RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorksj.ac.uk

Motivation as individual differences and task conditions from a regulatory focus perspective:

Their effects on L2 Korean speech performance

Yeji Han[1]

Kim McDonough[2]

[1] York St John University   [2] Concordia University

Corresponding author: Yeji Han

Address: York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York YO31 7EX

Email: y.han@yorksj.ac.uk

This version: July 8, 2019

Motivation as individual differences and task conditions from a regulatory focus perspective:

Their effects on L2 Korean speech performance

ABSTRACT

The role of individual differences in second language (L2) learning is widely acknowledged; however, how to accommodate individual differences in language teaching receives relatively little attention. Focusing specifically on motivation, this study explores the effectiveness of communicative tasks on Korean L2 speakers' complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexical dysfluency. Drawing upon the regulatory focus literature, the tasks were manipulated to emphasize either approach (i.e., promotion) or avoidance (i.e., prevention) motivational processes. Forty-seven Vietnamese learners of L2 Korean were randomly assigned to either promotion or prevention task and completed a scale-based questionnaire to assess their overall orientation to L2 instrumentality promotion/prevention. For data analysis, learners were median-split into promotion- and prevention groups based on their responses to the questionnaire items. 2 x 2 ANOVAs were conducted on linguistic measures (i.e., complexity, accuracy, fluency, lexical dysfluency) to investigate the main and interaction effects of L2 instrumentality promotion/prevention and task-induced promotion/prevention on L2 task performance. The quantitative findings revealed that L2 instrumentality prevention had a negative effect on the L2 speakers' accuracy. However, task-induced promotion/prevention had no main or interaction effects on their linguistic performance. Qualitative findings from interviews showed that the mismatch between L2 instrumentality promotion/prevention and task-induced promotion/prevention may distract from idea development during task performance. The findings are discussed in terms of pedagogical implications, in particular how to accommodate individual differences when developing teaching materials.

L2 task-based research to date has identified numerous affective and cognitive individual differences that mediate task performance (Dörnyei, 2014; Skehan, 1991, 2014), which legitimately calls into question a 'one-task-fits-all' approach to task-based instruction. Accordingly, there have been attempts to invent pedagogical activities that address individual differences; for instance, Gregersen and MacIntyre (2014) published a teaching resource that introduces activities designed to accommodate individual differences among learners. While innovative teaching activities such as motivational intervention or guided imaginary training reflect learner-centered approach to language teaching, the practicality of implementing such activities in class is somewhat questionable due to the lack of direct link with L2 morphosyntactic or phonological structure. Such 'side activities' apart from actual language teaching materials might be difficult to be incorporated in regular L2 class with short-and-limited class time.

To resolve such practical issues, task conditions could be diversified in a way that accommodates individual differences among learners. The current study attempts to create task conditions that reflect distinct motivation within the framework of regulatory focus; we chose this theoretical framework due to its potential for practical pedagogical intervention and theoretical accountability for the connection between motivation and task performance. To this date, only a few studies investigated the direct relationship between motivation and L2 task performance (e.g., Al Khalil, 2011; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004; Ma, 2009). The lack of motivation research in task-based language learning is surprising considering its conceptual relevance to a task and its potential to be enhanced through task conditions. While definitions of a task vary, there is consensus that a task includes a clearly defined non-linguistic outcome, which is the end-state that needs to be reached through a specified working procedure

(Ellis, 2009). Throughout the working procedure, language is used as a means of achieving the outcome; therefore, task performance itself is a motivational process working towards the end-state goal.

While the early L2 motivational studies have found significant correlations between motivational constructs and global measures of L2 learning outcomes such as grades (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972), only a few studies have attempted to explore how specific aspects of motivation are related to subdomains of L2 task performance. Both motivation and L2 performance are not unitary variables; subcomponents of L2 motivation play different roles in different aspects of L2 task performance such as quantity of speech (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000), (AlKhalil, 2011) and overall quality of task performance rated by native speaker judges (Ma, 2009). The overall findings of the previous studies show that situation-specific motivation such as attitudes towards a course or task had stronger effects on task performance than trait-based motivation, suggesting the importance of creating favourable learning environment and teaching materials. Also, a learner's general motivational orientation is influenced by environmental and temporal conditions such as task types manipulated based on the self-determination theory (Ma, 2009) or an interlocutor's motivation (Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004). However, beyond the empirical relationship between motivation and task performance, the lack of theoretical accountability makes it difficult to identify the precise role of L2 motivation in task performance. In sum, previous research supports that linguistic behavior during task performance derives from cognitive and motivational learning processes, which are influenced by task conditions. The nature of the interaction among learner factors and task conditions can be understood through reference to regulatory focus theory.

Regulatory Focus Theory

In psychology, regulatory focus theory was proposed as a process-oriented motivational theory that accounts for distinct motivational paths towards ideal self and ought self. Regulatory foci are distinctive motivational regulations, called *promotion* and *prevention*, towards ideal and ought selves (Higgins, 1998). A promotion focus involves eager approaching strategies moving towards ideal self, while a prevention focus involves vigilant avoidance strategies staying away from possible negative consequences, thus oriented towards ought self. They represent distinct, but not exclusive motivational dispositions towards the future selves.

In applied linguistics, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) proposed L2 motivational self system, taking into account of motivational dimension of the future selves. The model is composed of the ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self and L2 experience (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). The first two components are dynamic collection of self-images: the ideal L2 self represents what a learner ideally would like to become, and the ought-to L2 self represents what a learner thinks s/he ought to become (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). L2 learning experience is situation-specific motivation influenced by the immediate learning environment such as the influence of a teacher, peer group or learning materials. The motivational mechanism of the L2 motivational self system involves promotion and prevention foci, as learners try to fulfill the future-oriented ideal and ought-to L2 selves with efforts on momentary basis.

The concept of promotion and prevention orientations were initially applied to L2 instrumentality (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) to further differentiate between positive gains such as career achievements and educational opportunities (i.e., *L2 instrumentality promotion*) versus fears or concerns about negative losses, such as low course grades and test scores (i.e., *L2 instrumentality prevention*, Taguchi, Magid, & Papi., 2009). In addition to the conceptual level, regulatory focus has provided new dimensions of process-oriented L2 motivated (Papi,

Bondarenko, Mansouri, Feng, & Jiang, 2018; Papi & Teimouri, 2014; Teimouri, 2017). For example, Jang and Lee (2018) investigated the effects of the L2 selves on the different types of strategies and overall quality of L2 writing. The ideal L2 self predicted L2 writing quality and planning strategies, and although the ought-to L2 self was not a significant predictor, it did significantly correlate with revising strategies ($r = .24$, $p < .05$). The authors claimed that motivational processes involved in planning and revising strategies are promotion and prevention focus, respectively. In cognitive psychology, tasks that require creativity, fluency and risk-taking process (e.g., generating ideas) have promotion regulation while tasks that involve risk-avoidance and attention to details (e.g., detecting errors and proofreading text) have prevention regulation (Förster, Higgins, & Bianco, 2003; van Dijk & Kluger, 2011). Planning strategies involve motivation in eager manner, such as developing and organizing ideas and facilitating overall writing procedure with creativity. The advancement of ideas and writing process are conceptually mapped onto promotion whereas revising strategies, which entail focused attention to details and accuracy in vigilant manner, is related to prevention-focused strategic behavior.

Pedagogical and Theoretical Implications of Regulatory Fit

Due to the theoretical and empirical connection between cognitive and motivational process, matching a learner's motivational orientation with the means used to achieve a goal may facilitate goal pursuit behaviour. In other words, a learner with a promotion motivational tendency may exert motivated behaviour more strongly in promotion-focused task conditions than prevention-task conditions (Higgins, 2000). Regulatory fit theory provides solid theoretical ground for creating tasks that accommodate individual learners' motivational tendencies. However, a remaining challenge is how to design tasks that complement specific motivation orientations.

Recently, there have been a few applied linguistics studies that conceptualize regulatory focus as task-induced conditions that can be manipulated to impact task performance. For example, Papi (2018) conducted an experimental study on L2 vocabulary learning using promotion- and prevention-focused reward systems that reflected gain or loss incentive frames. ESL participants in the promotion condition were informed that they would enter a drawing to win $100 if they earn more than 75 points out of 100. On the other hand, the participants in the prevention condition were instructed to try not to lose more than 25 points out of 100 in order to enter the drawing. The interesting finding from the study was the interaction effect between the task conditions and individual motivational tendencies. The prevention-oriented learners performed better in the prevention condition than in the promotion condition, supporting regulatory focus fit theory in L2 context.

To operationalize task-induced regulatory focus, Papi (2018) manipulated a reward system, while the task content was identical in the promotion and prevention conditions (i.e., task-independent approach). However, it is also possible to manipulate task content itself to reflect promotion or prevention focus (i.e., task-integral approach), in which case task characteristics are structured around either approach or avoidance. Adopting the task-integral approach, Han and McDonough (2018) applied promotion and prevention focus to an L2 oral monologic speech task. The promotion task was to explain reasons why certain places are good for a field trip, while the prevention task was to explain reasons why certain places should be avoided for a field trip. The results showed that the prevention-focused task led to higher accuracy (i.e., lower error rate) and higher fluency (i.e., faster speech rate) than the promotion-focused task. No main or interaction effects for individual motivational orientation and motivational task condition were found, possibly due to the low reliability of the

promotion/prevention scales and the small number of the participants. The divergent findings may be due to the different modes of L2 performance, i.e., incidental vocabulary learning in Papi (2018) versus their focus on monologic speaking performance.

Due to the scarcity of regulatory focus research in the broader topic of L2 motivation, the findings of the studies to date are not generalizable to other L2 learning contexts or learner populations. However, the research designs and findings of the two studies provide theoretical and empirical basis for developing teaching materials that reflect learners' motivational orientations and trigger particular types of motivation through task conditions. The potential for pedagogical intervention that draws upon students' motivational strengths without requiring additional class time could bridge the gap between individual differences research and L2 pedagogy.

It is worth noting that the L2 motivational self system was developed in the context of learning global English (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009), and previous studies within the framework have been highly skewed towards L2 English (Boo, Dörnyei, & Ryan, 2015). Consequently, the applicability of the L2 selves concept has been questioned in languages other than English (LOTEs) contexts (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2017). To expand the empirical basis of motivation research to include LOTEs, this study targets Vietnamese learners of L2 Korean. Similar to global English, L2 Korean in Vietnam has instrumental values, as it is associated with perceived opportunities for higher education and socioeconomic capital (Han, 2017). A unique component of L2 Korean involves the interest in Korean pop culture, called *Korean Wave* (Jin, 2016). Additionally, due to historical and political influence of China, Vietnamese learners are expected to have exam pressure and a strong sense of responsibility for family, which can be found in the Confucian cultural zone (Apple, Silva, & Fellner, 2016). Since both the geological context and

target language are important constituents of culture, the target population in this study was chosen to diversify cultural understanding of L2 motivation.

The current study created pedagogical tasks for L2 Korean students with task-integral regulatory focus conditions (promotion or prevention) to assess their impact, alone and in combination with L2 motivational orientation, on students' linguistic task performance during interactive task performance. Their L2 motivational orientation was operationalized as L2 instrumentality promotion and prevention (Taguchi et al., 2009), while the tasks were manipulated to elicit promotion or prevention focus. Linguistic performance was operationalized in terms of linguistic measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency that were previously validated for L2 Korean with the addition of lexical dysfluency as a complementary fluency measure. The research question is:

RQ: Do communicative tasks that manipulate regulatory focus affect L2 Korean's complexity, accuracy, fluency, or lexical dysfluency during interactive task performance, either alone or in combination with students' L2 motivational orientation?

Method

Participants

The participants were 47 undergraduate Vietnamese students from departments of Korean studies at three universities in Hanoi, Vietnam. They were young adults with a mean age of 20.13 ($SD = .9$) and the gender distribution was highly skewed towards women (2 men, 45 women) which reflects the gender imbalance of the target population. The admission rates of the undergraduate programs were highly competitive. The programs' requirements included courses on Korean language on different skill areas, Korean linguistics, Korean–Vietnamese translation, Korean culture and history, and business internships at Korean companies. Additionally, students

are required to pass advanced level in a standardized Korean test called *Test of Proficiency in Korean* (TOPIK). Instrumental values of learning L2 Korean were highly acknowledged because most of graduates of the programs work at Korean institutions or pursue graduate studies in South Korea. The Vietnamese government has recently launched out teaching Korean as a foreign language subject in secondary school, but most of the participants at the time of the data collection entered the programs with little prior knowledge in Korean language.

Materials

The materials included a paper-based L2 motivation questionnaire and three interactive tasks. The questionnaire consisted of 12 items on L2 instrumentality promotion and prevention adopted from Taguchi et al. (2009). Each statement was anchored with 5-point Likert scales (1 = *strongly agree*, 5 = *strongly disagree*). The scale was reversed for the statistic analyses. The internal consistency of the measure was acceptable (Cronbach's α for L2 instrumental promotion = .71; L2 instrumental prevention = .89). The written consent form and questionnaire were provided in Vietnamese. As shown in Table 1, two task types were developed. For each task, the tasks were manipulated to create two versions that triggered either promotion or prevention focus. The first task, adapted from Han and McDonough (2018), was a role-play activity between a class president and reporter who were selecting locations for a departmental field trip. Six pictures of famous attractions in Hanoi were provided. For the promotion condition, the task was to select three desirable locations for the field trip, while the prevention condition task was to select three locations to avoid. The other task was a role-play between two friends who were deciding how to persuade a friend to accept (promotion) or reject (prevention) a job offer. In both promotion- and prevention-focused conditions, the same job lists were provided, which included advantages and disadvantages of the positions. Two versions of the job offer tasks were

created, one for a bank teller position and one for a tour guide. Thus, the total of three tasks were created for each promotion and prevention condition: the field trip, bank teller, and tour guide task. The written task materials and the oral task instructions were given in Korean.

Table 1

Summary of Tasks

Task Name	Task Type	Participant's Role in Task	Task Condition	Task Instruction
Destinations of field trip	Decision-making	Class president	Promotion	Select three good places for a field trip and explain why.
			Prevention	Select three places to avoid and explain why.
Giving advice about job offers	Collaborative reasoning	Friend	Promotion	Discuss reasons why a friend should accept job offers
			Prevention	Discuss reasons why a friend should reject job offers

Procedure

The data collection was carried out in a research lab at a university in Hanoi, Vietnam during individual sessions with each participant. After getting permission from the departments of Korean studies, the research was advertised by university emails and word of mouth, and the participants were invited through Google poll. When the participants arrived in the research lab, the first researcher explained the purpose and procedure of this study. After providing consent in a written form, the participants carried out the three oral tasks in either promotion or prevention

condition for approximately 20 to 30 minutes with the first researcher, and their interaction was audio-recorded for data analysis. Feedback was provided only if an error impeded the communication of meaning. Immediately after the oral tasks, a post-task interview followed. The participants were encouraged to talk about their thinking process during the task performance in Korean or Vietnamese depending on their preference. The interview was highly unstructured; and no preset question list was followed.

Data Analysis

The audio-recordings were transcribed and analyzed in terms of complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexical dysfluency. The measure of complexity was the mean number of dependent clauses per C-unit, which has been validated for L2 Korean by Kim, Nam, and Lee (2016). Accuracy was operationalized as the number of error-free C-units divided by the total number of C-units. The accuracy index was chosen based on Lee (2001)'s finding that the measure is the most sensitive to L2 Korean speech data among other accuracy indexes. Fluency was coded as speech rate based on syllable unit, i.e., the number of syllables divided by the total time spoken by the participant during the first minute of the task performance of each task. The fluency measure was validated for L2 Korean data by significant correlation with L2 Korean proficiency level (Kim, et al., 2016). However, to augment the fluency measure, lexical dysfluency was coded following Ortega (1995) as the number of self-correction, partial words, repetition divided by the total number of words. The indexes of lexical dysfluency were coded based on the number of episodes, not the number of cases. For example, the sentence '저는 저는 안 갔어요. 저는 안 갔어요. [I I didn't go. I didn't go]' involves two cases of repetitions: A word 'I' and a sentence 'I didn't go', but this part was coded as one episode of lexical dysfluency.

For coding reliability, 10% of the speech data was coded by an independent coder following training from the first researcher. The training session consisted of reviewing the definitions of the key terms such as an error, C-unit, self-correction, partial word, and repetition and practice coding the linguistic data. The interrater reliability was assessed using two-way mixed average-measures intraclass correlation. The intraclass correlation was .98 for complexity., 95 for accuracy, .94 for fluency, and .96 for lexical dysfluency.

The numeric values of the questionnaire items for L2 instrumentality promotion and prevention were summed separately. To create a group variable, each participant's L2 instrumentality promotion score was deducted from the L2 instrumentality prevention score. A median-split on the resulting score was used to create promotion and prevention orientation groups, (i.e., lower scores = promotion-oriented group; higher scores = prevention-oriented group). Four participants who fell into the median score (−2.00) were excluded from the ANOVA analyses. The post-task interview was transcribed, and comments were qualitatively examined to further elaborate the quantitative findings.

Results

This study investigated the effect of motivation as individual orientations and communicative task conditions on L2 speech performance, in particular, complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexical dysfluency. The mean and standard deviation of the motivational and linguistic variables are presented in Table 2 (the sum of L2 instrumentality promotion scale: $M = 25.53$, $SD = 2.87$; the sum of L2 instrumentality prevention scale: $M = 22.94$, $SD = 5.31$; complexity: $M = .39$, $SD = .16$; accuracy: $M = .63$, $SD = .15$; fluency: $M = 2.27$, $SD = .55$; lexical dysfluency: $M = .12$, $SD = .05$).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Motivational Variables and Linguistic Measures

Task Condition	L2 Instrumentality Promotion	L2 Instrumentality Prevention	Complexity	Accuracy	Fluency	Lexical Dysfluency
Promotion n = 24	25.04 (2.58)	22.21 (5.58)	.35 (.18)	.62 (.18)	2.33 (.64)	.12 (.05)
Prevention n = 23	26.04 (3.13)	23.70 (5.01)	.43 (.13)	.64 (.12)	2.22 (.46)	.12 (.04)
Total	25.53 (2.87)	22.94 (5.31)	.39 (.16)	.63 (.15)	2.27 (.55)	.12 (.05)

As a preliminary step, a correlation analysis was conducted to get a sense of the associations between motivation and linguistic performance. As shown in Table 3, lexical dysfluency and complexity were significantly correlated with L2 instrumentality promotion ($r = -.30$, $p = .02$) and L2 instrumentality prevention, respectively ($r = -.27$, $p = .04$). In general, the quality of task performance was negatively associated with motivational orientations except lexical dysfluency.

Table 3

Correlations of Motivational Variables and Linguistic Measures

Task Condition	L2 Instrumentality	Complexity	Accuracy	Fluency	Lexical Dysfluency
Promotion n = 24	Promotion	−.23	−.09	.17	−28
	Prevention	−.33	−.25	−.21	.00
Prevention n = 23	Promotion	−.32	−.09	.07	−.34
	Prevention	−.31	−.28	−.13	−.15

Total	Promotion	−.22	−.07	.10	−.30*
	Prevention	−.27*	−.25	−.19	.07

Note. * $p < .05$

For the main and interaction effects of regulatory focus on L2 task performance, four separate ANOVAs were conducted on complexity, accuracy, fluency and lexical dysfluency. The results from ANOVAs showed that L2 motivational orientations had a significant effect on accuracy [$F(1, 37) = 7.24, p = .01$]: Higher L2 instrumentality prevention was shown to predict lower level of accuracy. The main effects of task conditions and the interaction effect of motivational orientations and task conditions on accuracy were not significant [task conditions, $F(1, 37) = .01, p = .94$; the interaction effect, $F(1, 37) = .24, p = .63$]. The ANOVA results for complexity, fluency and lexical dysfluency were not significant. The statistical analyses showed that accuracy is negatively affected by L2 instrumentality prevention.

Table 4

ANOVA Results for Complexity

	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.	*F*	*p*
L2 Motivational Orientation	1	.00	.00	.11	.74
Task	1	.04	.04	1.07	.31
L2 Motivational Orientation * Task	1	.00	.00	.01	.91

Table 5

ANOVA Results for Accuracy

	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.	*F*	*p*
L2 Motivational Orientation	1	.15	.15	7.24	.01*

	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.	F	p
Task	1	.00	.00	.01	.94
L2 Motivational Orientation * Task	1	.00	.00	.24	.63

Table 6

ANOVA Results for Fluency

	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.	F	p
L2 Motivational Orientation	1	.27	.27	.81	.37
Task	1	.17	.17	.50	.48
L2 Motivational Orientation * Task	1	.01	.01	.04	.84

Table 7

ANOVA Results for Lexical Dysfluency

	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.	F	p
L2 Motivational Orientation	1	.00	.00	.50	.48
Task	1	.00	.00	.02	.90
L2 Motivational Orientation * Task	1	.00	.00	.21	.65

For the qualitative analysis of the interview data, the comments were examined and selected if they elucidate the research question as to motivational influence on task performance or interaction between participants' motivational orientations and the task conditions. Five students mentioned the mismatch between the task instruction and their idea development process during task performance. In Excerpt 1, Student 4 and Student 5 were given non-fit task instructions, which do not match their motivational orientations (i.e., promotion orientation-

prevention task, prevention orientation-promotion task). Student 1 and Student 3 were in the fit

conditions (i.e., promotion orientation-promotion task, prevention orientation-prevention task);

however, they mentioned content related to the other type of motivation. Student 2, who

mentioned the mismatch, had a neutral motivational orientation. She was given the prevention

task instruction, but the interview showed that she was interested in talking about positive

aspects of the job description.

Excerpt 1

Mismatch between Task Conditions and Motivational Process from Interview

Student 1 in prevention condition

[S1: I had to force myself to think and talk about negative points because all of these places are

great. These are population attractions. I chose these places according to the task instruction, but

I wasn't really into what I was saying.

Student 2 in prevention condition

S2: I wanted to say good things about this job. I could start off positive aspects first and then

move to negative points.

Student 3 in promotion condition

S3: I was thinking that the movie theater is expensive for students and boring….but I didn't say it

because it's a negative aspect of the place.

Student 4 in promotion condition

S4: When I first looked at the job description, I didn't like this job because of the low salary. I

was only thinking about negative aspects of this job….

(after several turns) You (the first researcher) kept talking about positive aspects of this job so I

[switched] my mindset from being negative to positive.

Student 5 in prevention condition

S5: I wanted to talk about positive aspects of the places rather than negative aspects. I think it is more difficult to talk about negative points than positive points.]

Among the five students, Student 4 showed the strongest prevention orientation among the 44 participants based on the composite questionnaire score (i.e., L2 instrumentality prevention minus L2 instrumentality promotion). Thus, we chose to closely investigate the transcript of Student 4's task performance. The researcher tried to encourage promotion focus during the task performance; however, Student 4 primarily mentioned negative reasons in all three tasks. Excerpt 2 shows examples of prevention-focus comments from her task performance.

Excerpt 2

Student 4 with the Strongest Prevention in Promotion Task Condition (S = Student 4, R = Researcher)

Field trip task

[R: (describing picture of an attraction) These are floating houses in the sea. People live on the sea.

S: It's scary. [We] might sink when [we] sleep there.

(after several turns)

R: Is there anything you want to add on the report form?

S: We can't buy [souvenir] because things are too expensive there.

(after several turns)

R: We can do outdoor activities there.

S: However, it's going to be difficult because the street is crowded with people at night.

Tourist job activity

R: What do you think about this job?

S: (laugh) I don't like this job. The salary is too low. (after several turns) The working time is too long. She will get tired by working till 9 p.m. It's not okay. (after several turns) There are advantages and disadvantages of this job. She would be better not to accept this offer.

Bank teller job activity

R: I think this is a really good job. It offers excellent salary and working conditions.

S: That's right, but there are not-so-good aspects too. (after several turns) It's too far from the city. (after several turns) She is going to get stressed from the work. (after several turns) She might not get along with her colleagues because they are too strict and authoritarian.]

Discussion

This study created a bridge between L2 motivation theory and teaching practice by drawing upon the regulatory focus framework to create tasks that elicited either promotion and prevention focus. With regards to the effects of motivational orientations on task performance, accuracy was negatively influenced by prevention-instrumentality. The result was counter-intuitive because a prevention focus conceptually represents vigilant motivational process, reflecting the sensitivity to negative outcomes. L2 learners with a strong prevention orientation are likely to try to avoid making errors, which is often perceived as negative outcomes during L2 task performance. The unexpected negative association between L2 instrumentality prevention and accuracy might be attributed to anxiety. The post-task performance interview data supports this view. Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4 are contrasting comments from two students who showed the strong or weak orientations towards L2 instrumentality prevention.

Excerpt 3

A Student with Strong L2 Instrumentality Prevention

[I couldn't recall the grammatical (particle). I repeated the phrase several times because I couldn't continue the sentence with a proper grammar item. That made me nervous.]

Throughout the interview, she was concerned about using proper grammar and was anxious when she failed to recall the correct grammatical forms. On the other hand, Excerpt 4 is from a student who had a low score on L2 instrumentality prevention.

Excerpt 4

A Student with Weak L2 Instrumentality Prevention

[I was searching for a proper vocabulary item. I was laughing because I couldn't recall the word I was looking for.]

Unlike the student in Excerpt 3, the student in Excerpt 4 showed a different emotional reaction to her inability to recall a vocabulary item. During the interview, the student in Excerpt 4 mostly talked about content of the tasks rather than language. The two excerpts cannot be generalized to the entire sample but illustrate how anxiety may have co-occurred with the prevention orientation. L2 instrumentality prevention involves long-term goals related to grades on Korean tests and courses, and the grade-dimension of it conceptually overlaps with the subconstructs of *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety* (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986), that is, *test anxiety* and *fear of negative evaluation*. Test pressure was found to be commonly experienced among Asian learner populations (Apple et al., 2016), which might be the case for the participants in this study. If test pressure triggers prevention orientation and anxiety concurrently, anxiety might have been be a mediating factor for the results.

According to the self-discrepancy theory in psychology (Higgins, 1987), responsibilities related to ought self may trigger anxiety when the discrepancy between the current state and

expected responsibilities is realized but not satisfied. Since a prevention focus is motivational

process towards ought self, the positive relationship between L2 instrumentality prevention and

anxiety is theoretically valid. If learners with the strong prevention orientation were more prone

to be anxious, the attentional focus on language might have led to more errors when the vigilant

attention against making errors are combined with anxiety. In the field of applied linguistics,

Papi (2010) empirically supported the relationship between the ought-to L2 self and L2 English

anxiety, and L2 anxiety has detrimental effects on task performance (e.g., Aida, 1994; Sheen,

2008). The possible influence of anxiety could also account for the divergent result from Han

and McDonough (2018), which showed the positive relationship between accuracy and task-

induced prevention. Task-induced prevention is temporarily triggered, therefore not likely to be

related to trait-based L2 anxiety.

In terms of lexical dysfluency, L2 instrumentality promotion was significantly correlated

to the less frequent lexical dysfluency markers, hence, the better speech performance. Although

the main effect was not significant in ANOVA, the significant correlation implies that learners

with high L2 instrumentality promotion concentrated more on language than content compared

to those who were with low L2 instrumentality promotion. The results can be better explained by

the findings of Kormos and Dörnyei (2004), which showed negative correlation between a

conversation partner's perceived incentive values of L2 learning and lexical richness. It should

be noted that in Kormos and Dörnyei (2004), the measure of incentive values of L2 learning is

very close to L2 instrumentality promotion such as education and career opportunities. Lexical

diversity of L2 speech, in turn, may result in lexical dysfluency because learners who tried a

wide range of vocabulary out of their comfort zone were more likely to stumble, producing

partial words, self-correction and repetition, which were coded as lexical dysfluency markers in

this study.

The lack of motivational effects on fluency was unexpected. Following Han and McDonough (2018) fluency was operationalized as speech rate based on syllable unit. However, this study adopted interactive tasks for longer period of time, while the previous study used a monologue task which lasted only for a few minutes. The dyadic interactive mode could have led to the divergent result because speech rate might be susceptible to interlocutor's speech during interaction. Overall, it is not surprising that learner' motivational orientations were found to play a role in the interactive task performance, considering that L2 interaction is goal-directed behaviour between two persons working towards a communicative goal.

With regards to task-induced motivational effects, no task effects on L2 task performance were unexpected because past studies have consistently shown strong influence of short-term task-related motivation on L2 task performance (e.g., Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004; Ma, 2009). The difference from the previous studies may be accounted by the different characteristics of task motivation. In the previous studies, task motivation was defined as learners' perceived preference towards tasks, whereas this study aimed to purposely trigger particular types of motivation through task instructions. Since L2 motivation fluctuates both in long-term and short-term (e.g., Hiromori, 2009; Pawlak, 2012; Shoaib & Dörnyei, 2005; Waninge, Dörnyei, & de Bot, 2014), regulatory focus triggered by the task instructions may not have successfully lasted during the L2 interactive task performance.

Also, the interactive nature of the tasks might have masked the effects of temporarily triggered regulatory focus because attentional resources were spread and divided into interaction with the interlocutor. Monologue task settings, such as the speaking-alone condition and planning time, resemble a speaking test rather than real-life speech behaviour; thus, a monologue

task could trigger intense concentration on the task itself. On the other hand, during interactive task performance, attentional allocation is directed to interaction with the interlocutor, possibly resulting in scattered attention to promotion or prevention dimensions of the task. The interaction effects between L2 motivational orientations and task conditions on task performance were not significant; however, the post-task interview revealed that the mismatch between L2 motivational orientations and task-induced regulatory focus can be distracting the process of idea development.

Conclusion

In conclusion, theoretical contribution of this study to L2 motivation research lies in the connection between the L2 selves and temporary L2 learning experience. The process-oriented characteristics of regulatory focus can address how the future-directed L2 selves interact with L2 learning process that occurs momentarily. To this date, L2 motivation as a field has been somewhat isolated from instructed SLA despite its associations to linguistic dimensions of task performance (e.g., Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Kormos & Dörnyei, 2004). The empirical findings from the previous research showed *what* aspects of task performance are affected by motivation but hardly explained *why* such connection takes place. Regulatory focus, grounded in cognitive process of goal-pursuit behaviour, accounts for why learners choose to allocate attention on different linguistic dimensions of task performance. Among with previous L2 research on regulatory focus (Han & McDonough, 2018; Jang & Lee, 2018; Papi, 2018), this study reframes linguistic dimensions of task performance as motivational decision, that is promotion and prevention.

In addition, the research design of this study provides a new perspective on instructed SLA. While the need for accommodating individual differences in L2 learning has been widely

acknowledged, a means to incorporate individual differences in L2 tasks has been rarely discussed. L2 task instructions structured around promotion and prevention focus provide potentials to create task conditions that match individual differences or temporarily trigger certain types of motivation with task design. For future research, classroom-based intervention research is a promising direction for researchers and teachers. Peer interaction between learners with similar or different motivational orientations may yield different levels of engagement: Pairs of similar motivational orientations may show better task engagement than pairs of incongruent motivational profiles. Knowing individual learners' motivational tendencies may help create learning environment that fits learners' motivational orientations. This line of research would inform teachers how to pair up students for task-based interaction to take full advantage of peer interaction. Moreover, understanding individual learners' motivational tendencies would enable to design and implement tasks oriented towards their motivational profile. Regulatory focus can provide a framework for incorporating motivation into their teaching strategies and task design. According regulatory fit theory (Higgins, 2000), a match between a person's motivational orientation towards a goal and the means to achieve the goal (i.e., task condition) improves task engagement. Teaching with tailored tasks may increase task engagement, which potentially leads to enhanced learning outcomes. In this way, individual differences on motivation would be accommodated in L2 teaching in practical manner, which is likely to lead to satisfying learning process and outcomes.

Apart from theoretical and pedagogical implications, this study contributes to diversify learner population and target language in SLA literature. Cross-cultural research with learners who have different sociocultural and L1 background would be interesting direction for future research. Since L2 motivation is highly culture-bound, the influence of motivation on L2 task

performance could vary across different learner populations. Asian learners of an Asian language have received little attention in the field, while Asian learners of global English has become a majority of research population (Apple et al., 2016). Given their unique sociocultural aspects, the target research population should bring about diverse types of motivation. We will continue studying this line of research as a way to help diversify instructed SLA.

References

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language
 anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(2),
 155−168.

AlKhalil, M. K. (2011). *Second language motivation: Its relationship to noticing, affect, and
 production in task-based interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgetown
 University, DC.

Apple, M. T., Silva, D. D., & Fellner, T. (Eds.) (2016). *L2 selves and motivations in Asian
 contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Boo, Z, Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005−2014: Understanding a
 publication surge and a change landscape. *System,55*, 145−157.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The motivational self system. In Z. Dornyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.),
 Motivation, language identity and the L2 self, (pp. 9−42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second
 language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task
 performance. *Language teaching research*, *4*(3), 275−300.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International
 Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 221–246.

Förster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Bianco, A. T. (2003). Speed/accuracy decisions in task

performance: Built-in trade-off or separate strategic concerns? *Organizational Behavior*

and Human Decision Processes, 90(1), 148–164.

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

MA: Newbury House.

Gregersen, T. & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). *Capitalizing on language learners' individuality:*

From premise to practice. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Han, Y. (2017). *L2 regulatory focus in the context of Korean language learning in Vietnam*

(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Concordia University, Montreal, QC.

Han, Y. & McDonough, K. (2018). Korean L2 speakers' regulatory focus and oral task

performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *56*(2),

181–203.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*,

94, 319–340.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle.

Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, *30*, 1–46.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American psychologist*, *55*(11),

1217–1230.

Hiromori, T. (2009). A process model of L2 learners' motivation: From the perspectives of

general tendency and individual differences. *System*, *37*(2), 313–321.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The*

Modern language journal, *70*(2), 125–132.

Jang, Y. & Lee, J. (2018). The effects of ideal and ought-to L2 selves on Korean EFL learners' writing strategy use and writing quality. *Reading and Writing*. 1–20. doi: 10.1007/s11145-018-9903-0

Jin, D. (2016). *New Korean Wave: Transnational cultural power in the age of social media.* University of Illinois press.

Kim, Y., Nam, J., & Lee, S. Y. (2016). Correlation of proficiency with complexity, accuracy, and fluency in spoken and written production: Evidence from L2 Korean. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages, 19*, 147–181.

Kormos, J. & Dörnyei, Z. (2004). The interaction of linguistic and motivational variables in second language task performance. *Zeitschrift für interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht, 9*(2), 1–19.

Lee, Y. G. (2001). Effects of task complexity on L2 production. *The Korean Language in America, 6*, 53–67.

Ma, J. H. (2009). *Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in L2 learners' task motivation: A self-determination theory perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Ortega, L. (1995). *The effect of planning in L2 Spanish narratives*. (Research Note #15). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System, 38*, 467–479.

Papi, M. (2018). Motivation as quality. Regulatory fit effects on incidental vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 1–24. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1017/S027226311700033X

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2018). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2×2 model of L2 self-guides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1–25. doi:10.1017/S0272263118000153

Papi, M. & Teimouri, Y. (2014). Language learner motivational types: A cluster analysis study. *Language Learning, 64*, 493–525. doi:10.1111/lang.12065

Pawlak, M. (2012). The dynamic nature of motivation in language learning: A classroom perspective. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching 2*(2). 249–278.

Plonsky, L. & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How big is "big"? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning*, *64*(4), 878−912.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning*, *58*(4), 835−874.

Shim, D. (2008). The growth of Korean cultural industries and the Korean wave. In B. H. Chua & K. Iwabuchi (Eds.), *East Asian pop culture: Analysing the Korean wave* (pp. 15−52). Aberdeen, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Shoaib, A. & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Affect in lifelong learning: Exploring L2 motivation as a dynamic process. In P. Benson & D. Nunan (Eds.). *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 22−41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *13*(2), 275−298.

Skehan, P. (2014). Foreign language aptitude and its relationship with grammar: A critical

    overview. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(3), 367−384.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese,

    Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E.

    Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66−96). Bristol:

    Multilingual Matters.

Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language*

    Acquisition, 39(4), 681−709.

TOPIK 한국어능력시험. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.topik.go.kr

Ushioda, E. & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Beyond global English: Motivation to learn languages in a

    multicultural world: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal,*

    101(3), 451−454.

Van Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. (2011). Task type as a moderator of positive/negative feedback

    effects on motivation and performance: A regulatory focus perspective. *Journal of*

    Organizational Behavior, 32(8), 1084−1105.

Waninge, F., Dörnyei, Z., & de Bot, K. (2014). Motivational dynamics in language learning:

    Change, stability, and context. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(3), 704−723.