

New Framework of Intrinsic/Extrinsic and Integrative/Instrumental Motivation in Second Language Acquisition

Junko MATSUZAKI CARREIRA *

There are several definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The different definitions may force second language acquisition (SLA) researchers to interpret their results in different ways. Some studies have introduced intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into SLA without defining and discussing them fully, thus giving rise to contradictions in SLA motivational research. SLA researchers need to pay more attention to the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This paper explores intrinsic and extrinsic motivational studies in SLA and also proposes a new framework for intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation. Although language learning motivation cannot be neatly categorized into eight types, the proposed framework covers various types of motivation for learning languages. This framework makes a contribution toward deepening the conceptual understanding of intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation.

By the 1990s Gardner's motivation theory had overwhelming dominance in second language (L2) motivation research (Dörnyei, 2001) Gardner and Lambert (1972) suggested *integrative motivation*, referring to positive attitudes and feelings toward the target language group, and *instrumental moti-*

* カレイラ松崎順子 カレイラまつざき・じゅんこ：敬愛大学国際学部非常勤講師 第二言語習得、動機

Part-time Lecturer, Faculty of International Studies, Keiai University; second language acquisition, motivation.

vation, referring to the potential utilitarian gains of L2 proficiency, such as getting a better job or higher salary. Some researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) however, have started to incorporate psychological and “education-friendly” motivation into SLA research (Dörnyei, 2001)

This study especially focuses on *intrinsic motivation*, referring to “motivation to engage in an activity for its own sake” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 245) and *extrinsic motivation*, referring to “motivation to engage in an activity as a means to an end” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 245) The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is one of the most general and well-known in psychological motivational theory (Dörnyei, 2001) Intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be easily identified in foreign language classrooms regardless of the differences between the cultural beliefs and the attitudes of learners and teachers (Brown, 2000)

In psychology, the definition of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has always been very controversial (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000) Several definitions have been discussed to date. These different definitions force SLA researchers to interpret their results in different ways. The relationships between intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation in SLA are therefore naturally ambiguous. SLA researchers need to pay more attention to the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. To this end, this paper explores intrinsic and extrinsic motivation studies in SLA and proposes a new framework for intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation.

Recent Trends in SLA Motivation Study

Gardner (1985) provided the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) which is a motivation test made up of over 130 items, including attitudes toward French Canadians, interest in foreign languages, attitudes toward European French people, attitudes toward learning French, integrative orientation, instru-

mental orientation, French class anxiety, and parental encouragement. This test has been used in L2 motivation studies all over the world (Dörnyei, 2001) Using the AMTB, Gardner found that instrumental motivation was positively related to achievement in language proficiency.

Since the late 1970s some researchers, however, have started to raise questions about Gardner's argument (Au, 1988; Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Svanes, 1987) For example, European and American students were considered integratively motivated at university in Norway, whereas the Middle Eastern, African, and Asian students were considered instrumentally motivated (Svanes, 1987) Svanes concluded that the types of motivation were related to the background of the students.

Clement and Kruidenier (1983) compared orientations to language acquisition in French and English high school students who were studying Spanish, English, and French in unicultural and multicultural milieus. Four orientations were common through all the groups: instrumental, friendship, travel, and knowledge orientations. However, Clement and Kruidenier found that integrative orientation appeared only in a multicultural milieu among the members of a dominant group: multicultural Francophones and Anglophones learning Spanish.

Furthermore, some researchers (Chihara & Oller, 1978; Clement, Dörnyei & Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, 1990, 1998; Schmidt, Boraie & Kassabgy, 1996) have argued that differences in contexts between SLA and foreign language learning (FLL) are significant. For example, Chihara and Oller (1978) found that the relationships between attitudes and English proficiency were weak in the Japanese English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Dörnyei (1990) attempted to conceptualize motivation in a typical European FLL context. Because learners in FLL had not had enough contact with the target language group, integrative motivation was determined by more general attitudes and beliefs: an interest in foreign languages and people, the cultural and intellectual values that the target language has, and new stimuli through learning and using the target language (Dörnyei, 1990)

Since the 1990s a number of researchers in SLA (Brown, 2000; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1994, 1996; Oxford & Shearin, 1994, 1996) have started to call for a more pragmatic and educational approach and incorporate the motivational concepts of other fields into SLA research. For example, Oxford and Shearin (1994, 1996) have tried to expand Gardner's theory by adopting the motivation theory of different branches of psychology: general, industrial, educational, and cognitive developmental psychology.

It is clear that the matter of motivation in SLA is not the dichotomy of integrative and instrumental motivation but rather a multifaceted phenomenon. Most researchers have not refuted Gardner's theory, but rather they have recognized the great influence of Gardner's theory (Dörnyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994) Dörnyei (1994) stated that "the main problem with Gardner's social psychological approach appeared to be, ironically, that it was too influential" (p. 273)

By the 1990s the theories of motivation in psychology had developed a number of cognitive constructs in general educational contexts (Dörnyei, 2001) One concept that has received the attention of SLA researchers is intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Several SLA researchers (e.g., Brown, 2000) have stressed the importance of intrinsic motivation in language classrooms. The definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which are complicated, are discussed in the next section.

Definitions of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic-extrinsic motivation distinction has been discussed in over 800 publications (Vallerand, 1997) There have been mainly two types of definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in psychology. First, Kruglanski (1975) introduced *endogenous-exogenous* attribution, which refers to means-goal categories. That is, endogenous action means an end in itself. For example, persons who have endogenous attribution learn English without special reasons and enjoy it. Their goal is

only to learn English. Exogenous action refers to “a means that mediates a further goal, one exogenous to it” (Kruglanski, 1975, p. 390) For example, persons who have exogenous attribution study English for external reasons, such as for careers and entrance examinations. Kruglanski stated that endogenous action is linked with intrinsic motivation.

Second, Heider (1958) introduced *perceived locus of causality* (PLOC) referring to actions or outcomes which can be perceived as personally caused or as a result of impersonal causes. *Personal causality* refers to “instances in which *P* causes *x* intentionally” (Heider, 1958, p. 100) For example, persons who have personal causality do it on their own and their goal is to get an object. *Impersonal causality* refers to instances in which “*P* may cause *x* unintentionally merely because his physical or social being exerts some influence on the environment” (Heider, 1958, p. 100) For example, persons who have impersonal causality do something with unconscious motivations and goals.

In addition, deCharms (1968/1983) expanded Heider’s concept and proposed *origin* and *pawn*. “An Origin is a person who perceives his behavior as determined by his own choosing; a Pawn is a person who perceives his behavior as determined by external forces beyond his control” (deCharms, 1968/1983, p. 273) An origin is intrinsically motivated, whereas a pawn is extrinsically motivated (deCharm, 1968/1983)

On the basis of these concepts, Deci and Ryan (1985) proposed a *self-determination theory*. There are different types of extrinsic motivation, some of which are more internalized into the self-concept than others, i.e., more self-determined than others (Deci & Ryan, 1985) For example, children who are not initially motivated to perform can be gradually motivated. Ryan, Connell and Deci (1985) stated that there is a shift from extrinsic control to self-regulation under certain conditions: *internalization*, referring to the process through which organisms transform regulation by external events into regulation by internal events (Ryan et al., 1985) Within the field of education, there are four levels of extrinsic motivation: *external regula-*

tion, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation(Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002)

First, external regulation refers to behavior that is decided through means external to the individual. For example, children behave in order to attain or avoid immediate consequence administered by others(Deci & Ryan, 1985)

Secondly, introjected regulation refers to behavior that is more internalized than external regulation. It involves an internal but pressured motivational orientation(Ryan et al., 1985) For example, introjected students may do their homework because they would feel guilty if they did not(Ryan et al., 1985)

The third stage of internalization is identified regulation. Through identification, children accept regulation as their own. Although their behavior is caused by others, individuals feel that it is important to follow the behavior that produces a certain outcome(Deci & Ryan, 1985) That is, internalized persons through identification determine to perform an action because they consider the activity worthwhile. When asked the reason for cleaning their room, self-regulated children through identification answered that “I like my room clean it lets me find things easier”(Deci & Ryan,1985, p. 137)

The most autonomous form of extrinsic motivation is integrated regulation. Ryan et al. (1985) stated that “all the various identifications or values that one holds are integrated with one another into a coherent, conflict-free hierarchy, and thus allow for smooth autonomous choice and functioning”(p. 36) Integrated regulation represents full self-determination, which results from the integration of the identification into one’s unified sense of self(Deci & Ryan, 1985) Ryan et al. reported that there was a significant decrease with both age and grade in the degree of extrinsic regulation. Introjected and identified regulations, however, showed little change during grades three through six.

How different are autonomous extrinsic motivation, such as identified and integrated regulations, and intrinsic motivation? Because identified and integrated regulations are relatively

self-determined kinds of extrinsic motivation, they can be considered close to intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2002). However, autonomous extrinsic motivation differs from intrinsic motivation. Although learners who have autonomous extrinsic motivation may find activities important for self-selected goals or purposes, learners who have intrinsic motivation might find activities interesting and fun (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

On the basis of self-determination, Hayamizu (1993) assumes that “two kinds of motivation are located on a continuous dimension not having an absolute borderline and that extrinsic motivation may be changed into intrinsic motivation” (p. 86). Hayamizu suggests the *construct of a belief of link*, which refers to the conviction of the changeability from extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation. Hayamizu (1995) also suggests that intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are not dichotomous, but continuous.

In sum, two types of definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation have been mainly discussed in psychology. One is based on Kruglanski (1975) and the other is based on Heider (1958), deCharms (1968/1983) and Deci and Ryan (1985). Consequently, how have the two definitions been introduced into SLA?

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in SLA

As in the case of psychology, the research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for learning languages can be classified into mainly two types. First, Vallerand et al. (1992, 1993) and Vallerand (1997) created the Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) on the basis of self-determination theory introduced by Deci and Ryan (1985). The AMS is composed of 28 items subdivided into seven subscales. The intrinsic motivation is divided into three types: *intrinsic motivation to know* (IM-knowledge), *intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments* (IM-accomplishment) and *intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation* (IM-stimulation). IM-knowledge refers to motivation for doing an activity for the pleasure related to developing knowledge and new ideas. IM-accom-

plishment is the feeling associated with attempting to realize a goal or master a task. IM-stimulation refers to motivation based on the sensations stimulated by doing a task, i.e., fun and excitement. The extrinsic motivation is also divided into three types: external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation(see above)

In addition to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, *amotivation*, which was posited by Deci and Ryan (1985) is included in the AMS. Persons who are amotivated, neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated, experience feelings of incompetence and have an expectancy of uncontrollability(Vallerand et al., 1992)

Noels et al.(2000) applied the AMS to the area of SLA. Noels et al. examined the validity and reliability of Language Learning Orientations Scale-Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Amotivation Subscale (LLOS-IEA) Noels et al. investigated the relations between the items of LLOS-IEA and the four orientations discussed by Clement and Kruidenier (1983) Instrumental orientation was associated with external regulation, whereas travel, friendship, and knowledge orientations were correlated with the more self-determined and intrinsic motivation(Noels et al., 2000)

Further, Noels(2001) investigated the relations between perception of teachers' communicative style and students' motivation. The results suggested that the teachers' behavior affects the students' generalized feelings of autonomy and competence. That is, the more the teacher was perceived as controlling, the less the students felt they were learning Spanish spontaneously and the lower the students' intrinsic motivation(Noels, 2001) In contrast, the more the teacher was perceived as being actively involved in students' learning by giving informative praise and encouragement, the more the students felt competent in learning Spanish(Noels, 2001) Noels also found that the integrative orientation was strongly correlated with intrinsic motivation and identified regulation. However, this is not to indicate that intrinsic and integrative orientations are identical(Noels, 2001)

Second, Schmidt et al. (1996) used the dichotomy of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation for their questionnaire. A questionnaire for motivational factors includes 50 items: intrinsic motivation (5 items) extrinsic motivation (15 items) personal goal (5 items) expectancy/control components (9 items) attitudes (4 items) anxiety (6 items) and motivational strength (6 items) Factor analysis revealed the underlying components behind EFL motivation for adult learners in Egypt. The factor analysis produced nine factors: determination, anxiety, instrumental motivation, sociability, attitudes to culture, foreign residence, intrinsic motivation, beliefs about failure, and enjoyment.

Schmidt et al. (1996) defined extrinsic motivation as motivation to obtain an external reward and intrinsic motivation as motivation to get sufficient rewards from the activity itself. Schmidt et al. stated that intrinsic-extrinsic distinction is similar to integrative-instrumental distinction, but not identical. Both instrumental and integrative motivation can be seen as sub-types of extrinsic motivation, because both are related to goals and outcomes (Schmidt et al., 1996) Schmidt et al. also state that integrative and instrumental motivation are not a dichotomy and that there are some learners who are both instrumentally and integratively motivated to learn a foreign language and those who are neither instrumentally nor integratively motivated.

Jacques (2001) developed a questionnaire based on Schmidt et al. (1996) There are three types of student questionnaires. One of them includes 52 items concerning motivation: integrative orientation, interest in foreign language and cultures, language requirement, heritage language, instrumental orientation, intrinsic motivation, etc. After factor analysis, six factors were extracted: value components, expectancy components, motivational strength, competitiveness, heritage languages, and cooperativeness.

Let us compare Noels (2000) and Schmidt et al. (1996) Noels (2001) found that integrative orientation was strongly correlated with intrinsic motivation and identified regulation, whereas instrumental orientation was associated with exter-

nal regulation, or extrinsic motivation. Noels considered the relationships between intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation from the view point of self-determination theory. On the other hand, Schmidt et al. (1996) regarded instrumental and integrative motivation, which are related to goals and outcomes, as subtypes of extrinsic motivation. It might be said that Schmidt et al. devised their questionnaire based on endogenous-exogenous attribution, although Schmidt et al. did not specifically mention this. Because Noels and Schmidt et al. adopted different concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, it is natural that their opinions were different. Next, some studies on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for learning EFL in Japan are discussed.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation for Learning EFL in Japan

In Japan, several researchers(e.g., Hiromori, 2003; Kimura, Nakata & Okumura, 2001; Takagi, 2003) have conducted research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for learning EFL, which can be mainly divided into two types. One is based on Noels et al. (2000) and the other on Schmidt et al. (1996)

On the basis of Noels et al. (2000) Honda and Sakyu (2004) and Hiromori (2003) have developed the Japanese version of the AMS. Honda and Sakyu (2004) conducted two surveys with 467 university students. The first one was IM/EM subscales and amotivation, including the three types of intrinsic motivation(i.e., knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation) and the three types of extrinsic motivation(i.e., external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation) based on Noels et al. (2000) The second one was motivational orientations, which was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of items based on Clément and Kruidesier (1983) understanding, travel and leisure, and friendship. The latter part of the second section consisted of integrative and instrumental scales, based on Gardner (1985)

The results of Honda and Sakyu (2004) were similar to Noels et al.(2000) They found that the IM/EM subscales, except the amotivation scale, were positively correlated with the five orientations: integrative, instrumental, understanding, travel and leisure, and friendship. The integrative orientation was more positively correlated with more self-determined motivation than with less self-determined motivation. On the other hand, the instrumental orientation was the most correlated with externally regulated motivation.

Hiromori (2003) investigated 275 high school students using two questionnaires. One was his own original questionnaire referring to the self-determination theory. The other was based on Noels et al.(2000). He attempted to validate the applicability of the self-determination theory to Japanese situations.

On the other hand, several researchers(Carreira, 2004; Kimura et al. 2001; Takagi, 2003) have made a questionnaire based on Schmidt et al.(1996) Tables 1, 2, and 3 show individual items in extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative (or interest in foreign countries) motivation subscales of each study, respectively. Table 4 compares the labels assigned to each subscale by each researcher before factor analysis among the four studies: Schmidt et al.(1996) Kimura et al.(2001) Carreira(2004) and Takagi(2003) Table 5 compares the factors extracted using factor analysis among the three studies: Schmidt et al.(1996) Kimura et al.(2001) and Carreira(2004) Because Takagi(2003) did not conduct factor analysis, her research is excluded from Table 5.

Kimura et al.(2001) constructed a questionnaire mainly based on Schmidt et al.(1996) and investigated 1,027 Japanese EFL students from various backgrounds. Their questionnaire included items concerning intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative motivation, etc.(Tables 1, 2, and 3) After factor analysis, they extracted six factors(Table 5) Factor 1 included intrinsic, integrative, and instrumental subscales, which is called intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive. Factor 2 included extrinsic and instrumental subscales, which is called extrinsic-

Table 1 *Items of Extrinsic Motivation*

Schmidt et al. (1996, p. 65-66)
English is important to me because it will broaden my view. The main reason I am taking this class is that my parents/my spouse/ my supervisors want me to improve my English. I want to do well in this class because it is important to show my ability to my family/friends/supervisors/others. Everybody in Egypt should be able to speak English. Being able to speak English will add to my social status. I am learning English because I want to spend a period of time in an English-speaking country. I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries. I want to learn English because I would like to emigrate. One main reason I learn English is that I can meet new people and make friends in my English class. I am learning English to become more educated. I need to be able to read textbooks in English. The main reason I need to learn English is to pass examinations. If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better job. Increasing my English proficiency will have financial benefits for me. If I can speak English, I will have a marvelous life.
Kimura et al. (2001, p. 53)
The main reason I am learning English is that I want my parents/my teacher to be happy about it. I am learning English because English is my compulsory subject. The main reason I am learning English is to pass examinations.. I am learning English because English is a must for a Japanese in the global society. I wouldn't like to learn English if I didn't have to do so(reverse- coded).
Takagi (2003, p. 70)
Everybody should be able to speak English because it is an internation- al language. I learn English because it is a required subject. English proficiency is necessary to become an educated person. English is important to broaden my outlook. I learn English to pass the entrance examination.

Table 2 *Items of Instrumental Motivation*

Kimura et al. (2001, p. 53)

I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries.
I want to learn English because I want to study abroad in the future.
The main reason I am learning English is that my future job requires the English skills.
One reason I am learning English is that I can make friends or correspond with people in foreign countries.
If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better job.
The better marks I can achieve in English class, the more chances I will get to find an exciting job.
Increasing my English proficiency will have a financial benefit for me.

Carreira (2004, p. 97-98)

I study English in order to make English easy in junior high school.
I study English because I think English will be necessary for me when I am an adult.
I study English for a future job.
I study English in order to enter a high school or a university.

Takagi (2003, p. 69)

The reason I am learning English is that my future job will require English skills.
I learn English because it is necessary to get good grades and qualifications for my future studies and job.
I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries.
If I learn better English, I will be able to get a better job in the future.
I want to learn English because I want to study abroad in the future.

instrumental motive. Factors 3, 4, 5, and 6 were influence of good teachers, communication apprehension, teacher-centered lectures, and negative learning experience, respectively.

Carreira (2004) investigated how 345 Japanese elementary school pupils' (174 third and 171 sixth graders) motivation for learning EFL changes with age. Factor analysis identified five underlying factors: interest in foreign countries, intrinsic motivation, instrumental motivation, caregivers' encouragement, and anxiety(Table 5) Referring to Schmidt et al.(1996) Carreira defined intrinsic motivation as motivation to get enough

Table 3 *Items of Integrative Motivation or Interest in Foreign Countries*

Kimura et al. (2001, p. 54)

I long for American or British culture.
I would like to make American or British friends.
I am learning English because I can touch upon the cultures of English-speaking countries.
I am learning English because I can communicate with people in South Asia or Africa (reverse-coded)
Most of my favorite actors and musicians are either British or American.

Carreira (2004, p. 97–98) Interest in foreign countries

I would like to go to various foreign countries.
I would like to make a lot of foreign friends.
I would like to talk to foreigners when my English becomes proficient.
I would like to live abroad.
I would like to know about foreign countries.

Takagi (2003, p. 69)

I learn English because I want to understand Western thought and religion.
I learn English because it is necessary to understand and study foreign cultures, history, and art.
I learn English because it is necessary for the introduction of scientific technology.
I learn English because I can make friends with foreign people.
I learn English because I would like to understand other cultures in English.

rewards from the activity itself and extrinsic motivation as motivation to obtain an external reward. Carreira considered interest in foreign countries and instrumental motivation as subtypes of extrinsic motivation. Her results of ANOVA revealed that intrinsic motivation, interest in foreign countries, and instrumental motivation show significant differences between the third and sixth graders. The average scores of the third graders were higher than those of the sixth graders. Carreira found a fairly significant developmental decline in motivation for learning English.

Takagi (2003) conducted research on the effects of early childhood language-learning experience on motivation toward

Table 4 *Subscales Determined by the Authors*

	Schmidt et al. (1996)	Kimura et al. (2001)	Carreira (2004)	Takagi (2003)
Subscale 1	Intrinsic motivation	Intrinsic motivation	Interest in foreign countries	Instrumental motivation
Subscale 2	Extrinsic motivation	Extrinsic motivation	Intrinsic motivation	Integrative motivation
Subscale 3	Personal goals	Instrumental motivation	Instrumental motivation	Intrinsic motivation
Subscale 4	Expectancy/control components	Situation specific motivation(anxiety)	Caregiver's encouragement	Attitudes toward the Anglo-Saxon world
Subscale 5	Attitudes	Teacher specific motivation	Anxiety	Extrinsic motivation
Subscale 6	Anxiety	Activity specific motivation		Anxiety
Subscale 7	Motivational strength	Integrative motivation		Efforts
Subscale 8		Attribution		Expectancy

Table 5 *Factors Extracted by Factor Analysis*

	Schmidt et al. (1996)	Kimura et al. (2001)	Carreira (2004)
Factor 1	Determination	Intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive	Interest in foreign countries
Factor 2	Anxiety	Extrinsic-instrumental motive	Intrinsic motivation
Factor 3	Instrumental orientation	Influence of good teachers	Instrumental motivation
Factor 4	Sociability	Communication apprehension	Caregivers' encouragement
Factor 5	Attitudes to foreign culture	Teacher-centered lectures	Anxiety
Factor 6	Foreign residence	Negative learning experience	
Factor 7	Intrinsic motivation		
Factor 8	Beliefs about failure		
Factor 9	Enjoyment		

learning English. She developed a questionnaire based on Kimura et al. (2001) and Schmidt et al. (1996) etc. She examined how motivation of junior high school students who received English instruction before entering junior high school differed with several variables: where they studied(e.g., in elementary school, in cram school, with a tutor, in private English school, or during club activities in the community) when they studied, and how frequently they studied English before entering junior high school. Takagi concluded that receiving English instruction in childhood generally had a positive effect on motivation and attitude but that the current English activities in public elementary schools did not have a significant impact on students' motivation and attitude.

The research by Takagi (2003) is very informative in understanding the effects of learning English in childhood. Takagi, however, used intrinsic and extrinsic motivation without defining them clearly. It is ambiguous how her items were created and grouped into each subscale, especially extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative subscales (Tables 1, 2, and 3) For example, she divided "I learn English to pass the entrance examination" and "If I learn better English, I will be able to get a better job in the future" into the extrinsic and instrumental motivation subscales, respectively. It is not clear what criteria Takagi used when she decided the items of the extrinsic and instrumental motivation subscales.

Takagi (2003) also added the scores on the subscale items to create eight motivational factors without doing factor analysis (Table 4) Do her items in each factor really reflect the same underlying variable? Factor analysis is a technique used to understand the structure of a set of data, to construct a questionnaire to measure an underlying variable, and to cluster a large number of variables into a smaller number of homogeneous sets (Field, 2005) Her items might have been clustered on rather different factors if she had conducted factor analysis.

Next, let us compare the above results. Because the questionnaires made by Kimura et al. (2001) Carreira (2004) and

Takagi (2003) are based on Schmidt et al. (1996) there are some similar items among them. However, with these studies employing different concepts of extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative motivation, there are some contradictory statements and findings among them.

Schmidt et al. (1996) defined extrinsic motivation as motivation to obtain an external reward and intrinsic motivation as motivation to get sufficient rewards from the activity itself. Thus, Schmidt et al. (1996) regarded instrumental and integrative motivation as subtypes of extrinsic motivation. After doing factor analysis, the extrinsic motivation subscales in Schmidt et al. (1996) divided into the following factors: instrumental orientation, foreign residence, sociability, etc. Carreira (2004) also saw instrumental motivation and interest in foreign countries as subtypes of extrinsic motivation.

On the other hand, Kimura et al. (2002) and Takagi (2003) categorized extrinsic, integrative, and instrumental motivation into separate subscales (Table 4). Kimura et al. defined extrinsic motivation as “the desire to engage in activities in anticipation of a reward from outside of and beyond the self” (Kimura, 2001, p. 49) referring to Deci and Ryan (1985). Schmidt et al. (1996) and Kimura et al. introduced different definitions of extrinsic motivation, although Kimura et al. developed their questionnaire based on Schmidt et al. Thus, some items were categorized into different subscales between Schmidt et al. and Kimura et al. For example, the following items were categorized into the extrinsic motivation subscale in Schmidt et al. (1996, p. 66) whereas they were categorized into the instrumental motivation subscale in Kimura et al. (2001, p. 53) “I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries,” “If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better job,” and “Increasing my English proficiency will have financial benefits for me.”

Further, Kimura et al. (2001, p. 53) categorized the following items into the instrumental subscale: “One reason I am learning English is that I can make friends or correspond with people in foreign countries,” “I want to learn English because I want to

study abroad in the future,” and “I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries.” Takagi (2003, p. 69) also grouped the two of them into the instrumental motivation subscale: “I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries” and “I want to learn English because I want to study abroad in the future.” Takagi, however, classified one item into the integrative motivation subscale: “I learn English because I can make friends with foreign people” (p. 69) On the other hand, Carreira (2004) classified the items similar to Kimura et al. (2001) and Takagi (2003) into the interest-in-foreign-countries subscale: “I would like to make a lot of foreign friends,” “I would like to live abroad,” “I would like to go to various foreign countries,” and “I would like to talk to foreigners when my English becomes proficient” (Carreira, 2004, p. 97-98)

After doing factor analysis, the above items in Kimura et al. (2001) were clustered on intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive. Some of the other items clustered on intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive were as follows (Kimura, 2001, p. 55) “I would like to make American or British friends,” “I am learning English because I can touch upon the cultures of English-speaking countries,” “I long for American or British culture,” and “I am learning English because I can communicate with people in South Asia or Africa (reverse-coded)” These are related to foreign people, countries, and cultures. It might be appropriate to classify the following items of Kimura et al. (p. 55) into interest-in-foreign-countries or integrative subscale: “I would like to make American or British friends,” “I am learning English because I can touch upon the cultures of English-speaking countries,” “I long for American or British culture,” “I am learning English because I can communicate with people in South Asia or Africa (reverse-coded)” “One reason I am learning English is that I can make friends or correspond with people in foreign countries,” “I want to learn English because I want to study abroad in the future,” and “I want to learn English because it is useful when traveling in many countries.” Thus, the first factor of Kimura et al. should be called intrinsic-integrative

motive rather than intrinsic-instrumental-integrative motive.

In sum, several studies on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for learning languages have been conducted. Combined with traditional motivation theory, such as integrative and instrumental motivation in SLA, the concepts of extrinsic, integrative, and instrumental motivation are complicated. That is, each study has interpreted extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative motivation differently. Some similar items are categorized into different subscales in other research. It might be difficult to compare subscales and factor structures of different studies because the labeling of subscales and factors is rather subjective. Some studies, however, do use intrinsic and extrinsic motivation without defining and discussing them fully, causing some contradictions in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation research in SLA. SLA researchers need to pay more attentions to the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In the next section, a new framework is proposed in order to deepen the conceptual understanding of intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation.

Framework of Intrinsic/Extrinsic and Integrative/Instrumental Motivation

Brown (2000) presents motivational dichotomies: intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation, citing the diagram by Kathleen Bailey. Brown (2000) divides such motivation into four categories: *intrinsic-integrative*, *intrinsic-instrumental*, *extrinsic-integrative*, and *extrinsic-instrumental*.

L2 learners with intrinsic-integrative motivation want to integrate into L2 culture, for example in the case of immigration or marriage (Brown, 2000) L2 learners with intrinsic-instrumental motivation want to attain goals utilizing an L2, for example in the case of making a good career using an L2 (Brown, 2000) L2 learners with extrinsic-integrative motivation are made to learn an L2 for integrative reasons by others, for example in the case of Japanese parents sending children to

Japanese-language schools(Brown, 2000). L2 learners with extrinsic-instrumental motivation are made to learn an L2 by external power, for example in the case of a company sending Japanese businessmen to the United States for language training (Brown, 2000) This categorization can be thought to be based on PLOC by Heider(1958)and deCharms(1968/1983) whether to learn or not depends on L2 learners themselves or external forces.

Some who have extrinsic-instrumental motivation, however, might enjoy learning an L2. Others who have intrinsic-integrative motivation might not be absorbed in L2 learning itself because they study the L2 only as a means to an end. That is, it can be said that Brown excluded the concept of endogenous-exogenous attribution.

In psychology, Hayamizu(1998) introduces the two definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into his model. One is autonomy or heteronomy and the other is means or goals. Hayamizu divides intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into four types: *goal-autonomy*, *means-heteronomy*, *goal-heteronomy*, and *means-autonomy*.

Goal-autonomy motivation can be regarded as perfect intrinsic motivation. Means-heteronomy motivation also may be called perfect extrinsic motivation. The concepts of goal-heteronomy motivation and means-autonomy motivation, however, have some inconsistencies(Hayamizu, 1998) Persons who have goal-heteronomy motivation are forced to do an action by others but are absorbed in the action because they find the action itself fun and enjoyable(Hayamizu, 1998) For example, young children are given some interesting and exciting tasks by teachers and parents and often become absorbed in them. Because their motivation is not autonomous, their action may stop if external controls are removed(Hayamizu, 1998) This case can easily be found in our daily life, especially among young children (Hayamizu, 1998) Hayamizu(1998)calls goal-heteronomy motivation “quasi-intrinsic motivation.”

On the other hand, means-autonomy motivation means that persons do some actions as a means to an end, but that they

decide what to do by themselves (Hayamizu, 1998) For example, students decide to study for university entrance examinations autonomously. Such cases can often be seen in our daily life (Hayamizu, 1998) The model of Hayamizu is helpful and informative for understanding the concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

On the basis of the models of Brown (2000) and Hayamizu (1996) this paper proposes a new framework. As has been seen, Brown proposes the two-by-two matrix combining intrinsic and extrinsic dimension with instrumental and integrative dimension, which is very informative. However, Brown does not include the concept of Kruglanski (1975)

Hayamizu combines the two definitions that psychological researchers have been discussing to date. The model of Hayamizu might facilitate SLA researchers to understand the complicated definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Thus, this paper subdivides the four categories of Hayamizu into integrative and instrumental motivation. There are eight types of motivation for language learning in this model (Table 6)

Persons with *means-autonomy-integrative* motivation want to integrate into L2 culture and learn the L2 only as a means to an end. For example, some immigrants in the United States study English because they want to be a member of American society quickly. But they do not have interest in learning English itself.

Persons with *means-autonomy-instrumental* motivation want to get utilitarian gains, such as getting a better job or higher salary, and learn an L2 only as a means to an end. For example, Japanese businessmen study English in order to get a high TOEIC score because they want to get a higher position in their company. After they achieve their goal, they might stop studying English. That is because studying English is only a means for them to get a higher position.

Persons with *goal-autonomy-integrative* motivation study an L2 because they want to integrate into the L2 culture. They are also absorbed in the L2 learning because they find the L2

Table 6 *Framework of Intrinsic-Extrinsic and Instrumental and Integrative Motivation*

Brown (2000)	Intrinsic-Integrative Intrinsic- Instrumental Extrinsic-Integrative Extrinsic-Instrumental
Hayamizu (1998)	Means-Autonomy Goal-Autonomy Means-Heteronomy Goal-Heteronomy
This study	Means-Autonomy-Integrative Means-Autonomy-Instrumental Goal-Autonomy-Integrative Goal-Autonomy-Instrumental Means-Heteronomy-Integrative Means-Heteronomy-Instrumental Goal-Heteronomy-Integrative Goal-Heteronomy-Instrumental

learning itself fun and enjoyable. For example, some immigrants in the United States study English because they want to be a member of American society quickly and simultaneously enjoy learning English.

Persons with *goal-autonomy-instrumental* motivation learn an L2 because they want to get utilitarian gains, such as getting a better job or higher salary. They are also absorbed in the L2 learning because they find the L2 learning itself fun and enjoyable. For example, some businessmen study English because they want to get a higher salary and position by getting a high TOEIC score. They also enjoy studying English.

Persons with *means-heteronomy-integrative* motivation are made to study an L2 for integrative reasons by external power and learn the L2 only as a means. For example, parents force immigrant children to learn an L2. The children are reluctant to study the L2 in order to catch up with school work.

Persons with *means-heteronomy-instrumental* motivation are made to study an L2 for instrumental reasons by external

power and learn the L2 only as a means. For example, parents force high school students to study English. The students are reluctant to study English in order to enter university.

Persons with *goal-heteronomy-integrative* motivation are made to study an L2 for integrative reasons by external power. Even so, they are absorbed in the L2 learning because they find the L2 learning itself fun and enjoyable. For example, children who live abroad are made to go to local school by their parents, but they enjoy their school life and L2 learning.

Persons with *goal-heteronomy-instrumental* motivation are made to study an L2 for instrumental reasons by external power. But they are absorbed in the L2 learning because they find the L2 learning itself fun and enjoyable. For example, a Japanese company encourages businessmen to get a high TOEIC score and makes them study English. Some of them really enjoy learning English.

The new framework introduces the two definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: one is autonomy or heteronomy and the other is means or goals, combined with traditional motivation theory, such as integrative and instrumental motivation in SLA. Grouping language learning motivation neatly into these eight types is difficult. There are inevitably some areas where the eight types overlap. In addition, motivation changes depending on time and contexts. In spite of these limitations, the new framework serves to bring the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to the attention of SLA researchers and to understand the concepts of intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation.

Conclusion

There are several definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which may force SLA researchers to interpret their results in different ways. Some studies introduce intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into SLA without defining and discussing them fully, thus giving rise to contradictions in SLA motivation

research. Consequently, SLA researchers need to pay more attention to the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

This paper proposes a new framework of intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation, on the basis of Brown (2000) and Hayamizu (1996). Although language learning motivation cannot be neatly categorized into the framework's eight types, the new framework does cover various types of motivation for learning languages. This framework makes a contribution toward deepening the conceptual understanding of intrinsic/extrinsic and integrative/instrumental motivation.

References

- Au, S. Y. (1988) A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second-language (L2) learning. *Language Learning*, 38, 75–100.
- Brown, H. D. (2000) *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (4th ed.) NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Carreira, M. J. (2004) *Motivation for learning English as a foreign language in Japanese elementary schools*. Unpublished master's thesis, Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan.
- Chihara, T. & Oller, J. (1978) Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning*, 28, 55–68.
- Clement, G., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, A. K. (1994) Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417–448.
- Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983) Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning*, 33, 273–291.
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991) Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469–512.
- deCharms, R. (1983) *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E. D. & Ryan, R. M. (1985) *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2002) The paradox of achievement: the harder you push, the worse it gets. In J. Aronson (Ed.) *Improving academic achievement. Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 61–87) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990) Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 46–78.
- (1994) Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 274–284.
- (1996) Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In Oxford, R. L. (Ed.) *Language learning motivation:*

- Pathways to the new century*(pp. 71–80) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117–135.
- (2001) *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985) *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitude and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972) *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Hayamizu, T. (1993) Between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation: Examination on individual beliefs of the links between both motivation. *Bulletin of the School of Education*, 40, 77–88. Nagoya University, Educational Psychology.
- (1995) Achievement motivation located between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. *Shinrigaku hyouron* [Japanese Psychological Review]. 38, 171–193.
- (1998) *Jikokeisei no shinri: Jiritsuteki doukizuke* [Psychology of self-formation: autonomous motivation]. Tokyo: Kanekoshobou.
- Heider, F. (1958) *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hiramori, T. (2003) What enhances language learners' motivation? High school English learners' motivation from the perspective of self-determination theory. *JALT Journal*, 25(2) 173–186.
- Honda, K. & Sakyu, M. (2004) Multiple models of motivation for Japanese EFL learners: An investigation into concepts in different paradigms. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 15, 41–50.
- Jacques, S. R. (2001) Preferences for instructional activities and motivation: A comparison of student and teacher perspectives. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.) *Motivation and second language acquisition*(pp. 185–211) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kimura, Y., Nakata, Y., & Okumura, T. (2001) Language learning motivation of EFL learners in Japan—a cross-sectional analysis of various learning milieus. *JALT Journal*, 23(1) 47–68.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1975) The endogenous-exogenous partition in attribution theory. *Psychological Review*, 82, 387–406.
- Noels, K. A. (2001) Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning*, 51, 107–144.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000) Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50, 57–85.
- Oxford, R. L. & Shearin, J. (1994) Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12–28.
- (1996) Language learning motivation in a new key. In R. L. Oxford. (Ed.) *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. (pp. 121–144) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pintrich, P. R. & Schunk, D. H. (2002) *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and application*. (2nd, ed.) New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ryan, R. M., Connell, J. P., & Deci, E. L. (1985) A motivational analysis of self-determination and self-regulation in education. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.) *Research on motivation in education*(Vol. 2, pp. 13–51) Orlando:

- Academic Press.
- Sansone, C. & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000) Controversies and new directions—Is it déjà vu all over again? In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz(Eds.) *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance*(pp. 443–453) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O.(1996) Foreign language motivation: Internal Structure and External Connections. In R. Oxford(Ed.) *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*(pp. 9–70) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Svanes, B.(1987) Motivation and cultural distance in second-language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 37, 341–359.
- Takagi, A.(2003) The effects of early childhood language learning experience on motivation towards learning English: A survey of public junior high school students. *JASTEC Journal*, 22, 47–71.
- Vallerand, R. L. (1997) Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna(Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 271–360) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Vallerand, R. L, Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1992) The academic motivation scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 52, 1003–1017.
- (1993) On the assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic, amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the academic motivation scale. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 53, 159–172.