



International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

ISSN: 1367-0050 (Print) 1747-7522 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rbeb20>

Operationalizing multilingualism: language learning motivation in Turkey

Amy S. Thompson & Zeynep Erdil-Moody

To cite this article: Amy S. Thompson & Zeynep Erdil-Moody (2016) Operationalizing multilingualism: language learning motivation in Turkey, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 19:3, 314-331, DOI: [10.1080/13670050.2014.985631](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.985631)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.985631>



Published online: 15 Dec 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1675



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 14 View citing articles [↗](#)

Operationalizing multilingualism: language learning motivation in Turkey

Amy S. Thompson* and Zeynep Erdil-Moody

Department of World Languages, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

(Received 16 April 2014; accepted 26 October 2014)

This study is an examination of language learning motivation and multilingual status in the Turkish English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Using Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) framework, specifically the ideal and ought-to L2 selves, this study examines the relationship between motivation and two operationalizations of multilingualism: (1) any experience with a third language and (2) Perceived Positive Language Interaction (PPLI). Using an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and one-way ANOVAs with the data from 159 EFL learners in Turkey, the results indicate that there is a significant group effect for multilingual status for both operationalizations of multilingualism with the ideal L2 self; however, no significant difference was found between the groups with the ought-to L2 self. There is also a discussion about the importance of performing EFAs with questionnaire data in a variety of contexts, as well as further insights regarding the operationalization of the PPLI construct. As the L2MSS has not yet been investigated in the Turkish context, the results of this study help to further elucidate Turkish EFL students' language learning motivation to add to the growing body of literature on the multifaceted and dynamic nature of motivation in the field of second language acquisition.

Keywords: motivation; L2 Motivational Self System; multilingualism; Perceived Positive Language Interaction

Introduction

Motivation has been shown to be one of the key components for successful second language (L2) learning. In an attempt to depict the multifaceted nature of language learning motivation from a different perspective, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) reconceptualized language learning motivation with the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS) framework using *the ideal L2 self*, *the ought-to L2 self*, and *the L2 learning experience* as the three components. Since Dörnyei's reconceptualization of L2 learning motivation, numerous studies have examined the L2MSS (e.g. Dörnyei and Chan 2013; Henry and Cliffordson 2013; Kormos and Csizér 2014). This research gives insight into a plethora of connections between the L2 selves and other individual aspects of language learners, including positive correlations between the ideal L2 self and strong visual learning style, vivid imagery capacity (Al-Shehri 2009), and integrativeness (Ryan 2009). The existing findings underscore the ideal L2 self as the most influential determiner of L2 motivation (Csizér and Kormos 2009; Csizér and Lukács 2010; Lamb 2007; Taguchi, Magid, and Papi 2009).

*Corresponding author. Email: athompson@usf.edu

However, there has not been much work done that investigates the interface of the L2MSS and multilingualism. As such, this study aims to fill this gap in second language acquisition (SLA) research regarding the interface of language learning motivation within the L2MSS framework and two operationalizations of multilingualism (previous language learning experience and Perceived Positive Language Interaction [PPLI]). The first categorization is operationalized so that even a small amount of language experience accounts for possible impact on the L2 selves. The second operationalization of multilingualism is a recently operationalized perspective to multilingualism, PPLI (Thompson 2013). PPLI refers to learners' self-reported perceptions on the interactions between previously learned languages; for the present study, how those perceptions influence the current language learning motivation was examined. This reconceptualization of multilingualism and its relationship to L2 motivation, specifically the L2 selves, sheds light on the interface of L2 learning motivation and multilingualism.

The current research design not only adds to the multilingualism literature, but also informs the impact of multilingual status on language learners' ideal and ought-to L2 self-constructs in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context of Turkey. As the L2MSS has not been investigated within this context, a relatively understudied EFL environment, this study contributes to further elucidate Turkish EFL students' language learning motivation to add to the growing body of literature of L2 motivation in the field of SLA, broadly construed.

Review of the literature

Overview of the L2MSS

Motivation has been defined as the 'central mental "engine" or "energy-center" that subsumes effort, want/will (cognition), and task-enjoyment (affect)' (Dörnyei 1998, 122). Emphasizing motivation as the primary incentive for learning to take place, research indicates that learners, even those who are adept at language learning, would not be likely to fulfill their long-term L2 learning goals without adequate motivation (Dörnyei 2005). Even though language pedagogy and well-designed curricula enhance the language teaching and learning process, L2 motivation still remains crucial for language learning. Dörnyei (2005, 2009) reconceptualized the notion of language learning motivation via the L2MSS; using psychological theories of 'self,' (Higgins 1987; Markus and Nurius 1986), three dimensions of the L2MSS were formed: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the learning experience. The two notions of self are the concepts under investigation in the current study, as to advance the understanding of the psychological underpinnings of the L2MSS. As such, an analysis of the participants' learning experiences is not included in this paper. The L2MSS builds on earlier mainstream theoretical frameworks in general motivational psychology, mainly possible selves (Markus and Nurius 1986), integrative and instrumental motivation (Gardner 1985), and self-discrepancy theory (Higgins 1987).

The ideal L2 self-component of the L2MSS has been found to have the strongest impact on L2 achievement (Dörnyei, Csizér, and Németh 2006) and is influenced by Gardner's (1985) integrative motivation with the idea to 'validate the reinterpretation of integrativeness as the ideal L2 self' (Dörnyei 2009, 28). As Dörnyei (2009) indicates, having an integrative disposition is related to wanting to master a language or wanting to become a proficient speaker of that language. This is a future-oriented desire to reduce the discrepancy between the actual L2 proficiency and the desired future L2 proficiency. As predicted by self-discrepancy theory, a strong ideal L2 self has a relationship to success in learning a second language: 'traditionally assumed that people need high

“ideal” goals or aspiration levels in order to motivate performance’ (Higgins 1987, 321) and includes a promotion focus for which the learner makes a strong effort to reduce the discrepancy between his or her actual self and the ideal L2 self. As Dörnyei (2009) indicates, the ideal L2 self instigates a powerful enticement ‘to learn the L2 because of the desire to reduce the discrepancy between our actual and ideal selves’ (29). The ideal L2 self refers to ‘L2-specific facets of one’s ideal self’ (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005, 616) and represents the characteristics that a person would like to possess such as wishes, desires, and hopes.

The ought-to L2 self is related to more extrinsic and instrumental motives that may not be completely internalized. This self refers to the traits that one believes one ought to possess such as various duties, obligations, professional status, or responsibilities. One’s self-created ideal self-image and the ought-to self-image based on society’s expectations might bear resemblance; however, they differ in the source of focus. While the ideal L2 self has a promotion focus with regard to one’s desires and hopes, the ought-to L2 self has a prevention focus, mostly related to responsibilities and obligations. In this approach, L2 motivation can be perceived as the overall desire to diminish the discrepancy between one’s actual self and his/her ideal and ought-to L2 selves, which is rooted in Higgins’s (1987) self-discrepancy theory. The incentive to reduce this discrepancy initiates distinctive self-regulatory strategies, which bring strong motivation and efficient effort into the process enhancing the L2 learning experience (Dörnyei 2009).

Although there is a relationship between Gardner’s integrative/instrumental model and the L2MSS, it is important to remember that the definitions of integrative motivation and the ideal L2 self and that of instrumental motivation and the ought-to L2 self are not synonymous. The concept of instrumental motivation traditionally included all of the external motivations (getting a good job, doing well on a university placement test) without regard to the promotion/prevention distinction, making the L2MSS more refined in its categorizations. With the L2MSS, any external motivation having a promotion focus, such as a raise at work, would, in fact, be more closely related to the ideal L2 self. Conversely, those external motivations with a prevention focus, such as not wanting to disappoint one’s in-laws, would play a role in the creation of the ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei 2009).

Research indicates that learners’ intended learning effort is influenced by their ideal L2 self; learners with a salient ideal L2 self not only show a high interest in foreign languages, but they also have been shown to be the most motivated learner group across all motivational dimensions (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005; Dörnyei and Ushioda 2009; Ryan 2009; Henry 2011). Additionally, Kormos and Csizér (2008) show that an ideal L2 self is an important dimension of L2 learning motivation across different age groups. In contrast, the findings did not identify the ought-to L2 self as a valid construct in this setting (Kormos and Csizér 2008; see also Csizér and Lukács 2010; Henry 2011; Lamb 2007, 2012; Taguchi, Magid, and Papi 2009). Likewise, Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) indicate that learners who lack professional future relevance of the L2 and who are also mostly motivated by the ought-to L2 self are the least motivated learners. These aforementioned findings demonstrate that thus far, the ideal L2 self is a more salient feature of learner motivation than the ought-to L2 self – findings that resonate with distinction between internalized and non-internalized instrumental motives. Internalized instrumental motives, which Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) relate to the ideal L2 self, are stronger incentives for L2 learning and enhance long-term persistency, whereas the non-internalized extrinsic motives are only effective for short-term motivation since they

‘cannot provide sustained commitment that the successful mastery of an L2 requires’ (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005, 29).

The L2MSS has been examined in relation to various independent variables, such as the proficiency and the gender of the language learners. With regards to proficiency and the ideal and ought-to L2 selves, the ideal L2 self consistently showed a predictive relationship to language proficiency. For example, Lamb (2012) found that positive views of learning experiences in school and a strong ideal L2 self both predicted proficiency in English (1013). Similarly, Ghapanchi, Khajavy, and Asadpour (2011) found that the ideal L2 self combined with the learning experience accounted for 35% of the variance with regard to proficiency. Kim (2012) found a relationship with proficiency and both the ideal and ought-to L2 selves: ‘The ideal L2 self (sig. = .000) and ought-to L2 self (sig. = .027) proved to be significant predictors for the English proficiency of Korean EFL students’ (39) concluding that ‘Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self proved to be meaningful predictors for Korean students’ English proficiency’ (44).

With regard to gender and language learning, females have typically been shown to be more positively disposed to language learning (see Ullman, Miranda, and Travers 2008, for a review). More specifically, Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) in their study of Hungarian secondary students found that females had more motivational intensity in English, German, French, Italian, and Russian (the five languages involved in the study). Similarly, Henry (2009), in the context of secondary school students in Sweden, found an increase in motivation in the female students between grades 6 and 9, whereas there was a decrease in the male students’ motivation during this same period; however, in the same context, Henry and Cliffordson (2013) found no gender differences in the ideal L2 or L3 selves. Also, in the Swedish context, Sylvén and Thompson (forthcoming) found significant differences with the latent variables ‘cultural interest,’ ‘interest in foreign languages,’ ‘international empathy,’ ‘travel orientation,’ ‘English anxiety,’ ‘lack of L2 self-confidence,’ and ‘intended learning effort,’ although no significant difference was found between the ideal L2 selves of the male and female students. As such, although females have typically been found to have more motivation in general with regard to language learning, there are mixed results for gender differences with regard to the L2MSS, specifically with the ideal L2 self.

Language learning motivation and multilingualism/PPLI

Research demonstrates cognitive and affective benefits of multilingualism for language learners, such as a higher tolerance of ambiguity (Dewaele and Wei 2013; Thompson and Lee 2013; Thompson and Aslan 2014), higher language aptitude (Thompson 2013), lower anxiety (e.g. Dewaele, Petrides, and Furnham 2008), and better learning strategies (e.g. Nayak et al. 1990). Csizér and Lukács (2010) and Henry (2011) have examined the relationship between languages studied and motivation in that there could be an effect of the L2 on the motivation of the L3. However, there is currently a dearth of published research on the motivational profiles of bilinguals versus multilinguals, which is the gap that the current study is attempting to fill. Operationalizing multilingualism is an important part of researching multilingualism, as multilingualism is defined in a variety of different ways. For the purpose of this current study, multilingualism is conceptualized in two distinct ways, the first operationalization taking into consideration even a small amount of exposure to more than one foreign language. Research indicates that prior language learning experience – even limited exposure to another language – influences

the subsequent L2 learning processes (e.g. De Angelis 2005a, 2005b, 2007; Thompson 2013), which is the basis of this first operationalization. The second operationalization is that of multilingualism defined as PPLI. Inspired by Kellerman's (1979) work on perceived language distance with L1 Dutch speakers learning English, Thompson (2013) operationalizes PPLI based on the learners' perceptions of previous foreign language interactions via an open-ended questionnaire item. If the participants perceived a positive language interaction between the foreign languages studied previously, they were classified as PPLI; if they did not perceive these positive interactions, they were classified as NPPLI (No Perceived Positive Language Interaction). In other words, it was argued that those multilinguals who did not see these positive interactions were processing language similarly to bilinguals (who saw no interactions because only one foreign language was studied), and thus, the participants who fell into these two categories (bilinguals as well as multilinguals who did not perceive positive interaction between foreign languages studied) were grouped together. Thompson (2013) found significantly higher language aptitude scores for both categorizations of multilingualism (any previous language learning experience and PPLI), which underscores the possible facilitative impact of one foreign language on subsequent foreign language acquisition. Similarly, Thompson and Aslan (2014) found the aforementioned PPLI/NPPLI operationalization insightful when analyzing language learning beliefs: the PPLI group was found to have a stronger desire to learn English well, relied less on translation for language learning, had more confidence in their English abilities and a greater desire to have contact with native speakers and cultures, and a greater tolerance of ambiguity. To explore the relationship of multilingualism and PPLI with other constructs, and to further solidify the construct of PPLI, both categorizations of multilingualism have been adopted for the current study to investigate the relationship between motivation and multilingualism.

Motivation in the Turkish context

The role of various languages in Turkey has been, and continues to be, multifaceted. According to Yağmur (2001), several different languages had an official capacity during the Ottoman Empire (Persian for literature study, Arabic for religious study, and Turkish for daily life); however, Turkish became the official language with the founding of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Given that Turkish is the official language in Turkey, all children, regardless of their L1 are educated in Turkish (Topbaş 2011); however, there is a preponderance of English-medium universities in Turkey today (Selvi 2011). The rapidly spreading role of English in higher education, as well as the need for English to ensure job security and economic advancement in Turkey (Doğançay-Aktuna 1998), makes the study of English language motivation in Turkey a topic of interest.

Research shows a strong correlation between language learners' individual goals to learn the language, motivation, and feelings about and attitudes toward that language (including the attitude toward culture and society), all of which have an effect on overall learning achievement (Engin 2009; Dörnyei 2009). To this end, there has been an increasing interest among researchers in Turkey in examining the relationship between motivation and Turkish EFL learners' language learning achievement (Engin 2009; Şakiroğlu and Dikilitaş 2012; Üstünel and Samur 2009). Engin (2009) states that most learners have instrumental motivation to learn English, such as finding a better or higher-paying job, as well as integrative reasons, such as being able to communicate with native

speakers and watch English movies and international channels. The positive correlation found between integrative motivation and achievement in language learning indicates that learners put extra effort into their coursework depending on their personally created goals to learn the language. Engin (2009) claims that this is because integrative motivation is derived from a personal willingness and desire to achieve a high proficiency in the language learning process, which corresponds to comparisons made between the ideal and ought-to L2 self dichotomy of the L2MSS framework.

Although Turkish learners of most languages have no direct access to the target community, they still want to understand the music, movies, and culture of the target language, a trend that was observed as early as Dörnyei (1990). This tendency among the learners can be defined within the framework of reinterpreting integrative motivation as the desire to 'integrate into the international community' and instrumental motivation as an 'investment in global market' (Bektaş-Çetinkaya and Oruç 2010, 4664). This finding of reconceptualized integrative and instrumental motivation among Turkish EFL learners also corresponds with Dörnyei's L2MSS framework within the ideal and ought-to L2 selves, as discussed in the previous section.

In the Turkish context, an overview of studies reveals three common foci among motivation studies in Turkish EFL settings. These include comparison of language learning motivation levels among different learner groups (Turgut and Irgin 2008; Bektaş-Çetinkaya and Oruç 2010), the impact of various individual differences (IDs) on motivation and achievement (Engin 2009; Gömleksiz 2010; Şakiroğlu and Dikilitaş 2012; Şen and Şen 2012; Üstünel and Samur 2009), and teachers' perspective of language learning motivation (Deniz 2010; İnceçay 2011).

The above-mentioned studies all focus on integrative or instrumental, and intrinsic or extrinsic motivation and examine the relationship between language learning motivation, IDs, and learning achievement. However, the existing studies did not examine the interface of language learning motivation and multilingualism, nor did they use the L2MSS as a framework.

Although the SLA literature includes studies that examine the validity the L2MSS construct, more research is needed to account for both 'commonalities across cultural settings' and 'idiosyncrasies of local context' in language learning motivation (Ryan 2009, 120). Turkey was selected for the context of this study because Turkey is a relatively understudied EFL environment with myriad cultural and linguistic complexities in relation to English language learning. This study is important for motivation scholars worldwide, as it adds to the growing body of motivational literature that can be used for cross-cultural comparisons of the L2MSS framework.

The study

This study is an examination of the relationship of previous language experiences, perceived positive interactions between foreign languages studied, gender, and proficiency to language learning motivation. As part of a larger study about individual differences, for this part of the study, 159 Turkish EFL learners completed a 20-item questionnaire with items regarding the ideal and ought-to L2 selves from Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010). The L2 self-scores from the participants were analyzed using an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) to examine the interface of motivation and the two operationalizations of multilingualism (any previous language learning experience other than English and PPLI). The

relationships between gender and motivation, as well as between English proficiency and motivation, were also examined.

As mentioned above, two major categorizations of multilingualism were used in this study. For the first categorization, the learners were classified as multilinguals if they had studied English and another language, regardless of the extent (De Angelis 2007). The second categorization ‘Perceived Positive Language Interaction (PPLI)’ (Thompson 2013) involved grouping the learners based on the interactions that they perceived of foreign languages studied; if the participants reported positive interaction, they were classified as PPLI (multilinguals only), and if they perceived no interaction or negative interaction, they were classified as ‘No Perceived Positive Language Interaction’ (NPPLI; bilinguals and a subset of multilinguals). The participants responded to the following question on the background questionnaire, which provided the data for the group coding: ‘If you have studied other languages in the past, do you think that this has helped or hindered your ability to learn subsequent languages? Please provide specific examples where appropriate.’ The responses were triple-rated and 100% agreement on the categorization was reached. The following is an example of an answer that qualified the participant as PPLI:

Kesinlikle olumlu etkisi oldu. İngilizce biliyor olmam sayesinde Fransızca öğrenirken daha bilinçli ve daha hazırdım.

It absolutely helped me positively. Thanks to knowing English, I was more conscious and ready to learn French. (Participant 71)

This participant perceived a positive interaction from a language other than the L1 (Turkish). The perceived positive interaction was at the lexical level between the participant’s L2 English and L3 French. The following is an example of a participant classified as NPPLI:

Genel anlamda benzer dilleri öğrenmek kolay olsa da, İngilizce bilgimin Almanca öğrenmeme olumsuz etkisi çok oluyor. Kurallar ve yapılar benzemiyor. Okunuşlarda da İngilizce’ye kayıyorum.

In general, it is easy to learn similar languages but my English knowledge has a negative impact on my German. Rules and structures are not similar. And I tend to read words with English pronunciation. (Participant 89)

This participant perceived a negative interaction between foreign languages studied (L2 English, L3 German).

Research questions

The research questions for the present study are as follows:

- (1) Does the EFA confirm the previously categorized ideal and ought-to L2 self latent variables?
- (2) Are there significant differences between bilingual and multilingual Turkish EFL learners with regard to their ideal and ought-to L2 selves?
- (3) Are there significant differences between PPLI and NPPLI Turkish EFL learners with regard to their ideal and ought-to L2 selves?
- (4) Do males and females have significantly distinct ideal and ought-to L2 selves?

- (5) Is there a significant relationship between language proficiency and the ideal and ought-to L2 selves?

Participants

Turkish EFL learners from different majors at different universities nationwide participated in this study. All participants completed an extensive background survey along with the motivation questionnaire, which included questions about English language proficiency, age, languages studied, and gender, as well as other information. All of the questionnaire items were presented both in English and in Turkish, as participants had different proficiency levels in English. Of the original volunteers, 166 completed the motivation questionnaire, although seven of these were eliminated because of an L1 other than Turkish. The participants consist of adult EFL learners, the majority of whom (72.3%) were between 18 and 22 years of age (18, $n = 14$; 19, $n = 13$; 20, $n = 33$; 21, $n = 24$; 22, $n = 31$; the remaining 44 participants were between 23 and 40 years of age). There were 49 males and 110 females in this study, and of the 159 participants, 63 were bilingual and 96 were multilingual. For the other operationalization of multilingualism (PPLI), 89 participants were NPPLI and 70 were PPLI. All of the bilinguals included in this study spoke Turkish as an L1 and English as an L2; the additional languages spoken by the multilinguals in this study included a wide range of languages. As a second foreign language (after English) German was the most common ($n = 67$), followed by French ($n = 14$), Spanish ($n = 6$), Arabic ($n = 3$), Russian ($n = 3$), Italian ($n = 2$), and Korean ($n = 1$). Of the multilinguals, 34 had a third foreign language with German again being the most common ($n = 12$), followed by French ($n = 7$), Italian ($n = 5$), Spanish ($n = 4$), and Arabic ($n = 1$), Japanese ($n = 1$), Korean ($n = 1$), Latin ($n = 1$), Polish ($n = 1$), and Russian ($n = 1$). Eleven participants studied a fourth foreign language, the languages of which included French ($n = 4$), Spanish ($n = 2$), and German ($n = 1$), Japanese ($n = 1$), Korean ($n = 1$), Romanian ($n = 1$), and Spanish ($n = 1$); only one participant studied a fifth foreign language, which was Japanese. The proficiencies of the foreign languages other than English varied from beginning to advanced, and although an analysis of motivation and English proficiency is included in this manuscript, a detailed analysis of the motivation and the proficiencies of the additional foreign languages is beyond the scope of this paper.

Procedure and data analysis

The current study presents an analysis of the ideal and ought-to L2 self questionnaire item responses with regard to two operationalizations of multilingualism. All participants completed an extensive background questionnaire along with the 20 5-point Likert scale ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self-motivation items from Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010). All of the questionnaire items were presented in both English and Turkish due to varying proficiency levels of the participants. The participants received a link from SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com); as such, the responses were completed on a volunteer basis, and the answers were recorded anonymously. The data were analyzed using SPSS version 22.

EFA, Cronbach's alpha internal reliability tests, and one-way ANOVAs were run to answer the research questions. To answer RQ1 'Does the EFA confirm the previously categorized ideal and ought-to L2 self latent variables?' an EFA was performed on the motivation questions to be able to both examine the interrelationships of the 20 items and

to better observe the patterned themes among the items by reducing the number of variables to a more manageable quantity (Mackey and Gass 2012). To examine the internal consistency, Cronbach's Alphas were run to explore the homogeneity of the items for the two factors. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for group comparisons. For RQ2 'Are there significant differences between bilingual and multilingual Turkish EFL learners with regard to their ideal and ought-to L2 selves?' a one-way ANOVA was performed using the factor scores as the dependent variables and the bilingual/multilingual group division as the independent variable. As noted above, participants were categorized as multilingual if they had studied English and one other foreign language, regardless of the proficiency attained. Similarly, to answer RQ3 'Are there significant differences between PPLI and NPPLI Turkish EFL learners with regard to their ideal and ought-to L2 selves?' a one-way ANOVA was performed using the factor scores as the dependent variables and the PPLI/NPPLI group division as the independent variable. For RQs 4 and 5, 'Do males and females have significantly distinct ideal and ought-to L2 selves?' and 'Is there a significant relationship between language proficiency and the ideal and ought-to L2 selves?' respectively, a one-way ANOVA was performed with the factor scores as the dependent variables and gender and English language proficiency as the dependent variables.

Results

RQ1: EFA of the ideal and ought-to L2 selves

To address the first research question, an EFA was performed with the responses of Turkish EFL students ($N = 159$). The EFA employed the maximum likelihood extraction method and the oblique direct oblimin rotation method. The items were included if they loaded at .3 or greater onto a factor, and factors were considered if they had an eigenvalue greater than 1. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) value for this analysis was .945 illustrating an adequate sample size.

The EFA revealed two factors with all but one question out of the original 20 questions: 'It will have a negative impact on my life if I don't learn English' loading onto one of the two factors at .3 or higher. The final two-factor structure with 19 items accounts for 67.14% of the total variance. The first factor (F1) was identified as the 'ideal L2 self'; with a Cronbach's alpha of .973, this factor includes 11 items, accounting for 53.04% of the variance.

The second factor (F2), consisting of eight items, was labeled as the 'ought-to L2 self.' This factor explains 14.55% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha value of .907. For the results of the EFA in the current study, one question intended for the ought-to L2 self in the original questionnaire items loaded on the ideal L2 self factor: 'Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.' Additionally, two questions loaded almost equally onto the two factors (with slightly higher loadings on F2, the ought-to L2 self): 'My parents believe that I must study English to be an educated person' and 'Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.' Table 1 illustrates the factor loadings for the two factors, and in the discussion section, the implications of these results are discussed.

Table 1. Factor loadings for the ideal and ought-to L2 selves.

| | Factor | | |
|---|--------|------|-----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | <i>h</i> ² |
| <i>Factor 1: ideal L2 self</i> | | | |
| 17. I can imagine myself writing English emails/letters fluently. | .983 | | .881 |
| 15. I imagine myself as someone who is able to speak English. | .951 | | .873 |
| 7. I can imagine a situation where I am speaking English with foreigners. | .950 | | .891 |
| 9. I can imagine myself speaking English with international colleagues. | .974 | | .901 |
| 1. I can imagine myself living abroad and having a discussion in English. | .940 | | .828 |
| 11. I can imagine myself living abroad and using English effectively for communicating with the locals. | .928 | | .897 |
| 5. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English. | .891 | | .827 |
| 3. I can imagine myself studying in a university where all my courses are taught in English. | .879 | | .691 |
| 19. The things I want to do in the future require me to use English. | .793 | | .681 |
| 13. I can imagine speaking English as if I were a native speaker of English. | .770 | | .620 |
| 16. Studying English is important to me because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English. | .576 | | .498 |
| <i>Factor 2: ought-to L2 self</i> | | | |
| 12. I have to study English, because if I do not study it, I think my parents will be disappointed with me. | | .867 | .706 |
| 4. Learning English is necessary because people surrounding me expect me to do so. | | .834 | .646 |
| 6. I consider learning English important because the people I respect think that I should do it. | | .820 | .684 |
| 8. If I fail to learn English, I'll be letting other people down. | | .809 | .672 |
| 10. Studying English is important to me in order to gain the approval of my peers/teachers/family/boss. | | .685 | .650 |
| 2. I study English because close friends of mine think it is important. | | .625 | .346 |
| 14. My parents believe that I must study English to be an educated person. | .348 | .480 | .516 |
| 18. Studying English is important to me because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English. | .350 | .437 | .465 |

RQ2: Multilingual status and motivation

The second research question investigates whether Turkish EFL learners' ideal and ought-to L2 selves differed according to the bilingual/multilingual grouping variable. A one-way ANOVA was run on the motivation factor scores of both bilingual (*n* = 63) and multilingual (*n* = 96) groups. The independent variable (grouping variable) in this analysis was the bilingual or multilingual status of the participants. Table 2 displays both

Table 2. ANOVA results for bilingual and multilingual groups.

| | Bilinguals (<i>n</i> = 63) | | Multilinguals (<i>n</i> = 96) | | ANOVA results | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
| F1 | 3.46 | 1.51 | 4.71 | 1.22 | 1, 157 | 33.15 | 0.174 | .000 |
| F2 | 3.08 | 1.31 | 3.11 | 1.18 | 1, 157 | .019 | 0.0001 | .892 |

the descriptive statistics and the ANOVA results of the two factor scores for the two groups.

As [Table 2](#) indicates, there was a significant difference at the $p < .001$ level between bilinguals and multilinguals with regard to their ideal L2 self; however, there was not a significant difference between the groups regarding their ought-to L2 self. As seen by the mean scores, the multilingual participants had a significantly stronger ideal L2 self than did the bilingual participants. Additionally, for F1 (the ideal L2 self), there was a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.174$; Cohen 1988) indicating a large effect for multilingual status with regards to the ideal L2 self. This was not true for F2 (the ought-to L2 self), which had a very small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.0001$).

RQ3: PPLI and motivation

The third research question investigates whether Turkish EFL learners' ideal and ought-to L2 selves differed according to the PPLI/NPPLI grouping variable. A one-way ANOVA was run on the motivation factor scores of both NPPLI ($n = 89$) and PPLI ($n = 70$) groups. The independent variable (grouping variable) in this analysis was the NPPLI or PPLI status of the participants. [Table 3](#) displays both the descriptive statistics and the ANOVA results of the two factor scores for the two groups.

As [Table 3](#) indicates, there was a significant difference at the $p < .001$ level between the NPPLI and PPLI groups with regards to the ideal L2 self, but similar to RQ2, there was not a significant difference between the groups regarding the ought-to L2 self. As seen by the mean scores, the participants who perceived a positive interaction between the foreign languages studied had a significantly stronger ideal L2 self than did those participants who did not perceive a positive interaction between foreign languages studied. Additionally, for F1 (the ideal L2 self), there was a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.194$) indicating a large effect for the grouping variable with regards to the ideal L2 self. This was not true for F2 (the ought-to L2 self), which had a very small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.004$).

As significant results were found for F1 (the ideal L2 self), further examination of this construct was warranted. In the aforementioned analyses, the NPPLI group consisted of both bilinguals and multilinguals who did not perceive positive interaction between foreign languages studied. Subsequently, a three-way group division analysis was performed with the following three groups: NPPLI bilinguals, NPPLI multilinguals, and PPLI. As there was no significant difference for F2 (the ought-to L2 self), the results will just be reported for F1 (the ideal L2 self). The ANOVA for this analysis was significant, $F(2, 163) = 18.665$, $p < .001$, and a Tukey's post hoc test indicated group differences between the PPLI group and the other two groups. However, the two NPPLI groups were not significantly different from each other.

The results illustrate that there was no significant difference between the two NPPLI groups (taking note that the NPPLI multilingual group was smaller than the NPPLI

Table 3. ANOVA results for PPLI and NPPLI groups.

| | NPPLI ($n = 89$) | | PPLI ($n = 70$) | | ANOVA results | | | |
|----|--------------------|------|-------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
| F1 | 3.64 | 1.54 | 4.95 | 1.00 | 1, 157 | 37.77 | 0.194 | .000 |
| F2 | 3.03 | 1.32 | 3.19 | 1.10 | 1, 157 | 0.683 | 0.004 | .410 |

Table 4. Post hoc results for the three-way group division for the ideal L2 self.

| Group 1: NPPLI bilinguals (<i>n</i> = 63) | | Group 2: NPPLI multilinguals (<i>n</i> = 26) | | Group 3: PPLI (<i>n</i> = 70) | | Tukey post hoc results | | |
|---|------|--|------|-----------------------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | Groups 1 and 2 | Groups 1 and 3 | Groups 2 and 3 |
| 3.46 | 1.51 | 4.09 | 1.54 | 4.95 | 1.00 | <i>p</i> = .104 | <i>p</i> = .000 | <i>p</i> = .014 |

bilingual group), although there was a significant difference between each NPPLI group and the PPLI group. This indicates that, at least for motivational constructs, combining the bilinguals and the multilinguals who do not perceive positive language interaction into one NPPLI group is warranted. For this analysis, the two NPPLI groups are behaving similarly in terms of their ideal L2 self providing further evidence of the importance of investigating learners’ PPLIs between foreign languages studied (see Table 4). These results support the argument that bilinguals and multilinguals who do not perceive positive interactions act similarly in certain aspects of language learning, further strengthening the PPLI construct.

RQ4: Gender and motivation

The fourth research question explored the relationship between gender and the Turkish EFL learners’ ideal and ought-to L2 selves. A one-way ANOVA with the independent variable (grouping variable) of gender (males, *n* = 49; females *n* = 110) and the dependent variable of the factors was run. Table 5 displays both the descriptive statistics and the ANOVA results of the two factor scores for the two groups.

The results indicate that there were no significant differences for gender with either of the factors (ideal L2 self, *p* = .322; ought-to L2 self, *p* = .270), and the effect sizes for both factors were small (ideal L2 self, $\eta^2 = 0.006$; ought-to L2 self, $\eta^2 = 0.008$). The lack of significant differences indicate that for this population, the ideal and ought-to selves are not distinguishing variables between males and females.

RQ5: English language proficiency and motivation

The fifth research question explored the relationship between English language proficiency and the Turkish EFL learners’ ideal and ought-to L2 selves. All of the participants completed a self-evaluation of their English proficiency on five categories (speaking, writing, reading, listening, and grammar) using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = true beginner, 5 = very advanced). (See Dewaele and Wei 2013 and Thompson and Lee 2013 for examples and discussion of using self-report data). An EFA (maximum likelihood for

Table 5. ANOVA results for gender.

| | Males (<i>n</i> = 49) | | Females (<i>n</i> = 110) | | ANOVA results | | | |
|----|------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
| F1 | 4.04 | 1.47 | 4.29 | 1.48 | 1, 157 | .986 | 0.006 | .322 |
| F2 | 3.26 | 1.27 | 3.03 | 1.21 | 1, 157 | 1.23 | 0.008 | .270 |

Table 6. ANOVA results for proficiency.

| | Beginners (<i>n</i> = 69) | | Intermediate/advanced (<i>n</i> = 86) | | ANOVA results | | | |
|----|----------------------------|------|--|------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | <i>df</i> | <i>F</i> | η^2 | <i>p</i> |
| F1 | 3.27 | 1.43 | 5.06 | .892 | 1, 153 | 91.56 | 0.374 | .000 |
| F2 | 2.95 | 1.24 | 3.25 | 1.21 | 1, 153 | 2.36 | 0.015 | .127 |

extraction with an oblique direct oblimin rotation) was run on the data from the five language skills of the 159 participants to determine how many constructs were underlying the proficiency measures. With a KMO of .898, the results illustrated that the five skills could be reduced into a single factor explaining 88.5% of the total variance (eigenvalue = 4.43). Because of the one-factor solution, the data from the five skills were averaged for each participant to create one continuous independent variable.

After the averages for each participant were calculated, two groups were formed to be used as the independent (grouping) variable. Group 1 consisted of the true beginners and beginners (*n* = 69, those with average proficiency scores of 1–2.9), and Group 2 consisted of the intermediate, advanced, and very advanced participants (*n* = 86, those with average proficiency scores of 3–5), making the groups almost equal in number. The total number for the English proficiency analysis was 155, as four participants did not complete the self-rated language proficiency scales. A one-way ANOVA with the independent variable (grouping variable) of English proficiency and the dependent variable of the ideal and ought-to L2 selves was run. Table 6 displays both the descriptive statistics and the ANOVA results of the two factor scores for the two groups.

As Table 6 indicates, there were significant differences at the $p < .001$ level between the two groups with regard to their ideal L2 self, but similar to RQ2 and RQ3, there were no significant differences between the groups regarding their ought-to L2 self. The mean scores illustrate that the participants with intermediate to advanced English language proficiency (Group 2) had a significantly stronger ideal L2 self than did those participants in Group 1. Additionally, for F1 (the ideal L2 self), there was a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.374$) indicating a large effect for the grouping variable of English language proficiency with regard to the ideal L2 self. The ought-to L2 self had a small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.015$), although this small effect size was larger than the other nonsignificant results in this study (see Plonsky and Oswald, 2014, for a detailed discussion on effect sizes).

Discussion and conclusion

In this study, which investigates the ideal and ought-to L2 selves of EFL learners in Turkey, several important issues were raised by the results. For RQ1, an EFA was performed to examine if in this context, the two latent variables would be represented as expected (i.e., if all of the questions intended for the ideal and ought-to L2 selves would load as expected). The results illustrate that for the most part, this was the case. However, there was one question that did not load onto either latent variable (Q20), one question intended for the ought-to L2 self that loaded onto the ideal L2 self (Q16), and two questions that loaded almost equally onto the two factors (Q14 and Q18). Since all questions did not load exactly as expected, these results support the idea of the importance of EFA for latent variable validation in a variety of contexts, as the results might change based on cultural influences.

As for the two questions that loaded onto the two factors almost equally, these results provide further support for the complexity of categorizing motivational types, as there is likely to be some overlap. In her discussion of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (see above for the relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to the L2MSS), Ortega (2009) states:

This simple binary picture is further complicated by the human desire to feel we belong to a community, that is, to feel relatedness. Because of the need for relatedness, certain external values, beliefs, and behaviors may be gradually adopted and internalized, thus allowing individuals to function more successfully. (p. 176)

As such, there is likely to be a gray area with the classification of motivational types, and these need to be examined accordingly. For example, *introjected regulation* is when people succumb to external or societal pressure by developing feelings of shame and guilt that can only be evaded if there is submission to the type of behavior that is expected by society. A person who learns a foreign language because of the shame of not being able to speak to his or her in-laws in that language would be an example of this. This type of motivation would likely pattern more closely to the ought-to L2 self, although there is some influence of the ideal L2 self in this sentiment. *Identified regulation* is closer to the ideal L2 self concept, as it is when external or societal values are internalized to the point that a language learner no longer views these values as external, societal pressures. However, since personal values are inevitably culturally-informed, the original sentiment might not have been entirely self-determined. Illustrated by the example in Ortega (2009), 'I choose to be the kind of person who can speak more than one language,' a language learner who thinks this is acting as if this sentiment was self-determined, although this concept was likely influenced by the belief system of this learner's society or immediate social group.

With regard to RQ2 and RQ3, for both categorizations of multilingualism (bilingual vs. multilingual and PPLI vs. NPPLI), between-group significant differences were found for the ideal L2 self (F1), but not for the ought-to L2 self (F2). The differences found between the groups for the ideal L2 self underscore the importance of carefully documenting and incorporating aspects of participants' previous language learning experiences for research on motivation, as well as for other topics in SLA. Additionally, although both group divisions illustrated significant differences for the construct of the ideal L2 self, the PPLI/NPPLI operationalization of multilingualism yielded a bigger *F*-value, a greater mean difference between groups, a smaller standard deviation for the PPLI group (as compared to the multilingual group), and a larger effect size (see Tables 2 and 3) warranting further investigation of the PPLI construct.

With regard to the three-way PPLI group division, the impetus for this analysis was to further explore the PPLI construct. Those language learners who perceived no interactions (the bilinguals and some of the multilinguals), as well as the multilinguals who perceived negative interactions are hypothesized to act similarly insofar as language learning is concerned (NPPLI group). The multilinguals who perceive positive interactions between languages studied (the PPLI group) are hypothesized to act differently than the NPPLI group. The purpose of the three-way group analysis was to investigate if this hypothesis could be maintained, specifically when comparing the NPPLI bilinguals and the NPPLI multilinguals. The results indicate that the two NPPLI groups (bilinguals and multilinguals) are indeed acting similarly in this study with no significant differences between those two groups. However, each of the NPPLI groups differed significantly

from the PPLI group (see Table 6). Thus, for future research, it is feasible to group the multilinguals who do not perceive positive interaction between languages studied and the bilinguals into one group (NPPLI) and the multilinguals who perceive positive interactions between languages studied into another group (PPLI).

The results of this study did not produce significant differences between genders for either the ideal L2 self or ought-to L2 self constructs (RQ4). Although previous research has generally found females to be more motivated than males (Dörnyei and Csizér 2002; Henry 2009; Ullman, Miranda, and Travers 2008), when looking at the ideal L2 self specifically, no differences have been found (Sylvén and Thompson, *forthcoming*; Henry and Cliffordson 2013). The current study supports these previous results with regards to gender and the ideal L2 self.

As for RQ5, the relationship of motivation to proficiency, a significant difference was found between the groups with the intermediate/advanced group having a stronger ideal L2 self than the beginner group. No significant difference was found for the ought-to L2 self with regard to proficiency. These results were similar to the finding of Lamb (2012), Ghapanchi, Khajavy, and Asadpour (2011), and Kim (2012) with regard to the significance of the ideal L2 self and proficiency. However, Kim (2012) also found a group difference with proficiency and the ought-to L2 self, which was not the case in the current study.

The significant differences found for the ideal L2 self, but not for the ought-to L2 self are similar to the results found in other studies in which the ought-to L2 self played a less important role in the results and implications. For example, Csizér and Lukács (2010) did not find a high enough measure of reliability (Cronbach's alpha) with the ought-to L2 self and in Kormos and Csizér (2008), the questions pertaining to the ought-to L2 self loaded onto multiple factors. This study, however, did achieve a high Cronbach's alpha for the ought-to L2 self (.907), and enough of the intended questions loaded onto F2 to make this a salient ought-to L2 self factor. However, there were no significant differences and extremely small effect sizes when examining both operationalizations of multilingual status with the ought-to L2 self, whereas the opposite was true for the ideal L2 self. These results indicate the need to further explore the concept of the ought-to L2 self in order to strengthen this latent variable. Thompson and Vásquez (*forthcoming*) indicate the need to include an examination of motivation using the concept of psychological reactance, or resistance to social influence (Miron and Brehm 2006, 10), as a potentially motivating variable. From this comes the idea of the *anti-ought-to L2 self*, or a self that is motivated by going against what society or other authority figures dictate, such as a child getting a tattoo because his or her parents said no. Of course, further empirical studies that specifically target this concept are needed to solidify this idea.

This study enhances the literature on multilingualism and motivation in several ways. First, at the time of writing this manuscript, there were no other published studies using the L2MSS in the context of Turkey. From a theoretical perspective, it is crucial to have studies from a variety of contexts to identify trends and/or differences that are generalizable making the current study of international importance. Additionally, the results of this study provide further insight into the importance of taking into account language learners' past language learning experiences, no matter how slight (De Angelis 2005a, 2005b, 2007), as well as whether or not participants perceived positive language interactions between foreign languages studied (Thompson 2013). As well as further exploring the concept of PPLI, future research should include an analysis of how language learning motivation differs depending on the language studied (i.e. Henry 2011). Finally, this is the first study to explore the construct of PPLI in conjunction with

language learning motivation; supporting previous work done on PPLI, the results of this study indicate that participants' perceptions of positive interactions between foreign languages studied is a significant concept to consider.

Funding

This work was supported, in part, by the University of South Florida Research & Innovation Internal Awards Program [grant number 0074160].

References

- Al-Shehri, A. S. 2009. "Motivation and Vision: The Relation between the Ideal L2 Self, Imagination and Visual Style." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 164–171. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Bektaş-Çetinkaya, Y., and N. Oruç. 2010. "Turkish Students' Motivation to Learn English at Public and Private Universities." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2: 4662–4666.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Csizér, K., and Z. Dörnyei. 2005. "Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior." *Language Learning* 55 (4): 613–659. doi:10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00319.
- Csizér, K., and J. Kormos. 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*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 98–119. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Csizér, K., and G. Lukacs. 2010. "The Comparative Analysis of Motivation, Attitudes and Selves: The Case of English and German in Hungary." *System* 38 (1): 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.12.001.
- De Angelis, G. 2005a. "Interlanguage Transfer of Function Words." *Language Learning* 55: 379–414. doi:10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00310.x.
- De Angelis, G. 2005b. "Multilingualism and Nonnative Lexical Transfer: An Identification Problem." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 2: 1–25. doi:10.1080/17501220508668374.
- De Angelis, G. 2007. *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Deniz, S. 2010. "Student Teachers' Evaluation of the Motivational Strategies Used in Foreign Language Teaching." *Social Behavior and Personality* 38 (9): 1269–1286. doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.9.1269.
- Dewaele, J.– M., K. V. Petrides, and A. Furnham. 2008. "The 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: 91–960. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00482.x.
- Dewaele, J.– M., and L. Wei. 2013. "Is Multilingualism Linked to a Higher Tolerance of Ambiguity? *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition* 16: 231–240. doi:10.1017/S1366728912000570.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S. 1998. "The Spread of English in Turkey and its Current Sociolinguistic Profile." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19: 24–39. doi:10.1177/0033688207079696.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1990. "Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign Language Learning." *Language Learning* 40: 46–78. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb00954.x.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1998. "Motivation in Second and Foreign Language Learning." *Language Teaching* 31: 117–135. doi:10.1017/S026144480001315X.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2005. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2009. "The L2 Motivational Self System." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 9–42. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., and L. Chan. 2013. "Motivation and Vision: An Analysis of Future L2 Self Images, Sensory Styles, and Imagery Capacity across two Target Languages." *Language Learning* 63 (3): 437–462. doi:10.1111/lang.12005.

- Dörnyei, Z., and K. Csizér. 2002. "Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a Longitudinal Nationwide Survey." *Applied Linguistics* 23 (4): 421–462. doi:10.1093/applin/23.4.421.
- Dörnyei, Z., K. Csizér, and N. Németh. 2006. *Motivation, Language Attitudes and Language Globalisation: A Hungarian Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., and T. Taguchi. 2010. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., and E. Ushioda. 2009. "Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self: Future Research Directions." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 350–356. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Engin, A. O. 2009. "Second Language Learning Success and Motivation." *Social Behavior and Personality* 37 (8): 1035–1042. doi:10.2224/sbp.2009.37.8.1035.
- Gardner, R. C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Ghapanchi, Z., G. H. Khajavy, and S. F. Asadpour. 2011. "L2 Motivation and Personality as Predictors of the Second Language Proficiency: Role of the Big Five Traits and L2 Motivational Self System." *Canadian Social Science* 7 (6): 148–155. doi:10.3968/j.css.1923669720110706.030.
- Gömleksiz, M. N. 2010. "An Evaluation of Students' Attitudes toward English Language Learning in Terms of Several Variables." *Procedia Social and behavioral Sciences* 9: 913–918. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.258.
- Henry, A. 2009. "Gender Differences in Compulsory School Pupils' L2 Self-concepts: A Longitudinal Study." *System* 37 (2): 177–193. doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.11.003.
- Henry, A. 2011. "Examining the Impact of L2 English on L3 Selves: A Case Study." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 8 (3): 235–255. doi:10.1080/14790718.2011.554983.
- Henry, A., and C. Cliffordson. 2013. "Motivation, Gender, and Possible Selves." *Language Learning* 63 (2): 271–295. doi:10.1111/lang.12009
- Higgins, E. T. 1987. "Self-discrepancy: A Theory Relating Self and Affect." *Psychological Review* 94 (3): 319–340. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319.
- İnceçay, G. 2011. "Pre-service Teachers' Language Learning Beliefs and Effects of These Beliefs on Their Practice Teaching." *Procedia Social and behavioral Sciences* 15: 128–133. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.061.
- Kellerman, E. 1979. "Transfer and Non-transfer: Where Are We Now?" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 2: 37–57. doi:10.1017/S0272263100000942.
- Kim, T. Y. 2012. "The L2 Motivational Self System of Korean EFL Students: Cross-grade Survey Analysis." *English Teaching* 67 (1): 29–56.
- Kormos, J., and K. Csizér. 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. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00443.
- Kormos, J., and K. Csizér. 2014. "The Interaction of Motivation, Self-regulatory Strategies, and Autonomous Learning Behavior in Different Learner Groups." *TESOL Quarterly* 48 (2): 275–299. doi:10.1002/tesq.129.
- Lamb, M. 2007. "The Impact of School on EFL Learning Motivation: An Indonesian Case Study." *TESOL Quarterly* 41 (4): 757–780. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00102.x.
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x.
- Mackey, A., and S. M. Gass, eds. 2012. *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A practical guide*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Markus, H., and P. Nurius. 1986. "Possible Selves." *American Psychologist* 41 (9): 954–969. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954.
- Miron, A. M., and J. W. Brehm. 2006. "Reactance Theory: 40 Years Later." *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* 37: 9–18. doi:10.1024/0044-3514.37.1.9.
- Nayak, H., N. Hansen, N. Krueger, and B. McLaughlin. 1990. "Language Learning Strategies in Monolingual and Multilingual Adults." *Language Learning* 40: 221–244. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb01334.x.
- Ortega, L. 2009. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London: Hodder.

- Plonsky, L., and F. L. Oswald. 2014. "How Big Is 'Big'? Interpreting Effect Sizes in L2 Research." *Language Learning* 64 (4): 878–912. doi:10.1111/lang.12079.
- Ryan, S. 2009. "Self and Identity in L2 Motivation in Japan: The Ideal L2 Self and Japanese Learners of English." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 350–356. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Şakiroğlu, B., and K. Dikilitaş. 2012. "Language Learning Motivation of Turkish Tertiary Level EFL Students." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46: 3215–3219. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.039.
- Selvi, A. F. 2011. "World Englishes in the Turkish Sociolinguistic Context." *World Englishes* 30 (2): 182–199. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01705.x.
- Şen, H., and M. Şen. 2012. "A Comparison of EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Language Learning Strategies (LLSS) and Learners' Reported Use of LLSS in Their English Language Classes." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46: 1846–1854. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.390.
- Sylvén, K., and A. Thompson. forthcoming. "Language Learning Motivation and CLIL: Is There a Connection?" *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*.
- Taguchi, T., M. Magid, and M. Papi. 2009. "The L2 Motivational Self System amongst Chinese, Japanese, and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 66–97. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Thompson, A. 2013. "The Interface of Language Aptitude and Multilingualism: Reconsidering the Bilingual/Multilingual Dichotomy." *Modern Language Journal* 97 (3): 685–670. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12034.x.
- Thompson, A., and E. Aslan. 2014. "Multilingualism, Perceived Positive Language Interaction (PPLI), and Learner Beliefs: What Do Turkish Students Believe?" *International Journal of Multilingualism*. doi:10.1080/14790718.2014.973413.
- Thompson, A., and J. Lee. 2013. "Anxiety and EFL: Does Multilingualism Matter?" *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (6): 730–749. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.713322.
- Thompson, A., and C. Vásquez. forthcoming. "Exploring Motivational Profiles through Language Learning Narratives." *Modern Language Journal*.
- Topbaş, S. 2011. "Implications of Bilingual Development for Specific Language Impairments in Turkey." *Clinical linguistics & phonetics* 25 (11–12): 989–997. doi:10.3109/02699206.2011.622425.
- Turgut, Y., and P. Irgin. 2009. "Young Learners' Language Learning Via Computer Games." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1: 760–764. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.135.
- Ullman, M. T., R. A. Miranda, and M. L. Travers. 2008. "Sex Differences in the Neurocognition of Language." In *Sex on the Brain: From Genes to Behavior*, edited by J. B. Becker, K. J. Berkley, and N. Geary, 291–309. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Üstünel, E., and E. Samur. 2009. "Examining the Relationship between Two Year Vocational School Students' Beliefs about Language Learning and Their Academic Success." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2: 3489–3493. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.540.
- Yağmur, K. 2001. "Turkish and Other Languages in Turkey." In *The Other Languages of Europe*, edited by G. Extra and D. Gorter, 407–427. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.