

Motivation in Higher Instrumental Education: A Survey with Music Teacher Candidates in Turkey

Gökhan ÖZTÜRK¹

Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University

Abstract

Current research shows that more systematic studies are needed on how or why the motivation phenomenon occurs in musical contexts. Further research with different socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics in different countries and geographical regions may provide important information to help explain the relationship between instrument training and motivation. In this context, the study aims to examine the motivation of a group of music teacher candidates and their relationships with various variables. The study was carried out in Turkey, at a public university and in a city that differs from many others in terms of socio-economic structure and dynamics. The study group consisted of students (N=86) enrolled in the Music Teacher Training Program at the university. The data were collected with the advisor database, demographic data form, and ‘The Motivation Scale for Individual Instrument Course’ developed by Girgin (2015). To analyze the data, frequency and percentage distribution, t-test, Mann-Whitney U, ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, and Spearman’s Correlation were used. The results showed that the students’ motivation levels of the individual instrument lesson were high-level in the dimensions of amotivation and success motivation and medium-level in the dimension of study motivation. The general motivation was high-level. There were not any significant differences between the general motivation and the variables of gender, grade level, and graduated high school. On the other hand, it was determined that the motivation scores differed significantly in favor of the groups that choosing the instrument voluntarily and devoted more time to practice the instrument. It was found that there was a positive correlation between motivation and course success. The results were discussed within the framework of the corporate culture and the socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics of the city and the students.

Keywords: Music Teacher Candidates, Musical Instrument Training, Motivation

DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2020.270.4

¹Asst. Prof., Faculty of Fine Arts, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1667-3758>

Correspondence: gokhan.ozturk@ibu.edu.tr

Introduction

Although there are different classifications (for more detail see Ballantyne & Packer, 2004; MEB, 2008; Uçan, 2006), competence fields of the music teaching profession are classified in four categories: a) content field knowledge, b) musical behavior styles, c) teaching knowledge, and d) teaching professional knowledge (Kalyoncu, 2005). Instrument training has a significant role in the acquisition of musical behavior styles that have a predominant place in this classification. The act of playing that is at the center of instrument training and base on the brain-body relationship requires interactive use of cognitive, perceptual, operational, and affective skills (Büyükkaksoy, 1997; Davidson, Faulkner, & McPherson, 2009; Smith, 2005). In this sense, instrument training is a 'difficult' field where the teaching of complex behaviors related to an instrument is targeted.

Success in instrument training depends on various common factors that are valid for other fields of education. These factors are described as attitude, anxiety, self-confidence, readiness, pre-learning, curriculum, learning content, educational environments, teaching materials, teacher, etc. (Feldman, 1997; Ormrod, 2013; Sichivitsa, 2007; Slavin, 2006). In addition to these factors, especially motivation is another important psychological factor that affects success in instrument training. In this study, the phenomenon of motivation in instrument training in the context of music teacher education is examined. For this purpose, in the conceptual framework; motivation, motivation in the learning-teaching process, instrument training-motivation relationship, and related research are presented with an overview from the perspective of educational psychology.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Many definitions of motivation have been formulated over the years. In general, motivation is defined as "various internal and external factors that push the organism into behavior, determine the regularity and continuity of these behaviors, give direction and purpose to behavior, and mechanisms that ensure their functioning" (Aydın, 2007, p. 195). In line with the bio-physiological and socio-psychological needs and desires of the individual, the motivation that has the power to initiate, direct and maintain the behavior (Alderman, 2004) is classified as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation according to an accepted approach. Intrinsic motivation arises when the individual performs a job, activity, or behavior that concerns him for reasons such as having fun, pleasure, enjoyment, benefiting, satisfaction, etc. (Duy, 2012; Feldman, 1997; Ormrod, 2013). Intrinsic motivation can direct behavior without the expectation of reward. Intrinsic motivation, an important driving force in the qualifications and processes that characterize human development such as growth and adaptation, is also the source of lifelong learning (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002). Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, refers to the individual's behavior to receive incentives such as reward-praise, to satisfy his/her social environment, or to avoid punishment (Duy, 2012; Slavin, 2006; West, 2013).

Motivation, as can be understood from the classification, is a multi-dimensional and complex phenomenon associated with many individual and environmental factors. For this reason, motivation has been handled in different ways in theories of educational psychology origin that guide learning-teaching processes. According to behavioral learning theories, motivation is an external phenomenon that depends on reinforcers such as reward, feedback, and punishment (Alexander, 2015). According to cognitive learning theories, thoughts, and perceptions about our environment are an integral part of our motivated behaviors. Cognitive factors such as interest, expectation, values, goals, and attributions affect motivation (Evans, 2016; Maehr, Pintrich, & Linnenbrink, 2002; Ormrod, 2013). In this respect, motivation is an internal phenomenon according to cognitive learning theories (Bozanoğlu, 2004; Schunk, 2012). Social cognitive learning theory, on the other hand, takes motivation together with internal and external reinforcers. Learning takes place mostly in a social environment. People gain knowledge, rules, skills, strategies, beliefs, and attitudes by observing others. They learn the usefulness, appropriateness, and results of modeled behaviors from role-models. In this process, individuals act according to their capacities and beliefs about the results of their behavior (Eryaman & Genc, 2010; Schunk, 2012). In this context, motivation is related to both the person's trust in his/her thoughts, goals, abilities and the social environment according to the social cognitive learning theory (Alderman, 2004; Duy, 2012; Evans, 2016; Feldman, 1997).

It is known that the students' competences to feel and reflect their expectations and needs will be different, therefore they are motivated in different ways (Aydın, 2007). Individual's perception of competence in matters like the expectation of success, interest in learning, goals, state of achievement of goals, learning -which variables the individual attributes the past success and failure on-, and all the cognitions related to the 'why am I learning?' question determine the level of motivation (Bozanoğlu, 2004). The expectation and support of the social environment, such as family, peer, teacher, and school, are other important factors that determine the level of motivation. On the other hand, factors that form the learning environment such as teaching strategies, classroom activities, and teacher-student interactions also have a huge impact on motivation in the learning process (Çakmak, 2017). As Schunk (2012) put it, motivation makes learning easier. Some simple learning can also happen without motivation. However, a motivated individual exhibits many features such as more internalizing and preserving information in the learning process, using high-level cognitive skills, determination in complex and difficult tasks, continuing learning activity in case of failure, and long-term and effective work (Ormrod, 2013; Slavin, 2006). It is known that students who have expectations of human curiosity, such as the desire to research, discover, understand, and know, and who determine their learning environment, process, and content within certain limits are more willing to participate in learning-teaching activities and to continue to attend activities for a long time; and also their motivation is higher (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002). Indeed, research shows that there is a significant positive relationship between motivation and learning (Asmus, 1994; Asmus & Harrison, 1990;

Cantero & Jauset-Berrocal, 2017; Cheng & Southcott, 2016; Katzenmoyer, 2003; Maehr & Archer, 1985; Ormrod, 2013).

It is very difficult to explain the motivation relationship with any field of education in all aspects. This difficulty also applies to instrument training. Students have different individual features as well as some common ones. These individual differences in the learning-teaching process appear as intelligence, talent, creativity, past experiences, cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, interest, gender, learning style and speed, readiness to learn, etc. (Cheng & Southcott, 2016; Duy, 2012). In musical instrument training, with these differences, it is known that physical suitability and musical ability are individual characteristics specific to the field, and skills such as coordination, endurance, and flexibility come to the fore. The theoretical dimension of instrument training lessons and the predominantly centered performance require the teaching processes to be carried out with intense content. Especially for instrument training in professional music education programs, advanced technical knowledge, skills, and personalized teaching practices are needed. As emphasized in some studies (Austin, 1990; Davidson et al., 2009; Wan & Gregory, 2018), instrument training requiring skills such as creativity and problem-solving is a long-term process demanding enormous effort, dedication, and willpower both from the teacher and the student, in which tough and systematic work is mandatory. This is a process in which many students have difficulties and the affective characteristics influence/influenced (Hallam et al., 2012).

The motivational themed literature in instrument training emphasizes in-class learning-teaching processes and practice. Instrument lessons are mostly performed one to one by nature, and the communication and interaction between the student and the teacher are quite different from the collective lessons in the traditional structure. The quality of communication in instrument classes can deeply affect the cognitive and affective processes of the student such as motivation, attention, analysis (Turhal, Kalyoncu, & Keçeci, 2018). In other words, in-class communication in instrument training is an important source of motivation for the student (Colwell, Hewitt, & Fonder, 2018; Evans & Bonneville-Roussy, 2016; Katzenmoyer, 2003; McPherson & McCormick, 2000). The teacher is a determining factor in effective communication. A successful instrument teacher -in addition to being a role-model with his/her musicianship, technical-pedagogical-didactic knowledge, sampling, and creativity- should encourage students to participate in the lesson and be able to use motivational factors effectively during the lesson process (Gembris & Davidson, 2002; Barry & Hallam, 2002; Colwell et al., 2018; McPherson & McCormick, 2000). Supportive environments and positive feedback provided by instrument teachers are also known to be influential on motivation (Barry & Hallam, 2002; Tucker, 2018). However, research shows that instrument teachers have a dominant role in lessons and adopt a controlling style, mostly tend to build technical skills and create a certain repertoire, and focus on the product that is the outcome of the lesson rather than the learning-teaching process; and that they ignore accepted theories that emphasize the importance of active participation of

the student in the learning process. Although this authoritarian approach is motivating for some students, it results in negative effects such as less participation, low learning and low study motivation for most students, and impacts affective characteristics negatively (Evans & Bonneville-Roussy, 2016; Jørgensen, 2000). However, it is known that affective characteristics guide behavior and cognition (Evans & Bonneville-Roussy, 2016) and affect learning by 11% to 27% (Asmus, 1985, 1994; Bloom, 1995; Maehr & Archer, 1985). According to Cattell and Butcher (1968), approximately 25% of academic success can be explained with motivational factors (cited in Cattell, Barton, & Dielman, 1972, p. 35). The variability of success in music education can be attributed to motivation from 12% to 27% (Asmus, 1985; Chandler, Chiarella, & Auria, 1987). In this context, motivation is an element that should not be ignored by instrument teachers in in-class communication and interaction processes.

The practice is a common acceptance attributed to the acquisition of technical and musical skills in instrument training (Austin & Berg, 2006; Barry & Hallam, 2002; Barry & McArthur, 1994; Davidson et al., 2009; Evans, 2016; Jørgensen & Hallam, 2016; McPherson & McCormick, 2000). Providing musical memory gains such as improvisation, creativity, and the development of interpretation and fighting stage fear, practice is a complex phenomenon involving numerous physical and mental processes (Barry & Hallam, 2002; Barry & McArthur, 1994; Jørgensen & Hallam, 2016). In the practical process, besides the time devoted to attention, effort, endurance, patience, and study, it is important how students perceive themselves, their tasks and performances and how they structure the process (Büyükaksoy, 1997; Davidson et al., 2009; Hallam, 2001; Barry & Hallam, 2002; McPherson & McCormick, 2000; Oare, 2011; Wan & Gregory, 2018). Because the students who employ metacognitive instrument practice strategies specific to the field to set a goal, make mental preparation, schematize the piece, identify problematic passages, etc. have high rates of motivation and success (Austin & Berg, 2006; Hallam, 2001, 2006; Barry & Hallam, 2002; Kılınc, 2017; Nielsen, 1999; Pike, 2011). However, despite the opposite results (Barry & McArthur, 1994; Jørgensen, 2000), it is known that teachers do not take enough time to teach effective extracurricular strategies in instrument lessons (Barry & McArthur, 1994; Jørgensen, 2000; McPherson, 2005; Oare, 2011), students do not follow a consistent and structured approach in their practical process (Austin & Berg, 2006; Barry, 2007; Bilen, 2007; Davidson et al., 2009; Hallam, 2001) and need help in strategic work, which is an important source of motivation (Barry & Hallam, 2002; Jørgensen, 2000; Özmenteş, 2012). However, practice is a process that students go through alone, without the guidance of a teacher and isolated from the social environment, often monotonous, annoying, and likely to fail. In this process, students may also experience problems in efficiency and concentration (Evans, 2016; Evans & Bonneville-Roussy, 2016; Jørgensen, 2000; McPherson, 2005; McPherson, Davidson, & Evans, 2016). In summary, practice, which is both a necessity and a ritual for the player (Austin & Berg, 2006; Pike, 2011; Squires, 2017), is a challenging process for students and demands a high level of motivation (Davidson, Sloboda, & Howe, 1995; Evans, 2016; Evans & Bonneville-Roussy, 2016).

Ömür (2011) reminds that in the process of professional instrument training, the teachers hear sentences such as ‘I have difficulty in finding an empty room when I come to school’, ‘I don’t work hard enough for my instrument’, ‘I am talentless in playing an instrument’, ‘I think I will not be able to play this piece’, ‘I am a bad instrument student’ from students and he points out that each sentence refers to many individual and environmental variables that affect motivation in instrument training. Instrument teachers constantly encounter the motivation/amotivation problem emphasized by Ömür (Burak, 2014; Cheng & Southcott, 2016; Schmidt, 2005; Squires, 2017). It is known that this problem has been investigated for many years. In a scientific event organized with the theme of music, creativity, and motivation in the early 1980s, it is emphasized that the decrease in students’ participation and interest in music is a professional problem, empirical research on the relationship between motivation and music is insufficient and many different motivational sources can be effective in students’ orientation to music and success in the field of music (Austin & Vispoel, 1992; English, Knieter, & Lehman, 1983; Hodges, 2003; Zimmerman, 2005). Theoretical studies conducted after this date (Asmus, 1994; Evans, 2015, 2016; Hallam, 2002; Maehr et al., 2002; Martin, Collie, & Evans, 2016; McPherson & Zimmerman, 2002; Sichivitsa, 2001) and research conducted in different models (Asmus, 1985, 1986a, 1986b; Austin, 1988a, 1988b; Austin & Vispoel, 1992, 1998; Colwell et al., 2018; Davidson et al., 1995; Evans, 2009; Kwan, 2007; Legette, 1998; Sandene, 1997; Schmidt, 1995, 2005; Sichivitsa, 2007; Zimmerman, 2005) provide strong evidence that the motivation phenomenon in the context of music and instrument education is associated with many individual variables such as self-confidence, self-esteem, aptitude perception, past musical experiences, goals, use of cognitive, metacognitive, and self-regulation skills, internal attributes, practice habits and strategies as well as with many environmental variables such as teacher, family, sibling, peer, classroom atmosphere, goal structure, difficulty of task, academic and social integration, and corporate culture.

Literature Review

In the literature, it is seen that instrument training and motivation related studies are mostly carried out within the framework of modern motivation theories and approaches such as attribution, self-efficacy, self-determination, self-regulation, expectancy-value, flow. In a series of studies based on attribution theory, it is determined that the vast majority of students taking voice, choir, instrument, and general music education attribute their achievements in musical behavior to internal motivation sources such as effort and ability rather than external motivation sources such as luck or difficulty of the task (Asmus, 1985, 1986a, 1986b; Asmus, 1987, cited in Asmus, 1994, p. 21; Austin & Vispoel, 1998; Kwan, 2007; Schatt, 2011; Schmidt, 1995). Also in some studies, it is observed that students attribute their failures to motivational resources such as effective practice strategies, peer support, and teacher feedback (Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Chandler et al., 1987; Dick, 2006). Different studies focusing on music education (Burak, 2013; Legette, 1998; Schmidt, 1995) and instrument training (Austin, 1988a, 1988b; Dick, 2006; McPherson & McCormick, 2000; Özmenteş, 2012; Sandene,

1997) based on attribution theory provide similar findings. In studies that test the effect of musical self-confidence and positive/negative feedback attributes on motivation, decision-making processes and instrument success in learning-teaching processes designed according to competitive and individualized goal structures; it is seen that both purpose structures do not make a significant difference on success and motivation (Austin, 1988a; Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Dick, 2006), however, self-confidence and teacher feedback are effective on effort, ability, affective attributes, motivation and course success in instrument training (Austin, 1988a; Sandene, 1997), and students with a high-level of self-perception attribute their achievements to ability (Austin & Vispoel, 1998). There are also findings showing that students learn better and are motivated better internally in instrument learning-teaching environments designed according to cooperative goal structures rather than competitive or individualized goal structures (Schmidt, 2005). In research carried out from different theoretical perspectives, especially self-determination theory, it is emphasized that when students' competence, relatedness, and autonomy needs are met, and they are provided with environments that encourage the use of self-regulated and meta-cognitive strategies that encourage critical thinking by the teacher, the motivation of students in the context of instrument training increases, on the contrary cases the process fails (Alexander, 2015; Evans, 2009; Hallam, 2001; Legutki, 2010; MacIntyre & Potter, 2014; McPherson, Osborne, Barrett, Davidson, & Faulkner, 2015; McPherson & Zimmerman, 2002; Zimmerman, 2005).

The Aim of the Study

As can be understood from the summary of the literature, achievement and motivation increase when instrument training is designed with an approach that takes into account intrinsic motivation sources and when learning-teaching environments that meet the expectations of students are presented. Also, the influence of factors such as practice strategies, feedback, teaching methods, the purpose structure of the class on autonomy perception, and intrinsic motivation is obvious. Again, as emphasized in many studies, the teacher is one of the dynamics that have the power to control, change and direct these variables that affect motivation (Asmus, 1986b; Austin & Vispoel, 1998; Gembris & Davidson, 2002; Hallam, 2002; Pike, 2011; Sandene, 1997; Schmidt, 1995, 2005; Tucker, 2018; Zimmerman, 2005). Yet, music and instrument teachers tend to use more supervisory and external sources of motivation instead of pursuing strategies that support autonomy and intrinsic motivation in the teaching process (Legutki, 2010; McPherson, Miksza, & Evans, 2011). In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in motivational studies in instrument training, but the motivational factors surrounding instrument learning-teaching processes can be overlooked by related people and syllabi. The research has provided important information about the causes and consequences of motivational behavior. Nevertheless, more systematic studies are needed on how or why motivation occurs in musical contexts (Asmus & Harrison, 1990; Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Cantero & Jauset-Berrocal, 2017; Maehr et al., 2002; West, 2013). In addition, music motivation

models underline the impact of social and cultural backgrounds on musical behavior and motivation. Although motivation is a universal phenomenon, some environmental resources may not be universal. Most cultural differences reflected in the behavior of an individual are basically motivational differences. Motivation does not only reflect the individual's unique desires, but also the characteristics of the cultural and social structure and norms to which it is attached. In other words, culture and social structure are the elements that shape motivation (Morling & Kitayama, 2008). In this context, all the research that will be conducted with students with different socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics in different countries, different schools, and different geographical regions may provide important information to help explain the relationship between instrument training and motivation. Based on these opinions, the aim of the study is to examine the motivations of a group of music teacher candidates who are representatives of a certain socio-economic and socio-cultural structure towards the individual instrument training lesson. The results are mostly discussed within the framework of the dynamics of the research group and the city and the possible effects of corporate culture on the results are emphasized. The study is considered to be important in terms of addressing the phenomenon of motivation in instrument training from a different perspective that is not included in current research in national literature.

Method

Research Model

The research has been structured according to the single survey and relational survey models, both being general survey models. "General survey models are the survey arrangements made on the entire population or a group, sample or sampling taken from it, in a population consisting of many elements, to make a general judgment about the population. With general survey models, single or relational surveys can be done" (Karasar, 2014, p. 79). In this context, the answers to the questions, 'What is the motivation level of music teacher candidates for instrument lesson?', 'Does motivation level differ according to gender, graduated high school, grade level, choosing the instrument voluntarily and practice time of the instrument?' and 'Is there a significant relationship between motivation and instrument course success?', are sought in the study.

The Scope of the Research

The study was carried out with 86 students enrolled in the Music Teacher Training Program of a public university. The results are not generalizable since the research was conducted with a study group of limited participants. On the other hand, the results are comparable to the results of the research to be carried out in different cities and universities with the same or similar characteristics as the city and university where this research was conducted. The socio-economic and socio-cultural structure of the city where the research was carried out and the students as well as the possibilities and applications of the institution are presented below in a general summary.

The City

Located in the interior of the Central Black Sea Region, the city is very rich in historical heritage and cultural texture. It has a positive city image in terms of agriculture and agricultural products, natural beauty, security, cuisine, and climate structure. The people are most helpful, friendly, hospitable, and attached to their traditions (Sadaklıoğlu & Aşık, 2019). However, according to the SEGE (2013) and OKA (2014) Reports, the city differs from many cities in terms of dynamics and socio-economic structures such as employment, education, health, accessibility, quality of life, poverty, production, and income. The city, where the transformation from agriculture to the industry has not been sufficiently realized, is far below the average of the region and country in terms of gross domestic product and other indicators of socio-economic development (Barış, 2019). The young population migrates to different cities due to their low employment opportunities. However, the city receives immigration from the surrounding rural areas. Social recreation areas in the city are also insufficient (OKA, 2014).

The Study Group

According to the research of Kiraz (2015), the socio-economic levels of students who prefer the university in the city are very low. Students mostly have a nuclear family structure and generally come from the lower and lower-middle classes. Most of the students live in the houses they rent together with a group of 5-7 friends, due to the insufficient number of dormitories, and they spend a large part of their monthly income, which is concentrated between 200-400 Turkish Lira, on nutrition and accommodation, and almost no share for entertainment. Fathers are generally the bread-winners in the families of students. Mothers are mostly domestic workers, who do not have a social security. Descriptive features of the study group determined as research variable is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic features of the study group

Variables		N	%
Gender	Female	54	62.8
	Male	32	37.2
Grade level	Freshmen	17	19.8
	Sophomore	21	24.4
	Junior	26	30.2
	Senior	22	25.6
Graduated high school	Fine Arts High School	64	74.4
	Other high school types	22	25.6
Choosing the instrument voluntarily	Yes	73	84.9
	No	13	15.1
Weekly instrument practice time	1-5 hours	50	58.1
	6-10 hours	24	27.9
	11 hours and over	12	14.0

As seen in Table 1, 62.8% of the study group is female and 37.2% is male. 19.8% of the group is freshman, 24.4% sophomore, 30.2% junior, and 25.6% senior. 74.4% of the study group is

graduated from Fine Arts High School and 25.6% from other high school types. The proportion of those who chose their instruments voluntarily is 84.9% and those who do not choose voluntarily is 15.1%. 58.1% of the group practices with the instrument for 1-5 hours a week, 27.9% for 6-10 hours, 14% for 11 hours and over.

The Institution*

The number of academic staff in the music education institution where the research was carried out is relatively adequate in comparison to many other institutions in the context of the minimum requirements for effective teaching. There is at least one field specialist instructor with 10 or more years of experience in string instrument family (except contrabass), flute, and guitar branches. The shortcoming in the field of Turkish music instruments is covered with the support provided by the University's Turkish Music State Conservatory. Since its establishment, the institution has the lowest student quota in Music Teacher Training Programs in Turkey. In addition to 1 concert hall and 4 classrooms, it provides education in its own specially equipped building with approximately 50 practice rooms. Every two students have the opportunity to study in one practice room. In-studio lessons, combining the students is not observed, and instrument lessons are carried out one-to-one under the nature of the lesson. Exams are conducted by the commissions formed according to the instrument type. Concert activities, which have an important place in the development of music identity, enable teacher-student interaction, and have advantages such as role-models through the stage performance of the teacher, are carried out intensely with the influence of the academic incentive application. Another issue that the institution emphasizes is the instrument selection method. The choice of instruments in the institution is made primarily in line with the preferences of the students and it is guided by instructors according to the criteria such as physical fitness and accessibility. Also, students who do not have financial means to obtain a good instrument are provided with Turkish and Western instruments registered in the inventory of the institution without any time limit.

Data Collection Tools

In the research, The Motivation for Individual Instrument Classes Scale** (Girgin, 2015) and demographic data form were used. The motivation scale had a three-factor structure consisting of 25 items. Factors explained 53% of the total variance. Factor load values of the items in the scale were between .51 and .82; item-total correlation values ranged between .22 and .68. In the scale, there were 10 items in the 'amotivation' dimension; 10 items in the 'achievement motivation' dimension, and 5 items in the 'motivation for studying' dimension. Cronbach Alpha (α) values were reported as .90 for amotivation, .88 for achievement motivation, .76 for motivation for studying, and .77 for overall scale.

* The explanations regarding the corporate culture are based on the personal observation, experience and knowledge of the researcher during his administrative and academic duties in the same institution.

** The author would like to thank Demet Girgin for approving the scale used in the research.

In this study, Alpha values were calculated as .93 for the overall and amotivational dimension, .84 for achievement motivation dimension, and .86 for motivation for studying dimension. In the scale, a 5-point Likert-type rating, consisting of choices between 'I fully agree (5)...I never agree (1)' was used. The items in the amotivational dimension were reverse coded. In the scale, the lowest 25 points and the highest 125 points can be achieved. The scale can also be used in a singular dimension. Although the original text states that the scale has a one-dimensional structure, there is no information about under which title the points will be explained if the scale is used as one-dimensional. Therefore, in this study, 'General Motivation' title was used within the knowledge of Demet Girgin to express the scores obtained from the scale. The scores from each dimension and the overall scale are given separately in the results section. While interpreting the scores, the score range between 1.00-2.33 was used for low-level motivation, 2.34-3.66 for medium-level motivation, and 3.67-5.00 for high-level motivation. The demographic data form contained questions about the music teacher candidates' gender, grade level, graduated high school, weekly instrument practice time, and method of choosing instruments. The individual instrument course success scores of the study group were collected from the advisor database. Necessary permissions for the research were obtained from the relevant institution.

Data Analysis

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values from descriptive statistical techniques were calculated to determine the motivation levels of the music teacher candidates for individual instrument lessons. Statistical hypothesis tests were applied to determine the univariate normality assumption. For this purpose, Kolmogorov-Smirnov ($N > 30$) and Shapiro-Wilk ($N < 30$) statistics analytical test values and skewness-kurtosis values of each data group analyzed were examined. For the normality assumption, ± 1 , ± 1.5 , ± 1.96 , ± 2 , ± 3 , ± 3.29 values are recommended in the literature. In this study, the ± 2 approach (George & Mallery, 2019, p. 114-115) was taken into consideration in the examination of skewness and kurtosis values. T-test and ANOVA were applied for normally distributed data groups whereas Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were applied for non-normally distributed data groups. Spearman Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between motivation and success. For the level of significance $p < .05$ was taken as reference. In cases where the difference was significant in variance analysis, Fisher's LSD test, which is one of the multiple comparison tests, was used. Bonferroni adjustment ($p = \alpha/k = .05/3 = .017$) was made for the significance value in the LSD Test. In the results, where the difference between the binary groups was significant, the effect size, which is an indicator of practical meaningfulness, was examined. In the calculation of the effect size, Cohen's d (δ) formula was used for the t-test. Cohen's d value was interpreted according to small-up to 0.2, medium up to 0.5, large up to 0.8, very large up to 1.3 effect value criteria (Cohen, 1977; Sullivan & Feinn, 2012). For the Mann-Whitney U test, $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$ formula was used to calculate the effect size. The effect size value was interpreted according to .10=small,

.30=medium, and .50=large criteria (Cohen, 1977, p. 82). In the variance analysis, the eta square (η^2) formula which is a value for the variance estimated by the sample was used to determine the effect size in the results where the difference was significant. SPSS program was used for data analysis.

Results

In this chapter, there are 1) descriptive results regarding students' motivation levels of musical instrument lesson, 2) results that show whether motivation level differs according to gender, graduated high school, grade level, choosing the instrument voluntarily and instrument practice time; and 3) results showing the relationship between motivation and course success.

Descriptive Results Related to the Level of Motivation

Table 2. Descriptive results regarding the dimensions of the motivation scale

Dimensions	\bar{X}	sd	Level
Amotivation	4.22	.78	High
Achievement motivation	4.36	.49	High
Motivation for studying	3.44	.85	Medium
General motivation	4.12	.56	High

In Table 2, it can be seen that the students' amotivation dimension average score is $\bar{X}=4.22$, achievement motivation dimension average score is $\bar{X}=4.36$, and motivation for study dimension average score is $\bar{X}=3.44$. The general motivation score is $\bar{X}=4.12$. Considering that amotivation dimension scores were reverse coded; this result shows that students' level of motivation for studying is medium, whereas their amotivation, achievement motivation, and general motivation levels are high.

Results Regarding Motivation Scores According to Gender, Graduated High School, Grade Level, Choosing the Instrument Voluntarily and Instrument Practice Time

Table 3a. Mann-Whitney U test results according to gender and motivation scores

Dimension	Gender	N	\bar{X}_{rank}	Sum of ranks	U	p	r
Amotivation	Female	54	38.94	2102.5	617.5	.03*	.24
	Male	32	51.20	1638.5			

*p<.05

According to Table 3a, amotivation dimension scores of the students show a significant difference according to gender ($U=617.5$ $p<.05$). Considering the mean rank, female students' amotivation scores ($\bar{X}_{\text{rank}}=38.94$) are lower than male students ($\bar{X}_{\text{rank}}=51.20$). However, the effect size level for the difference is small ($r=.24$).

Table 3b. T-test results according to gender and motivation scores

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p	δ
Achievement motivation	Female	54	4.30	.50	84	-1.44	.15	---
	Male	32	4.45	.45				
Motivation for studying	Female	54	3.34	.83	84	-1.41	.16	---
	Male	32	3.61	.86				
General motivation	Female	54	4.02	.56	84	-2.07	.04*	.48
	Male	32	4.28	.53				

*p<.05

According to Table 3b, the students' achievement motivation ($t_{(84)}=-1.44$ $p>.05$) and motivation for studying ($t_{(84)}=-1.41$ $p>.05$) scores do not differ significantly by gender. In contrast, general motivation scores differ statistically by gender ($t_{(84)}=-2.07$ $p<.05$). The general motivation score of male students ($\bar{X}=4.28$) is higher than the average of female students ($\bar{X}=4.02$). The effect size for the difference is at medium-level ($\delta=.48$).

Table 4a. Mann-Whitney U test results according to graduated high school and motivation scores

Dimension	Graduated high school	N	\bar{X}_{rank}	Sum of ranks	U	p
Amotivation	Fine Arts High School	64	44.74	2863.50	624.5	.43
	Others	22	39.89	877.50		

According to Table 4a, amotivation scores of the students do not show a significant difference according to the graduated high school ($U=624.5$ $p>.05$).

Table 4b. T-test results according to graduated high school and motivation scores

Dimensions	Graduated high school	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Achievement motivation	Fine Arts High School	64	4.37	.49	84	.42	.68
	Others	22	4.32	.48			
Motivation for studying	Fine Arts High School	64	3.46	.85	84	.48	.63
	Others	22	3.36	.85			
General motivation	Fine Arts High School	64	4.14	.59	84	.54	.59
	Others	22	4.06	.48			

According to Table 4b, the students' achievement motivation ($t_{(84)}=.42$ $p>.05$), motivation for studying ($t_{(84)}=.48$ $p>.05$), and general motivation ($t_{(84)}=.54$ $p>.05$) scores do not differ significantly according to the graduated high school. When Tables 4a and 4b are evaluated together, the motivation levels of the Fine Arts High School graduates who started instrument training earlier and those who started instrument training mostly at university are close to each other.

Table 5a. Kruskal-Wallis test results according to grade level and motivation scores

Dimension	Grade level	N	\bar{X}_{rank}	df	χ^2	p
Amotivation	Freshmen	17	51.41	3	3.52	.32
	Sophomore	21	39.43			
	Junior	26	46.00			
	Senior	22	38.32			

According to Table 5a, amotivation scores of the students do not show a significant difference according to the grade level [$\chi^2_{(3)}=3.52$ $p>.05$].

Table 5b. ANOVA results according to grade level and motivation scores

Dimensions	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Achievement motivation	Between groups	.47	3	.16	.65	.57
	Within groups	19.63	82	.24		
	Total	20.09	85			
Motivation for studying	Between groups	2.63	3	.88	1.13	.30
	Within groups	58.48	82	.71		
	Total	61.15	85			
General motivation	Between groups	.90	3	.30	.95	.42
	Within groups	25.85	82	.32		
	Total	26.75	85			

According to the results in Table 5b, there is no significant difference between students' achievement motivation [$F_{(3,82)}=.65$ $p>.05$], motivation for study [$F_{(3,82)}=1.13$ $p>.05$], and general motivation [$F_{(3,82)}=.95$ $p>.05$] scores by grade level. The results in Tables 5a and 5b show that instrument course motivation does not differ significantly according to the grade level.

Table 6a. Mann-Whitney U test results according to choosing the instrument voluntarily and motivation scores

Dimensions	Choosing voluntarily	N	\bar{X}_{rank}	Sum of ranks	U	p	r
Amotivation	Yes	73	46.84	3419.50	230.5	.00	.32
	No	13	24.73	321.50			
General motivation	Yes	73	47.13	3440.5	209.5	.00	.34
	No	13	23.12	300.5			

* $p<.05$

According to Table 6a, amotivation ($U=230.5$ $p<.05$) and general motivation ($U=230.5$ $p<.05$) scores of the students show a significant difference according to their choosing the instrument voluntarily. When the mean rank is taken into account, amotivation ($\bar{X}_{rank}=46.84$) and general motivation ($\bar{X}_{rank}=47.13$) scores of the students who chose their instruments voluntarily are higher than amotivation ($\bar{X}_{rank}=24.73$) and general motivation ($\bar{X}_{rank}=23.12$) scores of the students who did not choose voluntarily. The effect size values related to the differentiation in amotivation ($r=.32$) and general motivation ($r=.34$) dimensions are at medium-level.

Table 6b. T-test results according to choosing the instrument voluntarily and motivation scores

Dimensions	Choosing voluntarily	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p	δ
Achievement motivation	Yes	73	4.44	.41	84	4.22	.00	1.09
	No	13	3.88	.60				
Motivation for studying	Yes	73	3.54	.78	84	2.85	.01	.78
	No	13	2.85	.97				

* $p<.05$

According to Table 6b, students' achievement motivation ($t_{(84)}=4.22$ $p<.05$) and motivation for studying ($t_{(84)}=2.85$ $p<.05$) scores differ significantly depending on their choosing the instrument voluntarily. In both sub-dimensions, achievement motivation ($\bar{X}=4.44$) and motivation for studying ($\bar{X}=3.54$) scores of the students who chose their instruments voluntarily are higher than achievement motivation ($\bar{X}=3.88$) and motivation for studying ($\bar{X}=2.85$) scores of the students who did not choose their instruments voluntarily. The effect size values for the difference in between indicate very high-levels ($\delta=1.09$) for achievement motivation and high-levels ($\delta=.78$) for motivation for studying.

Table 7a. Kruskal-Wallis test results according to instrument practice time and motivation scores

Dimension	Practice time	N	\bar{X}_{rank}	df	χ^2	p	η^2
Amotivation	1-5 hours	50	34.80	2	15.15	.00*	.16
	6-10 hours	24	53.60				
	11 hours and over	12	59.54				

* $p<.017$

In Table 7a, it is seen that there is a significant difference between amotivation scores of the students according to the practice time of the instrument [$\chi^2_{(2)}=15.15$ $p<.017$]. According to Fisher's LSD test result applied for identifying the source of the difference; the scores of the students who practice 1-5 hours ($\bar{X}_{\text{rank}}=34.80$) are statistically lower than those who practice for 6-10 hours ($\bar{X}_{\text{rank}}=53.60$) and 11 hours and over ($\bar{X}_{\text{rank}}=59.54$). Although the difference is not significant, again, the motivation points of the students who practice 6-10 hours are lower than those of the students who practice 11 hours and over. According to the eta square ($\eta^2=.16$) value showing the effect size; students' instrument practice time explains 16% of amotivation scores throughout the sample.

Table 7b. ANOVA results according to instrument practice time and motivation scores

Dimensions	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Achievement motivation	Between groups	2.60	2	1.30	6.17	.00	.13
	Within groups	17.49	83	.21			
	Total	20.09	85				
Motivation for studying	Between groups	22.30	2	11.15	23.84	.00	.36
	Within groups	38.81	83	.47			
	Total	61.11	85				
General motivation	Between groups	6.93	2	3.47	14.52	.00	.26
	Within groups	19.82	83	.24			
	Total	26.75	85				

* $p<.017$

In Table 7b, it is seen that there is a significant difference between students' achievement motivation [$F_{(2-83)}=6.17$ $p<.017$], motivation for studying [$F_{(2-83)}=23.84$ $p<.017$] and general motivation [$F_{(2-83)}=14.52$ $p<.017$] scores according to the practice time of the instrument. According to Fisher's LSD test result applied for identifying the source of the difference; the achievement motivation point averages of the students practicing 1-5 hours ($\bar{X}=4.22$) are statistically lower than the average of the

students practicing 11 hours and over ($\bar{X}=4.68$). On the other hand, motivation for studying point averages of the students who practice 1-5 hours ($\bar{X}=3.03$) are statistically lower than the average of those who practice 6-10 hours ($\bar{X}=3.84$) and those practicing 11 hours and over ($\bar{X}=4.35$). Similarly, the average motivation points of the students who practicing 1-5 hours ($\bar{X}=3.89$) are still lower than the average of the students practicing 6-10 hours ($\bar{X}=4.36$) and those practicing 11 hours and over ($\bar{X}=4.60$). According to eta square values; students' instrument practice time explains 13% of achievement motivation scores ($\eta^2=.13$), 36% of motivation for studying scores ($\eta^2=.36$), and 26% of general motivation scores ($\eta^2=.26$) throughout the sample.

Results Regarding the Relationship Between Motivation and Course Success

Table 8. Spearman Correlation (r_s) analysis results regarding motivation and course success scores

Dimensions	Course success			
	N	r_s	p	r_s^2
Amotivation	86	.53	.00*	.28
Achievement motivation	86	.39	.00*	.15
Motivation for studying	86	.51	.00*	.26
General motivation	86	.55	.00*	.30

*p<.05

According to the results in Table 8, there is a medium-level, significant and positive relationship between the instrument course success and amotivation ($r_s=.53$ p<.05), achievement motivation ($r_s=.39$ p<.05), motivation for studying ($r_s=.51$ p<.05) and general motivation ($r_s=.55$ p<.05) scores. Our result can be interpreted that the instrument course success and motivation affect each other and that the highly motivated students are more successful. Considering the determination coefficient respectively ($r_s^2=0.28/r_s^2=0.15/r_s^2=0.26/r_s^2=0.30$), it can be said that 28% of the variability in the course success is caused by amotivation, 15% from achievement motivation, 26% from motivation for studying, and 30% from general motivation or vice versa.

Conclusion and Discussion

Being conducted to determine the motivations of the music teacher candidates for individual instrument lessons and to examine their relationship with various variables; in this research, it is observed that a) the motivation levels of the candidates are high; b) motivation scores do not differ according to gender, graduated high school, and grade level, but differ significantly in favor of students who choose their instrument voluntarily and devote more time to practice the instrument and c) there is a positive and significant relationship between motivation and course success.

The literature provides different results on the subject. In the research conducted by Durgun (2018) with a group of music students, it was seen that the students have a high level of instrument motivation and their motivation scores did not differ according to the grade level. In Kurtuldu and

Aksu's (2015) study, it was found that the instrument motivation levels of the music teacher candidates were again high, but the motivation scores differed in the variables of grade level, graduation, and gender. According to the study, women had higher motivation than men, and graduates of Fine Arts High School also had higher motivation than other high school graduates, and motivation decreased as the grade level increases. In Erdem's (2013) study, it was revealed that motivation did not differ according to gender and graduated high school, however, the motivation of students who chose their instruments voluntarily was higher than students who did not choose voluntarily. In another study (Çalışkan, 2008), it was also found that musical instrument motivation did not change according to grade level; that the motivation scores did not differ in the interest, educational atmosphere, and environment sub-dimensions of the scale used in the research, but differed in the professional expectation sub-dimension; that women had higher motivation than men, graduates of Fine Arts High School had higher motivation than other high school graduates; and the students who choose their instruments voluntarily also had high-level motivation scores. Despite the different results presented, common conclusions have been reached in studies showing that there is a positive and significant relationship between instrument success and motivation (Çalışkan, 2008; Durgun, 2018; Kurtuldu & Aksu, 2015).

Based on the findings and results of the relevant research, it can be said that it is difficult to make strong predictions about the effect or role of some of the variables discussed to explain the motivation phenomenon in the context of instrument training. The question of gender differences, which has gained importance in the field of educational psychology since the 1970s (Santrock, 2018; Slavin, 2006) and is controversial (Lichtenfeld & Stupnisky, 2013; Martin, 2007; Wigfield & Eccles, 2002), remains uncertain in motivational studies in music education and instrument training (Burak, 2013, 2014; Legette, 1998; Martin et al., 2016; McPherson et al., 2015; Sandene, 1997; Schatt, 2011; Schmidt, 2005). Similar uncertainty applies to the grade level variable (Asmus, 1985, 1986a, 1986b; Burak, 2013; Kwan, 2007; Legette, 1998; Martin, 2007; Sandene, 1997; Schmidt, 1995). It is known that past musical experiences have positive effects on motivation regarding musical behavior (Asmus, 1987, cited in Asmus, 1994, p. 21; Sichivitsa, 2001). However, it is seen that some results (Çalışkan, 2008; Kurtuldu & Aksu, 2015) do not match with our result showing that the motivation scores of Fine Arts High School and other high school graduates do not differ. Despite these results, as seen in studies focusing on the effects of environmental factors such as peers, teachers, and families in instrument selection, the motivation of students who chose their instruments voluntarily and their tendency to pursue musical activities are higher than those who chose as a result of environmental pressures (Austin, 1990; Cantero & Jauset-Berrocal, 2017). Similarly, most research results highlight the positive and significant relationship between instrument practice behavior and motivation and success (Kılınç, 2017; Özmenteş, 2012; Wan & Gregory, 2018). According to some studies (Asmus, 1985, 1986a, 1994; Chandler et al., 1987), approximately 25% of the variability in success in music

education can be explained with motivation. In general terms; contrary to gender, grade level and graduated school variables, it is seen that the results are consistent with the study results that reveal the relationship between motivation and instrument course success, instrument choice method, and instrument study behavior.

In Turkey, Music Teacher Training Programs select the students with special aptitude exams that are the same or similar in terms of content and application form. In all these institutions, instrument training courses are conducted according to the Central Bachelor's Program for Music Teacher Training. In other words, contrary to the research results carried out especially from the perspective of attribution theory, variables of musical aptitude and curriculum may be insufficient singly to explain students' motivation for instrument lessons depending on the cultural structure and application differences in the education system. As Aydın (2007) stated, It should be emphasized that any theoretical approach cannot explain the behavior in all aspects and regardless of the socio-cultural context, human beings cannot be reduced to a single prototype that has a common feature in all conditions and periods. Therefore, besides the environmental variables such as the application of the curriculum, the field competence of the instrument teacher, the preferred teaching methods and approaches, the quality of the teaching-learning processes; the social and economic characteristics of the city and the study group, and the corporate culture, which represents the facilities, applications and educational environments offered to the students are especially considered to be important factors to explain the high level of motivation.

As explained in the method section, the city where the research is conducted differs from many others in terms of socio-economic structure and dynamics. The social and cultural activities offered by the city cannot fully meet the demands of university students, who come from different cities and different social backgrounds, and who have different expectations due to the identity naturally created by being 'university student'. However, the table in the method section, which summarizes the difficult living conditions of the study group, suggests that the 'economic strength' of students is not enough to participate in most of the city's social activities. This social integration problem between the city and the student results in the students spending more time in the institution where they study instead of the city. On the other hand, it can be said that the patriarchal-based socio-economic structure owned by the study group creates "a good future" anxiety among the music teacher candidates. University education, which constitutes an important step in professional socialization, actually means a 'future' for these students rather than a profession. Although research shows that music teachers in Turkey have to deal with some organizational problems, experience a certain level of burnout and do not experience a qualified professional socialization process in pre-service and in-service training (Kalyoncu, 2011; Korkmaz, 2004; G. Öztürk & Ö. Öztürk, 2019; Ö. Öztürk & G. Öztürk, 2019), the undesirable picture does not negatively affect the expectations and desires of the music teacher candidates to be included in the teaching profession. Because, despite all the negativities

in the context of the profession, both female and male students need this profession for their economic freedom. According to the expectancy-value theory; the value that a person places on a task affects the choice of task, the effort to be made, and motivation. An individual's answer to the question "Why should I join this profession?" may vary depending on cognitive and environmental factors. For example, the individual may choose to take part in a particular task, as he finds it encouraging or is valued by the culture in which he lives. In other words, factors in the social world can direct students' goals, preferences, and motivational beliefs (Schunk, 2012; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000, 2002). It is known that the factors that motivate the individual are quite complex, and the organization with which he is affiliated, along with economic and psycho-social factors, also plays a motivating role. Personal motives that determine the individual's desires and needs may change direction, lose or gain power over time with the effect of a social organization such as university (Şimşek, Çelik, & Akgemci, 2013). Many universities in Turkey are unable to fully meet the expectations of society and youth for different reasons, in other words, the ideal university concept that universities offer and students dream of does not match (Tural & Şahin, 2013). In contrast, unlike students enrolled in other programs of the university where the research is conducted (Kiraz, 2015), it is also taken into account that the majority of the research group consciously and willingly chose their institutions, it is thought that the goals and expectations of the students for music education and the ideal university education in their minds coincide, the promise of the 'future' offered by the Music Teacher Training Program and the more time spent in the institution strengthen the sense of belonging towards the institution and this connection affects the motivation positively.

As mentioned in the introduction, the research emphasizes the effect of the teacher on motivation. When a teacher's field competence, feedback, teaching approach, and the learning-teaching environment s/he offers are approved by students, students are motivated more. In addition, some elements such as instrument practice conditions, concert events, instrument quality, the way of structuring lessons and exams, instrument selection methods are also known to affect motivation. As can be remembered, in the study, it was found that the motivation scores differ significantly in favor of the students who chose their instruments with their preference, and the effect value of the difference between the general motivation scores was at the 'medium' level. This result shows that there is a relationship between motivation and musical instrument selection method. One of the most obvious differences between musicians is instrument selection. The instrument is part of the student's identity rather than a physical object (MacIntyre & Potter, 2014), and the choice of the instrument is often driven by intrinsic motivation (Driscoll, 2009). For this reason, it is important for the student to choose an instrument suitable for his/her personality, in the communication and interaction processes in the lesson, to maintain musical activities and motivation (Driscoll, 2009; McPherson et al., 2016; Turhal et al., 2018). On the other hand, music motivation models provide important information about motivational factors that affect musical behavior. For example, according to Hallam's (2002) model,

which examines the motivational factors in the process of starting and continuing instrument training, the interaction of personal goals and environmental factors affects the motivation and subsequent behavior of the student. Similarly, according to Sichivitsa's (2001) model, the individual's future goals and preferences, and his/her academic and social integration in the university education process, are the main motivational factors that affect musical behavior. The match between the goals determined by needs, expectations and interests and university education affects students' motivation positively. Another factor that has the power to influence motivation is corporate culture. It is known that effective schools develop a climate or 'culture' that supports academic success. The way schools are organized in terms of leadership, curriculum, administrative functioning, and teaching practices can affect students' productivity and motivation (Maehr & Archer, 1985). In this context, it can be said that the study group's future goals and preferences shaped by their social and cultural backgrounds and the opportunities and the student-oriented practices that the institution they study offers, in other words, the corporate culture described in the method section are matched and the social and academic integrations of the students are realized. It is thought that this situation positively affects motivation for instrument lessons, which has an important role in the acquisition of musical behavior styles and the development of professional identity perception.

In the study, two remarkable results related to each other were detected. Although it does not affect the general level of motivation, students' motivation for studying is at a medium-level (see Table 2). However, the motivation scores differ significantly according to the frequency of practice (see Table 7a and 7b). The *eta square* value determined regarding the meaningful difference between motivation for studying and practice behavior can be interpreted as a strong relationship between these two variables. It is possible to support these results with some studies (Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Chandler et al., 1987; Dick, 2006). There are many internal and external factors that affect practice behavior and motivation. For example, according to Hallam (2006), Kılınç (2017), and Squires (2017); many variables affect students' motivation to practice instruments such as the selection of instruments and pieces, autonomy in determining practice time and duration, perception of musical ability, the intensity of other field courses, health status, effort to satisfy the teacher, physical suitability of the studying environment, social and educational feedbacks, qualifications of the teacher, economic situation, goals, attitudes. Some researchers emphasize the importance of structuring the instrument practice process (Davidson et al., 2009; Hallam, 2001; Özmenteş, 2012). Structuring the process is related to the use of effective instrument strategies. It is known that students who use metacognitive skills and self-regulation strategies in the instrument practice process have high success and motivation (Bilen, 2007; Hallam, 2001, 2006; Kılınç, 2017; Nielsen, 1999; Pike, 2011; Yokuş & Yokuş, 2010). However, when compared with professional musicians, it is seen that students taking instrument training do not follow a consistent and structured approach in the instrument practice process (Austin & Berg, 2006; Bilen, 2007; Davidson et al., 2009; Hallam, 2001), and there is a

complex relationship between the use of strategies in these students (Hallam, 2001). In this context, the result suggests that the study group does not have sufficient knowledge in terms of practice strategies, that they are exposed to some factors that affect the practice behavior and cannot be controlled by the institution and lecturers. Practice behavior is seen by the author as a strong rationale for explaining the medium-level scores obtained in the motivation for studying sub-dimension.

Recommendations

University life is not just a time in which students aim for academic success. It is also a period when they try to meet their social and personal needs and expectations. However, students who find themselves in a completely different social network with university life face many issues such as adapting to the academic and social environment, coping with basic problems such as nutrition and shelter, achieving independence within the social freedoms they acquire, and questioning their relationships with friends and the opposite sex (Kiraz, 2015; Özgüner & Özdemir, 2016). It is thought that this personal development and social integration process may have some positive and negative effects, especially on the musical instrument practice motivation. Examining student feedback will be more meaningful for these problematic subjects. To identify social and academic factors affecting instrument practice behavior and practice motivation, it is recommended to conduct qualitative research that offers ‘in-depth data’ such as focus group interviews with different student groups with high, medium, and low motivation levels and practice time.

“Most areas of education are slow to adapt to changing views that are based on research evidence, and this is particularly prominent in music education” (McPherson et al., 2011: 191). It can be said that motivation research in music education and instrument training, which have a history of about half a century, has gained an important accumulation in international literature and this accumulation has found a response in the curriculum in recent years. Motivation has also been extensively addressed in the national literature. However, apart from some remarkable studies, it is seen that a priori research results and knowledge originating from abroad have not been/could not be fully reflected in national literature or ‘overlooked’. The same problem exists in studies aiming for the development of a national origin motivation scale, which is employed for different instrument branches and requires a strong conceptual/theoretical framework. In this sense, it is recommended to conduct studies introducing models and scales and to conduct empirical studies that test their validity in Turkish culture and education system.

References

Alderman, M. K. (2004). *Motivation for Achievement: Possibilities for Teaching and Learning* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Alexander, D. L. (2015). *Intrinsic motivation in a collegiate secondary music instrument class* (Dissertation). The University of Rochester, Rochester.
- Asmus, E. P. (1985). Sixth graders' achievement motivation: Their views of success and failure in music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 85*, 1-13.
- Asmus, E. P. (1986a). Achievement motivation characteristics of music education and music therapy students as identified by attribution theory. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 86*, 71-85.
- Asmus, E. P. (1986b). Student beliefs about the causes of success and failure in music: A study of achievement motivation. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 34*(4), 262-278.
- Asmus, E. P. (1994). Motivation in music teaching and learning. *The Quarterly, 5*(4), 5-32.
- Asmus, E. P., & Harrison, C. S. (1990). Characteristics of motivation for music and musical aptitude of undergraduate nonmusic majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*(4), 258-268.
- Austin, J. R. (1988a). *Competitive and noncompetitive goal structures: An analysis of motivation and achievement outcomes among elementary band students* (Dissertation). The University of Iowa, Iowa.
- Austin, J. R. (1988b). The effect of music contest format on self-concept, motivation, achievement, and attitude of elementary band students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 36*(2), 95-107.
- Austin, J. R. (1990). Competition: Is music education the loser? *Music Education Journal, 76*(6), 21-25.
- Austin, J. R., & Berg, M. H. (2006). Exploring music practice among sixth-grade band and orchestra students. *Psychology of Music, 34*(4), 535-558.
- Austin, J. R., & Vispoel, W. P. (1992). Motivation after failure in school music performance classes: The facilitative effects of strategy attributions. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 111*, 1-23.
- Austin, J. R., & Vispoel, W. P. (1998). How American adolescents interpret success and failure in classroom music: Relationships among attributional beliefs, self-concepts and achievements. *Psychology of Music, 26*(1), 26-45.
- Aydın, A. (2007). *Eğitim Psikolojisi: Gelişim, Öğrenme, Öğretim*. Ankara: Tek Ağaç Eylül Yayıncılık.
- Ballantyne, J., & Packer, J. (2004). Effectiveness of preservice music teacher education programs: Perceptions of early-career music teachers. *Music Education Research, 6*(3), 299-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380042000281749>
- Barış, S. (2019). 21. Yüzyılda Tokat'ın ekonomik görünümü: TR83 ve Türkiye geneli ile bir karşılaştırma. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 111-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.410534>

- Barry, N. H. (2007). A qualitative study of applied music lessons and subsequent student practice sessions. *Contributions to Music Education, 34*(1), 51-65.
- Barry, N. H., & Hallam, S. (2002). Practice. In R. Parncutt & G. E. McPherson (Eds.), *The Science and Psychology of Music Performance: Creative Strategies for Teaching and Learning* (pp. 151-165). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Barry, N. H., & McArthur, V. (1994). Teaching practice strategies in the music studio: A survey of applied music teachers. *Psychology of Music, 22*(1), 44-55.
- Bilen, O. O. (2007). *Öz-düzenleyerek piyano çalışmanın sınav performansına etkisi* (Dissertation). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Bloom, B. S. (1995). *İnsan Nitelikleri ve Okulda Öğrenme*, (Trans.; D. A. Özçelik). İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.
- Bozanoğlu, İ. (2004). *Bilişsel davranışçı yaklaşıma dayalı grup rehberliğinin akademik risk altındaki öğrencilerin akademik alandaki güdülenme, benlik saygısı, başarı ve sınav kaygısı düzeylerine etkisi* (Dissertation). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Burak, S. (2013). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin müzik derslerindeki başarı ve başarısızlıklarının nedenlerine yönelik inançları. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*(2), 139-156.
- Burak, S. (2014). Motivation for instrument education: A study from the perspective of expectancy-value and flow theories. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 55*, 123-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.55.8>
- Büyükaksoy, F. (1997). *Keman Öğretiminde İlkeler ve Yöntemler*. Ankara: Armoni.
- Cantero, I. M., & Jauset-Berrocal, J. (2017). Why do they choose their instruments? *British Journal of Music Education, 34*(2), 203-215. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051716000280>
- Cattell, R. B., Barton, K., & Dielman, T. E. (1972). Prediction of school achievement from motivation, personality, and ability measures. *Psychological Reports, 30*(1), 35-43. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1972.30.1.35>
- Chandler, T. A., Chiarella, D., & Auria, C. (1987). Performance expectancy, success, satisfaction, and attributions as variables in band challenges. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 35*(4), 249-258.
- Cheng, Z., & Southcott, J. (2016). Improving students' intrinsic motivation in piano learning: Expert teacher voices. *Australian Journal of Music Education, 50*(2), 48-57.
- Cohen, J. W. (1977). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (Revised ed.). New York: Academic Press.

- Colwell, R. J., Hewitt, M. P., & Fonder, M. (2018). *The Teaching of Instrumental Music* (5th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Çakmak, M. (2017). Student teachers' views regarding the impact of effective teaching strategies on student motivation. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 6(2), 191-204.
- Çalışkan, T. (2008). *Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının bireysel çalgı eğitiminde güdülenme düzeyleri ve başarı durumları arasındaki ilişki* (Master thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Davidson, J. W., Sloboda, J. A., & Howe, M. J. A. (1995). The role of parents and teachers in the success and failure of instrumental learners. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 127, 40-44.
- Davidson, J., Faulkner, R., & McPherson, G. (2009). Motivating musical learning. *The Psychologist (Special Issue)*, 22(12), 1026-1029.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Springer Science
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). The paradox of achievement: The harder you push, the worse it gets. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving Academic Achievement: Impact of Psychological Factors on Education* (pp. 61-87). California, CA: Academic Press.
- Dick, H. J. (2006). *The relationship between instrumental music achievement and causal attributions for success and failure* (Dissertation). The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Driscoll, J. (2009). 'If I play my sax my parents are nice to me': Opportunity and motivation in musical instrument and singing tuition. *Music Education Research*, 11(1), 37-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800802547722>
- Durgun, M. (2018). *Güzel Sanatlar Lisesi müzik bölümü öğrencilerinin piyano dersi motivasyonlarının piyano dersi başarısı ile olan ilişkisinin incelenmesi* (Master thesis). Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Duy, B. (2012). Güdülenme ve bireysel farklılıklar. In A. Kaya (Ed.), *Eğitim Psikolojisi* (12nd ed.; pp. 505-551). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- English, W. S., Knieter, G. L., & Lehman, P. R. (1983). *Foreword*. The Ann Arbor Symposium, Session III: Motivation and Creativity (pp. i), Music Educators National Conference, Reston, Virginia.
- Erdem, B. (2013). *Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının bireysel çalgı eğitimine dönük motivasyon düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi* (Master thesis). Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Eryaman, M. Y. & Genc, S. Z. (2010). Learning theories. In C. Kridel (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*. Sage Publications.

- Evans, P. (2015). Self-determination theory: An approach to motivation in music education. *Musicae Scientiae*, 19(1), 65-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864914568044>
- Evans, P. (2016). Motivation. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The Child as Musician: A Handbook of Musical Development* (2nd ed.; pp. 325-339). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, P. A. (2009). *Psychological needs and social-cognitive influences on participation in music activities* (Dissertation). The University of Illinois, Champaign.
- Evans, P., & Bonneville-Roussy, A. (2016). Self-determined motivation for practice in university music students. *Psychology of Music*, 44(5), 1095-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735615610926>
- Feldman, R. S. (1997). *Essentials of Understanding Psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Education
- Gembris, H., & Davidson, J. W. (2002). Environmental influences. In R. Parncutt & G. E. McPherson (Eds.), *The Science and Psychology of Music Performance: Creative Strategies for Teaching and Learning* (pp. 17-30). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics 25 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. New York: Routledge.
- Girgin, D. (2015). Bireysel çalgı dersi motivasyon ölçeği: Geçerlik güvenirlik analizi. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 23(4), 1723-1736.
- Hallam, S. (2001). The development of metacognition in musicians: Implications for education. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(1), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051701000122>
- Hallam, S. (2002). Musical motivation: Towards a model synthesising the research. *Music Education Research*, 4(2), 225-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380022000011939>
- Hallam, S. (2006). *Music Psychology in Education*. Institute of Education, University of London.
- Hallam, S., Rinta, T., Varvarigou, M., Creech, A., Papageorgi, I., Gomes, T., & Lanipekun, J. (2012). The development of practising strategies in young people. *Psychology of Music*, 40(5), 652-680. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735612443868>
- Hodges, D. A. (2003). Music psychology and music education: What's the connection? *Research Studies in Music Education*, 21(1), 31-44.
- Jørgensen, H. (2000). Student learning in higher instrumental education: Who is responsible? *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(1), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051700000164>
- Jørgensen, H., & Hallam, S. (2016). Practicing. In S. Hallam, I. Cross & M. Thaut (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Music Psychology* (2nd ed.; pp. 449-462). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kalyoncu, N. (2005). Eğitim fakültelerinde uygulanan müzik öğretmenliği lisans programının revizyon gerekçeleriyle tutarlılığı. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(3), 207-220.

- Kalyoncu, N. (2011). Müzik öğretmenliği eğitiminde mesleki sosyalizasyon. *Orkestra*, 419, 16-27.
- Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (27th ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Katzenmoyer, S. P. (2003). *A study of the factors that influence the musical instrument selections of students: A comparison of teacher and student perceptions* (Dissertation). Shenandoah University, Winchester.
- Kılınç, S. (2017). *Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi müzik bölümü öğrencilerinin çalgı çalışma motivasyonlarını etkileyen unsurlar* (Master thesis). Erciyes Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Kiraz, K. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sorunları: Tokat örneği. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9, 521-534.
- Korkmaz, Ö. (2004). Müzik öğretmenlerinin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeyleri. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 20, 125-148.
- Kurtuldu, M. K., & Aksu, C. (2015). Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının piyano dersi motivasyon düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 21, 321-329.
- Kwan, E. (2007). *Secondary choral music education in Hong Kong: Relations among motivation to music, meaning of the choral experience, and selected demographic variables* (Dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Legette, R. M. (1998). Causal beliefs of public school students about success and failure in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(1), 102-111.
- Legutki, A. R. (2010). *Self-determined music participation: The role of psychological needs satisfaction, intrinsic motivation, and self-regulation in the high school band experience* (Dissertation). The University of Illinois, Champaign.
- Lichtenfeld, S., & Stupnisky, R. H. (2013). Elementary school students' achievement emotions: Influences of gender and relations to motivation and achievement. In L. Zhang & J. Chen (Eds.), *Academic Achievement* (pp. 33-62). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Potter, G. K. (2014). Music motivation and the effect of writing music: A comparison of pianists and guitarists. *Psychology of Music*, 42(3), 403-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735613477180>
- Maehr, M. L., & Archer, J. (1985). Motivation and School Achievement. Research Report for ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, University of Illinois.
- Maehr, M. L., Pintrich, P. R., & Linnenbrink, A. E. (2002). Motivation and achievement. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 348-372). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Martin, A. J. (2007). Examining a multidimensional model of student motivation and engagement using a construct validation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 413-440. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X118036>
- Martin, A. J., Collie, R. J., & Evans, P. (2016). Motivation and engagement in music: Theory, research, practice, and future directions. In J. Fleming, R. Gibson & M. Anderson (Eds.), *The Arts, Motivation and Engagement: How the Arts Makes a Difference* (pp. 169-185). London, UK: Routledge.
- McPherson, G. E. (2005). From child to musician: Skill development during the beginning stages of learning an instrument. *Psychology of Music*, 33(1), 5-35.
- McPherson, G. E., & McCormick, J. (2000). The contribution of motivational factors to instrumental performance in a music examination. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 15(1), 31-39.
- McPherson, G. E., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Self-regulation of musical learning: A social cognitive perspective. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 327-347). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McPherson, G. E., Davidson, J. W., & Evans, P. (2016). Playing an instrument. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The Child as Musician: A Handbook of Musical Development* (2nd ed.; pp. 401-421). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McPherson, G. E., Miksza, P., & Evans, P. (2011). Self-regulated learning in music practice and performance. In D. H. Schunk & J. A. Greene (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-regulation of Learning and Performance* (pp. 181-193). London, UK: Routledge.
- McPherson, G. E., Osborne, M. S., Barrett, M. S., Davidson, J. W., & Faulkner, R. (2015). Motivation to study music in Australian schools: The impact of music learning, gender, and socio-economic status. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 37(2), 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X15600914>
- MEB [Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı] (2008). *Öğretmen yeterlikleri: Öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi ve özel alan yeterlikleri*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları.
- Morling, B., & Kitayama, S. (2008). Culture and motivation. In J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation Science* (pp. 417-433). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Nielsen, S. G. (1999). Learning strategies in instrumental music practice. *British Journal of Music Education*, 16(3), 275-291.
- Oare, S. (2011). Practice education: Teaching instrumentalists to practice effectively. *Music Educators Journal*, 97(3), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432111400006>

- OKA [Orta Karadeniz Kalkınma Ajansı] (2014). “TR83 Bölgesi İlçeleri Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Endeksi”, *Orta Karadeniz Kalkınma Ajansı Raporu*. Middle Black Sea Development Agency Publication.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2013). *Öğrenme Psikolojisi*, (Trans. Ed.; M. Baloğlu). Ankara: Nobel.
- Ömür, Ö. (2011). The relationship between logical levels and instrument education. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 44(2), 247-260.
- Özgüner, M., & Özdemir, A. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin öğrenim gördükleri yöreye ve yöre halkına yönelik algılarının ölçülmesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(8), 3012-3032.
- Özmenteş, S. (2012). Relationships between daily practice time, attributions and performance level in instrument education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 3141-3145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.026>
- Öztürk, G., & Öztürk, Ö. (2019). Müzik öğretmenlerinin hizmetiçi eğitim ihtiyaçları (Tokat ili örneği). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 27(5), 1921-1934. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.3001>
- Öztürk, Ö., & Öztürk, G. (2019). Music teachers' status of participation in in-service training programs and their expectations. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 8(1), 245-257. <https://dx.doi.org/10.14686/buefad.458211>
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using Spss for Windows* (6th ed.). Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pike, P. D. (2011). Maintaining student motivation: On the musical journey toward mastery. *American Music Teacher*, 61(1), 20-24.
- Sadaklıoğlu, H., & Aşık, A. K. (2019). Şehir pazarlaması kapsamında şehir imajının ölçümü: Tokat örneği. *Enderun Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-15.
- Sandene, B. A. (1997). *An investigation of variables related to student motivation in instrumental music* (Dissertation). The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Santrock, J. W. (2018). *Eğitim Psikolojisi*, (Trans. Ed.; D. M. Siyez). Ankara: Nobel.
- Schatt, M. D. (2011). High school instrumental music students' attitudes and beliefs regarding practice: An application of attribution theory. *Update*, 29(2), 29-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123310396981>
- Schmidt, C. P. (1995). Attributions of success, grade level, and gender as factors in choral students' perceptions of teacher feedback. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43(4), 313-329.

- Schmidt, C. P. (2005). Relations among motivation, performance achievement, and music experience variables in secondary instrumental music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(2), 134-147.
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- SEGE [Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması] (2013). “İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Araştırması”, *Bölgesel Gelişme ve Yapısal Uyum Genel Müdürlüğü Raporu*. Ankara: Kalkınma Bakanlığı Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Dairesi Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Sichivitsa, V. O. (2001). *College choir members' motivation to persist in music: Application of the Tinto model* (Dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn.
- Sichivitsa, V. O. (2007). The influences of parents, teachers, peers and other factors on students' motivation in music. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 29, 55-68.
- Slavin, R. E. (2006). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, B. P. (2005). Goal orientation, implicit theory of ability, and collegiate instrumental music practice. *Psychology of Music*, 33(1), 36-57.
- Squires, M. (2017). Motivation in secondary music education. *The Canadian Music Educator*, 59(1), 10-13.
- Sullivan, G. M., & Feinn, R. (2012). Using effect size-or why the *p* value is not enough. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 4(3), 279-282. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1>
- Şimşek, Ş., Çelik, A., & Akgemci, T. (2013). *Davranış Bilimleri*. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Tucker, O. G. (2018). Positive teacher influence strategies to improve secondary instrumental students' motivation and perceptions of self. *Update*, 36(3), 5-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123317733109>
- Tural, D., & Şahin, S. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kendi üniversite ve ideal üniversite algıları: Gaziantep Üniversitesi örneği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(2), 209-240.
- Turhal, E., Kalyoncu, N., & Keçeci, A. (2018). Çalgı derslerindeki öğretmen-öğrenci iletişimde 'transaksiyonel analiz ego durumları'. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sanat & Tasarım Dergisi*, 8(2), 42-65.
- Uçan, A. (2006, April 26-28). *Müzik öğretmenliği yeterlikleri*. Paper presented at the Ulusal Müzik Eğitimi Sempozyumu (pp. 68-91). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Wan, L. A., & Gregory, S. (2018). Digital tools to support motivation of music students for instrumental practice. *Journal of Music, Technology & Education*, 11(1), 37-64.
- West, C. (2013). Motivating music students: A review of the literature. *Update*, 31(2), 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123312473611>

- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 68-81. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015>
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2002). The development of competence beliefs, expectancies for success, and achievement values from childhood through adolescence. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of Achievement Motivation* (pp. 91-120). California, CA: Academic Press.
- Yokuş, H., & Yokuş, T. (2010). *Müzik ve Çalgı Öğrenimi İçin Strateji Rehberi I: Öğrenme Stratejileri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Zimmerman, J. R. (2005). *The effects of periodic self-recording, self-listening and self-evaluation on the motivation and music self-concept of high school instrumentalists* (Dissertation). The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.