Perceptions of Teachers’ Communicative Style and Students’ Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation
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This study considers how students’ perceptions of their teachers’ communicative style, particularly the extent to which teachers are perceived to support students’ autonomy and to provide useful feedback about students’ learning progress, are related to students’ extrinsic and intrinsic motivational orientations. It also examines the link between these variables and various language learning outcomes, including effort, anxiety, and language competence. Students registered in a summer French immersion course (N = 78) completed a questionnaire that was used to assess the constructs described above. Correlational analyses determined that stronger feelings of intrinsic motivation were related to positive language learning outcomes, including greater motivational intensity, greater self-evaluations of competence, and a reduction in anxiety. Moreover, perceptions of the teacher’s communicative style were related to intrinsic motivation, such that the more controlling and the less informative students perceived the teacher to be, the lower students’ intrinsic motivation was. The implications of perceptions of teacher communicative style for motivation and language learning outcomes are discussed.
grees by certain goals or orientations toward learning the L2. Initially, two classes of goals were proposed: (a) the integrative orientation, or a desire to learn the L2 in order to interact and identify with members from the L2 community; and (b) the instrumental orientation, which refers to a desire to learn the L2 to achieve some practical goal (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972). Because of the link between the integrative orientation and positive attitudes toward the L2 community, Gardner and Lambert (1972) suggested that individuals with this orientation would demonstrate greater motivational effort in learning and thus achieve greater L2 competence than individuals with an instrumental orientation.

In recent years, there has been some shift in interest from the integrative motive to other motivational paradigms for understanding language learning motivation. This search for a new paradigm has arisen, in part, because of some equivocal findings regarding the importance of these two orientations for motivation and L2 achievement (cf. Au, 1988; Chihara & Oller, 1978; Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lukmani, 1972; Noels & Clément, 1989). In addition, and of particular relevance to the present discussion, several L2 scholars maintain that other reasons for learning a L2, particularly those pertaining to dynamics in the classroom context, may be at least as important as the integrative orientation and hence warrant greater empirical attention (Brown, 1990; Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Crooks & Schmidt, 1991; Ramage, 1990). For example, Oxford and Shearin (1994) listed a number of reasons for L2 learning, including (a) intellectual stimulation, (b) personal challenge, (c) showing off to friends, and (d) fascination with aspects of the language. Dörnyei (1990) has suggested that the need for achievement and the desire for stimulation are powerful motivators. Crooks and Schmidt (1991) include interest and curiosity in their list of motivators. Although these articles have prompted much discussion and debate over the necessity and utility of various theoretical formulations (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994a, 1994b; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; Oxford, 1994), there has been relatively little effort to examine alternative models empirically (cf. Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; but see also Dörnyei, 1990; Ramage, 1990; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

One purpose of the present article is to move in this direction by considering the application of Deci and Ryan’s (1985) Self-Determination Theory to the study of L2 motivation and by examining empirically several of its tenets. Like several other scholars (e.g., Brown, 1994; Dickinson, 1995; Dörnyei, 1994a; Schmidt, Boraic, & Kasabgy, 1996), we believe that the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation made by Deci and Ryan is useful for understanding L2 learning motivation. First, by recasting orientations into the self-determination framework, it is possible to organize systematically many of the reasons for learning a L2 that have been suggested in the literature. This model is thus quite comprehensive in the phenomena it describes. Second, as will be discussed in greater detail below, the theoretical framework explains, in terms of the psychological principles of self-determination and perceived competence, how different goals can influence the language learning process and hence learning outcomes. These psychological principles provide a mechanism by which motivation can be enhanced and thereby increase positive outcomes. Hence, this model has considerable explanatory power and potential for practical applications.

Self-Determination Theory

According to Deci and Ryan’s (1985) self-determination approach to motivation, intrinsic motivation refers to motivation to perform an activity simply for the pleasure and satisfaction that accompany the action. These feelings of pleasure derive from fulfilling innate needs for competence and self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). People who are intrinsically motivated feel that they are doing an activity because they have chosen to do so voluntarily and because the activity represents a challenge to their existing competencies and requires them to use their creative capabilities. This kind of motivation is considered to be highly self-determined in the sense that the reason for doing the activity is linked solely to the individual’s positive feelings while performing the task. An example of this type of motivation is the student who finds delight in learning a new way to express an idea in the L2.

Extrinsically motivated behaviours are those behaviours that are performed not because of inherent interest in the activity, but in order to arrive at some instrumental end, such that the source of regulation is external to the activity per se. Researchers believed originally that extrinsic motivation implied a lack of self-determination in the behaviours performed. More recently, however, Deci and Ryan (1985; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Rigby, Deci, Patrick, & Ryan, 1992) proposed that there are different
types of extrinsic motivation, some of which are more internalized into the self-concept than others (i.e., some that are more self-determined than others).

Within the realm of education, three levels of extrinsic motivation have been distinguished empirically (Vallerand et al., 1992, 1993). In terms of degree of self-determination, they are classified as: (a) external, (b) introjected, and (c) identified regulation. External regulation refers to behaviour that is determined through means external to the individual, such as a tangible reward or punishment. For example, the student who works hard to learn a L2 solely for the purpose of acquiring a course credit or gaining a teacher’s praise would be described as externally regulated. Because the reason for learning the L2 is completely regulated by contingencies outside the individual, the student’s effort and involvement in language learning would be expected to decrease once this reason is removed.

Introjected regulation represents reasons for performing an activity that are more internalized than in external regulation. These reasons pertain to performing an activity in response to some kind of pressure that the individual has internalized. Examples of this type of regulation are the student who does his or her L2 homework because he or she would feel guilty if it were not completed, or the student who puts effort into learning an assignment in order to impress others with his or her proficiency. Learning takes place as long as the student feels the need to reduce guilt or to self-aggrandize.

The third stage of internalization, at which point extrinsic motivation is most self-regulated, is identified regulation. At this point, the individual decides to perform a behaviour because he or she views the activity as personally worthwhile (Deci & Ryan, 1995). A student who feels that being culturally sensitive is important may view language learning very positively since it helps to support this valued goal. In this situation, the student would be expected to sustain learning as long as he or she judges it to be valuable.

A final motivational concept proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) is amotivation. A person is considered amotivated when she or he does not see a relation between her or his actions and their consequences, but rather sees the consequences as arising from factors beyond her or his control. In such circumstances, it is hypothesized that the person lacks any kind of motivation, which is a state similar to that of “learned helplessness” (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). The person would be expected to quit performing the activity.

The Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation for L2 Learning

The various motivational constructs described above have been related to several psychological variables that are important in the general educational setting, and hence they may have predictive utility for the language classroom. Increased intrinsic motivation has been related to greater interest in course material (Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983) and higher academic performance (Harter & Connell, 1984). The subtypes of extrinsic motivation have been shown to be related differentially to educational variables such as effort and positive emotions (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Vallerand, Blais, Briere, & Pelletier, 1989; Vallerand et al., 1993), and perseverance (Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand, Fortier, & Guay, 1996; Vallerand & Senécal, 1992). Amotivation has been associated with dropping out of college (Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1996). Because these variables are important in L2 learning as well as in education generally, it would seem that this motivational paradigm is also useful for understanding motivation to learn a L2.

Indeed, some empirical evidence suggests that the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic goals can be of service in predicting L2 learning outcomes. For example, the results of Ramage’s (1990) study indicate that continuing students tend to be more motivated to learn language for language’s sake, that is, to be intrinsically motivated, than students who decide to discontinue language studies. Students who decide to discontinue language studies can be characterized by a stronger interest in language learning as a means to other goals (e.g., academic credit), that is, to be more extrinsically motivated than students who continue language study. Kamada (1986) also reports that intrinsic interest, defined as the extent to which one “likes” the L2, is related to the acquisition of L2 skills (e.g., listening and speaking) beyond external requirements (e.g., reading and writing for examination requirements). Finally, research examining Gardner’s socioeducational model of language learning motivation has repeatedly demonstrated an important link between positive attitudes toward the learning situation and L2 achievement and related outcomes (see Gardner, 1983, for review). Thus, although L2 motivation has not been addressed in the self-determination framework, some evi-
dence points to the utility of the intrinsic/extrinsic distinction for predicting L2 learning outcomes. A first goal of the present study was to consider the relevance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for other constructs important for language learning, such as the intensity of motivation, anxiety experienced in the classroom, and competence in the L2.

Teachers’ Communicative Style and Self-Determination

According to the Self-Determination Theory, motivational style or orientation is influenced by those factors in the social environment that affect self-perceptions of competence and autonomy. In the language learning situation the teacher appears to be a key person who affects these perceptions. Hence, the manner in which teachers interact with students, that is, their communicative style, may be associated with the students’ motivational orientation. Self-perceptions of autonomy and competence are kept high to the extent that students make their own decisions about their learning and are provided with clear feedback about their progress. To the extent that teachers communicate with students in a manner that supports these self-perceptions, students are likely to be intrinsically oriented. At the same time, the benefits of an intrinsic orientation, such as sustained interest and possibly achievement, are likely to accrue. Conversely, students who find their teacher controlling or authoritarian and who believe that they are not given useful feedback about their progress may lose their sense of self-determination and competence in the learning process. Concurrently, they may put effort into the course only to the extent that it allows them to pass required tests and assignments and then drop out.

Whereas previous research has looked at teachers’ communicative style and student interest in the general classroom (see, e.g., Richmond & McCroskey, 1992b), very little has been done in the context of language learning (but see Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996). Moreover, although there has been some discussion of how teachers’ communicative style may relate to motivation (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994a; Ushioda, 1996), only a few empirical studies of language learning have isolated those teacher communication variables that are hypothesized to cause variations in self-determination and intrinsic interest (e.g., Schmidt et al., 1996). Thus, a second goal of this study was to determine how perceptions of the teacher as controlling (vs. autonomy-supportive) and as informative (i.e., as providing useful feed-
tion, the less intense will be students’ motivation and intention to continue to study the L2. A similar pattern will be evident with regard to language competence variables, and a reverse pattern will be evident with regard to anxiety in the classroom.

METHOD

Participants

The participants consisted of 78 Anglophone students registered in a 6-week summer French immersion program in Ottawa, Canada. This program is sponsored by the Canadian government and is free to university students. Women comprised 75.7% of the sample. The respondents ranged in age from 18 to 36 years, with a mean age of 22.01 years. The length of time spent learning the L2 ranged from a few weeks to 19 years, with a mean length of 6.73 years. The students were distributed fairly evenly across seven classes (from beginner to advanced), taught by seven different instructors; the percentage of the sample in each class ranged from 10.1% to 17.7% with a mean of 14.3%.

Materials

The materials used in this study consisted of a questionnaire with three sections. The first section was an instrument with five subscales designed to measure amotivation, intrinsic motivation, and the three subtypes of extrinsic motivation (external, introjected, and identified regulation). The second section contained scales that measured several variables shown to be important in L2 learning. The third section included questions pertaining to the students’ perceptions of their teacher. A description of the scales used, along with Cronbach alpha indices of internal consistency, follows.

Section 1: Amotivation, Intrinsic, and Extrinsic Motivation. In the first section of the questionnaire, participants were asked why they wished to study French (see Appendix). The potential responses included scales designed to assess three types of extrinsic motivation, including (a) External Regulation (5 items; \( \alpha = .78 \)), (b) Introjected Regulation (2 items; \( \alpha = .67 \)), and (c) Identified Regulation (5 items; \( \alpha = .79 \)). Intrinsic Motivation was assessed with 9 items, assessing the reasons for learning associated with positive feelings (\( \alpha = .82 \)). Amotivation was assessed with 3 items (\( \alpha = .81 \)). These items were drawn from an earlier study in which the psychometric properties of the subscales were found to be satisfactory (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 1996). They were adapted, in part, from items developed by Vallerand and his colleagues (e.g., Vallerand et al., 1989; 1992; 1993). Additional items were constructed on the basis of previous studies of orientations (e.g., Clément & Kruidenier, 1983). The items were randomly ordered throughout the first section. The student rated the extent to which the proposed reason reflected his or her reason for language learning by using a 7-point scale varying from (1) “Does not correspond at all” to (7) “Corresponds completely.” A high score indicated a strong correspondence between the proposed reason and the student’s reason for studying a L2.

Section 2: Educational Variables. The second section was composed of several scales that measured variables that have been shown to be important in L2 learning. Except where otherwise noted, each student was asked to indicate on a 7-point scale, anchored at one end by (1) “Disagree Completely” and at the other end by (7) “Agree Completely,” the extent to which he or she agreed with the proposed item. A high score thus corresponded to a high level of agreement with the proposed item. The items were presented in random order in this section. A brief description of each of these scales follows.

Classroom Anxiety. In order to assess anxiety while using the L2 in class, four items, two negative and two positive, were adapted from Gardner (1985; \( \alpha = .79 \)). Negative items were reversed; a high mean score indicated a high degree of anxiety while using the L2 in the classroom setting.

Motivational Intensity. Nine multiple-choice items, adapted from Gardner (1985), were used to determine the degree of effort that the student felt he or she exerted when learning the L2. A high mean score indicated a high motivational effort (low score = 1; high score = 3; \( \alpha = .72 \)).

Intention to Continue L2 Study. This scale had three items that measured the student’s intention to continue learning the L2 in the future. A high mean score suggested a strong intention to continue (\( \alpha = .83 \)).

Self-Evaluation. Self-evaluation of L2 competence was determined through the use of four 7-point scales (Clément, 1988). The four scales were related, respectively, to four aspects: (a) writing, (b) comprehension, (c) reading, and (d) speaking. The respondents indicated the extent to which they felt they could perform each of these tasks, from “not at all” to “very well.” Scores
obtained on each item were averaged to constitute a single self-evaluation index. A high score was indicative of a high degree of competence (α = .89).

L2 Course Achievement. In order to measure achievement in the L2, final course marks were obtained. These marks were standardized within the class group prior to their inclusion in the analyses.

Perceived Control. This scale, comprised of two items, served as an index of perceptions of the general learning environment as autonomy-supportive or controlling with regard to choices about education (adapted from Ryan & Connell, 1989; α = .70). A high mean score on this scale suggested a general feeling of being controlled and of not feeling autonomous while learning the L2.

Section 3: Perceptions of the Teacher. The third section consisted of items that measured the student’s perception, in general, of the communicative style of their language professors. This scale, adapted from Pelletier and Vallerand (1996; see also Pelletier, Tuson, & Haddad, 1997), consisted of two subscales that measured: (a) the student’s perception of the language professors as controlling (α = .62; e.g., “My professors pressure me to do what they want”) and (b) the perception of the professors as providing feedback in a positive, informative manner (α = .78 ; e.g., “The feedback I receive from my professors is constructive in helping me perform better in my courses”). Participants indicated on a 7-point scale, anchored at one end by (1) “Disagree Completely” and at the other end by (7) “Agree Completely,” the degree to which they agreed with the proposed item. A high mean score thus corresponded to a high degree of agreement with the item.

Procedure

For the most part, testing took place during regular class hours, although for one class it was necessary to test outside of class time. The experimenter, who was not personally acquainted with any of the participants, informed the students that their participation was voluntary. The students were also informed that (a) their names and their teachers’ names were not on the questionnaire, (b) their teachers would not see their responses, and (c) their participation would not affect their course grades. Both the students and the teachers signed a consent form indicating that they understood the nature and purpose of the study and agreed to participate. The students then completed the questionnaires without a time limit.

RESULTS

The present study examined the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as elaborated by Deci and Ryan (1985) and Vallerand and his colleagues (1989; 1992; 1993) in the context of L2 learning and assessed the relationships among these orientations, aspects of the teacher’s communicative style, and a variety of relevant language learning variables. Two sets of analyses were undertaken. First, the links between the orientations and the motivation, anxiety, and competence variables were assessed through correlational analyses to determine the predictive validity of the orientations. Second, correlational analyses assessed the associations among perceptions of the teachers’ communicative style (controlling and informative), and both the orientations and the variables of motivation and competence.

Correlations between Motivational Subtypes and Emotional, Motivational, and Competence Variables

As presented in Table 1, greater amotivation is associated with (a) greater anxiety in the language classroom, (b) lower motivational intensity, and (c) less intention to continue studying the language. The less self-determined forms of motivation are generally not associated with anxiety and motivational intensity, although students who are learning the L2 to achieve an external reward also intend to continue to study the language (possibly until they achieve their goal). Students who are motivated through the more self-determined forms of motivation are likely to experience less anxiety and to show greater motivation, in terms of intensity and intention to continue their studies. Although the final grades were unrelated to motivational subtypes, self-evaluation of language competence was related to motivation subtypes, such that feeling amotivated was associated with lower competence and feeling intrinsically motivated was associated with greater competence in the L2.

Correlations between Motivational Subtypes, and Perceptions of the Teacher and of the Environment as Controlling

As presented in Table 2, perceptions of the teacher were largely unrelated to the less self-determined forms of motivation and to amotiva-
tion. Greater intrinsic motivation was negatively associated with perceiving the teacher as controlling and positively associated with perceiving the teacher as informative. A similar pattern was shown for identified regulation, although these correlations were only marginally significant ($p < .075$).

Perceptions of being controlled generally were associated with amotivation, such that a greater sense of being controlled was linked with greater feelings of amotivation. The less self-determined forms of motivation (external and introjected regulation) were generally unrelated to these general perceptions, but the more self-determined forms were associated with them, such that greater identified regulation and intrinsic motivation were linked with lower perceptions of being controlled. Furthermore, significant correlations between perceptions of the environment as controlling and the two teacher perception scales showed that the more one perceived the teacher as controlling and less informative, the more one perceived the environment to be generally controlling ($r = .23$ and $r = -.23$, respectively, $p < .05$).

**Correlations between Perceptions of Teachers and the Emotional, Motivational, and Competence Variables**

Perceptions of the teacher as controlling were related to greater student anxiety in the language classroom and to less motivational intensity and intention to continue studying the L2, although only marginally in the last case ($p = .07$; see Table 3). Stronger perceptions of the teacher as controlling were also associated with assessing one's competence as lower, although they were not associated with the final grade. To the extent that

### TABLE 1
Correlations between Motivation Subtypes and Relevant Educational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Subtypes</th>
<th>Class Anxiety</th>
<th>Motivational Intensity</th>
<th>Intention to Continue</th>
<th>Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Final Grade*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>−.27*</td>
<td>−.44**</td>
<td>−.22*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>−.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>−.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Regulation</td>
<td>−.25*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>−.24*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 78.

* $N = 50$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

---

### TABLE 2
Correlations between Motivation Subtypes and Perceptions of the Professor and of the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Subtypes</th>
<th>Teacher Perceptions</th>
<th>Environment Perception of Being Controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Informatived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>−.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>−.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Regulation</td>
<td>−.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>−.23*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 78.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
the language teacher was perceived as providing relevant feedback (i.e., informative), students reported greater motivational intensity and intention to continue their studies. Informative teaching style was not significantly related to anxiety or to perceived competence, although the direction of the correlations was as hypothesized.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the relevance of the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as described by Deci and Ryan (1985) for L2 learning, and assessed the relation between these motivational goals, teacher communication style, and relevant language learning variables. The discussion bears on the usefulness of the self-determination paradigm for describing learner motivation and the relation between teacher communicative style and motivation subtypes, effort, and competence.

The results of the analyses of the subscales’ relations to other variables attested to the validity of distinguishing between more and less self-determined forms of motivation and amotivation as meaningfully different kinds of motivation. While recognizing the impossibility of making causal statements with reference to correlation coefficients, the general pattern of correlations is consistent with the expected relations outlined in Deci and Ryan’s (1985) model. Although the two less self-determined motivational orientations appear to be distinct constructs, they are similar in that they did not relate to the educational variables. This pattern suggests that learning a language for material rewards or because of some pressure is not supportive of sustained effort or eventual competence. In contrast, the more students feel that they personally have chosen to learn the language and the more they are learning it because they enjoy the learning process, the more effort they make and the more they intend to pursue their studies. Moreover, as is consistent with this greater effort, they are also likely to feel more competent and less anxious in the classroom. At the very least, any goal for learning a L2 would seem better than the lack of a goal; the more students feel amotivated, the less effort they will expend and the more anxiety they will feel. This pattern, then, points to the utility of the Self-Determination Theory for explaining the relationship between orientational goals and language learning outcomes. Language students who have valued goals for learning, particularly the goal of self-development and enjoyment in learning, tend to be more involved and successful in that learning experience.

The pattern of relations also suggests that intrinsic motivation is associated with the teachers’ communicative style. Perceptions of the language teacher as controlling and as failing to provide constructive information about the student’s learning corresponded with lessened identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. This pattern is consistent with Deci and Ryan’s (1985) contention that, to the extent that teachers support autonomy and provide informative feedback, the student’s sense of self-determination and enjoyment can be enhanced. At the same time, the findings suggest that the teacher’s style may not be relevant if the student pursues learning for extrinsic reasons. This failure to find a relation between these variables does not rule out the possibility that other sources of control, such as school administrators, family members, and peers, may relate to the motivation of these students (cf. Guay & Vallerand, 1997). Certainly the positive correlation between a general sense of being controlled and amotivation is consistent with Deci and Ryan’s idea that control, perceived as originating from whatever source, can be demotivating. At the same time, however, the teacher’s style may be related to this general perception and indirectly to its motivational implications, as evidenced by the relation between the perceptions of the teacher and general control. At the very least, then, perceptions of the teachers’ communicative style are associated with intrinsic motivation.

Although more rigorous experimental designs are necessary to verify the causal relationships, the results found in the present study attest to the predictive utility of the intrinsic and extrinsic ori-

---

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of the Teacher</th>
<th>Educational Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Informativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Anxiety</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Intensity</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Continue</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 78.

* p < .05, ** p < .01.
In our view, externally regulated extrinsic motivation, which is a matter for future research, which we are currently conducting (cf. Noels, 1997), to determine the link between the orientations described by Deci and Ryan (1985) and the integrative and instrumental orientations.

Learning another language is indeed a complicated process and many factors influence both linguistic and nonlinguistic outcomes. With its potential to be developed and maintained by the social environment, motivation is one element that educators can develop to improve their students’ L2 outcomes. In spite of the limitations inherent in this correlational study of a small sample of students in an immersion situation, the findings presented here demonstrate that perceptions of teacher control and feedback styles are associated with intrinsic motivation. It is hoped that this conceptualization will contribute to a better understanding of the relationships among teachers’ communicative style, motivation, and achievement in the language classroom.
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NOTES

1 According to Deci and Ryan (1985), integrated regulation (no formal relation to Gardner and Lambert’s [1972] notion of integrative orientation) represents a fourth level of extrinsic motivation that is more self-determined than identified regulation. With integrated regulation, the activities that a person performs are an expression of his or her self-concept. Although such behaviour is autonomously regulated, unlike intrinsic motivation, this form of regulation is not fundamentally driven by enjoyment of the activity per se, but by its importance to the individual’s self-concept. This form of regulation thus falls into the category of extrinsic motivation, although it is highly self-determined. It was not included in the present discussion because earlier studies of motivation in education suggested that it is not always readily distinguished from identified regulation (e.g., Vallerand, Brière, & Pelletier, 1989), especially for children and teenagers or people who are novices at a particular task, as these language learners might be considered to be.

2 This construct is termed “informational” by Deci and Ryan (1985), but for the purposes of this paper, this term has been changed to the more idiomatic expression “informative.”

3 Following the recommendations of the university ethics committee, students were asked to sign a second consent form to allow the release of their grades for the purposes of this research. Twenty-eight subjects declined to release this information.
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APPENDIX
Section 1 of Questionnaire

Why are you learning French?

Amotivation
I don’t know: I can’t come to understand what I am doing studying French. Honestly, I don’t know, I truly have the impression of wasting my time in studying French.
I cannot come to see why I study French, and frankly, I don’t give a damn.

External Regulation
In order to get a more prestigious job later on.
In order to have a better salary later on.
To gain the benefits that entrance into the Francophone community will provide me.

Introjected Regulation
Because I would feel guilty if I didn’t know French.
Because I would feel ashamed if I couldn’t speak to my friends from the Francophone community in French.

Identified Regulation
Because I think it is important for my personal development.
Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak more than one language.
Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak French.

Intrinsic Motivation
Because I enjoy the feeling of acquiring knowledge about the Francophone community and their way of life.
For the pleasure that I experience in knowing more about French literature.
For the satisfied feeling I get in finding out new things.
For the "high" I feel when hearing foreign languages spoken.
For the pleasure I get from hearing French spoken by Francophones.
For the "high" that I experience while speaking French.
For the enjoyment I experience when I grasp a difficult construct in French.
For the pleasure I experience when surpassing myself in my French studies.
For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in French.

Nominations needed for Emma Marie Birkmaier Award for Doctoral Dissertation Research in Foreign Language Education

Sponsored by ACTFL and the MLJ, the Emma Marie Birkmaier Award recognizes the author of an outstanding doctoral thesis in language learning or teaching, teacher preparation, curriculum development, evaluation, or any field directly related to second or foreign language education. For the 1999 award, dissertations completed in 1997 and 1998 will be considered.

Nominations, consisting of a letter of nomination and an abstract of the thesis, should be directed to the Award Committee Chair:

Dr. Dale Koike
The University of Texas at Austin
Department of Spanish & Portuguese
Batts Hall 110
Austin, TX 78712-1155
Work Tel: (512) 471-4936
Fax: (512) 471-4936
Email: d.koike@mail.utexas.edu

The award will be presented at the 1999 ACTFL Annual Meeting in Dallas. The winner will receive a plaque and a $500 cash award.