

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' PERCEIVED AUTONOMY SUPPORT AND MOTIVATIONAL PATTERNS IN ENGLISH WRITING COURSES: A SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY APPROACH*

Savaş YEŞİLYURT**

Abstract : In this study, it was aimed to identify the relationship between the motivational patterns of EFL students and their perceived autonomy support in writing classes from a self-determination theory perspective.

According to the analysis of the data obtained, it was found that there is a significant relationship between participants' perceived autonomy support and different motivation types. Data analyses also showed that the relationship between more autonomous motivation types and perceived autonomy support levels was stronger than the one between less autonomous motivation types and perceived autonomy support levels.

As a result, considering that almost all of the studies on self-determination theory showed that more intrinsic motivation types were more effective on academic achievement than extrinsic ones, it can be claimed that facilitating autonomy support in learning settings would enhance students' intrinsic motivations and their achievement levels in English writing classes.

Key Words: Self-determination theory, motivational patterns, EFL writing, perceived autonomy support, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amotivation

1. Introduction

Autonomy support in learning has been one of the most frequently studied issues in self-determination theory research in educational area (Reeve, 2002; 2006). Although self-determination is a theory which concerns with different conceptions such extrinsic/intrinsic motivation, three basic psychological needs, competence, autonomy, and relatedness, inner tendencies of individuals, etc., most researches on self-determination theory, as may be inferred from the name of the theory, have related their topics to the need for autonomy or autonomy support.

Self-determination theory, formulated by Deci and Ryan (1985a) as a model of motivation, personality and optimal functioning proposes that people have an innate tendency for personal growth, psychological development, mastering challenges in the environment, and integrating experience into self-

* The data of this study was drawn from the PhD thesis, "A Self-Determination Approach to Teaching Writing in Pre-Service EFL Teacher Education", completed by the researcher in 2008.

** Research Assistant, Atatürk University, The Institute of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching Department

concept. This theory associates such tendencies of individuals with three innate basic psychological needs, autonomy, competence, and relatedness, which need to be nurtured for their personal development, well-being, and integration to their environment (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). Among these three needs, *autonomy* refers people's strivings to be the origin of their behaviours or to have a right in determining them; *competence* refers to people's strivings to experience the feeling of competence and being able to affect the contexts and conditions that would allow such a feeling; and, *relatedness* refers to people's desires to relate to or care for others, to be cared by them and to have a satisfying relationship with the social environment (Deci & Ryan, 1991).

As mentioned above, a great many of the studies on self-determination theory have focused generally on the first one of these three needs, autonomy. Previous research (e.g., Assor & Kaplan, 2001; Deci, Betley, Kahle, Abrams & Porac, 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1985b; Ryan and Deci, 2000a) reported results showing the essence of the nutrition of the need for autonomy or autonomy support for both higher motivation of individuals for the activities they did and their well being, development and achievement in life. Especially, self-determination research in educational area has centred on the issues related to autonomy and autonomy support in the classroom (e.g., Assor, Kaplan, Kanat-Maymon & Roth, 2005; Black & Deci 2000; Noels, 2001; Noels, Clément & Pelletier, 1999; Noels, Pelletier, Clément & Vallerand, 2000; Reeve, Jang, Carrell, Jeon & Barch, 2004; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens & Soenens, 2005). These studies reported that whereas autonomy suppressive practices such as use of expected rewards, threats of punishment, deadlines, imposed goals, surveillance and competition thwart the intrinsic motivation of individuals, lead them to get amotivated and result in negative academic outcomes (Deci, et al., 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1985b), autonomy supportive practices such as provision of choices (Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith & Deci, 1978) and giving positive feedback enhance intrinsic motivation and, accordingly, academic achievement of students (Assor et al., 2005; Noels et al., 1999; Noels et al., 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). Reeve (2002) summarizes the findings of these studies in two sentences: (1) autonomously-motivated students thrive in educational settings, and (2) students benefit when teachers support their autonomy.

Among the studies which investigated autonomy support, some researched the relationship between autonomy support and types of motivation, or types of self-regulation, proposed by self determination theory (Assor et al., 2005; Black & Deci, 2000; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand & Brière, 2001; Reeve et al., 2004; Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). The findings of these studies indicated a positive correlation between autonomy supportive contexts, autonomy supportive teacher communicative styles and more self-determined motivation types, introjected regulation, integrated regulation, and intrinsic motivation, and students' academic performances. On the other hand, they also revealed a

positive correlation of controlling contexts and autonomy suppressive teacher behaviours with amotivation and external regulation and negative academic outcomes.

There are also some L2 researches which adapted self-determination theory to the investigation of L2 learners' motivation and focused on the relationship between the autonomy support in the classroom and students' extrinsic and intrinsic motivational profiles (e.g., Noels, 2001; Noels et al., 1999; 2000; Vandergrift, 2005) They found results that showed a positive correlation between autonomy support and students' intrinsic motivation and positive learning outcomes. As will be explained below, the main concern of this study is to analyze the relationship between the motivation types proposed by self-determination theory and students' perceived autonomy support as well. It would be useful to give some information about the motivation model and motivation types, or self-regulation styles, proposed by self-determination theory before the presentation of the research.

Within its motivation model, self-determination theory proposes three basic constructs of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Some sub-types of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations are also proposed.

One of the basic types of motivation is *extrinsic motivation*. Externally motivated people engage in the activities they do for some outcomes separate from them. This type of motivation falls into four different categories: external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation. *External regulation* refers to the least autonomous form of extrinsic motivation. Externally regulated behaviours were performed because of external sources such as getting a reward or avoiding a punishment. *Introjected regulation* is a more self-determined type of extrinsic motivation than external regulation. The basic reasons of introjected regulated behaviours are to avoid shame and guilt or to attain esteem and self-worth. *Identified regulation* is related to the activities done since they are found personally valuable, important, and useful by the people. *Integrated regulation* is the most autonomous type of extrinsic motivation. It refers to choiceful behaviours which are fully assimilated with individuals' other values, needs and identity ((Ryan & Deci, 2000a; Dörnyei, 2001, p.28).

The second of the basic motivation types is *intrinsic motivation*. Intrinsically motivated behaviours are performed by people for their own sakes and for the satisfaction from participating in them (Pelletier, Tuson, Green-Demers, Noels & Beaton, 1998). This type of motivation is divided into three sub-categories; intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish, and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. *Intrinsic motivation to know* refers to doing an activity for the pleasure of gaining knowledge and exploring new ideas. *Intrinsic motivation to accomplish* refers to the good feeling of mastering a challenging task. *Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation*

refers to engagement in activities for the enjoyment, fun, or excitement inherent in them (Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Briere, Senécal & Vallieres, 1992). *Amotivation*: Amotivation means a lack or absence of motivation. Amotivated people do not see any relationships between the behaviours they do and their outcomes (Ratelle, Guay, Vallerand, Larose & Senécal, 2007).

More autonomous motivation types are regarded to be superior to less autonomous ones in terms of their contributions to the well being, development, and achievement of people (Deci & Ryan, 1985a). Below, the methodology, participants, instruments, procedure, results and findings, implications and suggestions of the study will be presented.

II. Methodology

The data of this study was drawn from the PhD thesis of the researcher (Yeşilyurt, 2008) and the topic of it reflects a dimension of that thesis. By this study, it was intended to reinterpret and convey the findings related to this dimension. It was designed as a descriptive research which investigated its topic by collecting quantitative data from the participants. The purpose of the present study was to discover the relationship between the motivational patterns and autonomy-support perceptions of the university English language department students in writing classes from a self-determination theory perspective. Below, the procedure of the study is explained in detail. Firstly, the participants and instruments of the research are described; secondly, the data collection procedure is explained; and, finally, the analysis of the collected data is introduced.

A. Participants

The participants of this study were 275 preparatory and first year English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature students from the Education and Arts and Humanities faculties of Atatürk University who were taking writing courses in their departments during the data collection process. Over 85% of the preparatory and first year students at the two departments participated in the research. The reason for limiting the research to the preparatory and first year students was that only they were taking writing classes at the time of the administration of the survey.

Below, the participants are introduced according to their distribution by departments, day-time/evening classes, grades and genders. This distribution is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of participants according to their departments, day-time/evening classes, grades, and genders

Department	ELL				ELT							
	Day-time				Evening				Day			
Grade	Prep.		First		Prep.		First		Prep.		First	
Gender	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
	33	6	56	13	20	12	53	7	29	6	33	7
	39		69		32		60		35		40	
	108				92				75			
	200				75							
Total	275											

(Yeşilyurt, 2008, p. 76)

Note: F: Female, M: Male

As is seen in Table 1, most of the participants, 162 females and 38 males, were from the English Language and Literature Department. There are two major reasons of the difference between the numbers of the participants from the two departments. The first reason is that the number of the students of this department has been much greater than that of the English Language Teaching Department in recent years. The second reason is that whereas English Language and Literature Department has evening classes for every grade of students, English Language Teaching Department has no evening classes at the levels of first, second, and third grades. Among the participants from the ELL Department, 89 females and 19 males were day-time class students; and 73 females and 19 males were evening class students. As for the age range of the participants, they were between 17 and 22. However, most of them were, 63%, either 19 or 20 years old.

B. Instruments

In this study, the data were collected through two different scales: the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale and the Writing Motivation Scale. These instruments are described below.

1. The Perceived Autonomy Support Scale

This scale was used to measure the participants' perceptions of the autonomy support provided to them by their writing instructors. It was tried to explore if they were given the rights to tell their opinions freely, to choose the topics or activities in writing classes, if they feel under pressure about the deadlines or accuracy of the assignments, if they are provided with enough informative feedback, if they have the opportunity to have an effective and sufficient interaction with the instructors, etc. For this purpose, 14 items were

formed in the scale (see Yeşilyurt, 2008). The items were formed after a review of the related scales used in previous studies (e.g. Assor, Kaplan & Roth, 2002; Black & Deci, 2000; Chan, 2003; Ntoumanis, 2001; Williams & Deci, 1996; Williams, Saizow, Ross & Deci, 1997). The items taken from these studies were adapted to both the focus and context of the study.

A five-point Likert scale was used in the questionnaire. The participants were asked to mark the number which best corresponded to their opinions. In the scale, 1 referred to “Strongly Disagree”, 2 to “Disagree”, 3 to “Moderately Agree”, 4 to “Agree”, and 5 to “Strongly Agree”. The items with negative statements were reversely scored.

2. The Writing Motivation Scale

This instrument was used to determine the motivational orientations of the participants in writing classes from the perspective of the self-determination theory. The scale was designed through some adaptations from the self-regulation or learning motivation questionnaires used in the studies of L2 teaching/learning (e.g., Noels et al., 2000; Vandergrift, 2005) or completely different disciplines (e.g., Baldwin & Caldwell, 2003; Black & Deci, 2000; Deci, Hodges, Pierson & Tomassone, 1992; Ryan & Connell, 1989; Vallerand et al., 1992; Williams and Deci, 1996) with permissions from the researchers who had designed or used them before.

The Writing Motivation Scale (see Yeşilyurt, 2008) included 33 items falling into three basic and six sub-dimensions. Amotivation, extrinsic motivation (external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation) and intrinsic motivation (knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation) types of the participants were measured by this scale. In the scale, the 1st, 8th, 15th, 22nd, 27th and 32nd items belonged to the amotivation subscale; 2nd, 9th, 16th, 23rd, 28th and 33rd to external regulation subscale; 3rd, 10th, 17th, 24th and 29th to introjected regulation subscale; 4th, 11th, 18th, 25th and 30th to identified regulation subscale; 5th, 12th and 19th to intrinsic motivation for knowledge subscale; 6th, 13th, 20th and 26th to intrinsic motivation for accomplishment subscale; and 7th, 14th, 21st and 31st to intrinsic motivation for stimulation subscale. The same five-point Likert scale was used in this questionnaire as well.

To measure the reliability of the scales, a pilot application was carried out with 40 participants. The reliability coefficients were found as $\alpha=0.84$ for the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale and $\alpha=0.82$ for the Writing Motivation Scale. Since the reliability levels were evaluated to be high enough, the scales were used in the main study with no alterations.

3. Procedure

The data of this study was gathered during the regular classes of the participants in the first semester of the 2007-2008 Academic Year. The questionnaires were applied after the written permissions had been taken from

the administrations of the two faculties. It took nearly 35 minutes to respond to the questionnaires. After the completion of the data collection procedure, the data, in line with the purposes of the study, were analyzed by a statistical program for social sciences (SPSS for Windows).

III. Results and Findings

The data of this study were analyzed through the statistical program SPSS 16.00. By the help of this program, minimum and maximum scores, means and standard deviations of the scales were computed and correlation analyses between these scales were carried out. In this section, firstly, the participants' perceived autonomy support levels and different motivation patterns will be analyzed. As explained above, the data related to participants' perceived autonomy support and motivational patterns were collected by the Perceived Autonomy Support and the Writing Motivation Scale. The Writing Motivation Scale was used to determine the motivational profiles of the participants from the perspective of SDT, which investigates motivation in the categories of amotivation, extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation, and in the sub-types of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations whereas the Perceived Autonomy Support was used to find out participants' perceptions of the autonomy support provided by their writing instructors. Whereas an overall mean for the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale was measured, the same process was not carried out for the Writing Motivation Scale since different types of motivation have not been considered to be additive but different degrees of a continuum in self-determination literature (Calder & Staw, 1975; Deci and Ryan, 1985a).

In Table 2, minimums and maximum scores, means, and standard deviations of the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale and subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale, amotivation, extrinsic motivation (different regulatory types of it) and intrinsic motivation (its three different types) are shown.

Table 2. Minimum and maximum scores, means and standard deviations for the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale and subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	S. D.
Perceived Autonomy Support	275	1,29	4,93	3,54	0,58
Amotivation	275	1,00	4,33	1,99	0,58
Extrinsic Motivation	275	1,88	4,69	3,23	0,51
External Regulation	275	1,00	4,50	2,74	0,69
Introjected Regulation	275	1,80	5,00	3,35	0,60
Identified Regulation	275	1,80	5,00	3,68	0,56
Intrinsic Motivation	275	1,55	5,00	3,67	0,72
Intrinsic Motivation– Knowledge	275	1,67	5,00	3,81	0,76
Intrinsic Motivation– Accomplishment	275	1,75	5,00	3,85	0,72
Intrinsic Motivation– Stimulation	275	1,00	5,00	3,39	0,88
Valid N	275				

In this section, firstly, the analysis of the data obtained through Perceived Autonomy Support Scale will be introduced, and then the findings related to different motivational patterns of the participants will be conveyed. As seen in the table, considering that the highest possible score from this scale was 5, the overall perceived autonomy support level of the participants may be regarded to be high. This may mean that the participants, in general, had positive perceptions of the autonomy support provided by their writing instructors. Besides the overall mean of the scale, means for each item were also found in order to analyze their perceptions of different aspects of writing classes such as having right to choose the objectives, activities, materials, methods and topics; the opportunity to ask questions and express their thoughts freely; the flexibility about the deadlines of the writing assignments; and, the chance to plan, be responsible for and evaluate their own learning during the writing instruction process. The means for each item in the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Minimum and maximum scores, means and standard deviations for the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	S. D.
Item 1	275	1.00	5.00	3.48	1.03
Item 2	275	1.00	5.00	3.05	1.04
Item 3	275	1.00	5.00	2.94	1.10
Item 4	275	1.00	5.00	3.48	1.02
Item 5	275	1.00	5.00	4.28	0.89
Item 6	275	1.00	5.00	3.28	1.05
Item 7	275	1.00	5.00	3.53	1.06
Item 8	275	1.00	5.00	3.66	1.08
Item 9	275	1.00	5.00	3.71	1.00
Item 10	275	1.00	5.00	3.55	1.01
Item 11	275	1.00	5.00	4.13	0.88
Item 12	275	1.00	5.00	3.61	1.02
Item 13	275	1.00	5.00	3.77	0.96
Item 14	275	1.00	5.00	3.03	1.17
Mean	275	1.29	4.93	3.54	0.58
Valid N	275				

As seen in the table, the lowest scored items of the scale are the 2nd, 3rd and 14th ones. These items were related to participants' perceptions of autonomy in deciding on the writing activities, choosing the materials to be used, and the pressure they felt about the accuracy of the tasks. The means for these items were 3.05, 2.94, and 3.03 respectively. On the other hand, the highest means belonged to the 5th, 9th, 11th and 13th items which were scored 4.28, 3.71, 4.13, and 3.77 by the participants. These items included the statements related to participants' opportunity to tell their opinions in the classroom, the flexibility about the deadlines of the assignments, asking questions to their teachers freely, and being responsible for their own learning. As can be understood from Table 3, the scores, ranging from 3.28 to 3.66, of the other items were similar to each other.

Depending on the findings obtained from this scale, it can be claimed that students, in particular, in their interactions with their instructors, feel autonomous rather than controlled in writing classes. They do not feel under pressure and they have freedom to convey their thoughts and feelings to their teachers and classmates. On the contrary, it is also possible to argue that they do not find themselves autonomous enough in other aspects of writing classes such as deciding on the materials and activities. However, from these findings, it can be concluded that the students who participated in this research perceive the classroom climate of their writing classes generally as autonomy supportive. In

the following paragraphs of this section, a description of the data collected by the Writing Motivation Scale will be given.

Among the subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale, the amotivation subscale has the lowest mean (1.99). Low mean of the scores given to the items of this subscale points to a relatively high motivation of the participants for writing classes. The means of the other subscales were found to be significantly higher than amotivation.

Among the other subscales, the one whose mean was closest to that of amotivation is the external regulation sub-dimension of extrinsic motivation type. With its mean of 2.74, external regulation is the second lowest scored type of motivation. As explained in *Introduction*, externally regulated behaviours are performed by people because of some external forces such as attaining a reward or avoiding a punishment. Namely, such behaviours depend on the existence of rewards or punishments. Therefore, externally regulated behaviours may be quitted as soon as these reasons disappear.

Depending on the mean of this subscale, it can be claimed that the participants' reasons for writing classes are not much external. In other words, they do not, generally, write for the extraneous reasons such as showing others how good they are at writing in English, avoiding trouble, being supposed to do it, obeying a rule, leading the teacher to say nice things about them, and getting a reward, etc.

The second regulatory type of extrinsic motivation in the Writing Motivation Scale was introjected regulation. This type of extrinsic motivation of the participants was measured by the items stating reasons such as believing in the necessity of writing for successful language learning, wishing to impress the teachers and classmates, feeling of proud, avoidance of feeling bad, etc. The mean of the scores of these items was found to be 3.35. According to this figure, it can be said that introjected regulation is more effective in writing classes than external regulation.

Among the extrinsic motivation types, identified regulation was scored highest by the participants (M: 3.68). The reasons such as seeing writing as a good way of gaining skills in other areas of language learning, getting better at writing, maintaining good relationships with classmates, and determining the level of proficiency in writing were the mostly adopted extrinsic reasons for doing the activities in English writing classes by the participants. The levels of extrinsic motivation types get higher (introjected= 3.35; identified regulation= 3.68) as they get closer to the most autonomous end of extrinsic/intrinsic motivation continuum. In addition, the average of the means of these three extrinsic motivation types (regulation types) was calculated to be 3.23. This may refer to an existence of external reasons for doing the activities in writing classes.

The second main type of motivation investigated in this study was intrinsic motivation. For the analysis of this type of motivation of the

participants in writing classes, a general mean and means for each subtype (intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish, and intrinsic motivation for stimulation) were calculated. The mean of intrinsic motivation was found to be 3.67. This mean may be considered significantly higher than that of extrinsic motivation given above. This can be given as an indication of that the reasons inherent in the writing activities themselves are perceived as more important by the participants than those which are external to them.

Among the three subscales of intrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation for accomplishment, carrying out the activities in writing classes for reasons such as the contribution of carrying out hard writing tasks to the improvement of the performance in writing, the pleasure felt in perfecting the abilities in L2 writing, the good feeling when performing in writing better than expected, and the personal satisfaction for mastering difficult writing activities, was scored highest (M: 3.85) by the participants. Intrinsic motivation for knowledge, for the feeling of satisfaction, pleasure or excitement in learning or exploring new things, was second highest (M: 3.81) scored intrinsic motivation type. The lowest (M: 3.39) scored intrinsic motivation type was the intrinsic motivation for stimulation which refers to the feelings of happiness, joy, excitement, interest, fun, etc. during any writing activity. From these means, it can be inferred that the intrinsic motivation of the participants for writing classes is primarily based on their desire to accomplish, to know, and lastly, to experience stimulation.

However different motivational patterns of the participants in writing classes were analyzed separately above, it should also be noted that these motivational patterns are the parts of the same continuum. There are not exact borders between them and they are not contradictory to each other. In addition, they may simultaneously exist in a person. They may usually be intercorrelated to each other as well.

The correlations among amotivation, extrinsic motivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation for knowledge, intrinsic motivation for accomplishment, and intrinsic motivation for stimulation subscales and their correlations with the perceived autonomy support levels of the participants are illustrated in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale and subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale and intercorrelations among them

Subscales	Subscales												
	M	S.D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1.PAS	3.54	.58	1										
2.A.M.	1.99	.58	-.29**	1									
3.EM	3.23	.51	.19**	-.13*	1								
4.Ext.R.	2.74	.69	-.01	.23**	.82**	1							
5.Int. R.	3.35	.60	.23**	-.23**	.91**	.61**	1						
6. Id. R.	3.68	.56	.33**	-.46**	.73**	.26**	.68**	1					
7.IM	3.67	.72	.37**	-.65**	.38**	-.05	.45**	.68**	1				
8.IM-Know.	3.81	.76	.30**	-.56**	.34**	-.03	.39**	.61**	.89**	1			
9.IM-Acc.	3.85	.72	.39**	-.55**	.41**	.01	.47**	.67**	.90**	.73**	1		
10.IM-Stim.	3.39	.88	.31**	-.64**	.29**	-.09	.37**	.59**	.93**	.75**	.72**	1	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Note: PAS.: Perceived Autonomy Support, A.M.: Amotivation, EM: Extrinsic motivation, Ext.R: External regulation, Int.R. Introjected regulation, Id.R: Identified Regulation, IM: Intrinsic Motivation, IM-Know.: Intrinsic Motivation for Knowledge, IM-Acc.: Intrinsic Motivation for Accomplishment, IM-Stim.: Intrinsic Motivation for Stimulation.

When the intercorrelations among different subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale were analyzed, it was seen that amotivation had significant negative correlations with the other subscales. Amotivation had positive correlation with only external regulation. The other subscales had significant positive correlations with each other. In this study, the main concern is the investigation of the correlation of perceived autonomy support levels of the participants with their different types of motivation. It is clearly seen from Table 4 that perceived autonomy support levels of the participants are significantly and negatively correlated with their amotivation levels. From this negative correlation between perceived autonomy support and amotivation, it can be concluded that perceived autonomy support has positive correlation with students' motivation in writing classes. In other words, it can be claimed that autonomy support in writing classrooms enhances students' motivation in writing classes.

As seen in the table, there is no significant correlation between perceived autonomy support of the participants and their external regulation levels. On the contrary, there are significant positive correlations between the general perceived autonomy support level and other subscales of the Writing Motivation Scale. However, the general intrinsic motivation mean has higher levels of positive correlations with the perceived autonomy support of the

participants than the general extrinsic motivation mean. Among the extrinsic motivation subscales, identified regulation has the strongest correlation with the perceived autonomy support levels. And, among the intrinsic motivation subscales, the subscale which has highest level of correlation with perceived autonomy support of the participants is intrinsic motivation for accomplishment. In brief, it can be stated that more autonomous types of motivation have stronger correlations with students' perceptions of the autonomy support in writing classes. From this finding, considering the previous research demonstrated the superiority of more self-determined types of motivations to more controlled ones (Reeve, 2002), it can be concluded that autonomy supportive learning climates enhance intrinsic motivations of the learners and, accordingly, their academic performances. Therefore, such climates should be well developed and supported.

IV. Implications and Suggestions

The findings of this study showed that there is a significant relationship between perceived autonomy support levels of the students in English writing classes and their motivation patterns for these classes. The relation between more autonomous motivation types and perceived autonomy support levels were found to be stronger than the one between less autonomous motivation types and perceived autonomy support levels of the participants.

Depending on these findings, it is possible to state that autonomy supportive teaching practices and classroom climates enhance students' motivations, especially intrinsic motivations, in writing classes. Developing such practices and learning climates would facilitate their attendance to writing classes and participation in writing activities more and result in better academic outcomes. Therefore, writing instructors should provide students with enough autonomy to choose the objectives, activities, materials, methods and topics; to ask questions and express their thoughts freely; to have the flexibility about the deadlines of the writing assignments; and, the chance to plan, be responsible for and evaluate their own learning during the writing instruction process.

In the future, some researches may be conducted with both writing teachers and students to determine specific strategies of providing effective autonomy support in writing classes.

Özet : Bu çalışmada, İngilizce bölümü öğrencilerin İngilizce yazma derslerindeki güdülenme türleri ile bu derslerdeki algılanan özerklik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin öz-belirleme kuramı bakış açısına göre incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Elde edilen verilerin çözümlenmesi sonucunda, katılımcıların algılanan özerklik desteği düzeyleri ile farklı güdülenme türleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Veri çözümlenmeleri, özerklik düzeyi daha yüksek güdülenme türleri ile algılanan özerklik desteği arasındaki ilişkinin özerklik düzeyi daha düşük olan güdülenme türleri ile algılanan özerklik desteği arasındaki ilişkiyi daha güçlü olduğunu göstermiştir.

Öz-belirleme kuramı üzerine yapılmış çalışmaların hemen hemen hepsinin içsel güdülenme türlerinin dışsal olanlara göre akademik başarı üzerinde daha etkili olduğunu gösterdiğini düşünürsek, sonuç olarak, öğrenme ortamındaki özerklik desteğinin artırılmasının öğrencilerin içsel güdülenmeleri ve dolayısıyla da onların yazma derslerindeki başarılarını artırmada etkili olacağını söyleyebiliriz.

Anahtar sözcükler: Öz-belirleme kuramı, güdülenme türleri, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce’de yazma, algılanan özerklik desteği, içsel güdülenme, dışsal güdülenme, güdülenme yoksunluğu

References

- Assor, Avi & Kaplan, Haya, “Mapping the Domain of Autonomy Support: Five Important Ways to Enhance or Undermine Students’ Experience of Autonomy in Learning”, *Trends and Prospects in Motivation Research*, pp. 101-120, 2001.
- Assor, Avi, Kaplan, Haya & Roth, Guy, “Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviors predicting students’ engagement in schoolwork”, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 261-278, 2002.
- Assor, Avi, Kaplan, Haya, Kanat-Maymon, Yaniv & Roth, Guy, “Directly controlling teacher behaviors as predictors of poor motivation and engagement in girls and boys: The role of anger and anxiety”, *Learning and Instruction*, Vol. 15, pp. 397-413, 2005.
- Baldwin, Cheryl K. & Caldwell, Linda L., “Development of the Free Time Motivation Scale for Adolescents”, *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 129-151, 2003.
- Black, Aaron E. & Deci, Edward L., “The effects of instructors’ autonomy support and students’ autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory perspective”, *Science Education*, Vol. 84, pp. 740-756, 2000.
- Chan, Victoria, “Autonomous Language Learning: the teachers’ perspectives”, *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 33-54, 2003.
- Deci, Edward L., Betley, Gregory, Kahle, James, Abrams, Linda & Porac, Joseph, “When Trying to Win: Competition and Intrinsic Motivation”, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 79-83, 1981.
- Deci, Edward L., Hodges, Rosemary, Pierson, Louisa & Tomassone, Joseph, “Autonomy and competence as motivational factors in students with learning disabilities and emotional handicaps”, *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Vol. 25, pp. 457-471, 1992.
- Deci, Edward L. & Ryan, Richard M., *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*, New York: Plenum, 1985a.

- , "The General Causality Orientations Scale: Self-determination in personality", *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 19, pp. 109-134, 1985b.
- , "A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality" In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237-288), Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, *Teaching and Researching Motivation*, Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.
- Noels, Kimberly A., "New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation", In Zoltán Dörnyei & R. Smith (Eds.), *Motivation and second language learning* (pp. 43-68), Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001a.
- , "Learning Spanish as a Second Language: Learners' Orientations and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Communication Style", *Language Learning*, Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 107-144, 2001b.
- Noels, Kimberly A., Clément, Richard & Pelletier, Luc G., "Perceptions of Teachers' Communicative Style and Students' Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation", *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 83, pp. 23-34, 1999.
- Noels, Kimberly A., Pelletier, Luc G., Clément, Richard & Vallerand, Robert J., "Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory", *Language Learning*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 57-85, 2000.
- Ntoumanis, Nikos, "A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in physical education", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 71, pp. 225-242, 2001.
- Pelletier, Luc G., Fortier, Michelle S., Vallerand, Robert J. & Brière, Nathalie M., "Associations Among Perceived Autonomy Support, Forms of Self-Regulation, and Persistence: A Prospective Study", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 279-306, 2001.
- Pelletier, Luc G., Tuson, Kim M., Green-Demers, Isabelle, Noels, Kimberly & Beaton, Ann M., "Why Are You Doing Things for the Environment? The Motivation Toward the Environment Scale (MTES)", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp. 437-468, 1998.
- Ratelle, Catherine F., Guay, Frédéric, Vallerand, Robert J., Larose, Simon & Senécal, Caroline, "Autonomous, Controlled, and Amotivated Types of Academic Motivation: A Person-Oriented Analysis", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 99, No. 4, pp. 734-746, 2007.
- Reeve, Johnmarshall, "Self-determination theory applied to educational settings", In E.L. Deci & R.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 183-203). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2002.

- , "Teachers as Facilitators: What Autonomy-Supportive Teachers Do and Why Their Students Benefit", *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 106, No. 3, pp. 225-237, 2006.
- Reeve, Johnmarshall, Jang, Hyungshim, Carrell, Dan, Jeon, Soohyun & Barch, Jon, "Enhancing Students' Engagement by Increasing Teachers' Autonomy Support", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 147-169, 2004.
- Ryan, Richard M. & Connell, James P., "Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 57, pp. 749-761, 1989.
- Ryan, Richard M. & Deci, Edward L., "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 54-67, 2000a.
- , "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 68-78, 2000b.
- Vallerand, Robert J., Pelletier, Luc G., Blais, Marc R., Briere, Nathalie M., Senécal, Caroline B. & Vallières, Évelyne F., "The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 52, pp. 1003-1017, 1992.
- Vandergrift, Larry, "Relationships among Motivation Orientations, Metacognitive Awareness and Proficiency in L2 Listening", *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 70-89, 2005.
- Vansteenkiste, Maarten, Zhou, Mingming, Lens, Willy & Soenens, Bart, "Experiences of Autonomy and Control Among Chinese Learners: Vitalizing or Immobilizing?" *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 97, No. 3, pp. 468-483, 2005.
- Williams, Geoffrey C. & Deci, Edward L., "Internalization of biopsychosocial values by medical students: A test of self-determination theory", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 767-779, 1996.
- Williams, Geoffrey C., Saizow, Ronald, Ross, Lisa & Deci, Edward L., "Motivation underlying career choice for internal medicine and surgery", *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 45, pp. 1705-1713, 1997.
- Yeşilyurt, Savaş, 2008, *A Self-Determination Approach to Teaching Writing in Pre-Service EFL Teacher Education*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Erzurum: Atatürk University, The Institute of Social Sciences.
- Zuckerman, Miron, Porac, Joseph, Lathin, Drew, Smith, Raymond & Deci, Edward L., "On the Importance of Self-Determination for Intrinsically-Motivated Behavior", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 443-446, 1978.