



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' INTEGRATIVE / INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION LEVELS AND THEIR ACHIEVEMENT SCORES IN ENGLISH

Inst. Gökhan Çetinkaya
Düzce University, Düzce-Turkey
gokhancetinkaya@duzce.edu.tr

Inst. Orhan Ataman
Düzce University Düzce-Turkey
orhanataman@duzce.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of the study is to investigate the relationship between preparatory class students' integrative/instrumental motivation levels and their achievement scores in English. Data was collected from 151 EFL learners (63 female and 88 male) studying at voluntary-based preparatory classes at Düzce University in 2016-2017 academic year. To collect the data Motivation/Attitude Questionnaire (MAQ) developed by Dörnyei (1990) and translated into Turkish by Mendi (2009) was used. In addition to that, 16 students from different achievement levels were interviewed via semi-structured interview technique to have a better understanding of the issue. The results yielded that students had a higher level of instrumental motivation, which was also supported by the interview data. On the other hand, integrative motivation had a significant correlation with students' achievement scores while instrumental motivation did not. Furthermore, neither integrative nor instrumental motivation significantly differs according to participants' gender and their faculties.

Keywords: Integrative / instrumental motivation, English achievement.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is considered to be one of the most important factors affecting human behavior since motivation can explain people's goals to achieve and how much effort they will spend on it (Keller, 2010), and as Macaro (2006) explains, "human action is normally considered to be directed by purpose and dependent on the pursuance of goals" (p. 328). Similarly, as in any other areas of life, motivation has an important role in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), too. Dörnyei (1998) explains the role of motivation in SLA by stating that "Motivation provides the primary impetus to initiate learning the second language (L2) and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process" and most striking of all these, he also claims that "all the other factors involved in L2 acquisition presuppose motivation to some extent" (p. 117). Motivation is a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon (Gardner, 2007), so there are many definitions of motivation from different perspectives. For example, Gardner (1985) defines motivation as "the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language" (p. 10), and he further explains that each component by itself is not necessarily the indicator of motivation, though. According to Williams and Burden (1997), "motivation is a state of cognitive and emotional arousal which leads to a conscious decision to act and gives rise to period of sustained intellectual and/or physical effort in order to attain the previously set goals" (p. 120). For Dörnyei and Otto's (1998), motivation is not static but a dynamic phenomenon which changes during the L2 learning process, and according to Dörnyei's (2005) L2 Motivational self-system, it is a desire to reduce the gap between the actual and ideal L2 self.

The study of motivation in SLA has been initiated by Gardner and Lambert's (1972) publication (Dörnyei, 1990, 1994); their work was centered on the concepts – integrative and instrumental

motivation, and the social physiological perspectives have dominated the field till 1990s (Dörnyei, 1998, 2001). As Crooks and Schmidt (1991) state, "it was so dominant that even alternative concepts have not been seriously considered" (p. 501). However, it does not mean that these two pioneering concepts have lost their popularity, but other alternative viewpoints to Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model and the concept of integrativeness started to flourish in early 90s; even the starting point of one of the most recent L2 motivational models – L2 self-system proposed by Dörnyei (2005) is integrativeness, as well. In other words, integrative and instrumental motivation has been the focus point of many motivational research studies (Cziser & Dörnyei, 2005).

Integrative and Instrumental Motivation

Traditionally, one of the two dichotomies mainly studied in SLA is integrative/instrumental motivation (Rivera-Mills & Plonsky, 2007). Gardner (2001) defines integrative motivation as "the desire or willingness to identify with the other language community and tendency to evaluate the learning situation positively" (p. 9). On the other hand, instrumental motivation is defined as learning the language for pragmatic reasons like earning money, finding a job etc. (Gardner, 2006). Gardner (1985) states that integrative motivation is more important for success in L2 and even instrumental motivation includes some integrative orientations. Instrumental factors, on the other hand, are considered to be more important in FL context (Dörnyei, 1990; Oxford & Shearin, 1994); in other words, "some learners in some contexts are more successful in learning a language if they are integratively oriented and others in different contexts benefit from an instrumental orientation" (Brown, 2006, p. 171). In addition, Dörnyei's (1990) study revealed that there are different elements contributing to the integrative motivation in FL context. These elements are: interest in foreign languages, cultures, and people, desire to broaden one's view and avoid provincialism, desire for new stimuli and challenges and desire to integrate into a new community.

Motivation is considered to be one of the most important variables which is strongly related to success in SLA (Gardner, 2001; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Dörnyei, 2014). Gao (2009) further explains that "both integrative and instrumental motivation may lead to success. Rather, lack of either may lead to failure" (p. 275). In addition, according to Deci and Ryan (2008), not an individual's quantity of motivation but its type or quality can help predict the outcomes better. Dörnyei (1994) also suggests that learning a language is different from learning other school subjects, and it involves some social components. In this sense, the current study aims to investigate the relationship between preparatory school EFL students' integrative/instrumental motivation levels and their academic achievement scores in English, and the research questions are as follow:

1. What are the integrative/instrumental motivation levels of the participants?
2. Do the integrative/instrumental motivation levels of the participants differ according to their gender?
3. Do the integrative/instrumental motivation levels of the participants differ according to their faculties?
4. Is there a relationship between participants' integrative/instrumental motivation levels and their academic achievement scores in English?

METHOD

Research Design

The current study is a descriptive research aiming to investigate the relationship between students' integrative/instrumental motivations and their academic achievement scores in English. For this purpose, both quantitative and qualitative data were used for triangulation. Triangulation is defined as the use of multi-methods of data collection in order to have a deeper understanding of the subject by analyzing it from different perspectives by using both quantitative and qualitative data (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Participants

In the current study convenience sampling method – “choosing the nearest individuals to serve as respondents and continuing that process until the required sample size has been obtained or those who happen to be available and accessible at the time” – (Cohen et al., 2007, 114) was used in order to collect quantitative data, and a total of 151 students (88 male and 63 female) studying at voluntary-based English preparatory school at Düzce University in 2016-2017 academic year participated in the first phase. In addition, 60 students from Engineering Faculty, 59 students from Business Faculty and 32 students from Tourism Faculty constituted the total sample size. For the second phase of the study – the collection of qualitative data – maximum variation sampling method was preferred to be able to ensure the maximum variation so that the interviewees can represent the whole group (Yıldırım & Şimşek 2016). With this purpose in mind, 16 students in total were interviewed from different achievement groups. Students were divided into three groups according to their achievement scores; the 27% of the students in the top of the rank order by the students’ overall fall term grades were labelled as high level students, 27% of the students in the bottom of the list were labelled as low level, and the rest of the students constituted the medium level group. As a result, equal number of female and male students (8 males and females), 6 high level, 6 low level and 4 medium level students from three faculties (Engineering, Business and Tourism) were interviewed by the researchers.

Data Collection Instruments

In order to collect data, the researchers administered MAQ (Motivation/Attitude Questionnaire) together with demographic information form to 151 students and carried out semi-structured interviews with 16 students. First of all, 30-item MAQ developed by Dörnyei (1990) and translated into Turkish by Mendi (2009) was delivered. The previous studies showed that the Turkish version of MAQ has a high reliability ranging from .85 to .92 (Çetinkaya, 2017; Mendi, 2009; Öztürk & Gürbüz, 2013). In addition, Çetinkaya (2017) examined the construct validity of the questionnaire in a similar setting and found out that MAQ consisting of 30 items has a high construct validity. In the current study, Cronbach Alpha analysis revealed that MAQ and its sub-constructs are highly reliable. The results are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for MAQ and its Sub-constructs

Integrative Motivation	.89
Instrumental Motivation	.87
Total	.91

In the second phase, semi-structure interviews mainly consisting of three questions were carried out for triangulation. The questions in the interviews aimed to find answers to why students want to learn English and what kind of attitudes they have to foreign cultures and learning English itself.

Data Analysis Procedure

The quantitative data was analyzed via SPSS 23.0. First, the scores of two negative items (5 and 7) in MAQ were reversely coded with the help of SPSS. Then, the reliability of the questionnaire was examined via Cronbach Alpha’s Coefficients, and it was found out that MAQ is highly reliable. Finally, the normality of the variables, integrative/instrumental motivation, were examined via kurtosis and skewness statistics. George and Malley (2010) explain that kurtosis and skewness values of a normally distributed data are between +2 and -2. In the current study, the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables, integrative/instrumental motivation, are -.61 and -2.17 (SE = .197) and .72 and 7.64 (SE = .392) respectively. As these results show, the variable instrumental motivation, is not normally distributed, so non-parametric tests had to be used for the analyses related to instrumental motivation while parametric tests could be used for the analyses related to integrative motivation.

FINDINGS

Results Related to Research Question 1

To be able to find the integrative/instrumental levels of the participants, mean scores were calculated for each variable via descriptive statistics. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Participants' Integrative/Instrumental Motivation Levels

	Mean	Std. Deviation	SE Mean
Integrative motivation	3.61	.58	.047
Instrumental motivation	4.16	.64	.052

Öztürk and Gürbüz (2013) state that scores above 4 indicate high level, scores between 3 and 4 moderate level and scores below 3 indicate low level of motivation. As seen in Table 2, it was found out that students have a high level of instrumental motivation ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .64$) but a moderate level of integrative motivation ($M = 3.61$, $SD = .58$) in the current study.

Results Related to Research Question 2

To be able to find out whether the integrative/instrumental motivation levels of the participants differ according to gender, independent samples t -test and its non-parametric equivalent, Mann-Whitney U test were carried out. The results are presented in Table 3 and 4.

Table 3: Independent Samples t -test Results for Participants' Integrative Motivation with respect to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Integrative Motivation	Female	63	3.72	.50	1.99	149	.051
	Male	88	3.54	.63			

Table 4: Mann-Whitney U test Results for Participants' Instrumental and Total Motivation with Respect to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Z	Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)
Instrumental Motivation	Female	63	81,21	5116,00	2444.000	-1.24	.125
	Male	88	72,27	6360,00			

As seen in Table 3, there is no significant difference between female ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 50$) and male students' ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .63$) integrative motivation levels, $t(149) = 1.99$, $p = .051$. Similarly, as shown in Table 4, the instrumental motivation level of the participants does not significantly differ, $U = 2444.000$, $Z = -1.24$, $p = .125$, either.

Results Related to Research Question 3

In order to find out if the integrative/instrumental motivation levels of the participants differ by faculties, one-way ANOVA and its non-parametric equivalent, Kruskal Wallis test were conducted. The results are presented in Table 5 and 6.

Table 5: The Results of One-way ANOVA for Participants' Integrative Motivation with Respect to Faculties

	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2	.224	.112	.33	.72
Within Groups	148	50.519	.341		
Total	150	50.743			

Table 6: The Results of Kruskal Wallis test for Participants' Instrumental Motivation with Respect to Faculties

	Faculty	N	Mean Rank	Chi-square	Df	Asymp Sig.
Instrumental motivation	Engineering	60	76,67	1.16	2	.56
	g	59	79,14			
	Business	32	68,95			
	Tourism	151				
	Total					

As shown in Table 5 and 6, neither integrative $F(2,148) = .33, p = .72$ nor instrumental $\chi^2(2 N = 151) = 1.16, p = .56$ motivation levels of the students differ according to the faculties they study.

Results Related to Research Question 4

To be able to find out if there is a relationship between students' integrative/instrumental motivation levels and their academic achievement scores in English, both Pearson Product Momentum Correlations for integrative and Spearman's Rho for instrumental motivation were conducted. The results are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7: The relationship between students' integrative/instrumental motivation and their academic achievement scores in English.

		Integrative Motivation	Instrumental Motivation
Achievement Scores	R	.370	.022
	Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.786

N = 151

As shown in Table 7 above, there is a significant positive relationship between students' achievement scores and their integrative motivation ($r = .370$); however, the relationship can be considered to be at a moderate level (Cohen et al., 2007). On the other hand, no correlation was found between students' instrumental motivation and their achievement scores ($p = .22$).

Overall Results of the Interviews

Regardless of gender, faculty or achievement scores in English, all the students strongly stated that English is very important for them to be able to find a good job. However, students with higher grades also explained that English is useful for them to meet new people from different cultures, help them to travel and live abroad, learn about foreign cultures and follow the international media. Furthermore, two students from the average group indicated that English will gain them respect and statue in the society; in addition, all the students from high level group and two students from medium level group stated that they are curious and love to learn English and other foreign languages. On the other hand, students from low level group do not have such kind of worries except for one student, and she has such a view that English is useful in terms of intellectual development and as she learns English she can learn more about other cultures around the world. The emerging topics outlined from students' interviews are presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8: The interview results

Finding a job	Learning about other cultures
Necessary for further studies and job	Intellectual development
Travel	Living abroad
Gaining respect and statue among friends and society	Interest in and curiosity about learning English
Meeting new people and making friends	International interaction

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Instrumental motivation is considered to play a more important role in FL context (Dörnyei, 1990; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). In the current study, students were found to have a higher level of instrumental motivation. This finding is also consistent with the previous studies carried out in Turkey, too (Mendi, 2009; Öztürk & Gürbüz, 2013; Burgucu, 2011). It is also notable that students do not have a low level of integrative motivation but a moderate level. Behind instrumental goals like furthering a career, finding a job or passing exams, students are also motivated by other orientations like living abroad, meeting new people and making friends etc. as obtained through the interview data. This might be the result of globalized world and a desire to be the part of this internationalism.

Neither integrative nor instrumental motivation does not significantly differ according to gender. Results related to gender in terms of motivation are contradictory, though. While Çekirdek (2014) and Akram and Ghani's (2013) studies revealed no difference between female and male students' motivation levels, females were found to have a higher level of motivation in other studies carried out by Öztürk and Gürbüz (2013), Mendi (2009), Madran (2006) and Shaaban and Gaith (2000). In addition, Kızıltepe's (2003) study yielded that female students have significantly higher integrative motivation than male students, but the instrumental motivation does not significantly differ according to gender. In terms of faculties, there is no significant difference, either. There is no consistent results in the related literature; for example, Ataman's (2017) thesis study revealed no difference among university majors, but Burgucu (2011) and Çetinkaya (2017) found out that tourism students have a higher level of motivation than the students from other faculties. The fact that no significant difference was found with respect to gender and faculties suggests that the learning English is considered to be important by all the students. Not only tourism but also the engineering and business students are aware that English is necessary for their future studies and finding a job etc. regardless of gender. In addition, in order to develop international interactions and improve oneself intellectually, English is considered to be at the crux; that is English is seen as the way leading to all these targets.

Motivation is considered to be positively correlated to success in SLA (Gardner, 2001; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Dörnyei, 2014), this is supported by many studies (Gardner, 2007; Çekirdek, 2014; Ataman, 2017; Çetinkaya, 2017). However, the current study reveals that there is no correlation between students' instrumental motivation even though they have a high level of instrumental motivation. As the interview data shows, any student regardless of their achievement scores in English thinks that instrumentality is very important for them, so this might be the reason for the lack of a correlation between the variables. In addition, Shaaban and Gaith (2000) suggest that instrumental motivation does not necessarily lead to success. On the other hand, integrative motivation is moderately correlated to students' achievement scores in English in a positive direction. This can also be observed through interview data, too; on the contrary to poorer students, integrative orientations like intellectual development, living abroad, intellectual development etc. are stated by more successful students in general. These findings support the idea that although instrumental motivation is considered to be more important in FL context, integrative motivation is required for higher achievement in addition to instrumental motivation (Dörnyei, 1990). Furthermore, all the students voluntarily study at the preparatory school in their first year at university, and they do not have to get high grades from their exams; for this reason, instrumental goals do not appeal to their urgent needs in their current context since they neither have to pass an exam nor find a job. This also suggests that other than instrumental needs such as travel, international interactions, making new friends and so on are more appealing to them and direct their studies at the preparatory school.

As a conclusion, all the students are aware of how important learning a foreign language is regardless of gender, faculty and their achievement scores in English, but it is notable that not instrumental but integrative motivation is positively correlated to achievement scores. Therefore, teachers should focus on integrativeness more in the classroom because all the students are already aware of the



importance of English in terms of pragmatics. They should also push the students to turn their desires into action, as well.

WJEIS's Note: This article was presented at 8th International Conference on New Trends in Education - ICONTE, 18- 20 May, 2017, Antalya-Turkey and was selected for publication for Volume 7 Number 2 of WJEIS 2017 by ICONTE Scientific Committee.

REFERENCES

Akram, M., & Ghani, M. (2013). Gender and language learning motivation. *Academic Research International*, 4 (2), 536-540.

Ataman, O. (2017). Üniversite Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin İngilizce Öğrenmeye Yönelik Motivasyon Düzeyleri ve Tutumları İle Hazırlık Sınıfı Başarı Puanları Arasındaki İlişki. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Brown, H. D. (2006). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, (5th Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.

Burgucu, A. (2011). *The Role of Motivation, Attitude and Anxiety in Learning English as a foreign Language*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kafkas University, Kars.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. (6th Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language Learning* 41, 469-512.

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

Çekirdek, G. (2014). *Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin İngilizce Başarılarını Etkileyen Bazı Faktörlerin İncelenmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.

Çetinkaya, G. (2017). The Relationship among Language Learning Strategies, Motivation and Academic Achievement of University Preparatory School Students. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-Determination Theory: A Macro-theory of Human Motivation, Development, and Health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49 (3), 182-185.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40 (1), 46-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in Second and Foreign Language Learning. *Language Teaching*, 31 (3), 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New Themes and Approaches in Second Language Motivation Research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43-59.



- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *Psychology of a Language Learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Motivation in second language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 518-531). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning/Cengage Learning.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London)*, 4, 43-69.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. J. Doughty, and M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gao, F. (2009). Learning Korean language in China: motivations and strategies of non-Koreans. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13 (3), 273-284, DOI: 10.1080/13670050903006929.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Language Learning Motivation: The Student, the Teacher, and the Researcher. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 6 (1), 1-18.
- Gardner, R. C. (2006). The socio-educational model of Second Language Acquisition A research paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 237-260.
- Gardner, R. C. (2007). Motivation and Second Language Acquisition. *Porta Linguarum*, 8, 9-20.
- Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson
- Keller, J. M. (2010). Keller, J. M. (2010). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. New York: Springer.
- Kızıltepe, Z. (2003). Considering Gender with Attitudes and Motivation of EFL Students. *Education and Science*, 130 (28), 78-82.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for Language Learning and for Language Use: Revising the Theoretical Framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90 (3), 320-337.
- Madran, D. (2006). *Üniversite İngilizce Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Başarı Güdüsü Düzeylerinin Başarıları Üzerine Etkileri*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.
- Mendi, H. B. (2009). *The relationship between reading strategies, motivation and reading test performance in foreign language learning*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language Learning Motivation: Expanding the Theoretical Framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (1), 12-28.



Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2013). The impact of gender on foreign language speaking anxiety and motivation. *Akdeniz Language Studies Conference, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70* (2013), 654-665, DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.106.

Rivera-Mills, S., & Plonsky, L. (2007). Empowering Students with Language Learning Strategies: A Critical Review of Current Issues. *Foreign Language Annals, 40* (3), 535– 548.

Shaaban, K. A., & Ghaith, G. (2000). Student Motivation to Learn English as a Foreign Language. *Foreign Language Annals, 33* (6), 632-644.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]*. Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Yayınevi.