

## **Pedagogic Relations of Achievement Goal Model and Critical Literacy Development in Korea's EFL Contexts**

**Jong-Hee Lee**

Kangwon National University

**Lee, Jong-Hee. (2008). Pedagogic relations of achievement goal model and critical literacy development in Korea's EFL contexts. *Modern English Education*, 9(3), 102-122.**

This study reports the extent to which achievement goal theory can be applied to critical literacy education regarding its pedagogical implications in Korean classroom settings. Considering the learner's personal dispositions, the construct of 'mastery orientation' in achievement goal model is commensurate largely with 'intrinsic motivation' in self-determination theory, and 'integrative orientation' in Gardner's motivation theory as well. It is, however, increasingly clear that the pursuit of performance goals, often called ego-involvement goals, is underpinned by differentiated psychological attributions derived more from external sources involving social competition and comparison. Based on the implications of Gardner's motivation theory, then, it is reasonable to take into account Korea's sociocultural practices in school contexts; hierarchical teacher-student relationships and authoritative classroom instruction involve the top-down transmission of knowledge. Accordingly, the psychological burdens derived from conventionalized external factors and weak desires for potential pragmatic gains may entice most of EFL students to demonstrate *avoidance* behaviors to both of *task-oriented* and *ego-oriented* goal pursuits in classroom instruction for critical literacy skills.

[achievement goal model/critical literacy development/EFL education  
성취목표모형/비평독해작문능력개발/외국어로서의 영어교육]

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

#### **1. Objectives and Key Issues**

The purpose of this paper is to explicate the pedagogic relations of achievement goal model (or goal-orientation theory) and critical literacy development through the analytic examination of the model. Such an inquiry is based on the assumption that its central tenets may have a generic scope and limits in applying research findings about the model to critical literacy education in Korean EFL classroom contexts.

Within the theoretical frameworks of human motivation in educational psychology, goal-orientation theory has been recognized as the most vigorous field of research centered on the underlying factors of students' academic work in classroom learning (Dornyei, 2001). In this connection, it would be meaningful to write a critical review of the extent to which research on two components –mastery and performance goals – of the goal-orientation theory is useful in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) with a focus on critical reading processes in Korea's EFL education.

Given the underpinning perceptions of goal characteristics, the two achievement goal constructs are based on the presupposition that the pursuit of one's goal depends on either task-involved or ego-involved activity. However, EFL teaching and learning of critical literacy acquisition encompass a number of internal and external factors related to learners and their contexts. Personality and language aptitude are considered to be internally predominant factors; but cultural backgrounds and the nation's EFL education policy and practices are regarded as externally constrained factors. For this reason, goal-orientation theory is expected to offer valid foundations, within a certain scope and limit, for explaining EFL students' learning and performance in critical literacy development in Korea's EFL contexts.

In attempting this critical review, I have employed a broad range of secondary source related to valid research findings on achievement goal model and critical literacy education in an effort to explore the pedagogical relationships between the goal theory and critical literacy development, and to elicit their educational implications in Korea's EFL settings.

## 2. Topics for Critical Review

In the light of the central issues above, I would like to examine the following questions as a few componential topics essential for a critical analysis of main tenets associated with the goal-orientation theory outlined above:

- (1) What are the strengths and weaknesses of goal-orientation theory in the explanatory adequacy of the human motivation which underpins students' efforts for achievement in school settings?;
- (2) What are a range of substantive factors that may influence and explicate Korean students' learning motives and achievement levels in the nation's EFL instruction with an emphasis on critical literacy development?; and
- (3) To what extent is goal-orientation theory relevant or useful in providing the rationale for Korean students' performance and motivation issues related to EFL instruction with an emphasis on critical literacy development in Korea's classroom contexts?

It is, therefore, anticipated that a general set of well-grounded answers to these questions will be able to account for the extent to which goal-orientation theory is relevant to investigating Korean EFL students' performance and their motivational foundations in critical reading instruction.

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **1. Definitions and Conceptual Overview**

Researchers state that contemporary theories of achievement motivation, despite their increasingly refined developments, still remain fuzzy and complicated (Urduan & Mestas, 2006). It is necessary to review a few basic concepts with an emphasis on current goal-orientation theory. As an umbrella term, motivation may be referred to as an internal state that activates and gives direction to one's thoughts, feelings, and actions (Gardner & Tremblay, 1994). Compared with this broad notion, a rather concrete definition of motivation is given by Galloway, Rogers, Armstrong, and Leo (1998) motivation is persistent and focused goal-directed behavior as a stable

personality trait dependent on the domain of a specific task. However, there are difficulties establishing a narrowly definable concept of motivation because this term contains a wide range of variables in everyday contexts (Dornyei, 2001). From this point of view, the following comprehensive statement seems to be perceptive and reasonable:

Perhaps the only thing about motivation most researchers would agree on is that it, by definition, concerns the *direction* and *magnitude* of human behavior, that is: the *choice* of a particular action, the *persistence* with it, [and] the *effort* expended on it. In other words, motivation is responsible for *why* people decide to do something, *how long* they are willing to sustain the activity, [and] *how hard* they are going to pursue it. (p. 8, Italics original, Bracketed words added)

Here, key attention should be given to aspects of achievement goals, and a conceptual survey of mastery and performance goals will be provided within the theoretical frameworks of goal orientation.

Over the past twenty years, research findings about achievement motivation have supported that goals pursued by learners dominate the ways in which they react to success and failure in academic tasks. In the achievement goal literature, a dichotomous orientation – mastery goal (also called *learning* and *task*) and performance goal (also called *ego* and *ability*) – on learners' relative approach to their individual objectives has been recognized by scholars and researchers (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Darnon, Muller, Schrage, Pannuzzo, & Butera, 2006; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Urda & Mestas, 2006). Mastery orientation derives from a learner's intention to favor autonomous and substantive engagement with the task, while performance orientation to prefer a superficial processing instead of deep understanding (Elliot, McGregor, & Gable, 1999).

It is also reported that mastery-loaded learners tend to ascribe failure to their inadequate efforts on the contrary, performance-loaded learners are inclined to regard failure as their low capabilities (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). From these perspectives, understandably participants in the mastery goal condition show that their sense of achievement in the task is not at the mercy of external performance outcomes (e.g., academic grades); but, those in the performance goal condition indicate that their

sense of satisfaction with the task is predominated by their academic records. As a consequence, it is accepted that there has been a positive correlation between mastery orientation and intrinsic motivation which drives one to carry out a task for personal enjoyment, and between performance orientation and extrinsic motivation which involves pursuing an activity to gain rewards from external source (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999).

In addition to aspects of mastery goals and performance goals, Elliot (1999) suggested a performance-avoidance goal as a third type of motivation, which indicates the motivation to avoid performing poorly. This motivation is regarded as a powerful motivator in a specific situation, thereby totally different from being devoid of motivation. As a subsequent classification of achievement goals, Elliot and his colleagues proposed a framework of approach and avoidance, formulating three types of goals; performance-approach, performance-avoidance, and mastery-approach (Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). Further, a fourth goal named as mastery-avoidance was added by Elliot and McGregor (2001), which is often concerned with the circumstances that individual learners "focus on avoiding self-referential or task-referential incompetence" (Elliot, 2005, p. 61).

It is known that the four types of goals stated above may be ranked in accordance with the degree of predictability with regard to subsequent academic grades: (1) performance approach is most likely advantageous in goal-orientation (2) mastery approach is second most likely advantageous (3) mastery avoidance is second least likely advantageous and (4) performance avoidance is least likely advantageous (Elliot & McGregor, 1999; Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, Carter, & Elliot, 2000). These scholars also argued that compared with performance approach in academic achievement, mastery approach may be considered disadvantageous in attaining good grades mainly because taking a mastery approach may assist the learner in grasping course materials, but may lead to investing excessive time and energy on studying materials not directly related to grades.

Hence, goal-orientation theory is found to be a complex and multifaceted construct, and so this theory may encounter intrinsic controversies in terms of its generic scope and limits of applicability. The next section will take a look at the cogency and integrity of this motivation theory by examining the extent to which the research outcomes about this theory is relevant or useful in applying them to

Korean EFL students' performance and motivation issues related to critical literacy development.

## 2. Goal-Orientation Theory: Complexity and Controversy

In the light of the principal concepts above, this section will review and explore some controversial issues derived from the research findings of goal-orientation theory. Researchers have looked into various factors relevant to the foundations and integrity of this motivation theory. Barron and Harackiewicz (2001) examined the types of achievement goals enhancing optimal motivation through a critical test of the mastery versus multiple goal perspectives. They concluded that the multiple goal orientations – both mastery and performance goals – are beneficial to give students most advantageous motivation in a pursuit of successful academic achievement. This research finding provided a new perspective different from a number of early arguments that had advocated a mastery-goal orientation for the best motivation pursuit (Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). In this regard, Barron and Harackiewicz (2001, p. 720) implied how difficult and intricate the psychological variables underpinning achievement goals could be found:

(...) [w]hen goals were assigned, a more complex relationship between achievement goals and outcomes was found. Without the inclusion of a critical personality moderator variable, this relationship would have gone undetected. Measuring achievement orientation was a key component in understanding this pattern and in predicting when assigned goals would have positive effects. Simply assigning particular goals was not sufficient to produce the same benefits as when those same goals were self-set by participants (...).

In summary, this research outcome supports the probability that goal-orientation theories are dependent upon a plurality of factors associated with students' internal dispositions and external environment. Further, this observation casts doubts on the validity and reliability of such a clear-cut dichotomous theory focused on mastery goal and performance goal in constructing human motivation models.

Given the above-mentioned research finding, I can find it meaningful to review

another empirical study on the intrinsic complexity of achievement goal. Urdan and Mestas (2006) investigated the other goals which might underlie performance goals, and identified that there were a broad range of reasons for seeking to achieve performance goals. As recognizing the 'distinction between approach and avoidance tendencies in both mastery and performance goals' in terms of a four-goal matrix, they cast doubts on the simplicity and consistency of students' intrinsic attitudes concerning their achievement goals (Urdan & Mestas, 2006, p. 354). In this regard, the following statements indicate the unstable constructs of goal-orientation theory:

There are two important findings from the present study that have implications for achievement goal theory. First, students pursue performance goals for a wide variety of reasons. Therefore, even when a survey assessment has revealed that a student is high in his or her pursuit of performance-avoidance goals or performance-approach goals, there is still little that is revealed about that student's reason pursuing performance goals. (...) Second, participants in this study often blurred the distinction between the approach-avoidance and appearance-competition components of performance goals when interpreting survey items. (...) These results raise both theoretical and methodological questions about the meaning and study of performance goals. (p. 362)

With respect to this, they further argued that interview methods enabled them to obtain authentic data explaining variable elements of performance goal pursuit, and to validate their suggestions about much more complex meaning and function of performance goals than has been widely accepted so far in human motivation theory. The research outcomes which raised theoretical and methodological questions regarding the construct of performance goals are also deemed to undermine the cogency of goal-orientation theory.

Given the dichotomy of human motivation in this goal model, I can find it meaningful to take a look at the fundamental principles applied to the construction of a scientific theory. The rationale for systematic efforts to formulate a valid theory lies mainly in a pursuit of its practicality. From a different angle, however, the contracted tenets derived from such a pragmatic intent tend to make a theory narrowly definable and eventually incomplete in explicating a relevant phenomenon.

The next section will show that goal-orientation theory cannot be, in a crude sense, an exception to this, and so it may not demonstrate a far-reaching scope of application. The brief survey below is expected to provide a valid foundation for its limited availability to another discipline, including critical literacy education.

### 3. Principles of Theory Construction

In general, theory building in a scientific inquiry entails the abstraction of reality in the sense that a theoretical construct is based largely on the distinctive features of a certain observable phenomenon. The main reason for this is that such a curtailed approach can result in enhancing a degree or extent to which it may be used for practical purposes. The essential practicality makes it inevitable to depart from the elaborate description and explanation of reality in question, which leads to a framework of generalized proposition represented by simple rules and regularity. In parallel with this, Widdowson (1996) provides the features of abstraction required to formulate a theory as follows:

Abstraction involves the idealization of actual data, as part of the process of constructing models (...). These models are necessarily as a remove from familiar reality and may indeed bear little resemblance to it. (...) A model is an idealized version of reality: those features which are considered incidental are stripped away in order to give prominence to those features which are considered essential. (p. 18)

The main points noted here imply the common features of models developed by researchers, and the underlying reasons why they are in a continued pursuit of a theory or model in their fields of studies.

However, in terms of appraising a theory, Ellis (1996, p. 74), by accepting Widdowson's viewpoints, suggests the two guiding principles: interpretation and conceptual evaluation. In this context, interpretation is defined as "the elucidation and critical examination of ideas within the context of their own theoretical provenance" conceptual evaluation is concerned with "a consideration of the validity and relevance of the ideas to some other domain of inquiry" which entails an



investigation of the substantive purposes served by a theory. Hence, the requirement of the latter – conceptual evaluation – is in line with the primary intent of this paper; to take a look at the extent to which goal-orientation theory is relevant or useful in providing the rationale for Korean EFL students' performance and motivation issues related to critical literacy development. In light of this, the next section will devote itself to investigating the generic applicability of goal-orientation theory to critical literacy education in Korea's classroom contexts.

### **III. GOAL-ORIENTATION THEORY AND CRITICAL LITERACY EDUCATION**

To critically examine the scope of application that a scientific theory addresses is considered meaningful on the ground that a theory highly recognized of within its own academic provenance is not necessarily of value and use in some other areas of inquiry. Such a limited scope to be found in applying a theory to another discipline, if any, seems to be incomplete mainly due to the dangers of too narrowly definable areas of application. It is, however, recognized that researchers may encounter the dangers of attempting to explicate complex and discrete phenomena with the help of a single theory. These perspectives – limited scope and completeness – are considered incompatible with each other in the sense that a theory restricted in the specific phenomenon that it attempts to explicate tends to be incomplete.

With the mutual discrepancy of criteria in mind, the application of goal-orientation theory to critical literacy education in Korea's EFL classroom contexts goes back to three interrelated questions noted in Section 1-2. Topics for Critical Review of this paper: (1) strengths and weaknesses of goal-orientation theory; (2) Korea's critical literacy education – internal and external factors; (3) goal-orientation theory and critical literacy education – scope and limits of application in Korea.

#### **1. Strengths and Weaknesses of Goal-Orientation Theory**

As pointed out in the previous sentences, the relationship between limited scope

and completeness may be controversial in the evaluation of a scientific theory. However, considering a question about whether a theory is complete in such a limited scope of its application, the two criteria can be regarded as being individually recognizable.

In reviewing the strengths of goal-orientation theory, we first need to look at the scope to which this theory is constrained in its generic application. This achievement goal theory is based on whether an individual's genuine purpose is to enhance his abilities by learning new knowledge and skills as much as possible or to manifest his competence by performing as highly as possible relative to others. This theory argues that the former referred to as 'mastery goals' and the latter referred to as 'performance goals' lead an individual to pursue different kinds of focus: mastery goals guide to concentrate efforts on an academic task, whereas performance goals on social comparison (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Darnon, Muller, Schragger, Pannuzzo & Butera, 2006).

Based on the concepts above, the dichotomous tenets of the motivation theory may be clarified as follows: (1) favoring a deep processing of an achievement task or a surface processing of it (2) attributing failure to a lack of efforts or to a lack of abilities (3) fostering an adaptive pattern of achievement or a maladaptive pattern as a result of endorsing the two different goals (4) predicting epistemic regulation of a socio-cognitive conflict to be encountered with a task partner in processing materials to be learned or relational coordination of such a conflict. All of these research outcomes presuppose that human motivation in achievement tasks is constrained to the framework of mastery goals and performance goals.

Thus, only if this presupposition is proved to be true, the strengths of goal-orientation theory can be confirmed to lie in such a limited scope of application. It is, however, recognized that humans can be motivated in a number of ways of thinking about their goals and intentions. As long as a plurality of goals underpin an individual's motivation and behaviors, I may posit that the weaknesses of goal-orientation theory derive mainly from its incompleteness as a theory attempting to explain a partiality of complex human achievement motives.

In light of this, researchers have found a wide range of goals and other reasons set in an individual's motives related to the implementation of tasks (Brophy, 2004; Crozier, 1997; Elliot, 1999). They also held that multiple goals other than

mastery-oriented and performance-oriented motivation were considered equally or more important than these two general goals. Such different types of goals incorporate ones for avoiding work, socializing with others, maintaining intimacy, satisfying social responsibilities, and acquiring rewards. Brophy (2004, p. 100) pointed out that 'extrinsic goals' – e.g., desiring to get justifiable repayment – beyond the framework of achievement goal constructs are found to motivate an individual's behaviors. Based on these additional goals, I feel secure in confirming that achievement goal theory cannot be complete, thereby regarded as a substantive weakness in its entirety.

## 2. Korea's Critical Literacy Education: Internal & External Factors

### 1) Concepts and Problems

Relevant literature needs to be reviewed to explore a range of internal and external factors related to Korean EFL students' critical literacy learning motives. Here internal factors may be referred to as students' text processing abilities and psychological attitudes required to criticize the status-quo; external factors as a general set of environmental elements which influence their English language learning in Korea.

Reading comprehension, one of the receptive skills, provides a valid foundation for the rudimentary processes of foreign or second language (L2) acquisition (Block, 1992; Ellis, 1994). Critical reading in particular is recognized as an advanced step to enable language learners to interpret a text in a proactive manner (Young Mi Kim, 2006). On the part of readers, its aim is to construct their own ideas and speculations, or to evaluate the concepts and viewpoints they often encounter in an argumentative text (Schwegler, 2004). In doing so, the reader, getting out of the routine procedures of data reception and interpretation, would take an aggressive stance rather than a submissive attitude toward the language input (Widdowson, 1995). Yet, critical analysis may not be cogent and equitable unless it is well grounded on a circumspect and effective grasp of the reading materials (Mayfield, 2003).

The ordinary readers tend to pay little attention to rhetorical patterns and

linguistic features of the written texts routinely exposed to them, unless they are not adequately trained with respect to argument theory and practices (Carter & McCarthy, 1994). Unfamiliar with logical reasoning methods, they are, in most cases, not able to demonstrate critical interpretation skills on incoming data, and more seriously, their patterns of thinking can be predominated by the writer's intentions to disguise relevant facts in search of his unfair advantages. This problem seems to be typical of the consumer's misconceptions which often originate from acknowledging the surface meaning of advertisement texts for various commodities in carrying out social activities and relations based on free market economy worldwide.

## 2) Textual Facts and Contextual Features

A number of commercial advertisements possess such controversial factors in their linguistic features. It is useful to take a look at the following newspaper advertisement showing up in the internet web-site related to some leading tobacco brands in the world:

Seventy-three percent of the medical doctors surveyed said they would, if asked by a patient, recommend Lite Cigarettes with their low tar and nicotine for patients who smoke.

Obviously this brief advertisement appears to claim that quite a few doctors are encouraging the general public to smoke Lite Cigarettes. But if the reader scrutinizes the ad text by paying close attention to the details, s/he can recognize the fact that the sentential constituents are, in several respects, skillfully arranged for the manipulation of the reader's favorable impression towards Lite Cigarettes. Firstly, the ad text shows only a certain percentage of the doctors without specifying how many doctors were questioned in the actual survey. Secondly, the doctors who did respond avoided clarifying that they do recommend this brand; the advertisement text mentions apparently they would recommend it just in the case that a patient asked them about cigarette smoking. And thirdly, the final component of the advertisement text also makes a very significant contribution to its commercial

profitability; the doctors are willing to make such a recommendation for those patients who have smoking habits already.

From this analytical illustration, I can realize that there is a great disparity between the general impression fostered by this advertisement and what the advertisement text really says. As a result, on the part of the readers, to adequately develop critical reading skills is of great use for their justifiable interpretation of an ideological text. The main points stated above can lead us to understand that critical reading is a matter of constructing the interactional bases and dominant effects between both properties of texts and practices of interpretation in a particular social space, and wider social, cultural properties of that specific social domain, therefore to investigate how their textual facts and contextual factors are socially, culturally and ideologically motivated (Cook, 1994; Fairclough, 1996).

### 3) Education Policy and Classroom Practices

It should be, however, taken into careful account that Korean EFL students are largely in disadvantageous circumstances to develop their critical literacy due to the nation's authoritative educational practices underpinned by sociocultural conventions. The Korean government has maintained its conservative foreign language policy as a weak-form of public EFL education, placing a strong emphasis on the long-standing monolingual/monocultural society and national identity (MOE, 2005). The weak-form typology in Korea offers school lessons in mainstream language as a medium of instruction to teach English language. Hence the nation's EFL learning environment is strikingly different from a multilingual and multiethnic society such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. Because of such external factors in Korea, 'English and other foreign languages are taught primarily as formal school subjects with a substantial lack of direct exposure to native and foreign/second language speakers' (Hufton, Elliot, & Illushin, 2002).

With regard to classroom contexts, Shin and Crookes (2005) summarizes the contrastive teaching practices between the East Asian countries and the Western countries as follows:

There has long been a stereotypical dichotomy of teacher-centered, static, and

authoritarian classrooms in the East and student-centered, dynamic, and egalitarian classrooms in the West (...). That is, the West has been essentializing Asian classrooms as places where obedience and conformity to social norms are highly valued, where debate or discussion is not common particularly across status boundaries, and where authoritarian teachers are concerned with transmitting knowledge rather than being engaged in dialogue with the students. (p. 99)

From this perspective, I can understand the tendency that these marked classroom conventions in East Asian schools have made students submissive and obedient, and thereby their classrooms are, as a whole, rigid and hierarchical, which has impeded active discussions between teachers and students in an atmosphere of mutual support (Kubota, 1999, 2001; Reagan, 2000). The majority of students in East Asian countries, including Korea, have come to stay away from the movements of critical pedagogy (Kim, 1999; Kramer-Dahl, 2001; Sue, & Okazaki, 1990).

Based on the foregoing considerations, I want to argue that internal and external factors associated with Korean EFL students' critical literacy development motives fall largely on the continuum placed in between the two differentiated poles. Accordingly, internal factors are considered to involve their endocentric restraints against improving critical analysis skills for spoken/written discourse with individual learner variables in age, gender, personality, language aptitude, and EFL learning history and external factors are regarded as their exocentric constraints hampering critical literacy pedagogy, which are underpinned by the nation's weak-form EFL education policy, entirely homogeneous and monolingual/monocultural society, and hierarchical classroom practices between teachers and students. In this respect, I am able to posit that such external factors would hold sway above the internal factors rather than the other way around.

### 3. Goal-Orientation Theory and Critical Literacy Education: Scope and Limits of Application in Korea

As specified at the beginning, this paper aims to shed light on the generic scope and limits of applying the research outcomes about goal-orientation theory to critical literacy pedagogy in Korea's EFL classroom settings. To sum up, the framework of

achievement goal theory presupposes that human motivation constitutes two essential strands of goal pursuits – the desire to thoroughly understand learning materials and the desire to surpass others in performance. It is, however, our observation that EFL education practices in Korean classrooms incorporate the socio-culturally motivated external factors which impede students from developing critical literacy skills. Taking due note of these hard-wired conventions, we can posit that generic clues for the scope and limits of application noted above may lie in valid criteria as to:

whether Korean EFL students tend to demonstrate an *approach* or *avoidance* behavior to either of *task-oriented* and *ego-oriented* goal pursuits, or to both of these attributions in relation to their critical literacy development in classroom settings.

At this point, Korean EFL students' internal and external factors discussed earlier lead us to review Gardner's motivation theory in learning a foreign or second language. It is well known that Gardner's (1985, cited in Dornyei, 2001) motivation research addresses the mutual relationship between motivation and goal (which is referred to as 'orientation' in Gardner's work). He has argued the constructs of 'integrative orientation' and 'instrumental orientation', of which the former concerns itself with 'a positive disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community' the latter is concerned with 'the potential pragmatic gains of L2 proficiency, such as getting a better job or a higher salary' (p. 49). A key tenet of this motivational dichotomy is associated with two different psychological traits: (1) one is internal elements arising out of the learner's individual willingness to increase her/his L2 proficiency through being assimilated to mainstream speech community (2) the other is external elements invoking the learner's actual behavior which brings about certain rewarding outcomes.

With this in mind, it is useful to look at the following two sets of statements given by Dornyei (2001) in comparing achievement goal constructs together with self-determination theory and Gardner's motivation theory:

One of the most general and well-known distinctions in motivation theories is that of *intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation* (...). The first type of motivation deals

with behavior performed for its own sake in order to experience pleasure and satisfaction, such as the joy of doing a particular activity or satisfying one's curiosity. The second involves performing a behavior as a means to an end, that is, to receive some extrinsic reward (e.g. good grades) or to avoid punishment (Italicized word added). (p. 27)

Gardner argues that these three components (*motivational intensity, desire to learn the language, and attitudes towards learning the language*) belong together because the truly motivated individual displays all three. The role of orientation, then, is to help to arouse motivation and direct it towards a set of goals, either with a strong interpersonal quality (integrative) or a strong practical quality (instrumental) (Italicized words added). (p. 49)

Given the learner's personal dispositions, it is understandable that the construct of 'mastery orientation' in achievement goal framework is commensurate largely with 'intrinsic motivation' in self-determination theory, and 'integrative orientation' in Gardner's motivation theory as well. It is, however, increasingly clear that the pursuit of performance goals, which are often called ego-involvement goals, is underpinned by quite differentiated psychological attributions derived more from external sources involving social competition and comparison.

Based on the implications of Gardner's motivation theory, then, we might do well to take into account Korea's socio-cultural norms in school contexts – hierarchical teacher-student relationships and classroom practices involving a top-down transmission of knowledge. As a result, the psychological burdens stemming from conventionalized external factors and weak desires for potential pragmatic gains may entice most of EFL students to demonstrate *avoidance* behaviors to both of *task-oriented and ego-oriented* goal pursuits in classroom instruction for critical literacy skills. The inferential processes may lead to confirm that goal-orientation theory is virtually devoid of any tangible scope of application to critical literacy education in Korean EFL contexts on the ground of such a dual avoidance of mastery and performance goals. The final outcomes of this critical review are also deemed to be intrinsically unavoidable limits constraining the application of achievement goal constructs to the said classroom teaching practices in Korea.



#### IV. CONCLUSION

From a critical point of view, I have reviewed aspects of achievement goal model (or goal-orientation theory) and its applicability to Korea's critical literacy education. As in case of human desires for goal pursuits, the underlying notions of critical literacy development involve complex and multifaceted elements. To build up abilities for decoding a text critically, thorough comprehension of text contents must precede any possible criticism. And, as a follow-up action, the reader should have an adequate understanding of how arguments in the text are organized and worked out (Mayfield, 2003; Schwegler, 2004). In light of this, the importance of critical reading strategies is recognized on both sides of teachers and students.

A general type of input data processing also calls for the analysis and critic of the relationships among texts, language, power, social groups and community practices. It guides the reader to ways of taking a careful look at written, visual, aural, spoken, multi-media and performance texts to question and challenge the producer's attitudes, values, beliefs and other ideological factors placed beneath the surface of the texts (Brown & Yule, 1983; Fairclough, 1989, 1992; Seyler, 2003). These scholars point out that critical reading basically requires an analytical approach to text interpretation with such essential questions about the interactive processes among text, writer and reader as (a) in whose interest?, (b) for what purpose?, and (c) who benefits? Hence, this educational field necessitates far-reaching abilities and open-ended learning attitudes different from any other disciplines.

As a consequence, I can think of the possibility that the theoretical foundations of mastery-goal and performance-goal orientations may not be tenable, and so they may be entirely or partially deconstructed, only if there is another independent field of scientific inquiry to which the central tenets of the achievement goal theory cannot be applied. It is, however, important to recognize the probability that such a goal-orientation theory may be partially valid and reliable on the basis of concurrent multiple goals and other related factors because the learner may not always be motivated to thoroughly grasp study materials or to excel others in school settings.

Therefore, I feel secure in concluding that although goal-orientation theory has failed to demonstrate its explanatory adequacy with respect to critical literacy education in Korean EFL contexts, the genuine value of the theory should be highly recognized as long as it was constructed to satisfy the requirements of a designated group of people, and can provide valid explication for their essential questions. To put it reversely, it may not be possible in reality to properly evaluate such a theory without taking into account the specific purposes it was originally attempted to serve and the particular context in which it was established.

## REFERENCES

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms, goals, structures and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 267-271.
- Barron, K. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Achievement goals and optimal motivation: A multiple goals approach. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 229-254). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Barron, K. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2001). Achievement goals and optimal motivation: Testing multiple goal models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(5), 706-722.
- Block, E. L. (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 375-406.
- Brophy, J. (2004). *Motivating students to learn* (2nd ed.). London: LEA.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Longman: London.
- Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crozier, R. (1997). *Individual learners: Personality differences in education*. London: Routledge.
- Darnon, C., Muller, D., Schrager, S., Pannuzzo, N., & Butera, F. (2006). Mastery and performance goals predict epistemic and relational conflict regulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(4), 766-776.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.

- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, *95*, 256-273.
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*, 149-169.
- Elliot, A. J. (2005). A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct. In Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C. J. (Eds.) *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 52-72). New York: Guildford Press.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 218-232.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 968-980.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (1999). Test anxiety and the hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 628-644.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 X 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(3), 501-519.
- Elliot, A. J., McGregor, H. A., & Gable, S. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies, and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 549-563.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1996). Appraising second language acquisition theory in relation to language pedagogy. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.) *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 73-89). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. London: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's 'discourse analysis: A critical view'. *Language and Literature*, *5*(1), 49-55.
- Galloway, D., Rogers, C., Armstrong, D., & Leo, E. (1998). *Motivating the difficult to teach*. London: Longman.
- Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 359-368.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., Carter, S. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Short-term and long-term consequences of achievement goals predicting interest and performance over time. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*, 316-330.

- Hufton, N., Elliott, J., & Illushin, L. (2002). Educational motivation and engagement: Qualitative accounts across three countries. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28(2), 265-290.
- Kim, M. (1999). Cross-cultural perspectives on motivations of verbal communication Review, critique, and a theoretical framework. *Communication Yearbook*, 22, 51-89.
- Kim, Young Mi. (2006). L2 reader's critical reading interpretation. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 12(1), 1-27.
- Kramer-Dahl, A. (2001). Importing critical literacy pedagogy: Does it have to fail? *Language and Education*, 15(1), 14-32.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 9-35.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 9-38.
- Mayfield, M. (2003). *Thinking for yourself: Developing critical thinking skills through reading and writing* (6th ed.). Toronto: Thomson & Heinle.
- Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development. (2005). The five-year comprehensive EFL education promotion plan. trans. *School Policy & Guidelines for 2006-2010*. Seoul: MOE.
- Rawsthorne, L. & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 326-344.
- Reagan, T. (2000). *Non-western educational traditions: Alternative approaches to educational thought and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schwegler, J. C. (2004). *Patterns of exposition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seyler, D. U. (2003). *The reading context: Developing college reading skills* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Shin, H., & Crookes, G. (2005). Indigenous critical traditions for TEFL?: A historical and comparative perspective in the case of Korea. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: International Journal*, 2(2), 95-112.
- Sue, S., & Okazaki, S. (1990). Asian-American educational achievement: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist*, 45, 913-920.
- Urduan, T. & Mestas, M. (2006). The goals behind performance goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(2), 354-365.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.
- Widdowson, H. (1996). *Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jong-Hee Lee  
Department of English Language & Cultural Studies  
College of Humanities & Social Sciences  
Kangwon National University-Samcheok Campus  
1 Joongang-ro, Samcheok-si, Kangwon-do, 245-711, Korea  
Tel: (033) 570-6652  
Email: freshfields@kangwon.ac.kr

Received in October 1, 2008

Reviewed in October 14, 2008

Revised version received in December 11, 2008