T.C.

AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY

THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE

EDUCATION

MA THESIS

MULTILINGUAL SELF SYSTEMS OF MULTILINGUALS: SELF-MOTIVATION OF LEARNERS OF SEVERAL LANGUAGES

Sema AYKUŞ

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

MASTER'S PROGRAM

Antalya, 2022

T.C.

AKDENIZ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

MULTILINGUAL SELF SYSTEMS OF MULTILINGUALS:

SELF-MOTIVATION OF LEARNERS OF SEVERAL LANGUAGES

MASTER'S THESIS

SEMA AYKUŞ

Supervisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Simla COURSE

Antalya, 2022

DOĞRULUK BEYANI

Yüksek lisans olarak sunduğum bu çalışmayı, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yol ve yardıma başvurmaksızın yazdığımı, yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçalardan gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu ve bu eserleri her kullanışımda alıntı yaparak yararlandığımı belirtir; bunu onurumla doğrularım. Enstitü tarafından belli bir zamana bağlı olmaksızın, tezimle ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçlara katlanacağımı bildiririm.

…./.../2022

Sema Aykuş

AKDENİZ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

Sema Aykuş'un bu çalışması **04/08/2022** tarihinde jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında **Yüksek Lisans Tezi** olarak **oy birliği** ile kabul edilmiştir.

İMZA

Başkan : Doç. Dr. Yeşim BEKTAŞ ÇETİNKAYA ....
Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Üye : Prof. Dr. Binnur İLTER ....
Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Üye (Danışman) : Öğr. Üyes, Dr. Simla COURSE ....
Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİNİN ADI: Multilingual Self Systems of Multilinguals: Self-Motivation of Learners of Several Languages

ONAY: Bu tez, Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunca belirlenen yukarıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından uygun görülmüş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun .... tarihli ve …..………… sayılı kararıyla kabul edilmiştir.

Doç. Dr. Güçlü ŞEKERCİOĞLU
Enstitü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To the loving memory of my father Hasan Ali AYKUŞ,

I will always be your little daughter, you will always be my hero.

ABSTRACT

MULTILINGUAL SELF SYSTEMS OF MULTILINGUALS:

SELF-MOTIVATION OF LEARNERS OF SEVERAL LANGUAGES

Aykuş, Sema
Master's Thesis, Department of Foreign Language Education
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Simla Course
July 2022, 121 pages

The present study investigates the multilingual learners' motivational dispositions utilizing the framework of Multilingual Motivational Self System in a Turkish setting; for this purpose, a questionnaire looking into the L2 Motivational Self System and the Ideal Multilingual Self were used to explain different future selves of students'. Participants of the study were 405 Turkish students aged between 15 and 17 studying in four Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School in Antalya. Questionnaire-based quantitative research was adopted for this study. In order to uncover language learners' motivation on a multilingual level and present a Turkish perspective of multilingual motivation, a questionnaire with 25 Likert-type scale items was adapted from 'Dörnyei's Motivation Questionnaire' (Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Dörnyei, 2010) and Henry and Thorsen's (2018) 'the ideal multilingual self' studying. Results of the analysis suggest that multiple language learners have a fluid vision of themselves as multilinguals. Moreover, the study put forward that ideal L2 selves are important in forming an image of an ideal multilingual self, more so than other components of L2MSS. Recognizing language preferences, integrating a variety of language resources into the classroom, teaching multiple languages in a coordinated manner, and relying on more holistic approaches to language teaching with a focus on what multilingual learners can do with their linguistic resources all contribute to the future vision of being multilingual.

Key Words: L2 Motivational Self System, Ought to L2 Self, Ideal Multilingual Self, Language Learning Motivation, Second Language Learning, Multilingual Language Learning.

ÖZET

ÖĞRENEN MOTİVASYONUNA ÇOK DİLLİ YAKLAŞIM:

BİRDEN FAZLA DİL ÖĞRENENLERİN ÖZ MOTİVASYONLARI

Aykuş, Sema
Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü
Danışman: Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Simla Course
Temmuz 2022, 121 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, öğrenme motivasyonu benlik sistemleri teorik çerçevesini kullanarak birden fazla dil öğrenenlerin motivasyonel eğilimlerini araştırmaktadır; Bu amaçla, öğrencilerin farklı gelecek benliklerini açıklamak için Çok Dilli Dil Motivasyonu Benlik Sistemlerini ve ideal çok dilli benliği araştıran bir anket kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın katılımcıları Antalya'daki dört Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi'nde öğrenim görmekte olan 15-17 yaş arası 405 Türk öğrencidir. Bu çalışma için ankete dayalı nicel araştırma benimsenmiştir. Dil öğrenenlerin çok dilli düzeyde motivasyonunu ortaya çıkarmak ve çok dilli motivasyona Türkiye'den bir bakış açısı sunmak için, 'Dörnyei'nin Motivasyon anketi' (Taguchi, Magid ve Papi, 2009; Dörnyei, 2010) ve Henry ve Thorsen'in (2018) 'ideal çok dilli benlik' çalışmasından uyarlanan 25 maddelik 5'li likert tipi bir anket uygulanmıştır. Analizin sonuçları, birden fazla dil öğrenenlerin çok dilli benlik algısının değişken olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca bu çalışma, ideal çok dilli benlik kimliğini oluşturmada ikinci dil ideal benlik sisteminin, İkinci Dil Motivasyonu Benlik Sistemleri'nin diğer bileşenlerinden daha önemli olduğunu göstermektedir. Öğrenenlerin dil tercihlerinin farkında olmak, çeşitli dil kaynaklarını sınıfa entegre etmek, birden fazla dili koordineli bir şekilde öğretmek ve çok dilli öğrencilerin sahip olduğu dil hazinesiyle neler yapabileceğine odaklanarak dil öğretiminde daha bütünsel yaklaşımlara yönelmek, öğrencilerin çok dilli gelecek benliklerini oluşturmada katkıda bulunacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İkinci Dil Motivasyonu Benlik Sistemi, İdeal Benlik Sistemi, İdeal Çok Dilli Benlik, Dil Öğrenme Motivasyonu, İkinci Dil Öğrenimi, Çok Dilli Dil Öğrenimi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTONS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Definitions
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
ELT	English Language Teaching
LOTE	Languages Other than English
L1	Native Language
L2	Second Language
L3	Third Language
L4	Fourth Language
L2MSS	L2 Motivational Self System
MMSS	Multilingual Motivational Self System
SDT	Self Determination Theory
SLA	Second Language Acquisition

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Language is a powerful tool and a notable instrument in scientific communications, cultural exchange, politics, and the business world (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011). As the world gets more global, the diversity of languages becomes more common. Languages crossing the boundaries of nations, continents, and cultures lead to a culturally diverse and linguistically rich society. In this community, multilingual interactions are just a product of globalization or super-diversity (Garcia. 2018).

Multilingualism is a fact of life across all continents (Maher, 2017). As a result, it is not surprising that many individuals want to learn new languages and become multilingual, which is defined as someone who can speak more than one language (Dincer, 2018). Learning a second or more language allows one to make meaningful cross-cultural connections and establish a communication channel between people of various ethnolinguistic groupings. International contact also provides opportunities for language development and has a strong influence on the learners' attitudes and motivations, resulting in more motivated learning behaviour (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005b). Unfortunately, research on the importance of motivated learning behaviour in multilingualism is limited. (Henry, 2011; Thompson & Lee, 2013; Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017).

As mentioned, the study of L2/L3 motivation in situations where people simultaneously learn two or more foreign languages has received little attention (Henry, 2010); multilingualism, nonetheless, is an undeniable fact of life. The

longitudinal Hungarian studies of Dörnyei, Csizer, and Nemeth (2006) demonstrated that when several languages interfere, motivation is unlikely to be evenly distributed. Another study by Dörnyei and Csizer (2002) demonstrated learners' negative attitudes toward languages that are not globally popular, illustrating that the desire to learn a foreign language is likely to be hampered when English is available.

The majority of school-age learners begin learning one foreign language, and English as a lingua-franca is the most likely choice. Students who acquire more than one foreign language in school, on the other hand, should be considered. Therefore, the motivation of students who learn multiple foreign languages is the focus of this research. To acquire this, a questionnaire adapted from the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) (Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Dörnyei, 2010) and 'the ideal multilingual self' is utilized (Henry & Thorsen, 2018).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Multilingualism is part of social and economic life on the global scale as the key to economic, political, and social progress relies on the capacity of effective communication on the international level (MOE, 2018). With this respect, the English language curriculum of Turkey has been redesigned (ROT, 2012; 2014; 2020) within the principles and descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The CEFR is intended to overcome the barriers to communication, extent the understanding of different languages, enhance the efficiency of learning languages, and encourage to multiple foreign languages while altering English's dominance in international communication (Council of Europe, 2001).

To realise above mentioned aims, Council of Europe's (2001) language policies rely on promoting multilingualism and multicultural environment. The beginning of this process is language learning in school. Language education has frequently regarded language learning as unchanging, homogeneous, and monolithic entities (García & Sylvan, 2011). So, there are gaps in dynamic features of language learning, and multilingual learners' motivation is undeniably one of them. In L2 learning, motivation is an important factor. However, the fact remains that studies on multilingual learner motivation are scarce. That is, learning multiple languages is processes-oriented and may affect motivation for target languages (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). The dominance of Global English continues to have an impact on L2 motivation (Dörnyei & Csizer, 2002); however, this dominance of English also lays the ground for the study of L3 motivation (Henry, 2012).

The fact that the world is facing a mass migration and getting more multilingual is undeniable. Turkey, which is a candidate country for the European Union and has been seriously affected by this global migration wave caused by wars in the early 21st century or economic conditions, has adopted a multilingual approach in its recent policies on language learning. To elaborate, English and Russian (as a preparatory class) and German, French, Arabic, and Chinese (as optional foreign languages) have been included in the Vocational High School of Tourism (Özer, 2018). In Turkish public high schools, especially in Anatolian or Science high schools, a second foreign language other than English has been offered until recently; however, multilingual education in Turkish public high schools is a relatively new phenomenon. Thus, the impact of multiple language learning needs attention. All in all, this study aims to uncover language learners' motivation on a multilingual level, find out motivating factors that the teachers, instructors, and

educators should regard, and present a Turkish perspective of multilingual motivation for future research.

1.3. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

In consideration of the statements on multilingualism from the European and Turkish perspectives, this study aims to;

- offer an insight into multilingual language learners' L2MSS,

- investigate the relation of motivational variables of L2MSS and MMSS (multilingual motivational self system) in shaping motivated behaviour of multilingual language learners,

- explore the relationship between L2 self and the multilingual self.

Therefore, the present study is guided by the following research questions;

1- What are the multilingual learners' L2MSS?

- What is the multilingual learners' L2MSS in English?

- What is the multilingual learners' L2MSS in German?

- What is the multilingual learners' L2MSS in Russian?

2- What is the relationship between components of L2MSS of multilingual learners and their ideal multilingual self?

1.4. Significance of the Study

The common tendency in researching L2 learning motivation has a monolingual bias which conceptualizes the motivational system of a learner of different languages as separate entities rather than as cognitively interconnected (Henry, 2017). Therefore, this study is believed to be significant as there are not

many studies on language learners' motivation on a multilingual level in the Turkish context. This study offers an insight into multilingual language learners' L2MSS, investigates the relation of motivational variables and points out the effect of the L2 self on the ideal multilingual self.

1.5. Limitations

This study imposes limitations depending on the timing and context of the research. Firstly, the study was carried out during Covid-19 pandemic which resulted in distance education in schools. It is evident that distance learning has unique technological and pedagogical drawbacks (Kamal et al., 2021) such as the difficulty in catering to diversity or specific student needs, as well as restrictions on real-time interactions between students and teachers (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2021). Secondly, the multilingual language teaching is not available in all state schools. So the study is carried out at four Vocational High Schools of Tourism in Antalya, the only schools where multilingual education is offered in this city. Thus, the participants are only limited to aforementioned schools. Lastly, data collected through a stand-alone questionnaire due to restrictions caused by the pandemic, which means special care was given to wording by the researcher in order to avoid measurement error. Finally, because of the efforts to keep the survey as brief as possible in order not to contribute to participant fatigue, omitting items related to integrativeness is another limitation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Multilingualism

Multilingualism is a combination of Latin *multus* + *lingua* 'many' and 'language' (Maher, 2017). European Commision (2005) defines multilingualism as a person's ability to use multiple languages and the existence of multiple languages around geography. To Agnihotri (2014), multilingualism is concerned with how we use it in our lives, drawing on a diverse range of linguistic, cultural, intercultural, and interpretative resources in specific interaction contexts. According to Stavans and Hoffman (2015), multilingualism is an individual's ability to use a number of autonomous languages, which are viewed as separate linguistic systems. So as not to cause confusion, in this thesis multilingualism refers to the knowledge and use of more than two languages, while bilingualism refers to the knowledge and use of two autonomous languages (García & Wei, 2014).

It is visible that multilingualism is a complex phenomenon (Cenoz, 2013) and an ongoing research area globally (Garcia, 2018). Practical reasons such as increased exogamous marriages, widespread urbanisation, internal and international migration, and instrumental motivation, which result in a desire to fit into modern society, all contribute to a multi-diverse language society (Djite, 2009). In this multi-diverse society, language is an observable everyday act (Jørgensen, 2008). In such diverse societies, language learning patterns are largely diverse and the capacity of using more than one language, whatever the command of language, is related to the multilingual resource (Beacco, 2005). Multilingual resources are the result of specific pieces of the various languages along with individual expressive annotations

and creating relations between languages (Witt et al., 2009). These multilingual resources can be enriched by historical, cultural, social, educational, geographical, economic or political reasons, which leads to various languages being absorbed in various ways (Blommaert & Backus, 2013).

As a worldwide phenomenon, multilingualism has been approached and studied from various perspectives as a research area in disciplines such as linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and education (Cenoz, 2013). Van Els (2005) discusses the term from both individual and social perspectives. To him, individual perspective refers to how the languages spoken by an individual relate to one another, and social perspective focuses on the role of language in a particular country. Moraru (2020) redefines the phenomenon of multilingualism with Pierre Bourdieu's model of linguistic production and circulation. In the Bourdieusian perspective, there is a relationship between language preference and the role of language in a particular society (Moraru, 2020). This phenomenon was developed in Language and Symbolic Power to account for the relationship between language and power. From the sociolinguistic perspective, Djite (2009) outlines the evolving multilingualism of speech communities and claims that there is no choice except to accept this new multilingual reality.

Coetzee-Van Rooy (2014) discusses the observed multilingualism in the presence of English. The research is based on the linguistic repertoires of multilingual students in Southern Sotho and Zulu home language students in Gauteng's Vaal Triangle region. For the study, researcher conceptualised Dörnyei's (2009) L2 Motivation theory to understand 'sociolinguistic language mode' of a society and its influence on the 'language learning self' and the 'ought to language

self'. In Coetzee-Van Rooy's study, a 'multilingual language learning self' can be framed as the 'language learning self'. Respondents were motivated by 'ought to language self' for both home languages to become a multilingual. Home languages promoted social cohesion, and learning English is motivated by the desire to increase education. To conclude, in Coetzee-Van Rooy's study, being multilingual is essential and seen as a symbol of 'fitting in' or adapting to one's surroundings in the African context.

While more and more academic studies focus on multilingualism, the monolingual bias in education continues to dominate despite the formal recognition of the equity of all the official national languages (Wright, 2009). To disengage from the monolingual bias and to promote language diversity, 'New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism' (European Commission, 2005) encouraged mobility (e.g. Erasmus) and aimed to broaden linguistic horizons. Different lingual resources and multilingualism are the reasons people live side by side in an increasingly diverse world (Krumm, 2004). Within the context of globalization, multilingualism still continues to diversify (Aronin & Singleton, 2008).

Hence, promoting multilingualism in the educational systems is essential. Krumm (2004) emphasizes that one of the most fundamental goals of foreign language education is for students to understand that what individuals have in common is that they are all diverse and that different languages are significant to them. It is the responsibility of political and educational institutions and programs to create a climate for a positive future in multilingual education. Thus, the gaps for language education which is the mainstream of universal means of communication may be reduced.

2.1.1 Multilingual Theories in ELT

In language learning, multilingualism is having the knowledge of more than two languages to communicate formally and informally (Okal, 2014). Learning one language opens a door to learning another which fosters language awareness (Krumm, 2014). A multilingual climate in class generates the expression of different languages, so the teaching and learning of different languages can be inspired (European Commission, 2005). This classroom setting with linguistic diversity and multilingualism motivates students to learn other languages (Buchs & Maradan, 2021).

In Veera and Päivi's (2018) study Finnish schools, the teachers' and students' perceptions of multilingualism and the benefit of students' multilingual background in learning English was investigated. For teachers, multilingualism is the potential of an individual's linguistic resource, not a barrier. Sharing their experiences in linguistically diverse language classroom, the majority of teachers stated that they had developed some strategies for utilizing their students' multilingual background for the benefit of teaching English. To students, English was relatively easy to learn and especially in learning vocabulary, their L1s offer them some help.

Similarly, as argued by Poudel (2019), language preferences and bringing a diversity of language practices into the classroom can give justice to the student's languages and promote identity investment in school education. Consequently, teachers, like the learners they teach, bring into a variety of resources including experience, skills, and knowledge. Krumm (2004) proves this phenomenon with an example from a secondary school teacher of German and English at a school in Vienna. Recognizing the presence of native speakers of ten different languages in her

classroom, the teacher initiated the 'Our ten languages' project, in which each language group in her class was asked to present a text or song in their native language. This project lead to an increase in language awareness as well as the integration of students from migrant families who were just then accepted as 'language experts' in the classroom. This had a very positive effect on the students' learning attitudes in terms of learning German and English.

Furthermore, multilinguals have more such potential affordances available in comparison to monolinguals, and language teaching can make use of all of the students' existing linguistic resources. In Singleton and Aronin's (2009) view, multilinguals are more aware of their language resources and available opportunities than other language users. Likewise, Krumm (2004) asserts that when students study more than one language, the languages should be taught in a coordinated manner.

Cenoz and Gorter (2011) states a more holistic approach to language learning and focuses on what multilingual learners can do with their linguistic resource. This holistic approach examines characteristics of multilingual practices such as translanguaging, codeswitching and codemeshing. *Translanguaging* is a pedagogical practice where students switch between the language of input and the language of output deliberately (Garcia & Lin, 2017). *Codeswitching* is common in multilingual communities and means a person's ability to communicate in more than one language and to switch between two different systems (Canagarajah, 2011; Winata et al., 2021). Translanguaging and code-switching illustrate what bilingual and multilingual speakers do in social interaction (Smith & Murillo, 2015). However, *codemeshing* considers the languages as part of a single integrated system and allows

for the mixing of communicative modes and different symbol systems (Canagarajah, 2011).

Thompson and Lee (2013) investigated multilinguals' self-awareness which may reduce their language learning anxiety and trigger motivation to learn another language. A number of researchers (Baker, 2000; Dewaele, 2007; Dewaele et al., 2008) claim that classroom and language learning anxiety levels increase in L2 learning process; however, anxiety levels decrease if learners interact with two or more languages. Similarly, a recent study by Thompson and Khawaja (2016) examined the relationship between foreign language anxiety and multilingualism in the Turkish context. Analysis of the study, on which the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism has an effect, depicted that the interrelated components of lingual systems are followed by participants' multilingual profiles changing over time.

To get a better insight into those everchanging elements in lingustic systems, the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism stemmed from Dynamic Systems Theory. Jessner (2008) introduced the Dynamic System Theory to discuss multilingual language acquisition and explain the significant difference between L2 and L3 learning and set goals for multilingual teaching. Accordingly, differences between second and third language learning can be linked to a higher level of metalinguistic awareness. Jessner's Dynamic Model of Multilingual System inspired Henry's (2017) Multilingual Motivational Self Systems. According to Henry (2020), when a bilingual/multilingual person learns a second language, or when a monolingual person learns two or more L2s at the same time, dynamic interactions between the self-guides of the various motivational systems occur. So, Henry (2017) reconsidered language learning motivation from a multilingual perspective. He found that the the

multilingual self has a positive effect on attitude to learn another langauge while bilingual self has a negative one. Consequently, many researchers (Henry & Thorsen, 2018; Huang, 2019; Liu, 2020; Henry, 2020; Wang & Fisher, 2021; Mayumi & Zheng, 2021; Fukui & Yashima, 2021) focused on simultaneous L2/L3 acquisition to investigate the motivational development of learners' multilingual selves for learning a language other than English (LOTE) and to explain explain the difficulties and challenges of motivational dynamics in learning L1, L2, and L3.

As cited above, the effect of multilingualism on language education theory, pedagogy, and research appears to have been penetrating our understanding of language learning motivation (Ushioda, 2017). So, this study aims to investigate language learning motivation from a multilingual perspective while interpreting relation of motivational components.

2.2. Motivational Theories

The term motivation is derived from the Latin verb *movere* which means *to move* (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Motivation relates to energy, direction and determination; it is activation and intention with all aspects (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Motivation is critical to all kinds of conscious and intentional human learning, so it has been a considerable pedagogical and research matter in the field of education (Ushioda, 2012).

There is a global acceptance that motivation has a vital role in academic learning thus language learning and the process of mastering language skills are no exception (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005a). The role of motivation in L2 has been addressed by a great number of researchers for the understanding of motivational characteristics to address diverse individual learner needs (Tarhan & Balban,

2014). A notable statement of the role of motivation in L2 is Gardner's (1985) portrayal of motivation and language learning. He related motivation and language learning to the willingness to learn a language, the effort and persistence to reach the goal, and the satisfaction of the experience.

Gardner (2006) explained and classified the attitude and motive from three perspectives; *societal, activity-centred and individual*. The societal perspective of motivation focuses on L2 acquisition from community-level reasons such as different cultures or national groups have different attitudes or pressures on them to learn another language or to maintain their own language. While societal motives are shaped by expectations of society, activity-centred motives are directly tied to the task at hand. It is the motivation to do well in a certain period of time. These two motives constitute an individual perspective that has been shaped by Dörnyei (2001). Individual perspective by revealing that motivation of an individual to learn another language can be influenced by external factors. This is exemplified by self-identity and societal relations, and by education-friendly process focusing on individual and classroom interactions.

A futher instance of individual perspective is Lennartson's (2008) study. He discussed the students' motivation and attitude towards learning a second language by comparing British and Swedish students' points of view. The motivating factors of students vary from positive to negative depending on their age, background, goal, attitude, the target language, method of teaching/learning and the instructor of the target language. Some L2 learners have more positive attitudes than others. This can be explained by individual differences on motivating factors. Thus, the term attitude

is often associated with individual differences in language-learning and closely interrelated with motivation.

To sum up, current L2 motivation research dates back to the initial study of Gardner and Lambert (1972), which is based on the distinction between integrative and instrumental orientations of learners of French as a second language (Gardner, 2006). Tracing back the roots of motivation offers a useful framework for examining past, current, and future research perspectives on L2 motivation (Ushioda, 2012).

2.2.1. The Social Psychological Period

Motivational theories commonly focus on *how* and *why* people move in a certain direction in their action; however, in the educational context motivation has been developing and changing throughout time (Dörnyei & Otto, 1998).

Throughout history, motivational theories have been fluxing. However, the origins of L2 motivation go back to two social psychologists who worked in the bilingual setting in Canada; Wallace Lambert and Robert Gardner. They distinguished language learning motivation from other types of learning motivation emphasising the relation between L2 learning and learners' attitude toward the L2 community. Gardner and Lambert shaped the study of L2 motivation associating the social context of learning, attitude and relations between linguistic communities (Dörnyei, 2001).

Initially, Lambert (1963a) emphasized cognitive factors such as language aptitude and intelligence and affective factors such as attitudes and motivation in his social-psychological model. Some definitions for motivation are as follows: "learner's ethnocentric tendencies and his attitudes toward the other group are

believed to determine his success in learning the new language" (Lambert,1963b, 114), "the extent to which individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (Gardner, 1985, p.10).

In Gardner's theory motivation comprises three components; *motivational intensity of effort*, *desire to learn the language*, and *an attitude towards the act of learning the language* (Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011). A truly motivated individual shows all three aspects because these three components belong together (Dörnyei, 2001). However, on second language acquisition, most of the studies at the time were concerned with the ability for language assuming that achievement is a result of linguistic aptitude (Gardner & Lambert, 1959). Motivation and interest play an important role in second language acquisition. Due to difficulty in measuring these aspects, systematic attention should be given to. Steadfastly rooted in the social-psychological paradigm, L2 motivation research adopted individual-cognitive perspectives as a result.

2.2.1.1. Integrative Motivation vs Instrumental Motivation

As argued above, the earliest study that puts the idea of motivation in second language education emerged from Lambert and Gardner. The socio-educational model has been influential on language learning motivation (Lin & Warschauer, 2011). As stated in the previous chapter, this model of motivation consists of three components; effort, want and affect. The model also identifies traditional social-psychological notions of integrative and instrumental motivational orientations. For Lambert and Gardner, instrumentality and integrativeness are not classified as types of motivation, but rather termed as orientation (Brown, 2007). Gardner and

Lambert's (1959, p.271) study verbalized integrative orientation as "characterized by a willingness to be like valued members of the language community". Gardner (2001) defined integrativess as openness and admiration for foreign culture and different cultural groups' ways of life and desire for becoming similar to members of another cultural community. On the ground of this, a positive attitude toward the community where the language is spoken is effective in language learning (Gardner, 1985; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Brown (2007) explained integrative orientation as social and cultural fulfilments relating to different needs in learning a foreign language, such as integration into the culture of the L2 group and becoming involved socially. Instrumental orientation practically associates with integrative orientation according to Gardner's theory, relating pragmatic reasons for L2 learning, such as promotion or better income (Dörnyei, 2001). Within either orientation, motivational intensity can be high or low: An integratively oriented learner might become more successful in language learning while another might be driven to success by instrumental orientation (Brown, 2007). Also, classification of reasons as integrative or instrumental can be ambiguous since a particular reason might be classified differently by another researcher (Gardner, 1985).

In the field of language learning motivation, Gardner's integrativeness variable remained important to his paradigm and is still a key concept in motivation research. A recent study exploring the relationship between learners' intended effort and motivation found that integrativeness was the only variable that contributed to learning motivation (Kwok & Carson, 2018). In contrast, Busse and Williams (2010) found out that learners of German are primarily motivated by intrinsic motivation, with the ideal L2 self and integrativeness having no effect on learning motivation. Bektaş-Çetinkaya (2012) comments that Gardner's concept of instrumental

orientation should be expanded. Her findings from the Turkish setting revealed that the difference between instrumental and integrative orientation appears to be blurred. Utilitarian motivations for studying English, such as the desire to make foreign friends, interact with integrative reasons. These studies show that in its exploration of learners as agents, L2 motivation research has turned its attention to the learners' self-systems in its journey to broaden the scope of language learning motivation (Course & Saka, 2021).

2.2.2. The Cognitive-Situated Period

Language motivation research witnessed a shift into a much more learner-centred context in the early 1990s, narrowing the original macro-perspective of the socio-educational model of motivation (Gardner, 2010; Al-Hoorie 2017). Re-opening the agenda, Crookes and Schmidt (1991) put an emphasis on the micro-level concept of motivation which deals with the cognitive processing of SLA stimuli. Considering the impact of the main components of learning contexts such as classroom, teacher and syllabus, the use of motivation as a cover term in language learning was relinquished in the field of educational psychology (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). The Gardnerian tradition of social-psychology research on motivation was reinterpreted by integrating social psychological perspectives into cognitive motivation concepts (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Criticizing Gardner's theory as lacking classroom-specific motives, Dörnyei (1994) complemented the Gardnerian tradition with theories of psychological literature and their relevance to L2 learning. The understanding of L2 motivation by narrowing down the social-psychological approach into student-centered motivation led to cognitive revolution in psychology (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). The cognitivist

approach claims that perception of one's current state may either increase motivation or influence current motivation (Heckhausen & Heckhausen, 2018). Studies concerning different variables (e.g. learner identity, classroom activities, experiences, attitudes, culture etc.) pay attention to the process of linking motivation to various resources in a dynamic classroom context (Nikolov, 2001). Focusing on L2 motivation from a classroom-oriented perception, the cognitive-situated period blossomed into more complex and extended theoretical frameworks of L2 motivation.

2.2.2.1. Intrinsic Motivation vs Extrinsic Motivation

Over decades many studies have been conducted to understand what motives L2 learners. As motivation is a key factor, L2 learning demands time and effort. Consistency, persistence, energy, direction and purpose help learners remain motivated and motivation is an investment that contributes to learning an L2 (Berges-puyó, 2018). In this sense, the movement towards a specific goal is the reason that motivates a learner.

The intensity towards a goal can be either high or low and it is resulted by individual differences in motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Brown, 2007). These differences are due to inherent growth tendencies and innate psychological needs or external reinforcements, and Deci (1972) distinguishes them as intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are derived from personal perception or feeling (Calder & Staw, 1975). *Intrinsic motivation* refers to activities done for an aim and inherent tendencies or innateness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Intrinsically motivated behaviours such as engaging, exciting and fun activities

provide one's own satisfaction and are not dependent on external incentives (Deci & Ryan, 2020). These instricially motivated behaviours that seem to occur independently of any reinforcement conditions are prototypes of autonomous functioning (Scott et al., 1992). In contrast to intrinsically motivated behaviours, extrinsic motivation refers to the behaviours done because it leads to external rewards or instrumental end (Deci, 1972; Noels et al., 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2020).

Deci (1971) highlighted a phenomenon where external reward affects once intrinsically motivated behaviour. In his study, he investigated the effect of external rewards given for an intrinsically motivated activity depending on different prizes. The subjects were lacking in intrinsic motivation for the activity when money was used as an external reward; however, the subjects' intrinsic motivation seemed to increase when verbal reinforcement and positive feedback were used as external rewards. One can conclude that intrinsic motivation and external motivation interact. This differentiation between intrinsic motivation and external motivation is the basis of Self Determination Theory (SDT) (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

2.2.2.2. Self Determination Theory

People have different kinds and amounts of motivation. They vary in level and orientation of motivation. The term SDT is based on one's ability to manage and make choices with their own will (Deci, 1971). Deci and Ryan (2000) detailed that SDT distinguishes different types of motivation based on the different reasons or goals. The obvious distinction is between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation which leads to the understanding of individual differences (Pae, 2008).

SDT research started with a focus on the activities done intrinsically or "for their own sake" (Deci & Ryan, 2020, p.2). A self-determined or autonomous activity

means intrinscially driven behaviour, and the introduction of external incentives is likely to impede one's self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2020). According to SDT, different types of motivations are based on different reasons or goals (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Hence, the effect of external motivators on intrinsically motivated behaviour is the basis. SDT deals with *internalisation* that is posited as the process and extends of the transformation within and between orientations (Deci et al., 1991). Deci et al. (1991) and Vallerand and Bisonnette (1992) situated the four types of extrinsic motivation to explain the internalization process: *External regulation, introjected regulation, Identified regulation and Integrated regulation.*

External regulation occurs as a consequence of rewarding a behaviour (e.g., praise) or avoiding a negative statement (e.g., criticism) (Vallerand & Bisonnette, 1992). *Introjected regulation* is the beginning to internalize the consequences of an action that one should do or would feel guilty about if one did not (Deci et al., 1991). *Identified regulation* is a more autonomous, or self-determined, form of extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). *Integrated regulation* represents actions that are performed because of personal importance to the individual or because of being congruous with one's psychological needs (Deci et al., 1991).

SDT, as one of the most promising and effective theories in the field of motivation over a decade, has received considerable attention in education (Haukås et al., 2022). In language learning, SDT contends that some learners may learn as they are autonomously motivated; however, others may be obliged to instrumental and external goals (Alamer, 2021). There is self-determination and value in either case. The lack of internalization or value in the act, though, results in amotivation

(Ryan, 1995). *Amotivation* is a lack of intention and motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Deci and Ryan (1985) related self-determination to autonomy proposing that events enhancing intrinsic motivation facilitate self-determination and support autonomy. *Autonomy* is taking responsibility and control for one's own learning. Dickinson (1995, p.167) clarified autonomy as "an attitude towards learning in which the learner is prepared to take, or does take, responsibility for his own learning". Autonomy is equivalent to self-learning; it is not something teachers do to their learners. Little (1991, p.4) argued that "autonomy is a capacity- for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action."

2.2.2.3. Attribution Theory

Attribution theory tries to explain determinants of one's past experiences and how those various attributions influence behaviour in various ways (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Substantially, subjective reasons to which we ascribe our past successes and failures shape our future actions (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). In other words, it is the transformation of one's past experiences. The attribution approach investigates the the interpretation of cause and effect or the perseverance of a specific event that happened (Weiner, 1972). The approach delves into the ascription of one's own behaviour and inference of one's own internal states (Deci & Ryan 1985).

As an analysis of the determinants of success and failure, the attribution approach integrates the specific emotional consequences of particular causal attributions (Weiner, 1986, 2010). In their study, Hashemi and Zabihi (2011) investigated the effects of attributional beliefs on Intermediate EFL learners. To understand individual differences, the relevance of placement test results and EFL

learners' reasons for success and failure in language learning were investigated. The findings of the study supported Weiner's attribution theory and showed the value of learners' effort in learning a foreign language. It can be concluded that different attributional factors bring different outcomes in learners; an alteration in learners' attribution patterns may lead to a change in result.

2.2.2.4. Self-Efficacy Theory

Self-efficacy perceptions are one of the most important methods of self-reflection in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997). Albert Bandura established the self-efficacy theory, which refers to people's assessments of their skills to perform specific tasks. As a result, their sense of efficacy influences the activities they undertake, as well as their degree of aspiration, effort, and persistence (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Per the self-efficacy theory, judgments and expectations of behavioural skills and capabilities, and the chances of efficiently dealing with outer factors and challenges, decide the beginning and continuation of behavior patterns (Maddux, 1995). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) clarified that those who have a low sense of self-esteem in particular topics regard challenging tasks as threats, thus they focus on their own character defects and barriers instead of how to complete the task properly. As a consequence, individuals are liable to lose trust in their capabilities and give up. A solid concept of self, on the other hand, improves people's achievement behaviour by assisting them in approaching tense situations with confidence.

Self-efficacy beliefs shape the attitude by assuming how capable one is. The confidence in desired outcomes leads to motivation and achievement. In her action

research, İçmez (2009) investigated preparatory year students' motivation using critical reading. The results revealed a high level of self-efficacy highlighting the students' academic success as language learners. Accordingly, the respondents' high efficacy was found emerging from their previous experiences. In their recent study, Thomson et al. (2019) investigated the relationship between student self-beliefs and their success in a bilingual course programme. The analysis of qualitative data supports that L2 proficiency, preparatory course performance, and self-efficacy predict success. Moreover, the stronger the efficacy is, the more effort students put forth. To understand the learners' self-efficacy beliefs in language learning, Raoofi et al (2012) studied the effect of self-efficacy and factors affecting self-efficacy. The results showed that self-efficacy beliefs predict performance and strategy training affects self-efficacy. Above studies support Bandura's (1997) claim that self-efficacy beliefs predict performance.

2.2.3. Socio-Dynamic Perspectives

The research of L2 motivation witnessed a catch-up phase with mainstream educational psychology. It was a blossom of new and encouraging ideas which are derived from cognitive psychology. According to Dörnyei and Ryan's (2015) analysis, Socio-Dynamic perspectives are characterized by the dynamic nature of motivation. The search for *cause-effect relationship* has led L2 motivation to evolve in various concepts as intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and attributions (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

This shift began with a situated examination of specific learner behaviours and classroom processes. During a language class, one can notice that L2 motivation

varies, and in the case of learning an L2 for a certain amount of time, motivation is anticipated to go into a variety of stages (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015).

2.2.3.1. The L2 Motivational Self System

The L2MSS was first proposed by Zoltán Dörnyei in 2005, with a solid basis on specific aspects of self-theory 'possible selves' introduced by Markus and Nurius (1986) and the self-discrepancy theory of Higgins (1987).

In the field of L2 motivation, it has been long believed that learning a foreign language is the same as learning other academic subjects. So they used paradigms linking the L2 to an individual's own core (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). The concept of integrativeness/integrative motivation first presented by Gardner and Lambert (1959) had dominated L2 motivation research. (see 2.2.1.1. for a detailed review.) Nevertheless, the label 'integrative' was rather restricting and did not make sense in a learning environment to a certain extent. The lead of 'self' in psychological research spread the seeds of the L2 Motivation Self System.

Employing psychological theories of the self with firmly set roots in previous research, the basis of the L2MSS approach is conceptualising second language learning motivation within a 'self' framework (Dörnyei, 2005). Dörnyei's L2MSS bases on Markus and Nurius's possible selves in L2 learning and Higgins' theory of self-discrepancy (Course & Saka, 2021). This tripartite model consists of the Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self and L2 Learning Experience.

 The emergence of L2MSS will be detailed in the following section.

2.2.3.2. The Self Discrepancy Theory

People differ in the kinds of emotional problems. So their perception of actual-self attributes or self-concepts can be a major source of emotional-motivational problems. Considering the negativity of actual-self attributes solely, some people suffer from sadness and disappointment, whereas others suffer from fear and restlessness. To address this, Higgins (1989) and his colleagues proposed the model of 'self-discrepancy'.

The Self-discrepancy theory is based on interconnections of different types of self-confidence and states which lead to emotional weaknesses (Higgins, 1989). To differentiate between various forms of self, two psychological variables, *domains of the self* and *standpoints on the self,* are proposed via the Self Disperacy Theory (Higgins, 1987).

Domains of the self identify three types of self-domains: *The actual self*, is a depiction of the qualities that someone (you or someone else) feels you have; *the ideal self* is a representation of the qualities that someone (you or someone else) would like you to have in an ideal situation; the *ought self* is your representation of the qualities that someone (you or someone else) thinks you should or ought to have (Higgins, 1987, 1989; Higgins et al. , 1985). The basic struggle between one's 'personal interests' and one's 'feeling of duty' reflects the difference between the 'ideal' self and the 'ought' self (Higgins et al., 1985).

Standpoints on the self identify three types of standpoints: your own personal standpoint and the standpoint of some significant others (Higgins, 1985). The distinction between 'own' and 'other' as self-state representations can relate to different emotional/motivational conditions. Six basic types of self-state

representations result from combining each of the domains of the self with each of the standpoints on the self: actual/own, actual/other, ideal/own, ideal/other, ought/own, and ought/other (Higgins, 1987). The actual/own and actual/other constitute a person's self-concept (Wylie, 1979). The ideal/own, ideal/other, ought/own, and ought/ other are self-directive standards or self-guides (Higgins et al. ,1986).

The Self Disperacy Theory defines which sentimental issues relate to various self-state. Selves that are postulated above are stimulating. The reason for this is that discrepancy between the current self and future self leads to discomfort. That feeling of discomfort encourages one to enhance harmony with both of selves. Higgins (1987) verbalized that without even being conscious of a discrepancy or its effect, self-discrepancy can be employed to understand the actions. Macintyre et al. (2009) exemplify this as follows:

> *A woman might experience tension if she envisions working at a bilingual job over the summer (an ideal self) but cannot currently speak the language fluently (current self), so to reduce that feeling of discomfort, she decides to enrol in an advanced language course. The emotions experienced are critical to understanding the motivational properties of possible selves*

(p.47).

2.2.3.3. Possible Selves and Future Self-Guides

To define possible selves, Markus and Nurius (1986, p.954) came up with a broad expression: *"What others are now, I could become."*. Possible selves are based on past representations of the self and include future representations of the self. To

shed a light, possible selves are distinguishable from now selves; however, they are still connected closely to them. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) defined possible selves as a representation of positive and negative selves that one wishes to become or avoid. Oyserman and James (2009) put forward that possible selves are the components of self-concept that are focused on the future, such as the positive and negative selves that one wishes to become or avoid.

An individual may create any variety of possible selves without restraint; however, possible selves are determined by the individual's socio-cultural and historical resources. The media's models, visuals, and signs, as well as the individual's immediate social experiences, shape the image of possible self (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Possible selves represent the individuals' ideas of "ideal selves that we would very much like to become, selves that we could become, and selves we are afraid of becoming" (Markus & Nurius, 1986, p. 954). Here-and-now selves involve tangible images and senses, that is, they are a reality for the individual (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Noting that they all come under the label of possible selves, ideal selves cover either negative or positive selves such as the successful self or the depressed self (Dörnyei, 2009).

Whereas possible selves is confused with future self-guides, they are not similar. The possible self is about current state, so it predicts rather than guides the likely future scenario. Dörnyei (2009, 2014) outlines the necessary conditions for future self-guides as available, elaborate and vivid, plausible and coherent.

That the Higgins' study of selves roots back to Markus and Nurius's is crucial to understand. Both Higgins (1987) and Markus and Nurius (1986) mentioned the concept of the ideal self and the ought self; however, conceptualising the future-

oriented self aspects by Higgins ,and Markus and Nurius' is divergent. Markus and Nurius indicated more than one possible self, whereas Higgins suggested that an individual has a distinct ideal and ought self. Accordingly, Higgings reiterated that ideal self-guides have a promotion focus, whereas ought self-guides have a prevention focus (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

Dörnyei and Csizér's (2002) longitudinal survey of L2 motivation in Hungary explored that Hungarian students' L2 motivation is affected by the concept of integrativeness of Gardner (1985). The Hungarian context create a need for rethinking integrativeness. Although Dörnyei (2009, also see Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002) revealed that findings on integrativeness scale confirm that of Robert Gardner's, Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) proposed reinterpretation of the term within individual's self-concept because of the complex nature of language and L2 motivation.

All in all, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) reconceptualized what Markus and Nurius (1986) and Higgins (1987, 1989; Higgins et al., 1985, 1986) recognized as ideal and ought-to selves as the L2MSS. L2MSS became a tripartite model substituting the traditional dichotomy of instrumental versus integrative motivation with the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015).

2.2.3.4. Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self

Knowing the fact that Dörnyei (2005, 2009) proposed the L2MSS construct based on Gardner's (1985) theoretical framework, it is no surprise Dörnyei's tripartite model traces back to the traditional aspects of motivation. In his L2MSS, instrumentality can be divided into two categories: instrumentality prevention and

instrumentality promotion. Ideal L2 self has instrumental focus while ought-to L2 self has prevention focus. To detail, this section will be reviewed in two dimensions.

2.2.3.4.1. Ideal L2 Self

Dörnyei (2010, p.79) refers ideal self as "the attributes that someone would ideally like to possess". It is a representation of all the characteristics that a person would like to have in that regard. The ideal L2 self is a cognitive representation of all the gains of language competence thus it is intrinsically linked to instrumentality or promotion focus (Dörnyei, 2010). However, ideal L2 self as a highly individual aspect to language learning motivation. As a powerful motivator to learn the language, the ideal L2 self reduces the gap between now-selves and future-selves (Csizér & Lukács, 2010). This is associated with a view of learning as a primarily social process placing imagination at its core rather than integration.

To understand the nature of the components of the tripartite model of L2MSS, the studies specifically tested the relationship between integrativeness and the ideal L2 self. Dörnyei and Csizér's (2002, 2005a) longitudinal nationwide survey in Hungary is the confirmation of Gardner's (1985; 2001) integrativeness construct in L2 learning. In their studies, Dörnyei and Csizér investigated primary school pupils' language preference and motivation concerning English, German, French, Italian and Russian. English, maintaining its position during the examined period. Integrativeness was found significant in explaining the language preference and motivation in five target languages.

Taguchi et al. (2009) investigated the correlation coefficients between the ideal L2 self and integrativeness in Japan, China and Iran. Integrativeness was

positively linked with the ideal L2 self for all three groupings. The findings support the use of the ideal L2 self instead of integrativeness.

Islam et al. (2013) contributed to Dörnyei's (2009) L2MSS with their study on reporting undergraduate students' motivation to learn English in the Pakistani context. This study supports Dörnyei's claim about the distinct nature of instrumentality (promotion) and instrumentality (prevention), as well as their strong relationship with the ideal L2 self. In the study, ideal L2 self as criterion measure contributes strongly to instrumentality (promotion) among other variables.

Course and Saka (2021) investigated Dörnyei's tripartite model of L2MSS to explain the language learning motivation of university students in the Turkish context. Ideal L2 self predicted effort to learn English pretty strong after learning experience and instrumentality promotion was the strongest predictor of ideal L2 self which was followed by learning experience. This conclusion backs up prior research indicating ideal L2 self and its relation to instrumentality (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Taguchi et al. ,2009; Islam et al., 2013).

As understood from above studies, the ideal L2 self, which correlates highly with integrativeness, corresponds to instrumental motives (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Michiko & Osamu, 2013). Furthermore, it is important to emphasise that ideal L2 self was constantly found to be better in predicting the criterion measures compared to integrativeness which will be detailed in the review of the studies below.

Csizér and Kormos (2009) found that the ideal L2 self tends to be more effective in determining motivated behaviour. Their study from the Hungarian setting investigated secondary school pupils and university students' motivating and

attitudinal dispositions supporting Dörnyei's (2005) concept of the Motivational Self System. The findings revealed that the ideal L2 self has a considerable impact on motivated learning behavior. Liu and Zhang (2021) support the previous findings with their study of two bilingual high schools in Tibetan setting. Chinese as a foreign language learners' L2MSS was investigated. The findings revealed that the ideal L2 self is strongly predicted by intended effort.

Arslan and Çiftçi's (2021) recent study showed that the ideal L2 self is the dominant component of the L2MSS for Turkish sixth graders. Another salient result is the positive link between the ideal L2 self and L2 learning experience indicating the students' positive attitudes and experiences with English result in a vivid ideal L2 self which echoes to Lamb's (2012) study rewieved in section 2.2.3.5.

Using the L2MSS paradigm, Liu and Thompson (2018) researched the motivational profiles of Chinese EFL learners between the ages of 17 and 36. Their findings revealed that the ideal L2 self is the most powerful predictor of English proficiency.

Martinović's (2018) study in the Croatian context supported the importance of the ideal L2 self in understanding L2 motivated learner behaviour, as well as the close relationship between pragmatic motives and future career success. The findings revealed that university students with higher grade levels put in more effort to learn English, and had a stronger ideal L2 self and a more internalised instrumental motivation.

Busse and Williams (2010) illustrated the various motivations that drive university-level students to pursue a modern foreign language at the university level in the United Kingdom context. Their study found that there is a moderate

correlation between the ideal L2 self and students' intrinsic reasons for studying, implying that the enjoyment of learning German is linked to the ability to imagine oneself as a successful speaker of that language. The study also clarified a comparative statement on German-L2/English-L3 students' English-related results. The ideal English selves contribute to their learning motivation, but their ideal German selves play a negative role in motivated learning behaviour.

Goktepe (2014) utilized Dörnyei and Csizér's (2006), and Ryan's (2005) surveys to explore freshmen' perceptions and motivations toward English language learning in a Turkish University. The results demonstrated that professional needs motivate freshmen which means they are instrumentally motivated. The study's most interesting result is the ideal L2 self. The participants of the researchers envision that they could eventually be a native-like speakers of English. This could indicate that the age group of respondents is an important factor in having clear goals in language learning, which is a similar finding with Csizér and Kormos's (2008) study.

The above-mentioned study by Csizér and Kormos investigated the motivation for learning English in three different age groups. For secondary school pupils and university students, the ideal L2 self-predicted language learning attitude. When compared, university students had the highest value for the ideal L2 self. University-level students' self-image is fairly stable but still flexible which can be supported by Carlson's finding (1965, p.665): "the process of change in the self-image which goes with adolescent development".

Oakes (2013) investigated why students choose to learn a foreign language at an English-speaking university. Examining the L2 motivation and the effect of

L1and linguistic resource on target language, the study revealed a significant correlation between proficiency and ideal L2 self.

2.2.3.4.2 Ought to L2 Self

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the learner's ideal L2 self encapsulates the extent to which he or she can see himself or herself as a highly-skilled L2 user. However, the external pressures that the individual is aware of during the learning process are encapsulated by ought-to L2 self (Csizér, 2019). The ought-to L2 self is concerned with the characteristics that one should have in order to satisfy expectations and refrain from potentially negative outcomes (Ueki & Takeuchi, 2013). From this perspective, it is similar to Higgins' ought self, as it includes more external types of instrumental motives (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Liu and Thompson (2018) used the tripartite model of L2MSS in their study on the motivational profiles of Chinese EFL learners with an age range from 17 to 36 years old. The findings revealed that the ought-to L2 self has a negative effect on English proficiency scores. This means that a student's English competence tends to be lower if he or she has a more powerful ought-to self. A more recent study (Li & Zhang, 2021) from the Tibetan setting examined Dörnyei's L2MSS to explain Tibetan students' motivation for learning Chinese as a second language and its effect on Chinese learning achievement. Their findings confirmed the previous study's conclusions. Lower Chinese learning achievement is likely to be predicted by a higher ought-to L2 self.

Csizér and Kormos (2009) conducted an empirical study to investigate the role of Dörnyei's tripartite framework of motivation which is the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self as well as an L2 learning experience. The participants of the study

were high school and university students studying English in Hungary. Ought-to L2 self was measured to understand students' motivations in learning English. The findings revealed the ought-to L2 self seems to have a minor impact in predicting Hungarian students' language learning efforts. The relationship between ought-to L2 self and motivated behaviour was very weak in the university student sample, and there was no link between ought-to L2 self and motivated behaviour in the secondary school student group. Lamb's (2012) findings showed similar results to that of Csizér and Kormos' (2009) results on secondary school students. The ought-to L2 self was found insufficient in explaining the criterion measure.

A similar result in terms of intrinsic features was found in Peng's (2015) study on university students in China to understand the correlation of the three factors of L2MSS. The results revealed that there is less influence of the ought-to L2 self on the ideal L2 self. According to findings, the ought-to L2 self does not predict the ideal L2 self strongly. However, Kim (2009) explains this as, if the L2 learners do not have a goal, they will not internalize the ought-to L2 self and also fail to adopt an ideal L2 self.

Goktepe (2014) investigated first-year Turkish undergraduates' attitudes about learning English as a foreign language. Ought-to L2 selves were salient as a result of the influence of families, demonstrating that students were not intrinsically motivated. A supporting study (Yetkin & Ekin, 2018) demonstrated Turkish secondary school EFL learners' future orientations toward language learning motivation. The findings showed that the students' ought-to L2 self levels were high and determined by extrinsic factors, implying that societal expectations could influence L2 learning in Turkish students. A recent study (Arslan & Çiftçi, 2021)

investigating the L2MSS of secondary school students in the Turkish context showed that the predictive power of ought-to L2 self on effort for language learning correlates moderately, which contrasts with the previous two studies reviewed. Course and Saka's (2021) study, investigating Turkish University students' ought-to L2 selves, displayed a similar result to that of Arslan and Çiftçi (2021). This can be an implication that for younger Turkish students, the shifting toward a more individualistic lifestyle results in a more clear image of oneself. This backs up the prior research on L2 motivation in Turkey from the university student perspective (Bektaş-Çetinkaya & Oruç, 2010; Altiner, 2018).

Dörnyei and Chan (2013) investigated the relation of sensory and imagery aspects with description of the strength of the secondary school learners' ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self and how these variables are linked to English and Mandarin learning achievement. For both English and Mandarin, the ought-to L2 self was found to be positively associated with intended effort. However, their correlation with course grades were insignificant. According to study, the ought-to L2 self typically displayed weaker links with the criterion measures than the ideal L2 self which was also displayed by the majority of past studies (Csizer & Kormos, 2009; Csizer & Lukacs, 2010; Taguchi et al., 2009).

Busse and Williams (2010) investigated how the ideal self and the ought-to self influence students' decisions to study German at the university level. The findings revealed that the ought-to self had no correlation with any other variables, with the exception of a weak correlation with instrumental reasons for studying. Similar result was found in Oakes's (2013) study on French or Spanish learners at the university level. The ought-to L2 self was considered negligible.

2.2.3.5. Learning Experience

Dörnyei (2005, 2009, 2010) emphasized learning experience as a component of his tripartite model. In literature, the learning experience is an umbrella term and was used as 'attitudes to learning English' (Taguchi, 2013; Taguchi et al., 2009; You & Dörnyei, 2016; You et al., 2016), as 'L2 learning experience' (Csizer & Kormos, 2009) and as 'English learning experience' (Papi, 2010).

L2 learning experience means motives related to learning environment and past experience. This component portrays the influence of the learning environment on the students. While ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self are associated with future-based self-images, L2 learning experience is concerned with what is happening right now and is associated with learners' attitudes toward the current learning context (Yetkin & Ekin, 2018).

To distinguish the learning experience from the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self, Dörnyei (2019) revisited the outcome of empirical research conducted in Hungary. ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self are a good fit with future self guides; however, there is a direct impact of the learning experience on students. The initial motivation to learn a language for some language learners originates from the actual language learning process rather than internally or externally generated self-images. This result echoes Lamb's (2012) and Course and Saka's (2021) findings. Lamb (2012) compared adolescents from rural and urban areas in Indonesia. According to the findings, the most powerful predictor of L2 proficiency is a positive English (L2) learning experience. Course and Saka (2021) explored L2MSS to explain L2 motivation in the context of a Turkish university. Their findings discovered that the learning experience is the most significant predictor of intended effort. Also, the

ideal L2 self and learning experience was the second strongest predictor of each other.

Busse and Williams (2010) investigated reasons to study a modern foreign language other than English. The relation of intrinsic reasons and ideal L2 self with learning experience was tested with regression analysis. While intrinsic reasons were found as a significant contributor to learners' previous experiences, ideal L2 self remained statistically insignificant demonstrating no causal relationship between students' ideal L2 self and learning experience.

Peng (2015) conducted a study on university students in China to investigate interrelationships between the three components of L2MSS. L2 learning experience directly influenced the ideal L2 self which indicates that positive past experiences play an important role in internalization. Li and Zhang's (2021) study from a Tibetan setting showed similar results. Ideal L2 self was found to be a strong predictor of the learning experience.

Csizer and Kormos (2009) observed that for both high school and secondary school students, ideal L2 self and L2 learning experience significantly contribute to motivated learning behaviour. The function of the language learning context was also critical, as students had an intrinsic interest in learning an L2 and a strong L2 self-concept. However, different from Dörnyei's L2MSS model, ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience were either not related or showed the only weak effect. These motivational variables were clearly different and independent.

You and Dörnyei (2016) also found out that learning experience differed from the first two in that it focused on the learners' current experience rather than their imagined future experience. The tripartite construct has been affirmed in diverse

L2/L3 learning contexts, so the realities of one's L2 learning experience are the result of multiple factors related to various aspects of the learning environment and the learner's personal life (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015).

According to Kim (2012), Korean EFL students were exposed to an inordinate levels of social pressure to learn English in order to secure what is perceived to be a bright future. Therefore, extrinsic sources influenced EFL learners' tendency toward language.

Yetkin and Ekin (2018) investigated Turkish EFL learners' L2 motivational dispositions. The data showed that the students were satisfied with the English learning experience. The greater variance over intended effort was explained by language learning experience. The learners' learning experience differed according to their attitude; however, the mean values decreased over time as they were exposed to more language experience, which contrasts with Kim's (2012) findings in a Korean setting.

2.2.3.6. Multilingual Motivational Self System

L2 motivational theories have been perceived from a monolingual bias. The research area of multilingual language learning has received little attention, and studies on multilingual contexts in which learners are actively involved in learning multiple L2s are scarce (Henry, 2010). The motivational systems of different languages have been examined separately in L2 motivation studies, rather than being cognitively integrated (Henry, 2017). Learning about the motivation of learners of English and LOTE within the same learner group may be particularly useful in understanding LOTE motivation (Huang, 2019). Hungarian longitudinal studies, which is the most ambitious L2 motivation research in terms of dynamics of

motivational changes, have shown that in situations where multiple languages are available, motivation is unlikely to be distributed evenly (Dörnyei et al., 2006). Findings of earlier studies show that the desire to learn German, French, Italian and Russian was found hampered when English is available (Dörnyei & Csizer, 2002; Dörnyei & Csizer, 2005a, Dörnyei et al., 2006).

Henry (2010) used the framework of working self-concept to understand simultaneous language learning and the effects of langauges on each other (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Simultaneous L2 English and LOTE as L3 or L4 learners, according to his research, may not have a single L2 self, but rather adopt multiple language-specific images of themselves. The English L2 self, in particular, was found to influence motivation to learn an L3 or L4. A present L2 English self may affect L3 learning motivation negatively. He proposed combining separate language-selves into a generic L2 working self-concept.

In his case study of Swedish secondary students learning English and a LOTE, Henry (2011) used a possible selves perspective to investigate the impact of English on L3 motivation. The impact of L2 self-guides and multilingual self-guides sketched out to address the distinction between billingualism and multilingualism. For students who develop bilingual self, knowledge of English comfortably provides all of the opportunities needed in life, and learning Spanish is simply not worth the effort which means the influence of L2 English on L3 motivation is negative. However, the ideal Spanish self is enhanced for those who develop an ideal multilingual self. In such situations of multiple learning/acquisition, the self-guides of different language systems interact (Henry, 2011, 2017). From this point, Henry (2017) revisited the phenomenon of multilingual identity and multilingual

motivation. He conceptualized the MMSS building on Dörnyei's L2MSS which was reviewed in section 2.2.3.1 and ideal multilingual self was brought to research agenda.

2.2.3.6.1. Ideal Multilingual Self

The ideal L2 self and the ideal multilingual self are not the same things. The desire to become multilingual is distinct from the desire to become fluent in a single language. The ideal multilingual self is not associated with a specific language, but rather with a more holistic, future-oriented self-concept. Although the self-concept of L2 takes place under the shadow of Global English, the goal of becoming multilingual can be used to counteract risks and reduce the likelihood of negative self-revisions when an ideal multilingual self is also developed (Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017).

Henry and Thorsen (2018) conducted an experimental study on secondary school students in Sweden. The study found that the ideal multilingual self and the ideal L2 self were distinct constructs. The ideal multilingual self did not affect language learners' intended effort directly; the intended effort, on the other hand, was affected by the ideal L2 self. Different from the ideal L2 self, It was less possible for the ideal multilingual self to be effectively connected to learners' learning activities, according to the researchers. The participants were in their early teens (aged 13 to 15) and a further research on the relationship between the ideal multilingual self and ideal L2 self should be considered with different learner groups.

Henry (2020) built on Henry and Thorsen's (2018) modelling of multilingual motivation to investigate the occurrences that may contribute to the multilingual

motivation of secondary school students. The study found that the social environment plays a role in the development of multilingual self-guides. The school system and surrounding environment stimulate interest and engagement in foreign languge learning, encouraging students to learn additional foreign languges.

Fukui and Yashima (2021) uncovered the experiences of two Japanese students simultaneously learning L2 English and L3 Chinese in Taiwan. In their three years longitudinal study, the presence of the ideal multilingual self and its effect on language learning were investigated. The result showed that if the ideal multilingual self is present, the L3 self resists toward any threat from L2 self. However, if the presence of selves are seperate, L2 self and L3 self do not interwine and even L2 self inteferes with L3 learning motivation leading loss of interest in being multilingual and retaining their bilingual self.

Huang (2019) investigated learners' motivation for three language clusters namely Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Thai and Malay), Northeast Asian (Japanese and Korean) and European (German, Spanish and French) in Taiwan. The participants of the study were university students. According to the findings, for Southeast Asian and European groupings, learning experience predicted intended effort strongly followed by ideal L2 self and cultural interest. For Northeast Asian, learning experience, again, predicted intended effort strongly followed by cultural interest and ideal L2 self. In LOTE regression model, ought-to self was found to be insignificant. This indicates that respondents rely on their class experience. Particularly today, humans are being replaced by technology and traditional classes transform into online lessons. This can indicate that those participants language interaction may be locked into classroom solely.

Mayumi and Zheng (2021) examined the motivation of five university students in United Kingdom who began learning Chinese. The participants were multiple language learners as they had already studied foreign languages such as French, German, and Spanish before starting University. Dörnyei's L2MSS (2005, 2009) and Henry's (2017) concept of the ideal multilingual self were utilized to investigate the motivations of multilingual language learners. The findings revealed that multilingual language learners should strategically balance the gains across the languages to develop an ideal multilingual self. Furthermore, in order to be an effective multilingual user, they ought to be capable of developing a solid ideal L2 self. This finding supports Henry and Thorsen's (2018) claim that a multiple language learner's ideal multilingual self and ideal L2 self in each language are separate constructs. Still, these two components are closely linked in developing the ideal multilingual self.

Wang and Fisher (2021) took a longitudinal case study in a university in China. Respondents were English majors learning French and French majors. They investigated Chinese university students' LOTE motivational dynamics, with a focus on the role of multilingual tendencies in this process. From the initial analysis, for both group of students ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self contributed to their LOTE motivation. Learners' positive attitudes towards language improved their LOTE motivation. However, in the process, students presented a negative turn because of unsatisfactory experiences with their current French learning. This ended up with a fading attitude towards ideal L2 self resulting with a weaker ideal multilingual self. Ought-to L2 self remained stable anyhow. The stronger ought-to French selves of French majors do not destroy their ideal French selves due to negative learning experiences; however, English majors ought to French selves cannot contribute to

sustain their ideal French selves as they will discontinue learning French after graduation.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLGY

3.1. Background of the Study

This study aims to uncover language learners' motivation on a multilingual level and present motivating factors of the multilingual learners from a Turkish perspective. So, this research investigates the self motivations of Turkish high school students who learn English as an L2, German and Russian as an L3 at the same time. In this respect, the research model, respondents, setting of the study, instruments and procedure for data collection, and data analysis of the following research questions;

1- What are the multiligual learners' L2MSS?

- What are the multilingual learners' L2MSS in English?
- What are the multilingual learners' L2MSS in German?
- What are the multilingual learners' L2MSS in Russian?

2- What is the relationship between components of L2MSS of multilingual learners and their ideal multilingual self?

3.2. Research Model

The study is questionnaire-based quantitative research. Quantitative research, as described by Bryman (2012), is a research technique that emphasizes quantification in data gathering and analysis. It generates precise and dependable measurements that can be analyzed statistically (Queirós et al., 2017). Quantitive methods are strong at studying larger groups of people and making generalizations from the sample group (Holton & Burnett, 2005) and employ a large sample size

obtained through a definite process (Curtis et al.,2016). Leedy and Ormrdod (2010) emphasise the importance of large sampling as it "*makes better sense of the world through measurement and numbers*" (p.211). So to have a more general idea of the multilingual students self-perceptions in language learning, quantitative data is used to address the research questions.

To analyse numerical multivariate data, regression analysis is applied. According to Büyüköztürk (2002), multivariate regression analysis is a model with one dependent variable and multiple independent variables. Multiple linear regression analysis is utilized to predict the value of the dependent variable and measure the effect of the independent variables. In this way, a more general idea of the multilingual students' self-perceptions in language learning is obtained by seeking an answer to what the case is in the real world.

In this study, students self-completed the questionnaires due to covid restrictions and distance learning. Self-complete questionnaires are less expensive to conduct and allow for a larger sample size (Williams, 2003).

3.3. Population and Sample

Purposive sampling was used for the selection of the students. The population group that is appropriate for the study is multilingual learners who learn three or more languages at the same time. To reach the target group, multilingual schools were identified initially. In this study, the term multilingual defines people who learn more than two languages simultaneously. While choosing the four schools for the data collection, the grade levels of students and the languages they learn were considered to illustrate the motivational differences among languages and eligibility (multilingual language learners simultaneously) of respondents. For respondents who

learn the same languages simultaneously, English, German, and Russian were found as standard courses during 10th and 11th grades in vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in the field of tourism. For the data collection, online questionnaires were used due to the Covid-19 outbreak.

Participants of the study were 405 Turkish students aged between 15 and 17 studying in vocational and technical Anatolian high school in Antalya during the 2021-2022 Academic Year. 10th and 11th-grade level students took part in this research. The students were from food and beverage and accommodation and travel services in the field of Tourism. All the respondents were fluent in Turkish as native speakers.

3.4. The Setting of the Study

The study took place at vocational and technical Anatolian high schools of Tourism in Antalya which are titled Protocol or Project schools by the Turkish Ministry of National Education. All the schools the study is conducted in are multilingual; English, German and Russian are languages studied at school.

The regulation of appoint an educational institution affiliated with the Ministry as a project school is stated in the Ministry Of National Education Implementing Special Program And Project Educational Institutions Regulation (ROT Official Gazette, 2016). To be appointed as a project school, the schools need to prove to the ministry of national education that they intend to implement a development plan, have historical importance, have high academic achievement by the students or staff, or that they provide thematic education.

The education policy of the Vocational High School of Tourism in Turkey was reconstructed as a test study; English and Russian as a preparatory classes; and German, French, Arabic, or Chinese as optional foreign languages (Özer, 2018). The high schools where the study was implemented accept students according to High School Entrance System which is a national exam in Turkey. The students can apply for schools according to their exam results. Following the application, students are required to take an intramural English exam. Successful students in this intramural English exam are eligible to enrol.

The language of instruction is Turkish. 10th grade students have 6 hours of English, 8 hours of Russian and 2 hours of German in their weekly schedule. 11th-grade students have 6 hours of English, 8 hours of Russian and 4 hours of German in their weekly schedule.

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

In order to answer research questions, a multilingual self motivation questionnaire was used as a research tool (see Appendix A). In this section, the instrument will be analyzed in detail.

3.5.1. Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire

The Multilingual Self Motivation questionnaire was adapted from 2 different questionnaires. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 18 and 23 are extracted from the Ideal multilingual self questionnaire used in Sweden by Henry and Thorsen (2017). Items 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are extracted from the motivation questionnaires used in the 2008-2009 comparative survey project in Japan, China and Iran (see Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Dörnyei, 2010). The aim of the questionnaire is to investigate students' L2MSS in English, German and

Russian, their motivations to learn multiple languages and also to find out the effect of L2 self on ideal multilingual self.

For the study, a questionnaire is adapted for every survey requires its own unique instrument that is appropriate for the setting (Dörnyei& Ushioda, 2011). Also borrowing the items from tried and tested instruments that are published in the literature is recommended (Dörnyei, 2007).

In order to preclude any misconception, the 25 items questionnaire was translated in Turkish and two experts of Turkish language analyzed and checked for compliance. Following, the questionnaire was conducted in Turkish. To clarify the items on the questionnaire and how to answer the questions, a statement was given on online questionnaires.

Reliability analysis of the adapted version of the Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire and the number of items are demonstrated in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1. Constructs of the adapted version of the Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire and the number of items

Construct	Item Number
Language Learning Experience	5, 6, 11, 12
Ideal L2 Self	7, 9, 13,15, 19, 25
Ought To L2 Self	8, 14,17, 20, 22, 24
Intended Learning Effort	10, 16, 18, 21, 23
Ideal Multilingual Self	1, 2, 3, 4

Reliability analysis of the adapted version of Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire is demonstrated in Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2. *Reliability Analysis of the Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire*

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire (English)	, 970
Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire (German)	, 971
Multilingual Self Motivation Questionnaire (Russian)	, 973

In SLA research area, likert-scale questionnaires have been the most commonly applied questionnaire are likert-scale questionnaires beacuse they are useful in studies examining individual differences in self-confidence, anxiety, and motivation (Nemoto & Beglar, 2014). When conducted, analyzing the items' internal consistency using Cronbach alpha statistics is essential (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The higher Cronbach's alpha coefficient emphasizes the scale's high reliability according to literature. Mertens, (2019, p.381) emphasises that "coefficients range from 0.00 to +/- 1.00, with 1.00 indicating perfect reliability. The closer to 1.00, the more reliable the instrument". As seen in the reliability analysis table, the questionnaire is dependable.

3.5.2. Pilot Study

The piloting process took place in 2 vocational and technical Anatolian high schools of Tourism. 315 students answered the questionnaires online. The students were asked to answer a five-point likert scale (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) questionnaire and give their opinions about it. After the data collection, analysis of reliability, validity and feedback from students, unreliable items were omitted or reworded in the questionnaire. The final version of the questionnaire is shaped accordingly. Collected data from the pilot study were analyzed via SPSS 24.0 Statistical Package.

For 47 items on the pilotting questionnaire, the alpha coefficient was found reliable. ($\alpha >$, 70). The scale was revised, and unreliable items were excluded. When feedback from students was regarded, the most frequent ones were the number of questions causing exhaustion and repetition of some questions which makes it unclear. So after diminishing the number of questions, omitting similar questions and checking the wording, the final draft of the questionnaire was shaped.

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

After the piloting process, in the middle of the first term of the 2021-2022 academic year, an online version of the questionnaire was given to the students via online communication tools by means of teachers. Instructions for the questionnaire were given at the beginning page of the online questionnaire. The respondents were also informed about the study's purpose and assured that their responses would only be used for this study.

3.7. Data Analysis

After implementation of the questionnaires, students' responses were analyzed by using SPSS 24.0 Statistical Package. First reliability analysis was conducted to analyse internal consistency. Then, descriptive statistics; frequencies, mean, maximum and minimum, variance and standard deviation were calculated to see the patterns. Then, normality tests were carried out to see whether the data were normally distributed for further analysis. To see the predictors of variables, multiple linear regression analysis was utilized.

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to demonstrate data analysis using a multilingual self-motivation questionnaire. Data is categorized under two sub-headings in order to answer the research questions.

4.2. Multilingual learners' L2 Motivational Self Systems

The agreement likert scale questions investigate four components of L2MSS, namely ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, learning experience and intended learning effort. The findings will be shown for each component in English, German and Russian.

4.2.1. Multilingual learners' Ideal L2 Self in English

Table 4.1. Responses Regarding Ideal L2 Self in English

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
7- I see myself as someone in the future who is good at speaking these languages.	25	6,2	31	7,7	99	24.4	102	25,2	148	36.5	405	100
9- Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using these languages.	29	7,2	24	5,9	66	16,3	116	28,6	170	42	405	100
13- I can imagine myself speaking these languages with international friends or colleagues.	29	7,2	35	8,6	83	20,5	102	25,2	156	38,5	405	100
15- I can imagine myself living abroad and using these languages effectively for communicating with the locals.	31	7,7	27	6,7	70	17,3	97	24,0	180	44,4	405	100
20- The things I want to do in the future require me to use these languages.	33	8,1	27	6,7	51	12,6	83	20,5	211	52,1	405	100
25- I can imagine myself writing e-mails/letters fluently in these languages.	32	7,9	38	9,4	87	21,5	88	21,7	160	39,5	405	100

When the results are considered, it is clear from Table 4.1 that most respondents have strong ideal L2 self in English.

250 out of 405 respondents visualise themselves as someone who is good at speaking English (61%). 286 out of 405 picture themselves using English in their future careers (68%). 258 out of 405 respondents envision themselves speaking English with international friends or colleagues (63%). 277 out of 405 imagine themselves living abroad and using English effectively (68%). 294 out of 405 are aware of the necessity of English for their future (72%). 248 out of 405 see themselves writing e-mails/letters in English (61%).

Table 4.2. Responses Regarding Ideal L2 Self in German

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
7- I see myself as someone in the future who is good at speaking these languages.	41	10,1	44	10,9	135	33.3	104	25,7	81	20	405	100
9- Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using these languages.	34	8,4	40	9,9	114	28,1	106	26,2	111	27,4	405	100
13- I can imagine myself speaking these languages with international friends or colleagues.	41	10,1	43	10,6	121	29,9	98	24,2	102	25,2	405	100
15- I can imagine myself living abroad and using these languages effectively for communicating with the locals.	46	11,4	41	10,1	104	25,7	96	23,7	118	29,1	405	100
20- The things I want to do in the future require me to use these languages.	44	10,9	39	9,6	81	20	104	25,7	137	33,8	405	100
25- I can imagine myself writing e-mails/letters fluently in these languages.	51	12,6	49	12,1	127	31,4	66	16,3	112	27,7	405	100

Findings reveal that respondents have a weaker ideal L2 self in German when compared to English. While statements 9,15 and 20 represent a strong ideal L2 self in German, statements 7,13 and 25 represent a weaker ideal L2 self.

220 out of 405 envision themselves as someone in the future who is less capable of speaking German (54%). 217 out of 405 imagine themselves using German in their future careers (54%). 205 out of 405 Multilingual learners have a weaker sense of envisioning themselves speaking German with international friends or colleagues (51%). 214 out of 405 are aware of the necessity of German for their future (59%). 227 out of 405 have a weaker sense of envisioning themselves writing e-mails/letters in German (56%).

Table 4.3. *Responses Regarding Ideal L2 Self in Russian*

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
7- I see myself as someone in the future who is good at speaking these languages.	28	6,9	42	10,4	120	29,6	99	24,4	116	28,6	405	100
9- Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using these languages.	44	10,9	31	7,7	82	20,2	99	24,4	149	36,8	405	100
13- I can imagine myself speaking these languages with international friends or colleagues.	42	10,4	36	8,9	98	24,2	93	23	136	33,6	405	100
15- I can imagine myself living abroad and using these languages effectively for communicating with the locals.	51	12,6	33	8,1	84	20,7	84	20,7	153	37,8	405	100
20- The things I want to do in the future require me to use these languages.	55	13,6	28	6,9	71	17,5	80	19,8	171	42,2	405	100
25- I can imagine myself writing e-mails/letters fluently in these languages.	51	12,6	39	9,6	108	26,7	86	21,2	121	29,9	405	100

As seen in Table 4.3 most respondents have strong ideal L2 self in Russian. 215 out of 405 picture themselves as someone who is good at speaking Russian

(53%). 248 out of 405 imagine themselves using Russian in their future careers (61%). 229 out of 405 envision themselves speaking Russian with international friends or colleagues (57%). 237 out of 405 visualise themselves living abroad and using Russian effectively (59%). 251 out of 405 are aware of the necessity of Russian for their future (62%). 207 out of 405 envision themselves writing e-mails/letters in Russian (51%).

For all questions, ideal L2 self for the English language scores are the highest followed by Russian. German scores are the lowest among these three languages.

4.2.2. Ought to L2 Self

Table 4.4. Responses Regarding Ought to L2 Self in English

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
8- I study these languages because close friends of mine think it is important.	61	15,1	64	15,8	74	18,3	112	27,7	94	23,2	405	100
14- I consider learning these languages important because the people I respect think that I should do it.	39	9,6	40	9,9	62	15,3	108	26,7	156	38,5	405	100
17- My parents believe that I must study these languages to be an educated person.	29	7,2	27	6,7	40	9,9	102	25,2	207	51,1	405	100
20- Studying these languages is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak foreign language.	27	6,7	27	6,7	44	10,9	98	24,2	209	51,5	405	100
22- If I fail to learn these languages I'll be letting other people down.	58	14,3	65	16,0	64	15,8	101	24,9	117	28,9	405	100
24- Studying these languages is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.	51	12,6	60	14,8	77	19	84	20,7	133	32,8	405	100

54

Frequency tables show that acceptance by significant others are relatively important for learning English. Statements 14, 17 and 20 have a slightly higher frequency compared to statements 8, 22 and 24. Considering the above statements, milieu has a strong effect on learning English and shape respondents' ideas and motivation level.

Table 4.4 presents that more than 50% of the respondents are motivated to learn English in order to be approved and respected by their significant others (peers/ teachers/ family) and compensate their parents' demands (statement 8 = 50,9%, statement 14 = 65,2%, statement 17 = 76,3%, statement 20 = 75,7%, statement 22 = 53,8%, statement 24 = 53,5%).

Table 4.5. *Responses Regarding Ought to L2 Self in German*

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
8- I study these languages because close friends of mine think it is important.	62	15,3	74	18,3	100	24,7	93	23	76	18,8	405	100
14- I consider learning these languages important because the people I respect think that I should do it.	54	13,3	52	12,8	74	18,3	107	26,4	118	29,1	405	100
17- My parents believe that I must study these languages to be an educated person.	38	9,4	32	7,9	66	16,3	104	25,7	165	40,7	405	100
20- Studying these languages is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak foreign language.	39	9,6	33	8,1	70	17,3	101	24,9	162	40	405	100
22- If I fail to learn these languages I'll be letting other people down.	68	16,8	66	16,3	90	22,2	91	22,5	90	22,2	405	100
24- Studying these languages is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.	61	15,1	62	15,3	100	24,7	83	20,5	99	24,4	405	100

Table 4.5 presents that not all respondents are motivated to learn German in order to be approved and respected by their significant others (peers/ teachers/ family) and compensate for their parents' demands. While statements 14=55, 5%, 17 =66, 4% and 20=64, 9% represent strong ought to L2 self in German, statements 8 =58, 3%, 22=55, 3% and 24=55, 1% represent weaker ought to L2 self in German.

Table 4.6 presents that respondents are relatively motivated to learn Russian in order to meet expectations and avoid potentially negative outcomes. Statements 14=60%, 17=71,4%, 20=71,4%, 20=65,7% and 24=50,1% represent strong ought to L2 self in Russian; however, statements 8=52,4% and 22=52,1% represent weaker ought to L2 self in Russian.

Table 4.6 Responses Regarding Ought to L2 Self in Russian

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
8- I study these languages because close friends of mine think it is important.	63	15,6	73	18	76	18,8	92	22,7	101	24,9	405	100
14- I consider learning these languages important because the people I respect think that I should do it.	58	14,3	47	11,6	57	14,1	104	25,7	139	34,3	405	100
17- My parents believe that I must study these languages to be an educated person.	41	10,1	28	6,9	47	11,6	115	28,4	174	43	405	100
20- Studying these languages is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak foreign language.	43	10,6	26	6,4	70	17,3	89	22	177	43,7	405	100
22- If I fail to learn these languages I'll be letting other people down.	77	19	60	14,8	74	18,3	94	23,2	100	24,7	405	100
24- Studying these languages is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.	67	16,5	50	12,3	85	21	84	20,7	119	29,4	405	100

When above tables analysed, ought to L2 self scores in English are the highest followed by Russian. German scores are the lowest among these three languages. The difference between English and Russian is the highest in ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. There is almost 10% difference between English and Russian. The difference between English and German is even steeper.

4.2.3. Language Learning Experience

Respondents' learning experience in English, German and Russian are represented below. As understood from Table 4.7, respondents have a positive learning experience in English. 293 out of 405 enjoy learning English (72%). 267 out of 405 like the atmosphere of the lessons (66%). 288 out of 405 find learning English interesting (71%), And 235 out of 405 look forward to English classes (58%).

Table 4.7. Responses Regarding Language Learning Experience in English

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
5- I really enjoy learning these languages.	33	8,1	26	6,4	53	13,1	131	32,3	162	40	405	100
6-I like the atmosphere of these languages' classes.	41	10,1	22	5,4	75	18,1	122	30,1	145	35,8	405	100
11- I find learning these languages really interesting.	36	8,9	25	6,2	56	13,8	117	28,9	171	42,2	405	100
12- I always look forward to these languages' classes.	40	9,9	44	10,9	86	21,2	99	24,4	136	33,6	405	100

As shown in Table 4. 8, respondents learning experience in German has a positive tendency. 236 out of 405 enjoy learning German (58%). 255 out of 405 like the atmosphere of the lessons (63%). 236 out of 405 find learning German interesting (58%), and 215 out of 405 look forward to German classes (53%).

Table 4.8. Responses Regarding Language Learning Experience in German

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
5- I really enjoy learning these languages.	42	10,4	35	8,6	92	22,7	118	29,1	118	29,1	405	100
6- I like the atmosphere of these languages' classes.	44	10,9	32	7,9	74	18,3	126	31,1	129	31,9	405	100
11- I find learning these languages really interesting.	49	12,1	39	9,6	81	20	112	27,7	124	30,6	405	100
12- I always look forward to these languages' classes.	44	10,9	46	11,4	100	24,7	112	27,7	103	25,4	405	100

Respondents' learning experience in Russian is analysed in table 4.9. 255 out of 405 enjoy learning Russian (63%). 266 out of 405 like the atmosphere of the lessons (66%). 265 out of 405 find learning Russian interesting (65%) and 227 out of 405 look forward to Russian classes (56%).

Table 4.9. Responses Regarding Language Learning Experience in Russian

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
5- I really enjoy learning these languages.	43	10,6	34	8,4	73	18	98	24,2	157	38,8	405	100
6-I like the atmosphere of these languages' classes.	41	10,1	38	9,4	60	14,8	107	26,4	159	39,3	405	100
11- I find learning these languages really interesting.	47	11,6	27	6,7	66	16,3	92	22,7	173	42,7	405	100
12- I always look forward to these languages' classes.	43	10,6	51	12,6	84	20,7	92	22,7	135	33,3	405	100

English gets the highest learning experience score in all questions but one: For question 6, English and Russian scores are equal. For all other questions, English scores are the highest followed by Russian. German scores are the lowest among these three languages.

4.2.4. Intended Learning Effort

Table 4.10. Responses Regarding Intended Learning Effort for English

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10- Compared to my classmates, I think I study these languages relatively hard.	35	8,6	53	13,1	134	33,1	79	19,5	104	25,7	405	100
16- If my teacher would give the class an optional assignment, I would certainly volunteer to do it.	38	9,4	46	11,4	106	26,2	96	23,7	119	29,4	405	100
19- I am willing to work hard at learning these languages.	31	7,7	26	6,4	92	22,7	96	23,7	160	39,5	405	100
21- I am working hard at learning these languages.	27	6,7	42	10,4	103	25,4	103	25,4	130	32,1	405	100
23- I can honestly say that I am really doing my best to learn these languages.	25	6,2	38	9,4	86	21,2	110	27,2	146	36	405	100

Findings of respondents' efforts in English are displayed in Table 4.10. While statements 16, 19, 21 and 23 present a higher frequency above 50%, statement 10 presents that respondents' effort is less than 50 %. 183 out of 405 think they don't study English relatively hard compared to their peers (55%). 215 out of 405 volunteer to do an optional assignment in English class (53%). 256 out of 405 are willing to work hard in English (63%). 233 out of 405 work hard at learning English (57%). 256 out of 405 state that they do their best to learn English (63%).

Respondents' efforts in German are shown in Table 4.11. Statements 19 and 23 present a higher frequency above 50%, statements 10,16 and 21 present that their effort is less than 50%. The data shows that 243 out of 405 think they do not study German harder compared to their peers (60%). 214 out of 405 are unwilling to do an optional assignment in German class (53%). 218 out of 405 are motivated to work

hard in German (54%). 215 out of 405 do not work hard at learning German (53%). 210 out of 405 report that they do their best to learn German (52%).

Table 4.11. Responses Regarding Intended Learning Effort for German

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10- Compared to my classmates, I think I study these languages relatively hard.	48	11,9	62	15,3	133	32,8	88	21,7	74	18,3	405	100
16- If my teacher would give the class an optional assignment, I would certainly volunteer to do it.	48	11,9	45	11,1	121	29,9	82	20,2	109	26,9	405	100
19- I am willing to work hard at learning these languages.	39	9,6	26	7,2	119	29,4	101	24,9	117	28,9	405	100
21- I am working hard at learning these languages.	40	9,9	49	12,1	126	31,1	88	21,7	102	25,2	405	100
23- I can honestly say that I am really doing my best to learn these languages.	37	9,1	43	10,6	115	28,4	99	24,4	111	27,4	405	100

Table 4.12, respondents' effort in Russian is displayed. As shown, statements 16, 19, 21 and 23 present a higher frequency above 50%, and statement 10 presents that multilingual students' effort is less than 50%.

Table 4.12. Responses Regarding Intended Learning Effort for Russian

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
10- Compared to my classmates, I think I study these languages relatively hard.	50	12,3	53	13,1	110	27,2	93	23	99	24,4	405	100
16- If my teacher would give the class an optional assignment, I would certainly volunteer to do it.	56	13,8	45	11,1	97	24	83	20,5	124	30,6	405	100
19- I am willing to work hard at learning these languages.	43	10,6	23	5,7	99	24,4	97	24	143	35,3	405	100
21- I am working hard at learning these languages.	38	9,4	47	11,6	101	24,9	97	24	122	30,1	405	100
23- I can honestly say that I am really doing my best to learn these languages.	45	11,1	35	8,6	91	22,5	100	24,7	134	33,1	405	100

213 out of 405 think they do not study Russian hard enough compared to their peers (52%). 207 out of 405 are willing to do an optional assignment in Russian class (51%). 240 out of 405 are motivated to work hard in Russian (59%). 219 out of 405 try hard at learning Russian (54%). 234 out of 405 frankly states doing their best to learn Russian (58%).

English gets the highest scores in all questions but one. For question 10, Russian scores are higher. For all other questions, English scores are the highest followed by Russian. German scores are the lowest among these three languages.

4.3. Multilingual learners' Ideal Multilingual Selves

In table 4.13, respondents' ideal multilingual self is displayed. 311 out of 405 respondents vision themselves can speak several different languages (77%). 267 out of 405 image themselves as using several different languages (in addition to their mother tongue) in contact with different people (66%). 311 out of 405 want to be someone who can speak several different languages (in addition to their mother tongue) (77%). 295 out of 405 dream to use several different languages (in addition to their mother tongue) effectively in the future (73%).

As understood, the respondents' ideal multilingual self scores are quite high compared to ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, learning experience and intended learning effort. While intended learning effort shows the lowest frequency in German followed by learning experience, ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self is the highest in English. There's almost 10% difference between English and Russian ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. The difference between English and German is even steeper.

Table 4.13. *Responses Regarding Ideal Multilingual Selves in English, German and Russian*

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1- I see myself as someone in the future who can speak *several different languages*	35	8,6	17	4,2	42	10,4	118	29,1	193	47,7	405	100
2- I see myself as someone who in the future can uses *several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue) in contact with different people.*	27	6,7	25	6,2	86	33,3	135	33,3	132	32,6	405	100
3- When I think about the kind of person I will be in the future, *being someone who can speak several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue)* **is a part of who I will be.**	34	8,4	19	4,7	41	10,1	129	31,9	182	44,9	405	100
4- If my dreams come true, I will use *several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue)* **effectively in the future.**	29	7,2	24	5,9	57	14,1	129	31,9	166	41	405	100

4.4. Multilingual Self Systems

In order to carry out further analysis to explain the motivational self systems of the learners, normality tests were carried out. Analysis for distribution of Multilingual learners' points from normality tests in English, German and Russian are shown in tables 4.14, 4.15 4.16 and 4.17.

As displayed on the tables, respondents' points in ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, intended learning effort and learning experience are normally distributed whereas the point of ideal multilingual self is not normally distributed.

Table 4.14. *Distribution of Scores from Normality Tests in English*

	Ideal L2 Self	Ought to L2 self	Intended Learning Effort	Learning Experience
			Statistics	
Mean	23,1802	22,0099	18,1728	15,1605
Median	24,0000	24,0000	19,0000	16,0000
Mode	30,00	30,00	25,00	20,00
Skewness	-,942	-,750	-,591	-,861
Kurtosis	,140	-,195	-,337	,097

Table 4.15. *Distribution of Scores from Normality Tests in German*

	Ideal L2 Self	Ought to L2 self	Intended Learning Effort	Learning
			Statistics	
Mean	18,0222	20,7802	17,0543	14,2370
Median	19,0000	22,0000	17,0000	15,0000
Mode	25,00	18,00	15,00	20,00
Skewness	-,748	-,485	-,417	-,671
Kurtosis	-,287	-,560	-,492	-,416

Table 4.16. *Distribution of Scores from Normality Tests in Russian*

	Ideal L2 Self	Ought to L2 self	Intended Learning	Learning Experience
			Statistics	
Mean	18,7753	21,6593	21,0025	14,8123
Median	20,0000	24,0000	22,0000	18,0000
Mode	25,00	30,00	30,00	20,00
Skewness	-,824	-,662	-,624	-,741
Kurtosis	-,323	-,562	-,492	-,242

Table 4.17 *Distribution of Scores from Normality Tests in English, German and Russian*

	Statistics
	Ideal Multilingual Self
Mean	15,7580
Median	17,0000
Mode	20,00
Skewness	-1,257
Kurtosis	,930

Regardless of the level of skewness, sample sizes greater than 85, representing the formula's maximum sample size score, should be sufficient to provide stable means and standard deviations (Piovesana & Senior, 2016). The rules of thumb suggests that "skewness values withing ± 2.0 are considered relatively normal" (Hahs-Vaughn & Lomax, 2013, p.89) Also the assumption of univariate normality is met by kurtosis and skewness values less than ± 2.0 (Kunnan, 1998).

Multiple linear regression was fitted to explain participants' intended learning effort based on ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, learning experience and ideal multilingual self to analyse large numbers of predictors. The final model is shown on tables 4.18. 4.19. and 4.20.

Table 4.18 *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of English Language with Intended Learning Effort as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**β**	**t**	**p**
Ideal L2 Self	,391	,048	,485	8,172	,000
Learning Experience	,285	,051	,296	5,634	,000
Ought to L2 self	,138	,032	,165	4,348	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	-,019	,039	-,015	-,472	,637
Adjusted R2	,783*				
F	366,37				

*p<.05.

Table 4.18 shows that ideal L2 self, ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience have a meaningful relationship with the intended learning effort. 78% of the variance in the criterion is explained and it is significantly useful in explaining the relationship between variances for English F (4, 400) =366,37, p<.05. The final model shows that ideal l2 self is stonger than the remaining 2 variables. Its β value is three times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and a lot higher than that of learning experience. ideal multilingual self found insignificant.

In table 4.19, 80% of the variance in the criterion is explained and it is significantly useful in explaining the relationship between ideal L2 self, ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self, learning experience and intended learning effort in German F (4, 400) = 415,39, p<.05. As understood from the table below, the final model shows that ideal L2 self is stonger than the remaining 2 variables. β value of ideal L2 self is two times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and higher than that of learning experience. ideal multilingual self found insignificant.

Table 4.19. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of German Language with Intended Learning Effort as the Dependent Variable*

| | **Final Model** | | | | |
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,325	,042	,398	7,820	,000
Learning Experience	,325	,048	,342	7,100	,000
Ought to L2 self	,176	,032	,211	5,488	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	,028	,027	,022	1,008	,314
Adjusted R2	,806*				
F	415.39				

*p<.05.

Table 4.20. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Russian Language with Intended Learning Effort as the Dependent Variable*

| | **Final Model** | | | | |
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,340	,045	,419	7,539	,000
Learning Experience	,307	,050	,315	6,158	,000
Ought to L2 self	,186	,033	,224	5,678	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	-,011	,034	-,009	-,332	,740
Adjusted R2	,828*				
F	485,61				

*p<.05.

In table 4.20, 83% of the variance in the criterion is explained and it is significantly useful in explaining the relationship between ideal L2 self, ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self, learning experience and intended learning effort in Russian $F_{(4,400)} = 485,61$, p<.05. The final model shows that the β value of ideal L2 self is two times as much as that of learning experience and a lot higher than that of ought-to L2 self. Ideal multilingual self found insignificant.

For all three languages, ideal L2 self is the strongest predictor of intended learning effort by far. Its β value is almost double learning experience and almost triple ought-to L2 self. German's final model; however, is more evenly distributed. Although ideal L2 self predicts the intended learning effort, it is not as strongly related to the outcome as it is in English or Russian. Ideal L2 self's relation to the outcome in these models seems more stable for all three languages.

In table 4.21, the relationship of ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience as independent variables and ideal l2 self as dependent variable is observable. 85% of the variance in the criterion is explained and it is significantly useful in explaining the relationship between variances for English $F_{(3,401)}$ = 744,700, $p<.05$. The final model shows that learning experience is stonger than the remaining 2 variables. Its β value is three times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and six times as much that of ideal multilingual self.

Table 4.21. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of English Language with Ideal L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**β**	**t**	**p**
Learning Experience	,738	,038	,619	19,576	,000
Ought to L2 self	,245	,031	,236	7,969	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	,234	,039	,156	5,951	,000
Adjusted R2	,847*				
F	744,70				

*$p<.05$.

The findings of data on table 4.22 shows the relationship of ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience as independent variables and ideal L2 self as dependent variable. 81% of the variance in the criterion is explained and it is

significantly useful in explaining the relationship between variances for German F (3,401) = 581,32, p<.05. The final model shows that β value of learning experience is two times as much as that of ought-to L2 self. Ideal multilingual self is found insignificant.

Table 4.22. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of German Language with Ideal L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**β**	**t**	**p**
Learning Experience	,751	,040	,645	18,658	,000
Ought to L2 self	,310	,035	,303	8.772	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	-,002	,033	-,001	-,064	,949
Adjusted R2	,813*				
F	581,32				

*p<.05.

In table 4.23, how the ideal multilingual self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience as independent variables relate to ideal L2 self as dependent variable is shown. 86% of the variance in the criterion is significantly explained for Russian F (3,401) = 833,992, p<.05. As understood from the final model, learning experience is stonger than the remaining 2 variables. Its β value is three times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and six times as much that of ideal multilingual self.

Table 4.23. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Russian Language with Ideal L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**β**	**t**	**p**
Learning Experience	,748	,041	,624	18,436	,000
Ought to L2 self	,291	,033	,284	8,758	,000
Ideal Multilingual Self	,152	,037	,094	4,153	,000
Adjusted R2	,861*				
F	833,992				

*p<.05.

For all three languages, learning experience is the strongest predictor of ideal L2 self. For English and Russian, its β value three times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and six times as much that of ideal multilingual self. However, for German's final model, β value of learning experience is two times as much as that of ought-to L2 self and is not significantly related to ideal multilingual self. learning experience's relation to the outcome in these models seems more stable for all three languages.

In tables 4.24, 4.25 and 4.26, the relationship of ideal L2 self, ideal multilingual self and learning experience as independent variables and ought-to L2 self as dependent variable is observable.

Table 4.24. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of English Language with Ought to L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,557	,070	,579	7,969	,000
Learning Experience	,206	,079	,180	2,615	,009
Ideal Multilingual self	,094	,062	,065	1,521	,129
Adjusted R2	,626*				
F	223,97				

*p<.05.

In table 4.24, 63% of the variance for English is displayed and it is useful in explaining the relationship between variances F (3,401) =223,97, p<.05. The final model shows ideal L2 self's β value is five times as much as that of learning experience. ideal multilingual self is found insignificant.

Table 4.25. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of German Language with Ought to L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,520	,059	,532	8,772	,000
Learning Experience	,355	,069	,312	5,138	,000
Ideal Multilingual self	,010	,043	,007	,245	,807
Adjusted R2	,672*				
F	273,31				

*p<.05.

In table 4.25, 67% of the variance for German is observable and it can be inferred that it is useful in explaining the relationship between variances. F (3,401) =273,31, p<.05. The final model shows that the β value of ideal L2 self is almost two times stronger than learning experience. Ideal multilingual self is not significant.

In below table 4.26, 72% of the variance for Russian is explained and there is a significat relationship between variances $F_{(3,401)} = 351,60$, $p<.05$. Similar to the German language, the final model of Russian shows that the β value of ideal L2 self is almost two times stronger than learning experience. Ideal multilingual self is not significant.

Table 4.26. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Russian Language with Ought to L2 Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,552	,063	,566	8,758	,000
Learning Experience	,352	,074	,301	4,761	,000
Ideal Multilingual self	,007	,052	,004	,131	,896
Adjusted R2	,725*				
F	351,60				

*p<.05.

The models for all three languages are very similar to each other. The ideal l2 self is the strongest predictor of the ought-to L2 self. German and Russian's final model is more evenly distributed and shows a more similar distribution; however, the β value for English's final model is five times as much as that of the learning experience. Unlike the ideal L2 self, the ideal multilingual self does not predict the ought-to L2 self in any of these three languages.

In tables 4.27, 4.28 and 4.29, the relationship of ideal L2 self, ideal multilingual self and ought-to L2 self as independent variables and learning experience as dependent variable is observable.

Table 4.27. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of English Language with Learning Experience as the Dependent Variable*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
	Final Model				
Ideal L2 Self	,662	,034	,790	19,576	,000
Ought to L2 self	,081	,031	,093	2,615	,009
Ideal Multilingual self	,058	,039	,046	1,489	,137
Adjusted R2	,804*				
F	554,55				

*p<.05.

In table 4.27, 80% of the variance for English is explained and the relationship between variances is found significant F (4,400) =554,55, p<.05. The final model shows that ideal L2 self's β value is seven times as much as that of ought-to L2 self. Ideal multilingual self is found insignificant.

Table 4.28 *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of German Language with Learning Experience as the Dependent Variable*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
	Final Model				
Ideal L2 Self	,619	,033	,720	18,658	,000
Ought to L2 self	,174	,034	,198	5,138	,000
Ideal Multilingual self	-,028	,030	-,022	-,943	,346
Adjusted R2	,790*				
F	507,01				

*p<.05.

As displayed on the table 4.28, 79% of the variance for German is explained and the relationship between variances is significant F (3,401) =592,150, p<.05. The final model shows a similar distribution to that of English. Ideal L2 self is the strongest predictor of learning experience and its β value is seven times as much as that of ought-to L2 self. Ideal multilingual self is found insignificant.

In table 4.29, 84% of the variance for Russian is defined and the relationship between variances is explained significantly F (3,401) =687,18, p<.05. Similar to English and German's final model, the ideal l2 self is the strongest predictor of learning experience and its β value is seven times as much as that of the ought-to L2 self. It is interesting that the ideal multilingual self does not predict learning experience in English and German (two languages the students are motivated to learn and two languages for which are strong) but it predicts learning experience in Russian.

Table 4.29. *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Russian Language with Learning Experience as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Ideal L2 Self	,613	,033	,735	18,436	,000
Ought to L2 self	,152	,032	,178	4,761	,000
Ideal Multilingual self	,055	,034	,041	1,625	,105
Adjusted R2	,836*				
F	687,18				

*p<.05.

In table 4.30, 56% of the variance for English, German and Russian is explained and the relationship between variances is significant. F (12,392) = 43,246, p<.05. The relationship between components of L2MMS as independent variables and ideal multilingual self as dependent variable for all three languages is observable. The final model shows that ideal l2 self for English's β value is the strongest predictor of ideal multilingual self. It is almost two times as much as that of ideal L2 self for Russian. The remaining variables are found insignificant.

Table 4.30 *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of English, German and Russian Language with Ideal Multilingual Self as the Dependent Variable*

	Final Model				
Variable	**B**	**SE B**	**β**	**t**	**p**
Ideal L2 Self for English	,248	,069	,372	3,589	,000
Ideal L2 Self for Russian	,147	,067	,238	2,179	,030
Intended Effort for German	120	,062	149	1,954	,051
Learning Experience for English	,117	,067	,147	1,733	,084
Learning Experience for Russian	,084	,070	,113	1,198	,232
Ought to L2 self for English	,023	,060	,034	,389	,698
Learning Experience for German	,021	,059	,028	,359	,719
Intended Effort for Russian	,009	,076	,012	,123	,902
Intended Effort for English	,004	,074	,005	,059	,953
Ought to L2 self for German	,002	,041	-,004	-,061	,951
Ought to L2 self for Russian	-,026	,064	-,042	-,412	,681
Ideal L2 Self for German	-,092	,056	-,139	-1,676	,095
Adjusted R2	,557*				
F	43,24				

*p<.05.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Introduction

This research aims to uncover multilingual language learners' L2MSS and the effect of the L2 self on the multilingual self. In this chapter, findings will be discussed in light of research questions concerning the previous research.

5.2. L2 Motivational Self Systems of Multilingual Learners

The first research question aims to investigate and reveal multilingual language learners' predispositions toward their language learning motivation in the future. In this regard, Multilingual Learners' language learning motivation was analyzed seperately for English, German and Russian languages.

- *L2MSS for English:* The final model for English presents that ideal L2 self is the strongest predictor of intended effort. Its β value is almost double that of learning experience and four times as much as that of ought-to L2 self. Learners' intended efforts toward language learning are related to ideal L2 self (Dörnyei, 2009, 2010). Similar findings reviewed in literature (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Busse & Williams, 2010; Li & Zhang, 2021; Arslan & Çiftçi, 2021) and the relation was detailed below.

  Csizér and Kormos (2009) investigated secondary school pupils' and university students' effort to L2 in Hungarian setting and found that the ideal L2 self efficiently predicts effort. Arslan and Çiftçi's (2021) study show a similar result in terms of the school level of the respondents. Similar to the previous study, Turkish secondary school students' ideal L2 self is the

dominant component in shaping motivated behaviour. Li and Zhang's (2021) findings from two bilingual high schools in a Tibetan setting revealed that Chinese as a foreign language learners' ideal L2 self is strongly predicted by intended effort.

The final model displays that learning experience predicts intended learning effort moderately. According to Dörnyei (2019), the direct impact of the learning environment motivates language learning. This study's findings differ from Lamb's (2012), Yetkin and Ekin's (2018) and Course and Saka's (2021) study; In their study, the greater variance of intended effort is explained by the learning experience.

Finally, data reveals that respondents ought to L2 selves have an influence but is not a strong predictor of the intended learning effort. The findings support Csizér and Kormos's study (2009) which revealed that the ought-to L2 self has a minor impact in predicting Hungarian students' language learning effort. Lamb's (2012) study echoes that of Csizér and Kormos' (2009) results.

Unlike the recent studies of Arslan and Çiftçi (2021), Course and Saka's (2021), in which ought-to L2 self predicts intended learning effort moderately, and earlier studies of Goktepe (2014) and Yetkin and Ekin (2018), in which ought-to L2 self was salient as a result of the influence of families, the findings of this study contrasts with earlier studies from Turkish context. As stated in the literature review, this proves that young Turkish students are starting to have a clearer image over time.

- **L2MSS for German:** The final model for German presents that ideal L2 self is the strongest predictor of intended learning effort which is similar to the

ideal L2 self for English. Although German posits a slightly weaker relation compared to ideal L2 self for English, Busse and Williams's (2010) study shows that German-L2/English-L3 university students' motivated learning behaviour is shaped by their ideal L2 self. The finding contradicts this research's findings for the German language as German was found positive and significant in shaping learning motivation. The β values for learning experience and ought-to L2 self as predictors of intended learning effort are similar to that of Russian which will be discussed below.

- *L2MSS for Russian:* Multiple regression analysis of Russian language presents that ideal L2 self is the strongest predictor of intended learning effort. All three languages have almost the same β value; however, English is the strongest and Russian follows in ranking. This can be explained by the self-concept of L2 under the shadow of Global English (Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017). As discussed above, ideal L2 self is the dominant component in shaping motivated behaviour in language learning.

The age of respondents is an important indicator in determining motivated learning behaviour. The responses of participants of this study gave roughly the same results in ideal L2 self in English, German and Russian, indicating that age group should be considered. Studies reviewed in literature show that one's self-image changes as a result of development of adolescents (Liu & Thompson, 2018; Martinović, 2018; Csizér & Kormos, 2008; Oakes, 2013). The respondents of this study are high school students. This indicates that their self-image is relatively stable but nevertheless flexible. A good indicator of that difference is Csizér and Kormos's (2008) study on secondary school pupils and university students. Compared to

secondary school pupils, university students reported the greatest ideal L2 self value. Similar findings of university level students (Oakes, 2013; Martinović, 2018; Liu &Thompson, 2018) revealed the ideal L2 self as the most powerful predictor for language learning. Young adults' image of themselves is more solid compared to under-age.

Data reveals that respondents ought-to L2 selves have an influence but do not strongly predict the intended learning effort. However, the ought-to L2 self in Russian is relatively ranking higher than in German, English shows the weakest relation. This finding will be discussed from different perspectives.

Initially, the ought-to L2 self will be considered from L2MSS studies conducted on LOTE (Li & Zhang, 2021; Dörnyei & Chan, 2013; Busse & Williams, 2010; Oakes, 2013) Dörnyei and Chan (2013) investigated relation of English and Mandarin learning achievement with ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. For both language, the ought-to L2 self typically displays weaker links with the criterion measures than the ideal L2 self which is echoed in this study. Busse and Williams (2010) researched how students' decisions to study German are influenced by their ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. The data demonstrated that the ought-to L2 self is insignificant in relation to other variables. A resembling finding is observable in Oakes's (2013) study on French or Spanish learners.

Secondly, the ought-to L2 self will be considered according to school levels. For this study, weaker relation of ought-to L2 self shows that high school students are slightly affected by meeting expectations and avoiding potentially negative outcomes. Similar relation was found in high school levels from Csizér and Kormos's (2009), Lamb's (2012) and Li and Zhang's

(2021) research. The ought-to L2 self had negative or weaker connections with the criterion measures. Peng's (2015) study on university students revealed that there is less influence of ought-to L2 self on ideal L2 self, whereas Göktepe (2014) investigated that first-year undergraduates' ought-to L2 selves were high and determined by extrinsic factors. This contrast can be explained by the setting of the study which will be discussed below.

Lastly, the ought-to L2 self encapsulates the external factors (Csizér, 2019). Socio-cultural aspects have an influence on that factors. The study takes place in Antalya, Turkey, so similar studies from Turkish context will be argued. Goktepe (2014) demonstrated L2 motivations of university students. The study revealed the strong impact of family. An echoing study (Yetkin & Ekin, 2018) from secondary school level unwrapped the high impact of societal expectations; however, a more recent study (Arslan & Çiftçi, 2021) manifested the fading influence of family and social expectation. Their study still shows the inflence of ought-to L2 self, but it is moderate. It is possible to argue that the influence of family and social expectations on teenagers in the Turkish context is dwindling.

Multiple language learners' efforts present a moderate disposition towards learning experience in German, Russian, and English, in descending order. German and Russian languages have almost equal value. Deepening the argument, the Henry's study (2020) is explanatory. The claim is that school system and surrounding environment stimulate interest and engagement in foreign langue learning. Another explanatory study (Huang, 2019) found out that respondents rely on their class experience for learning, which indicates that language interaction of those participants may be limited

to the classroom. Based on the findings, it can be interpreted that the respondents' interactions in German and Russian may be depending on solely classroom interaction compared to English. Respondents have the least number of German lesson in their weekly schedule compared to English and Russian, learning experience of German language has the strongest β value. The β value of Russian learning experience is slightly close to that of German learning experience. Altough there is a high Russian population in Antalya, which means interaction in Russian is part of daily life interaction, this can be reasoned out that English is still dominant in social life and that the English course has been taking place in the education life of the participants for a more extended period than the Russian and German course, which may be another reason.

5.3. L2 and Multilingual Motivational Self Systems of Multilingual Learners

The second research question discovers the relation between L2MMS and MMSS components. In this regard, the analysis was done for English, German and Russian languages to find out Multilingual Learners's Motivational dispositions.

- *Ideal Multilingual Self:* Ideal multilingual self as dependent variable predicts ideal L2 self in English strongly, followed by ideal L2 self in Russian. Mayumi and Zheng's (2021) and Wang and Fisher's (2021) solid image of future vision to develop multilingual self support this finding. As understood, the learners of English and Russian have a clear vision of themselves as multilingual learners. Language preference, in this case English and Russian, can be explained by Moraru's (2020) statement on the role of language in a particular society deducing Pierre Bourdieu's model of linguistic production

and circulation. English is a global, dominant and legitimate language and Russian is valued in Antalya for social environment. Henry (2020) found that the social environment plays a role in the development of multilingual self-guides. Also this results in constituting a self image of L2 as multilingual learners; respondents developed an ideal multilingual self in Russian.

Henry and Thorsen's (2018) experimental study claims that ideal multilingual self and ideal L2 self are distinct constructs, but still these two are closely linked in developing the ideal multilingual self. German ideal L2 self; however, is found insignificant and reflected in the findings of data as an interesting point. The findings show that their ideal multilingual self is predicted by their ideal English, ideal Russian selves. So, it can be inferred that ideal L2 self is important in forming an image of an ideal multilingual self, more so than other components of L2MSS.

5.4. Conclusion

This study investigated the multilingual learners' motivational dispositions utilizing the framework of L2MSS in a Turkish setting; and for this purpose a questionnaire looking into the L2MSS (Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Dörnyei, 2010) and another studying 'the ideal multilingual self' (Henry & Thorsen, 2018) were used. The results revealed that multiple language learners have a fluid vision of themselves as multilinguals. Morever, the study put forward that while constituting an ideal multilingual self, ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self and learning experience do not function evenly. Ideal L2 selves are important in forming an image of an ideal multilingual self, more so than other components of L2MSS. The L2 preference leads to particular results. Effort to learn English, Russian and German is predicted

by ideal L2 self; regarding this, ideal L2 self is predicted by learning experience. Ideal multilingual self, however, came up with distinct results. For English and Russian language, ideal L2 selves is the strongest predictor of ideal multilingual self. Ideal German self predicts ideal multilingual self negatively. However, for German, the predictive power of intended effort is positive and stronger. Another distinct result is the predictive power of learning experience for English on ideal multilingual self. As the respondents of this thesis are students studying at vocational schools students, who intern in fields of tourism and are required to use these languages actively, learning experience for English is meaningful and predictive in constituting the ideal multilingual self.

5.5. Recommendations for Further Research

This research offered a multilingual perspective on motivational theories from Turkish setting. Similar studies should be applied to explore whether multiple language learners in different settings, various age groups or other LOTE learners have similar motivational paths.

The very research relies upon instant replies from students. Doing a longitudinal analysis to see the development or adding items related to integrativeness or instrumentality may lead to different results. Furthermore, benefiting from classroom observations and interviews allows you to evaluate the situation in order to explain, better understand, and investigate the research subjects' opinions, behaviour, experiences, and phenomena.

This study contains valuable findings that can be utilized by both language teachers and policymakers for foreign language education. Recognizing language

preferences, integrating a variety of language resources into classroom, teaching multiple languages in a coordinated manner, and relying on more holistic approaches to language teaching with a focus on what multilingual learners can do with their linguistic resource all contribute to the future vision of being a multilingual. Moreover, this research is pathfinder for language policy of Turkey on multilingual level. The language teaching has been regarded from monolingual bias, but the findings show that a more and blended approach in multilingual language teaching rather than recognizing each language as seperate systems, should be paid attention. Adapting language coursebooks for multilingual learners by bringing the learned languages together on a common ground provides meaningful learning.

REFERENCES

Agnihotri, R. K. (2014). Multilinguality, education and harmony. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11, 364–379.

Alamer, A. (2021). Construct Validation of Self-Determination Theory in Second Language Scale: The Bifactor Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, *12*.

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Sixty years of language motivation research: Looking back and looking forward. *Sage Open*, *7*(1), 2.158.244.017.701.976.

Altiner, C. (2018). Preparatory School Students' English Language Learning Motivation: A Sample from Turkey. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(8), 1729-1737.

Aronin, L. (2016). Multi-competence and dominant language constellation. In V. Cook & Li Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multicompetence* (pp. 142–163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aronin, L. & Singleton, D. (2008). Multilingualism as a New Linguistic Dispensation, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(1).

Arslan, T., & Çiftçi, H. (2021). Second language motivational self system of sixth graders in Turkey: A correlational study. *Tesol Journal*, *12*(1), e00518.

Baker, C. (2000). A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters.*

Bandura, A. (1997), *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman

Beacco, J. C. (2005). Languages and language repertoires: Plurilingualism as a way of life in Europe. *Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe*.

Bektaş-Çetinkaya, Y. (2012). Turkish University Students' Motivation to Learn English: Integration into International Community. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *43*, 130-140.

Bektaş-Çetinkaya, Y., & Oruç, N. (2010). Turkish students 'motivation to learn English at public and private universities. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4662-4666.

Berges-Puyó, J. G. (2018). Motivational factors in learning an L2: A study on intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, classroom materials and teacher's behaviours. *December), 0–20*.

Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2013). Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In *Multilingualism and multimodality* (pp. 9-32). Brill.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education Inc

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Buchs, C., & Maradan, M. (2021). Fostering equity in a multicultural and multilingual classroom through cooperative learning. *Intercultural Education*, *32*(4), 401-416.

Busse, V. & Williams M., (2010). Why German? Motivation of students studying German at English universities, *The Language Learning Journal,* 38(1), 67-85

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı: İstatistik. Araştırma Deseni, SPSS Uygulamaları ve Yorum, *Pegem-a Yayıncılık*, Ankara.

Calder, B. J., & Staw, B. M. (1975). Self-perception of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *31*(4), 599.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401-417.

Carlson, R. (1965). Stability and change in the adolescent's self-image. *Child development*, 659-666.

Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *33*, 3-18.

Cenoz, J. & D. Gorter. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 339–43.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. (2014). Explaining the ordinary magic of stable African multilingualism in the Vaal Triangle region in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *35*(2), 121-138.

Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. (2001). *Common European framework of*

reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press.

Course, S., & Saka, F. Ö. (2021). Investigating L2 Motivational Self System in the Turkish University Context. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, *50*(2), 649-662.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language learning*, *41*(4), 469-512.

Csizér, K., (2019). The L2 motivational self-system. In *The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning*, 71-93. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behavior. *Language learning*, *55*(4), 613-659.

Csizér, K. & Kormos, J., (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language learning*, *58*(2), 327-355.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: a comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English, in Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self, eds Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, Bristol*: Multilingual Matters*, 98–209

Csizér, K., & Lukács, G. (2010). The comparative analysis of motivation, attitudes and selves: The case of English and German in Hungary. *System*, *38*(1), 1-13.

Curtis, E. A., Comiskey, C., & Dempsey, O. (2016). *Importance and use of correlational research. Nurse Researcher, 23(6), 20–25.*

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 105.

Deci, E. L. (1972). Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *22*(1), 113.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M., (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist*, *55*(1), 68.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *61*, 101860.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational psychologist*, *26*(3-4), 325-346.

Dewaele, J. M. (2007). The Effect of Multilingualism, Sociobiographical, and Situational Factors on Communicative Anxiety and Foreign Language Anxiety of Mature Language Learners, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11, 391–409.

Dewaele, J.-M., Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2008). Effects of Trait Emotional Intelligence and Sociobiographical Variables on Communicative Anxiety and Foreign Language Anxiety Among Adult Multilinguals: A Review and Empirical Investigation, *Language Learning*, 58(4), 911–960.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and Motivation: A Literature Review. *System*, 23, 165-174.

Dincer, A. (2018). Motivational factors in multilingual students' learning additional languages: The case of English and Turkish. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 275-299.

Djité, P. (2009). Multilingualism: the case for a new research focus.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The modern language journal*, *78*(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Essex: Longman

Dornyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. *New Jersey: Mahwah*.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009) The L2 Motivational Self System. In Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 9–42.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010) Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the . *Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts and skills*, *3*(5), 74-83.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 Learning Experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19-30.

Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). The Motivational Foundation of Learning Languages Other Than Global English: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions. *The Modern Language Journal,* 101(3), 455–468.

Dörnyei, Z. , & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language learning*, *63*(3), 437-462.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied linguistics*, *23*(4), 421-462.

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K., (2005a). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behaviour. *Language learning*, *55*(4), 613-659.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2005b). The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation. *Journal of language and social psychology*, *24*(4), 327-357.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation*. Multilingual Matters.32-54.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). Motivation, language identities and the L2 self: Future research directions. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, 350-356.

Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. 2nd Edition, Pearson, Harlow.

European Commission (2005). A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism, *COM(2005) 596 final*. Brussels: European Commission.

Fukui, H., & Yashima, T. (2021). Exploring evolving motivation to learn two languages simultaneously in a study-abroad context. *The Modern Language Journal*, *105*(1), 267-293.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(4), 331-362.

García, O. (2018). The multiplicities of multilingual interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(7), 881-891.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern language journal*, *95*(3), 385-400.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*, 46-62. Palgrave Pivot, London.

García, O., & Lin, A. M. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 117-130.

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

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. *Motivation and second language acquisition*, *23*(1), 1-19. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=7MELVJorM6AC&oi=fnd &pg=PA1&dq=gardner+r.c.+2001&ots=4I52MhjfGV&sig=kFudDzsxtv_Zd MMgTD3Gnwq7vls&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=gardner%20r.c.%202001& f=false

Gardner R. C. (2006). Motivation and Attitudes in Second Language Learning, *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 348-355.

Gardner A. (2010). Revising Integrative Motivation: L2 Motivation Research and Learner Context, S*tudies in Applied Language and TESOL,* 10(2).

Gardner R.C. & Lambert W.E (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie,* 13(4), 266–272.

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

Ghazvini, S. D., & Khajehpour, M. (2011). Attitudes and motivation in learning English as a second language in high school students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1209-1213.

Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education.

Goktepe, F. T. (2014). Attitudes and motivation of Turkish undergraduate EFL students towards learning English language. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, *2*(3), 314.

Hashemi, M. R., & Zabihi, R. (2011). Learners' Attributional Beliefs in Success or Failure and Their Performance on the Interchange Objective Placement Test. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 1(8).

Hahs-Vaughn, D., & Lomax, R. (2013). *An introduction to statistical concepts*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=5B1ty140blIC&lpg=PR4&dq=An%20Introduction%20to%20Statistical%20Concepts%3A%20Third%20Edition%20Richard%20G.%20Lomax%2CDebbie%20L.%20Hahs-

Vaughn%20Routledge%20%2F%20Taylor%20and%20Francis%202012&hl
=tr&pg=PA89#v=onepage&q=An%20Introduction%20to%20Statistical%20
Concepts:%20Third%20Edition%20Richard%20G.%20Lomax,Debbie%20L.
%20Hahs-

Vaughn%20Routledge%20/%20Taylor%20and%20Francis%202012&f=false

Haukås, Å., Pietzuch, A., & Schei, J. H. A. (2022). Investigating the effectiveness of an online language teacher education programme informed by self-determination theory. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-16.

Heckhausen, J. & Heckhausen, H. (2018). Motivation and action: Introduction and overview. *Motivation and Action*, Third Edition.

Henry, A. (2010). Contexts of possibility in simultaneous language learning: using the L2 Motivational Self System to assess the impact of global English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 31(2), 149–162.

Henry, A. (2011). Examining the impact of L2 English on L3 selves: A case study. International Journal of Multilingualism, 8(3), 235–255.

Henry, A. (2012). L3 Motivation, *Academic Thesis*, Göteborgs University.

Henry, A. (2017). L2 Motivation and Multilingual Identities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101, 3, 548–565.

Henry, A. (2020). Learner–environment adaptations in multiple language learning: casing the ideal multilingual self as a system functioning in context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-18.

Henry & Thorsen (2018) The ideal multilingual self: validity, influences on motivation, and role in multilingual education, *International Journal of Multilingualism, 15*:4, 349-364

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*(3), 319.

Higgins, E. T. (1989). Self-discrepancy theory: What patterns of self-beliefs cause people to suffer? In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 22, 93-136. Academic Press.

Higgins, E. T., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. *Social cognition*, *3*(1), 51-76.

Higgins, E. & Strauman, Timothy & Klein, R. & Sorrentino, R. M. (1986). Standards and the process of self-evaluation: Multiple effects from multiple stages. *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behaviour*. 1, 23-63.

Holton, E. F., & Burnett, M. F. (2005). The basics of quantitative research. *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*, 29-44.

Huang, S.-C. (2019). Learning experience reigns – Taiwanese learners' motivation in learning eight additional languages as compared to English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–14.

İçmez, S. (2009). Motivation and critical reading in efl classrooms: a case of elt preparatory students. *Journal Of Theory & Practice İn Education (JTPE)*, *5*(2).

Islam, M., Lamb, M. & Chambers, G. (2013). The L2 motivational self-system and national interest: A Pakistani perspective. *System* 41(2), 231-244.

Jessner, U. (2008). A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 270–283.

Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual Languaging around and among Children and Adolescents, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5 (3): 161–176.

Kamal, M. I., Zubanova, S., Isaeva, A., & Movchun, V. (2021). Distance learning impact on the English language teaching during COVID-19. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(6), 7307-7319.

Kim, T. Y. (2009). The dynamics of L2 self and L2 learning motivation: A qualitative case study of Korean ESL students. *English Teaching*, *64*(3), 49-70.

Kim, T. Y. (2012). TheL2 Motivational Self System of Korean EFL Students: Cross-grade Survey Analysis.

Krumm, H-J. (2004). Heterogeneity: Multilingualism and democracy. *Utbildning och demokrati 13*, no. 3: 61-77.

Kwok, C. K., & Carson, L. (2018). Integrativeness and intended effort in language learning motivation amongst some young adult learners of Japanese. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 8(2), 265–279.

Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language learning*, *62*(4), 997-1023.

Lambert, W. (1963a). Psychological approaches to the study of language. Modern Language Journal. *Part I: On Learning, Thinking and Human Abilities* 47(2), 51-62.

Lambert, W. (1963b). Psychological approaches to the study of language; *Part II: On Second-Language Learning and Bilingualism Modern Language Journal*, 47(3), 114-121.

Leedy P.D. & Ormrod J. E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. Ninth edition. Pearson Education, Harlow.

Lennartsson, F. (2008). Students' motivation and attitudes towards learning a second language: -British and Swedish students' points of view (Dissertation).

Li, M., & Zhang, L. (2021). Tibetan CSL Learners' L2 Motivational Self System and L2 Achievement. *System*, *97*, 102436.

Lin, C. H., & Warschauer, M. (2011). Integrative versus Instrumental Orientation among Online Language Learners Orientação Integrativa versus Instrumental entre aprendizes on-line de língua. *Linguagens e Diálogos*, *2*(1), 58-86.

Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Liu, M. (2020). The emotional basis of the ideal multilingual self: the case of simultaneous language learners in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-18

Liu, Y., & Thompson, A. S. (2018). Language learning motivation in China: An exploration of the L2MSS and psychological reactance. *System*, *72*, 37-48.

Macintyre, P. & MacKinnon, S.P. & Clément, R. (2009). The baby, the bathwater, and the future of language learning motivation research. In Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds), Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 43-65.

Maddux, J. E. (1995). Self-Efficacy Theory. *The Plenum Series in Social/Clinical Psychology,* 3–33.

Maher, J. C. (2017). *Multilingualism: A very short introduction* (Vol. 525). Oxford University Press.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American psychologist*, *41*(9), 954.

Martinović, A. (2018). The L2 motivational self system. *Jezikoslovlje*, *19*(1), 133-157.

Mayumi, K., & Zheng, Y. (2021). Becoming a speaker of multiple languages: an investigation into UK university students' motivation for learning Chinese. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-15.

Mertens, D. M. (2019). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage publications.

Michiko, U. & Osamu, T. (2013). Forming a clearer image of the : the L2 Motivational Self System and learner autonomy in a Japanese EFL context, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(3), 238-252.

Ministry of Education, MOE (2018), English Languague Syllabus, Ankara

Oroujlou & Vahedi. (2011). Motivation, attitude, and language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 29, 994-1000.

Moorhouse, B. & Kohnke, L. (2021). Responses of the English- Language-Teaching Community to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *RELC Journal.* 52. 359-378.

Moraru, M. (2020). Toward a Bourdieusian theory of multilingualism. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *17*(2), 79-100.

Nemoto, T., & Beglar, D. (2014). Developing Likert-scale questionnaires. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), JALT2013 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT.

Nikolov, M. (2001). A study of unsuccessful language learners. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition*, 147–172. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language learning*, 50(1), 57-85.

Oakes, L. (2013). Foreign language learning in a 'monoglot culture': Motivational variables amongst students of French and Spanish at an English university. *System*, *41*(1), 178-191.

Okal, B. O. (2014). Benefits of Multilingualism in Education, *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3): 223-229.

Oyserman, D. and James, L. (2009) Possible selves: From content to process. In Markman, K., Klein, W.M.P. and Suhr, J.A. (eds) *The Handbook of Imagination and Mental Stimulation.* New York: Psychology Press: 373–94.

Özer M., (2018). 2023 Education Vision And New Goals İn Vocational And Technical Education. Journal of Higher Education and Science/Journal of Higher Education and Science, 8(3), 425-435.

Pae, T. (2008). Second language orientation and self-determination theory: A structural analysis of the factors affecting second language achievement, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 5-27, 27(1).

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, *38*(3), 467-479.

Peng, J. E. (2015). L2 motivational self system, attitudes, and affect as predictors of L2 WTC: An imagined community perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *24*(2), 433-443.

Piovesana, A., & Senior, G. (2016*). How Small Is Big: Sample Size and Skewness. Assessment*, 25(6), 793–800.

Poudel, T. (2019). The place of English in edudcational policy of Nepal: A crtical discourse.

Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European journal of education studies*.

Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-Efficacy in Second/Foreign Language Learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 60-73.

ROT Official Gazette (2012) The Law On Primary Education and Education and Amending Some Laws, 28261, 11.04. 2012, Presidency of Administrative Affairs, General Directorate of Law and Legislation, Ankara.

ROT Official Gazette (2014). Ministry of National Education Pre-school Education and Primary Education Institutions Regulation, 29072. 26.07. 2014, Presidency of Administrative Affairs, General Directorate of Law and Legislation, Ankara.

ROT Official Gazette (2016). MOE, Ministry Of National Education Implementing Special Program And Project Educational Institutions Regulation, 29818, 01.09.2016, Article 6/1. , Presidency of Administrative Affairs, General Directorate of Law and Legislation, Ankara.

ROT Official Gazette (2020). Ministry Of National Education Secondary Education Institutions Regulation, 31232, 02.09.2020, Presidency of Administrative Affairs, General Directorate of Law and Legislation, Ankara.

Ryan, R. M. (1995). *Psychological Needs and the Facilitation of Integrative Processes. ,* 63(3), 397–427.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *25*(1), 54-67.

Ryan, S. (2005). Language learning motivation within the context of globalisation: An L2 self within an imagined global community. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 3(1), 23-45.

Singleton, D. & Aronin, L. (2007) Multiple Language Learning in the Light of the Theory of Affordances, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1:1, 83-96

Smith. P. H. & Murillo L. A. (2015) Theorizing Translanguaging and Multilingual Literacies Through Human Capital Theory, *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 59-73.

Stavans, A., & Hoffmann, C. (2015). *Multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scott Rigby, C. Deci, E. L. Patrick, B. C. *et al.* (1992). Beyond the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy: Self-determination in motivation and learning. *Motiv Emot* 16, 165–185.

Tarhan H. & Balban S. (2014). Motivation, Learner Identity and Language Learning, *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 5(1), 183-197.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 66-97.

Taguchi, N. (2013). Motivation, attitudes and selves in the Japanese context: A mixed-methods approach. In M. T. Apple, D. Da Silva, & T. Fellner (Eds.), *Language learning motivation in Japan.* 169–188. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=GdkDAQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Language+Learning+Motivation+in+Japan&ots=GMPIVNdTcP&sig=kGg79NJih5ij9UuxMRNidY5qj8I&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Language%20Learning%20Motivation%20in%20Japan&f=false

Thompson, A. S., & Lee, J. (2013). Anxiety and EFL: does multilingualism matter? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 16(6), 730–749.

Thompson, G., Aizawa, I., Curle, S., & Rose, H. (2019). Exploring the role of self-efficacy beliefs and learner success in English medium instruction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1–14.*

Thompson, A. S., & Khawaja, A. J. (2016). Foreign language anxiety in Turkey: The role of multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *37*(2), 115-130.

Ueki, M. & Takeuchi, O. (2013). Forming a clearer image of the : the L2 Motivational Self System and learner autonomy in a Japanese EFL context, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(3), 238-252

Ushioda, E. (2012). *Motivation: L2 learning as a special case?* In: Mercer, S. and Ryan, S. and Williams, M., (eds.) Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory and practice. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 58-73.

Ushioda, E. (2017). The impact of global English on motivation to learn other languages: Toward an ideal multilingual self. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(3), 469-482.

Vallerand, R. J., & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and motivational styles as predictors of behaviour: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality, 60(3), 599–620.*

Van Els, T. (2005). Multilingualism in the European Union, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 264-280.

Veera, I. & Päivi P. (2018). Multilingualism as a resource in the foreign language classroom, *ELT Journal*, 72(3), 237–248.

Wang, T., & Fisher, L. (2021). Using a dynamic Motivational Self System to investigate Chinese undergraduate learners' motivation towards the learning of a LOTE: the role of the multilingual self. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-23.

Weiner B. (1972). Attribution Theory, Achievement Motivation, and the Educational Process. *Review of Educational Research.* , 42(2):203-215.

Weiner, B. (1986). Attribution, emotion, and action. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior*,281–312. Guilford Press.

Weiner B. (2010). The Development of an Attribution-Based Theory of Motivation: A History of Ideas, *Educational Psychologist*, 45: 1, 28-36.,

Winata, G. I., Cahyawijaya, S., Liu, Z., Lin, Z., Madotto, A., & Fung, P. (2021). Are multilingual models effective in code-switching?. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13309*.

Williams A. (2003). How to … Write and analyse a questionnaire, Journal of Orthodontics, 30(3), 245-252.

Witt, A., Heid, U., Sasaki, F., & Sérasset, G. (2009). Multilingual language resources and interoperability. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, *43*(1), 1-14.

Wright, S. (2009). The elephant in the room: Language issues in the European Union. European Journal of Language Policy, 1(2), 93–119.

Wylie, R. C. (1979). The Self-Concept: Volume 2. *Theory and Research on Selected Topics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=YBLTctXRoUQC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Ruth+C+Wylie&ots=hTOc3vdO7p&sig=LOQ9wGimebvA7fqewY4Wy5VKaVg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Ruth%20C%20Wylie&f=false

Yetkin, R., & Semih, E. (2018). Motivational orientations of secondary school EFL learners toward language learning. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 375-388.Motivational orientations of secondary school EFL learners toward language learning. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 375-388.

You, C., & Dörnyei, Z. (2016). Language learning motivation in China: Results of a large-scale stratified survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 495-516.

You, C. J., Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2016). Motivation, vision, and gender: A survey of learners of English in China. *Language Learning*, 66(1), 94-123.

Appendix A: Multilingual Motivation Questionnaire

Survey

This questionnaire was prepared for the study conducted for Akdeniz University Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Foreign Language Education, on self-motivation of multilingual language learners. This is not a test, so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. In this survey we are interested in your personal opinion about learning multiple languages. Please answer your answers sincerely, because only in this way can data relevant to the purpose of the research be provided. The information you provide will be used for research purposes only, and I thank you for your contributions.

School:_____

Grade:_____

'1' : **Strongly Disagree**　　'2' : **Disagree** '　　　'3' : **Neutral**
'4' : **Agree**　　　　'5' : **Strongly Agree**

In this section, circle the number that best suits you to express your attitude towards the English, German and Russian languages.	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neutral*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
1. I see myself as someone in the future who can speak *several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue)*	1	2	3	4	5
2. I see myself as someone who in the future can uses *several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue) in contact with different people.*	1	2	3	4	5
3. When I think about the kind of person I will be in the future, *being someone who can speak several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue)* is a part of who I will be.	1	2	3	4	5
4. If my dreams come true, I will use *several different languages (in addition to my mother tongue)* effectively in the future.	1	2	3	4	5

	English					German					Russian				
*In this section, to express your attitude towards English, German and Russian languages **separately for each language**, circle the number that suits you best.*															
	Strongly Disagree	*Disagree*	*Neutral*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neutral*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neutral*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
5. I really enjoy learning these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. I like the atmosphere of these languages' classes.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. I see myself as someone in the future who is good at speaking these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. I study these languages because close friends of mine think it is important.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Compared to my classmates, I think I study these languages relatively hard.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. I find learning these languages really interesting.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. I always look forward to these languages' classes.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. I can imagine myself speaking these languages with international friends or colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. I consider learning these languages important because the people I respect think that I should do it.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15. I can imagine myself living abroad and using these languages effectively for communicating with the locals.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16. If my teacher would give the class an optional assignment, I would certainly volunteer to do it.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. My parents believe that I must study these languages to be an educated person.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18. I am willing to work hard at learning these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19. The things I want to do in the future require me to use these	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

languages.														
20. Studying these languages is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21. I am working hard at learning these languages	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22. If I fail to learn these languages I'll be letting other people down.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23. I can honestly say that I am really doing my best to learn these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
24. Studying these languages is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25. I can imagine myself writing e-mails/letters fluently in these languages.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B: Çok Dilli Öğrenen Motivasyonu Anketi

Anket

Bu anket, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans programı için yapılan, birden fazla dil öğrenenlerin öz motivasyonlarını ele alan çalışma için hazırlanmıştır. Bu bir test değildir, bu yüzden "doğru" veya "yanlış" cevaplar yoktur. Bu ankette birden fazla dil öğrenme ile ilgili kişisel fikrinizle ilgileniyoruz. Lütfen yanıtlarınızı içtenlikle cevaplayınız, çünkü yalnızca bu şekilde araştırmanın amacına uygun veri sağlanabilir. Vereceğiniz bilgiler yalnızca araştırma amaçlı kullanılacak olup, katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Okulunuz:_____

Sınıfınız:_____

'1' : **Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum**   '2' : **Katılmıyorum**   '3' : **Kararsızım**
'4' : **Katılıyorum**   '5' : **Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**

*Bu bölümde **İngilizce, Almanca ve Rusça dillerine yönelik tutumunuzu** belirtmek için size en uygun olan rakamı daire içine alınız.*

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1. Gelecekte, (Anadilime ek olarak) birkaç farklı dili konuşabilen biri olmak isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Kendimi, gelecekte farklı insanlarla iletişim halinde (ana dilime ek olarak) birkaç farklı dil kullanabilen biri olarak görüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Gelecekte nasıl bir insan olacağımı düşündüğümde, (anadilimin yanı sıra) birkaç farklı dil konuşabilen biri olmak isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Eğer hayallerim gerçekleşirse, gelecekte (ana dilime ek olarak) birkaç farklı dili etkin bir şekilde kullanacağım.	1	2	3	4	5

*Bu bölümde İngilizce, Almanca ve Rusça dillerine yönelik **tutumunuzu her bir dil için ayrı ayrı olacak şekilde** belirtmek için size en uygun olan rakamı daire içine alınız.*

	İngilizce					Almanca					Rusça				
	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	*Katılmıyorum*	*Kararsızım*	*Katılıyorum*	*Kesinlikle Katılıyorum*	*Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum*	*Katılmıyorum*	*Kararsızım*	*Katılıyorum*	*Kesinlikle Katılıyorum*	*Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum*	*Katılmıyorum*	*Kararsızım*	*Katılıyorum*	*Kesinlikle Katılıyorum*
5. Bu dilleri öğrenmekten gerçekten keyif alıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Bu dillerin derslerindeki atmosferi seviyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Gelecekte kendimi bu dilleri iyi konuşan biri olarak görüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Bu dilleri öğreniyorum çünkü yakın arkadaşlarım önemli olduğunu düşünüyor.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Gelecekteki kariyerimi düşündüğümde, kendimi bu dilleri kullanırken	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

hayal ediyorum.														
10. Sınıf arkadaşlarıma kıyasla, bu dilleri daha fazla çalıştığımı düşünüyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11. Bu dilleri öğrenmek gerçekten ilgimi çekiyor.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12. Bu dillerin derslerini her zaman hevesle beklerim.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13. Bu dilleri farklı ülkelerden arkadaşlarımla veya meslektaşlarımla konuştuğumu hayal edebiliyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14. Bu dilleri öğrenmem önemli çünkü saygı duyduğum insanlar bu dilleri öğrenmem gerektiğini düşünüyor.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15. Yurtdışında yaşadığımı ve orda yaşayan insanlarla bu dillerde etkili bir şekilde iletişim kurabildiğimi hayal edebiliyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

16. Öğretmenim, bu dillerle ilgili sınıfa isteğe bağlı bir görev/ödev verirse, bunu yapmaya gönüllü olurum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. Annem/Babam, eğitimli bir insan olmam için bu dilleri öğrenmem gerektiğine inanıyor.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18. Bu dilleri öğrenmek için çok çalışmaya hazırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19. İleride yapmak istediğim şeyler bu dilleri kullanmamı gerektiriyor.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
20. Bu dilleri öğrenmek benim için önemli çünkü eğitimli bir kişinin yabancı dil konuşabilmesi gerekir.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21. Bu dilleri öğrenmek için çok çalışıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22. Bu dilleri öğrenemezsem, diğer insanları hayal kırıklığına uğratmış olacağım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23. Bu dilleri öğrenmek için	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

elimden gelenin en iyisini yapıyorum.														
24. Akranlarımın / öğretmenlerimin / ailemin onayını almak için bu dilleri öğrenmem önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25. Kendimi bu dillerde akıcı bir şekilde e-posta / mektup yazarken hayal edebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
26. Bu dilleri öğrenemezsem, diğer insanları hayal kırıklığına uğratmış olacağım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
27. Bu dilleri öğrenmek için elimden gelenin en iyisini yapıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
28. Akranlarımın / öğretmenlerimin / ailemin onayını almak için bu dilleri öğrenmem önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
29. Kendimi bu dillerde akıcı bir şekilde e-posta / mektup yazarken hayal edebiliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

T.C
AKDENİZ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu
KURUL KARARI

TOPLANTI TARİHİ : 01.07.2021

TOPLANTI SAYISI : 07

KARAR SAYISI : 241

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Simla COURSE**'nin danışmanlığını, **Sema AYKUŞ**'un araştırmacılığını üstlendiği, *"Öğrenen Motivasyonuna Çok Dilli Yaklaşım: Birden Fazla Dil Öğrenenlerin Öz Motivasyonları"* konulu çalışmanın, fikri hukuki ve telif hakları bakımından metot ve ölçeğine ilişkin sorumluluğun başvurucuya ait olmak üzere, proje süresince uygulanmasının etik olarak **uygun olduğuna** oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. Hilmi DEMİRKAYA
Kurul Başkanı

Başkan
Prof. Dr.
Hilmi DEMİRKAYA

Başkan Yrd.
Prof. Dr.
Sibel MEHTER AYKIN

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Ebru İÇİGEN

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Nurşen ADAK

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Sibel PAŞAOĞLU YÖNDEM
(katılamadı)

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Taner KORKUT
(görevli-izinli)

Üye
Prof. Dr.
Gökhan AKYÜZ

ANTALYA VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-98057890-20-38597750   08.12.2021
Konu : Araştırma Uygulama İzin Talebi
        (Sema AYKUŞ)

İL MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE
ANTALYA

İlgi : 21/01/2020 tarih ve 1563890 sayılı Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına Bağlı Okul ve Kurumlarda
Yapılacak Araştırma, Yarışma ve Sosyal Etkinlik İzinlerine Yönelik İzin ve Uygulama
Genelgesi.

İlimiz Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sema AYKUŞ'un **"Öğrenen
Motivasyonuna Çok Dilli Yaklaşım:Birden Fazla Dil Öğrenenlerin Öz Motivasyonları"** adlı
araştırmasını 22.10.2021 tarih ve 35318485 sayılı Makam Onayında belirtilen, örneklem azlığından
dolayı İlimiz Alanya İlçesi Ümit Altay Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi ve Manavgat İlçesi Evliya
Çelebi Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesini eklemek istediğine ilişkin 30/11/2021 tarihli dilekçesi
Müdürlüğümüz ARGE Birimi Değerlendirme ve İnceleme Komisyonunca incelenmiş olup;

Adı geçenin ilgi Genelge kapsamında 2021-2022 Eğitim Öğretim Yılı içerisinde olmak üzere,
İlimiz Alanya İlçesi Ümit Altay Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi ve Manavgat İlçesi Evliya Çelebi
Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi öğrencilerine yönelik araştırmasını, Okul Müdürlüklerinin
sorumluluğunda Eğitim Öğretim faaliyetlerini aksatmaksızın yapması,

Söz konusu araştırmanın bitimine müteakip; sonuç raporunun bir örneğinin CD ortamında
Müdürlüğümüz Ar-Ge bürosuna gönderilmesi kaydıyla uygulanması, Komisyonca uygun görülmüştür.

Makamlarınızca da uygun görüldüğü takdirde, Valilik Makamının 25/08/2020 tarih ve 24911
sayılı yetki devrine göre olurlarınıza arz ederim.

Mehmet KARAKAŞ
Müdür a.
Müdür Yardımcısı

OLUR
08.12.2021

Hüseyin ER
Vali a.
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürü

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler:

Adı Soyadı : Sema Aykuş

Eğitim Durumu:

Lisans Öğrenimi: Atatürk Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

Bildiği Yabancı Diller: İngilizce, İspanyolca

İş Deneyimi:

Stajlar:

      Erzurum Lisesi- Yakutiye/Erzurum

Çalıştığı Kurumlar:

      Antalya İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü (2022-….)

      Yeşilbayır Borsa İstanbul Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi- (2021-2022)

      Eskihisar Şehit Nuri Çavdar Ortaokulu (2018-2019)

      Mehmet Akif Ortaokulu (2015-2018)

      Köprüköy Kaymakamlığı (Projeler Birimi) (2014-2015)

      Köprüköy İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü (2013-2014)

Eğirmez Ortaokulu (2012-2015)

Döşemealtı Halk Eğitim Müdürlüğü (2011- 2012)

1% match (Internet from 17-May-2016)
http://opus.bath.ac.uk

<1% match (Internet from 30-Oct-2020)
http://egitimbilim.akdeniz.edu.tr

<1% match (student papers from 30-May-2022)
Submitted to Assumption University on 2022-05-30

<1% match (Internet from 10-Feb-2022)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280761188_The_Dynamics_of_L2_Self_and_L2_Learning_Motivation_A_Qualitative_Case_Study_of_Kor

<1% match (Internet from 04-Jul-2022)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356192104_Graduate_Students%27_Challenges_in_Academic_Writing

<1% match (Internet from 27-Jun-2022)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247529063_Middle-
Level_Hotel_Managers'_Corporate_Entrepreneurial_Behavior_and_Risk-Taking_Propensities_A_Case_of_Didim_Turkey

<1% match (Internet from 27-Oct-2020)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272688666_Self-efficacy_in_SecondForeign_Language_Learning_Contexts

<1% match (Internet from 06-Jul-2018)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/210373259_The_L

<1% match (Internet from 01-Jul-2022)
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sayma-Arju-
2/publication/358782274_SPECTRUM/links/6215037c791f4437f1558abc/SPECTRUM.pdf

<1% match (Internet from 01-Nov-2020)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259419190_Language_power_and_identity

<1% match (Internet from 11-Oct-2020)
https://www.degruyter.com/view/journals/cercles/8/2/article-p265.xml

<1% match (Internet from 25-Nov-2015)
http://jalt-publications.org

<1% match (Internet from 19-Sep-2017)
https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/413953/1/LIBRARY_COPY_PhD_thesis_Gandy_Quijano_not_signed_July13.pdf

<1% match (Internet from 04-Jul-2019)
https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/432082/1/LIBRARY_COPY_Pignot_Shahov_Thesis.pdf

<1% match (Internet from 13-May-2019)
https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/ssllt/article/viewFile/12295/16950

<1% match (Internet from 17-Apr-2022)
https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/ssllt/article/download/22219/27157

<1% match (Internet from 01-Jan-2022)
https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/ssllt/article/view/22219

<1% match (student papers from 14-Jul-2016)
Submitted to University of Central Florida on 2016-07-14

<1% match (Internet from 14-Mar-2022)
http://mjltm.org

<1% match (Internet from 02-Jan-2022)
http://mjltm.org

<1% match (Internet from 26-Jun-2018)
http://mjltm.org

<1% match (publications)
Cecilia Thorsen, Alastair Henry, Christina Cliffordson. "The case of a missing person? The current L2 self and the L2 Motivational Self
System", International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2017

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kâğıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

☐ Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

☐ Tezim/Raporum sadece Akdeniz Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.

☐ Tezimin/Raporumun …… yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

[Tarih ve İmza]

[Öğrencinin Adı Soyadı]