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As many foreign language teachers would agree, motivation is one of the most striking individual differences between L2 learners. This study investigates learners' reasons for starting to learn Turkish as an L2, here called orientations (following Gardner 1985) and possible relations between these orientations and their executive motivation (Dörnyei & Ottó 1998) in carrying out the learning tasks in the long run. Specifically, in order to understand whether the three types of orientation (Noels 2001) have different relations with the later executive motivation, both qualitative and quantitative methods have been used. The results indicate that intrinsic orientation, the pleasure of language learning per se, is significantly related to executive motivation. Integrative orientation, the desire to get to know the L2 community, is also in a statistically significant relation with the dependent variable, though to a smaller extent. Finally, extrinsic/instrumental orientation, referring to the more practical reasons for learning Turkish, turns out not to be significantly correlated with extrinsic motivation.
Introduction

Although adults differ from one another to a certain extent in the ability to use their native language with all its delicacies, every healthy child raised under normal circumstances is assumed to master the language s/he is exposed to very quickly, and relatively effortlessly (e.g. Chomsky 1959). The end product of this process is the emergence of individuals who converge on the grammar of the language spoken in their community. While young children are so successful in acquiring a language, much older adults with developed cognitive abilities and considerable life experience, who have already adopted one language, seem to have a great difficulty learning a new language, sometimes even in spite of explicit teaching, as many language teachers would agree. Undoubtedly, many adult learners master the foreign/second language (L2) they are learning; however, there is still great variation among the ultimate levels of competence attained by L2 learners and unlike L1, the differences go beyond stylistics and relate to more fundamental aspects of language. In order to understand why some learners are more competent than others and why there is such great variation in L2 competence, researchers have investigated individual differences in language learning. While earlier studies in individual differences have focused factors such as age, sex, intelligence, personality and aptitude, the present study investigates motivation.

Although motivation is a concept that is frequently used in daily life to refer to the driving force that leads individuals into action, it is a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon (Dörnyei 2001) which is difficult to define. In the context of the present study, Dörnyei and Ottó’s (1998) definition of L2 motivation is adopted. According to this definition motivation is:

...the dynamically changing cumulative arousal in a person that initiates, directs, coordinates, amplifies, terminates, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial
wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalized and (successfully or unsuccessfully) acted out (p. 65).

The importance of the role that motivation plays in L2 learning is quite obvious as the process cannot begin in the first place with the lack thereof. Moreover, most L2 learners complain that learning a new language is a difficult, tedious and long process (Bogaards, 1991) and staying motivated in the long run is crucial for the learning to continue. The other reason why the present study focuses on motivation is that unlike some other individual difference factors, such as sex, aptitude and age; it is open to modifications through internal and external influences. Motivation is not an innate, immutable and stable phenomenon; therefore both the learner and the teacher have the power to improve it and hence, contribute to the efficacy of L2 learning.

As the importance of motivation in L2 learning is totally acknowledged in our day, there have recently been a great number of theoretical and experimental studies investigating it. However, this was not always the case. Before the publication of the studies of Gardner and Lambert (1959), competence in L2 was considered to be related to intelligence and verbal aptitude only. It is the seminal work of R.C. Gardner and his colleagues carried out in the bilingual setting of Canada that introduced motivation as a major factor influencing L2 learning. These early studies were social psychological in nature. Gardner's socio-educational model (1985) is considered to provide basis of the current L2 motivation research. The model has been revised over the time. In its latest version (Gardner 2001) the model comprises of four components: external influences, individual differences, language acquisition contexts and outcomes. Outcomes are the linguistic and non-linguistic results of the L2 acquisition process and language acquisition contexts are the formal and informal settings where learning might take place. More important for the present purposes are the external influences and especially individual differences components. Among external influences,
Gardner cites the history of the language learner and motivators like the teacher that plays a role in motivating the learner. Individual differences, on the other hand, include aptitude and integrative motivation, other motivational and non-motivational factors. In this model, integrative motivation includes three variables: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation. Integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation are influenced by the history of the learner and motivators respectively and have a direct influence on motivation together with other motivational factors. Integrativeness, which is a key concept in the model is defined as “a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer psychologically to the other language community” (Gardner 2001). Hence, a high level of integrativeness indicates a strong interest in learning the target language in order to identify with the group speaking this language.

Motivation, on the other hand is conceived as a variable including the elements of effort, desire and positive affect and influencing other non-motivational factors itself. To operationalize the variables in the model, Gardner (1985) puts forward an associated set of measures called the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). The AMTB is a multi-component motivation test including more than 130 items and has sound psychometric properties like construct and predictive validity (Gardner and MacIntyre 1993). Its variations are still used all over the world for experimental L2 studies (Dörnyei 2001).

The social psychological period defined by Gardner and his associates' earlier work in Canada can be considered as the first one of the three phases of L2 motivation research (Dörnyei 2005). The second phase is the cognitive-situated period which lasted during the 1990s. In this period, there are attempts to adopt the theories of motivation in the dominant main-stream cognitive psychology to L2 learning research. Among the various theories of motivation, self-determination theory and attribution theory are the ones that have received the most of L2 researchers' attention. Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan 1985), which emphasizes different types of intrinsic and extrinsic motives has been a dominant theory in motivational psychology. Noels (2001) and her
colleagues (Noels, Pelletier, Clément & Vallerand 2000) have started a systematic empirical research program to apply the theory into the L2 domain. Attribution theory, on the other hand, is another important theory of motivation that influenced L2 researchers. According to this theory, the subjective reasons to which individuals attribute their past successes and failures, in other words, their attributions shape their future motivation to a considerable extent (Weiner 1992). In accordance with the claims of this theory, it has been demonstrated that attributions play a crucial role in L2 learning motivation (e.g. Ushioda 2001). Without doubt, there are many more theories of motivation in mainstream psychology and several other attempts to apply these to L2 research; however, a comprehensive review of this literature is beyond the scope of the present paper. To sum up, the common objective of the endeavors of adapting the theories in mainstream cognitive psychology into L2 learning research, is to replace the macro-level L2 motivation studies with a micro-level approach as learning takes place in several different contexts and in unique situations (Dörnyei 2005).

The cognitive-situated approach of 1990s has yielded several empirical studies and have inspired the process-oriented period which takes into account the dynamic character of motivation and its variability over time. Due to the fact that it provides coverage to all the empirical data in the literature and that it considers the temporal dimension of motivation, the present study is carried out within the framework of the process model of L2 motivation (Dörnyei & Ottó 1998). This model, inspired by the action control theory (Heckhausen & Kuhl 1985), organizes the motivational influences that show up along an action sequence during L2 learning. The action sequence is comprised of three phases: preactional phase corresponding to choice motivation before the action, actional phase corresponding to executive motivation and postactional phase which refers to the retrospection after the completion of the action. For each of these actional phases, there is a corresponding motivational influence. The motivational influences effective in the preactional phase contain three different sub-processes: motivational influences on goal setting, intention formation
and the initiation of intention enactment. If the instigation force of these *motivational influences* enables the learner to cross the metaphorical Rubicon, then choice motivation is replaced by executive motivation as the action is launched. At this actional phase, executive motivational influences are operative. In the postactional evaluation phase, there are also certain corresponding motivational influences. The main advantage of this model is that it captures the dynamic aspect of motivation and differentiates between choice motivation of the preactional stage and executive motivation required for carrying out the learning tasks at the later actional phase.

Having provided some basic theoretical information on L2 motivation literature as a background, in the rest of this paper, the present study will be presented. To this end, first some relevant concepts will be defined. Then, the research questions and hypotheses will be presented along with an explanation of why the target language is Turkish in this study. Next, information on the qualitative and quantitative methods that have been used will be provided. The analyses and discussion of the results will follow and in the end, further possible implications of the study will be considered.

**The Study**

Basic concepts: Orientations and executive motivation

As already mentioned in the previous section, recently there have been several studies investigating motivation in L2 learning. Most of these studies focus on the relation between the learner's motivation and his/her success in learning the target language. Unlike these studies, the present research does not aim to relate motivation to L2 competence, rather it investigates the relation between the different phases of L2 learning motivation. More specifically it focuses on the relation between *choice motivation*, which refers to the reasons why an individual starts to learn an L2 in the first place and *executive motivation* which provides the driving force for the learner when s/he is striving to accomplish the required learning tasks in the long term.
In this study, choice motivation will be represented by different kinds of orientations, which is a term adopted from Gardner (1985). This terminology is useful for emphasizing the difference between the preactional and actional phases as using the term motivation for both the reasons the learner has for launching the action and the energy source for carrying out tasks could lead to some confusion. To distinguish between different types orientations, certain dichotomies have been proposed in the literature. One such dichotomy mostly adopted by the proponents of the self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan 1985) is between intrinsic and extrinsic motives. Basically, intrinsic motives are the more internal reasons related to the pleasure the individual gets in carrying out a certain action; whereas extrinsic motives refer to external awards that will be gained or the negative outcomes that will be avoided if the individual chooses to act. Another dichotomy, very prominent in the L2 motivation literature is the distinction between integrative and instrumental orientations. Integrative orientation can be defined as a willingness to interact, get to know better, and even become like the members of the community speaking the target language (Gardner & Lambert 1959), while instrumental orientation covers the utilitarian reasons for learning this L2. Given the social psychological context of the Francophone-Anglophone bilingual setting of Canada, integrativeness is a central concept in Gardner's work. Obviously, instrumental orientation and extrinsic motives refer to the same external reasons for starting to learn a language. Intrinsic and integrative orientations on the other hand are not interchangeable. Although integrative orientation has both internal and external aspects, it seems worth being considered as a third type of orientation on its own as language is a part of an individual's identity and as to learn a human language is also to learn about the culture and identity of the actual people speaking this language. Therefore, the present study follows Noels (2001) in categorizing types of orientations in three groups: intrinsic, extrinsic/instrumental and integrative orientations.

Intrinsic orientation refers to the pleasure experienced during the process of language learning. It
means enjoying L2 learning per se. *Intrinsic orientation* might be related to the satisfaction of one's curiosity through gaining knowledge, to a feeling of accomplishment of mastering a difficult task or to the inherent pleasure related to the aesthetics of the activity like the rhythm of a language (Noels 2001). Table 1 gives examples of sentences that intrinsically oriented L2 learners would use as answers to the question of “Why are you learning this language?”.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

*Extrinsic/instrumental orientation*, on the other hand, leads the individual to launch on an activity for the sake of other, rather utilitarian reasons. In the L2 learning scenario, not every learner may find the challenge so inherently interesting, novel or exciting. Some learners may start to learn the L2, because it is part of the curriculum of their study program or because they want to achieve some other goal which requires them to learn the language. *Extrinsic/instrumental orientation* might involve different degrees of *self-determination* (Noels 2001). In other words, the learners may internalize this external need of learning the L2 to different extends. For example one learner might really be convinced that learning the language will help them with their career; whereas another learner might be carrying out the learning tasks just to avoid negative outcomes like failing to get a degree without believing in the need for learning the L2. Although both are extrinsically motivated, the former seems to have internalized the *extrinsic/instrumental orientation* and to have a feeling of personal choice and relevance, the latter does not (Noels 2001). Therefore, the practical reasons may be more or less *self-determined*, what they have in common is that they relate to a goal other than language learning per se, that will lead to a reward or help avoid a negative result. Some sample comments of L2 learners with *extrinsic/instrumental orientation* are presented in Table 2.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]
The third type of orientation is *integrative orientation* which implies learning a certain target language in order to interact or identify oneself with members of the community speaking this language. As mentioned above, *integrative orientation* has both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects. Just like *intrinsic orientation*, it defines an inherent interest in the target language and the associated culture. On the other hand, it can also be considered to resemble *extrinsic/instrumental orientation* in that learning the L2 is a means of getting to know the people who speak it (Noels 2001). Given that language is closely related to the identity of an individual and a community, it is appropriate to keep *integrative orientation* as a distinct category of its own as unlike the *intrinsic* and *extrinsic/instrumental orientations* which pertain to the immediate learning situation, it is relevant for the intergroup situation. The comments in Table 3 demonstrate the point of view of integratively oriented learners.

*INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE*

It should be noted that the distinction between these three types of orientation does not necessarily imply that a certain learner might have only one kind of orientation. A single learner may well exhibit more than one kind of orientation and even certain amounts of all three. In the context of the present study, if a learner is said to be, for instance, “intrinsically oriented”, this means that the dominant type of orientation of this person is *intrinsic orientation*. However, this does not exclude the possibility that this learner may also have some integrative and/or extrinsic instrumental reasons.

While *orientations* are the reasons that lead the individual to launch on the learning process, *executive motivation* refers to the ensemble of influences that enter into play as soon as the learning process starts. Therefore, *executive motivation* can be defined as the driving force that enables the
learner to accomplish the arduous tasks that are required for learning to take place in the long run. Although *executive motivation* is closely related to the concept of *task motivation* (c.f. Dörnyei 2005), in the present context it refers to a more general state of motivation rather than the attitudes towards single learning tasks. As the factor of novelty that is present for most learners in the beginning is replaced with many classroom distractors and learning tasks that require effort, a sustained *executive motivation* is essential for long-term success. In this study, *executive motivation* is measured through three different concepts: enthusiasm, effort and the desire to continue to learn the L2. Several factors that are relevant to the learning process such as the teacher, teaching material, classroom atmosphere and class mates might potentially affect *executive motivation*.

Research Questions and Predictions

Unlike most recent studies on L2 motivation, the present research does not focus on the role of motivation in L2 competence; instead, it investigates the relationship between different types of *orientations* and *executive motivation*. More precisely, it seeks an answer to the question of whether initial *orientation* type has an effect on the later *executive motivation* together with other factors such as the teacher, learning material, classmates, etc. focusing on a specific group of L2 learners: learners of Turkish as L2.

The present research questions, therefore; are twofold. The first line of questions relate to the *orientations* of L2 learners of Turkish. Who learn Turkish as an L2? In which contexts? And most importantly, for what reasons? It is predicted that individuals with different L1s might be learning Turkish for a variety of reasons in different contexts; which makes Turkish as a suitable target language for a study of L2 *orientations* and motivation. The first part of the present study deals with these rather general questions.
The second line of questions are on the possible relationship between the three types of orientation and executive motivation of L2 learners of Turkish. The main aim is to find out whether there is a relationship between orientations of the preactional stage and executive motivation of the actional stage of L2 learning. If there is, then a second question emerges: “Is a certain orientation type more related to executive motivation than the others?” It is hypothesized that although other factors come into play when the learner crosses the Rubicon, the original reasons why they started this endeavor should still have an influence at their long-term motivation. With regard to the types of orientations, it is predicted that intrinsic orientation is more likely to be related to executive motivation, because learners who inherently enjoy the process of language learning would not be so inclined to abstain from putting effort on the learning tasks as the ones who don't enjoy it.

As to the choice of the target language as Turkish, it should first be stated that most literature in L2 motivation has investigated the acquisition of English, French, Spanish and German with very few studies focusing on other languages. Unfortunately, apart from the few exceptions (e.g. Yaylı 2007, Osam & Ağazade 2004), there are not any systematic motivational studies on Turkish as a foreign/second language. The present study, therefore; aims to fill in this gap in the literature.

Turkish is an agglutinated Altaic language with a rich morphology, a free word order (main word order being Subject-Object-Verb as the language is head-final), and vowel harmony. It is both a historical and a modern language which is (together with its dialects) spoken by about 200 million people all over the world (Akdoğan, Özkan & Kurt 2001). It is spoken not only on the Anatolian peninsula but also on a vast geography including the south-east Europe, North Siberia, Middle East, ex-USSR and China (Bozdemir, 1991). Apart from the native speakers, many people with different L1s learn Turkish as a foreign or second language in a variety of contexts and for different reasons. This is the second and most important reason why the present study has L2 learners as the target
Methodology

In order to answer the present research questions a mixed methodology with both qualitative and quantitative techniques was used. The first part of study is qualitative in nature and provides the preliminary data which serve as a basis for the main quantitative questionnaire study.

Qualitative Study

The objective of the preliminary qualitative study was to explore the major characteristics of the population learning Turkish as an L2 in Turkey or abroad and to obtain detailed information about the individual opinions of these learners on their reasons for learning Turkish, the difficulties they encounter during the process, and so on. In other words, the aim was to determine the general profile of learners of Turkish as an L2 and to use the data while preparing the quantitative study, which constitutes the major part of the present research. To this end, semi-structured interviews with 10 informants were conducted. 8 of the informants were L2 learners of Turkish, and 2 were teachers of Turkish as an L2. The latter were both native Turkish speakers. One of these teachers was located and interviewed in Turkey (Ankara) and the other in France (Paris). Of the 8 learners, 2 were learning Turkish abroad as a foreign language and 6 in Turkey, as a second language. 5 of the learners were French native speakers, 2 were English native speakers and 1 was a German native speaker. The interviews were carried out in the native language of every learner (except with the German native speaker, with whom the interview was realized in English, a language in which is this informant is fluent) by the same interviewer.

The interviews with the two teachers revealed the general profiles of and the main differences between L2 learners of Turkish in Turkey and in France. The informant teaching Turkish at a
private university in Ankara explained that her students were mainly the exchange students that come to study in Turkey, the foreign academic staff and their family members. The second teacher teaching Turkish at an institution in Paris at several levels indicated that his students were mostly Francophones, but added that there were also some Turcophones who are members of Turkish families having immigrated in France and who would like to improve their Turkish. On the other hand, during the interviews with the learners, in addition to general questions like age, occupation, nationality, mother tongue, educational level; several questions which can be grouped under six categories were asked. First, the informants were asked to define their understanding of the notion of motivation which aimed to initiate a reflection on the issue. As 6 of the 8 learners were also teachers of their L1 as a foreign language, they were already familiar with the notion. Then, they were asked to explain the reasons why they started to learn Turkish. The third group of questions were aimed at exploring their level of interest in learning this language and the level of effort they put into the activity. Another set of questions was related to their attitudes towards Turkey and the Turkish people. The fifth group consisted of questions on their evaluation of their teacher of Turkish, of their class and the teaching/learning materials and the last group included questions regarding the difficulties they encountered and their self-motivation techniques. These questions yielded a very rich corpus; however, due to space limitations, only some extracts that are relevant for the present purposes will be quoted (and in cases of French-speaking informants, translated into English) here.

[…] Regarding my motivation for learning Turkish, well I'd say it's quite... There are two things: First, the utility... First of all, it is obligatory to speak Turkish when you're living in Ankara […]. Well it could be for shopping, for dwelling, etc. It's really a practical purpose, for the daily life. Then, there is pleasure motivation. I have two types of it. First there is the pleasure of daily situations, I mean being able to say “Hoşbulduk!” (Politeness term in response to “welcome”, literally translated
as “we found well”), “thank you”, etc. Being able to be nice to people, being able to enter into communication with people [...] . And another thing, it's an intellectual pleasure to see that at the age of 30, one can still learn a new language, understand it, acquire a new logic, a grammar... The Turkish language is so different than French (his L1), so what is more, it's like an intellectual game. I'd say it's the joy of learning! [...] 

This informant, who had had training not only in teaching French as a foreign language, but also in psychology and social psychology; provides detailed information about his orientation types. Obviously, he demonstrates that a single individual may have more than one reason for starting to learn a foreign language. In his case, “the utility” which he refers to expresses his extrinsic/instrumental orientation while his willingness to communicate with people reflects his integrative orientation and his considering L2 learning as a game demonstrates his intrinsic orientation.

Another subject who studied archeology and history of art outside of Turkey and who had a very close Turkish friend called “Betül” says: “Why I'm motivated to learn Turkish... Maybe because of “Betül”, and because of archeology, to understand all the literature...”. Her orientation combination is one of integrative and extrinsic/instrumental. Other combinations are also possible. For instance, an informant who lived in Turkey exhibits strong intrinsic and extrinsic/instrumental orientations at the same time by saying:

My primary motivation was to be able to communicate. And then, I have a very particular relation with languages, I mean, I love foreign languages. I love foreign languages and it's true that I immediately fell in love with the Turkish language, so this was an extra motivation to learn it! But it's true that the primary reason was my social life, to facilitate my social life, of course.
Sometimes, it gets more and more difficult to make a distinction between different types, for example between integrative orientation and executive/instrumental orientation. A comparison of the two following informants' quotes demonstrates the fine differences between orientation types:

I had a boyfriend of Turkish origin for twelve years, his mom spoke French very well and his grandma didn't speak it at all. I absolutely wanted to talk with her, so I said to myself “OK, if this old lady can't speak French, then I will learn Turkish!” and as I had already learned a few foreign languages and as I was looking for something a bit more exotic, I had found a chance, so it was to be able to talk with a grandmother-in-law [...]

Although L2 Turkish is a means of communication for this informant who lives in France, there is an underlying desire to get to know the people who speaks it. Together with her general positive attitude towards Turkish culture, her orientation is likely to be dominantly integrative. Another informant living in Turkey indicates a similar reason in addition to an intrinsic orientation; however, his reason looks like both an integrative one and slightly more like an extrinsic/instrumental one:

Because I like languages and my girlfriend is Turkish. I guess someone might say: “So what? She speaks English!” But I figured, you know, while socializing there were going to be times when they are with Turks and I don't want to be left out like that.

These individual examples demonstrate that learners may have more than one type of orientation at the same time, to varying degrees and that the distinction between these three types is not always
straightforward. To sum up, the semi-structured interviews with the teachers and learners of Turkish as an L2 indicate that learners start studying Turkish for diverse reasons. A tourist visiting Turkey and loving the country, a person whose significant other or close friend is Turkish, someone who is interested in the structures of different languages, the third generation children of Turkish families who had immigrated to another country, a person who moves to Turkey for his/her job or studies and an archeology student all have different reasons for starting to learn Turkish. In order to understand whether orientation types are related to learners' long-term executive motivation to varying extends, these qualitative data are used as a basis for the preparation of the main questionnaire study.

Quantitative Study

Although the case studies presented in the previous section were highly informative, in order to investigate the relation between the orientations and executive motivation of the general population learning Turkish as an L2, a larger scale quantitative study was required. To that end, an online questionnaire was prepared. Since the AMTB of Gardner (1985), questionnaires have been a widely preferred method in L2 motivation studies and have been proven to be an efficient tool in collecting information from a large number of participants (Dörnyei 2003). As the situations and contexts of learning Turkish as an L2 have their specific aspects, instead of applying one of questionnaires that were successfully used in previous studies, an ad hoc questionnaire entitled “Motivation in Learning Turkish” was created. The items in the questionnaire included both novel questions designed in the light of the qualitative data obtained from the interviews and those that are adaptations of classical motivation survey questions into L2 Turkish learning. There were a total of 60 items in the questionnaire (c.f. Appendix). The first 46 items were Likert-scale questions for which the participant was given a sentence on some aspect of her/his L2 motivation and asked to indicate the extend to which s/he agrees with this statements. There were five options ranging from
“strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

These 46 items consisted of the four scales: *intrinsic orientation*, *extrinsic/instrumental orientation*, *integrative orientation* and *executive motivation*, each of which included several positive and negative statements aimed at measuring the same phenomenon in order to ensure internal consistence. Questions 47-59 ask the participants to give some general personal information and information regarding their background in learning Turkish and possibly other languages. These questions require either simple verbal or numerical replies or the choice between the options “Yes” and “No”. The last item in the questionnaire is an optional open-ended question asking the participant to precise if they have any other remarks on their reasons of learning Turkish, their motivation and the difficulties they had during the learning process.

Before the actual application of the questionnaire, a small piloting was conducted and certain revisions were made on the wording of the items. The main questionnaire was applied online. Electronic surveys constitute a methodology which is more and more often used in scientific research. Although this method has some disadvantages such as sample demographic limitations -population being limited to those who have access to computers and the internet-, the difficulty of guaranteeing anonymity and confidentiality and possible technical problems (Barribeau et al. 2005); its advantages outweigh these shortcomings in the context of the present study. The most important strength of this method is the wide coverage it provides. The electronic questionnaire has accessed a large number of participants studying Turkish as an L2 all around the world; which would have otherwise been impossible. Furthermore, a higher response rate, a quicker response time than pencil-and-paper questionnaires, the ease of editing and more candid responses are among the other advantages of electronic surveys (Barribeau et al. 2005). The participants received an e-mail with
the link of the online questionnaire in the body of the message. They were informed about the study in general and the procedure. It was emphasized that the questionnaire was not a “test” of any kind but a tool to collect their opinions and that their information would be kept confidential. Participants were free to choose to fill in either the English or the French version of the questionnaire depending on their L1 and/or their level of competence in these languages. The reason why the questionnaire was not presented in Turkish was that there could be and as it turned out there was indeed variation among the learners' levels of competence in the target language Turkish and that beginners might not feel comfortable using this language. The links to the English and French versions of the questionnaire are as follows (available on 04.01.2009):

http://freeonlinesurveys.com/rendersurvey.asp?sid=97vbt5bb5hoeco0106869
http://freeonlinesurveys.com/rendersurvey.asp?sid=kv14dksokuri2mu107181

Access to subjects was ensured through contacts with institutions and teachers teaching Turkish as an L2 in different countries; online discussion groups and individual e-mails. As a result, the data from 129 participants from all around the world were included in the study. Of all the participants, 20 preferred not to indicate their sex. 45 of the rest were male, and 64 were female. 106 of the participants revealed their age. The mean age of these participants was 29 and the median was 26. These subjects had a variety of L1s and nationalities as illustrated in Graph 1:

[INSERT GRAPH 1 ABOUT HERE]

Results

The data obtained through the online questionnaire was analyzed statistically using SPSS. The independent variable of the study is kind of orientation: intrinsic, extrinsic/instrumental and
integrative; and the dependent variable is *executive motivation* defined here in terms of three sub-variables: *enthusiasm, desire to continue to learn Turkish* and *effort*. The items that constitute the scales corresponding to these variables (c.f. Table 5a & 5b) have been proven to be internally consistent, when there is more than one item in the scale, which is the case for most of the variables. Other questions which do not straightforwardly fall into one of these scales have been excluded from the analysis.

[INSERT TABLE 5a & 5b ABOUT HERE]

Correlations constitute a good starting point to investigate whether there is indeed a relationship between the three types of *orientation* and *executive motivation*. First of all there is a statistically significant correlation between *intrinsic orientation* and *executive motivation* ($R = 0.602, p < 0.001$) (c.f. Tables 6a and 6b). This indicates that learners who have intrinsic reasons for learning Turkish as an L2, who in other words love language learning *per se*, also have a high level of *executive motivation*.

[INSERT TABLES 6a & 6b ABOUT HERE]

Secondly, the correlation between *integrative orientation* and *executive motivation* is also statistically significant ($r = 0.461, p < 0.001$) (c.f. Tables 7a and 7b). Therefore, it is possible to see that *executive motivation* is also related to a high *integrative orientation* although the extent of this relation is not as great as that between *executive motivation* and *intrinsic orientation*.

[INSERT TABLES 7a & 7b ABOUT HERE]
The (negative) correlation between extrinsic/instrumental orientation and executive motivation; on the other hand, is not statistically significant ($r = -0.062, p < 0.001$) (c.f. Tables 8a and 8b). This implies that unlike intrinsic and integrative reasons for learning Turkish as an L2, extrinsic/instrumental orientation is not significantly related to executive motivation in the present context.

As the qualitative data indicated that individuals may have more than one kind of orientation, it is also important to look at the possible relations between the orientation types themselves. First, although the correlation is not very high, there is a significant linear relation between intrinsic orientation and integrative orientation ($r = 0.49, p < 0.001$). As for the relation between intrinsic orientation and extrinsic/instrumental orientation, there is a statistically significant negative correlation ($r = -0.304, p < 0.001$) although the value of the correlation is not too high. In the end, it is observed that there is not a significant correlation between integrative orientation and extrinsic/instrumental orientation ($r = -0.54, p < 0.001$).

Although correlations are useful research tools, they do not give information about the predictive power of variables. Regression analysis on the other hand, enables the researchers to fit a predictive model to their data and use that model to predict values of the dependent variable from one or more independent variables (Field 2005). Given that this study also seeks to predict an outcome from several predictors, a multiple regression analysis is an even more suitable tool for the present purposes. Tables 9a-c summarize the results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis with the same independent and dependent variables.
The interpretation of these tables reveals that SPSS first entered *intrinsic orientation* in the multiple regression, which accounted for 36% of the variation in *executive motivation* ($F_{1,127} = 72.212, p < 0.001$). *Integrative orientation* was entered secondly and accounted for a further 3.6% of the variation in *executive motivation* ($F_{1,126} = 7.615, p = 0.007$). On the other hand, the third predictor, *extrinsic/instrumental orientation* did not account for any additional proportion of the variation in the dependent variable. To sum up, a greater *executive motivation* was associated with higher *intrinsic* and *integrative orientations*.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The results of the multiple regression analysis and correlations confirm the two predictions mentioned *supra*. First of all, while novel factors may well start to have an influence on the executive motivation of a learner as soon as the learning process begins, it is observed that (at least certain types of) reasons that the individual has for starting to learn Turkish still have an effect on their *executive motivation* in the long term. Secondly, as expected, different types of reasons turned out to be related with *executive motivation* at varying degrees and as predicted it was *intrinsic orientation* that was most likely to be associated with *executive motivation*. In addition, *integrative orientation* was also found to be relevant for sustained *executive motivation*, although its correlation with the dependent variable is not as high as *intrinsic motivation*. It also turned out that *intrinsic* and *integrative orientations* together account for a considerable amount of variation in *executive motivation*. On the other hand, *extrinsic/instrumental orientations*, in other words more practical and utilitarian reasons for taking up Turkish as an L2, were not significantly related with sustained motivation in the execution of the tedious language learning tasks in the context of the present study. It should be no surprise that intrinsically oriented learners, who by definition enjoy the learning process itself are more likely to stay enthusiastic for a long while, to put considerable effort in the long run and to be willing to continue to learn Turkish. On the other hand, the reason
underlying the significant correlation between *integrative orientation* and *executive motivation* could be that these learners do not consider L2 Turkish as a mere subject matter. For them, Turkish might be more than that, like a part of the identity and culture of the community who speak it. Their desire to get to know the target community seems to enable them to stay motivated in the long term. Finally, although external awards, urgent needs, and such instrumental reasons might be effective in motivation the individual to act on certain tasks, the present results suggests that they are not sufficient (at least not on their own) for sustaining *executive motivation* over long periods of time.

To sum up, the present study revealed that individuals start learning Turkish for a variety of reasons. These individuals may have one or more types of *orientations* and their initial *orientations*, and their *orientation* types, especially their *intrinsic* and *integrative orientations* are significantly related to their later *executive motivation*. However, L2 motivation of Turkish is still an area of research that is at its infancy and further studies are needed. Among possible research paths are the motivation and orientations of L2 Turkish learners who are native speakers of other Turkic languages and of the immigrants who are in the process of acquiring Turkish as a second language in Turkey without explicit teaching. Furthermore, the results of the present study also indicate that future research is required on the interaction of *orientations* with the other factors that are argued to influence *executive motivation*. In conclusion, the finding that *intrinsic* and *integrative orientations* are remarkably related to Turkish L2 learners' motivation in executing the learning tasks, has potential implications for teachers who seek to devise tasks that will motivate their learners and for learners who would like to increase their levels of self-motivation.
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APPENDIX

MOTIVATION IN LEARNING TURKISH, July 2005

We would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning your motivation in learning Turkish as a foreign/second language. This survey is conducted in the framework of our MA research at University of Paris 3. This is not a test so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. The information provided will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purposes. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Gözde Bahadır at gozdebahadir@yahoo.com. Thank you very much for your help!

1) I learn Turkish, because I live in Turkey and in order to communicate with local people I have to know their language.

2) I learn Turkish so that I can learn more about history/archeology.

3) I learn Turkish because, with the recent European Union related developments, Turkey is becoming a strategically important country and knowing its language will be an advantage for me.

4) I learn Turkish, because I need it for my job.

5) I learn Turkish in order to communicate with my Turkish friends.

6) I learn Turkish so that I can communicate with people when I travel to Turkey.

7) I learn Turkish, because I have Turkish parents or relatives.

8) I like learning foreign languages.

9) I learn Turkish, because I enjoy it.

10) I learn Turkish, because it is a different language from my mother tongue.

11) I would like to learn another language after Turkish.

12) I enjoy learning Turkish.
13) I work hard to learn Turkish.
14) I study Turkish outside the class, as well.
15) I try to benefit from every opportunity to practice Turkish outside the class.
16) I learn Turkish with a real enthusiasm.
17) I want to continue learning Turkish.
18) I sometimes feel that learning Turkish is a burden.
19) I feel comfortable expressing myself in Turkish.
20) I read Turkish newspapers regularly.
21) I read Turkish books.
22) I watch Turkish TV channels.
23) I am quite competent in Turkish.
24) My Turkish level enables me to survive if I go to Turkey.
25) I think Turkish people are warm and friendly.
26) I think Turkey is a beautiful country.
27) I like Turkish people.
28) I have many Turkish friends.
29) I would like to (continue to) live in Turkey in the future.
30) I feel anxious when I use Turkish in social situations outside the class.
31) My current/last Turkish teacher is/was very effective.
32) I feel comfortable using Turkish in class.
33) My current/last Turkish teacher is/was really friendly.
34) My classmates encourage me to study harder.
35) I like participating in classes.
36) I get positive feedback on my Turkish.
37) I am satisfied with the learning materials we have in our Turkish class.
38) The textbook we use in class is very interesting.
39) I sometimes get bored while studying Turkish.

40) I think Turkish is a difficult language.

41) I think Turkish is a harmonious language.

42) Learning Turkish is like a hobby for me.

43) I learn Turkish in order to pass some exams/ because my studies require it.

44) I sometimes feel discouraged about learning Turkish.

45) I can easily motivate myself for studying Turkish.

46) I am thinking of stopping learning Turkish.

47) Name, Surname

48) Nationality

49) Age

50) Sex

51) Profession

52) How long have you been learning Turkish and where (in which city and institution) ?

53) Have you ever been to Turkey? (If yes, please specify where, how many times, and for how long)

54) At present, do you live in Turkey?

55) Do you have any Turkish origins in your family? (If yes, could you explain?)

56) Is your husband/wife/fiancée/partner/etc. Turkish?

57) Do you speak any other foreign languages? (If yes, please specify how long you have been learning them and your level of proficiency.)

58) Are you a native bilingual? (If yes, what are your native languages?)

59) What is the place of Turkish in your chronological language learning order? (If your mother tongue is your L1, Turkish is your L…?)

60) Do you have any other comments about your reasons for learning Turkish, your motivation or the difficulties you have (had) while studying Turkish?
TABLES AND GRAPHS

Table 1. Intrinsic Orientations

- “I love learning foreign languages.”
- “French is such a melodic and harmonious language.”
- “Learning Chinese is like a great challenge for me! It is so different from my mother tongue.”
- “I feel really good at German and I want to become even more fluent.”
- “Learning Turkish is really fun.”

Table 2. Extrinsic/Instrumental Orientations

- “I am required to take a foreign language to complete my M.A. degree, this is why I am learning Spanish.”
- “In order to find a decent job, I have to learn English.”
- “I want to work in a bank in Tokyo, so speaking Japanese will be an important advantage for me.”
- “I am an archaeologist and I believe learning Greek will help me with the ancient texts.”

Table 3. Integrative Orientations

- “I think Portuguese people are very friendly, I would like to learn their language to communicate with them in their language.”
- “My husband's parents are Italian. I want to learn Italian to get closer to them.”
- “I have many Dutch friends. I learn Dutch and go to the Netherlands very often to see them.”
- “I think the French culture is very rich and interesting. This is why I am learning French.”
- “I love Japan, Japanese people, culture, food, music and language. Actually I am fascinated by everything that is Japanese and therefore I started to study the Japanese language.”
**Table 4. Sample Likert-scale items from the questionnaire Motivation in Learning Turkish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think Turkish people are warm and friendly.</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Neither agree not disagree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel that learning Turkish is a burden.</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree ○ Agree ○ Neither agree not disagree ○ Disagree ○ Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5a. Items measuring the independent variable**

**Independent Variable: Kind of Orientation**

1. **Intrinsic Orientation:**
   9) I learn Turkish, because I enjoy it.
   12) I enjoy learning Turkish.
   42) Learning Turkish is like a hobby for me

2. **Extrinsic/Instrumental Orientation:**
   1) I learn Turkish, because I live in Turkey and in order to communicate with local people I have to know their language.
   4) I learn Turkish, because I need it for my job.
   43) I learn Turkish in order to pass some exams/ because my studies require it.

3. **Integrative Orientation:**
   5) I learn Turkish in order to communicate with my Turkish friends.
   25) I think Turkish people are warm and friendly.
   26) I think Turkey is a beautiful country.
   27) I like Turkish people.
Table 5b. Items measuring the independent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Executive Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enthusiasm:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I learn Turkish with a real enthusiasm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I sometimes feel that learning Turkish is a burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) I sometimes feel discouraged about learning Turkish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) I can easily motivate myself for studying Turkish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Persistence/Desire to Continue Learning Turkish:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I want to continue learning Turkish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) I am thinking of stopping learning Turkish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effort:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I work hard to learn Turkish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6a. Descriptive Statistics: Intrinsic Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>3.8450</td>
<td>.53326</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>4.1401</td>
<td>.72043</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b. Correlations: Intrinsic Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>INTRINSIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.602(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 7a. Descriptive Statistics: Integrative Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>3.8450</td>
<td>.53326</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>4.0678</td>
<td>.68018</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7b. Correlations: Integrative Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>INTEGRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.461(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.461(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8a. Descriptive Statistics: Extrinsic/Instrumental Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>3.8450</td>
<td>.53326</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRINSIC</td>
<td>3.8140</td>
<td>1.19090</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8b. Correlations: Extrinsic/Instrumental Orientation - Executive Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>EXTRINSIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRINSIC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9a. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.602(a)</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.42745</td>
<td></td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>72.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.632(a)</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.41674</td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>7.615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), INTRINSIC  
b Predictors: (Constant), INTRINSIC, INTEGRATIVE

Table 9b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: MOTIVATION

Table 9c. Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>.219(a)</td>
<td>2.759</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXTRINSIC</td>
<td>.133(a)</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRINSIC</td>
<td>.112(b)</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors in the Model: (Constant), INTRINSIC  
b Predictors in the Model: (Constant), INTRINSIC, INTEGRATIVE  
c Dependent Variable: MOTIVATION

Graph 1. Nationalities of the participants