Vision Theory vs. Goal-Setting Theory: A Critical Analysis

Ali H. Al-Hoorie

Ahmed Al Shlowiy

English Language and Preparatory Year Institute
Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu
Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT: In recent years, vision has become a major theme in language motivation research, capturing a core feature of modern theories of language motivation. However, empirical investigations have mostly followed the prototypical design of administering self-report questionnaires and examining correlations among a handful of variables. At the same time, substantial overlap can be found between the current conceptualization of vision theory and the long-standing tradition of goal-setting theory. After demonstrating this substantial overlap, and taking our cues from goal-setting theory, this paper highlights critical gaps in current research into vision, including its sensory element, characteristics of effective vision, vision evolution over time, vision multiplicity and potential inter-vision conflict, vision mediators, collective vision, and the role of emotions and self-satisfaction at the end. The ultimate aim of this article is to propose a research agenda to examine the extent to which vision *can* be meaningfully distinguished from goal.
Keywords: language motivation, second language acquisition, vision, goal.

Teoría de la visión versus teoría del establecimiento de objetivos: un análisis crítico.

RESUMEN: En los últimos años, la visión se ha convertido en un tema principal en la investigación sobre la motivación del lenguaje, capturando una característica central de las teorías modernas sobre motivación del lenguaje. Sin embargo, las investigaciones empíricas han seguido principalmente el diseño prototípico de administrar cuestionarios de autoevaluación y examinar las correlaciones entre un puñado de variables. Al mismo tiempo, se puede encontrar una superposición sustancial entre la conceptualización actual de la teoría de la visión y la larga tradición de la teoría del establecimiento de objetivos. Después de demostrar esta superposición sustancial, y teniendo en cuenta nuestras indicaciones sobre la teoría del establecimiento de objetivos, este artículo destaca las brechas críticas en la investigación actual sobre la visión, incluyendo su elemento sensorial, características de visión efectiva, evolución de la visión a lo largo del tiempo, multiplicidad de visiones y posible conflicto entre ellas, mediadores visuales, visión colectiva y el papel de las emociones y la autosatisfacción al final. El propósito final de este artículo es proponer una agenda de investigación para examinar hasta qué punto la visión *puede* distinguirse significativamente del objetivo.
Palabras clave: motivación del lenguaje, adquisición de un segundo idioma, visión, objetivo

1. Introduction

In recent years, the second language (L2) motivation literature has witnessed the emergence of what Muir and Dörnyei (2013, p. 362) call *vision theory*. This idea refers to the proposal that imagery and vision of a desired, long-term goal could be a motivating factor in language learning. Vision theory has provided the foundation of the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). Although the L2 Motivational Self System draws from both the socio-educational model (Gardner, 1985, 2010) and self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987), it admittedly draws most heavily from possible selves theory (Markus & Nurius, 1986) as is evident in theory (focusing on vision and visualization), measurement (omitting discrepancy), and general methodological approach (relying on questionnaires rather than experimental manipulation of ideals and oughts). Just as Dörnyei, Henry, and Muir (2016) put it, the L2 Motivational Self System "is centered on a key premise rooted in the understanding that the way in which people imagine themselves in the future plays an important role in energizing their learning behavior in the present" (p. 53).

In addition to the above-mentioned theories, vision theory also draws from a fourth—though less-acknowledged—tradition, namely goal-setting theory (cf. Dörnyei et al., 2016, chap. 3; Locke & Latham, 1990, 2013c). In fact, Muir and Dörnyei (2013) describe goal-setting theory as "[t]he most obvious connection" (p. 366) to vision theory. Goal-setting theory has a long-standing tradition predating even the cognitive revolution itself (Locke, 1996; Locke & Latham, 1990). Locke and Latham (2006) report that it had been developed over a 25-year period from the results of around 400 laboratory and field studies. Despite all of this, goal-setting theory does not feature prominently in current vision theory literature or the language motivation field more generally. Closer comparison between these two theories however reveals considerable overlap, to the extent that it is not clear what contribution vision theory makes to knowledge of learner motivation over and above knowledge already known from goal-setting theory. Considering the decades-long history of goal-setting theory, it is important to examine how this new vision theory contributes to this literature in order to avoid repackaging existing constructs into new terminology (Al-Hoorie, 2018). In this article, we first overview some examples of the overlap between these two theories. We then highlight important gaps in vision theory literature that are yet to be addressed to a satisfactory extent in L2 research.

2. Parallel between vision theory and goal-setting theory

As Muir and Dörnyei (2013) explain, albeit briefly, there are a lot of themes in common between vision theory and goal-setting theory. These themes have not been explicitly discussed in the field to date, perhaps raising the perception that there is not much overlap between the two theories. This is especially problematic considering the occasionally different terminology used, and the somewhat different foci of the two theories considering their applied contexts and histories. In this section, therefore, we survey some examples of similarities between the two theories.

According to Dörnyei (2009; see also Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Hadfield & Dörnyei, 2013), the effect of the proposed vision-based approach requires the satisfaction of certain

conditions—or moderators to use a more technical language. These moderators have received considerable attention in the goals literature. In this section, we show some parallels and findings from the goals literature in mainstream psychology.

The first condition is that the ideal vision *needs to exist*. That is, the learner should formulate an ideal vision that s/he considers to be personally important. This idea can also be found in the goals literature. For example, Austin and Vancouver (1996) discuss the importance of "goal establishment". They argue that the origin of a goal could be external to the individual, internal, or a combination of the two. Austin and Vancouver (1996) then review research showing that external goals can be internalized through different mechanisms, most notably persuasion. Persuasion has been shown to facilitate both goal acceptance and subsequent commitment. In fact, the name of goal-*setting* theory demonstrates the importance of this step.

Another condition is *substantiating the vision*. This idea refers to the need for the learner to believe that the vision is plausible. Again, this notion is pervasive in the goals literature. As Bandura (2013) explains, self-efficacy plays a major role in goals. Cognitively, self-efficacy influences whether the individual thinks in a self-enhancing or self-debilitating way while they try to achieve their goals. Motivationally, self-efficacy has an effect on the level of goal difficulty that one selects, how much effort one then invests, and the degree of persistence at the face of setbacks. Affectively, one's beliefs in their coping ability influence their emotional life and vulnerability to depression and stress during the goal accomplishment struggle. Decisionally, self-efficacy influences what decisions are made and how well they are, then, implemented.

Vision theory also emphasizes the motivational effect of *visualization*. In contrast to vision—which concerns an ultimate end-state one strives to achieve, as explained above—visualization is typically a technique of mentally practicing task performance without a physical stimulus. Visualization has also been investigated in goal-setting theory for decades. For example, Morin and Latham (2000) conducted an experiment where they trained supervisors on mental practice to improve their communication skills and interaction with others. Six months later, trained supervisors exhibited higher self-efficacy compared to those in the control group. Self-efficacy, in turn, predicted both goal commitment and communication skills. As Austin and Vancouver (1996; see also Bandura, 1986) argue, mental simulation during planning can achieve comparable results to those obtained from behavioral practice.

A further condition is the *development of an action plan*. That is, the vision needs to be operationalized so that the learner has a roadmap of what needs to be done. A very similar notion is found in the goals literature. An important characteristic of effective goals is specificity. Interestingly, some goals literature actually downplays the role of specific goals on performance improvement, unless they are additionally coupled with an appropriate level of difficulty (see Locke & Latham, 1990). Without the difficulty dimension, the primary effect of goal specificity is to simply reduce variance among individuals since they are all following the same roadmap.

Besides, the vision *needs to be activated* in order to keep it alive. Similar to the previous factors, activation has also received substantial attention in the goals literature. Researchers have investigated factors such as salience, availability, and accessibility in memory. In fact, as Austin and Vancouver (1996) argue, the "more common understanding of goals is as dynamically conscious—shuttling in and out of working memory as required" (p. 345).

Continuous awareness of the goal is not required. Once a goal is adopted, it remains in the background of consciousness guiding and giving meaning to mental and physical actions leading to a goal (Locke & Latham, 1990). Actually, "at any point in time, more nonconscious goals are operating than conscious ones" (Austin & Vancouver, 1996, p. 346).

Another condition postulated in the vision tradition is *considering failure*. This is proposed to counterbalance the vision. In goal-setting theory, a somewhat similar aspect has been investigated, namely fear of failure (e.g., Latham & Locke, 2013). This tradition has focused on the need to decrease fear of failure in order to counteract its debilitating effects. A slightly different construct is that of balance between positive and negative expectations in the same domain (Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006). However, evidence seems mixed in this regard. For example, Knox (2006) suggests that feared possible selves are not salient for males. Furthermore, hardly any evidence for an independent effect of this negative dimension is currently available in the context of L2 learning.

This brief overview shows that there are a lot of shared themes between these two theories. It also points out some interesting avenues for future research. The next section focuses more explicitly on potential future research directions that could help delineate the distinction between these two theories.

3. CONTRIBUTION OF VISION THEORY

3.1. Does the sensory element of vision make a unique contribution to language learning motivation?

Although the term vision has a broad definition referring to a desired, long-term goal as explained above, vision theory advocates a narrower dimension emphasizing the sensory element of one's vision. To quote Hadfield and Dörnyei,

When we use the word 'vision', we use it literally: possible selves are more than mere long-term goals or future plans in that they involve tangible *images* and *senses*. If we have a well-developed possible future self, we can imagine this self in vivid, realistic situations…. possible selves are a *reality* for the individual: people can 'see' and 'hear' a possible self. (Hadfield & Dörnyei, 2013, p. 2, original emphasis)

Similarly, Dörnyei and Chan (2013) define vision as "the sensory experience of a future goal state or… a personalized goal that the learner has made his/her own by adding to it the imagined reality of the goal experience" (pp. 454-455). Based on this view, Dörnyei (2014) argues that there is a "qualitative difference" (p. 12) between goal and vision in that the latter contains sensory elements and tangible images of the desired outcome and how to achieve it, which is "unlike an abstract, cognitive goal" (p. 12).

Dörnyei and colleagues (e.g., Dörnyei, 2014; Dörnyei et al., 2016) additionally argue that a key brainchild of vision theory is *directed motivation currents* (henceforth, DMC), or what Ibrahim and Al-Hoorie (2019) call *sustained flow*. DMC is the unique flow-like motivational surge one can experience for a prolonged period of time. Dörnyei, Muir, and Ibrahim (2014) argue that vision is an integral component of the DMC experience, in that "the intensity of a DMC cannot be achieved without adding this visionary quality to guiding goals" (p. 13).

Considering the overlap between vision theory and goal-setting theory discussed in the previous section, it is essential to closely examine the role of vision and its unique contribution to the existing goals literature. Despite claims about the role of vision and its sensory element in particular, hardly any quantitative analysis has been conducted to examine the extent to which a sensory element contributes to learning motivation. Some qualitative research conducted to date, however, do not seem to support this hypothesis. For example, Ibrahim (2016b) found that his participants' DMC was fueled not by their visions but by the DMC experience itself. Vision was not a salient aspect for these learners, and was often completely absent. In fact, some participants reported deliberately *avoiding* visualization (see Ibrahim, 2016a). Similar findings were obtained by Henry, Davydenko, and Dörnyei (2015). In this study of female migrants and asylum seekers, the results also showed that the participants, despite the DMC experience, had only vague future visions. The authors conclude that "our analyses failed to reveal long-term goals that were explicitly defined. Nor did the women give voice to idealised versions or describe specific visions of future selves" (pp. 341–342). Instead, their motivation seemed to be sustained by classic factors such as goal-setting, appraisal of ability, and feedback. A further study was conducted by Murphy, Stubbings, and Uemura (2017). These researchers interviewed high-ability Japanese learners of English about their DMC experiences. The participants did not report vision or visualization of a future state to be a salient motivator for their DMC experience. In fact, even after direct questioning, only three out of the nine participants reported engaging in some form of visualization—and it was not reported as a key component.

The results of these studies suggest that, although a future vision might play some role in triggering DMC, there is currently no reason to believe that it is an indispensable component throughout the DMC experience. It is possible that DMC could instead be sustained by, for example, the pleasure of the activity or the sense of progress felt during the DMC experience. Considering the central role ascribed to the sensory element of vision, hypothesized as a qualitative difference between goals and visions, it is important to examine whether and to what extent this sensory element contributes to the DMC experience and to motivation more generally. It is equally important to quantify this effect in order to facilitate comparison to the effect of conventional goals. Two interventions (Chan, 2014; Magid, 2014) showed positive results but they lacked blinding and a control group. A third intervention (Mackay, 2014) found no significant differences between the treatment and the control groups. Ideally, an intervention study should include a control group that receives a conventional goal treatment (i.e., not involving a sensory element) in order to compare its effect on a visualization intervention.

3.2. What are the characteristics of effective vision?

Whether or not the sensory element plays a role, it is important to find out what characteristics make a vision more effective in motivating language learning. It has been argued that a special feature of vision is that it sheds light on goal importance and commitment. Dörnyei and colleagues (2016) argue that goal-setting theory "only goes as far as to state that high commitment is achieved if an individual is convinced that the goal is important, without elaborating much on what it is that makes goals 'important'" (Dörnyei et al., 2016, p. 41). However, it would be fair to say that goal-setting theory has paid a decent amount of

attention to what makes goals important and consequently enhances commitment. In fact, in their 1990 book, Locke and Latham devote two chapters to this topic. They set off stating that,

> The integrating principle behind the factors discussed in this section is that they lead the individual to believe that trying for or attaining the goal is *important* and do so without arousing conflict between the goal in question and other goals, or do so by eliminating such conflict. (Locke & Latham, 1990, pp. 132-133, original emphasis).

Locke and Latham (1990) then go on to review these commitment factors, including the role of authority (e.g., the teacher in the context of language learning), peers, and whether commitment is made publicly or privately. Locke and Latham (1990) also compare the effectiveness of self-set goals versus assigned goals (see pp. 167–169). Their review shows, for example, that self-set goals are not always superior to assigned goals in either goal commitment or performance improvement. Other characteristics influencing the effectiveness of goals include goal specificity, appropriate level of difficulty, feedback availability, task complexity, and situational constraints (Locke & Latham, 2006). An interesting concept in this regard is *goal intensity*, which refers to "the effort needed to set a goal, the position of a goal in an individual's goal hierarchy, and the extent to which a person is committed to goal attainment" (Locke & Latham, 2013a, p. 5).

Future research should investigate the extent to which the characteristics of an effective vision are similar or different from those of an effective goal. For example, future research could compare the motivational effect of self-set vision versus vision set by others such as the teacher and peers. Another line of research could examine the effect of making one's vision public, whether it increases commitment, how vision is revised based on reactions from others, and whether certain personality characteristics —including gender— plays a moderating role. It would also be interesting to find out whether it makes sense to speak of 'vision intensity' (i.e., the effort it requires, its importance, and how committed one is to realizing it).

3.3. Can the language learner have more than one vision? How does the learner handle vision multiplicity effectively?

Discussion of the sensory element of vision and of its characteristics is consistent with the general narrative in vision theory that assumes that the learner has a single vision. In fact, one would be hard-pressed to find the word *vision* in the plural form in relation to a single learner. In goal-setting theory, researchers have explored situations where multiple goals exist. As Locke and Latham (1990) review, goal interrelations have been conceptualized in various ways including hierarchies, networks, branching paths or trees, graphs, lattices, and vectors. In a similar vein, Sun and Frese (2013) discuss three types of goal typologies: independent goals (goals in different domains competing for one's limited resources), sequentially interdependent goals (achieving one goal leads to the other), and reciprocally interdependent goals (goals synergetically supporting each other). This dimension is sometimes called connectedness-complexity of goals (Austin & Vancouver, 1996).

In the language learning domains, it is not hard to imagine a learner possessing more than one vision. For example, a learner might hope to be a fluent speaker of the target language, and also a professional translator of legal documents. These two visions fall under the overall umbrella of linguistic proficiency but have different linguistic emphases and training requirements. A second learner, on the other hand, might have a linguistic vision and a cultural vision. The cultural vision could represent an interest in the cultural products of the target community such as their music, TV shows, and celebrities (Gardner, 1985, 2010). Because of the resulting reciproal effects, this learner may have an additional advantage in that leisure time activities become further learning opportunities. In contrast, a third learner might have conflicting visions. One vision might relate to academic achievement while the other to belonging to a certain social group, sometimes resulting in what have been called the norm of mediocrity (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Locke and Latham (2013b) describe vision as "a form of superordinate goal" (p. 629). According to the goals literature, one particular advantage of possessing such a long-term vision is that it reduces goal conflict (for a review, see Sun & Frese, 2013). That is, a superordinate goal can combine supporting subgoals performed daily, give an overall meaning to them, and facilitate synergy among them. Freitas, Clark, Kim, and Levy (2009) illustrate this notion by giving the example of the goal of "being excellent at work" and the goal of "eating healthy food". Although these two goals might at first seem too disparate, they can be sensibly combined under the higher-level goal of being "a successful, self-disciplined person".

Little language learning motivation research has explored the (possibly common) scenario of vision multiplicity. Lack of motivation may not only be because of a lack of vision, but also due to the presence of other visions competing for attention and energy. To better understand these processes, future research should examine how learners manage this multiplicity and how vision conflict could be resolved effectively.

3.4. How does vision evolve over time?

Whether the learner has one or multiple visions, it is also insightful to understand how they evolve over time. Goal-setting researchers have examined the developmental stages of goals. Austin and Vancouver (1996) describe four stages: establishing, planning, striving, and revising. That is, individuals first decide on what goals to pursue, make plans on how to go about doing that, exert effort trying to achieve these goals, and finally reflect on their experience and its outcomes. Other models propose three similar phases: forethought, performance, and self-reflection (Bandura, 1986; Zimmerman & Campillo, 2003). These models show how goal pursuit unfolds over time. Some researchers have also questioned the linearity of this process, arguing for the possibility of nonlinear and parallel processes (Austin & Vancouver, 1996; Simon, 1994).

Some language researchers have already explored the possibility of viewing motivation as a complex dynamic process (Dörnyei, MacIntyre, & Henry, 2015; Hiver & Al-Hoorie, 2016). However, there seems to be less interest in how vision itself changes over time. Currently, it is not clear how visions form in the first place, and what role parents, peers, and teachers play in shaping vision. Other factors could also contribute to vision change, including the source of the vision, its attainability, and the level of satisfaction from it. Investigations of change could be at different time-scales, ranging from micro to macro. Micro time-scales can

shed light on change within seconds and minutes and typically requires specialized software to capture variations accurately (e.g., the idiodynamic approach, MacIntyre, 2012) while macro investigations can extend years and even decades, which makes them less popular (Sugita McEown, Noels, & Chaffee, 2014). Investigating vision at these varying time-scales would enrich our understanding of learning motivation.

3.5. What are the mediators of vision? Through what mechanisms does vision exert their influence?

As surveyed in the first part of this article, some attention has been directed toward moderators, or what Dörnyei (2009) calls conditions of visions. However, less attention has been paid to mediators of visions. While moderators influence the effectiveness of vision, mediators explain the mechanisms of *how* vision exerts its effect. The goal-setting literature has a number of mechanisms including directive function (directing attention and effort toward goal-relevant activities and away from goal-irrelevant activities), energizing function (expending more effort, especially with difficult goals), persistence, and indirectly through arousal, discovery and use of relevant strategies and knowledge (Locke & Latham, 2002). More recently, goal researchers have examined additional mechanisms such as attributions, emotions, goal self-setting, and self-efficacy (Eberly, Liu, Mitchell, & Lee, 2013; Heslin & Caprar, 2013).

A potential mechanism through which vision exerts its effect is unconscious processes. Within goal-setting theory, some research has investigated this possibility. For example, Stajkovic, Locke, and Blair (2006) compared "assigned conscious goals" and "primed unconscious goals" and found that each made a contribution to improving performance. Interestingly, the researchers also found an interaction between the two, in that congruence between conscious and unconscious goals further improved performance to achieve conscious goals. Similarly, research by Shantz and Latham (2009, 2011) has shown that priming goals both in lab and field experiments can have a positive impact on motivated behavior. Shantz and Latham (2011) meta-analyzed the results from their research and found a moderate effect size of $d = 0.56$.

In their discussion of DMCs in language learning, Dörnyei et al. (2016) describe unconscious self-regulation as "admittedly an oxymoron" (p. 85). Language learning is a long-term enterprise with many intermediary steps. It would not be too surprising that unconscious processes play a role (Al-Hoorie, 2016a; Al-Hoorie, 2016b). A better understanding of the steps involved in actualizing vision, how learners struggle while doing so, what strategies and techniques are utilized by different learners during vision striving are important questions for future research. Little attention has been directed toward the process by which vision can have its effect and whether it is distinct from that of conventional goals.

3.6. Does collective vision exist? Is it possible to foster it?

Apart from what makes vision effective or how, most discussion of vision has assumed that it is held by an individual learner. Little attention has been paid to the possibility that a group of learners might share a collective vision and its dynamics. In goal-setting theory, *group goals* have been shown to be distinct *personal goals*. For example, group performance improves when personal goals are in line with group goals, but deteriorates when they are

in conflict (Seijts & Latham, 2000). Another difference is that personal goals are mediated by task strategy and individual effort, whereas group goals are mediated by team-related effort only (DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & Wiechmann, 2004).

When it comes to language learning, Ibrahim and Al-Hoorie (2019) examined collective DMCs, or what they call *shared, sustained flow*. They found that class projects can help foster the collective DMC experience. At the same time, their results also point to certain facilitative conditions including forming a group identity, attaching personal value, and providing partial autonomy. Research into collective vision is still at its infancy. It would be informative to investigate the visions held by learners in one class, how comparable they are, and to what extent such comparability contributes to motivation, effort, and eventual language learning achievement success.

3.7. How does vision relate to emotions and self-satisfaction?

Locke and Latham (2006) argue that goals are closely related to affect in that "goals set the primary standard for self-satisfaction with performance" (p. 265). In fact, Locke and Latham (1990, p. 234) report a strong weighted mean correlation ($r = .51$) between goal success and satisfaction. During the activity, also, goal setting is closely related to moment-to-moment affective states in that appropriate goals can increase interest and reduce boredom. Plemmons and Weiss (2013) go as far as to claim that it is "virtually impossible to discuss goal processes without reference to affect, just as it is impossible to discuss affect processes without reference to goals" (p. 117).

Within language learning motivation, there has been some interest in emotions lately (see Al-Hoorie, 2017). As vision is posited to represent the ultimate desire of the individual, or what the learner would like to become in the long run (Dörnyei, 2014), it would seem commonsense to argue that vision is firmly tied to emotions. When it comes to the DMC experience, it "offers an exciting and fully satisfying experience against which the emotional state of everyday life does not always compare" (Dörnyei et al., 2014, p. 99).

However, little research has investigated the interconnections between emotion and vision outside the admittedly extraordinary experience of DMC. It is likely that emotion plays a role in influencing vision selection, revision, and perception of performance out-comes. Different emotions (e.g., anxiety, sadness, anger) might also have different effects on these vision processes.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Just as Muir and Dörnyei (2013) put it, vision theory is "only one part of a wider narrative" (p. 362). It is therefore essential not to lose sight of the overall picture but care-fully examine the unique contribution of vision theory to this wider narrative. This type of examination might, in turn, suggest avenues for expanding current vision theory, including aspects that are taken for granted. For example, while current vision theory emphasizes discrepancy reduction, other theories additionally emphasize discrepancy *creation* (Locke & Latham, 2006) and discrepancy *production* (Bandura, 1997). Indeed, "negative discrepancy tells only half the story and not necessarily the more interesting half" (Bandura, 1997, p. 131).

The above discussion has also shown that an important tool to investigate vision is intentional intervention. Most research to date has relied on questionnaire-based observational designs and qualitative methods (Al-Hoorie, 2018; Lamb, 2017), leading Ushioda (2016) to describe such approaches as "rather dull" (p. 565). This status quo may be attributed to historical reasons, but for vision research to gain credibility, grappling with experimentation seems inevitable (Hiver & Al-Hoorie, 2020).

A running theme of this paper is the need to pinpoint what unique contribution vision theory can make to effective language over and above what is already known from the goals literature. The ability to visualize desired outcomes to improve motivation and performance has been around for decades (e.g., Clark, 1960). Back in the 1980s, Bandura argued that visualization exerts its effect through classical factors already known to psychologists back then,

> Having people visualize themselves executing activities skillfully raises their perceived self-efficacy that they will be able to perform better… Such boosts of self-efficacy are likely to improve performance by reducing impeding self-doubts and by enlisting the effort needed to do well. (Bandura, 1986, p. 62).

If this is the case, theorists should consider why vision should be considered qualitatively different from goals. Future research on this issue would hopefully shed more light on the apparently considerable overlap between these two theories.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

6. REFERENCES

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016a). Unconscious motivation. Part I: Implicit attitudes toward L2 speakers. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *6*(3), 423–454. doi:10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.3.4

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016b). Unconscious motivation. Part II: Implicit attitudes and L2 achievement. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *6*(4), 619–649. doi:10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.4.4

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Sixty years of language motivation research: Looking back and looking forward. *SAGE Open*. doi:10.1177/2158244017701976

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

Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*(3), 338–375. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.120.3.338

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2013). The role of self-efficacy in goal-based motivation. In E. A. Locke & G. P.

Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 147–157). Routledge.

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

Clark, L. V. (1960). Effect of mental practice on the development of a certain motor skill. *Research Quarterly. American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 31*(4), 560–569. doi:10.1080/10671188.1960.10613109

DeShon, R. P., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Schmidt, A. M., Milner, K. R., & Wiechmann, D. (2004). A multiple-goal, multilevel model of feedback effects on the regulation of individual and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(6), 1035–1056. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1035

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Future self-guides and vision. In K. Csizér & M. Magid (Eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning* (pp. 7–18). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning, 63*(3), 437–462. doi:10.1111/lang.12005

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. Routledge.

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

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D., & Henry, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Motivational dynamics in language learning*. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., Muir, C., & Ibrahim, Z. (2014). Directed Motivational Currents: Energising language learning by creating intense motivational pathways. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice* (pp. 9–29). John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, U. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Pearson.

Eberly, M. B., Liu, D., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2013). Attributions and emotions as mediators and/or moderators in the goal-striving process. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 35–50). Routledge.

Freitas, A. L., Clark, S. L., Kim, J. Y., & Levy, S. R. (2009). Action-construal levels and perceived conflict among ongoing goals: Implications for positive affect. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(5), 938–941. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.05.006

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model*. Peter Lang.

Hadfield, J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). *Motivating learning*. Routledge.

Henry, A., Davydenko, S., & 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

Heslin, P. A., & Caprar, D. V. (2013). Goals and self-efficacy as mediators. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 213–230). Routledge.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*(3), 319–340. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016). Putting complexity theory into practice: A dynamic ensemble for second language research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(4), 741–756. doi:10.1111/modl.12347

Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2020). *Research methods for complexity theory in applied linguistics*. Multilingual Matters.

Ibrahim, Z. (2016a). Affect in directed motivational currents: Positive emotionality in long-term L2 engagement. In P. D. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Positive psychology in SLA* (pp. 258–281). Multilingual Matters.

Ibrahim, Z. (2016b). *Directed Motivational Currents: Optimal productivity and long-term sustainability in second language acquisition*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Ibrahim, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2019). Shared, sustained flow: Triggering motivation with collaborative projects. *ELT Journal*, *73*(1), 51–60. doi:10.1093/elt/ccy025

Knox, M. (2006). Gender and possible selves. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 61–77). Nova Science Publishers.

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

Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2013). Potential pitfalls in goal setting and how to avoid them. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 569–579). Routledge.

Locke, E. A. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 5*(2), 117–124. doi:10.1016/S0962-1849(96)80005-9

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705–717. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*(5), 265–268. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00449.x

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2013a). Goal setting theory, 1990. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 3–15). Routledge.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2013b). Goal setting theory: The current state. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 623–630). Routledge.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2013c). *New developments in goal setting and task performance*. Routledge.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2012). The idiodynamic method: A closer look at the dynamics of communication traits. *Communication Research Reports, 29*(4), 361–367. doi:10.1080/08824096.2012.723274

Mackay, J. (2014). Applications and implications of the L2 Motivational Self System in a Catalan EFL context. In K. Csizér & M. Magid (Eds.), *The Impact of Self-Concept on Language Learning* (pp. 377–400). Multilingual Matters.

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

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41*(9), 954–969. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954

Morin, L., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effect of mental practice and goal setting as a transfer of training intervention on supervisors' self-efficacy and communication skills: An exploratory study. *Applied Psychology, 49*(3), 566–578. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00032

Muir, C., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). Directed Motivational Currents: Using vision to create effective motivational pathways. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 3*(3), 357–375.

Murphy, R. S., Stubbings, C., & Uemura, T. (2017). NeuroELT perspectives: Directed Motivational Currents —Theoretical, experimental, and pedagogical research. *University of Kitakyushu Kiban Center Journal, 29*, 19–135.

Oyserman, D., & Fryberg, S. (2006). The possible selves of diverse adolescents: Content and function across gender, race and national origin. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 17–39). Nova Science Publishers.

Plemmons, S. A., & Weiss, H. M. (2013). Goals and affect. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 117–132). Routledge.

Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 32*(2), 104–116. doi:10.1037/h0087105

Shantz, A., & Latham, G. P. (2009). An exploratory field experiment of the effect of subconscious and conscious goals on employee performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(1), 9–17. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.01.001

Shantz, A., & Latham, G. P. (2011). The effect of primed goals on employee performance: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management, 50*(2), 289–299. doi:10.1002/hrm.20418

Simon, H. A. (1994). The bottleneck of attention: Connecting thought with motivation. In W. D. Spaulding (Ed.), *Integrative views of motivation, cognition, and emotion: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 41, pp. 1–21). University of Nebraska Press.

Stajkovic, A. D., Locke, E. A., & Blair, E. S. (2006). A first examination of the relationships between primed subconscious goals, assigned conscious goals, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1172–1180. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1172

Sugita McEown, M., Noels, K. A., & Chaffee, K. E. (2014). At the interface of the Socio-Educational Model, Self-Determination Theory and the L2 Motivational Self System models. In K. Csizér & M. Magid (Eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning* (pp. 19–50). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sun, S. H., & Frese, M. (2013). Multiple goal pursuit. In E. A. Locke & G. P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (pp. 177–194). Routledge.

Ushioda, E. (2016). Language learning motivation through a small lens: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 49*(4), 564–577. doi:10.1017/S0261444816000173

Zimmerman, B. J., & Campillo, M. (2003). Motivating self-regulated problem solvers. In J. E. Davidson & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of problem solving* (pp. 233–262). Cambridge University Press.