Abstract
Effective teaching practice requires that teachers know their students not as 'faceless average learners', but as individuals. The most individual of learner characteristics is personality and yet language education research has made little progress in understanding the role of personality. As the field of language learning motivation seeks to develop frameworks for motivational teaching practice, a richer understanding of learners' individuality is crucial in shaping practices that respond to learners needs. The present study examines the role of learners' personality and teachers' practice in shaping motivation and self-efficacy in language learning. Drawing on data gathered from 277 learners of English in Hong Kong, aged 11-14, and 24 lesson observations, across 10 classes, the study applies hierarchical multiple regression analysis to reveal a significant role of personality and teachers' motivational practice in predicting language learning motivation and self-efficacy. Results reveal that while personality variables demonstrated large effect sizes for motivational orientations, teacher practice variables evidenced large effect sizes for language learning self-efficacy. Implications are discussed for theorisation of language learning motivation and for teaching practice, with a particular emphasis on language teacher education.

I Introduction

Motivation and self-efficacy in language learning are widely recognised as powerful predictors of language learning success (e.g. Horwitz et al., 1986; Norris & Ortega, 2003; Alrabai & Moskovski, 2016), attracting considerable interest from researchers and educators. Nevertheless, while teachers have long been asking the question of *how* instruction can generate a socio-affective disposition conducive to second language acquisition (De Graaff & Housen, 2009), only recently has this question begun to attract the attention of researchers. Understanding teacher and learner factors that shape motivation and self-efficacy is not only a crucial step towards informing pedagogical practices for effective learning, but also a significant contribution towards enriching theorisations of the role of learners' affect in language learning. Thus, this study focuses on two variables, as yet under-researched in relation to language learning motivation and learning self-efficacy, namely learners' personality and teachers' instructional practices.

1 Conceptual framework: Language learning motivation and self-efficacy

Gardner's Socio-educational Model (1985; 2010), identifies two primary orientations for understanding learners' language learning motivation, namely attaining membership of the L2 speaking community (i.e. integrativeness), or the pragmatic gains, such as social recognition or economic advantages (instrumental orientation). While the model has received some criticism for its limited applicability to classroom settings, it is effective in capturing the wider purpose and context of language learning for communication and use in real social settings and is instrumental in shaping the field of language learning motivation even today (MacIntyre et al., 2009).

Building on the work of Gardner Dörnyei's (2005) L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) proposes a three-component model comprising: the ideal L2 self, referring to the L2-specific facet of the ideal self; the ought-to L2 self, namely L2 related attributes the learner believes they should have in order to meet external expectations or avoid negative outcomes;

and the L2 learning experience, concerning the motivational impact of the learning environment. The ideal L2 self is considered a particularly powerful motivator driving learners to reduce the discrepancy between their actual self and their ideal self.

Research supports both the relevance of Gardner's Socio-educational model (e.g. Wei, 2007; Tran, 2018) and the selves components of Dörnyei's L2MSS (You & Dörnyei, 2016; Liu & Thompson, 2018; and see Al-Hoorie, 2018 for a meta-analysis) for explaining language learning motivation in the Chinese context. Indeed, integrativeness and instrumentality in the socioeducational model are considered as antecedents of the selves components of the L2MSS (Dörnyei, 2005). While studies have demonstrated the predictive power of integrativeness for language attainment (See Gardner, 2010 for a review), evidence suggests also the pedagogical potential of the possible L2 selves for promoting motivated learning (e.g. Chan 2014; Fukuda et al., 2011; Magid & Chan, 2012; Magid, 2014; Murray, 2013; Yashima, 2013). Notwithstanding existing support for the L2MSS, questions have been raised about the nature of the evidence this support draws on. Hiver and Al-Hoorie (2020), for example, proposes that a misapplication of structural equation modelling may call into question the unambiguous support for the role of vision espoused by You and Dörnyei (2016). Similarly, those studies that do point to a pedagogical benefit of the visionary element of the ideal L2 self for motivating learning (e.g. Chan 2014; Magid & Chan, 2012; Magid, 2014) typically rely on qualitative data and have been critiqued for a lack of adequate blinding potentially allowing for a Hawthorne effect, as well as for a lack of validity in outcome variables specifically relating to the ideal L2 self. In contrast with the focus that has been placed on these components, the L2 learning experience component of the L2MSS has received limited attention in theory or research (Dörnyei, 2019). Understanding the interplay between language motivation and teachers' instructional practice, as a significant aspect of the language learning experience, constitutes a potentially significant contribution to clearer theorisation of the L2MSS and to conceptualising language learning motivation as situated and contextually responsive.

Seeking to explore the influence of cultural context on motivational orientations, Chen et al. (2005) propose a new construct, termed the *required orientation,* capturing the significance of meeting educational requirements in Chinese settings in ways that existing models do not. They argue that in Chinese heritage societies particular significance is given to group expectations, which are themselves tied to requirements, particularly in the form of exam success. Meeting such requirements is considered a means of gaining social recognition and bringing credit to the family (Ng, 2003). To what extent this construct may constitute a culture-specific facet of the ought-to L2 self requires further theorization, yet studies have supported the relevance of this construct for understanding language learning motivation in contexts such as Hong Kong and Taiwan and this may be particularly so among school-age populations where learning and teaching are strongly shaped and directed by external requirements (Chen et al., 2005; AUTHOR, 2018; Warden and Lin, 2000).

In line with the L2MSS framework, the capacity to recognise oneself as a communicator in the L2 constitutes a key motivator (Henry, 2009). Language learning self-efficacy, referring to the degree to which learners believe they are capable of successfully learning a language, is fundamental to this capacity. While existing L2 motivation frameworks do not account for the role of self-efficacy, social cognitive theory emphasises the influence of self-efficacy in self-regulating motivation, influencing causal attributions of success and failure, the kinds of outcomes learners expect and the kinds of goals individuals set (Bandura, 1986; 1994). Specifically, self-efficacy influences the degree of effort an individual is willing to expend to achieve the task, as well as their persistence in the face of obstacles and is seen to be positively associated both with learning achievement and with learning motivation (Mills et al., 2007; Schunk and Usher, 2012; Williams and Williams, 2010). If motivation is understood as a process through which goal-directed activities are energized, directed and sustained, self-

efficacy is seen to have a particularly important effect on motivation, shaping influencing effort and persistence (Schunk & Usher, 2012). Emerging evidence points to the potential fruitfulness of examining the role of personality traits as important predictors of self-efficacy (Brown and Cinamon, 2016; Lent and Brown, 2008; Tang et al., 2008). Thus, part of the answer to the question of how instruction can promote language learning motivation may be lie in furthering our understanding of the factors that predict language learning self-efficacy.

2 Teachers' instructional practice

Dörnyei (2001) proposes a systematic practice-oriented framework for understanding teacher motivational practice in language teaching; to date this remains one of, if not *the* only such framework. The framework proposes teacher motivational practice spanning four dimensions: *creating basic motivational conditions, generating initial motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation* and *encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation.* The first three dimensions refer to teacher discourse strategies that can be seen as relevant to learning across domains, as well as those specific to language learning, such as promoting instrumental and integrative values. These dimensions reflect notions proposed, for instance, in expectancy value theory (e.g. Wigfield & Eccles, 1992), as well as goal setting theory (Locke, 1968). The fourth dimension, encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation, draws on attribution theory (Covington, 1998), focussing on building learners' self-efficacy and acknowledging their efforts and achievements. Thus, the teacher motivational practice framework entails both language learning motivation and self-efficacy.

A handful of studies have considered the potential pedagogical implications of what is known about language learning motivation. Yet, while many of the motivational strategies proposed in the literature are indeed rooted in theoretical advances in L2 motivation (e.g. Allison & Halliwell, 2002; Kubanyiova & Dörnyei, 2014; Teimouri, 2017), very little has been done to generate empirical evidence as to the effects of specific practices on language learners' motivation. Instead, the focus in language education research has been more towards descriptive accounts of what teachers do to motivate their learners, as well as on teacher and student perceptions of the effectiveness of these strategies (e.g. Dörnyei and Csizér, 1998; Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007; Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012). Furthermore, the majority of studies have relied on teachers' self-report of the motivational strategies they use (e.g. Sugita McEown & Takeuchi, 2014).

Lamb's (2017) state-of-the-art review highlights three studies that have adopted a 'more sophisticated' approach looking at the relationship between teachers' observed motivational practice and learners' motivation (Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Wong, 2014), while a further two studies have implemented quasi-experimental approaches to examine this interplay (Alrabai, 2016; Moskovsky et al., 2012). An unsurprising but important finding of previous work has been that there is no universal set of motivational strategies that works in all contexts and with all students (Lamb, 2017), suggesting on the one hand a need for better theoretical understanding of the role of the L2 learning experience in shaping motivation and on the other hand a need for teachers to develop a rich understanding of their learners and the classroom. Another findings, however, has been that in all contexts, whether through teacher self-report or through direct observation, there is evidence that teaching practice can and does make a difference to learners' motivation, again emphasising the importance of better understanding its role.

Extending previous work, the present study takes a fine-grained approach to L2 motivation to understand the interplay between teacher practice and specific motivational orientations. Such understanding contributes not only to the development of more focused teaching practice, but also to enriching theorisation of L2 motivation where the role of the L2 learning experience is still largely unexplored.

3 Personality

Adopting a systems-oriented conception aligned with most conceptualisations of personality today (Mayer, 2015), personality can be understood as the 'set of psychological mechanisms and traits within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intrapsychic, physical, and social environments' (Larsen & Buss, 2010, p.4). Within this system, it is possible to identify what Mayer (2015) refers to as 'personality parts' or 'traits' that are essential detectors for understanding individuality. The personality systems framework essentially proposes that this system of traits (i.e. an individual's personality) interacts with its inner and outer surroundings including social settings and the psychological situations emerging from them. Thus, personality is conceived of as experiential, negotiating between individuals' inner needs and resources and the outer demands of their social settings in order to hep humans 'survive and thrive' (Mayer, 2015). The school classroom constitutes an example of a social setting that exerts motivational demands on learners. Personality must negotiate between the outer demand to persist in learning even in the face of challenge and the learners' inner need for motivation to drive that persistence. Understanding the nature of the interactions between different personality traits and motivational orientations is essential for uncovering the role that learners' inner resources play in driving motivated learning and ultimately in enhancing understanding of why some learners 'survive and thrive' and others do not.

The 'Big Five' framework (Goldberg, 1992; Costa & McCrae, 1985, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 2003) provides one of the most established operationalisations of personality. It offers a theoretically and empirically driven, taxonomic framework operationalising individual personality difference through five factors, namely: extraversion; emotional regulation; conscientiousness; agreeableness; and openness to experience. Studies considering the relationship between personality and academic motivation have found that personality does indeed significantly predict variance in motivation. Among college students, Komarraju et al. (2009) found that conscientiousness and openness to experience predicted variance in intrinsic motivation and conscientiousness and extraversion predicted variance in extrinsic motivation, while Clark and Schroth (2010) also found differential effects of personality on sub-types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Among adolescents, McGeown et al. (2014) found both self-efficacy and conscientiousness positively predicted intrinsic motivation, while only self-efficacy predicted extrinsic motivation. Such studies point not only to the predictive power of personality in motivation, but also to differential effects of diverse personality traits on varying motivational orientations. They further suggest that if we are to better understand the relationship between personality and attainment, we may first need to better understand the relationship between personality and mediating factors such as motivation and self-efficacy (Medford & McGeown, 2012).

Dewaele (2005) posits that in focusing on groups rather than individuals, SLA research risks constructing faceless average learners (p.368). In his critique of the general marginalisation of psychological variables in SLA research; while a number of variables have since received greater attention, this remains true of personality (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Dewaele (2005) argues not only for the considerable potential of personality traits to yield insights into the neurological substrates of language learning processes, but also for better understanding the psychological and emotional dimensions of SLA in order to inform pedagogy that equips learners with greater sociocultural competence (pp.376-77). Indeed, Sakui and Cowie (2011) argue that language teachers have long recognised the influence of learners' personalities in shaping their language learning behaviours and in-class participation. Yet, the handful of studies examining the role of personality in language learning has primarily focused on its relationship with attainment, indicating a significant role of personality traits

(e.g. Busch, 1982; Brown et al., 1996). In a concise overview of the relationship between personality and SLA, Dewaele (2013) points to studies that have observed differential associations between diverse personality traits and different language learning aspects, while also highlighting that results have been inconsistent. The most frequently examined trait in this regard has been extraversion, on the perhaps over-simplified assumption that a more sociable, person-oriented nature is conducive to seeking out and findings opportunities for interaction, providing greater chances in turn for language development. However, overall studies correlating extraversion and L2 test scores have shown weak or inconsistent results (e.g. Dewaele & Furnham, 1999). Indeed, Ehrman (2008) found that the best language learners tended towards introverted personality types. Ehrman's (1994) earlier work, based on Jung's personality profiles, pointed to relative advantages and disadvantages of varying personality traits in the process of language learning, with intuitive-feeling types showing higher levels of L2 learning achievement, perhaps because they were more adept at establishing interpersonal connections and inferring meaning from conversation. These findings were further supported by Ehrman and Oxford (1995), who indicated that personality influences students' response to the learning situation while also playing a major role in the kinds of learning strategies deployed, which in turn shapes learning outcomes. Meanwhile, studies have pointed to a differential role of personality traits across diverse aspects of language learning (Ockey's, 2011; Liang & Kelsen, 2018; Wucherer & Reiterer, 2018). A similar finding emerged from Verhoeven and Vermeer's (2002) study examining the relationship between personality traits and specific domains of communicative competence among teenage L2 learners, where different personality traits correlated with diverse aspects of communicative competence, pointing not only to the need to better understand the role of personality in language learning, but also to adopt more elaborate approaches that explore sub-domains of the language learning experience and outcomes.

The role of emotional regulation has also generated interesting findings. Building on the work to understand the role of emotions, particularly language learning anxiety, in language learning (e.g. Horwitz et al., 1986; Koch & Terrell, 1991; Garrett and Young, 2009), emotional regulation strategies have been explored as an integral part of language learning strategies' research (e.g. O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Bown & White, 2010). This work has indicated the importance of emotional regulation in enabling learners to cope with mistakes, overcome frustration and maintain motivation during the often arduous process of language learning. Such studies point also to the potential usefulness of understanding trait emotional regulation as a resource the learner brings to this challenging process, not least among school age learners where motivation for language learning is known to be a particular challenge.

4 Aims and research questions

The main aim of the present study was to examine learner personality and teacher practice as two predictors of English learning motivation. A secondary concern was to explore the extent to which personality and teacher motivational practice might predict English learning self-efficacy. Finally, the study explored whether personality traits and instructional practices were differentially related to the diverse motivational orientations of English language learning motivation.

While the parent study from which this paper stems did generate measures of language proficiency, this paper focuses specifically and deliberately on understanding the ways in which teacher and student variables interact with the structure of L2 motivation, without reference to attainment. In so doing, the paper takes the view that the primary goal of education is not to increase learner productivity, but to promote whole-person development. Such an endeavour requires understanding learners' aspirations and desires for their own sake and not

simply for the grades they may generate. There is no doubt that attainment is important and this is well attested by the vast number of studies that have examined the relationship between L2 motivation and attainment (e.g. Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Noels et al., 2003; Wong & Wong, 2017). Nevertheless, to consider this the only, or indeed the primary focus of educational research would be to adopt a sadly reductionist view that would both limit the scope of research to enrich and extend knowledge and would carry heavy ethical responsibilities in its contribution to a problematic performance-based view of the learner. .

The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between personality and English language learning motivation?
2. What is the relationship between teacher motivational practice and English language learning motivation?
3. To what extent are these relationships seen to be consistent across motivational sub-constructs?
4. To what extent do personality and teacher motivational practice predict English learning self-efficacy?

II Methodology
1 Participants
The findings reported here form part of a larger parent study surveying the English language learning motivation of students across eleven Hong Kong secondary schools. Of the eleven schools, six participated in lesson observations. Data reported in this paper, therefore, constitutes this sub-sample.

Participants were recruited through purposive, stratified sampling and comprised Hong Kong secondary school students, in grades 1 (n = 98), 3 (n = 85) and 4 (n = 94), with an N = 277 (M = 129, F = 125, Undeclared = 23). All schools were Subsidized Schools, accounting for the majority of the Hong Kong secondary school population, and were, therefore, required to follow the curriculum indicated by the Government. Due to a lack of publicly available data, socio-economic status was determined according to school location and in consultation with teachers at the schools. Mid (n = 231) and low (n = 46) socio-economic status were represented across the participants.

Two teachers in each of the six schools participated in two observations during one school term. Thus, data was gathered from a total of twelve teachers and twenty-four observations. Each lesson was forty minutes long and in each case the whole lesson was observed. The distribution of observations is shown in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1

2 Tools
1 Motivation survey
There is a strong precedent for the use of surveys for examining motivation, both in the field of Psychology and in studies of language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 2010). Rooted in this strong tradition and as the first study to apply language learning motivation specific frameworks to understanding secondary school learners' motivation for learning English in Hong Kong, the study adopted a quantitative approach, allowing for generating a broad picture understanding of the phenomenon and paving the way for further qualitative studies.

The survey consisted of multi-item scales examining a range of English learning motivation constructs (see Table 2). These were developed on the basis of previous literature,

specifically Taguchi, Magid and Papi (2009), Gardner (2010) and Chen, Warden and Chang (2005). Students responded to questionnaire items on a four-point Likert scale. Although the constructs have been validated in previous studies, all scales were again examined for internal consistency in relation to the specific population used in the present study. Outcomes of this examination are detailed in the account of the analytical procedures below.

INSERT TABLE 2

As can be seen in Table 2, the survey comprised the following motivation scales (sample items are included in the appendix):

English Language Learning motivation – general disposition towards the learning of English

Integrative orientation - disposition towards the target language speaking group, desire to communicate with them, to understand and participate in their culture (Gardner, 2010).

Instrumental Orientation (Promotion) - potential pragmatic gains of English language learning, for instance in terms of future career opportunities and perceived social status (Gardner, 2010).

Instrumental Orientation (Prevention) - extent to which learners are driven to learn English language by a fear of failing or being perceived to fail (Gardner, 2010).

Ideal L2 Self - the projected language learner and the extent to which English language learning or use play a part in this ideal self (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009).

Ought-to L2 self - the role of societal or significant others' expectations in motivating English language learning (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009).

Required Orientation – a sociocultural emphasis on fulfilling educational requirements (Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005).

Given that integrativeness and instrumentality are considered antecedents of the ideal and ought-to L2 selves respectively (Dörnyei, 2005), it is important to explain why these orientations were included as distinct constructs. In part this goes back to the discussion on the lack of consensus regarding theoretical conceptualisations of language learning motivation relevant to the Chinese, and even more so the Hong Kong context. Since the operationalization of integrativeness and instrumentality within the L2MSS assumes that the respondent *will* have an ideal and ought-to L2 self, this would create problems of validity if students did *not* have developed ideal and ought-to L2 selves. Indeed, research evidence suggests that possible selves emerge less clearly among adolescent populations than among adults (e.g. Kormos & Csizér, 2008), possibly explained by the fact that self-image undergoes considerable change during these years (Carlson, 1965). For this reason, the survey explicitly tapped into integrativeness and instrumentalism as well as the possible selves.

2 Five-Factor Personality Inventory – Children (FFPIC)
The FFPI-C is a standardised questionnaire, originally developed by McGhee, et al. (2007), consisting of 75 items in total used to assess the 'Big Five' personality traits, namely extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, agreeableness and emotional regulation, among individuals aged nine to nineteen years old. For the purposes of this study, only four of the five sub-scales were used; conscientiousness, openness to experience,

emotional regulation and extraversion, since these have been seen to be most closely associated with the language learning experience. Conscientiousness comprises sub-traits such as competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline and deliberation; openness to experiences includes traits such as interest in aesthetics, imagination, openness to feelings or other values, intellectual curiosity. Emotional regulation (Neuroticism in the adult version of the FFPI) comprises sub-traits such as anxiety, feelings of hostility or anger, self-consciousness and vulnerability. Extraversion refers, for example, to gregariousness, warmth, excitement seeking, optimism and assertiveness (McGhee et al., 2007).

Respondents are required to respond to sets of items corresponding to each personality trait, on a 5-point Likert scale. A detailed account of the reliability and validity of the inventory can be found in the examiner's manual (McGhee et al., 2007), though once again, reliability measures were obtained for the four traits included in the study, for the present dataset, and are shown in Table 2. In line with previous studies (e.g. McGeown et al., 2014), these values indicated moderate internal consistency.

3 MOLT Observation schedule

The MOLT schedule operationalises teacher motivational practice in two main categories, namely 1) strategies for generating, maintaining and protecting situation-specific task motivation and 2) those that focus on encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation. The former is further subdivided into aspects of teacher discourse, participant organisation (i.e. the use of pair/group work), and activity design. Teacher discourse focuses on teachers' use of strategies specific to language learning, such as *promoting instrumental and integrative values*, as well as those that are seen to promote motivation across learning domains, for instance *social chat; signposting; stating communicative purpose/utility of activity; establishing relevance; arousing curiosity or attention; scaffolding; promoting autonomy; referential questions*. Meanwhile, encouraging positive retrospective evaluation consists of strategies focussing primarily on forms of feedback, namely *class applause; effective praise; elicitation of self/peer correction session; process feedback session; neutral feedback session*.

Significantly, Dörnyei's framework also identified pair/group work and activity design as motivational strategies. While studies on teacher motivational practice in Hong Kong are difficult to find, research evidence suggests that classroom practice is characterised by high levels of teacher discourse and a didactic approach (e.g. Cheng et al., 2010; Yeung, 2009), whereby teachers typically give instructions, deliver content, provide information and take on most of the decision-making. Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) also found that the teacher-centred nature of South Korean classrooms meant that in some cases the degree of teacher motivational practice observed was limited to the extent that they advised caution in the interpretation of the findings. Thus, the present study focused on teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective evaluation as those strategies that most closely reflect the reality in the research setting and, therefore, have the greatest ecological validity for the purposes of the research.

The structure of the MOLT follows largely that developed by Spada and Fröhlich (1995) for examining the communicative orientation of language teaching (COLT). This original framework adopted a time-based coding convention, whereby if two different events belonging to the same category were taking place within the same one-minute segment only the one taking the greater proportion of time would be recorded. This approach was considered, but rejected because it was felt this would fail to capture the richness of classroom practice. Furthermore, while the time-coding approach adopted by Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) adhered to the time-coding of the original COLT, the COLT's focus on linguistic orientation rendered this approach more suitable than it might for observing motivational orientation of a classroom. In the context of linguistic input, output and usage the amount of time spent can be

a significant influence on linguistic outcomes. More time can mean more exposure or can equally mean more output, both of which impact on language development. The effectiveness of a motivational strategy, however, may depend more on the nature of the strategy and the way it is deployed than on the amount of time it takes to deploy. Thus, each instance of teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective evaluation was treated as an event and counts for each sub-strategy were generated for each class observed and across classes, with mean counts calculated for each teacher.

Structured observations were conducted using the MOLT schedule. The final analysis focused on teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective evaluation since piloting as well as the analysis of the main study data revealed that the use of other strategies was too infrequent to enable analysis.

3 Procedures

Items for the English learning motivation and personality scales were translated into Chinese and examined by three bilingual English and Chinese speakers, forming a bilingual panel. Following piloting, a bilingual version of the questionnaire was distributed, in paper mode, across schools participating in the study, towards the end of the school year.

Observations were conducted during semester two of the school year. In each of the six participating schools, two teachers were observed over two classes, totalling twenty-four observations (see Table 1 for distribution). Lessons were video-recorded for subsequent coding and analysis. A stimulated recall interview with each of the teachers provided a form of member-checking that was important in validating subsequent coding and interpretation of the data.

Informed consent was obtained from students, teachers and principals of the schools involved in the study, in accordance with the University's ethics guidelines for research with human participants.

4 Analysis

For the purposes of analysing the lesson observations, a panel of raters developed a codebook, which includes a definition of each code and examples of illustrative data (Creswell, 2014). Definition and examples were guided by the MOLT taxonomy and by the studies that have previously implemented the MOLT, namely Dörnyei (2001) and Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). The coding scheme was then used by the panel to code a lesson recording and generate discussion for the purposes of coming to an agreed interpretation of the recording. Throughout the coding of the lesson observations, the panel engaged in ongoing discussions whenever there was ambiguity in the coding, such that consensus could be reached. Once all observations were coded, counts were generated for the use of each of the strategies in each lesson. Mean scores for each teacher across the two lessons observed were also calculated. Counts and mean scores were entered into SPSS in order to enable further inferential analysis.

Survey data were coded and entered into the SPSS dataset. In the case of English language learning motivation data, these were entered as raw scores, while mean scores were also calculated for each of the motivational sub-scales. Raw scores from the FFPI-C were converted to t scores to be used in the analysis, using standardisation norms. Data emerging from the FFPI-C were coded according to the guidance provided in the manual and T-scores were generated (McGhee, et al. 2007), allowing interpretation of the data relative to a normative sample. Following initial descriptive analysis, screening procedures were conducted. Given recent critiques of the use of Cronbach's alpha as a measure of internal consistency, MacDonald's omega was used instead (for a critical comparison of these measures see Dunn, Baguley & Brunsden, 2014 or Starkweather, 2012). An examination of correlations between variables, as well as measures of the variance inflation factor and tolerance statistics

were also conducted. Most reliability scores were at .70 and above, indicating moderate-high internal consistency (Hair et al., 2006; Hinton, et al., 2004). The exception to this was the Openness to experience scale, at .61, so findings relating to this scale should be interpreted with caution.

A mixed model analysis was conducted to determine whether the nature of the data required hierarchical linear modelling. Given that participant data were located within classes, each taught by a different teacher, a hierarchical linear modelling approach would have been necessary if the data were shown to be nested indicated by a significant effect of clustering by class. Mixed model analysis was conducted with L2 motivation as the dependent variable and teacher as the intercept. The relationship between class and L2 motivation showed no significant variance in intercepts across participants, Var (u_{0j}) = 0, χ^2 (1) = 0.00, $p > .05$, indicating that data was not nested and, therefore, excluding the suitability of hierarchical modelling. Furthermore, independence of residuals was established by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.9. Visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values established homoscedasticity, while visual inspection of scatter plots indicated a linear relationship between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables.

Collinearity indicated the variance inflation factor (VIF) ranged between 1.04 and 1.39 while the tolerance statistics ranged between .73 and .96. Additionally, the correlations amongst all predictor variables entered into the analysis were examined (see Table 3). No correlations exceeded r = .44, thus falling well within the .7 threshold required to exclude the possibility of multicollinearity (see Tabachnik and Fidell, 2007). Descriptive statistics for the variables examined, including mean scores, standard deviations and correlation coefficients, are presented in Table 3.

These various measures for screening the data confirmed the suitability of hierarchical multiple regression (HRM) analysis for modelling the data. This was chosen over a standard multiple regression on the basis that students bring their personality traits to the classroom before being exposed to teachers practices. Thus, HRM made it possible to control for the effect of student personality when taking account of the role of teacher practice. The first regression analysis examined English learning motivation as the outcome variable, with personality and teacher motivational practice as predictor variables in steps 1 and 2 respectively. Subsequent analyses were run on each of the motivational orientations, each time with personality and teacher motivational practice as predictor variables in steps 1 and 2 respectively. Finally HMR analysis was conducted with language learning self-efficacy as the outcome variable, again with personality and teacher motivational practice as predictor variables in steps 1 and 2 respectively.

III Findings

In engaging with the findings, readers should note that the authors adopted Keith's (2015) recommendations for school-based research, whereby β values below .05 are considered too small to be considered a meaningful, those above .05 are small but meaningful, .10 represents a moderate effect and .25 and above is indicative of a large effect.

INSERT TABLE 3

Table 4 presents the regression results for English learning motivation. In order to answer the first research question, in the first step of the regression analysis, four predictors were entered: conscientiousness, openness to experience, extraversion and emotional regulation. This model was statistically significant $F(4, 224)$ = 13.95; $p < .001$ and explained 19% of variance in English learning motivation. Conscientiousness and openness to experience made a significant

unique contribution to the model (see Table 4). Research question two examined the relationship between teacher motivational practice and English learning motivation. After entry of teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective evaluation at step 2, the model as a whole explained 21% of variance ($F(6, 238) = 10.67$, p <.001), indicating that the introduction of these teacher motivational practice variables explained only an additional 2% of variance in English learning motivation, after controlling for personality variables (R^2 change = .0; $F(2, 238) = 3.52$, $p < .5$), with only encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation emerging as a significant moderate predictor ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$).

INSERT TABLE 4

In the final adjusted model, *openness to experience* ($\beta = .26$, $p < .001$) and *conscientiousness* ($\beta = .23$, $p < .001$) evidenced a significant effect on English learning motivation, while *encouraging positive retrospective evaluation* also demonstrated a significant effect on English learning motivation ($\beta = .16$, p < .05). In line with Keith's guide for interpreting effect size, the effect of openness to experience on English language learning motivation can be considered to be large, while conscientiousness was also nearing a large effect size. The effect of encouraging positive self-retrospection is considered moderate.

The third research question examined the extent to which relationships observed varied according to motivational sub-constructs. A series of further regression analyses were conducted for each of the motivation sub-constructs. These are presented in Table 5. As before, personality was entered in step one and teacher motivational practice variables in step two.

INSERT TABLE 5

The models indicated that personality was a significant predictor for all English learning motivation sub-constructs, predicting overall between 5% (in the case of instrumentality promotion) and 14% (in the case of the ideal L2 self) of variance. Conscientiousness was a highly significant predictor of instrumentality prevention, with a large effect size of ($\beta = .30$ $p < .001$), as well as demonstrating a large significant effect on ought-to L2 self ($\beta = .26$ p <.001). The same trait was seen to have a moderate significant effect on integrative orientation ($\beta = .14$ p <.05). Openness to experience emerged as the most consistent predictor with a large significant effect on ideal L2 self ($\beta = .25$, p <.001) and required orientation ($\beta = .26$, p < .001) and a moderate significant effect on integrative orientation ($\beta = .16$, p <.05), instrumental promotion ($\beta = .17$, p<.05) and ought-to L2 self ($\beta = .17$, p < .05). Neither emotional regulation nor extraversion emerged as significant predictors of any of the motivational orientations.

Teacher motivational practice was seen to be a significant predictor of integrativeness, ideal L2 self and required orientations, predicting 11%, 3% and 2% respectively. Specifically, while the effect of teacher discourse was seen to have a moderate effect in the case of integrative orientation ($\beta = .13$, p <.05) and required orientation ($\beta = .15$, p <.05), encouraging retrospective self-evaluation evidenced a large significant effect on integrative orientation ($\beta = .33$, p <.001), as well as a moderate significant effect on ideal L2 self ($\beta = .18$, p <.01).

Finally, multiple regression analysis examined the relationship between personality and English learning self-efficacy, in order to answer research question four (see Table 6).

INSERT TABLE 6

As before, the four personality traits were entered in step one. This model was statistically significant, $F(4, 224) = 9.19$; $p < .001$ and explained 13% of variance in English learning self-efficacy. Emotional regulation and conscientiousness made a significant unique contribution to the model (see Table 6). After entry of teacher motivational practice at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 25% ($F(2, 238) = 17.82$; $p < .001$). The introduction of teacher motivational practice explained an additional 11% of variance in English learning self-efficacy, after controlling for personality traits (R^2 Change = .11; $F(2, 238) = 17.82$, $p < .001$). In the final adjusted model four out of six predictor variables were statistically significant. Three personality traits showed a moderate significant effect: emotional regulation ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$). Encouraging positive retrospective evaluation ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$) recorded a large significant effect on English learning self-efficacy, while the teacher discourse was also nearing a large effect size ($\beta = .24$, $p < .001$).

IV Discussion

Recent shifts in the field of language learning motivation have emphasised the importance of context. In instructed language learning, the classroom constitutes the most immediate learning context, with teachers' practice arguably on the most important features, yet little attention has been given to the way this factor interacts with language motivation. Furthermore, while there are notable exceptions to this (Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Wong, 2014), these studies have not accounted for the innate traits learners bring to the learning process in the form of their personalities. In fact, despite support for the role of personality in shaping motivation and the recognised need for effective teaching to recognise individual difference, this learner variable has received scant attention in the field of language education. Addressing this gap, the present study examined the ways in which learner personality and teacher motivational practices interact with English learning motivation and self-efficacy.

In answer to research questions one and two, both student personality and teacher practice significantly predicted variance in English learning motivation. In relation to student personality, conscientiousness and openness to experience emerged as strong significant predictors while emotional regulation and extraversion did not. Teacher discourse, the most frequently observed teaching strategy, showed no predictive power for English learning motivation, while encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation demonstrated a moderate significant effect on English learning motivation, but accounted for only 2% of variation. Question three examined the relationship of student and teacher variables to diverse motivational orientations. Regarding student personality, conscientiousness was a moderate predictor of integrative orientation and a strong significant predictor of instrumental prevention, predicted integrativeness, instrumental prevention, ought-to L2 self and the required orientation, while openness to experience positively predicted integrativeness, instrumental prevention and the ought-to L2 self. With the exception of instrumental prevention, openness to experience significantly predicted all other motivational orientations evidencing a strong effect on ideal L2 self and required orientation. In other words, personality traits were seen to positively and significantly predict variation across all motivational orientations. Findings further showed that teaching practice was significant in predicting integrative orientation, ideal L2 self and required orientation. Specifically, while teacher discourse was at best a moderate significant predictor of integrativeness and required orientation, encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation was a strong significant predictor of integrativeness and the ideal L2 self. Finally, the fourth research question examined the relationship between student and teacher variables and language learning self-efficacy. Emotional regulation, and conscientiousness were both seen to be significant

moderate predictors. Teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation both emerged as significant strong predictors of language learning self-efficacy.

The findings indicate that language learners' motivation and self-efficacy are responsive to effective feedback practices, thus confirming similar previous findings (e.g. Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Wong, 2014) and pointing to the fact that teaching practices matter and that teachers can effect motivational change. On the other hand, the most frequently occurring strategy (teacher discourse) was not the most effective indicating that not all strategies are effective and that teachers can inadvertently give too much attention to ineffective strategies. Instead, while encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation was used far less frequently, it was found to be particularly powerful in predicting integrativeness and the ideal L2 self. Noting that integrativeness is considered a key antecedent of the ideal L2 self, one way of explaining the relationship with these particular orientations may be that positive feedback from teachers, peers and through self-evaluation enables learners to feel closer that membership of the target language community is an attainable goal, thus strengthening also their sense of L2 identity. This finding contributes to a slowly but steadily increasing research interest in practices that can promote the development of learners' L2 selves and extends this possibility to adolescent learners who have been less researched than adult populations.

Research suggests that language learning motivation is associated with 18-33% of variation in language learning achievement (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Al-Hoorie, 2018). This being the case the motivational dimension of language teaching should be an essential component of language teacher education programs and yet the field of language motivation has yet to make a clear impact on teachers' professional development (Lamb, 2017). The findings of the present study align with Lamb's (2017) argument that while certain general principles can be applied to motivational practice, the role of individual differences is such that universal practices are unlikely to exist. Thus, teachers need to be aware of general principles of motivational practice and yet to be highly sensitive to the fact their effectiveness will and should vary according to the specific local conditions, the goals, desires and needs of their learners. In this sense, the present study underpins Glas' (2016) caution that any a priori lists of motivational strategies must be coupled with a focus on the thinking and decision-making of teachers and the extent to which a sense of agency enables them to make decisions about motivational pedagogy that is contextually responsive. A clear implication of the study is thus directed at teacher educators to equip teachers with the knowledge, skills and agency to understand motivation in their classrooms and to develop pedagogies that work for their learners.

Teacher motivational practice in language education is an area that is ripe for research, for instance through intervention studies adopting a longitudinal approach to examine the sustained effects of a cohesive approach to motivational practice on students' L2 motivation. A further important extension of existing research would be qualitative studies of teachers' cognitions on L2 motivation and the ways in which they make decisions within the context of the their classrooms and their institutions. With the exception of Kubanyiova's (2007) study of EFL teachers in Slovakia, very little work has been done to understand the ways and means through which teacher cognitions on L2 motivational practice can be developed and supported and how conceptual change takes place. Combining these avenues would provide rich insights into contextually situated practices constituting a step towards promoting a more authentically person-in-context relational view of motivation (Ushioda, 2009) and generating important insights that could shape teacher education for motivational practice.

The present study considered also the relationship of teacher motivational practice to English learning self-efficacy. The significant role self-efficacy plays in promoting learning attainment is well-established (e.g. Schunk and Usher, 2012; Mills et al., 2007), while studies

also provided evidence of a relationship between self-efficacy and learning motivation (e.g. Schunk & Pajares, 2009; Williams & Williams, 2010). Teacher practice was seen to significantly predict self-efficacy, with encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation demonstrating a strong effect on language learning self-efficacy and teacher discourse also nearing a large effect. While some have argued that self-efficacy can be used as a proxy measure of language learning motivation, it is interesting to note that these two affective factors interact differently with teachers' practices. Teacher discourse and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation were strong predictors of self-efficacy, but not so for English learning motivation, suggesting the two factors are in fact not measuring the same thing. Considering the micro-strategies used by teachers, it is evident that while those under encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation can be considered overtly associated with learners' self-efficacy, those under teacher discourse are not. Thus, the findings raise questions about whether some learner outcomes (learner self-efficacy) may be more susceptible to teachers' practices than others (motivational orientations).

The present study took the view that examination of the effects of teacher practice on language learning motivation should acknowledge the role of individual differences also (Lamb, 2017). One of the most individual differences is that of personality, which, while acknowledged as a predictor of learning motivation in other domains (e.g. Clark & Schroth, 2011; Woodrow, 2006), has been largely ignored in language learning motivation research (Dewaele, 2010). The present study thus constitutes an important step towards addressing this gap.

Despite the interest that the extravert/introvert construct has garnered in relation to its potential for promoting effective language learning (Dewaele, 2007), the present study found that neither this trait nor emotional regulation were significant in predicting English learning motivation or any motivational orientation. Instead, openness to experience and conscientiousness emerged as significant predictors, predicting a combined 18% of variance in English learning motivation. The emergence of conscientiousness as a significant predictor aligns with findings across other learning domains (e.g. Komarraju et al., 2009; McGeown et al., 2014), as might be expected given that this trait taps into sub-traits that are not domain-specific, e.g. sense of duty, self-discipline, achievement striving. Looking more closely at the motivational orientations, conscientiousness emerged as a moderate predictor of integrativeness but a strong predictor of instrumental prevention and ought-to L2 self; orientations that entail notions of meeting the expectations of others and avoiding failure. Given that previous literature argues for the influence of sociocultural ecology on personality traits (see Tirandis & Suh, 2002), supporting a dynamic view of personality, it may be that exploring the mediating effects of sociocultural context on personality as the core of learners' identities lies at the heart of understanding the way that L2 manifests differently across sociocultural settings. The role of sociocultural context in mediating the relationship between personality and language learning motivation, merits theoretical exploration and would also be an important step in understanding the extent to which within a dynamic view of personality may shape different motivational outcomes across diverse sociocultural settings.

The potential of openness to experience, including traits such as curiosity, openness to other values, feelings and a preference for novelty, has been under-explored in the context of language learning. Yet, it seems highly pertinent to the processes entailed in learning a new language, where students engage with a new communication system, norms and values and are involved in the development of new identities. Students who are more comfortable with and even desirous of novelty may be more highly motivated in language learning. This view is supported by the fact that openness to experience was found to be a significant predictor of integrativeness, representing a disposition towards the target language speaking group and participating in their community. Further support is offered by the finding of strong predictive

power of openness to experience for the ideal L2 self, a construct that entails learners' engagement in the development of linguistic identity. From the nature of the data gathered it is not possible to ascertain whether this is because learners who are more open to new experience have greater imaginative capacity to envisage an ideal L2 self, whether they are more at ease with the notion of a new or evolving identity or whether it is a combination of both. Further exploration of this interplay would not only contribute to theorisation of the L2 selves, but may also yield insights into possible ways through which teachers might promote and support learners L2 identity development.

Very little is known about the relationship between personality and learning self-efficacy, particularly in L2 learning. Aligning with studies in other domains (e.g. Brown and Cinamon, 2016; Lent and Brown, 2008; Tang et al., 2008), this study found that personality was indeed a significant predictor of English learning self-efficacy, with emotional regulation emerging and conscientiousness demonstrating significant moderate effects. Overall the findings support a stronger role of learner personality in predicting motivational orientations and a stronger role of teacher discourse in predicting learner self-efficacy. Once again the findings support the need to further explore the role of personality in language learning and particularly to understand the interplay between learner and teacher variables in this enterprise. Doing so would enable the development of models of motivational practice more likely to respond to the individual needs of learners and to make greater use of the resources they bring to the classroom.

Recent work in personality studies indicates that personality traits can and do change throughout the lifespan (Roberts et al., 2008; Specht et al., 2014), for instance in response to age-graded life transitions, such as starting work, getting married etc., that require young adults to adopt new social roles associated with societal expectations and behavioural demands (Bleidorn, 2015). This dynamic view of personality aligns with current conceptualisations of language learning motivation also as a dynamic construct that responds to situations and contexts (Henry et al., 2015). Thus, there seems to be rich potential in exploring the ways in which personality development may interact with changing currents and patterns of motivation. Furthermore, the possibility of personality development opens up avenues for exploring the extent to which traits such as openness to experience and conscientiousness can be promoted, for instance through pedagogy and curriculum design that encourage reflective engagement with other values and other life experiences. Approaches to language education rooted in notions of intercultural citizenship, might on the one hand promote greater conscientiousness as language learning becomes a way through which to exercise active and meaningful citizenship in a global, multilingual world (Liddicoat and Scarino, 2013). On the other hand, through an emphasis on intercultural communicative competence and the requirement to better understand otherness, they may also foster greater openness to experience engaging learners with other values and ways of life (Porto et al., 2017).

In examining the role of personality traits and the role of teaching practice in predicting L2 motivation and self-efficacy, the present study makes a significant contribution to the field. Few studies have examined teacher practice through observation rather than self-report and none, to the best of my knowledge, have considered the individual resources that learners bring in the form of their personalities or how these personalities impact on L2 outcomes. The findings generated have implications for the way that L2 motivation and self-efficacy are theorised and point to the need to better understand the role of learner and teacher variables and by doing so to grant grater agency to learners and teachers. Furthermore, they strongly support calls for greater recognition of the need for teacher education courses to integrate a strong component of preparation for motivational teaching practice in their programmes that not only provides teachers with an understanding of general principles of motivational practice,

but with the tools, skills and reflexivity to develop and adapt practices to the needs and contexts of their learners.

References

AUTHOR (2018).

Al-Hoorie, A-H. (2018). The L2 motivational self-system: a meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 8(4): 721-754. Doi:10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.4.2.

Alison J and Halliwell S (2002) *Challenging Classes: Focus on Pupil Behaviour*. London: CILT.

Alrabai F and Moskovsky C (2016) The relationship between learners' affective variables and second language achievement. *Arab World English Journal* 7(2): 77-103. Doi: 10.24093/awej/vol7no2.6.

Bandura A (1986) The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 4: 359–373.

Bandura A (1994) Self-efficacy. In Ramachaudran V.S. (ed) *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior.* New York: Academic Press, pp.71-81.

Bernaus M and Gardner RC (2008) Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal* 92(2): 387–401. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00753.x

Bleidorn W (2015) What accounts for personality maturation in early adulthood? *Current directions in psychological science* 24(3): 245-252. Doi:10.1177/0963721414568662.

Bown J and White CJ (2010) Affect in a self-regulatory framework for language learning. *System* 38(3): 432-443. doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.016

Brown D and Cinamon RG (2016) Personality traits' effects on self-efficacy and outcome expectations for high school major choice. *International Journal of Vocational Education* 16: 343-361. Doi.org/10.1007/s10775-015-9316-4.

Brown JD, Robson G, and Rosenkjar P (1996). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL* 15(1): 33-12.

Busch D (1982) Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning* 32(1): 109-132.

Carlson R (1965) Stability and change in the adolescent's self-image. *Child Development* 36: 659-666.

Chan L (2014) Effects of an imagery training strategy on Chinese university students' possible second language selves and learning experiences. In Csizér K and Magid M (eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 357–376.

Cheng H and Dörnyei Z (2007) The use of motivational strategies in Language instruction: the case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and teaching* 1(1): 153-174. doi.org/10.2167/illt048.0.

Cheng MH, Cheng AYN and Tang SYF (2010) Closing the gap between the theory and practice of teaching: implications for teacher education programmes in Hong Kong. *Journal of education for teaching* 36(1): 91-104.

Chen JF, Warden CA, and Chang H-T (2005) Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly* 39(4): 609–633. doi.org/10.2307/3588524

Clark MH and Schroth CA (2010) Examining relationships between academic motivation and personality among college students. *Learning and Individual Differences* 20: 19-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2009.10.002.

Cohen A and Macaro E (2007) *Language learner strategies: over 30 years of research and Practice.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Costa PT Jr and McCrae RR (1985) The NEO Personality Inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa PT and McCrae RR (1995) Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 64(1): 21-50. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6401_2.

Covington MV (1998) *The Will to Learn: A Guide for Motivating Young People.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell J (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Graaff R and Housen A (2009) Investigating the effects and effectiveness of L2 instruction. In Long M and Doughty C (eds) *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 726-755.

Dewaele, J.-M. & Furnham, A. (1999) Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 509-544.

Dewaele J-M (2005) Investigating the psychological and emotional dimensions in instructed Language learning: obstacles and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal* 89(3): 367-380. Doi.org/0026-7902/05/367-38.

Dewaele J-M (2007) Inter-individual variation in self-perceived oral communicative competence of English L2 users. In Alcón Soler, E. and Safont Jordà MP (eds) *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, pp. 141-165.

Dewaele J-M (2010) *Emotions in multiple languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dewaele J-M (2013) Personality in second language acquisition. In Chapelle CA (ed) *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1-8, DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0904 9781405198431

Dörnyei Z (2001) *Motivational strategies: creating and maintaining student motivation in the foreign language classroom.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei Z (2005) *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei Z (2010) *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Dörnyei Z and Csizér K (1998) Ten commandments for motivating language learners: results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research* 2(3): 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z. & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited.* New York: Routledge.

Dunn TJ, Baguley T and Brunsden V (2014) From alpha to omega: A practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology* 105: 399–412.

Ehrman ME (1994) The Type Differentiation Indicator and adult language learning success. *Journal of Psychological Type* 30: 10-29.

Ehrman ME (2008) Personality and good language learners. In Griffiths C (ed) *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 83-99.

Ehrman ME and Oxford RL (1995) Cognition plus: correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal* 79(1): 67-89. Doi.org/ 147.8.204.164.

Fukuda S T, Sakata H and Takeuchi M (2011) Facilitating autonomy to enhance motivation: Examining the effects of a guided-autonomy syllabus. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 8(1): 71–86.

Gardner RC (1985) *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes*

and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner RC (2010) *Motivation and second language acquisition: the socio-educational model.* New York: Peter Lang.

Garrett P and Young RF (2009) Theorizing affect in foreign language learning: an analysis of one learner's responses to a communicative-based Portuguese course. *Modern Language Journal* 93(2): 209-226. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00857.x

Glas K (2016) Opening up 'spaces for maoeuvre': English teacher perspectives on learner motivation. *Research Papers in Education* 31(4): 442-461. Doi:10.1080/02671522.2015.1049287.

Goldberg LR (1992) The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment* 4(1): 26-42. Doi:10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26.

Guilloteaux, M. J. and Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly 42*(1): 55-77. Doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x.

Hair J, Anderson R, Tatham R. and Black W. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis.* NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, Inc.

Hinton P, Brownlow C, McMurray I and Cozens B (2004) *SPSS Explained*. London: Routledge.

Henry A (2009) Gender differences in compulsory school pupils' L2 self-concepts: A longitudinal study. *System* 37: 177–93. Doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.11.003.

Henry A, Davydenko S and Dörnyei Z (2015) The anatomy of Directed Motivational Currents: Exploring intense and enduring periods of L2 motivation. *The Modern Language Journal* 99(2): 329-345. Doi: 10.1111/modl.12214.

Hiver, P. and Al-Hoorie, A-H. (2020). Re-examining the role of vision in second language motivation: a preregistered conceptual replication of You, Dörnyei, and Csizér (2016). *Language Learning* 70(1), 48-102.

Horwitz EK, Horwitz MB and Cope J (1986) Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal* 70: 125-32.

Keith TZ (2015) *Multiple regression and beyond: an introduction to multiple regression and structural equation modelling* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Koch AA and Terrell TD (1991) Affective reactions of foreign language students to natural approach activities and teaching techniques. In Horwitz EK and Young DJ (eds) *Language anxiety: from theory and research to classroom implications.* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., pp.57-64.

Komarraju M, Karau SJ and Schmeck RR (2009) Role of the Big Five personality traits in predicting college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences,* 19(1): 47-52. DOI:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.07.001

Kormos J and Csizér K (2008) Age-Related Differences in the Motivation of Learning English as a Foreign Language: Attitudes, Selves, and Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language Learning* 58(2): 327-355. doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00443.x

Kubanyiova M (2007) *Teacher development in action: an empirically-based model of promoting conceptual change in in-service language teachers in Slovakia.* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Nottingham University, Nottingham, UK.

Kubanyiova M and Dörnyei Z (2014) *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: building vision in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamb M (2017) The motivational dimension of language teaching. *Language Teaching,* 50(3): 301-346. Doi:10.1017/S0261444817000088.

Larsen RJ and Buss DM (2010) *Personality Psychology.* McGraw Hill: New York.

Lent RW and Brown SD (2008) Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in

the context of work. *Journal of Career Assessment* 16: 6–21. Doi:10.1177/1069072707305769

Liang HY and Kelsen B (2018) Influence of personality and motivation on oral presentation performance. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 47(4): 755-776. Doi: 10.1007/s10936-017-9551-6.

Liddicoat A and Scarino A (2013) *Intercultural language teaching and learning*. Chichester: Wiley.

Liu Y and Thompson A (2018) Language learning motivation in China: an exploration of the L2MSS and psychological reactance. *System* 72: 37-48. Doi:10.1016/j.system.2017.09.025

Locke EA (1968) Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 3(2): 157–189. Doi:10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4.

MacIntyre PD, Mackinnon SP and Clément R (2009) From integrative motivation to possible selves: The baby, the bathwater and the future of language learning motivation research. In Dörnyei Z and Ushioda E (eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. North York, ON: Multilingual Matters, pp. 43-65.

Magid M (2014) A motivational programme for learners of English: An application of the L2 motivational self-system. In Csizér K and Magid M (eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 333–356.

Magid M and Chan L (2012) Motivating English learners by helping them visualize their Ideal L2 self: lessons from two motivational programmes. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 6(2): 113-125.

Masgoret AM and Gardner R (2003) Attitudes, motivation and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning* 53(1): 123-163. Doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00227.

Mayer JD (2015) The personality systems framework: current theory and development. *Journal of Research in Personality* 56: 4-14. doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.01.001

McCrae RR and Costa PT (2003) *Personality in Adulthood: a five-factor theory perspective,* 2nd ed. New York NY: Guilford Press.

McGeown S, Putwain D, Geijer Simpson E, Boffey E, Markham J and Vince A (2014) Predictors of adolescents' academic motivation: Personality, self-efficacy and adolescents' characteristics. *Learning and individual differences* 32: 278-286. doi,.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.03.022.

McGhee RL, Ehrler DJ and Buckhalt JA (2007) Five-Factor Personality Inventory - Children (FFPI-C). Texas, U.S: PRO-ED, Inc.

Medford E and McGeown S (2012) The influence of personality characteristics on children's intrinsic motivation. *Learning and Individual Differences* 22(6): 786-791. Doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2012.06.002

Mills N, Pajares F and Herron C (2007) Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to Achievement and motivation. *Language Learning* 57(3): 417-442. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00421.x.

Moskovsky C, Alrabai F, Paolini S and Ractheva S (2012) The effects of teachers' motivational strategies on learners' motivation: a controlled investigation of second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 63(1): 34-62. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00717.x

Murray G (2013) Pedagogy of the possible: Imagination, autonomy, and space. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 3(3): 377-396. Doi:10.14746/ssllt.2013.3.3.4

Ng C-H (2003) Re-conceptualizing Achievement Goals from a Cultural Perspective. Paper

presented at *Joint Conference of NZARE & AARE*, Auckland, New Zealand.

Noels KA, Pelletier LG, Clément R and Vallerand RJ (2003) Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and Self-Determination Theory. *Language Learning* 53(1): 33-64. Doi:10.1111/1467-9922.53223

Norris JM and Ortega L (2003) Defining and measuring SLA. In Doughty CJ and Long MH (eds) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp.717-761.

Ockey G (2011) Self-consciousness and assertiveness as explanatory variables of L2 oral ability: A latent variable approach. *Language Learning* 61: 968–989. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00625.x.

O'Malley JM and Chamot AU (1990) *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Papi M and Abdollahzadeh E (2012) Teacher motivational practice, student motivation, and possible L2 selves: An examination in the Iranian EFL context. *Language Learning,* 62(2): 571-594.

Porto M, Houghton SA and Byram M (2017) Intercultural citizenship in the (foreign) language classroom. *Language Teaching Research* 22(5): 484-498.

Roberts BW, Wood D and Caspi A (2008) The development of personality traits in adulthood. In John OP, Robins RW and Pervin LA (eds) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press, pp.375-398.

Ruesch A, Bown J and Dewey D (2012) Student and teacher perception of motivational strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 6(1): 15-27. Doi: 10.1080/17501229.2011.562510

Sakui K and Cowie N (2011) The dark side of motivation: teachers' perspectives on 'unmotivation'. *ELT Journal* 66(2): 205-213. Doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr045 .

Schunk DH and Pajares F (2009) Self-efficacy theory. In Wenzel KR and Wigfield A (eds) *Educational psychology handbook series. Handbook of motivation at school*. New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, pp.35-53.

Schunk DH and Usher EL (2012) Social cognitive theory and motivation. In Ryan RM (ed) *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of human motivation*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press, pp.13-27.

Spada N and Fröhlich M (1995) *COLT Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications.* Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Specht J, Bleidorn W, Denissen JJ, Hennecke M, Hutteman R, Kandler C, Zimmermann J (2014) What drives adult personality development? A comparison of theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence. *European Journal of Personality* 28: 216–230.

Starkweather J (2012) Step out of the past: Stop using coefficient alpha; there are better ways to calculate reliability. *Benchmarks RSS Matters*. Retrieved from: http://web3.unt.edu/benchmarks/issues/2012/06/rss-matters

Sugita McEown M and Takeuchi O (2014) Motivational strategies in EFL classrooms: How do teachers impact students' motivation? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 8(1): 20-38. Doi: 10.1080/17501229.2012.741133

Tabachnick B, Fiddell L (2007) *Using multivariate statistics* (5th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Taguchi T, Magid M and Papi M (2009) The L2 motivational self system amongst Chinese, Japanese, and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Dornyei Z and Ushioda E (eds) *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp.66-97.

Tang M, Pan W and Newmeyer M (2008) Factors influencing high school students' career aspirations. *Professional School Counselling* 11: 285-295.

Teimouri Y (2017) L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 39: 691–709. Doi:10.1017/S0272263116000243.

Tirandis HC and Suh EM (2002) Cultural influenced on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53: 133-160. Doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135200

Tran M (2018) *A mixed methods study of Hong Kong adults' motivation to learn English in continuing education.* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR.

Ushioda E (2009) A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. Dörnyei Z and Ushioda E (eds) *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 215-228.

Verhoeven L and Vermeer A (2002) Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 361-374. Doi:10.1017/S014271640200303X.

Warden CA and Lin HJ (2000) Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals* 33(5): 535-547. Doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb01997.x.

Wei M (2007) The interrelatedness of affective factors in EFL learning: an examination of motivational patterns in relation to anxiety in China. *TESL-EJ* 11(1): 1-23.

Wigfield A and Eccles JS (1992) The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review* 12(3): 265-310. Doi:10.1016/0273-2297(92)90011-P.

Williams T and Williams K (2010) Self-efficacy and performance in mathematics: Reciprocal determinism in 33 nations. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 102(2): 453-466. Doi:10.1037/a0017271

Wong RMH (2014) An investigation of strategies for student motivation in the Chinese EFL context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 8(2): 132-154. Doi: doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.777449.

Wong MHR and Wong R (2017) Alignment of motivational strategies: the perceptions of teachers and students. *Educational Practice and Theory* 39(2): 57-85. Doi: 10.7459/ept/39.2.05.

Woodrow L (2006) Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal* 37: 308-328. Doi: 10.1177/0033688206071315.

Wucherer BV and Reiterer SM (2018) Language is a girlie thing, isn't it? A psycholinguistic exploration of the L2 gender gap. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 21(1): 118-134. Doi: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1142499.

Yashima T (2013) Individuality, imagination and community in a globalizing world. In Benson P and Cooker L (eds.) *The applied linguistic individual*. London: Equinox Publishing, pp. 46-58.

Yeung SYS (2009) Is student-centred pedagogy impossible in Hong Kong? The case of inquiry in classrooms. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 10(3): 377-386.

You CJ and Dörnyei Z (2016) Language learning motivation in China: Results of a large-scale stratified survey. *Applied Linguistics* 37(4): 495-516. Doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu046

Appendix A: Sample questionnaire items

How important to you are the following reasons for learning English? (Please mark 1-4 with 4 being very important and 1 being not important at all.

Constructs	Items
	To be more at ease communicating with other people who speak English.

Integrative Orientation	So I can meet and converse with more and varied people.
	Because I like English-language films or TV programmes.
Instrumentality – Promotion	Because English proficiency is necessary for being promoted in the future.
	Because I think it will be useful in getting a good job.
	Because high English proficiency will help me make more money.
Instrumentality – Prevention	Studying English is necessary for me because I do not want to get a poor mark or fail in tests.
	Studying English is important to me because I would feel ashamed if I got bad grades in English.
	Studying English is important to me because if I do not have knowledge of English I will be considered a weak learner.
Ought-To L2 Self	In order to gain the approval of others (e.g., my peers/ teachers/ family).
	I consider learning English important because the people I respect think that I should do it.
	Because my parents/family believe(s) that I must study English to be an educated person.
Required Orientation	To help me pass required classes (e.g., English language, Maths and Liberal Studies).
	To help me pass elective classes (e.g., Chemistry, Geography, Economics, etc.)
	I need English skills to help me pass an exam for further study at university.
Ideal L2 Self	I can imagine myself living abroad and having a discussion in English.
	Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.
	I can imagine myself speaking English as if I were a native speaker.