagogical in-service training, I tried to follow Keller's (2010) strategies to create a motivating classroom environment. That project was indeed an incentive for the present study.

4. Rationale of the Study

Tunisia is a North-African country where Arabic is the first language and French is the second language. In Tunisia, English is taught in state primary schools from grade five (and, in some schools, grade four). It is the second foreign language after French. Still, there is a significant difference between the use of these two foreign languages in Tunisians' daily life. Indeed, French is not merely an L2 but part of the Tunisian dialect (Boukadi and Troudi 2017, Sayhi 2017). However, English is mostly restricted to instructed contexts and is rarely used by students outside of the classroom (Abdeljaoued and Labassi 2021). However, it is noteworthy

that social media stands out in this context since the growing majority of ads and foreign series are presented in English, which exposes teenagers to English more than ever before (see section 2.2).

Although language motivation research offers insight into the factors that influence learners' motivations, it has received little attention in the Tunisian higher education context (Lachheb 2014, Hermessi 2019). The proliferation of research on language learning motivation has spanned over 60 years and still attracts novice scholars to investigate new contexts and target new populations. In fact, inquiries into how learners' motivation to learn English is shaped by their teachers' use of MotS yielded a positive correlation. Teachers' attempts to enhance their students' motivation in this respect may offer insights to reforms in the language learning classroom.

5. Research Objectives

Through a scrutiny of the previous literature, this study aims to fill a gap by bridging L2 motivation theories and classroom practice, and by drawing on fresher insights from language psychology and applied linguistics as well as instructional design and education fields. The present study seeks to contribute to the scarce field of studies on classroom motivational practice in the Tunisian higher education context by taking both teachers' and students' perspectives into consideration and aims to offer ways to enhance students' motivational behavior. In so doing, this project relies on various L2 motivation theories, namely Dörnyei's (2001) process model of motivational teaching and Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2MSS model of L2 self-perception as well as Keller's (2010) ARCS instructional model. Indeed, Boo et al. (2015) support the new trend in L2 motivation research of employing different theoretical frameworks. They go as far as to assume that "the increase in the 'more than one concept' category highlights an innovative interest in juxtaposing diverse perspectives" (155). Besides combining theoretical frameworks, this study also mixes research methods. A mixed-methods research is a methodology for conducting research which combines quantitative and qualitative approaches in one study throughout the process of collecting and analyzing data. Through a combination of quantitative and qualitative results, the present study aims to compare both sets of data and get a thorough picture of teachers' motivational practice.

6. Research Questions

The primary aim of this thesis is to enquire into the MotS used by EFL teachers in Tunisian universities and to determine the extent to which students find them effective. It also

aims to explore the influence of these motivational practices on students' self-perception. The present research attempts to contribute to the L2 motivation research by addressing a new context. This study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the motivational strategies that Tunisian EFL teachers employ?
2. Is there a significant difference between students' perception of MotS and their teachers' reported use of MotS?
3. What is the relationship between teachers' self-reported use of MotS and their actual classroom practice?
4. In what ways is teachers' motivational practice related to students' EFL self-perception?

7. Thesis Outline

This thesis consists of six chapters. This first chapter has introduced the research components, including the theoretical background, the research context, the researcher's motivation to conduct the research project, and the rationale behind it. After the first introductory chapter, the thesis will unfold as follows. The second chapter reviews recent literature that is deemed relevant to this study. It provides a state-of-the-art of the current L2 motivation theories. The chapter also reviews the shifts in the conceptualization of language learning motivation and outlines the theories that inform this study. The third chapter addresses the methodological concerns of this research, such as recruiting participants, choosing the research instruments, describing the research context, presenting the quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis, and discussing issues arising in relation to reliability and validity. The fourth chapter outlines the findings of the study in light of the main research questions by reporting the quantitative and qualitative results. The fifth chapter discusses the findings in comparison to previous similar studies. This thesis concludes with the sixth chapter, summarizing the main findings and the limitations of the thesis. This chapter also offers insights into the main contributions of the study on the empirical, theoretical, and pedagogical levels. Final remarks for implications for future research will equally be put forward.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

"Motivation refers broadly to what people desire,
what they choose to do, and what they commit to do"
Keller (2010, 3)

1. Introduction

The chapter starts with an overview of the research setting, namely the Tunisian higher education context. I will also give an overview of the theories and previous studies that laid the foundation for the present work. I will survey the most important theories of L2 motivation, with a focus on the theories that are under study. In addition, I will give a brief outline of the principal theoretical frameworks for this study, which will be presented in a chronological order to showcase the developments in the field of language motivation research. This review is far from being comprehensive, as it will only shed light on the most prominent L2 motivation theories and the related works to the present study. It primarily outlines the historical development of the L2 motivation research field with a focus on the main theories under examination. This chapter concludes the review with some remarks on the development of the L2 motivation research field.

2. The Research Setting

2.1. The Sociolinguistic Landscape of Tunisia

Tunisia's geographical position, situated at the heart of the Mediterranean, made it a crossroad for different civilizations and languages throughout its history. Numerous languages have left traces in today's Tunisian dialect, namely French, Italian, Turkish, and Amazigh (Daoud 2001). The Amazigh (or 'Berber') language, which is believed to be spoken by indigenous people in the Maghreb region, is underrepresented nowadays in Tunisia due to the limited number of its speakers and its underprivileged status in the national language policy. Unlike neighboring Maghreb countries (Libya, Algeria, and Morocco), the percentage of the Berber-speaking community in Tunisia remains comparatively low. In fact, since it is currently spoken by less than 1% of the Tunisian population, Berber is classified as a "dying language" (Daoud 2011, 10). The Amazigh population living predominantly in the southern part of

Tunisia only constitute around a hundred thousand[1]. Smari and Hortobágyi (2020) pinpoint the diversity of Tunisia's history that shaped its current rich linguistic landscape. The authors enumerate the civilizations that had left a footprint in today's linguistic scene, namely Carthaginians, Turks, Byzantine, etc. Along these lines, the language status in Tunisia is described as multilingual *par excellence* (Navracsics and Smari 2019, Badwan 2019). Nowadays, people often use code-switching between French and Tunisian Arabic. Also, French represents a major part in students' education from primary school onwards.

2.2. Schooling in Tunisia

Education in Tunisia is divided into three levels: six years of basic education at primary school followed by three years at middle school (age 6 - 15), four years of secondary education (age 15 - 19), and higher education (starting from the age of 19). At primary schools, children start learning all subjects in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). The Tunisian dialect is considered as a low form of Arabic so it is not used in formal education. French language classes are introduced in the third grade, while learning English starts from the sixth grade, which is the final year of primary school. Once they move to middle school, known in French as *collège*, students continue to study all subjects in Arabic. However, when they start high school, French becomes the language of instruction for all scientific subjects (Math, Physics, Chemistry, Science, Technology, Economics, Finance, and Information Technology). At the end of the final year of secondary school, students have to take a high school-leaving exam, called in French: *Baccaleauréat*. Depending on their exam score, students can choose which universities they can apply for. At university level, scientific fields continue to be taught in French. Access to education is considered free for all levels for public institutions but students are still asked to pay a small registration fee at the beginning of each academic year.

2.3. English Language Teaching in Tunisia: History and Current Challenges

Tunisia was under the spotlight in 2011 when the ruling regime was ousted on January 14. The Tunisian revolution was the starting point of the 'Arab Spring' that aimed to unroot dictatorships in the MENA region. Since then, the country has witnessed severe political, economic, and social turmoil. This political unrest has significantly affected the educational system in Tunisia due to the frequent change of appointed governments and ministers,

[1] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berbers#cite_note-18

especially for English language teaching policy (Daoud 2019). The status of English in Tunisian education is still in the second place after French. French is still the dominant language of instruction and used most often in society. Moreover, job opportunities are still related to mastering French since it's the language of administration in private companies. Instrumental motivation to be fluent in English could only be relevant to people who aim to move to Gulf countries, which has become a trend.

In a seminal book chapter, Daoud (2011) outlines the policy of English language teaching in Tunisia and stresses the role of exchange programs and youth-led programs administered by the U.S. embassy and opportunities funded by the British Council such as debate programs (namely the Young Arab Voices) in promoting the position of English in Tunisia. In the wake of the Arab Spring, civil society activists have surged involving youth all over the country and reaching out to those in marginalized areas namely through trainings, workshops, and Erasmus exchange programs. Badwan (2019) observes that language planning in Tunisia is fraught with uncertainty as it is influenced by employers' linguistic demands, global expectations, national impositions, and parental involvement, to cite but a few factors. She also remarks that the current policies still promote French as a de facto language in higher education since it is the predominant language of instruction. Even though scientific fields are taught in French (Medicine, Information Technology, Pharmacy, Business), English is mandatory for all non-English majors. English majors study language, culture, and literature courses in English. They also have optional classes in French or other foreign languages that are offered at university (for e.g., German, Spanish, Italian). There are two private universities where the language of instruction is English: South Mediterranean University and Mediterranean School of Business). The only state university that uses English as a medium of instruction is the Tunisian Business School. These universities are in the capital, Tunis, and are highly competitive unlike the majority of private universities that have a less prestigious reputation (Badwan 2019). It should be stated that ESP teachers have no expertise in any of the fields they are assigned to teach (for e.g., mechanical engineering, finance, business, or accounting). They were just appointed in their universities through a random process that the ministry of higher education follows for recruitment. Moreover, as noted by Daoud (2019), ESP teachers in Tunisia have no special training and are often left on their own to design the curriculum. This fact has led to closing undergraduate programs in business English at some universities.

Another issue that was among the factors that led to the Tunisian revolution is unemployment among fresh graduates. Jules and Barton (2018) claim that the high number of unemployability among Tunisian university graduates is mainly due to the mismatch between their education and the demands of the labor market. In an attempt to narrow the gap between the job market and graduates' qualifications, the LMD (BA – MA – PhD) system was introduced in 2006[2]. It mainly reduced the bachelor's degree from four to three years and the name of the diploma from *Maîtrise* to *Licence*. It is worth mentioning, here, that education policies change with the change of ministers appointed at the Ministry of Higher Education and Research, which results in the failure to implement any long-term plans. According to the latest report released by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research that presents data on the academic year of 2020-2021, there are 13 state universities besides the Directorate of Higher Institutes of Technological Studies.

According to Daoud (2019), the advance in information technologies created new challenges for both teachers and students in Tunisia as it deepened the divide between what students learn in the classroom and what they actually need in the real world. He further explains his idea when he states: "This poses the challenge of motivating students and the even bigger challenge of maintaining the level of motivation achieved and raising it even higher in any given lesson or a whole course within and beyond the classroom" (Daoud 2019, 181). The latter argument attests to the importance of investigating Tunisian students' motivation and exploring ways of enhancing it in English language classes.

Daoud (2019) emphasizes the role played by teachers of English in Tunisia, especially during social and economic instability, to promote English language teaching following the growing demand to learn it. Given the challenges teachers are currently facing, more than ever before, Daoud (2019) urges applied linguists to support teachers by doing applied linguistics, i.e., working with teachers and researching classrooms. He argues: "We need to actually do applied linguistics, by working closely with teachers to help them meet the complex challenges of classroom implementation" (190). Indeed, university teachers who have to pass an exam to be qualified, get appointed at universities with no pre-service or in-service trainings. Unlike secondary school teachers, university teachers are rather left alone to design their own courses and choose textbooks for their students. From my own experience, novice university teachers

[2] http://www.isetkr.rnu.tn/new/pdfs/note_de_cadrage_LMD_Version-Francaise.pdf

can only get the help of senior colleagues who are ready to collaborate and provide feedback and advice.

Another challenge that emerged in Tunisian higher education in the wake of the pandemic was related to online instruction. In fact, online teaching has never been adopted as an official alternative form of instruction and not even in the form of remote emergency teaching (Khlaif et al. 2021). Indeed, the pandemic has severely affected education in Tunisia, mainly in basic and secondary education. Following the outbreak of Covid-19 and the imposition of a lockdown, educational institutions were completely shut down for months. Conducting remote online classes was not an option for public schools due to students' limited access to internet and computers in underprivileged areas. For higher education, the official statement of the ministry left it optional for teachers whether they would like to continue teaching online. However, since teachers would still have to catch up for all the content taught online once classes resume, many of them did not welcome the idea of remote teaching. Only teachers who had facilities and were willing to conduct online classes chose to continue teaching. Once the regulations changed, students were given classes for ten days before having to sit for end-of-semester exams.

3. Changes in Conceptualizing Language Learning Motivation

4. Defining L2 Motivation

Salvin (2001) defines motivation as, "an internal process that activates, guides and maintains behavior over time" (345). Evidently, motivation represents a vital aspect of our daily life, academic journey, and later our chosen career path. As Keller (1983) puts it, "motivation refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid and the degree of effort they will exert in this respect" (389). Without that inner force which drives a person to start a task and complete it, the latter is often not achieved wholeheartedly. In fact, language learning motivation is the key learner variable, without which learning is not possible (Cohen and Dörnyei 2002). The latter conceptualization of motivation is primarily relevant to adult foreign language learners who choose to learn the language and often strive to reach a good proficiency level for a personal or professional goal. Along these lines, Dörnyei (2010) states that: "without sufficient motivation even the brightest learners are unlikely to persist long enough to attain any really useful language" (74). In simpler terms, motivation is not only a condition for success but also for the mastery of the foreign language in the long run.

Since the 1960s, language learning motivation has been the primary focus of individual differences (IDs) studies (Ushioda 2012). Despite considering IDs as a 'myth' (Dörnyei 2009), ID scholars sought to identify "*why*, *how long*, *how hard*, *how well*, *how proactively*, and *in what way* the learner engaged in the learning process" (Dörnyei and Ryan, 2015, 6 [emphasis in original]). Motivation could be viewed as "one of the key factors that distinguishes first language acquisition from SLA" (Ushioda 2012, 58). Indeed, L2 learners were thought to differ from L1 learners in how proficient they can get, an aspect which led ID researchers to identify the various ID variables that could affect the learning process, like anxiety, age, motivation, aptitude, and learning styles, to mention but a few (Dörnyei 2005). L2 learning motivation is undeniably the most studied variable in ID studies. As Dörnyei (2005) advances, all ID variables are somehow related to the study of motivation since "it provides the primary impetus to initiate L2 learning and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process" (65).

Csizér (2020) criticizes L2 motivation definitions that are just centered around the learner and that do not account for the learning setting. She explains that: "classroom learning cannot be fathomed without teacher-student and student-student interactions" (9). She further emphasizes that a definition of L2 motivation should include the classroom environment and should highlight the fact that motivation is not static. Combining the researchers' and teachers' perspective of motivation, Csizér (2020) puts forward the following definition of L2 motivation:

> [It is] an interactional process which subsumes effort and persistence to learn a foreign language and which is co-constructed by teachers and students alike in the classroom with an effect on activities and learning taking place both within and outside the classroom (11).

Through this definition, Csizér (2020) proposes a new conceptualization of L2 motivation taking into account both the learners and teachers. She additionally emphasizes the role of the teacher and stresses that motivation is a joint effort.

5. History of L2 Motivation Theories

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) remark that L2 motivation research was driven by a strong belief that studying a second language is not only different from acquiring an L1 but it is significantly different from studying other school subjects. For this reason, researchers often

had conceptualizations that motivation "linked the L2 to the individual's 'personal core', forming part of one's identity" (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2021, 59). The field of L2 motivation research has gone through different research phases as postulated by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) who divide the history of L2 motivation theory into three main phases: "the social psychological beginnings; accounting for cognitive theories and the classroom reality; focus on time, context and vision" (39). Historical accounts of theorizing L2 motivation have generally agreed on these three stages (Dörnyei and Ryan 2015, Dörnyei and Ushioda 2011, 2021): the social-psychological stage from the early days of L2 motivation research in the late 1950s to the 1990s when focus was placed on the learners' psychological state and their attitude towards the L2 social environment. During the cognitive-situated period in the 1990s the focus shifted to the educational context making theories more classroom-focused. The socio-dynamic stage started at the turn of the century and continued to the present day. Despite this three-stage classification, scholars still argue that the different phases inform one another and are still relevant and overlapping, as will be indicated in the following sections.

5.1. The Social-Psychological Period

The field of L2 motivation research traces its origins to the two educational psychologists Gardner and Lambert (1959) who pioneered L2 motivation research with the introduction of the notions of integrative and instrumental motivation in language learning psychology. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) observe, the fundamental premise of the social-psychological perspective of L2 motivation was the fact that learners' perceptions of the L2 and its target community, along with their overall ethnocentric orientation, had a direct bearing on how they learned the L2.

The birthplace of research into the area of motivation in SLA was Canada, an officially bilingual country where English and French are spoken. Gardner (2010) draws on four major aspects in the process of L2 learning: "the social milieu, individual differences, second language acquisition contexts, and outcomes" (45). According to the Gardnerian model, learners' motivation to learn the L2 heavily depended on their attitude towards the L2 community and their orientation, i.e., their goals (Gardner and Lambert 1972). As a matter of fact, L2 learning motivation was conceptualized in terms of two main variables, namely integrative motivation and instrumental motivation. The latter elements constitute the socio-educational theory (Gardner 1985). Integrativeness encompasses the learner's personal interest in the target-language people and culture as well as an ultimate goal to integrate into their

community. In other words, it "reflects a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community" (Gardner 2001, 5). On the other hand, instrumentality is related to the learner's goals such as getting good grades, passing a language proficiency exam, or applying for a job. The focus of leaners with instrumental motivation is rather placed on the pragmatic value of the L2. The social-psychological era is characterized, as described by Oxford (2020), by the "emergence of individual motivation in sociocultural contexts" (185). In fact, the social psychological period gave little importance to teaching but rather focused mainly on the learner, as acknowledged by Gardner himself who writes:

> It is not intended to provide explanations to individual teachers as to why or why not some of their students are more or less successful than others, or to give teachers advice on how to motivate their students, or to provide reasons to students to help them understand their own success or lack thereof (Gardner 2010, 26).

In response to Gardner's (2010) argument, Csizér (2017) comments that the linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes of language learning in various contexts may encompass the classroom environment; Hence, the importance of motivational dimensions of the classroom learning context in relation to students' attitudes towards their teacher as well as the course content.

Gardner's (1985) model has significantly contributed to the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Still, although this model was quite prominent, it was not beyond reproach. In fact, the socio-educational model was severely criticized for various reasons. First, it was considered too context specific as it could not be valid outside of Canada. For instance, Lamb (2004) investigated the notion of integrativeness in Indonesia, a country where learners have no contact with the target language speakers. The same applies to monolingual countries. More concerns were later raised with the spread of English globally as a lingua franca. In fact, English is no longer associated with a specific native Anglophone community (Dörnyei 2010). A case in point is teaching English in Tunisia where it is considered a foreign language as learners have rarely any contact with English native speakers. The Gardnerian view was also criticized because it portrayed language motivation as a trait-like construct, while it was claimed that it should not be considered static since it often changes throughout the learning process (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2011). Another significant critique was related to the conceptual ambiguity around the concept of integrativeness. Besides the blurry distinction between instrumental and integrative motivation at times, the notion of integrativeness was criticized

by Dörnyei (1994) who raised concerns over its conceptual definition. It should be mentioned that there were other theories that were also part of the social-psychological period. These include Schumann's (1978) acculturation model, Clément et al. (1980) social context model and Giles and Byrne's (1982) intergroup model.

5.2. The Cognitive-Situated Period

The second era of L2 motivation research is the cognitive-situated period. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) posit that the cognitive shift in the 1990s did not result in abandoning the socio-psychological perspective but rather in "integrating cognitive motivation concepts from educational psychology" (45). Having said that, Al-Hoorie (2017) speculates that, in contrast with the social-psychological era's emphasis on the macro-level picture, this period heavily focused on classroom practices and conceived of motivation research as more teacher-friendly. Hence, he suggests that it might be suitable to refer to this phase as the "educational period" (Al-Hoorie 2017, 3). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) note that this educational shift brought a new research focus on classroom-related variables:

> L2 motivation research increasingly focused on understanding the determinants of classroom motivation, and the business of directly addressing language teachers' needs and interests and seeking to engage with this professional community began to feature more explicitly among the purposes of research on L2 motivation (114).

During this period, the role of teachers in enhancing students' motivation through their classroom practices gained momentum. Students' motivation was still theorized in terms of dichotomies: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan 1985). Put differently, when learners act on their own initiative to satisfy innate desires for competence and self-determination, they are considered to be motivated by intrinsic factors such as pleasure and satisfaction. For instance, an individual who actually enjoys the learning experience in L2 learning settings is an instance of intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation refers to actions taken for and in favor of instrumental and external motives. For example, this notion applies to a learner who aspires to acquire knowledge in order to get an award or receive a scholarship. These two dimensions are not mutually exclusive since "people can, for example, be simultaneously intrinsically motivated and identified for some actions, or both externally regulated and introjected" (Ryan and Deci 2020, 3). Indeed, this dichotomy of motivation developed into the self-determination theory (SDT) that has been widely used (Noels et al.

2000). Noels et al. (2000) posit that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation "lie along a continuum of self-determination" (60). According to Niemiec and Ryan (2009), "the Self-Determination Theory sustains that when students' basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness are supported in the classroom, they are more likely to internalize their motivation to learn and to be more autonomously engaged in their studies" (139). Along the same line, Ryan and Deci (2020) describe it as follows: "SDT assumes people are inherently prone toward psychological growth and integration, and thus toward learning, mastery and connection with others" (1). Put differently, based on how people meet their requirements for autonomy, relatedness, and competence, this theory accentuates both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In this respect, Ushioda (2012) avers: "these newly adopted motivation concepts represent particular cognitions affecting motivated engagement in learning, such as goals, expectancies, beliefs, self-perceptions, and evaluations of success and failure experiences" (63).

Even though the cognitive-situated period started with the self-determination theory that was introduced by Deci and Ryan (1985), other models of L2 motivation followed suit and became prominent (Crookes and Schmidt 1991, Dörnyei 1994, Williams and Burden 1997). In this context, Csizér (2017) notes that these frameworks were education-friendly and spurred empirical studies—although most of them did not focus on the classroom context per se. Based on Keller's (1983) theory of motivation in terms of interest, relevance, expectancy, and satisfaction, Crookes and Schmidt (1991) proposed a model that has four components. It includes four levels: (1) the micro level involving the effects of motivation on how L2 stimuli are processed cognitively; (2) the classroom level dealing with teachers' motivational techniques including activities, feedback, and extrinsic rewards; (3) the syllabus or curriculum level; and (4) a broader view taking into account "considerations relevant to informal, out-of-class and long-term factors" (483). Drawing on the latter framework, Dörnyei (1994a) proposed a tripartite view of L2 motivation that encompasses the language level, the learner level, and the learning situation level. The language level involves the integrative and instrumental orientations of the L2 learner. The second level, i.e., the learner level, focuses on various affective and cognitive aspects such as the learner's anxiety, self-confidence, and self-efficacy. The learning situation level consists of three motivational components: (a) course-specific elements that are connected to the teaching materials, tasks, and the syllabus, (b) teacher-specific components that include the teacher's personality and teaching style, and (c) group-specific motivational components that focus on the classroom dynamics.

5.3. The Current Period

Al-Hoorie (2017) contends that it is quite challenging to label the current phase of language motivation research, as it has brought up various research trends. Oxford (2020) stresses the fact that concepts of one phase of L2 motivation research often continue to be relevant in other trends in what she describes as "patterns of influence and confluence" (186). She posits that this interaction can bring to the surface old concepts and revive their usage: "it is frequently the case that the later stages' contents, sometimes by means of contrast, retrospectively shine a new light on the earlier stages' contents" (ibid.). A case in point is Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2 motivational self system (L2MSS) model that was proposed following his reconceptualization of the notion of 'integrativeness' that could be illustrated in its first element, the ideal L2 self. Dörnyei (2010) contends that he built on Gardner's (1985) model in explaining learners' integrativeness in the light of their ideal self-image. He explains his assumption as follows:

> If our ideal self is associated with the mastery of an L2, that is, if the person that we would like to become is proficient in the L2, we can be described in Gardner's (1985) terminology as having an integrative disposition (Dörnyei 2010, 78).

In addition, Dörnyei's (2005) three-dimensional motivation model is a combination and elaboration of two taxonomies, namely Noels et al.'s (2003) construct that conceptualizes three interconnected types of orientations (intrinsic, extrinsic and integrative motives for language learning) and Ushioda's (2001) motivational dimensions that are based on eight elements: language-related enjoyment, positive learning history, personal satisfaction, external pressure or incentives, personal goals, desired levels of L2 competence, and academic interest and feelings towards the L2-speaking people or countries.

The L2MSS model (Dörnyei 2005) is composed of three dimensions: the 'Ideal L2 Self', the 'Ought-to L2 Self' and 'L2 Learning Experience' that are outlined as follows:

1. The Ideal L2 Self refers to the L2 target image of one's ideal self: the desire to narrow the gap between one's actual and ideal L2 selves is a powerful incentive to learn the L2 if the person they would like to become speaks that language fluently.

2. The Ought-to L2 Self describes the characteristics that learners assume they should have (such as different duties, obligations, or commitments) in order to prevent potential negative consequences.

3. The L2 Learning Experience relates context-specific motives to the current learning environment and experience (Dörnyei 2005, 105).

Ever since its introduction, the L2MSS model has been widely applied in various countries and in different learning contexts and has become the dominant L2 motivation model (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2009, Boo et al. 2015, Csizér 2020). It was also applied with L2 adult learners in Hungarian corporate contexts (Kálmán 2021).

With the spread of multilingualism throughout Europe, learners usually study English as an L2 besides another European language to be able to communicate with neighboring EU citizens. Accordingly, European learners may have an L3 self that is "created by the desire to speak the specific languages the learner is simultaneously engaging with" (Dörnyei 2019b, 48). Along these lines, Henry (2014, 2017) proposed a new label: leaners' ideal multilingual self.

In addition, recently, there has been a new direction in language motivation research that focuses on languages other than English (LOTEs) as a movement to shed light on foreign language learning in the era of global English. It has also been suggested that English as a lingua franca (ELF) has negatively affected learning other languages (Csizér and Illés 2020). Many LOTE studies have applied the L2MSS model as a theoretical framework (Henry 2017, Stamenkovska et al. 2022, Kouraichi forthcoming, Ushioda 2019a). Boo et al. (2015) suggest that the main reason behind the immense applicability of the L2MSS framework is its versatility, which they explain as follows: "it not only allowed for the engagement with existing theories and methods on their own terms but it also offered a springboard for new approaches" (153).

Another prominent model is the 'person-in-context relational view of motivation' that was advanced by Ushioda (2009). In a call for a qualitative shift to L2 motivation research, Ushioda (2009, 2012) has brought to the surface a socio-dynamic perspective of L2 learners by highlighting some limitations of the view of L2 motivation as a linear concept. Indeed, L2 motivation cannot be explained in terms of a cause-and-effect relationship since complex variables are interrelated to explain L2 learners' motivation. She advocates for a shift from abstract 'L2 learners' to real 'persons-in-context' (Ushioda 2009) to deepen one's understanding of language motivation by attending to the interplay between individual learners

and their contexts. In fact, she calls researchers to view "motivation as emergent from relations between real persons, with particular social identities, and the unfolding cultural context of activity" (Ushioda 2009, 215). Put simply, L2 learners are "necessarily located in particular cultural and historical contexts" (p. 216). Motivation is, thus, perceived as "an organic process that emerges through the complex system of interrelations" (Ushioda 2009, 220). The uniqueness of L2 learners is the most important aspect since a learner is indeed a person with a different life story to tell besides becoming an L2 learner (Consoli 2020, 2021). This view was developed by Consoli (2022) who put forward the 'life capital' perception of L2 learners.

The 'trait-state dilemma' of defining motivation, as Dörnyei (2020) calls it, was sparked by the view that IDs were not static but are rather likely to change over time and they often interact with each other. The complexity and multi-faceted nature of motivation paved the way for the complex dynamics system (CDS) perspective (Larsen-Freeman 1997; De Bot et al. 2007; De Bot and Larsen-Freeman 2011). The adoption of a complexity theory view of language motivation was considered as the approach that could account for the complexity of its conceptualization (Dörnyei 2009b, Dörnyei et al. 2015). In order to account for the changes throughout L2 learning process, Ushioda (2012) urges L2 motivation scholars "to look beyond not just social psychology but also cognitive theories of motivation, and adopt a rather more holistic perspective that takes account of these dynamically interacting complexities" (63). Along these lines, Csizér (2017) contends that "because learning an L2 is a long enterprise, students' level of motivation is bound to change throughout the process" (421). This statement attests to the changing dimension of L2 motivation, which led researchers to take into consideration the dynamic nature of motivation. However, Dörnyei (2014) points out the challenges in operationalizing the CDS theory in language motivation research. As he states, this approach is "a new and uncharted territory that there are simply no tried and tested research methodological templates available" (Dörnyei 2014, 83-84).

6. The Process-Oriented View of L2 Motivation

Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) drew on Heckhausen and Kuhl's (1985)'s Action Control Theory to develop a process model of L2 motivation that classifies motivated behavior into a three-fold process. The first stage is the "pre-actional" phase which constitutes of three sub-categories, namely goal setting, intention formation and initiating intention enactment (47). During this phase, learners' initial motivational hopes and aspirations are turned into goals that are conceptualized as intentions or steps they should follow, which in turn will eventually start

the process of intention enactment. This process may be influenced by learners' goals, their attitudes towards the L2, their expectations of success as well as the learning environment. The second stage is labelled "actional," which has to do with sustaining motivation throughout the L2 learning process. It includes sub-categories such as appraisal, self-regulation, and protecting the learning progress. The third stage is called "post-actional"; it involves learners' self-efficacy as well as a retrospection and evaluation of the strategies used through providing feedback, praise, evaluation.

The model that had been initially conceptualized in Hungary by Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) was later developed by Dörnyei (2001) who viewed the process of L2 motivational teaching in terms of 35 macro strategies for a total of 103 micro-strategies. This model sparked new research studies that explored "how a motivational teaching practice can have a significant positive impact on student motivation" (Dörnyei 2020, 56). Dörnyei's (2001) process-oriented model is divided into four categories, as delineated below.

1- Creating the basic motivational conditions:

The first step consists in setting the motivational conditions that would create a motivating L2 learning classroom environment. Some of these conditions are grouped by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) into three categories: "(i) appropriate teacher behaviors and a good relationship with the students; (ii) a pleasant and supportive atmosphere in the classroom; (iii) a cohesive learner group with appropriate group norms" (116). These variables highlight the paramount role of the teacher by considering "[his] motivational role as the key social figure within the learning environment" (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2021, 116).

2- Generating initial student motivation

The second step is to elicit students' motivation. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) point out that there is no guarantee for students to be motivated even when teachers are lucky enough to have a group of highly interested students. Dörnyei (2001) divided this category into five sub-components:

- Enhancing learners' language-related values and attitudes: there are three types of language-related values namely intrinsic, instrumental, and integrative.

- Increasing learners' expectancy of success: the expectation of success will motivate students to devote effort into learning.
- Increasing learners' goal-orientedness: some students may not understand the goal of a particular activity.
- Making the teaching materials relevant for the learners: students often want to know the relevance of the learned content to their life outside of the classroom.
- Creating realistic learners' beliefs.

3- Maintaining and Protecting Motivation

Once initial student motivation has been created, it is vital to use motivational strategies to safeguard the created atmosphere. Teachers are expected to actively cultivate motivation in order to avoid "the natural tendency to lose sight of the goal, to get tired or bored of the activity and to give way to attractive distractions" (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2021, 119). This process is fostered by making the learning activities stimulating and enjoyable, protecting the learners' psychological well-being through enhancing their self-esteem and self-efficacy skills.

4- Encouraging Positive Self-Evaluation

The fourth and final step is to encourage students' self-evaluation by providing constructive feedback. In this context, Ushioda (2022) warns against using the carrot-and-stick approach. She urges teachers to motivate students without resorting to punishments or rewards. In other terms, L2 teachers can make learners intrinsically motivated to do a task while enjoying it. Dörnyei (2020) illustrates this idea as he suggests: "by offering grades and prizes, we are not making the learning activity itself any more rewarding but are simply offering a compensation for the engagement" (54). Hence, he views that one way to enhance students' motivation in a meaningful way is by applying motivational strategies.

Dörnyei's (2001) view of motivational teaching was developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) who carried out a large-scale study to empirically investigate the use of motivational strategies by ESOL teachers in the Korean context (for more details check section 4.2.1.3). They designed a classroom observation scheme: the motivation orientation of language teaching (MOLT). Comparing students' questionnaire answers and observation results, the findings indicated a strong correlation between teachers' motivational practice and students' motivated behavior. The MOLT scheme was often used besides a student

questionnaire and was adapted to different English language learning contexts, namely China (Hsu 2020), Hungary (Kouraichi and Lesznyák 2022), and Estonia (Kouraichi in press).

7. Motivational Strategies

Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) affirm that: "teachers' motivational practice does matter" (72). In fact, the importance of teachers' motivational practice has been raised since the cognitive-situated period. This view was followed by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) who proposed ten commandments for teachers to adopt motivational teaching strategies through a large-scale study conducted in Hungary. More to the point, Cohen and Henry (2019) hold that students' motivation can be enhanced in a conscious manner; L2 teachers can do so through employing principled methods to generate and sustain students' motivation. As an answer to the assumption that all learners can be motivated, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) state that "*most* students' motivation can be 'worked on' and increased" [emphasis in original] (113). Along these lines, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) define MotS as the instructional techniques deployed "to consciously generate and enhance student motivation, as well as maintain ongoing motivated behavior and protect it from distracting and/or competing action tendencies" (103).

In a review chapter, Lamb (2019) highlights the importance of teachers' use of motivational teaching strategies as it "has the potential to speak directly to teachers, since it deals centrally with their conscious behaviors and the impact on learners" (288). Lamb (2017) equally explains that, through targeting students' motivation, teachers can generate and develop it in a way to enhance students' learning effort so as to allow them to get higher results and to sustain their motivation to the following stage of their studies. Lamb (2019) points out that the overall majority of teachers believe that it is their duty to motivate learners with varying degrees. He proposes that "there will be times (e.g., Monday morning?) or tasks (grammar revision sessions?) when deliberate attempts to motivate may feel more urgent, and of course some learners for whom such efforts will be more necessary" (287).

With reference to empirical research on MotS, Lamb (2019) contends that the number of published studies on motivational language teaching strategies remains scarce in the area of L2 motivation research. Csizér (2017) highlights the scarcity of research on motivation in instructed environments and tries to account for it, arguing that "researchers are primarily interested in the language learner as opposed to the impact that L2 instruction may have on the learner" (418). She calls for the consideration of classroom-level as well as instruction-related variables in future empirical L2 motivation studies. Indeed, one of the challenges in applying MotS, according to Dörnyei (2020), is finding ways to enhance motivation meaningfully

without resorting to the 'carrots and sticks' approach. Dörnyei (2020) proposes that "a 'meaningful' approach to motivating learners […] would need to turn the learning activity itself into being more rewarding" (54). He puts forward innovations that provide concrete ways to enhance students' motivation in a meaningful way, such as the application of MotS. In addition, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) identify some challenges in researching MotS, mainly related to the fact that the effectiveness of the use of MotS can only be investigated through experimental or quasi-experimental studies that are energy-draining and time-consuming. They put forward the following question: "would self-report measures suffice or do we need observational data concerning actual motivated student behavior?" (133). In this vein, in response to Lamb's (2016) longitudinal study in Indonesia, there has been calls not only for longitudinal methods of inquiries but also recommendation to use reflexive and reflective approach to guarantee the validity of the findings given the pivotal role of the participants (Consoli and Aoyama 2020, Consoli and Ganassin 2022).

Ushioda (2022) considers the use of MotS as a 'nudging practice'. She illustrates her point by stating that "teachers have an educational and moral responsibility to steer students toward making optimal choices" (14). However, she warns teachers against the ethical considerations of over-employing MotS, as she believes that students may become reliant on their teachers' use of MotS and would be unable to build their independent sense of agency and control over their learning process (Ushioda 2020). In this context, Spratt et al. (2002) examined the relation between autonomy and motivation with tertiary students in Hong Kong. Their findings suggest that motivation is an important predictor of learner autonomy. Hence, they recommend that L2 teachers should use MotS for their students to become autonomous. By the same token, instead of consciously applying MotS, Ushioda (2022) supports the view of "nurturing students' own motivation to learn" (11). Still, the importance of researching the use of MotS is stressed by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) as they argue:

> The most educational researchers can do at present is to raise teachers' own L2 *motivational awareness* of motivational strategies by providing them with a menu of potentially useful insights and suggestions from which they can select according to their actual priorities and concerns [emphasis in original] (112).

Following the widely held assumption that L2 teachers play a pivotal role in enhancing L2 students' motivation in the classroom, Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) conducted a large-scale study in Korea to empirically support this claim. They looked at the impact of

instructional strategies employed by EFL teachers to foster a motivating learning environment. Based on Dörnyei's (2001) model of motivational teaching, they stress the importance of culture in implementing specific MotS. The MotS used in Taiwan by Cheng and Dörnyei (2007) differ from those used in South Korea as reported by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). In a study by Bernaus and Gardner (2008), the findings show a discrepancy between students' view of MotS and teachers' reported strategy use. Csizér (2017) points out that there is no single advice or strategy that would work for all teachers in different cultural and educational contexts. Ruesch et al. (2012) and Wong (2014) emphasize that students' perception of MotS is subject to cross-cultural differences.

In the Hungarian high school context, Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022) explored the use of MotS by EFL teachers through online and in-person classroom observations and through administering a questionnaire to students and teachers. Teachers' reported use of MotS was compared with their students' questionnaire answers, which confirmed the effectiveness of the perceived strategies. Interestingly, classroom observations highlighted the focus on more attention-getting strategies in contrast with the satisfaction-generating strategies as reported in the questionnaires. More to the point, teachers who were observed both during face-to-face and online classes were found to employ MotS more frequently in online classes than during in-person classes.

8. The L2 Motivational Self System

The process-oriented view of motivation (Dörnyei 2001) was developed into the socio-dynamic perspective, which according to Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), aimed to highlight "the situated complexity of the L2 motivation process and its organic development in dynamic interaction with a multiplicity of internal, social and contextual factors" (p. 72). In fact, L2 motivation was no longer viewed as a linear concept but rather conceptualized along with other IDs in terms of interactions and relations that are affected by complex social and temporal changes. L2 motivation was then adapted to various theoretical frameworks and innovative methodologies (Dörnyei and Ryan 2015). Hiver and Papi (2019) equally account for the dynamic nature of L2 motivation as they argue that "variability and change are at the heart of all L2 motivation" (122). In addition, the dichotomies, such as the integrative/instrumental orientation as well as the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation are no longer valid to capture the complexity of L2 motivation. As a matter of fact, the L2 learning process undergoes nonlinear changes throughout time. These changes require more focus on the process rather than the

learning outcome (Hiver and Al-Hoorie 2016, Hiver and Papi 2019). L2 learning from the socio-dynamic perspective is thus conceptualized following the view that "certain phenomena involve multiple parts interacting together through dynamic, nonlinear processes that lead to striking emergent patterns over time" (Hiver and Al-Hoorie 2016, 742). In this vein, the L2MSS model explains the dynamic nature of L2 motivation as it is affected by the learners and the L2 learning context. The L2MSS model highlights learners' possible selves that are characterized by "a dynamic, forward-pointing conception that can explain how someone is moved from the present towards the future" (Dörnyei 2009b, 213).

The L2MSS originated from a large-scale study in Hungary and was later validated in other contexts (Ryan 2009b, Taguchi et al. 2009, Dörnyei and Taguchi 2010). Dörnyei et al. (2006) reported the results of a longitudinal study that targeted 13,391 high school students in Hungary through administering a questionnaire that investigated learners' attitudes towards learning any of these five foreign languages: Russian, German, English, French, and Italian. The results were also published in a number of articles (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005a, 2005b; Dörnyei and Csizér 2002). The concept of integrativeness was found to have a significant role in L2 learners' motivation despite the fact that they have little contact with native speakers or the possibility to integrate into the target language community. In fact, this finding paved the way for designing the L2MSS model.

In regard to the definition of motivation as the effort and perseverance to learn L2, it is conceptualized in terms of three dimensions of the L2MSS. According to Dörnyei (2009b), the L2 Motivational Self System includes three categories: (i) the ideal L2 self that is "centered around the internal desires of the learner", the ought-to L2 self that involves "the motivational regulations of social pressure exercised by significant or authoritative people in the learner's environment", and the L2 learning experience which is about "the actual experience of being engaged in the learning process" (218).

Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2MSS model is built on two founding theories: Markus and Nurius's (1986) notion of possible selves and Higgins's (1987) self-discrepancy theory. The concept of possible selves was put forth by Markus and Nurius (1986), in the psychology field, as a model that connects the self concept and motivational behavior. Possible selves are conceptualized as the mental representations of individuals' aspirations, motives, fears, and threats. This view of possible selves is shaped by an individual's possible self-beliefs in two ways: the hope to attain the future desired state as opposed to the fear of an unwanted self-

image. This conception goes beyond personal goals to comprehend fantasies, hopes and fears. Possible selves are also individuals' ideas of what they could become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming (Markus and Nurius 1986, 954). The primary driver of an L2 learner is this vivid perception of the ideal self. It goes along the cognitive elements of a learner's desires, anxieties, goals, and threats. The 'possible selves' theory connects the learner's current self and their future mental image. It has the ability to spur transformation in a learner from their current self to who they want to be in the future. As a matter of fact, the vision depends on the learner, their imagination to be motivated, and their willingness to ultimately achieve their goals and face any hurdles they may encounter. According to Dörnyei (2009): "tangible images and senses ensures that they receive phenomenological validity and are experienced by an individual" (12).

The motivational dimension of possible selves is further developed in Higgins's (1987) self-discrepancy theory. It rests upon three concepts: the actual self (representing a person's self-beliefs at a certain point), the ideal self (constituting individuals' beliefs of how they aspire to become), and the ought-to self (representing what others wish or expect us to become). Following this view, motivation aims to narrow the gap between the actual self and the ideal or ought-to selves.

Learners' vision is actually different their goals since "it subsumes both a desired goal and a representation of how the individual approaches or realizes that goal" (Dörnyei 2014b, 12). L2 learners' mental imagery of their future self is a predictor of their L2 learning process and progress. Put differently, motivational currents work along "visionary goals (i.e. future self-guides powered by mental imagery) and well-designed action sequences (i.e. learning plans)" (15). Moreover, vision and its related dimensions, such as mental imagery, can predict one's long-term L2 learning. That is, it is highly likely that motivational currents might be appropriately facilitated with the optimal assistance from "visionary goals (i.e., future self-guides powered by mental imagery) and well-designed action sequences (i.e., learning plans)" (15). Directed and future-oriented vision was later developed by Muir & Dörnyei (2013) who put forward the directed motivational currents (DMC).

According to Mahmoodi and Yousefi (2022), the L2MSS is the most commonly used framework for student motivation, followed by SDT. In their synthetic review, Mahmoodi and Yousefi (2022) conclude by stating: "We found no studies in Australia and the African continent. Therefore, by embracing southern contexts, future scholarship can challenge

mainstream motivation perspectives and reveal topics occluded from exploration in the L2 motivation field" (12). The model has been widely applied across the globe in countries like Saudi Arabia (Moskovsky et al. 2016), Hungary (Csizér and Kálmán 2019), South Korea (Kong et al. 2018), China (Liu and Thompson 2018), to cite but a few. A review of a few empirical studies that are relevant to the present research will follow in the next sections.

8.1. The Ideal L2 Self

The first component of the L2 motivational self system, the ideal L2 self, can be viewed from a Gardnerian perspective in terms of integrative and instrumental values. Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) propose that "the term may not so much be related to any actual, or metaphorical, *integration* into an L2 community as to some more basic *identification process* within the individual's *self-concept*" ([emphasis in original] 456). They explained that the construct of integrativeness, originally proposed by Gardner (1985), should be interpreted in a new way. According to Dörnyei (2005), one's integrativeness with the L2-speaking community is a facet of their ideal L2 self. In fact, a learner often aspires to speak the L2 fluently and to be able to integrate easily. As concerns the element of instrumentality, the representation of the ideal L2 self as a proficient speaker equally entails a successful professional self (Dörnyei 2010). In addition, Dörnyei (2010) argues that instrumentality could also be viewed in the L2MSS model. On the one hand, it could be associated with ideal L2 self-image as a future successful person on the professional level (learning English to get promoted); on the other hand, it could be related to the ought-to L2 self when parents, for instance, put pressure on their children to get a good job in the future or to pass an exam. In this context, Ushioda (2013a) points out that Japanese EFL learners' motivation could be viewed in light of the self concept. In fact, due to globalization, it has become possible to internally identify with a target international identity and to be considered a global citizen instead of trying to identify with an external community. Similarly, Lamb's (2004) findings from Indonesian high school students support Dörnyei and Csizér's (2002) claims about the changing view of integrativeness. As concluded by Dörnyei and Csizér (2005) in their study of the effects of attitudinal contact on adolescent Hungarians' motivational disposition, intercultural contact through tourism plays a major role in promoting students' motivated language learning behavior. Csizér (2020) also accentuates the importance of learners' identification with the L2 community in conceptualizing the L2MSS model.

The 'ideal L2 Self Element' has received most attention in various studies, as it is often perceived as the central component of the L2MSS model. As posited by Dörnyei (2005), the

ideal L2 self is a strong motivator for L2 learners if they aim to become proficient L2 speakers, since they have a strong desire to narrow the gap between their actual self and their future ideal L2 self. Numerous empirical studies investigated the role of the L2 ideal self in motivating learners. For instance, in a study by Piniel and Csizér (2015), the IDs among Hungarian English majors were studied throughout a semester of a writing seminar. Interestingly, the findings indicated that the ought-to L2 self and the L2 learning experience vary through time while the L2 ideal self remained static. In fact, the stability of the ideal L2 self construct proves that the strong image that students have of themselves is not influenced by the expectations of their social milieu nor by their unfavorable learning experience. In another study by Taguchi et al. (2009), the relationship between the ideal L2 self and the notion of integrativeness was explored in China, Iran, and Japan. The findings revealed that integrativeness can be defined as the ideal L2 self given its powerful influence in motivating EFL learners. In an attempt to test the impact of the ideal L2 self on Japanese EFL learners' motivated behavior, Ryan (2009) concluded that the ideal L2 self is directly correlated with learners' motivated behavior and that integrativeness constitutes a major part of the ideal L2 self construct.

Papi et al (2019) identified two main limitations of the L2MSS model pertaining to "asymmetricity in standpoints and lack of clear regulatory distinctions" (15). In fact, the distinction of the two self-guides holds two different variables (that are promotion and prevention). In other words, L2 learners' hopes, aspirations, advancements, growth, and accomplishments highlight L2 ideal self-guides with a focus on promotion. In contrast, the prevention focus refers to ought self-guides that are related to responsibilities and obligations (Dörnyei 2009). Higgins (1998) supports this idea by arguing that "different ways of regulating pleasure and pain, called regulatory focus, have a major impact on people's feelings, thoughts, and actions that is independent of the hedonic principle per se" ([emphasis in original] 2). In this context, Papi et al (2019) reconceptualized the L2 ideal self and the ought-to L2 self to be divided into own and other aspects. In other terms, each element should include questionnaire items capturing the difference between aspects that relate to the L2 learner and others that are influenced by the social milieu of the learner. Their conceptualization was validated in a study with a group of students in the U.S using confirmatory factor analysis as well as regression analysis, resulting in the 2X2 model (Papi et al. 2019).

8.2. The Ought-to L2 Self

The second construct of the L2MSS model, the ought-to L2 self, is concerned with the qualities that L2 learners ought to have in order to meet the expectations of their family, social milieu, or significant others. As a matter of fact, L2 learners are rather motivated by external ought-to perceptions that dictate it as their responsibility or obligation to master the L2 (Dörnyei 2005, 2009). Put differently, learners who are motivated by their ought-to L2 selves are influenced by the view that it is their duty or responsibility to fulfill people's perceptions and views and not theirs. As a matter of fact, L2 learners are driven by the responsibility to do well in order to meet their significant others' expectations. In this sense, L2 motivation, in this case, may not be driven by the learner's personal desire to learn L2 but may rather spring from the desire to please other people.

Some empirical studies have addressed the construct of the ought-to L2 self in relation to the notion of instrumentality. Ryan (2009) concluded that Japanese learners have an instrumental motive to learn the L2 for professional success, which is closely associated with their ought-to L2 self. In addition, Kormos and Csizér (2008) studied the relationship between the ideal self and ought-to L2 self with integrativeness and instrumentality among Hungarian high school students, university students and adult learners. Depending on their self-guides and international posture, all age groups showed different attitudes and motivated behavior. The authors also noted that L2 ought-to self-construct was not valid. Along these lines, Csizér and Kormos (2008) found that some questionnaire items loaded on instrumentality without being designed to measure it in the first place.

8.3. The L2 Learning Experience

The third element, the L2 learning experience, is not related to the learners' self-concept. It rather concerns the learning environment in the classroom, the teacher, the teaching materials, the classmates, and the successful learning experience. The L2 learning experience was not empirically studied in relation to the ideal or ought-to L2 self. Indeed, Csizér and Kálmán (2019) propose that, despite applying the L2MSS model in various contexts, the component of the L2 learning experience has received very little attention. In this context, Dörnyei (2019) contends that the element of the L2 learning experience is "undertheorized," which has made it "the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System" (22). In an attempt to reconceptualize this element, Dörnyei (2019) proposes drawing on the notion of engagement to define it as "the perceived quality of the learners' engagement with various aspects of the

language learning process" (26). The scarcity of studies focusing on the L2 learning experience is explained by the ambiguity of the L2 learning experience component. Dörnyei (2009) claims that this component was conceptualized differently from the ideal and ought-to L2 self. Hence, it requires further study. It has also been questioned whether the learning experience concerns only the classroom or whether it extends beyond the classroom to include the L2 learning experience as a whole. Ryan (2008) argues that this view allows us to "remove the risk of the narrow classroom-based interpretation of this aspect of the L2 self and allow us to consider the experience of L2 learners in a more comprehensive manner, taking into account learning experience both within and outside the confines of the classroom" (118).

In view of the versatile research using the L2MSS model, there has been scarce research on the L2 learning experience. Csizér (2019) conducted a qualitative interview study to investigate teachers' opinion on the L2 learning experience. Although it did not involve students, this study yielded insightful results such as the importance of teaching-related factors like teachers' personality traits and teaching methods, student-related factors such as opportunities of language contact, the link between success experiences and self-efficacy for students and teachers, positive attitudes, self-related issues, and dispositions towards learning. Csizér and Kálmán (2019) argue that "attitudes and dispositions do not only act as prerequisites to positive learning experiences, but they are an integral part of both retrospective and concurrent learning experiences, which create a cycle of positive attributions conductive to L2 motivation" (239). In fact, foreign language learners can initiate and nurture their motivational drive—a process influenced by temporal and contextual changes. The learning experience could also influence this progress. In addition, Piniel and Albert (2019) propose that the L2 learning experience construct could be linked to the notion of 'flow' in order to develop our understanding of it. The concept of flow is defined by the learners' ability to focus on the process of learning, their ability to control their learning pace, and the confidence they should muster to deal with any given task (Piniel and Albert 2019). Moreover, in a study by Csizér and Kormos (2009), the L2 learning experience was addressed as a variable in itself. The authors defined the L2 learning experience as the classroom learning environment that determines Hungarian high school and university students' enjoyment of learning English. Their results revealed that students' positive attitudes towards their teacher and the learning environment as well as the engaging tasks made students enthusiastic to learn the L2. Similar results were also found by Lamb (2009) who investigated the L2 learning experience of two Indonesian students. As previously mentioned, the L2 experience element of the L2MSS model has received scarce attention by researchers. In an attempt to fill this gap, I will use the ARCS

model (Keller 2010) that originates from instructional theory that was applied in language learning contexts to bridge the gap between L2 motivation theories and classroom practice.

9. The ARCS Model

The ARCS (attention, relevance, confidence, satisfaction) model was conceptualized by Keller (1983) in attempt to fill the gap in motivation research of designing instruction that would stimulate students' motivation to learn. He believed that most theories of the time either focused on the psychological aspects of student motivation or their job satisfaction, i.e., the instrumental view. These approaches, in Keller's (1983) view, did not highlight the strategies that teachers can use to motivate students. His instructional model is based on the expectancy-value theory (Atkinson 1964) which suggests that students are motivated to engage in a particular activity if it is viewed to be linked to a personal need or an expectation for success. These two categories were further developed into four components, namely interest, relevance, expectancy, and outcomes. Interest is related to factors of raising and stimulating students' attention. Relevance is about goal-directed activities that students perceive their relevance to their needs. Expectancy refers to learners' expectations for success after mastering the learned material. Outcomes are related to the intrinsic reinforcement of learning. These categories were later labelled as attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction (Keller 1987).

The most recent view of the ARCS model was proposed by Keller (2010). It was driven by the complexity of conceptualizing motivation, which can be due to "the complexity of environmental, cultural, and personal factors that interact to influence a person's motivation at any given point in time" (Keller 2010, 12). To further illustrate his point on the complexity of motivation, Keller (2010) uses the metaphor of 'leaves or a rock'. He raises the question of whether motivation should be compared to a pile of dry leaves or rather to a rock. Some learners would view motivation as a pile of leaves since it "can be unstable, frequently changing, elusive, and easily modified by external forces" (Keller 2010, 21). If we apply this view to a classroom context, students can be highly motivated at one point, and then their motivational state might quickly drop. As a matter of fact, even though teachers employ motivational techniques, their effectiveness might be short-lived. For learners who would opt for the rock metaphor, they consider motivation "as being determined, single minded, strong willed, and resistant to change" (Keller 2010, 21). Following Keller's argument, while it would seem easier to motivate students with a stable and high motivational level, they can be much more resistant to change especially "in situations that are not consistent with their goals" (Keller 2010, 22).

In his ARCS model, Keller (2010) classifies motivation into four categories: "these categories enable you to quickly gain an overview of the major dimensions of human motivation, especially in the context of learning motivation, and how to create strategies to stimulate and sustain motivation in each of the four areas" (44). Consequently, the application of these teaching strategies is straightforward for teachers. They could touch upon these four elements to enhance their students' motivation and apply them in their classes. The following subsections will provide further explanation to each element of the ARCS model (Keller 2010).

9.1. Attention

The first category, attention, includes "motivational variables related to stimulating and sustaining learners' curiosities and interests" (Keller 2010, 44). To put simply, it is mainly concerned with finding ways to direct and manage L2 leaners' attention during the lesson. Attention-getting strategies involve three subcategories:

1. Perceptual Arousal:

The teacher may pose the following rhetorical question: "what can I do to capture students' interest?" The teacher is expected to draw students' attention by using new ways of tickling their curiosity. Examples of perceptual arousing strategies include using videos, photos, anecdotes, and having a good sense of humor.

2. Inquiry Arousal:

The teacher seeks ways to stimulate an attitude of inquiry among students. It is often employed during warm-up activities at the beginning of the lesson when students are involved in a problem-solving activity through the use of questions.

3. Variability:

In order to sustain students' attention throughout the class, variation should be used in the activities. It can be attained through a change of the tone of the voice or through presenting different materials each time.

9.2. Relevance

The second category is relevance, whereby the teacher attempts to narrow the discrepancy between the learners' goals and the subject matter. Keller (2010) postulates that, when the material speaks to the students' needs, students will acknowledge its importance and

become more motivated to study it. He further explains: “before students can be motivated to learn, they will have to believe that the instruction is related to important personal goals or motives and feel connected to the setting” (Keller 2010, 45). Relevance-producing strategies include:

1. Goal Orientation:

Teachers try to understand students’ needs and do their best to accommodate them. This is possible in situations when the teacher, for example, highlights the personal relevance of the material. In fact, students become “more motivated to learn if they perceive that the new knowledge or skill will help them achieve a goal in the present or future” (Keller 2010, 45).

2. Motive Matching:

Teachers are expected to take into account the personal motives of students and to provide them with appropriate choices. They are also advised to provide students with the opportunity to define their achievement goals. The use of motive matching strategies may be exemplified through the inclusion of competitive games or cooperative group work, which will make the tasks more appealing.

3. Familiarity:

The teacher attempts to relate the instruction to the learners’ previous experiences and interests in order to engage their interest in the content of the lesson. For instance, to make the abstract material sound more concrete, the teacher may resort to using familiar examples that are relevant to prior experiences.

9.3. Confidence

Confidence-building strategies are used in order to convince learners that they are able to learn and to work on their assignments successfully. This is possible through following these three strategies.

1. Learning Requirements:

Teachers usually help their students build a positive expectation for success through clearly presenting the learning requirements. The latter make the activity clearer for students and allow them to avoid any confusion that might affect their psychological state.

2. Success Opportunities:

Students' learning experience is expected to support their beliefs in succeeding based on their competence. Their success opportunities should vary from the accomplishment of simple tasks to the acquisition of new knowledge and completion of challenging tasks that require more skills to achieve mastery.

3. Personal Control:

Informing students with the expected goal of a particular activity nurtures their confidence. When students are clearly aware that their success is based on their efforts and when the evaluation criteria are clearly stated, students will have a higher chance of success if they meet the requirements. Being aware of what is expected from them would foster students' personal control over their learning experience. In addition, providing student with corrective feedback that helps them recognize their mistakes would boost their personal control and uplift their self-confidence.

9.4. Satisfaction

According to Keller (2010), students should have a sense of satisfaction either during or following their learning experience. This is possible through the following sub-strategies:

1. Natural consequences:

The teacher may ask: How can I provide meaningful opportunities for learners to use their newly acquired knowledge/skill? The teacher can provide meaningful opportunities for students to use the newly learned content. Examples include case studies, experiential learning activities for possible application opportunities, and praise is encouraged.

2. Positive Consequences:

In order to reinforce the learners' efforts to succeed, students expect to receive symbolic rewards such as certificates in recognition of their accomplishment.

3. Equity:

Following successful task accomplishments and rewards, equity is guaranteed through consistency in providing initial criteria and expectations.

To sum up, Keller (2010) proposes that "these categories of motivational variables help you understand the major components of the motivation to learn and provide guidance for generating strategies to use for each category" (55). Csizér (2020), on her part, argues that the ARCS model bridges the gap between SLA theories and teaching practice since, "on the one hand, Keller's theory was firmly embedded in the psychological tradition of motivation research (expectancy-value theory, field theory and social-learning theory), while on the other hand, it provided clear implications for teachers in terms of how to increase students' motivation" (13). In fact, the ARCS model can be easily followed by teachers or curriculum designers in lesson planning.

In a state-of-the-art paper, Li and Keller (2018) reviewed studies that applied the ARCS model in various areas. Most studies were carried out in computer-assisted contexts, e-learning platforms or with the use of electronic resources (e.g., the use of tablets) in the STEM field. They also reviewed a few studies pertinent to L2 motivation research. As argued by Maeng and Lee (2015), "research in this area has not adequately considered important aspects of L2 motivation from a classroom perspective, such as teachers, materials, tasks, and instructional design" (27). In this context, Maeng and Lee (2015) conducted a study in South Korea in which they examined EFL teachers' implementation of the ARCS strategies in macro-teaching classes. After observing and recording macro-teaching sessions, they concluded that teachers' experience as well as their proficiency levels were of paramount importance in implementing MotS. For instance, more experienced teachers tended to use strategies less often than novice teachers. Teachers' English proficiency was also another factor in determining their motivational practice. In fact, they recommended training novice teachers to include the ARCS categories in their lesson plans to enhance their students' motivation.

Another study was conducted by Min and Chon (2020) who explored the effectiveness of using the ARCS strategies by comparing students' perceptions of these MotS to their teachers' reported use of these MotS. They also interviewed some students to further examine their perception of MotS. They were the first to adapt the instructional materials motivational survey (IMMS) (see section 4.2.1.1) to include a teacher version with the same items. The original version was developed by Keller (2010) following his ARCS model. The adapted version by Min and Chon (2020) made the comparison of teachers and students views on the

use of the ARCS strategies possible. The same items were put in a statement form for the student version (Teacher uses …) and in question form in the teacher version (Do you use…?).

The ARCS model was applied in Hungary for the first time (Kouraichi and Lesznyák 2022) to highlight teachers' motivational practice through their reported questionnaire answers and classroom observations. Students were also involved through IMMS questionnaire (Min and Chon 2020). The questionnaire results indicated that students perceived the MotS implemented by their teachers regardless of their proficiency levels since they were mostly high achievers. Hungarian teachers of English mainly relied on using attention-getting and satisfaction-generating strategies.

A similar study was carried out in Estonia involving ESP students and teachers at Tallinn university (Kouraichi in press). The data were collected through the IMMS questionnaire to students and teachers as well as online an in-person class observation through the MOLT scheme. Interestingly, the findings revealed the frequent use of confidence-building strategies, which was also confirmed by the observation results. This study contributed to the limited research on language learning motivation in English in the Estonian higher education context.

10. Concluding remarks

Throughout this chapter, I have provided a preview of the main theoretical frameworks used for this research while highlighting the literature gap that this study aims to fill. This research has three guiding frameworks, namely Dörnyei's (2001) process model of motivational teaching, Dörnyei's (2009a) L2MSS model, and Keller's (2010) ARCS model. By and large, conceptualizing language learning motivation has developed from being viewed as a psychological trait to being theorized as a dynamic concept that is dependent on time and context. Moreover, a growing interest has focused on the learning context that involves the classroom environment and the teacher, a worthwhile research quest. In the present research, I am particularly interested in exploring how Tunisian university students envision their future selves as users of English and how these future selves are shaped by their present learning experience. To conclude, the following chapter illustrates the continuity of L2 motivation models and the way in which they inform each other. I have tried to connect the relevant L2 motivation models that fit into this study and to showcase how they feed into each other, forming continuity in theorizing L2 motivation.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction

This chapter will present the data collection and analysis procedures for the present study. I will start the chapter by listing the research questions that drive the present work. The selection of participants will be explained, then the research setting, and the sampling method will be briefly described followed by the data collection procedure of questionnaire administration and classroom observations will be highlighted. In addition, the methodology adopted together with the steps followed will be explained. The main statistical procedures used for the quantitative analysis of the data will also be outlined.

2. Research Questions

In light of the literature gap that was identified in section 2, this research aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the motivational strategies that Tunisian EFL teachers employ?
2. Is there a significant difference between students' perception of motivational strategies and their teachers' reported use of motivational strategies?
3. What is the relationship between teachers' self-reported use of motivational strategies and their actual classroom practice?
4. How is teachers' motivational practice related to students' EFL self-perception?

3. Research Design

During the early days of L2 motivation research, Gardner (1972) suggested that a quantitative method is an appropriate method of data collection in the field of L2 motivation. The most common quantitative data collection method in L2 motivation research is using cross-sectional surveys. The majority of quantitative studies include self-report questionnaires with close-ended items that are administered only once. According to Sekaran (2003), a questionnaire is defined as: "a preformulated written set of questions to which respondents record their answers, usually within rather closely defined alternatives" (43). Since surveys typically ask respondents to report on their overall experience, the main advantage of this data collection method is its convenience to researchers. In fact, it is cost-effective and relatively quick to gather answers from a large sample especially if the survey is administered online. It

could also reach a larger population, which would allow the generalization of the findings. In fact, a quantitative method is an appropriate method when the total sample contains a large number of participants. Then, in 2005, Dörnyei employed a quantitative method to build the L2MSS model of motivation. However, it should be noted that this method can only record general data on L2 motivation as a stable construct and cannot record its temporal or contextual change. Another drawback is that respondents cannot reflect on their answer choice or learning experience as with open-ended questions. Despite these shortcomings, questionnaires have been widely used and have yielded interesting results in L2 motivation (Boo et al. 2015). In a survey of 335 empirical L2 motivation studies, Boo et al. (2015) identified that 53% of papers employed quantitative research methods, while studies that followed mixed methodologies or qualitative methods represent around 21% each.

Qualitative methods of data collection include journals, interviews, narratives, and classroom observations. With the use of a qualitative approach, the researcher is able to perform systematic data collection and analysis that foregrounds the complexity of the research setting and highlights how the context affects the informants' experiences (Patton, 2002). The aim of the analysis is to find recurrent themes in the data. Ushioda (2009, 2016) has been calling for more qualitative methods in L2 motivation research that would underscore participants' behavior in a particular context by adopting a 'small lens' approach. Moreover, the 'wine and conversation approach' proposed by Ushioda (2020) is another instance of qualitative data collection through interviews. This approach foregrounds Ushioda's (2009) proposal for conducting a small lens research that would explore the individual learner's L2 learning experience in more details. While this approach could yield rich findings, it is time-consuming to recruit participants, conduct long interviews and analyze the data. As concerns the present study, although it could have been highly effective to conduct post-lesson interviews with teachers, I did not do so due to time constraints. I still managed to have some brief conversations with the participants after class observations and I took notes of their remarks. It should equally be noted that learning contexts play a pivotal role in influencing students' motivated behavior (Dörnyei and Ushioda 2011). Classroom observations are regarded as a context-sensitive approach to record classroom dynamics involving the teacher, the students, their interactions, and reactions. For classroom observations, the researcher can either follow a particular scheme or simply take notes of what is happening at the time of the observation or later if the lesson is recorded.

The present research is designed as a mixed-method study to explore the use of MotS by EFL university teachers in Tunisia and investigate students' motivational selves. Stange (2006) defines the mixed method approach as a process that "involved integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to generating new knowledge and can involve either concurrent or sequential use of these two classes of methods to follow a line of inquiry" (24). Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis aims to provide the research with a thorough understanding of the data (Bulsara 2015). Csizér (2017) argues that the possibilities of quantitative and qualitative approaches are numerous to explore teachers' influence on students' L2 motivation. However, she explains that the scarcity of such studies may be due to the complexity of the research design that is needed to analyze the data. According to Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021), classroom observation data can be used along a questionnaire that records self-reports of the teachers or students. In this regard, the present study uses a mixed methods approach by combining classroom observations with teacher reports on their motivational teaching practice. In fact, adopting mixed methodologies, quantitative and qualitative, adds to the validity of research (Dörnyei 2007). Along these lines, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021) propose that "scholars hope to maximize both the internal and the external validity of the research through offsetting the inherent weaknesses of a method by the strength of another" (223). Comparing teachers' questionnaire answers with results of classroom observations will add to the validity of the findings.

4. Data Collection

The data collection process was carried out during the academic year of 2021-2022. The whole process covered nearly two semesters, starting from September 2021 and ending in May 2022. A call for teacher participants was shared in the fall semester when the pilot study was conducted. Then during the spring semester, the main data for this study were collected. During the data collection period, classes were held in-person and masks were compulsory in classrooms as per the Covid-19 regulations. Heads of English departments were first contacted via phone or email and written or oral consent was obtained before the start of the data collection process. A Google form was then shared on Facebook with my network and in groups of teacher associations in Tunisia to recruit teachers willing to participate in the study. A total of 46 teachers of English from nine universities answered the questionnaire while nearly half agreed to take part in classroom observations. Student participants and teacher participants were later contacted at the beginning of the spring semester.

5. Participants

The present research involved 13 institutions from 9 public universities which cover 10 governorates across the country. The participants were recruited from different universities in Tunisia by using both convenience and snowball sampling methods to reach out to participants willing to answer the questionnaire and participate in the classroom observation. Convenience sampling was followed by snowball effect through teachers asking other colleagues to participate. Sampling techniques include random and non-random methods (Dörnyei 2007). Part of the non-random method is convenience sampling, which is, according to Dörnyei and Csizér (2012), considered as the major non-probability sampling method among L2 researchers. As stated by Dörnyei and Csizér (2012): "members of the target population are selected only if they meet certain practical criteria, such as geographical proximity, availability at a certain time, or easy accessibility" (81). They add that snowball sampling is a sort of a 'chain reaction' through which the researcher chooses a small group of participants who fit the selection criteria and requests their help in recruiting more participants with the same characteristics.

It should be mentioned that I had easier access to English majors because I knew teacher colleagues at various faculties of Humanities. Access to other institutions was rather difficult because heads of departments or institutions were not cooperative and did not allow class observations since sanitary Covid restrictions were in place. The choice of university students was based on various reasons. First, access to university students is much easier than secondary school students since the latter would require their consent besides parental consent. The second reason was that the targeted age group will better evaluate their L2MSS and evaluate their teachers' use of MotS. For administrative reasons, I was cautious that some strikes in secondary education might affect the data collection process and the observation of classes could take a longer time. Another reason was the interest in understanding the importance of English learning from the perspective of university graduates. In their review of language motivation studies, Boo et al. (2015) state that the ease of access to university students as well as ethical measures are the main reasons for the popularity of this target population in L2 motivation studies. They remark that the most appropriate target population is secondary school students who are underrepresented in SLA research.

5.1.1. Student Participants

A Total of 264 undergraduate students were recruited (English majors: N = 248 and non-English majors: N = 16). The table below gives more information on the background of the student participants. Interestingly, some respondents did not indicate their age and/or their gender. Note that most students were between 19 and 24 years old, which is the usual age for undergraduate students in Tunisia. Only a few participants were aged 25 or above. Student participants were recruited from different universities across Tunisia. However, the majority were from one university which was the easiest to access (the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of Sousse). As will be explained in the next section, questionnaire administration for students had to be conducted both online, and in a pen and paper format. In addition, for logistical reasons, the vast majority of student respondents were eventually from one university.

Table 1: Students' background information

Gender	Male	57
	Female	171
	Other	2
Age	Less than 20 years old	23
	20 - 24 years old	193
	25 - 30 years old	9
	More than 30 years old	3

4.1.2. Teacher Participants

The total number of teachers involved in this study is 46. Out of the total number of participants, 21 teachers volunteered to take part in the classroom observation phase. Given the relatively large number of observations scheduled over a short period of time and the different universities involved, only one class observation could be scheduled per teacher. The following table gives further details on the teacher participants' age, gender, and years of teaching experience. The study involved participants with a wide range of experience as some were novice teachers, mid-career and even approaching retirement (65 years old). All participants were Tunisian with Arabic as their first language, French being the second language, and English the third language.

Table 2: Teacher participants

Number of teachers	Gender		Age	Years of teaching experience
Total 46	Female	Male	28 - 59	1 - 35
	42	4		

Although 91% of teacher participants were female, it should be noted that this percentage does not reflect the real proportion of male and female university teachers of English. According to data published on the ministry of higher education and research in 2021, the percentage of female university teachers was 54%[3]. There are 13 universities and one general directorate of technical institutes in Tunisia. Teacher respondents were from 10 different universities across Tunisia. For the class observations, I visited 6 universities in 4 different cities along the coast of Tunisia. Only 4 out of 21 teachers who volunteered for observations were teaching ESP students. Among the overall number of participants, eight teachers taught ESP students while thirty-eight teachers were teaching English majors.

4.2. Instruments

To answer the above stated research questions, I used two questionnaires. The IMMS questionnaire was distributed to students and teachers and the L2MSS questionnaire was only administered for students only. I also conducted classroom observations using the MOLT scheme. The details for each instrument will be given in the following sections.

4.2.1. Questionnaires

4.2.1.1. The IMMS Questionnaire

The instructional materials motivational survey (IMMS) was originally designed by Keller (2010). It follows the four main categories of the ARCS model (described in section 2.9). Min and Chon (2020) adapted the original IMMS and designed a teacher version of the same questionnaire. The difference between the original questionnaire designed by Keller (2010) and the version that was developed by Min and Chon (2020) lies mainly in the degree of explicitness in the wording of items. The adapted version includes 40 items listed as close-

[3] http://www.mes.tn/page.php?code_menu=13

ended statements and was validated in the Korean context. The same items were addressing either students or teachers. In the student version, items start by "Teacher gives..." while in the teacher version items are formulated as questions "Do you use …?". The administered version had two parts. The first part collected participants' background information including their age, gender, university, and years of teaching experience (for teachers). The second part asked teachers to report on the MotS they employ in the EFL class and students to evaluate their teacher's motivational practice (see appendix A). The following are examples for each of the ARCS categories:

- Attention (10 items): e.g., Teacher varies teaching materials or presentation style, when necessary
- Relevance (10 items): e.g., Teacher clearly explains the relevance of the lesson to what I already know
- Confidence (10 items): e.g., Teacher tells us about what I will be able to do after successfully completing the lesson
- Satisfaction (10 items): e.g., Teacher shows personal interest when I work hard or when I complete an assignment successfully

In a study conducted by Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022) in the Hungarian high school context, the IMMS questionnaire was translated into Hungarian, the participants' native language. The main reason for the translation was that student participants were teenagers and they might not have encountered some words in English related to classroom dynamics and teaching techniques. For this research, the questionnaire was administered in English for a number of reasons. First, students at university level are expected to have a B1 level (they should pass in the high school leaving exam) and the questionnaire items were easy to understand. It should be noted that the questionnaire was not translated into Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) since students will not be able to understand some technical words related to instructional materials. In fact, since most technical terms in Tunisia are often used in French, students often ignore their MSA counterpart. In Kouraichi (2018), the IMMS was translated into MSA because it was administered to middle school students. Still, while piloting the questionnaire, I found that many words had to be explained to students. To guarantee the reliability of students' answers and their teachers', questionnaires for both groups needed to be in the same language, that is English. The questionnaires were piloted with a small sample to check the clarity of items and yield feedback from participants.

For the IMMS questionnaire, teachers and students were asked to respond following a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaires were administered following Dörnyei's (2007) guidelines. The purpose of the questionnaire was first briefly outlined, the anonymity of answers was explained, and a thank you note was stated at the end of the questionnaire. It was also explained to student respondents that there was no right or wrong answers, and that their answers will be kept confidential, totally anonymous, and will not be shared with their teacher.

Student questionnaires were shared first online via a Google form. In order to guarantee the completion of the questionnaire, all responses were marked mandatory in the Google form. However, due to the limited number of responses and time constraints, a pen-and-paper version was later distributed and collected by teachers during their classes or by me following the class observation. Since the questionnaire follows a Likert scale, coding answers was straightforward. The gender of participants was coded into 1 (female) and 2 (male). The option 'other' was also provided in the questionnaire and coded as 3.

4.2.1.2. The L2MSS Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed following Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2MSS model (section 2.8). The administered items were adapted from previous versions of the L2MSS questionnaire by Dörnyei (2005, 2010), Dörnyei and Ryan (2015), Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009), and Papi et al. (2019). The adapted questionnaire includes six subscales: ideal L2 self/own, ideal L2 self/other, ought-to L2 self/own, ought-to L2 self/other, willingness-to-communicate, and L2 learning experience. The ideal L2 self/own included seven items, six items represented the ideal L2 self/other, and five items were listed under each of the ought-to L2 self/own and ought-to L2 self/other. The willingness to communicate component also included five items, which were all adapted from the original questionnaire designed by Dörnyei (2009). The own/other distinction was adapted from the 2 x 2 model by Papi et al. (2019). The last five items under the L2 learning experience were based on Dörnyei and Ryan's (2015) conceptualization. A total of 33 items were presented in order (see Appendix C). Below are examples for each category of the questionnaire:

- **Ideal L2 Self/Own:** I often imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English fluently.

- **Ideal L2 Self/Other:** The most important people to me hope that I will one day speak English fluently.
- **Ought-to L2 Self/Own:** If I don't work on my English, it will have a negative impact on my future.
- **Ought-to L2 Self/Other:** Learning English is necessary because the people surrounding me expect me to do so.
- **Willingness to Communicate:** I try to talk when I have a chance to speak English in English classes.
- **L2 learning experience:** In general, I have had great English teachers.

The L2MSS questionnaire was administered to students as a separate section of the same Google form as the IMMS. Since it followed a different rating scale, the new Likert-type for the L2MSS questionnaire was explained to respondents. Students were expected to answer items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The validity and reliability of the scales developed by Taguchi et al. (2009) were verified in Japan, China, and Iran. They were also validated in Korea (You and Dörnyei 2016, You et al. 2016).

4.2.1.3. Classroom Observation

The motivational orientation of language teaching (MOLT) observation scheme that was developed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) was used for classroom observations. The MOLT scheme was designed following two main frameworks: Dörnyei's (2001) process model of motivational strategies and Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) classroom observation scheme: the communicative orientation of language teaching (COLT). The MOLT scheme was used in different contexts: China (Hsu 2020, Thayne 2013, Hennerby-Leung and Xiao 2020), Hong Kong (Lee and Lo 2017, Lee et al. 2020, Lee 2022) Iran (Papi and Abdollahzadeh 2012), and Hungary (Kouraichi and Lesznyák 2022). It was reported that the cultural context plays a vital role in the use of MotS (Wong 2014).

The MOLT scheme comprises two major parts. The first part is used to report the teacher's use of motivational strategies. It includes 25 items that are grouped under four categories: teacher discourse, participation structure, encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation, and activity design. To arouse students' curiosity or attention, state the communicative purpose or utility of the activities, provide appropriate strategies and/or models to help students complete an activity successfully, and other similar activities are all part of

teacher discourse. Teachers may also engage in informal social conversations with students. Whether or not students work in pairs or groups is determined by the participation structure. Teachers should discuss exercise answers with the whole class without expressing any judgement or criticism, concentrate on what can be learned from their mistakes, help students learn from their own mistakes, revise their work, or review and correct their peers' work, among other strategies to promote positive retrospective self-evaluation. Activity design looks at whether an activity gives students the chance to express their personal opinion, includes elements of curiosity, creativity, or fantasy, poses an intellectual challenge, results in the creation of a tangible product, and promotes individual or team competition.

The second part documents students' motivated behavior that can be measured in terms of three variables: attention, engagement, and eager volunteering. Students demonstrate attention when two thirds or more are eagerly following the teacher's talk and movements, noticing their classmates when they participate, watching any visual or listening to auditory stimuli provided by their teacher. Engagement is measured when at least two thirds of the class are actively participating in a discussion with the teacher, working on their assignments, or exhibiting any non-verbal body sign that they are engaged with the teacher. Students' volunteering is noted when one third of the class are volunteering to engage in a speaking activity without the teacher assigning them to speak, for instance.

The MOLT scheme followed a time sampling method, which "gives a chronological representation of the flow of the whole class, that is, the distribution of the particular phenomenon throughout the class" (Dörnyei 2007, 180). The observer records minute-by-minute the above-mentioned variables as each minute elapses on the timer. Following Spada and Fröhlich's (1995) recommendation, whenever more than one event is observed under the same category, only the event that lasts longer should be recorded in a one-minute segment.

All classroom observations were conducted during the spring semester of the academic year 2021-2022 (February-March 2022). A total of 21 face-to-face classes were observed. Classes were taught by 21 teachers from different universities and different classes (language, culture studies, literature). Only 4 teachers were teaching ESP classes while 19 taught English majors. Due to the limited data collection time, one observation was scheduled for each teacher. Each class lasted one hour but the observation of the main lesson lasted only 45 minutes (excluding any late starts, breaks, etc.). Following Covid-19 sanitary measures, only the researcher could observe classes, after the approval of the head of institutes or department

chairs. During the classroom observation, the researcher is a nonparticipant-observer (Dörnyei 2007). Since the observer uses an observation scheme, it is called 'a structured observation' (Dörnyei 2007). Tables 3 and 4 below list information related to the teacher participating in the observations.

Table 3: Number of participants in Classroom observations

Institutions	**Number of Teachers involved**
Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse	9
Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax	5
Institute of Higher Studies of Business of Sfax	3
Higher Institute of Languages of Nabeul	2
Higher Institute of Applied Languages of Moknine	1
Higher Institute of Technological Studies of Sfax	1
Total	**21**

More information on participating teachers in classroom observations is detailed in the table below (table 4). Teachers are randomly numbered from 1 to 21. As shown in the table below, teachers' age and years of teaching experience are diverse. Only 3 teachers were male and 18 were female. Teachers had varying years of teaching experience. They gave various classes (literature, culture, ESP, language, linguistics, and translation). All classes took place once per week and lasted one hour. All observed classes were seminars. Lectures are often given in the form of a monologue by the teacher who just dictates the lecture to students without any discussions or activities.

Table 4: Teacher participants in classroom observation

Teachers	Age	Experience	Gender	Class	University
Teacher 1	33	10	Female	Writing	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 2	40	12	Female	Drama	Higher Institute of Applied Languages of Moknine
Teacher 3	39	14	Female	Translation	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax
Teacher 4	59	32	Female	ESP	Institute of Higher Studies of Business of Sfax
Teacher 5	55	33	Female	ESP	Institute of Higher Studies of Business of Sfax
Teacher 6	27	1	Female	British civilization	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 7	45	21	Female	Arab American literature	Faculty of arts and human sciences Sousse
Teacher 8	30	3	Male	American civilization	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 9	48	25	Male	Pragmatics	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax
Teacher 10	51	22	Female	Syntax	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax
Teacher 11	35	12	Female	Arab American literature	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 12	35	10	Female	Poetry	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 13	34	10	Female	Pragmatics	Higher Institute of Languages of Nabeul
Teacher 14	28	3	Female	Grammar	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax
Teacher 15	39	15	Female	Grammar	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 16	43	19	Male	American civilization	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 17	48	25	Female	Grammar	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sousse
Teacher 18	49	26	Female	ESP	Higher Institute of Technological Studies of Sfax
Teacher 19	31	7	Female	Pronunciation	The higher institute of languages Nabeul
Teacher 20	35	8	Female	ESP	Institute of Higher Studies of Business of Sfax
Teacher 21	38	14	Female	Pragmatics	Faculty of Arts and Humanities of Sfax

During each of the class observations, I chose an unobtrusive place in the classroom where I could get a clear view of all the students as well as the teacher. I usually sat at the back equipped with the observation scheme (on which I also took notes) and my phone to use the timer. Before each classroom visit, I showed the teachers the MOLT observation scheme. However, they did not get a copy of the scheme in order not to impact their lesson planning. When the class was over, I had a short conversation with the teachers who often asked to check the observation scheme and were eager to know what I recorded. I took this chance to double check the reliability of my coding and hear the participants' perspective. All participating teachers confirmed my coding and at times commented on the class dynamics, students' level of engagement and even explained why they overused a specific item (stating the purpose of an activity, for instance). Agreement between the observer and the teacher attested to the reliability of the observation results.

5. Data Analysis

5.1. The IMMS Questionnaire Analysis

The questionnaire analysis followed the steps put forward by Dörnyei and Csizér (2012, 83-84). The first step, that was about preparing the raw data to be processed, consisted of: (1) coding the questionnaire data, i.e. entering numbers corresponding to the Likert-scale used and turning gender information into numbers (1- female, 2- male, 3- other); (2) inputting the data into the statistical package for the social sciences software (SPSS); (3) cleaning the data, i.e., checking for any mistakes when coding or entering the data; and (4) manipulating the data which is mainly about deciding on how to deal with missing data. The second step is reducing the number of variables of the questionnaire through factor analysis. The last step is to analyze the data through SPSS.

5.2. Validity And Reliability of The IMMS Questionnaire

The quality of a questionnaire is measured through its validity and reliability. The former is defined as the instrument's capacity to measure what it was initially designed to measure while the latter is about the consistency of the results produced for the target population (Dörnyei 2007). To put it in the words of Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010), "the reliability of a psychometric instrument refers to the extent to which scores on the instrument are free from errors of measurement" (93). For this aim, in order to verify the reliability of the IMMS questionnaire, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component analysis was run through the SPSS version 25. Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010) argue that the aim of EFA is to

explore interrelationships between the questionnaire items and seeks to construct clusters of similar underlying themes. Loewen and Gonulal (2015) offer a step-by-step guide to conducing EFA in L2 research. They suggest that "factor analysis seeks to determine the fewest number of variables that will still explain a substantial amount of variance in the data" (182). As a matter of fact, the original number of questionnaire items is likely to be reduced. However, they also confirm that "the factors generated from a factor analysis can be used in subsequent analyses" (183).

A factor analysis of the 40 items of the original IMMS questionnaire was run and only 27 items loaded above 0.3 on one of the four factors. It accounted for 53 % of the original data. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy value indicates that the correlations are suitable for factor analysis (Meyers et al. 2016). The KMO value of 0.86 represents a very good sample size for this study (Plonsky 2015) as shown in table 5. A total of 10 items loaded on the first factor which was labeled as confidence-building strategies. As put forward by Meyers et al (2016), "the correlations for the first component are generally moderately high" (525). The second factor was composed of 7 items that were named as the relevance-producing strategies. Attention-getting and satisfaction-generating strategies included 5 items each. The decision to label factors was informed by the theoretical framework (Keller's (2010) ARCS model) and a scrutiny of the loaded items. All steps of factor analysis were double checked through the detailed account offered by Vandergrift et al. (2006). As proposed by Loewen and Gonulal (2015), "it is crucial for researchers to be informed about the various options in conducting an EFA and to follow a decision pathway to obtain the best results" (187). Along these lines, Meyers et al. (2016) assert that the interpretation of the factor analysis output that finally decided by the researcher is "an informed but ultimately subjective choice" (554).

Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test of the IMMS questionnaire

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		,895
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3357,620
	df	351
	Sig.	,000

To check the internal reliability of questionnaires, this study relies on the Cronbach Alpha. The aim of calculating the Cronbach Alpha is to check the reliability of each scale in this questionnaire. The mean of the inter-items correlation of all scales is 60% or above which means the questionnaire has a good mean. In other words, all scales should measure .70 or above in the Cronbach Alpha in order to achieve internal reliability for the multi-items scale is recommended by Dörnyei (2007). In this context, Dörnyei (2003) suggests that: "if the Cronbach Alpha of the scale does not reach 60%, there are warning bells" (17).

The following table shows the labelled fours factors that emerged from the EFA, their Cronbach Alpha, the percentage of variance for each factor as well as the factor loadings.

Table 6: Validity of the IMMS questionnaire

Category	**Cronbach alpha**
Attention	0.817
Relevance	0.761
Confidence	0.896
Satisfaction	0.776
All items	0.817

The below table includes the items that loaded higher than .04 on the factor of attention-getting strategies. It includes six items with a total percentage of variance of 11.87%.

Table 7: Factor loading of attention-getting strategies

Attention-getting strategies	**Loading**
Percentage of Variance	11.87%
1. Teacher uses different visual or auditory materials.	,859
2. Teacher uses pictures that show tables and flowcharts.	,832
3. Teacher uses pictures, images, and photos.	,801
4. Teacher uses what we know already.	
7. Teacher varies teaching materials or presentation style, when necessary.	,603
9. Teacher uses a variety of teaching methods (E.g., singing in English, cooperative learning, project work, discussions)	,530

Table 8 below includes the loaded relevance-producing strategies. It has seven items with a total percentage of variance of 12. 14%.

Table 8: Factor loading of relevance-producing strategies

Relevance-producing strategies	**Loading**
Percentage of Variance	12.14%
4. Teacher uses what we know already.	,481
18. Teacher clearly explains the relevance of the lesson to what I already know.	,440
24. Teacher presents materials that are not so difficult.	,678
25. Teacher provides tasks and assignments that are not so difficult.	,668
26. Teacher presents materials in an explicit and easy-to-follow way.	,641
39. Tests are always about what I've learnt.	,471
40. The difficulty of the tests are appropriate, neither easy nor difficult.	,628

The following table lists the loaded item that were labelled under the confidence-building strategies. This factor includes six items that present 20% of the total variance.

Table 9: Factor loading for confidence-building strategies

Confidence-building strategies	Loading
Percentage of Variance	20.0%
11. Teacher explains how each lesson is going to benefit us.	,784
12. Teacher explains what can be learnt from the course.	,803
13. Teacher explains in detail how successful learning is going to help me.	,771
19. Teacher clearly tells me how the new course content is related to what we know.	,573
20. Teacher explains course objectives and how the course is going to be run.	,722
21. Teacher presents clear evaluation criteria before assessment.	,536
23. Teacher tells us about what I will be able to do after successfully completing the lesson.	,653

The table below includes five items listed under the satisfaction-generating strategies that represent 9.77% of the total variance

Table 10: Factor loading for satisfaction-generating strategies

Satisfaction-generating strategies	Loading
Percentage of variance	9.77%
33. Teacher sympathizes and understands the difficulties we face while learning.	,413
34. Teacher compliments us when we provide the correct answer.	,524
35. Teacher rewards us when we win games or activities.	,723
36. Teacher shows personal interest when I work hard or when I complete an assignment successfully.	,646
37. Teacher provides symbolic rewards for students who have successfully completed activities.	,749

The reliability of a questionnaire in quantitative research is measured by the internal consistency coefficient of a given scale, that is its Cronbach's alpha. The Cronbach's alpha of a scale should be higher than 0.7 to prove that the questionnaire was reliable (Dörnyei and Taguchi, 2009). The reliability of the IMMS questionnaire was verified through computing Cronbach's alpha for all the loaded items then for items of each ARCS category. The following table illustrates the results.

Table 11: Reliability of the IMMS questionnaire

IMMS items	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
All questionnaire items	.91	27
Attention items	.81	5
Relevance items	.76	7
Confidence items	.88	10
Satisfaction items	.77	5

Once the items to be analyzed were decided upon, it was possible to proceed with the analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistical tests were computed to answer the research questions. Descriptive statistics are used to "describe the characteristics of the sample", as well as to "check the variables for any violation of the assumptions underlying the statistical techniques that will be used to address the research questions" (Pallant 2010, 53). These include computing means for each of the ARCS strategies for the teacher and student groups and carrying out independent samples t-tests to identify any significant differences between the two groups.

5.3. The L2MSS Questionnaire Analysis

5.4. Validity And Reliability of The L2MSS Questionnaire

The same validation procedure (mentioned in section 5.2) was applied for the L2MSS questionnaire. The six emerging factors were clear and straightforward with no second round for item deletion. The same number of items as in the original questionnaire (33) were valid. The Cronbach's alpha of the questionnaire was .861. The KMO value was .808 which proved that the present data were suitable for principal components analysis. Moreover, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$), indicating sufficient correlation between the L2MSS variables to proceed with the analysis (see table 12 below). A total of six factors had eigenvalues greater than 1, cumulatively accounting for 56.48% of the total variance. Subscales

were easily constructed based on the internal consistency of each scale as shown by the factor analysis results. With the exception of the L2 learning experience, whose reliability is relatively low, all other subscales exhibited very good internal consistency. Bivariate correlation analyses were at a later stage conducted to check whether there was any significant correlation between any of the six L2MSS scales and between the L2MSS categories and the IMMS strategies.

Table 12: KMO and Bartlett's Test of the L2MSS questionnaire

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.808
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3277.221
	df	528
	Sig.	.000

The following tables show results of the EFA of the L2MSS questionnaire. The seven factors were labelled as the ideal L2 self own as shown in the table below.

Table 13: Factor loading for the ideal L2S own

Items	**Ideal L2S own**
% Variance	10.40
Cronbach's alpha	.82
1. I often imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English fluently.	.800
2. I can imagine myself using English effectively for communicating with the locals in English - speaking areas.	.693
3. I can imagine a day when I am speaking English with English-speaking friends.	.801
4. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself being able to use English.	.719
5. I can imagine myself writing work e-mails in English to my boss, colleagues, and clients.	.517
6. When I think about my future, it is important that I use English.	.364
7. I can imagine myself texting and messaging in English with friends, family, and native speakers.	.480

The table below includes six items that are labeled as the ideal L2 self other. Its Cronbach's alpha is .844 which is quite high.

Table 14: Factor loading for the ideal L2 self other

Ideal L2 Self Other	**Loading**
% Variance	11.308
Cronbach's alpha	.844
8. My family hopes that I will one day speak English fluently.	.804
9. The most important people to me hope that I will one day speak English fluently.	.777
10. My family will be proud if I will one day master the English language.	.690
11. My community will be happy if I learn to speak English fluently.	.527
12. My friends will be happy if one day I speak English fluently.	.659
13. My parents hope that I will speak English fluently one day.	.817

The table below includes six items that are labeled as the ideal L2 self other. Its Cronbach's alpha is .75.

Table 15: Factor loading for the ought-to L2 self own

Ought-to L2 Self Own	
% Variance	9.20
Cronbach's alpha	.75
14. I need to study English in order to succeed in my future career.	.673
15. I must study English to be an educated person.	.587
16. I have to study English so I can be an active and productive member of my society and culture.	.616
17. If I don't work on my English, it will have a negative impact on my future.	.683
18. If I don't work on my English, I will have difficulty in my social life.	.670

The table below includes six items that are labeled as the ought-to L2 self other. Its Cronbach's alpha is .79.

Table 16: Factor loading for the ought-to L2 self other

Ought-to L2 self other	Loading
Percentage of variance	8.63
Cronbach Alpha	.79
19. Learning English is necessary because the people surrounding me expect me to do so.	.606
20. I need to study English in order to gain the approval of the people most important to me.	.644
21. Learning English is necessary because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.	.642
22. If I don't work on my English, I will disappoint my family.	.742
23. My family puts a lot of pressure on me to learn English	.703

The table below includes six items that are labeled as the WTC. Its Cronbach's alpha is .8 and the percentage of variance is 9.21%.

Table 17: Factor loading for the WTC

Willingness to communicate	
Cronbach's alpha	.8
Percentage of variance	9.21
24. I choose to speak English when I am given a chance to talk freely in an English class.	.653
25. I volunteer to respond to or ask questions in English class.	.707
26. I like to speak English with other students who speak English at university.	.742
27. I like to speak English with friends or acquaintances outside of university.	.758
28. I try to talk when I have a chance to speak English in English classes.	.632

The table below includes six items that are labeled as the L2 learning experience. Its Cronbach's alpha is .69 and the percentage of variance is 7.71%.

Table 18: Factor loading for the L2 learning experience

L2 Learning experience	**Loading**
Cronbach's alpha	.69
Percentage of variance	7.71
29. In general, I have had great English teachers.	.600
30. I like the textbooks we have used in my English classes.	.708
31. The activities we do in my English classes are useful.	.746
32. I like the students in my English classes.	.615
33. I am usually very happy with my English grades.	.546

5.5. Observation Analysis

The analysis of the MOLT observation data followed the procedure proposed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) and Guilloteaux (2013). Then, quantitative comparisons were made between teachers' questionnaire data and their observation results through the ARCS categories. As suggested by Dörnyei (2007), "processing structured observational data is relatively straightforward and can be further analyzed by means of statistical procedures" (185). In fact, no inferential statistical tests were used for the analysis. SPSS was only used to compute standardized z-scores.

The first step of the observational data analysis consisted of computing all the MOLT data through an Excel sheet for each lesson. This was calculated through entering the tally marks that corresponded to the number of minutes for each activity. Since some classes started or ended at a different time, all classes followed a 45-minute observation time frame. The frequency of each variable was calculated then entered into SPSS to compute z-scores, which were compared to the z-scores generated from teachers' questionnaire results for all ARCS categories. Table 19 below illustrates the MOLT items that document teachers' motivational teaching, which were categorized according to the ARCS categories as proposed by Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022). The classification of the MOLT categories was based on Dörnyei's (1994) model that in turn followed Keller's (1983) model. Attention-getting strategies are represented through social chat, arousing curiosity, and creative elements. Relevance-

producing strategies include elements such as signposting, stating purpose, establishing relevance, promoting integrative and instrumental values, referential questions, and personalization. The confidence-building strategies are composed of scaffolding, promoting cooperation or autonomy, pair work or group work, intellectual challenge, and tangible task product. The satisfaction-generating strategies are tangible rewards, individual or team competition, neutral or process feedback, self or peer-correction, class applause and effective praise. The mean for each strategy is presented in minutes.

Table 19: Correspondence of the MOLT items into the ARCS categories

Attention	**Relevance**	**Confidence**	**Satisfaction**
social chat	signposting	scaffolding	tangible rewards
arousing curiosity	stating purpose	promoting cooperation	individual competition
creative element	establishing relevance	promoting autonomy	team competition
	promoting integrative values	Pair work	neutral feedback
	promoting instrumental values	Group work	process feedback
	referential questions	intellectual challenge	self/peer correction
	personalization	tangible task product	effective praise
			class applause

6. Pilot Study

Each of the instruments used for the present study was piloted in the fall semester of 2021. Since I was not present on-site at the time, I had to ask for assistance of fellow colleagues. As proposed by Dörnyei and Csizér (2012), the piloting of the questionnaire was first conducted through a think aloud session with colleagues to check whether there was any ambiguity in the questionnaire items then checking the validity of the items through a sample that is similar to the target population.

A small-scale pilot study was conducted with participants (5 teachers and 42 students) in order to test the validity of the materials developed for the main study, determine the time

frame required to answer questionnaire by respondents, find out any confusion that may arise from questionnaire items, and change the wording of the questionnaire items. Since the number of participants did not reach 100, factor analysis was not possible as this is the minimum required number (Dörnyei and Csizér 2011, 81).

Participating teachers suggested some changes in the wording of a few questionnaire items that might create confusion for students. In addition, teachers suggested that a pen and paper version of the questionnaire would be more practical since not all students access their emails or would be willing to answer a questionnaire online in a timely manner. Follow-up retrospective surveys were not possible since teachers often have no breaks between classes, so they have no time for that. It would be challenging to ask them to do it at a later point as they would likely forget which strategies they used for that particular class.

For the observation scheme, I asked the help of two colleagues to do peer feedback during the observations. They reported that it was at times challenging to decide which strategy to record per minute. In addition, the student motivational behavior in the MOLT observation scheme was quite problematic since it recorded students' attention, engagement, and volunteering in a proportion of one third or two thirds of the classroom. As these variables also varied throughout the class, I had to be very careful when recording their behavior as no other rating scheme was possible.

The final instruments and procedure were mostly the same for the dissertation study but with a few minor modifications. First, I had to merge the IMMS and L2MSS questionnaire in one single document so that students could answer both at one time. Second, more rigor was needed when recording students' motivated behavior. Lastly, a pen-and-paper version was handed to student respondents, but teachers filled out the questionnaire online through the Google form.

7. Ethical Considerations

The present study followed two main ethical measures for officials (department chairs and deans) and participants. First, heads of departments or institutes were contacted by email or telephone. Some granted me written permission via email and others asked me to write an official letter. For the qualitative data, teachers were provided with ethical issues at stake and were informed of the possibility to change their mind and not conduct classroom observations at any time.

Student and teacher participants were asked for their consent to process the data before starting to answer the questionnaires. It aimed to inform students that the questionnaire is totally anonymous and would not affect their grades in any way, clearly state that their participation is voluntary, explain the importance of their contribution to my study, and show appreciation of their participation. Moreover, I confirmed that the questionnaire responses will only be used for my research purposes, will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone other than myself.

8. Concluding Thoughts

This chapter has underpinned the methodological design for the present study. After presenting a description of the research design, the methods of data collection were provided. Then, the processes of questionnaire administration, sampling, data analysis approach and the rationales of these processes were outlined. I also gave an overview of the research context, Tunisian universities. I concluded by highlighting the challenges I have encountered during the piloting of instruments and reporting the ethical procedures. Due to Covid-19 measures during the data collection period, the intended plan had to be readjusted and the total number of participants was different from the target population. Still, I managed to get the necessary number for valid statistical analysis and I involved various universities across Tunisia. The findings of the qualitative and quantitative data analysis will be presented in the next chapter followed by the discussion.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

1. Introduction

This chapter will report on the results of this study followed by a brief interpretation of the main findings. The results will be reported following each research question. First, the results of the IMMS questionnaire for teachers and students will be presented, followed by results of the L2MSS questionnaire to students. In addition, a correlation analysis of the L2MSS and the IMMS scores will be made. Then, observation results will be presented and explained in light of the ARCS categories. The results will be connected and summed up in the concluding remarks.

2. Questionnaire results

2.1. IMMS results

The first research question aimed at finding out the MotS that university teachers of English in Tunisia resort to the most. The IMMS was administered to 46 teachers of English to explore their use of MotS following Keller's (2010) ARCS model. The teacher respondents rated how they deployed the ARCS strategies on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). After an EFA was run, 27 out of 40 questionnaire items were valid. The four factors with loadings above .4 were labelled according to the ARCS categories. The means of each category were computed through SPSS to obtain the following results (table 20 below).

Table 20: Teachers' IMMS Mean Scores

Rank	ARCS Strategies	Mean	SD
1	Confidence-building strategies	4.12	1.33
2	Relevance-producing strategies	4.09	1.22
3	Satisfaction-generating strategies	4.01	1.49
4	Attention-getting strategies	3.80	1.34

Teacher participants are EFL teachers at university level who gave various classes to English and non-English majors. In order to find out the most frequently employed MotS, teachers' mean scores are ranked from highest to lowest as follows: confidence-building strategies are the most frequently used (M = 4.12). Relevance-producing strategies come in the second place (M = 4.09) followed by satisfaction-generating strategies (M = 4.01). The least frequently used strategies were those of attention-getting (M = 3.80).

The means of students' questionnaire responses were also computed through SPSS for each of the ARCS categories. The table below highlights the ranked ARCS categories from the perspective of students.

Table 21: Students' IMMS Mean Scores

Rank	ARCS Strategies	Mean	SD
1	Relevance-producing strategies	3.39	1.22
2	Confidence-building strategies	3.30	1.33
3	Satisfaction-generating strategies	2.95	1.49
4	Attention-getting strategies	2.72	1.34

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the difference between the ARCS strategies in both students' and teachers' groups. There was a significant difference at the $p<.05$ level for the perception of the ARCS categories among students [F (5) = 92,393, p = 0,00] (see table 22 below).

Table 22: Students' ANOVA results

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's Trace	,174	92,393	3,000	1317,000	,000
Wilks' Lambda	,826	92,393	3,000	1317,000	,000
Hoteling's Trace	,210	92,393	3,000	1317,000	,000
Roy's Largest Root	,210	92,393	3,000	1317,000	,000

Table 23: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon
					Greenhouse-Geisser
Students	,932	93,419	5	,000	,954

A significant difference was also found in the teachers' use of the ARCS strategies [F (5) = 14,099, p = 0,00] (see table 22 below).

Table 24: Teachers' ANOVA results

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's Trace	,157	14,099	3,000	227,000	,000
Wilks' Lambda	,843	14,099	3,000	227,000	,000
Hoteling's Trace	,186	14,099	3,000	227,000	,000
Roy's Largest Root	,186	14,099	3,000	227,000	,000

Table 25: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon
					Greenhouse-Geisser
Students	,767	60,360	5	,000	,877

The second research question seeks to identify whether there is any significant difference between teachers' reported use of MotS and students' evaluation of the deployed MotS. After mean scores of ARCS categories were computed for students' IMMS results, an independent samples t-test was computed on SPSS to examine the difference between teachers' and students' responses. At first glance, students' mean scores look quite low compared to teachers' ratings. The results of the independent samples t-test further indicate that the difference between teachers' reported use of MotS and students' perception of these MotS is indeed significant for all of the four ARCS categories. In fact, the discrepancy between mean

scores of both groups shows that students did not perceive the MotS used by their teachers as reported by their students, hence the lack of effectiveness of the MotS on the part of teachers.

Table 26: Teachers and students t-test results

	Mean scores		T-test*
	Students (N=264)	Teachers (N= 46)	
Attention-getting strategies	2.72	3.80	.00
Relevance-producing strategies	3.39	4.09	.00
Confidence-building strategies	3.30	4.12	.00
Satisfaction-generating strategies	2.95	4.01	.00

*p <0.05

As the table above shows, students' answers follow a different order than teachers. Relevance-producing strategies are seen to be used most often by teachers, followed by confidence-building strategies. The opposite order is perceived by students. Similarly to teachers' view, satisfaction-generating strategies and attention-getting strategies come in the second position. The significant difference between students and teachers on all categories seems intriguing. Indeed, it is noteworthy to mention that the comparison between both groups is quite revealing. Data collected from one group only (for e.g., teachers) would have provided a very different picture on the use of MotS. It is thus important to throw light on the use of the MotS from the students' view. Taking into account students' perspective lays bare the usefulness of the MotS.

3. Observation Results

The third research question sought to examine the relationship between teachers' self-reported use of MotS and their actual classroom practice by comparing their questionnaire results with observation results. The observation results will be reported following two steps. First, results of the MOLT scheme will be described. A comparison of the MOLT results and the questionnaire results of the observed teachers will then be carried out for each participant. The documented MotS following the MOLT scheme were computed as detailed in Section 4.2.1.3. For each observation, the average time spent on each item was calculated. The sums were then computed for each strategy as shown in Table 25 below. The MOLT categories are listed as they appear on the scheme and not in order of frequency. A total of 21 classes were

observed, four of which were given for ESP students. Each class lasted 45 minutes. To gain an overview of the time frame spent on each strategy, the minimum and maximum scores were also listed (table 27). The minute-by-minute observation data recorded the teachers' motivational practice and students' motivated behavior.

The table below illustrates the frequencies of the MOLT items that are designed by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). The MotS observed follow Dörnyei's (2001) process model of motivational teaching. Teachers' motivational practice is reported in terms of four categories: teacher discourse, activity design, participant structure and positive retrospective self-evaluation. The second part reported students' motivated behavior, which is documented through students' attention, engagement, and eager volunteering. Results of students were not analyzed as they are not part of the research questions for the present study. More focus was given to teachers observed use of MotS as compared to their questionnaire responses.

Table 27: Observed Frequencies of MOLT Variables

Strategies	Mean	Min	Max	Strategies	Mean	Min	Max
Social chat	1.5	0	2	Tangible rewards	1	0	1
Signposting	2.7	0	7	Personalization	-	-	-
Stating purpose	2.8	0	5	Creative element	1	0	1
Establishing relevance	3.1	0	6	Intellectual challenge	3	0	3
Promoting integrative values	-	-	-	Tangible task product	-	-	-
Promoting instrumental values	-	-	-	Individual competition	1	0	1
Arousing curiosity	1.4	0	2	Team competition	-	-	-
Scaffolding	3.3	0	11	Neutral feedback	1	0	1
Promoting cooperation	1		1	Process feedback	5.9	0	14
Promoting autonomy	-	-	-	Self/peer correction	2.5	0	5
Referential questions	3.6	0	6	Effective praise	1.7	0	3
Pair work	4.8	0	12	Class applause	1.5	0	2
Group work	15	0	21				

Under the category of participant structures, group work was the most frequently observed strategy. Teachers opted for structuring teamwork in groups more often than pair work. As concerns teacher discourse, scaffolding was the most frequently used, followed by signposting, establishing relevance, and stating purpose. During the class observations, various items were not observed. These include promoting integrative and instrumental values, promoting autonomy, personalization, tangible task product, and team competition.

The relevance-producing strategies that pertained mainly to the teacher discourse category were the most frequently observed MotS. These strategies aim to remind the students of previously learned material and refresh their minds about relevant knowledge. Moreover, teachers made sure to state the purpose of tasks to motivate students to work on them. Making students aware of the goals as well as benefits and takeaways of a particular task would encourage them to complete it successfully. Examples of relevance- producing strategies include statements like "what did we see last week?", "by the end of this lesson, you will be able to …", "do you remember this structure?", "look at us nowadays!". It goes without saying that teachers tend to repeat the instructions over and over again, hence the importance of signposting.

The following are some examples of MotS strategies by a sample of the participating teachers. Teacher 1 gave a writing class. She was helping students through eliciting their answers (saying parts of a word: "contro…. versial"). She stated the purpose of an activity: "Today we will watch a series; The purpose is to listen carefully and find out …" She then presented a PowerPoint presentation about argumentative essays. She explained the purpose of argumentative essays and provided steps to write one. In a fun atmosphere with many jokes, the teacher answered a phone call then told students "It's a colleague who is coming to pick up something". At the end of class, she moderated a debate by guiding questions: "Do you agree with parents? Are you for or against drinking alcohol?" She made sure to provide positive feedback with words of encouragement like: "nice! I knew you could do it!". Teacher 2 taught a drama class. The class started with a presentation by three students on Tennessee Williams' *The Glass Menagerie*. Once the presentation was over, the teacher tried to elicit students' feedback: "what do you think about your friends' presentation?". She also gave presenters feedback about their time management and presentation skills as well as the content they presented. Then she said "now let's move to .... we are going to delve deeper into the dichotomy of realism and reality", "let's go back to the idea of...". Teacher 3 taught a translation class. She started by checking students' homework. She asked students about the translation problems that they encountered when translating proverbs. She then asked them to check each other's translation through peer feedback. She asked students: "how did you solve the problems you found? Did you use Linguee?" She praised a student by saying: "Look at your friend's work! thank you for your good work!". Later, she then gave a PowerPoint presentation about translation frameworks, the role of technology, multi-modal genres, and examples of localization. Teacher 6 taught an American culture class. She prepared a PowerPoint

presentation about the conservative party and factors of the victory. First, she apologized saying: “sorry the classroom was only assigned yesterday”. She tried to refresh students’ minds by asking: “what did we cover last week?”. She used a lot of signposting: “During the previous tutorials I have explained what is meant by...”, “I am going to give you 2 minutes...”, “I would like to focus on... while reading”, “we are going to see why they won by a slim majority...”, “we mentioned that”, “this leads us to talk about....”. Teacher 7 gave a class on Arab American literature. A group of four students gave a presentation that focuses on key concepts in Arab American literature entitled: “How do we define Arab-ness?”. The teacher tried to elicit peer feedback before giving her own feedback. She then facilitated a discussion: “What do you notice as literature students?”; “this is a good example of hyphenation from the text”. The class of teacher 8 was about the structure of the U.S. government. The teacher started the class by drawing a diagram on the board then started a discussion. Students were very involved and the teacher praised them by saying “that’s a very good idea! Very interesting questions, thank you”. Teacher 18 gave students a handout with grammar exercises, gave them time to work on exercises individually then corrected them. The teacher first explained adverb construction (quick – quickly, fluent – fluently, beautiful – beautifully). She also explained the difference between adjectives describing people and things (interested-interesting {e.g., in Arabic}, motivated – motivating, bored – boring). The following table includes more examples of the MOLT categories.

Table 28: Examples of MOLT items

MOLT Category	Example
Social chat	What did you study this morning?
Signposting	During the previous tutorials …. Today we will …
Stating purpose	I would like you to focus on … while reading
Establishing relevance	This is a good example of hyphenation from the text
Arousing curiosity	Are you excited to watch the next part of the video?
Referential questions	Do you agree with the parents?
Effective praise	That’s a very good idea, thank you!
Self-correction	“Can you explain to your friends why you think it’s a …

Table 29: Observed ARCS strategies

Participant	Attention	Relevance	Confidence	Satisfaction
Teacher 1	5	17	11	10
Teacher 2	0	8	16	3
Teacher 3	0	11	3	1
Teacher 4	0	3	11	8
Teacher 5	0	4	18	13
Teacher 6	1	9	12	3
Teacher 7	2	9	23	3
Teacher 8	1	4	0	3
Teacher 9	1	12	4	2
Teacher 10	2	7	4	5
Teacher 11	0	7	9	8
Teacher 12	2	14	3	1
Teacher 13	0	4	0	20
Teacher 14	0	5	4	7
Teacher 15	0	5	8	11
Teacher 16	0	11	0	2
Teacher 17	0	4	0	17
Teacher 18	0	3	4	11
Teacher 19	0	1	0	8
Teacher 20	3	11	1	2
Teacher 21	0	11	5	11
Mean	**0.8**	**7.6**	**6.4**	**7.1**

As shown in the above table, the overall means for the time spent using each of the ARCS strategies highlight the use of relevance-producing strategies first (M = 7.6 mins), followed by satisfaction-getting strategies (M = 7.1 mins) then confidence-building strategies (M= 6.4 mins). Attention-getting strategies (M = 0.8 mins) come last with quite a big difference. Unlike the IMMS results reported earlier in which confidence-building strategies were ranked first, classroom observations revealed that teachers resort to relevance-producing strategies the most. The only resemblance in the use of MotS is with the least used attention-getting strategies, which was revealed both through questionnaire and observation results.

It is worth restating that the MOLT categories were categorized under the four constituents of the ARCS model. Social chat, arousing curiosity, and creative elements are categorized under attention-getting strategies. Relevance-producing strategies are represented by elements such as signposting, stating purpose, establishing relevance, and referential questions. The confidence-building strategies include scaffolding, promoting cooperation, pair work or group work, and intellectual challenge. The satisfaction-generating strategies are composed of tangible rewards, individual competition, neutral or process feedback, self or peer-correction, class applause and effective praise. According to the results shown in the table above, teachers who were observed used relevance-producing strategies frequently. These MotS included signposting, stating the purpose of an activity, establishing relevance to previous knowledge, and posing referential questions. Interestingly, students' IMMS results also confirm the frequent use of relevance-producing strategies (see table 29 above).

At a second stage, standardized z-scores were computed in SPSS to compare questionnaire results with those found during observations. The z-scores for all the participating teachers (N = 21) are shown in table x below. Interestingly, z-scores of observations and questionnaire for each teacher vary. Some scores are both positive. Some have two negative scores. Other teachers have one positive and one negative score for either of the instruments. The latter result is due to the fact that teachers either underestimate their actual use of MotS or use MotS more frequently than stated in the questionnaire answer. This change of judgement may be influenced by my presence as an observer or a colleague and the participant's attempt to score higher on the MOLT scheme.

Table 30: Observation and Questionnaire Z-scores

Teachers	Questionnaire z-scores	Observation z-scores
Teacher 1	2.41	1.07
Teacher 2	0.57	-1
Teacher 3	-0.8	0.67
Teacher 4	0	-0.83
Teacher 5	1.49	0.44
Teacher 6	0.34	-1.35
Teacher 7	1.72	-2.21
Teacher 8	-1.61	0.03
Teacher 9	-0.34	-0.25
Teacher 10	-0.46	-0.48
Teacher 11	0.23	0.61
Teacher 12	-0.23	-0.31
Teacher 13	0.23	0.67
Teacher 14	-0.69	0.20
Teacher 15	0.23	0.15
Teacher 16	-1.03	1.24
Teacher 17	-0.11	-1.35
Teacher 18	-0.46	0.61
Teacher 19	-1.49	-0.48
Teacher 20	-0.57	0.49
Teacher 21	0.57	2.05

To make the interpretation of the z-score comparison easier, they will be divided into four main groups: negative for questionnaire and positive for observation, negative for observation and positive for questionnaire, both z-scores are positive, and both are negative. In the first group, we have teachers 1, 5, 11, 13, 15 and 21. In the second group, there are teachers 9, 10, 12, 17 and 19. Teachers who scored negative z-scores for observation and positive for questionnaires, are number 2, 4, 6, and 7. Teachers who scored positive z-scores for observation and negative for questionnaires, are number 3, 8, 14, 16, 18 and 20. As illustrated in table 29 below, the numbers under each group are quite close so there is no huge discrepancy between the overall perceptions.

Table 31: Comparisons of z-scores

+ z-scores	- z-scores	+ Q/ - O	-Q / +O
Teacher 1	Teacher 9	Teacher 2	Teacher 3
Teacher 5	Teacher 10	Teacher 4	Teacher 8
Teacher 11	Teacher 12	Teacher 6	Teacher 14
Teacher 13	Teacher 17	Teacher 7	Teacher 16
Teacher 15	Teacher 19		Teacher 18
Teacher 21			Teacher 20

4. L2MSS Questionnaire Results

The fourth research question aims to discover how teachers' motivational practice is related to students' EFL self-perception. To answer this question, the L2MSS questionnaire was administered to students (N = 264) in English. It followed a Likert-scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All questionnaire items (N= 33) were validated under six categories: ideal L2 self own, ideal L2 self other, ought-to L2 self own, ought-to L2 self other, WTC, L2 learning experience. Descriptive statistics were run through SPSS and the mean score for each category is reported in the table below.

Table 32: L2MSS descriptive statistics

L2MSS categories	Mean	SD
Ideal L2 Self Own	5.93	1.28
Ideal L2 Self Other	5.61	1.65
Ought-to L2 Self Own	4.94	1.78
Ought-to L2 Self Other	3.52	2.09
Willingness to Communicate	5.37	1.60
L2 Learning Experience	4.84	1.68

The category with the highest mean is the L2 ideal self own followed by the ideal L2 self other. Then comes the WTC, followed by the ought-to L2 self own. The lowest means are the L2 learning experience and the ought-to L2 self other. From a first glance at the results, we notice that the L2 ideal self is the highest motivator for Tunisian EFL university students, which explains its relationship with their WTC since they are confident enough to use the language. However, the ought-to L2 self is quite low among Tunisian EFL students, which could be explained by the fact that there is no social pressure on them to master English from their milieu. The difference between the ought-to L2 self own and ought-to L2 self other may be due to the learners' feeling that they are under pressure from their significant others more than it is actually the case. The L2 learning experience is not high either; this finding could be due to the textbooks used, teachers' personality or students' lack of enjoyment of their English classes. Moreover, the low rate of the L2 learning experience could be linked to students' perception of the low use of MotS.

There was a significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level for the evaluation of the different L2MSS categories amongst students [$F(14) = 262.441$, $p = 0.00$] (see table 33 below).

Table 33: L2MSS ANOVA results

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's Trace	.513	262.441	5.000	1245.000	.000
Wilks' Lambda	.487	262.441	5.000	1245.000	.000
Hoteling's Trace	1.054	262.441	5.000	1245.000	.000
Roy's Largest Root	1.054	262.441	5.000	1245.000	.000

Table 34: L2MSS Mauchly test

Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon
					Greenhouse-Geisser
Students	.748	362.568	14	.000	.889

5. Correlations among the L2MSS Categories

Bivariate correlational analysis was performed in order to examine and explain the strength and direction of the linear relationships between the L2MSS categories. As the table below shows, there are many correlations between each of the questionnaire variables. According to Cohen (1998), the strength of correlations is determined by their value. If the Pearson correlation is between .5 and 1.0 it is considered strong. A moderate correlation is between .3 and .49 while a weak correlation is between .1 and .29. All correlations are weak or moderate.

We can notice from this glance at the correlational analysis that the L2MSS elements are moderately interconnected. A closer look at these links can reveal important insights into the nature of the students' future guides. There is a negative correlation between the ideal L2 self (own) and ought-to L2 self (other). This could be interpreted that the ought-to L2 self does not influence students' future ideal self image. There is a positive correlation between the ideal L2 self (own) and the WTC. Another positive correlation was found between the ideal L2 self (other) and the L2 language experience as well as the ought-to L2 self own and the ought-to L2 self other and the L2 language experience. The WTC and the L2 learning experience are also positively correlated.

Table 35: Correlation Analysis among the L2MSS categories

		Ideal L2 self own	Ideal L2 self other	Ought-to L2 self own	Ought-to L2 self other	WTC	L2 learning experience
Ideal L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	1	.033	.026	-.106**	.293**	.083**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.243	.363	.000	.000	.003
Ideal L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	.033	1	.191**	.193**	.098**	.108**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.243		.000	.000	.001	.000
Ought-to L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	.026	.191**	1	.300**	.068*	.201**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.363	.000		.000	.016	.000
Ought-to L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	-.106**	.193**	.300**	1	-.021	.082**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.455	.004
WTC	Pearson Correlation	.293**	.098**	.068*	-.021	1	.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.016	.455		.000
L2 learning experience	Pearson Correlation	.083**	.108**	.201**	.082**	.151**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000	.004	.000	

The positive correlations among the L2MSS questionnaire items, except for the ideal L2 self (own) and ought-to L2 self (other) is quite informative. It proves the interconnectedness among these categories as well as their mutual influence.

6. Correlations between the ARCS and L2MSS Categories

The fourth research questions aimed to find out the ways teachers' used MotS affect students' self-perception. Another bivariate correlation analysis was then carried out through SPSS to find out the relationships between the MotS of teachers and students' self perception. The following table highlights the correlations found between the IMMS categories and the L2MSS variables.

Table 36: Correlation between students' L2MSS and the IMMS results for the teachers' questionnaire

		Attention	Relevance	Confidence	Satisfaction
Ideal L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	-.02	.08**	-.035	-.090**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.319	.002	.216	.002
Ideal L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	-.047	.002	.055	.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.938	.056	.817
Ought-to L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	-.022	-.02	.098**	.157**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.432	.407	.001	.000
Ought-to L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	-.004	-.04	.092**	.179**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.891	.151	.001	.000
WTC	Pearson Correlation	-.01	.09**	.052	-.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.536	.001	.071	.525
L2 language experience	Pearson Correlation	.053	.12**	.146**	.190**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.064	.000	.000	.000

As shown in the table above, there are very weak correlations between the L2MSS and the ARCS categories. There is a positive correlation between the ought-to L2 own with each of confidence-building and satisfaction-generating. The ought-to L2 other is positively correlated with confidence-building and satisfaction-generating as well. A positive correlation relates WTC with relevance-producing strategies. The L2 learning experience is correlated respectively with relevance, confidence, and satisfaction. Interestingly, attention-getting strategies are not correlated with any of the L2MSS categories.

Another bivariate correlation analysis was conducted with students' evaluation of the ARCS categories through the IMMS questionnaire. As shown in the table 35 below, there are very weak correlations between the L2MSS and the ARCS categories. There is a positive correlation between the ideal L2 own with attention-getting strategies. The ought-to L2 own is positively correlated with relevance-producing strategies. A positive correlation relates WTC and the L2 learning experience with satisfaction-generating strategies.

Table 37: Correlation results between the L2MSS and ARCS categories for the students' questionnaires

		A	R	C	S
Ideal L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	.082**	,024	,005	-,049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.405	,870	,083
Ideal L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	-.026	-.031	-.009	-.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.367	.279	.747	.188
Ought-to L2 self own	Pearson Correlation	-.064*	-.110**	-.018	.056*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.000	.517	.049
Ought-to L2 self other	Pearson Correlation	-.026	-.081**	.005	.058*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.364	.004	.869	.041
WTC	Pearson Correlation	.031	.026	.002	-.060*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.268	.365	.930	.033
L2 learning experience	Pearson Correlation	-.045	-.064*	-.034	.101**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.108	.023	.226	.000

7. Concluding Remarks

The present chapter has reported the main findings of the study that answered the four research questions. The first research question aimed to find out the MotS used by Tunisian EFL teachers. Descriptive statistics that were conducted through SPSS reported the mean scores for each of the ARCS strategies. The results show that teachers tend to rely on

confidence-building strategies the most. The second research question looked at the difference between students' and teachers' perspective on the use of MotS. Independent samples t-test demonstrated the significant difference between students' and teachers' mean scores on all of the ARCS categories. To answer the third research question, a comparison was carried out between teachers' observation and questionnaire results. The observation results have shown that teachers rely most on relevance-producing strategies. Lastly, to answer the fourth research question, correlation analysis was computed between the ARCS and L2MSS categories. The findings have shown positive correlations among most of the variables. The next chapter will explain in detail these reported findings and compare them with previous research. It will also highlight the contribution and limitations of the present research.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

1. Introduction

The present chapter will build on the previous one, namely the major findings of this study. It will attempt to summarize the results of both questionnaires and classroom observations and connect them with relevant past research. The main findings will be compared and contrasted with previous similar studies. The following sections will be categorized under themes following the research questions. The last section will highlight any limitations and put forward practical applications of the findings.

2. Teachers' use of the ARCS strategies

The aim of the first research question of the present study is to explore the use of MotS by Tunisian EFL university teachers in terms of the ARCS categories. For this question, The IMMS questionnaire (Min and Chon 2020) was administered to teachers (N = 46). The first part of the questionnaire collected demographic data of participants (age, gender, and years of teaching experience) and the second part asked teachers to report their use of MotS according to Keller's (2010) ARCS strategies. The results of the descriptive statistics computed through SPSS revealed that the most frequently used strategies are confidence-building strategies. Teachers' mean scores are ranked as follows: the confidence-building strategies are the most frequently used (M = 4.12). Relevance-producing strategies come second (M = 4.09) followed by satisfaction-generating strategies (M = 4.01). The least frequently used MotS were attention-getting strategies (M = 3.80).

These findings echo those found by Kouraichi (in press) in the Estonian higher education context. Indeed, the focus on confidence-building strategies with university students makes sense as teachers seek to prepare students for their post-graduation professional life and hope to endow students with the needed confidence to use English outside the confines of the classroom. It could also be hypothesized that the dominant use of confidence-building strategies targets students' ideal L2 self. Another explanation is the general application of the communicative language teaching methodology in English teachers' trainings in Tunisia. I believe that confidence is one of the main prerequisites for communication in English. Hence, by boosting students' confidence, teachers guarantee a better level of communication during

classes and possibly outside of the classroom. More to the point, as stated in the literature review, motivation is a predictor of learner autonomy (Spratt 2002). Confidence-building strategies help develop students' autonomous learning as advocated by Ushioda (2022) who argues for promoting students' inner motivation.

Confidence-building strategies also aim to boost students' success opportunities. This is possible through a clear outline of the learning requirements while granting students with personal control. All these factors help build students' feelings of confidence that they can fulfill the course requirements and succeed. As compared to previous studies, these findings differ from those of Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022) as they found that Hungarian high school teachers employ satisfaction-generating and attention-getting strategies the most. Moreover, Min and Chon (2020) concluded that confidence-building strategies are deployed most frequently. However, their interview results indicated teachers' frequent use of relevance-producing strategies. In the same context, in Maeng and Lee's (2015) Korean study, confidence-building strategies ranked last as they were poorly used. In fact, control was in the hand of teachers not students. In addition, the evaluation criteria were not clearly presented to students. Still, they acknowledge the importance of these MotS in reducing students' anxiety levels and recommend the following: "creating less stressful learning environment, setting up attainable goals for language learning, and providing space for students to do their own learning" (34). Even though goals were clearly stated to students in this study, they did not acknowledge the use of confidence-building strategies, but rather rated the relevance-producing strategies to be the most important.

Relevance-producing strategies are equally important in the EFL classroom. As with any other subject, students often question the relevance of the learned material. Once they judge the content to be irrelevant, they are bored and often lose interest in the class. Whether they are at a beginner, intermediate, or advanced-level, students appreciate when teachers explain the relevance of the subject matter. Students who perceive the importance of the new taught material to their daily life or to a future language situation (for instance, when living abroad), they are more likely to remember it and use it later on. As shown in Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022), however, high school students and teachers did not rate well relevance-producing strategies. This result might reveal that high school students are more goal-oriented since they give more importance to satisfaction-generating strategies.

3. Students' and Teachers' Perception on the Use of MotS

To answer the second research question, an independent samples t-test was run on SPSS to identify the difference between teachers' and students' responses. The comparison of students' and teachers' mean scores showed that differences were indeed significant for all of the ARCS MotS. It should be noted that students' mean scores were quite low on all levels. They ranked the use of relevance-producing strategies to be the highest (M = 3.39), followed by confidence building strategies (M = 3.30). Next were satisfaction-generating strategies (M = 2.95), and lastly attention-getting strategies (M = 2.72). The variation in ranking the MotS used as well as the significant differences between the mean scores of students and teachers showcase that the MotS employed by teachers did not prove appealing to students.

The reasons behind the significant result of the independent-samples t-test could be accounted for from both the teachers' and students' perspectives. As found by Min and Chon (2020), students did not recognize the MotS employed by their teachers. The reason why MotS were undervalued by students could be related to students' low proficiency level as they suggested. The same result was found by Bernaus and Gardner (2008). Another possible explanation is students' feeling that the MotS are poorly employed or used in a manipulative way, with no positive outcome. On the contrary, Kouraichi and Lesznyák (2022) found that Hungarian high school students' perception of the used MotS and their teachers' reported use of MotS were in line, which could be viewed in light of their high proficiency level. For the present study, I could not carry put a proficiency test for participating students due to time constraints. The only hypothesis is that students must have passed a B1 level exam in their high school leaving exam. Hence, I cannot assume any relation between students' proficiency levels and their perception of the MotS.

Students' perception of motivational teaching strategies is of utmost importance. Indeed, given the changing times, students nowadays have a very short attention span, are usually from a different generation than their teachers, and find technology and social media the most appealing. Throughout the classes observed, however, there was a very limited use of technology and no use of internet or any online platforms. The use of technology was restricted to projecting PowerPoint presentations and videos. In addition, there was no use of online games or quizzes (such as Kahoot) that might be appealing to students. Attention-getting strategies that were reported to be used the least were related to technology or internet use. It should also be stated that the use of mobile phones is strictly prohibited in Tunisian classrooms. As a matter of fact, the prohibited use of smartphones together with the poorly equipped

classrooms explain the absence of online resources in EFL classes. Still, Tunisian EFL teachers make a tremendous efforts to enhance their students' motivation through employing MotS, as shown in the observations, despite the poor technological facilities. In fact, nowadays students have access to information through internet or chat GPT. Teachers' role is no longer to give information or home assignments, but rather to facilitate the learning process in an engaging classroom atmosphere.

4. Teachers' Motivational Practice

Some MOLT items were totally absent during all the observed classes (for instance, promoting instrumental and integrative values). Hermessi (2017) explored the attitude of Tunisian teachers of English towards including cultural aspects of English-speaking communities which was considered too problematic or sensitive, hence the explanation of the absence of any integrative or instrumental values by participants. Given the difference in cultural and religious values between Tunisia and English-speaking countries, some EFL teachers avoid exposing students to any 'foreign values'. Moreover, even though group work was often used in observed classes, there was no team competition. Group work was used only to facilitate tasks and promote cooperation among individual members. Team competition might not be appealing to university students, unlike high school students.

Relevance-producing strategies were documented as the most frequently used MotS during the observations. These strategies include asking referential questions and ways of establishing relevance under the category of teacher discourse. Confidence-building strategies were ranked in the second position with items like stating purpose of an activity and scaffolding. Satisfaction-generating strategies included effective praise and process feedback. Attention-getting strategies are an important factor in enhancing students' motivation (Bernaus and Gardner 2008). However, they were the least used MotS in this study. This finding could be due to the short-term effect of these strategies since students' attention cannot be stimulated for a long time, especially with university students. Moreover, attention-getting strategies could be the most challenging to employ. Indeed, despite the spread of IT and internet nowadays, Tunisian university classrooms are still not technologically equipped. Using technological ways have proved to be motivating for Tunisian university students (Lachheb 2014). Still, given the lack of these facilities, it is challenging for EFL teachers to deploy online games, quizzes or at times even the video projector to arouse students' attention.

Yang and Sanchez (2021) observed Chinese teachers' use of the MOLT strategies but also accounted for those that were not part of the designed observation scheme. In the present research, going beyond the MOLT items was not an option since it was structured in a minute-by-minute way. Thus, taking notes of other strategies was quite challenging. Moreover, for the purpose of the present study to compare the MOLT and ARCS categories, closely following the scheme was important. In fact, the comparison of teachers' z-scores revealed that there were some differences with their questionnaire answers. Some teachers underestimated their motivational practice. It could also be the case that during the observation, the teacher could employ more MotS than originally planned due to students' engagement. In other cases, teachers used less MotS than reported in their questionnaire answers. Reasons could include the teacher's underuse of MotS in general or any unexpected circumstances that might have affected the teacher's lesson plan. For instance, the teacher could be demotivated due to an administrative problem that occurred before class, or due to students' showing up late to class or not doing their assignments, which might result in a different lesson plan than expected.

Despite the effectiveness of Dörnyei's (2001) MotS expressed by teachers and learners, Lamb contends that (2019): "teachers do not use them as frequently as one would expect from their stated importance, and when they do, students do not always recognize them" (295). This argument supports the result of the present study that students did not recognize the MotS used by their teachers and have a significantly different perspective on the reports use of MotS. Dörnyei's (2001) taxonomy could yield interesting results when combined with Keller's (2010) ARCS model, as suggested by the findings of the classroom observations. It is worth noting that only one hour-long class was observed for every participating teacher. A one-time class cannot be generalized to a semester long. Certainly, a teacher's motivational practice fluctuates throughout the semester depending on various factors such as the students' preparedness, their attitudes, their personality, to name but a few. In this context, Consoli and Aoyama (2020) responded to Lamb's (2016) article on motivational strategies and recommended employing a reflexive and reflective approach to accentuate the role of the participant (i.e., the teacher). Moreover, Ushioda (2022) warns teachers against falling in the trap of the carrot-and-stick approach. She rather accentuates the role of promoting students' own motivation to have a long-lasting effect. For instance, while satisfaction-generating strategies may take the form of a carrot-and-stick approach especially if teachers use external rewards, confidence-building strategies boost students' self-regulation and help them be intrinsically motivated to do a particular task.

5. Correlation of the ARCS Strategies and Students' L2MSS

The fourth and final research question aimed to explore the effect of the ARCS strategies employed by teachers on students' L2 self perception through a correlation analysis. The results of the correlation analysis between the ARCS MotS and the L2MSS items revealed that ideal L2 self own is weakly correlated with relevance and satisfaction strategies. The ideal L2 self other is not correlated with any of the ARCS strategies. Both the ought-to L2 self own and other have a weak correlation with confidence and satisfaction. WTC is correlated with relevance-producing strategies only. The L2 learning experience is correlated to all categories except attention-getting strategies. Interestingly, the attention-getting strategies were not correlated with any of the L2MSS categories. This result could be explained by the short effect of these MotS as their effect is usually temporary and could not be part of a future-related vision. Relevance-producing and satisfaction-generating strategies were positively correlated with the ideal L2 self own, which indicates the role of these strategies in shaping an ideal self image of the Tunisian EFL learner. Confidence-building and satisfaction-generating strategies are correlated with the ought-to L2 self-own and other. This result is also insightful in terms of the MotS that an EFL learner is expected to appreciate in order to avoid any negative judgement. Confidence-building strategies aim to boost students' confidence of success while satisfaction-generating strategies seek to reinforce these feelings of success. Relevance-producing strategies are related with EFL students' WTC. In fact, students may be more motivated to talk about topics that they find relevant to their goals. The importance of relevance-producing strategies is also highlighted by Chambers (1999) who argues: "if pupils do not see the relevance of a subject, the teacher has from the outset a major challenge" (38). All of the ARCS strategies except attention are correlated to the L2 learning experience. Students' learning experience could be influenced by teachers' use of relevance-producing strategies, confidence-building strategies, and satisfaction-generating strategies. This result reinforces the positive impact that the ARCS model could produce in EFL the classroom.

A possible takeaway of the correlation results is the recommendation to include vision-building MotS in the EFL classroom as recommended by Dörnyei (2014). Along these lines, Vlaeva and Dörnyei (2021) call for building learners' vision in the classroom. Mental imagery when properly implemented could help learners build a vivid image of their future L2 self. They offer the following pedagogical recommendations by suggesting that teachers should "embed vision interventions in L2 instruction proper, target mental imagery at the proximal

objectives learners are pursuing, and sequence visualization training incrementally, and build 'up' to vision" (Vlaeva and Dörnyei 2021, 962). Dörnyei and Kubanyiova (2014) equally propose that the most important pedagogical intervention could be vision-related motivational impact on students as they argue that "we have come to believe that vision is one of the single most important factors within the domain of language learning: where there is a vision, there is a way" (2). Vision enhancement could be part of the educational reforms that Daoud (2011) has called for to improve the quality of ELT in Tunisia. It could start with teacher trainees who would be theoretically and pedagogically equipped to implement the L2MSS in their teaching practice. On a second step, teachers can work on combining the L2MSS elements with the ARCS categories to guarantee a stronger correlation between them.

6. Concluding remarks

This study endeavors to showcase the pivotal role of MotS in enhancing Tunisian EFL students' motivation to learn English as well as its influence on building their future English language vision. The present chapter has attempted to report and interpret the main findings in light of relevant previous studies. It should be mentioned that the researcher offers a subjective interpretation of participants' perceptions (Creswell, 2013). In other words, my interpretation of results could be influenced by my professional experience as a Tunisian teacher and my cultural values as a local. In fact, my interpretation and understanding of learners' EFL motivation as well as teachers' implementation of MotS could be biased.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

1. Introduction

This thesis includes six chapters. The first chapter is an introduction. The second chapter highlighted the Tunisian research context as well as the development of the L2 motivation research, with a focus on the main theoretical frameworks that inform the present work. The methodology chapter foregrounds the data collection and analyses procedures. The findings chapter reports the main quantitative and qualitative results. The discussion chapter analyzes the main findings in light of the previous studies. This final concluding chapter aims to summarize the main findings of the present thesis. It will highlight the contributions of this study on the theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical levels within the field of L2 motivation research in general and in the Tunisian higher education context in particular. Limitations of the study will then be highlighted. Lastly, future research directions will be outlined.

2. Summary of the Main Findings

The present study was set out to examine Tunisian EFL teachers' motivational practice through questionnaire administration to both students and teachers. It also explores whether students recognize the MotS deployed by their teacher based on Keller's (2010) ARCS model. This study equally aimed to zoom in on EFL teachers' use of MotS at university level through classroom observation. Another goal was to explore ways teachers' MotS affect students' self-vision in light of the L2MSS model. For these aims, a sample of 264 Tunisian university students were recruited from different parts of the country as well as 46 teachers of English. Questionnaires were administered to students and teachers during the spring term of 2022. In addition, classroom observations were conducted in February 2022 with 21 participating teachers. Teachers' questionnaire results highlighted their frequent use of confidence-building strategies. The observation results, on the other hand, showed teachers' reliance on relevance-producing strategies. Along these lines, students reported using relevance-producing strategies most often. However, the significant difference between students' and teachers' perception of the MotS used showcase that the deployed MotS are not appealing to enhance students' motivation. Moreover, the correlation analysis between the ARCS strategies used by teachers

and students' L2MSS has shown the effectiveness of implementing the ARCS model to develop students' self-vision.

3. Theoretical Contributions

Through a combination of different theoretical models, this study managed to contribute to the theoretical conception of L2 motivation and implementing motivation strategies in the EFL classroom. By applying Dörnyei's (2001) model of motivational teaching together with Keller's (2010) ARCS model, a broader conception of MotS was presented, with a focus on how these two models inform each other. This continuity in theorizing language learning motivation was highlighted in the review of the literature. The categorization of Dörnyei and Guilloteaux's (2008) MOLT items into the ARCS strategies offered a new perspective into the continuity of L2 motivation theories (as argued in the literature review chapter). The new categories give a more detailed picture of the MotS deployed by teachers with a more detailed framework. In addition, the positive correlation found between the use of the ARCS strategies and students' self-vision further illustrates the effectiveness of implementing Keller's (2010) ARCS model. More to the point, the combination of the L2MSS and the IMMS questionnaires, together with the MOLT observation scheme showcase the possibility of drawing on various L2 motivation frameworks to get a broader picture of the results.

4. Methodological Contributions

On the methodological level, this study has used two different questionnaires as well as classroom observation. As pointed out by Boo et al. (2015), the rate of mixed-method studies is relatively low in L2 motivation research as compared to quantitative studies. In fact, the comparison of questionnaire and observation results can give new research insights into using different research instruments for the same aim. The z-score comparison for each teacher has shown a variation between their questionnaire answers and their actual employment of MotS during the observation. This research paves the way for more mixed-method studies that combine questionnaire data with classroom observation as proposed by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2021). Another advantage in the study design is the administration of questionnaires to both teachers and students. Taking both participants' opinions on the same set of strategies proved very interesting as they might indeed have different perspectives. The majority of previous studies have involved either students or teachers only.

5. Pedagogical Contributions

The pedagogical contributions of this study are manifold. As far as students are concerned, the importance of their view has proven invaluable. More to the point, giving students the chance to evaluate their teacher's performance could be informative for teachers as well. Students should often get the chance to evaluate their teachers, not just at the end of the term. Students' perception could urge teachers to adapt to their needs. Based on students' answers, teachers can tailor the syllabus according to their recommendations and needs. Indeed, Tunisian university teachers have the freedom to design their own teaching materials and adapt to students' preferences. As concerns teachers, the results of the present study could provide them with an easy-to-follow framework that they could implement in their classrooms. Moreover, these findings can be implemented in teacher training programs. Workshops could be given to novice and experienced teachers to allow them to reflect on their motivational practice as well as trying to use the ARCS strategies in their own classrooms. In light of the strategies that were found to be dominant, EFL teachers may be advised to focus more on satisfaction-generating strategies and attention-getting strategies that were scarcely used. Confidence-building and relevance-producing strategies have also proved to be appreciated by students. Teachers may resort to the ARCS model to design their lesson plans, taking into consideration their students' preferences.

Another way of implementing the results of the present study would be to follow Maeng and Lee's (2015) study and tailor a pre-service teacher training program following the ARCS strategies. Another possibility would be to build learners' L2 vision along with MotS as proposed by Vlaeva and Dörnyei (2021). These suggestions are a response to Daoud's (2019) call for 'doing applied linguistics' in the English language classroom.

6. Limitations of the Study

This study does certainly have a few limitations. Although this study used mixed methods, interviews can contribute an additional perspective on teachers' motivational practice. As concerns the instrument, recall interviews would have been quite interesting in having the teachers comment on their motivational practices. A retrospection on their practice could make teachers more aware of their use of MotS. Still, I managed to do brief conversations with teachers after each lesson and took notes of their comments. As far as the target population is concerned, a comparison of English and non-English majors would have been possible if

more participating students and ESP teachers were recruited. However, there was an overarching majority of English majors due to ease of access. In addition, if more time was possible for the data collection, I could provide students with an English proficiency test. Their proficiency level could affect their evaluation of the employed MotS. Moreover, their proficiency may be correlated with their self-perception. In addition, observations could be scheduled for a whole semester to gain a more thorough view of teachers' motivational practice. It should also be mentioned that the observation data is influenced by my personal view and interpretation of the MOLT and ARCS categories. Inter-rater reliability check would add to the reliability of the data if another observer was present with the researcher.

7. Suggestions for Future Research

Future research can build on the main findings of the present study in various ways. In fact, new research studies may focus on the comparison of students' motivation to learn English and LOTE – namely French. Another possible area of focus is ESP students with more students recruited from other majors. Moreover, given the complexity and fluctuation of students' motivation, a longitudinal study could record the changes of students' self-vision. A longitudinal study can capture the changes in both teachers' use of MotS as well as changes in students' self-perception. Another possibility would be to use another observation scheme combining the MOLT and ARCS categories that would allow the observer to take notes and expand on the listed strategies.

8. Final Thoughts

This final concluding chapter has presented a summary of the major findings. It then underscored the theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical contributions of this study. It also highlighted the limitations before listing recommendations for future research. The main aims of this research lay in investigating the use of MotS by Tunisian EFL teachers and whether their students find them effective. It also looked at the difference between teachers' reported use of MotS through their questionnaire answers and their actual motivational teaching during classroom observation. The last goal was to explore the correlation between teacher's MotS and students' self-perception. Combining different theoretical L2 motivation frameworks, this study has highlighted the connections between different models and the possibility to combine them. On the methodological level, this study has contributed to the limited L2 motivation research using mixed methods. Through comparing quantitative questionnaire data with

qualitative observation data, this study could bring to the surface one of the advantages of mixed-method research. The pedagogical contribution of the present research is presented through the recommendation to implement the results found in teacher training programs. Although this study yielded insightful results, it had some limitations related to the absence of post-lesson teacher interviews and its focus on English majors. Still, this study has contributed to the ever-growing L2 motivation research by studying a less researched context, Tunisia.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Abdeljaoued, Marii, and Tahar Labassi. 2021. “English as the Lingua Franca of Academic Publishing in Tunisia.” *World Englishes* 40 (2): 245–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12511.

Al-Hoorie, Ali H. 2017. “Sixty Years of Language Motivation Research: Looking Back and Looking Forward.” *SAGE Open* 7 (1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017701976.

Al-Hoorie, Ali H., and Peter D. MacIntyre, eds. 2020. *Contemporary Language Motivation Theory: 60 Years since Gardner and Lambert (1959)*. Psychology of Language Learning and Teaching 4. Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.

Al-Hoorie, Ali H., Fruzsina Szabó, and Zoltán Dörnyei, eds. 2022. *Researching Language Learning Motivation: A Concise Guide*. London ; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Aouina, Hichem. 2013. “Globalisation and Language Policy in Tunisia: Shifts in Domains of Use and Linguistic Attitudes.” PhD Thesis.

Atkinson, John. W. 1964. *An introduction to motivation.* Van Nostrand.

Badwan, Khawla. 2021. “Agency in Educational Language Planning: Perspectives from Higher Education in Tunisia.” *Current Issues in Language Planning* 22 (1–2): 99–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2019.1700056.

Battenburg, John. 1997. “English Versus French: Language Rivalry in Tunisia.” *World Englishes* 16 (2): 281–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00062.

Bernaus, Mercè, and Robert C. Gardner. 2008. “Teacher Motivation Strategies, Student Perceptions, Student Motivation, and English Achievement.” *The Modern Language Journal* 92 (3): 387–401. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00753.x.

Boukadi, Samira, and Salah Troudi. 2017. "English Education Policy in Tunisia, Issues of Language Policy in Post-Revolution Tunisia." In *English Language Education Policy in the Middle East and North Africa*, edited by Robert Kirkpatrick, 13:257–77. Language Policy. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46778-8_15.

Chambers, Gary N. 1999. *Motivating Language Learners*. Modern Languages in Practice 12. Clevedon [U.K.] ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Cheng, Hsing-Fu, and Zoltán Dörnyei. 2007. "The Use of Motivational Strategies in Language Instruction: The Case of EFL Teaching in Taiwan." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 1 (1): 153–74. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt048.0.

Clément, R., R. C. Gardner, and Padric C. Smythe. 1980. "Social and Individual Factors in Second Language Acquisition." Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement 12 (4): 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0081081.

Cohen, Andrew D. and Henry, Alastair. 2020. "Focus on the Language Learner: Styles, Strategies and Motivation." In *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*, edited by Norbert Schmitt and Michael P. H. Rodgers, Third edition, 165–89. London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Cohen, Andrew D.and Zoltán Dörnyei. 2002. "Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles, and strategies". Schmitt, N. (ed.). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics.* London: Edward Arnold, 170-190.

Consoli, Sal. 2020. The motivational journeys of Chinese postgraduate students in a UK University: an ecological perspective for practitioners and academics. PhD thesis, University of Warwick. Retrieved from: http://webcat.warwick.ac.uk/record=b3493076~S15

Consoli, Sal. 2021. "Understanding Motivation through Ecological Research: The Case of Exploratory Practice" In *Complexity Perspectives on Researching Language Learner and Teacher Psychology* edited by Richard J. Sampson and Richard S. Pinner, 120-135. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923569-009

Consoli, Sal, and Sara Ganassin. 2022. *Reflexivity in Applied Linguistics: Opportunities, Challenges, and Suggestions.* 1st ed. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003149408.

Consoli, Sal. 2022. "Life Capital: An Epistemic and Methodological Lens for TESOL Research." *TESOL Quarterly* 56 (4): 1397–1409. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3154.

Consoli, Sal, and Takumi Aoyama. 2020. "Longitudinal L2 Motivation Inquiry: A Response to Lamb's (2016) 'When Motivation Research Motivates: Issues in Long-Term Empirical Investigations.'" *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching 14* (2): 178–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1548081

Crookes, Graham, and Richard W. Schmidt. 1991. "Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda." *Language Learning* 41 (4): 469–512. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00690.x

Csizér, Kata and Dörnyei, Zoltan. 2005a. The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. Modern Language Journal, 89. 19–36.

Csizér, Kata and Dörnyei, Zoltan. 2005b. Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behaviour. Language Learning, 55. 613–659.

Csizér, Kata, and Csaba Kálmán. 2019. "A Study of Retrospective and Concurrent Foreign Language Learning Experiences: A Comparative Interview Study in Hungary." *Studies in*

Second Language Learning and Teaching 9 (1): 225–46. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.10.

Csizér, Kata, and Éva Illés. 2020. "Helping to Maximize Learners' Motivation for Second Language Learning." Language Teaching Research Quarterly 19 (May): 19–31. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.19.02.

Csizér, Kata, and Judit Kormos. 2009. "5. Learning Experiences, Selves and Motivated Learning Behaviour: A Comparative Analysis of Structural Models for Hungarian Secondary and University Learners of English." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda, 98–119. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-006.

Csizér, Kata. 2017. Motivation in the L2 classroom. In S. Loewen, M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge, New York, NY (2017), pp. 418-432

Csizér, Kata. 2020. *Second Language Learning Motivation in a European Context: The Case of Hungary*. 1st ed. 2020. Cham, Cham: Springer International Publishing Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64462-8.

Daoud, Mohamed. 2001. "The Language Situation in Tunisia." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 2 (1): 1–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200108668018

Daoud, Mohamed. 2011. "The Sociolinguistic Situation in Tunisia: Language Rivalry or Accommodation?" *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2011 (211). https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2011.036.

Daoud, Mohamed. 2019. "Language Teaching in Turbulent Times: Curriculum-Savvy Teachers for Curriculum Success and Sustainability." In *Voices and Practices in Applied Linguistics: Diversifying a Discipline*, edited by Clare Wright, Lou Harvey, and James Simpson, 177–93. White Rose University Press. https://doi.org/10.22599/BAAL1.k.

De Bot, Kees, Wander Lowie, and Marjolijn Verspoor. 2007. "A Dynamic Systems Theory Approach to Second Language Acquisition." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 10 (01): 7. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002732.

Deci, Edward L., and Richard M. Ryan. 1985. Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior. Boston, MA: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2009. "2. The L2 Motivational Self System." In Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self, edited by Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda, 9–42. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003.

Dörnyei Zoltán, and Ema Ushioda. 2011. *Teaching and Researching Motivation.* 2nd Edition, Pearson, Harlow.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Ali H. Al-Hoorie. 2017. "The Motivational Foundation of Learning Languages Other Than Global English: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 455–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12408.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Christine Muir. 2019. "Creating a Motivating Classroom Environment." In *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*, edited by Xuesong Gao, 719–36. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_36.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Ema Ushioda. 2021. *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Third edition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Kata Csizér. 1998a. "Ten Commandments for Motivating Language Learners: Results of an Empirical Study." *Language Teaching Research* 2 (3): 203–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889800200303.

Dörnyei, Zoltan, and Stephen Ryan. 2015. *The Psychology of the Language Learner Revisited*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, and Tatsuya Taguchi. 2009. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. 2nd ed. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203864739.

Dörnyei, Zoltán, Kata Csizér, and Nóra Németh. 2006. *Motivation, Language Attitudes and Globalisation: A Hungarian Perspective*. Second Language Acquisition 18. Clevedon, [England] ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1994. "Understanding L2 Motivation: On with the Challenge!" *The Modern Language Journal* 78 (4): 515–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02071.x.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1998b. "Ten Commandments for Motivating Language Learners: Results of an Empirical Study." *Language Teaching Research* 2 (3): 203–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889800200303.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2001. *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. 11. print. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2002. “Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a Longitudinal Nationwide Survey.” *Applied Linguistics* 23 (4): 421–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.421.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2005. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. New York London: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2010. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. Second Edition. Second Language Acquisition Research Series. Monographs on Research Methodology. New York ; London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2010. Researching motivation: from integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. In S. Hunston and D. Oakey (eds.). Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts ad skills (74-83). London: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2014. “Researching Complex Dynamic Systems: ‘Retrodictive Qualitative Modelling’ in the Language Classroom.” *Language Teaching* 47 (1): 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000516.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2020. *Innovations and Challenges in Language Learning Motivation*. Innovations and Challenges in Applied Linguistics. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. and Csizér, Kata. 2002. “Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a Longitudinal Nationwide Survey.” Applied Linguistics 23 (4): 421–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.421.

Erdil-Moody, Zeynep, and Amy S. Thompson. 2020. “Exploring Motivational Strategies in Higher Education: Student and Instructor Perceptions.” *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, December, 387–412. https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.834670.

Gardner Robert C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, Robert C. 2001. Integrative Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Honolulu: Publishing Company, Ltd.

Gardner, Robert C. 2010. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The Socio-Educational Model*. Language as Social Action, v. 10. New York: Peter Lang.

Gardner, Robert C., and Wallace E. Lambert. 1959. “Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition.” Canadian Journal of Psychology / Revue Canadienne de Psychologie 13 (4): 266–72. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0083787.

Gardner, Robert C., and Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Newbury House, Rowley.

Giles, Howard, and Jane L. Byrne. 1982. “An Intergroup Approach to Second Language Acquisition.” Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 3 (1): 17–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1982.9994069.

Guilloteaux, Marie J., and Zoltán Dörnyei. 2008. “Motivating Language Learners: A Classroom-Oriented Investigation of the Effects of Motivational Strategies on Student Motivation.” *TESOL Quarterly* 42 (1): 55–77. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x.

Guilloteaux, Marie-José. 2013. “Motivational Strategies for the Language Classroom: Perceptions of Korean Secondary School English Teachers.” *System* 41 (1): 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.12.002.

Heckhausen, Heinz. & Kuhl, Julius. 1985. “From wishes to action: The dead-ends and short-cuts on the long way to action”. In M. Frese & J. Sabini (Eds.), Goal-directed behavior: The concept of action in psychology (pp. 134–160). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hennebry-Leung, Mairin, and Hu Amy Xiao. 2020. “Examining the Role of the Learner and the Teacher in Language Learning Motivation.” *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938810.

Henry, Alastair, and Christina Cliffordson. 2013. “Motivation, Gender, and Possible Selves: Motivation, Gender, and Possible Selves.” *Language Learning* 63 (2): 271–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12009.

Henry, Alastair. 2014. “The Dynamics of L3 Motivation: A Longitudinal Interview/ Observation-Based Study.” In Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning, edited by Zoltán Dörnyei, Peter D. MacIntyre, and Alastair Henry, 315–42. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092574-021.

Henry, Alastair. 2017. “L2 Motivation and Multilingual Identities.” The Modern Language Journal 101 (3): 548–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12412.

Hermessi, Tarek. 2017. “An Evaluation of the Place of Culture in English Education in Tunisia.” In *Evaluation in Foreign Language Education in the Middle East and North Africa*, edited by Sahbi Hidri and Christine Coombe, 203–20. Second Language Learning and Teaching. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43234-2_12.

Hermessi, Tarek. 2022. “Motivation for Learning EFL in Tunisia: An Eclectic Theoretical Approach and a Structural Equation Modeling Approach.” *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, January, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.2012477.

Higgins, E. Tory. 1987. “Self-Discrepancy: A Theory Relating Self and Affect.” Psychological Review 94 (3): 319–40. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319.

Hsu, Hsiao-Wen. 2020. “A Classroom-Oriented Exploration of Rural High School Teacher’s Motivational Practice on Student Motivation.” *English Teaching & Learning* 44 (3): 229–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00043-0.

Hutchinson, Tom, and Alan Waters. 1987. *English for Specific Purposes*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031.

Jules, Tavis Deryck, and Teresa Barton. 2018. *Educational Transitions in Post-Revolutionary Spaces: Islam, Security and Social Movements in Tunisia*. London ; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Kálmán, Csaba. 2021. The Teacher’s Role in Motivating Adult Learners of English: A Questionnaire Study in Hungarian Corporate Contexts. In DEAL 2021: *Current Explorations in English Applied Linguistics*. Kucsák Könyvkötészet és Nyomda.

Karimi, Mohammad Nabi, and Samane Saddat Hosseini Zade. 2019. “Teachers’ Use of Motivational Strategies: Effects of a Motivation-Oriented Professional Development Course.” *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 13 (2): 194–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1422255.

Keller, John M. 1983. “Motivational Design of Instruction.” In *Instructional Design Theories and Models: An Overview of Their Current Status*, edited by Reigeluth, C.M., 383–434. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Keller, John M. 1987. “Development and Use of the ARCS Model of Instructional Design.” *Journal of Instructional Development* 10 (3): 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02905780.

Keller, John M. 2010a. *Motivational Design for Learning and Performance*. Boston, MA: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1250-3.

Keller, John M. 2010b. “What Is Motivational Design?” In *Motivational Design for Learning and Performance*, by John M. Keller, 21–41. Boston, MA: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1250-3_2.

Khlaif, Zuheir N., Soheil Salha, and Bochra Kouraichi. 2021. “Emergency Remote Learning during COVID-19 Crisis: Students’ Engagement.” Education and Information Technologies 26 (6): 7033–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10566-4.

Kong, Ji Hyun, Jeong Eun Han, Sungjo Kim, Hunil Park, Yong Suk Kim, and Hyunjoo Park. 2018. “L2 Motivational Self System, International Posture and Competitiveness of Korean CTL and LCTL College Learners: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach.” System 72 (February): 178–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.11.005.

Kouraichi, Bochra, and Lesznyák, Márta. 2022. “Teachers’ Use of Motivational Strategies in the EFL Classroom: A Study of Hungarian High Schools.” *Anglica. An International Journal of English Studies* 31 (2): 147–68. https://doi.org/10.7311/0860-5734.31.2.08.

Kouraichi, Bochra. 2018. “Foreign Language Learners’ Motivation: A Comparative Study of Tunisian Middle-School Students Using the ARCS Model.” In *Challenges of Modern Foreign*

Language Teaching: Reflections and Analyses, edited by Tinnefeld, Thomas, 147–56. Saarbrücken Series on Linguistics and Language Methodology. Saarbrücken Germany: HTW Saar.

Kouraichi, Bochra (in press). ESP Teachers' Use of Motivational Strategies: A classroom-oriented view of Estonian University Teaching. Proceedings of the 23rd Summer School of Psycholinguistics. Akadémiai Kiádo

Kouraichi, Bochra (in press). Enhancing EFL Students' Motivation Using the ARCS Model: Tunisian University Students. The ESSE Messenger.

Lee, Jang Ho, and Yuen Yi Lo. 2017. "An Exploratory Study on the Relationships between Attitudes toward Classroom Language Choice, Motivation, and Proficiency of EFL Learners." *System* 67 (July): 121–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.04.017.

Lee, Tim S. O. 2022. "Motivational Strategies in Undergraduate EAP Courses: Student Perceptions and Suggestions." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, March, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2050888.

Lee, Tim S. O., David Gardner, and Ken Lau. 2020. "The Effects of L2 Motivational Strategies: Within and beyond the L2 Classroom." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 14 (5): 451–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1620240.

Lachheb, Ahmed. 2013. "Information Technology Effects on Tunisian College Students; Tunisian English Majors as a Case Study." https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20490.06087.

Lamb, Martin. 2004. "Integrative Motivation in a Globalizing World." *System* 32 (1): 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2003.04.002.

Lamb, Martin. 2009. "Situating the L2 Self: Two Indonesian school learners of English". In: Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self. Multilingual Matters , Bristol , 229 - 247.

Lamb, Martin. 2017. “The Motivational Dimension of Language Teaching.” *Language Teaching* 50 (3): 301–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000088.

Lamb, Martin. 2019. “Motivational Teaching Strategies.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning*, edited by Martin Lamb, Kata Csizér, Alastair Henry, and Stephen Ryan, 287–305. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28380-3_14.

Lee, Jang Ho, and Yuen Yi Lo. 2017. An Exploratory Study on the Relationships between Attitudes toward Classroom Language Choice, Motivation, and Proficiency of EFL Learners. *System* 67 (July): 121–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.04.017.

Lee, Tim S. O. 2022. “Motivational Strategies in Undergraduate EAP Courses: Student Perceptions and Suggestions.” *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, March, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2050888.

Lee, Tim S. O., David Gardner, and Ken Lau. 2020. “The Effects of L2 Motivational Strategies: Within and beyond the L2 Classroom.” *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 14 (5): 451–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1620240.

Li, Kun, and John M. Keller. 2018. “Use of the ARCS Model in Education: A Literature Review.” *Computers & Education* 122 (July): 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.03.019.

Liu, Yao, and Amy S. Thompson. 2018. “Language Learning Motivation in China: An Exploration of the L2MSS and Psychological Reactance.” System 72 (February): 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.025.

Maeng, Unkyoung, and Sangmin-Michelle Lee. 2015. "EFL Teachers' Behavior of Using Motivational Strategies: The Case of Teaching in the Korean Context." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 46 (February): 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.10.010.

Mahmoodi, Mohammad Hadi, and Moslem Yousefi. 2022. "Second Language Motivation Research 2010–2019: A Synthetic Exploration." *The Language Learning Journal* 50 (3): 273–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1869809.

Markus, Hazel, and Paula Nurius. 1986. "Possible Selves." *American Psychologist* 41 (9): 954–69. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954.

Mercer, Sarah, Stephen Ryan, and Marion Williams, eds. 2012. *Psychology for Language Learning: Insights from Research, Theory and Practice*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Meyers, Lawrence S., Glenn Gamst, and A. J. Guarino. 2017a. *Applied Multivariate Research: Design and Interpretation*. Third Edition. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Min, Moon Hong, and Yuah V. Chon. 2020. "Teacher Motivational Strategies for EFL Learners: For Better or Worse." *RELC Journal* 52 (3): 557–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688219900812.

Moskovsky, Christo, Turki Assulaimani, Silvia Racheva, and Jean Harkins. 2016. "The L2 Motivational Self System and L2 Achievement: A Study of Saudi EFL Learners." The Modern Language Journal 100 (3): 641–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12340

Muir, Christine, and Zoltán Dörnyei. 2013. "Directed Motivational Currents: Using Vision to Create Effective Motivational Pathways." Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching 3 (3): 357. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2013.3.3.3.

Niemiec, Christopher P., and Richard M. Ryan. 2009. "Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness in the Classroom: Applying Self-Determination Theory to Educational Practice." Theory and Research in Education 7 (2): 133–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318.

Noels, Kimberly A., Luc G. Pelletier, Richard Clément, and Robert J. Vallerand. 2003. "Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory: Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory." Language Learning 53 (S1): 33–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.53223.

Noels, Kimberly A., Luc G. Pelletier, Richard Clément, and Robert J. Vallerand. 2000. "Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory." *Language Learning* 50 (1): 57–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00111.

Papi, Mostafa, Anna Vitalyevna Bondarenko, Soheil Mansouri, Liying Feng, and Chen Jiang. 2019. "Rethinking L2 Motivation Research: The 2 × 2 Model of L2 Self-Guides." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 41 (2): 337–61. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2015. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice.* Fourth edition. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Plonsky, Luke, and Talip Gonulal. 2015. "Methodological Synthesis in Quantitative L2 Research: A Review of Reviews and a Case Study of Exploratory Factor Analysis: Methodological Reviews and a Case Study of EFA." *Language Learning* 65 (S1): 9–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12111.

Plonsky, Luke, ed. 2015. *Advancing Quantitative Methods in Second Language Research*. Second Language Acquisition Research Series. New York: Routledge.

Rahmouni, Mohieddine, and Mohammed Abdulaziz Aleid. 2020. “Teachers’ Practices and Children’s Motivation towards Science Learning in MENA Countries: Evidence from Tunisia and UAE.” *International Journal of Educational Research* 103: 101605. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101605.

Ruesch, Ashley, Jennifer Bown, and Dan P. Dewey. 2012. “Student and Teacher Perceptions of Motivational Strategies in the Foreign Language Classroom.” *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 6 (1): 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2011.562510.

Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. 2020. “Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation from a Self-Determination Theory Perspective: Definitions, Theory, Practices, and Future Directions.” *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 61 (April): 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860.

Ryan, Stephen. 2008. The ideal L2 selves of Japanese learners of English. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Ryan, Stephen. 2009. “Self and Identity in L2 Motivation in Japan: The Ideal L2 Self and Japanese Learners of English”. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self (pp. 120-143). Bristol: Multi-lingual Matters.

Sayahi, Lotfi. 2011. “Introduction. Current Perspectives on Tunisian Sociolinguistics.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2011 (211): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2011.035.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley Mass: Newbury House.

Shahriar, Ambreen, and Ghazal Kazim Syed, eds. 2017. *Student Culture and Identity in Higher Education:* Advances in Higher Education and Professional Development. IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-2551-6.

Shawn Loewen and Talip Gonulal. 2015. "Exploratory Factor Analysis and Principal Components Analysis." In *Advancing Quntitative Methods in Second Langugae Research*. Routledge.

Sekaran, Uma. 2003. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach.* 4th Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Slavin, Robert E. 2001. *A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning*. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.

Smari, Ibtissem, and Ildikó Hortobágyi. 2020. "Language Policies and Multilingualism in Modern Tunisia." *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov, Series IV: Philology. Cultural Studies* 13 (62) (Special Issue): 207–32. https://doi.org/10.31926/but.pcs.2020.62.13.3.12.

Smari, Ibtissem, and Judit Navracsics. 2019. "Multilingualism and Its Impact on Identity: Tunisian Case Study." *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány*, vol. 19. issue 1. ISSN 15871061. https://doi.org/10.18460/ANY.2019.1.005.

Spada, N., & Frohlich, M. 1995. *COLT Observation Scheme*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Spratt, Mary, Gillian Humphreys, and Victoria Chan. 2002. "Autonomy and Motivation: Which Comes First?" *Language Teaching Research* 6 (3): 245–66. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr106oa.

Stamenkovska, Tatjana, Csaba Kálmán, and János Gordon Győri. 2022. "The Motivational Disposition of International Students Learning Foreign Languages in Hungary: Testing the L2 Motivation Self System in the Hungarian Context." Journal of Adult Learning, Knowledge and Innovation 5 (2): 101–10. https://doi.org/10.1556/2059.2022.00060.

Stange, K. C. 2006. "Publishing Multimethod Research." The Annals of Family Medicine 4 (4): 292–94. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.615.

Sugita McEown, Maya, and Osamu Takeuchi. 2014. "Motivational Strategies in EFL Classrooms: How Do Teachers Impact Students' Motivation?" *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 8 (1): 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2012.741133.

Taguchi, Tatsuya. Michael Magid and Mostafa Papi. 2009. "The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study". In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), Motivation, language identity and the L2 self (pp. 66-97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tavakoli, Mansoor, Hadi Yaghoubinejad, and Nourollah Zarrinabadi. 2018. "Using Motivational Strategies in L2 Classrooms: Does Culture Have a Role?" *Current Psychology* 37 (3): 477–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9523-2.

Teimouri, Yasser. 2017. "L2 Selves, Emotions, and Motivated Behaviors." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 39 (4): 681–709. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263116000243.

Ushioda, Ema. 2001. Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In: Dörnyei, Z. and Schmidt, R., (eds.) *Motivation and second language acquisition.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, pp. 93-125.

Ushioda, Ema. 2009. “A Person-in-Context Relational View of Emergent Motivation, Self and Identity.” In Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self, edited by Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda, 215–28. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-012.

Ushioda, Ema. 2012. “Motivation: L2 Learning as a Special Case?” In *Psychology for Language Learning*, edited by Sarah Mercer, Stephen Ryan, and Marion Williams, 58–73. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137032829_5.

Ushioda, Ema. 2013a. “Motivation and ELT: Looking Ahead to the Future.” In *International Perspectives on Motivation*, edited by Ema Ushioda, 233–39. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137000873_13.

Ushioda, Ema. 2013b. “Foreign Language Motivation Research in Japan: An ‘Insider’ Perspective from Outside Japan.” In *Language Learning Motivation in Japan*, edited by Matthew T. Apple, Dexter Da Silva, and Terry Fellner, 1–14. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090518-003.

Vandergrift, Larry, Christine C. M. Goh, Catherine J. Mareschal, and Marzieh H. Tafaghodtari. 2006. “The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire: Development and Validation: *Language Learning*.” *Language Learning* 56 (3): 431–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.00373.x.

Veltcheff, Caroline. 2006. “Le Français En Tunisie : Une Langue Vivante Ou Une Langue Morte ?:” *Le Français Aujourd’hui* n° 154 (3): 83–92. https://doi.org/10.3917/lfa.154.0083.

Verspoor, Marjolyn, Kees De Bot, and Wander Lowie, eds. 2011. *A Dynamic Approach to Second Language Development: Methods and Techniques*. Language Learning & Language Teaching (LL&LT) 29. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Company.

Vlaeva, Denny, and Zoltán Dörnyei. 2021. “Vision Enhancement and Language Learning: A Critical Analysis of Vision-Building in an English for Academic Purposes Programme.” Language Teaching Research 25 (6): 946–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211014551.

Wong, Ruth M.H. 2014. “An Investigation of Strategies for Student Motivation in the Chinese EFL Context.” *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 8 (2): 132–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.777449.

Yang, Zening, and Hugo Santiago Sanchez. 2021. “Teachers’ Pedagogical Intentions While Using Motivational Strategies.” *ELT Journal*, October, ccab070. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab070.

Yousefi, Moslem, and Mohammad Hadi Mahmoodi. 2022. “The L2 Motivational Self-system: A Meta-analysis Approach.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 32 (2): 274–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12416.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: The L2MSS Questionnaire

The below questionnaire items were adapted from previous versions of the L2MSS by Dörnyei (2005, 2010), Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009), Papi et al. (2019).

Ideal L2 Self/Own

1. I often imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English fluently.
2. I can imagine myself using English effectively for communicating with the locals in English - speaking areas.
3. I can imagine a day when I am speaking English with English-speaking friends.
4. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself being able to use English.
5. I can imagine myself writing work e-mails in English to my boss, colleagues, and clients.
6. When I think about my future, it is important that I use English.
7. I can imagine myself texting and messaging in English with friends, family, and native speakers.

Ideal L2 Self/Other

8. My family hopes that I will one day speak English fluently.
9. The most important people to me hope that I will one day speak English fluently.
10. My family will be proud if I will one day master the English language.
11. My community will be happy if I learn to speak English fluently.
12. My friends will be happy if one day I speak English fluently.
13. My parents hope that I will speak English fluently one day.

Ought-to L2 Self/Own

14. I need to study English in order to succeed in my future career.
15. I must study English to be an educated person.
16. I have to study English so I can be an active and productive member of my society and culture.
17. If I don't work on my English, it will have a negative impact on my future.
18. If I don't work on my English, I will have difficulty in my social life.

Ought-to L2 Self/Other

19. Learning English is necessary because the people surrounding me expect me to do so.
20. I need to study English in order to gain the approval of the people most important to me.
21. Learning English is necessary because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.
22. If I don't work on my English, I will disappoint my family.
23. My family puts a lot of pressure on me to learn English.

Willingness to Communicate

24. I choose to speak English when I am given a chance to talk freely in an English class.
25. I volunteer to respond to or ask questions in English class.
26. I like to speak English with other students who speak English at university.
27. I like to speak English with friends or acquaintances outside of university.
28. I try to talk when I have a chance to speak English in English classes.

L2 learning experience

29. In general, I have had great English teachers.
30. I like the textbooks we have used in my English classes.
31. The activities we do in my English classes are useful.
32. I like the students in my English classes.
33. I am usually very happy with my English grades.

Appendix B: The IMMS Questionnaire for Teachers

1. Do you use different visual or auditory materials?
2. Do you use pictures that show tables and flowcharts?
3. Do you use pictures, images, and photos?
4. Do you use what students know already?
5. Do you ask a lot of questions and take care in providing answers to students' questions?
6. Do you give students problems to solve during class?
7. Do you vary teaching materials or presentation style, when necessary?
8. Do you use both Arabic and English as needed in the lessons?
9. Do you use a variety of teaching methods (E.g., singing in English, cooperative learning, project word, discussions)?
10. Do you change the tone of voice as needed (E.g., bold, funny, cute)?
11. Do you explain how each lesson is going to benefit students?
12. Do you explain what can be learnt from the course?
13. Do you explain in detail how successful learning is going to help students?
14. Do you provide a non-competitive learning context?
15. Do you provide a learning context where cooperative learning is used?
16. Do you organize pair and group work that requires cooperation?
17. Do you use anecdotes and stories you know during the lessons?
18. Do you clearly explain the relevance of the lesson to what students already know?
19. Do you clearly tell students how the new course content is related to what they know?
20. Do you explain course objectives and how the course is going to be run?
21. Do you present clear evaluation criteria before assessment?
22. Do you provide opportunities for students to talk or write about what they want to learn?

23. Do you tell students about what they will be able to do after successfully completing the lesson?
24. Do you present materials that are not so difficult?
25. Do you provide tasks and assignments that are not so difficult?
26. Do you present materials in an explicit and easy-to-follow way?
27. Do you allow students to control their pace of learning?
28. Do you encourage students to study on their own?
29. Do you help students to review and recycle parts of what they have learnt, when needed?
30. Do you allow students to try out what they have learnt in real life (e.g., conversing with a native speaker)?
31. Do you provide positive response to assignments and problems that they have completed?
32. Do you allow students to help peers when they have completed their work?
33. Do you sympathize and understand the difficulties students face while learning?
34. Do you compliment students when they provide the correct answer?
35. Do you reward students when they win games or activities?
36. Do you show personal interest when they work hard or when they complete an assignment successfully?
37. Do you provide symbolic rewards for students who have successfully completed activities?
38. Students can get good grades if they work hard enough.
39. Tests are always about what students have learnt.
40. The difficulty of the tests is appropriate, neither easy nor difficult.

Appendix C: The IMMS Questionnaire for Students

1. Teacher uses different visual or auditory materials.
2. Teacher uses pictures that show tables and flowcharts.
3. Teacher uses pictures, images, or photos.
4. Teacher uses what we know already.
5. Teacher asks a lot of questions and takes care in providing answers to my questions.
6. Teacher gives us problems to solve during class.
7. Teacher varies teaching materials or presentation style, when necessary.
8. Teacher uses both Arabic and English as needed in the lessons.
9. Teacher uses a variety of teaching methods (E.g., singing in English, cooperative learning, project work, discussions)
10. Teacher changes the tone of voice as needed. (E.g., bold, funny, cute)
11. Teacher explains how each lesson is going to benefit us
12. Teacher explains what can be learnt from the course
13. Teacher explains in detail how successful learning is going to help me
14. Teacher provides a non-competitive learning context.
15. Teacher provides a learning context where cooperative learning is used.
16. Teacher organizes pair and group work that requires cooperation.
17. Teacher uses anecdotes and stories s/he knows during the lessons.
18. Teacher clearly explains the relevance of the lesson to what I already know.
19. Teacher clearly tells me how the new course content is related to what we know.
20. Teacher explains course objectives and how the course is going to be run.
21. Teacher presents clear evaluation criteria before assessment.
22. Teacher provides opportunities for me to talk or write about what I want to learn.

23. Teacher tells us about what I will be able to do after successfully completing the lesson.
24. Teacher presents materials that are not so difficult.
25. Teacher provides tasks and assignments that are not so difficult.
26. Teacher presents materials in an explicit and easy-to-follow way.
27. Teacher allows us to control the pace of learning.
28. Teacher encourages us to study on our own.
29. Teacher helps us to review and recycle parts of what we have learnt, when needed.
30. Teacher allows us to try out what we have learnt in real life (e.g., conversing with a native speaker).
31. Teacher provides positive response to assignments and problems that I've completed.
32. Teacher allows me to help peers when I have completed my work.
33. Teacher sympathizes and understands the difficulties we face while learning.
34. Teacher compliments us when we provide the correct answer.
35. Teacher rewards us when we win games or activities.
36. Teacher shows personal interest when I work hard or when I complete an assignment successfully
37. Teacher provides symbolic rewards for students who have successfully completed activities.
38. I can get good grades if I work hard enough.
39. Tests are always about what I have learnt.
40. The difficulty of the tests is appropriate, neither easy nor difficult.

Appendix D: The MOLT Observation Scheme

Learners' motivated behavior			Eager volunteering (>1/3 of the class)					
			Engagement (>2/3 of the class)					
			Attention (>2/3 of the class)					
Teacher's motivational practice	Encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation		Class applause					
			Effective praise					
			Elicitation of self/peer correction session					
			Process feedback session					
			Neutral feedback session					
	Generating, maintaining, and protecting situation-specific task motivation	*Activity design*	+ team competition					
			+ individual competition					
			+ tangible task product					
			+ intellectual challenge					
			+ creative/interesting/fantasy element					
			+ personalization					
			+ tangible reward					
		P.S.[a]	Group work					
			Pair work					
		Teacher discourse	Referential Questions					
			Promoting autonomy					
			Promoting cooperation					
			Scaffolding					
			Arousing curiosity or attention					
			Promoting instrumental values					
			Promoting integrative values					
			Establishing relevance					
			Stating communicative purpose/utility of activity					
			Signposting					
			Social chat (unrelated to the lesson)					
minutes				1	2	3	4	5