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Background

Historical Development

Interest in emotions in second language acquisition (SLA) has never been entirely absent but neither was it given much explicit attention because of a clear preference for “rational thought” (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). As a consequence, very little attention was paid to learners’ emotions and to the very topic of how emotions were communicated verbally and non-verbally in the second language curriculum (Dewaele, 2005). The aim of the present chapter is to trace the origins and the subsequent development and operationalization of the learner emotion, enjoyment, as part of a growing interest in the role that various emotions play in SLA.

Psychologists have been looking at the role of learner emotions in general education for some time. Ryan, Connell, and Plant (1990) used the framework of self-determination theory to look at the relationships between emotion/motivation variables and performance in a first language (L1) setting. Emotions have also been included in the research designs of educational psychologists. Pekrun’s (2006) influential control-value theory of achievement emotions included both positive and negative emotions (enjoyment, frustration, boredom, joy, hope, pride, anxiety, hopelessness, shame, and anger). His aim was to conceptually integrate emotion, motivation, and cognition.

Language anxiety was the first emotional variable to become established as an important individual difference between learners in SLA research. Gardner (1985) included it explicitly as part of the construct of attitudes and motivation (the dimensions of foreign language use anxiety and foreign language classroom anxiety). Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) brought foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA) center stage. They presented it as a psychological construct that was independent from general anxiety and was unique to the foreign language (FL) context. Horwitz (2017) attributed FLCA to learners’ “distress at their inability to be themselves and to connect authentically with other people through the limitation of the new language” (p. 41). The availability of a reliable instrument to measure FLCA (Horwitz et al., 1986) led to a period of intense research in the field. Studies based on different learner populations showed that FLCA had a debilitative effect, and a meta-analysis showed a moderate negative relationship between FLCA and performance (Botes et al., 2020b).

The role of positive emotions remained more in the background during that time. Gardner (1985) did point out that success in SLA depended on learners’ positive attitudes toward the learning situation (i.e., the course and the teacher), integrativeness (including positive opinions of users.
Enjoyment of the target language), and motivation (i.e., a combination of desire to master the target language, the required effort, and the pleasure associated with the learning). One could thus argue that emotions infused Gardner’s socio-educational model but that the positive ones were seen as part of other constructs. MacIntyre (2002) did point explicitly to the relationship between motivation and emotion.

The role of emotions was not very different in Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) second language (L2) motivational self-system, where only the third, experiential dimension, namely the L2 learning experience, contained items about interest, enjoyment, and excitement in the FL class and the FL. FL anxiety had a more prominent role in Dörnyei’s model with items about anxiety in using the FL inside and outside of class. Also, Dörnyei (2009) pointed out that this third dimension reflected previous research on motivation and was “conceptualised at a different level from the two self-guides” (p. 29). It also attracted less research attention than the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) did acknowledge that individual differences research in SLA had insufficiently acknowledged the role of emotions and that these had been shunned by researchers who preferred cognitivist perspectives (p. 9).

Green (1993) was the first SLA study—to my knowledge—to include a specific positive emotion in the research design. The researcher investigated the relationship between students’ perceptions of enjoyableness, effectiveness, and frequency of specific classroom activities. The first SLA study to include both positive and negative emotions in the research design is Imai’s (2010) case study. She found that both positive emotions (such as enjoyment and empathy) and negative emotions (such as boredom, regret, and frustration) have the potential to contribute to learning, depending on how participants made sense of or ignored the emotions interactationally. Another pioneering study in this field is Lumby (2011) who focused explicitly on enjoyment among English secondary school learners by looking at policy documents and interviews with learners. He found that learners reported that experiences of flow were highly enjoyable and most strongly enmeshed with learning.

The advent of positive psychology (PP) around the start of the new millennium offered a new perspective in the field and acted as a catalyst for more SLA research on the role of various emotions. PP originated as a reaction against the traditional focus of psychology on problems. Its aim is to show how “normal” people live with the goal of helping them to thrive and flourish (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). It brought about a realization that SLA classroom emotion research was too narrowly focused on anxiety and its negative effects, and that it there was an urgent need to consider a wider range of learner emotions (MacIntyre et al., 2016, 2019; MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012). A more nuanced understanding emerged of the role of emotions, including the realization that negative emotions are not necessarily “bad” and that teachers should help learners deal with them rather than trying to suppress them (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016).

It would be an exaggeration to claim that the previous paragraphs represent the complete history of the concept of enjoyment in SLA research. I can only claim that part of it represented my personal history. As a French applied linguist, I grew up with the motivation theories of Gardner and Dörnyei, did research on FLCA, and was interested in emotions in multilingualism (Dewaele, 2010), but I was largely unaware of the research in educational psychology and PP. The change in perspective came from people like Peter MacIntyre, who sits on the border between psychology and applied linguistics, and Tammy Gregersen, who has a foot in teacher education and learner psychology (MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012).

Major Theory

The arrival of PP in SLA in 2012 has been a watershed moment (Dewaele et al., 2019a; Shao et al., 2020). It highlighted the fact that the field needed a more holistic approach, just as applied
linguists had once been too obsessed about learner errors and ignored what learners did right (Dewaele & Li, 2020). PP researchers acknowledge the existence of difficulties and challenges in people’s lives, but they want to complement them with concepts such as flow, hope, courage, well-being, optimism, creativity, happiness, flourishing, grit, resilience, positive emotions, life longings, emotional creativity, strengths, wisdom, health, and laughter. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) add that a PP approach is not just seeing reality through a rosy lens: “Positive psychology does not rely on wishful thinking, faith, self-deception, fads, or hand waving; it tries to adapt what is best in the scientific method to the unique problems that human behavior presents to those who wish to understand it in all its complexity” (p. 7).

Seligman (2018) developed an influential model of psychological well-being and happiness that consists of five elements, labeled PERMA. The “p” stands for Positive emotion and the ability to remain optimistic. Interestingly, he also distinguishes between pleasure and enjoyment, where the former relates to satisfying bodily needs (sleep, hunger, and thirst), whereas the latter is linked to creativity and intellectual challenge. The “e” stands for Engagement with activities that use one’s character strengths and where a flow experience may emerge when a person is so absorbed in the activity that they lose their sense of time. The “r” stands for positive interpersonal Relationships and social connections, in other words, emotional and physical interaction with other humans. The “m” stands for Meaning and fulfillment by serving a cause beyond oneself. And the “a” stands for Accomplishment and achievement of goals that can give a sense of satisfaction, pride, and fulfillment. The five elements of PERMA are the basic building blocks of well-being, which is the basis for flourishing. Individuals who manage to reach the pinnacle of these dimensions thrive and prosper both at an individual and a group level.

Oxford (2020) was inspired by the basic principle of PP that the aim of any activity (learning or teaching an FL, for example) is not just becoming more proficient and knowledgeable, but becoming a happier person. This requires a particular focus on emotions both as independent and dependent variables. It implies the use of strategies to manage negative emotions and to change one’s mind about them, and for teachers to focus on their own emotional well-being through emotion regulation and emotional labor2. Oxford argues that challenging episodes in the classroom can lead to wisdom and that teachers should use the “compass of emotion” (2020, p. 249).

MacIntyre and Gregersen (2012) introduced PP, and more specifically Fredrickson’s (2001) broaden-and-build theory, to the field of applied linguistics. Adapting the theory to the SLA context, they argued that learners’ positive emotions can counter and overcome the effects of negative emotions on FL learning and use. The effects of positive emotions go well beyond the experience of pleasant feelings. The former enhance learners’ acclimatization in the classroom, boosting their ability to notice things and to absorb more language input. Positive emotions can also help flush out lingering effects of negative emotions. In contrast, learners in a high-anxiety classroom are more likely to feel under threat, which will lead them to clam up, to narrow their focus, and to retain much less information. Repeated negative or positive classroom emotions have longer-term psychological consequences. Negative emotions risk undermining learners’ self-image and self-confidence which dampens their willingness to communicate, pushing them to play it safe and remain isolated (cf. Dewaele, 2019a; Papi & Khajavi, 2021; Teimouri, 2017). On the other hand, positive emotions can boost social cohesion as well as learners’ long-term resilience and hardiness, encouraging them to explore and take linguistic risks without fear of punishment or ridicule.

A second theoretical source of inspiration for research on emotions in SLA has come from educational psychology, namely Pekrun’s control-value theory of achievement emotion (Pekrun, 2006; Shao et al., 2019). These achievement emotions are pervasive in educational contexts. They are organized along three dimensions: object focus (the activity itself vs. the outcome), valence (positive vs. negative), and activation (deactivation vs. activation). According to this framework, enjoyment is an activity-related, positive, and activating achievement emotion arising from the learning activities. In contrast, anxiety arises from the uncontrollability or uncertainty over the attainment
Enjoyment of success or the prevention of failure. The term “academic enjoyment” is prominent in Götz et al. (2008). The researchers collected data from 1,280 German pupils on their grades for maths and German (L1) classes to see how well they predicted enjoyment. The authors found levels of enjoyment for both courses unrelated. However, strong performance in the previous exams was a strong predictor of enjoyment in both classes.

Li and colleagues (Li, 2020; Dewaele & Li, 2018; Li et al., 2018, 2020; Li & Xu, 2019) have investigated foreign language enjoyment (FLE), as it was defined by Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014), by combining elements of Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000), Fredrickson (2001), and Pekrun (2006). Li (2018) has argued that these theories supplement each other and can be integrated as a holistic theoretical framework that allows theoretical triangulation. The theories have a number of communalities such as a holistic perspective on emotions and a differentiation of the effects of positive and negative emotions on cognitive, social, and psychological processes. They recognize the central role of positive emotions in learners’ well-being and performance. There are also some striking differences. The control-value theory has a narrower scope and is more specific to educational contexts. The control-value theory considers both the antecedents and outcomes of achievement emotions, while the broaden-and-build theory only addresses the broad effects of emotions. Only the control-value theory addresses the reciprocity and bi-directionality of emotions. A final distinction is that the control-value theory does not consider the interaction between positive and negative emotions, something that is central in the broaden-and-build theory that emphasizes the essential role of positive emotions in neutralizing the after-effects of negative emotions (Dewaele & Li, 2020).

Research Evidence

Comparison in Levels of FLE and FLCA

One of the original research questions in Dewaele and MacIntyre’s mixed-methods (2014) study was whether FL learners experienced more foreign language enjoyment (FLE) than FLCA in their classrooms. Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) found that this was the case in a sample of 1,746 FL learners (from a wide age range and from all over the world), a pattern confirmed in later research (Botes, 2021; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2019; Dewaele et al., 2018; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019). Moreover, Resnik and Dewaele (2020) found a similar pattern both in FL and L1 classes. This finding is not generalizable to the whole learner population as data were collected through snowball or convenience sampling. It is thus likely that self-selected participants were more likely to be good and motivated students. Levels of FLE might thus be lower in the general learner population and levels of FLCA might be higher. The only study so far to have found higher levels of FLCA than FLE was Li and Xu’s (2019) investigation into Chinese EFL learners. Levels of FLE can also change over time (cf. Dewaele & Dewaele, 2017; Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Elahi Shirvan et al., 2021; Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2020).

Relationship between FLE and FLCA

The central research question in the early studies was the relationship between FLE and FLCA. Were they like the two faces of Janus, namely opposite ends of the same psychological dimension, or were they in fact separate dimensions? Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) found a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.36$) between FLE and FLCA, suggesting a degree of inter-relationship but essentially independent dimensions. This finding was confirmed in participants’ descriptions of an enjoyable episode in the FL classroom. Many reported high levels of FLCA seconds before experiencing high levels of FLE. The independence of FLE and FLCA was confirmed in a follow-up study by Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016) on the same database. The authors argued that these positive and negative
emotions complement each other, just like learners’ left and right feet, and that learners need to regulate both emotions: “the goal is not to eliminate FLCA any more than a runner would wish to eliminate one of her feet (even the sore, aching one). Learners will find their balance when both feet, enjoyment and anxiety, are brought into equilibrium” (pp. 233–234). Similar moderate negative correlations between FLE and FLCA have been observed in different contexts and language combinations including British learners of French, German, and Spanish (Dewaele et al., 2018); Spanish EFL learners (Dewaele et al., 2019b); Saudi EFL university students (Dewaele & Alfawzan, 2018); Turkish students of Italian and English (Dewaele & Proietti, 2020); and Chinese EFL learners (Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Li, 2018, 2020; Li et al. 2018, 2019). A similar pattern emerged between joy and anxiety in Teimouri et al. (2020). Only in Dewaele et al.’s (2019c) study on Kazakh learners of Turkish was the relationship between FLE and FLCA positive (significant but with a small effect size). Elahi Shirvan and Taherian (2021) found that the relationship between FLE and FLCA evolved over a semester, with a stronger negative correlation at the end of the semester than at the beginning. A meta-analysis of studies that correlated FLE and FLCA found a moderate negative correlation overall ($r = -0.32$, $k = 47$, $N = 22,664$), suggesting that learners who experience more FLE typically suffer less from FLCA (Botes et al. 2022). A different picture emerges about the relationship between FLE and FLCA when looking at second-by-second fluctuations. Boudreau et al. (2018) asked participants to complete a one-minute speaking task in the FL after which they viewed the recording of their performance and reported their levels of FLE and FLCA second by second. Correlation analyses of the FLE and FLCA values for every participant showed huge variation, shifting from positive to negative and then to zero. This finding confirmed that FLE and FLCA are independent dimensions. Subsequent interviews revealed that the fluctuations were linked to linguistic difficulties or to surges in enjoyment or boredom in discussing a particular topic.

**Relationship between FLE and Motivation**

Pavelescu’s (2019) case study of two Romanian EFL learners showed a complex interplay between language learning emotions and motivation. A love for English and classroom enjoyment shaped their future L2 selves and supported their motivation. However, a co-occurrence of positive emotions and motivation does not negate their independence. They are conceptually different and move along different time frames. Further evidence for their independence emerged in a quantitative, longitudinal research design that included both FLE and motivation measures (ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self) (Saito et al., 2018). The authors established that despite a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.48$) between private FLE and ideal L2 self (p. 726), both variables predicted unique variance in comprehensibility gains of Japanese EFL learners over one term. In other words, FLE was not subsumed under motivation. Teimouri (2017) and Papi and Khajavi (2021) reported that students’ ideal L2 self was a strong predictor of joy.

**Sources of FLE (Learner-Internal Variables)**

Research on the sources of variation in levels of FLE started with a focus on learner-internal variables, before expanding to learner-external variables. Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) found that participants who scored highest on FLE knew significantly more languages; had reached higher levels in the FL; felt above average in their FL class; were in tertiary rather than secondary education; and were older, male, and Western (rather than Asian).

**Age**

The finding that older learners report more FLE has been confirmed in a number of studies (Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele et al, 2019c). The increase in FLE over time was also linked to a change in the predictors of FLE over time. Dewaele and Dewaele (2017) used a pseudo-longitudi-
nal design to look for change over time in three age groups of pupils from two British secondary schools. They found that FLE and FLCA were quite stable but that FLE was predicted by different variables over time. Fewer learner-internal and teacher-centered variables predicted FLE in the youngest group (12–13 years old) and in the oldest age group (16–18 years old) compared to the middle age group (14–15 years old), where FLE was predicted by attitude toward the FL, attitude toward the teacher, teacher un/predictability, and multilingualism. Mierzwa (2018) found a similar non-linear pattern for age, with increased FLE from the first to the second grade of a secondary school followed by a sharp decrease in the third grade.

Gender

Female participants scored significantly higher than male participants on both FLE and FLCA in MacIntyre and Dewaele (2014). To gain a more granular understanding of the gender effect, Dewaele et al. (2016) carried out an item-level analysis on the same corpus and found that female participants experienced significantly more mild anxiety (worrying about making errors and lower confidence) but not more extreme anxiety than the male participants. They also reported more fun and more pride in their FL performance than their male peers. Similar patterns emerged in Dewaele et al. (2018) but Mierzwa (2018) found an opposite pattern, with male learners scoring higher on FLE.

Multilingualism

The knowledge of more languages has been linked to higher levels of FLE in some studies—though the effect sizes were small (Botes et al., 2020; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Dewaele et al., 2019c)—but not in others (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2019; Dewaele et al., 2018). It is unclear whether the knowledge of more languages has a direct or indirect effect on FLE. In the case of a direct effect, multilinguals may enjoy learning new languages more because they have more experience with them and may have developed clear strategies for language learning. In the case of an indirect effect, multilingualism may have affected a number of personality traits (cf. Dewaele & Botes, 2020) which may, in turn, shape FLE.

Trait Emotional Intelligence

Trait emotional intelligence (TEI) (Petrides et al., 2007) has been found to be moderately positively correlated with FLE (Li & Xu, 2019). TEI seems to be partially mediated by FLE to influence perceived achievement and actual achievement in the FL indirectly (Li, 2020). High levels of TEI have been linked to higher FLE but also to higher enjoyment in the L1 class (Resnik & Dewaele, 2020, 2021).

Cultural Empathy

Cultural empathy reflects the ability to empathize with the feelings and thoughts of individuals from a different cultural background (van der Zee et al., 2013). Participants who scored high on cultural empathy were found to report higher levels of FLE (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2019). This is not surprising as empathy is also a central facet of TEI.

Level of Mastery in the FL

More advanced learners have been found to report higher levels of FLE than beginning learners (Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014; Mierzwa, 2018). This phenomenon is probably not unique to FL learning. Botes et al. (2020) argued that violin players might wince at the scratching sounds emerging from their instrument just like beginner FL speakers might curse.
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their lack of vocabulary, grammar, and syntax. However, increased knowledge and practice may boost confidence and enjoyment at the ability to produce music and fluent, coherent speech. As mentioned before, the causality could also go the other way round, with learners experiencing higher levels of FLE investing more effort in the learning and reaching higher levels of mastery in the longer term.

Relative Standing in the Group

Participants who feel that their mastery of the FL is above average within their group of peers report higher levels of FLE. On the other hand, those who feel they do not know the FL as well as their peers report lower FLE, often preferring silence to avoid standing out negatively. The fear of ridicule or sarcasm saps their FLE (Dewaele et al., 2018, Dewaele & Dewaele, 2017; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Li et al., 2019). Again, it could be argued that the causality is bi-directional.

FL Proficiency and Results

Higher proficiency scores and good test results have been linked to higher levels of FLE (Botes et al., 2020; Dewaele & Alfawazan, 2018; Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele & Proietti Ergün, 2020; Li, 2018; Li et al., 2019; Mierzwa, 2018; Teimouri et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2019). The strength of the relationship between FLE and proficiency and test results has also been shown to vary between stronger and weaker students (Li et al., 2019). The relationship was strong among a high-achievement group and non-significant in a low-achievement group (which reported more FLCA and lower overall FLE). The argument for bi-directional causality applies here too. High levels of FLE are likely to be linked to increased effort, leading to higher proficiency and better test results. The feeling of doing well, the gain of social standing in the group, and teacher praise may in turn strengthen enjoyment in the FL class. On the other hand, disappointing progress and weak results may demotivate learners and even push them to abandon the FL course. Botes et al. (2022) carried out a meta-analysis of a total of \( k = 97 \) effect sizes that linked FLE and various variables. They found that FLE was moderately positively correlated with academic achievement in the FL (\( r = 0.30 \)) and with self-perceived achievement in the FL (\( r = 0.27 \)). A stronger positive correlation was found between FLE and Willingness to Communicate (\( r = 0.48 \)).

Sources of FLE (Interaction between Learner-Internal and Learner-External Variables)

Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) had included an open question inviting participants to relate an enjoyable episode in the FL class in as much detail as possible. Analysis of the feedback revealed that FLE peaked in activities that empowered students, gave them a degree of autonomy, encouraged them to be creative, and allowed them to bond with classmates. The classroom environment strongly contributed to the experience of FLE. Praise and encouragement from teachers and peers, combined with humor, mutual trust, and respect, were frequently mentioned.

Attitude towards the FL

More positive attitudes toward the FL and the culture have been found to be linked to higher levels of FLE (De Smet al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele & Dewaele, 2017; Dewaele, Özdemir et al., 2019; Dewaele & Proietti Ergün, 2020).

Role of the Teacher

More positive attitudes toward the FL teacher and frequency of FL use by the teacher were found to be strong predictors of FLE (Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2019c; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Li, et al., 2019). The factor of teacher unpredictability in class predicted FLE in Western classrooms
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(Dewaele et al., 2018), but not in Chinese EFL classrooms (Li, et al., 2018; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019). A teacher’s friendliness was found to predict FLE in all contexts (Dewaele et al., 2019; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2019; Li et al., 2019) while a FL teacher’s strong foreign accent was a negative predictor of FLE among Spanish learners in Dewaele et al. (2019), though the foreign accent could, in fact, be a symptom of weak overall knowledge of the FL. Levels of FLE depend very much on who the teacher is. Dewaele and Dewaele (2020) investigated the FLE levels of students who had two teachers for the same FL and found higher scores for FLE with the main teacher compared to the second teacher. In contrast, scores for FLCA were identical for both teachers. The authors argue that the main teacher may have been better at regulating the emotional temperature in the FL classroom. An analysis of the descriptions of intense FLE during classroom episodes in Dewaele and MacIntyre (2019) showed that teachers were most frequently mentioned in relation to FLE. The same finding emerged in the qualitative data of Li (2020) and Jiang and Dewaele (2019). The effect of teacher seemed even stronger in Chinese classrooms, which could be linked to the central and dominant role of the teacher in Chinese education. Dewaele and Li (2021) used mediation analysis to investigate the link between teacher enthusiasm, Chinese EFL learners’ emotions, and their social-behavioral learning engagement. Learners with more enthusiastic teachers reported more enjoyment and less boredom which boosted their engagement. Teimouri et al. (2020) also found that language joy correlated strongly with teacher perception.

School Context

The status of an FL in a school determines students’ FLE. De Smet et al. (2018) found that primary- and secondary-level pupils in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) schools based in French-speaking Belgium reported higher FLE in the target languages than pupils in non-CLIL schools. Similarly, attitudes towards Turkish and levels of FLE were found to be particularly high in a prestigious Kazakh university with a strong Turkish connection (Dewaele et al., 2019c). A similar picture emerged in an immersion school in Istanbul where levels of FLE in Italian and English FL classes were particularly high (Dewaele & Proietti, 2020). Moreover, when schools were forced to switch to emergency remote teaching with the onset of the COVID pandemic, levels of FLE decreased significantly (Resnik & Dewaele, 2021).

Societal Context

De Smet et al. (2018) also found higher levels of FLE and lower levels of FLCA for English than for Dutch in both CLIL and non-CLIL schools. Dutch is perceived by Belgian Francophones as the language of the Flemish community with whom they have a difficult political relationship, which explains why students enjoy the language less and feel more anxious using it. The attitude towards English and English speakers was much more positive, which was reflected in classroom emotions.

To conclude, it seems that FLE is a crucial emotional ingredient of FL learning (see Tables 12.1a and 12.1b for an overview). FLE is the fuel that drives the learning, and it is strengthened and replenished by the performance and progress in the FL. It shows convincingly that it was time to expand earlier research that focused exclusively on the role of FLCA. FLE and FLCA are independent dimensions that are not in a see-saw relationship, which means that learners could experience both simultaneously or neither of them. The crucial implication of this finding is that teachers should not overly worry about their students’ FLCA but rather focus on boosting their FLE and teach them how to handle their FLCA.

Data Elicitation

Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) developed an FLE scale consisting of 21 items with five-point Likert-scale ratings reflecting positive emotions towards the learning experience, peers, and the
teacher. The scale had internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = 0.86$. FLE was defined as “a complex emotion, capturing interacting dimensions of challenge and perceived ability that reflect the human drive for success in the face of difficult tasks, pleasure is considered simply an agreeable feeling. On the one hand, enjoyments occur when people not only meet their needs, but exceed them to accomplish something new or even unexpected; on the other hand, pleasure is a simpler feeling that something likable is happening” (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016, pp. 216–217). The mixed-methods approach was deliberate. The authors who are steeped in the quantitative research tradition wished to be able to make some generalizations based on statistical analyses but wanted to complement them with learners’ voices and detailed descriptions of their unique experiences. The qualitative data helped shed light on the potential causes of FLE, and the quantification of the themes that emerged from the stories allowed the authors to draw some pedagogical implications. Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) thus followed the principles of convergent parallel design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), where quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously with equal emphasis on both methods. Separate analyses are then carried out on the quantitative and qualitative data before mixing the findings in the discussion. Such triangulation is possible “by directly comparing and contrasting quantitative results with qualitative findings for corroboration and validation purposes” (p. 77).

Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016) investigated the factor structure of the FLE and FLCA items in more detail. The eight FLCA items loaded on a first dimension, the 21 FLE items loaded on two dimensions: one that reflected the social dimension of enjoyment (“We laugh a lot”) and another that reflected the private dimension of enjoyment (“I enjoy it”). Further analysis was carried out by Botes et al. (2021) of the factor structure and item loadings of the FLE measure in the same

Table 12.1a Learner-Internal Factors Linked to Enjoyment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Multilingual Trait</th>
<th>Trait EI</th>
<th>Autonomy Attitude</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>FL Level</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Relative Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM14</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMMD16</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD17</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWSD18</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA18</td>
<td>189+152</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJD18</td>
<td>1,718+360</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ21</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMGHV18</td>
<td>869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM19</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ns +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFMS19</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J19</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD19</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LX19</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO19</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ ns ns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtoappear</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD20</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD21</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDG20</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPE20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12.1b Learner-External Factors Linked to Enjoyment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>Mesoc-Context</th>
<th>Macro-Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM14</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMMD16</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD17</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWSD18</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA18</td>
<td>189+152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJD18</td>
<td>1,718+360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ21</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAI18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMGHV18</td>
<td>869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM19</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS19</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD19</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDJ19</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LX19</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGW19</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO19</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtoappear</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD20</td>
<td>768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD21</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDG20</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL21</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T: teacher; Attitude T: attitudes toward the teacher; +: positive relationship; -: negative relationship; ns: non-significant relationship between enjoyment and independent variable.
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database. Principal component analyses revealed three factors. The first factor referred to the role of the teacher in creating a positive environment in the FL classroom. The second factor reflected a personal enjoyment of FL learning. And the third factor represented the social enjoyment of FL learning and more specifically the social cohesion and solidarity with peers. In order to construct the short foreign language enjoyment scale (S-FLES), three items were then selected per dimension on the basis of their factor loadings, the ant colony optimization algorithm, and theoretical considerations. It was independently tested via a confirmatory factor analysis. The measurement model was found to have a good fit and strong validity and reliability.

The original FLE scale was translated into Chinese by Li (2018) and published in Li et al. (2018). The authors selected 11 items reflecting the social and private dimensions from Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016) for the Chinese version of the FLE scale. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were performed to confirm the construct validity. These were complemented with item analysis, reliability tests, and validity tests (Li et al., 2018). A three-factor structure of FLE emerged (FLE-private, FLE-teacher, and FLE-atmosphere). Reliability of the scale was good. Split-half reliability was also high. Convergent and discriminant validity were also found to be satisfactory.

Jin and Zhang (2018) also translated the complete 21-item FLE scale into Chinese, replacing “foreign” with English to suit the Chinese EFL context. Dropping one item, they established that the new 20-item English classroom enjoyment scale had a Cronbach alpha value of 0.91. Principal component analysis revealed three factors: enjoyment of teacher support, enjoyment of English learning, and enjoyment of student support. Jin and Zhang (2021) reduced their scale to 16 items, preserving the original structure, and claim that it outperforms Li et al.’s (2018) Chinese version of the FLE scale in terms of psychometric properties and scoring variability (p. 1037).

Dewaele and MacIntyre’s (2014, 2019) large international samples (N = 1,746 and N = 750) based on snowball sampling meant that the participants were not representative of the general population. It had a high proportion of female, Western, educated participants, and undoubtedly a high proportion of enthusiastic learners. Other studies have focused on participants from one specific nationality, often one specific FL, and secondary school or university students. English was the target language in all Chinese studies on FLE so far (Jiang & Dewaele, 2019; Jin & Zhang, 2021; Li, 2018, 2020; Li et al., 2018, 2019; Li & Xu, 2019) as well as the study on Spaniards (Dewaele, to appear; Dewaele et al., 2019), Japanese (Saito et al., 2018), Iranians (Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2018, 2020), Romanians (Dewaele & Pavelescu, 2021; Pavelescu & Petrić, 2018), Hungarians (Piniel & Albert, 2018), and Saudis (Dewaele & Alfawazan, 2018). The studies that focused on languages other than English did find that attitude towards the language was a stronger predictor of FLE (De Smet et al., 2018; Dewaele & Dewaele, 2017; Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2019).

It is also worth pointing out that there are fewer qualitative studies on FLE. Piniel and Albert (2018) used Pekrun’s control–value theory as a basis for a study on achievement emotions of Hungarians EFL learners. They used a corpus of written reports on their different emotional experiences in using English inside and outside the classroom, and found that enjoyment and anxiety were most frequently mentioned. Ross and Rivers (2018) used semi-structured interviews with eight EFL learners in Australia and found that enjoyment, hope, and frustration were more intense outside the English classroom than within. Pavelescu and Petrić (2018) adopted a multiple case study design to focus on the emotional experiences of four Romanian EFL students. The authors used different qualitative methods (classroom observations and interviews with participants and teachers) to investigate participants’ fluctuating emotions (including love and enjoyment) since they started the study of English. They found that the love of English was the driving force in their learning and allowed them to cope when enjoyment dipped occasionally in the classroom. A follow-up qualitative study with two participants showed that enjoyment had a unique shape for each learner (Dewaele & Pavelescu, 2021). The authors warn that a numerical score on the FLE scale cannot encompass the whole elusive emotion and its dynamic character. While material gath-
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ered via open questions can complement the quantitative data, “there is a danger of assuming that the statistical dimensions of FLE and FLCA that emerge from the statistical analyses are completely valid, reliable and encompass the whole phenomenon. Researchers need to resist the temptation to essentialize emerging constructs” (p. 12).

Practical Applications

Findings from research on FLE can have important pedagogical and psychological consequences. A pedagogy informed by learner emotions would be more respectful not just of learners’ cognitive needs but also their emotional needs (MacIntyre et al., 2016, 2019; Oxford, 2020). As we pointed out earlier, enjoyment is more than mere pleasure. It implies challenge, hard work, and a sense of fulfillment at completing something that is really difficult. Higher levels of FLE among learners are linked with better performance but also with increased well-being. Moreover, through the process of emotion contagion, the enjoyment that learners experience will rub off on their teachers, who will in turn be better equipped to inspire their students (Moskowitz & Dewaele, 2021; Oxford, 2020; Talebzadeh et al., 2020). It is important also for teachers to develop an ability to perceive whether their students are enjoying themselves. Since FLE can be fleeting and is not necessarily transparent, this observation requires some effort by teachers (Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2018b).

Measuring learners’ FLE when performing a range of tasks in different modalities (including online vs. face to face) could provide researchers and teachers with a clear understanding of what students actually enjoy doing. Understanding how FLE emerges is the key to developing optimal blended learning that would allow FL learners to progress more smoothly and quickly. More specifically, FL teachers could seek to awaken interest in the FL and the FL culture, convince learners that progress is possible, and they could think about optimally challenging classroom activities in which students have a degree of autonomy and are encouraged to be creative. Teachers can also engage in some discreet social engineering in order for students to bond with their classmates. This can happen easily in a classroom environment where hard work, laughter, mutual trust, solidarity, praise, and encouragement make learners push and enjoy themselves, which can be further reinforced with good performance in tests.

Future Directions

Dewaele and Li (2020) have argued that researchers need to reflect on the role that their own complex values, identities, and experiences play on their research findings and interpretations. Locating subjectivity and evaluating its potential effects on the findings may not neutralize the effects but at least it can show an awareness of their potential influence.

Early research on FLE used mixed methods and this continues to be a popular approach, complemented with quantitative and purely qualitative studies. It is crucial that mixed-methods designs continue to be used in future research. They offer researchers binocular vision and allow them “to perceive three-dimensional images of phenomena” (Dewaele, 2019b, p. 85).

Future research designs on FLE could expand the range of time frames. While most studies focus on a time frame of a couple of months, some studies have expanded the window to the years preceding the data collection through retrodictive qualitative modeling (Dewaele & Pavelescu, 2021; Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2020) while others have looked at short-term fluctuations of FLE (Boudreau et al., 2018; Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2018a, b). It would also be enlightening to see FLE evolve from class to class over a school term or an academic year, for example.

Future research could also move away from simple correlational designs towards more complex statistical techniques to capture the effects of dynamic interactive variables (Dewaele & Li, 2020). Mediation analysis can be used to uncover the direct and indirect effects of independent
and dependent variables (Dewaele & Li, 2021). The second type deals with developmental data and pursues the trajectory or changing trends. Latent growth curve modeling can be deployed to explore the growth and changing trends of FLE over time (Elahi Shirvan & Taherian, 2021; Elahi Shirvan et al., 2021). Such techniques allow an investigation of the complex relationships of FLE with learner-internal and learner-external variables at both the individual level and the group level. These advanced statistical techniques also accommodate the assumptions of dynamic systems theory (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Elahi Shirvan & Talebzadeh, 2020).

The field also needs exploratory and experimental research in classrooms. Intervention studies and action research could also lead to the development of specific ways and techniques to boost FLE, both in the short term and in the longer term (Li & Xu, 2019). It would be useful to dig deeper into specific classroom activities in order to find out what specific tasks learners enjoy or fear, and how these could be tweaked to find an optimal balance.

More research is also needed to find out what the effect is of the specific language on FLE to further explore the very nature of FLE: is it more trait-like, state-like, or just ephemeral? In other words, is FLE stable across the various FLs that a learner studies simultaneously (Dewaele & Proietti Ergün, 2020; Piechurska–Kuciel, 2017)? It would be interesting also to find out whether levels of FLE would be different for English than for French or German in Iran (which has a tense relationship with the US and the UK), compared to levels of FLE for English, French, and German in Japan, which has a good political relationship with the US and the UK. It would also be particularly useful to focus on learners of multiple FLs to see to what extent FLE is correlated across the FLs (Dewaele & Proietti Ergün, 2020) and whether the FL itself is a confounding variable. Such research could throw a light on the combined interactive effects of political and historical contexts on FLE. Further research is also needed on the enjoyment that secondary school pupils experience in their L1 class (Resnik & Dewaele, 2020). The absence of data on FL learners’ L1(s) is a gap in individual differences research in SLA. This absence is all the more surprising considering that there is wide agreement that multilinguals (even incipient ones) are multicompetent and that all languages are connected in the multilingual mind (Cook, 2016).

Another area that deserves increased attention is the relationship between learner enjoyment, anxiety, boredom (Li, 2021; Li et al., 2020), their engagement (Dewaele & Li, 2021; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020), and motivation (Papi & Teimouri, 2014). Such research can stimulate the development of teaching techniques that makes L2 learning more enjoyable and therefore more successful (e.g., Sato, 2021).

Finally, further research on enjoyment could adopt a more granular view, considering the subscales of FLE, and link them to specific tasks (Botes et al., 2020).

To conclude, we hope to have demonstrated that a holistic approach to classroom emotions is vital for SLA research into individual differences. Enjoyment (and other positive emotions) are the metaphorical fuel for the FL process.

Notes
1 One could argue that the “interest” construct in Gardner (1985) has a positive emotional connotation.
2 Defined by Hochschild (1983) as “the management of feelings to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (p. 7).
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