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Abstract: This study investigates if language teachers can motivate the undergraduate students who learn language at a British university using the three factors which are considered as the fundamental to motivation in psychology studies. 19 participant's students were learned Japanese language in university of South of England in the Institution Wide Language Program (IWLP). The study was experimental and the participants studied in the experimental classes which include the three factors for one semester during the spring term of 2019. The methodology of this study used questionnaire and questionnaires were analysed whether participants experienced the three factors using qualitative analysis. The results showed that the majority of students agreed that they experienced three factors, which illustrate helping students’ motivation. It was concluded that it is possible for language teachers to manipulate the language learning environment and language teachers can make the majority of students motivate and facilitate students’ language learning. However, a student with reasonable adjustment experienced only two of the three factors, which indicated that this student was unable to experience motivation.
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INTRODUCTION
A learning environment includes students’ diversity. There is variety of ability students in language classrooms including cultural, physical and mental disabilities. Specially, there are two tracks of students which are high and low track; even students are belonging from so many different cultural background and nationalities, also students with special abilities and students with depression and anxiety. This study includes diversity of students in terms of abilities, cultural background and mental disability.

At this University where the researcher conducted this study, teaching staff are encouraged to use the term ‘Reasonable Adjustment (RA). The students who are facing difficulty with depression anxiety and learning difficulty which has been increasing continuously in recent years refers RA. The majority of RAs registered with Student Support Unit (SSU) at the University.

According to a recent report (Hughes and Spanner, 2019), there are three terms related to students’ mental disabilities: mental health; mental illness; mental health illness or poor mental health. Mental health defines ‘a full details of experience ranging from good mental health to mental illness’ Hughes and Spanner. 2019, 9). Hughes and Spanner, (2019) defines mental illness as ‘a condition and experience, thoughts, involving, feelings, symptoms and/or behaviours, which is the reason of distress and reduces functioning’ (p 9). Mental health problems or mental illness defines ‘a wide range of individuals experiencing levels of psychological distress beyond normal experience and beyond their present ability to effectively manage. It should be noted that this term includes both those who experience mental illness and those who experiences fall below this threshold, whose mental health is not good’ (Hughes and Spanner. 2019).

To align with the above three terms and based on the current best practice, the definition of RAs in this study seems a combination of ‘mental illness’ and ‘mental health illness or poor mental health’. As RAs in this study encompasses both mild and severe mental disability - one who was admitted to a psychological hospital (very severe) and ones could attend classes (mild).

There is a burgeoning literature which emphases motivation as one of crucial factors for RAs as follows: ‘motivation is sometimes a problem for people with psychiatric disabilities’ (Megivern, Pellerito and Mowbray, 2003, 228). (Roesser et al., 1998) claims that negative emotions (i.e. anxiety, depression, anger). It seems that motivation is very important for any learning environment including language.

Research Questions (RQs) of this study are:
RQ1. What motivates students?
RQ2. Is experimental learning environment help student's motivation including RAs?
RQ3 will be investigated using literature review in the next section.

Three Fundamental Factors to Motivation
Psychology studies claim that people will be likely to express their inherent tendency to learn, to do
and to grow under conditions conducive to 1) autonomy; 2) belonging and 3) perceived competence (Ryan & Powelson, 1991). Mentioned three conditions are considered as important constructs to be discussed as basis of the experimental study. (Selingman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) point out the importance of motivation in that motivated persons are able to fulfill their potentialities and able to see out progressively greater challenge. In this paper, motivation refers to academic motivation, which is determine ‘a student’s energy and drive to learn, reach their potential’ and work effectively (Bulger, McGeown and Clair-Thompson, 2015, p. 541).

**Autonomy**

Autonomy or “self-determination” is claimed to be one of conditions conducive to motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 1987). In the classrooms of language, student’s autonomy is widely determined by teachers’ teaching style and orientation. Teacher’s teaching style has two types: autonomy-supportive and controlling/authoritarian.

The findings of controlling teachers in the previous studies include that: 1) teachers produced students who were more passive and less interested orientation towards learning (Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman and Ryan, 1981; 2) students depicted themselves either passively compliant or rebellious (deCharms, 1976; 3) students of a pressured teacher who used controlling strategies performed more poorly than students of a non-pressured teacher (Flink, Boggiano and Barret, 1990). Students’ passive attitude is identified by students’ use of words such as ‘nervous’, ‘shy’, ‘stress’ and ‘afraid’ (Sieglova. et al., 2017). Passive attitude relates to students’ negative self-evaluation, i.e. lack of self-confidence. Teacher-centred teaching, whole class instruction, emphasis of accuracy and the use of reward may also contribute to students’ passive attitude (Sieglova, 2019).

By contrast, there are positive findings for autonomy-supportive teachers as follows: 1) students would be more likely to promote confidence and mastery motivation in language learning; 2) teachers were rated by students as ‘warmer’ than those who were autonomy-supportive (Harter. 1981 and1982) ; 3) students depicted themselves as active, interested and constructive student-teacher interactions (deCharms, 1976); 4) students who were in autonomous supportive learning were much more likely to retain rote knowledge over time even controlling for intelligence (Ryan and Connell, 1989). However, too much emphasis on autonomy and freedom may lead to dissatisfaction and depression (Selingman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) for some students. However, in general, if students perceive that their teacher cares them, Students foster feelings of belongingness as well as the adoption and internalisation of goals and values of caregivers (Baumeister and Leary, 1995). Furthermore, if students feel that their teacher supports their autonomy and that they feel connected to and supported, students are likely to be highly motivated (Ryan and Powelson, 1991) and behave cooperatively to the teacher. Autonomy seems to be closely related to sense of belonging, which will be discussed next.

**Relatedness/Belonging**

Belonging in this study refers to academic belonging, which is defined as ‘students’ subjective perception that they are valued, accepted and legitimate members in their academic domains’ (Lewis. et al., 2016). Academic belonging has usually two levels, i.e. an individual class or/and educational institutions. This study looks at an individual class in this study as an individual class may be particularly salient in terms of students’ experiences in that they provide a regularly scheduled setting for interaction with a predictable group of others (Freeman and Jensen, 2007).

Students’ interaction and exertion of influence are influential factors for students’ sense of belonging in group (Schaps and Solomon, 2003). In language teaching classrooms, teacher-centred and student-cantered interactions are used. Students may feel sense of belonging through one-to-one interaction. Whole group instruction tends to be perceived by students as relatively teacher-controlled (Marks, 2000) and students’ interaction is restricted as teacher dominates the classroom (teacher-centred). Teacher is usually regarded as the main exertion of influence in teacher-centred whole class instruction and teacher-centred classroom is preferred teaching pedagogies in collectivist countries (The Author, 2013).

On the other hand, pair work, cooperative learning and reciprocal teaching are perceived by students as relatively student-controlled (Mark, 2000). Pair work allows students one-to-one interaction experience. One-to-one interaction and student-centred class are preferred in individualist countries (The Author, 2013). The strength of student-centred activities is elicitation of students’ thinking in the form of discussion (Brown, 1994). Elicitation of students’ thinking is positively
associated with sense of belonging (Solomon. et al., 1997). Student-centred may give an addictive effect to people who perceive an environment as caring, and also fulfil their need to belong (Baumeister and Leary. 1995). In order for students to perceive language classrooms as caring, students’ mutual acceptance and respectful interaction with others are conducive to developing a sense of belonging (Anderman. 2003; Solomon. et al., 1997).

**Perceived Competence**

One of the definitions of competence may be having control over outcomes (Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall. 1965). Perceived competence means “the level of one’s control over the environment and one’s action” (Koufaris. 2002, 208), which may be also captured by the term “perceived control”. Everyone feel "A positive mood while experiencing higher level of control over situations”(Whitson and Consoli. 2009, 44).

Perceived competence also gives people ‘confidence’. Confidence can be gained from sense of accomplishment (Dweck. 1986), which is “derived from the exercise of one’s capacities under condition of optimal challenge” (Ryan and Powelson. 1991, 52). The optimal challenge level should be set just beyond one’s current level of functioning as it gives students sense of confidence and self-esteem (Harter. 1983; Adey. et al., 2007). Although “just beyond one’s current level” should be pitched to be challenging but not realistic and not unachievable (Lumby. 2011), as correct optimal challenge level elicits students’ thinking. In order for students to perceive their competence, teachers should give students' optimal challenge.

Perceived competence may also relate to effective and meaningful contribution to the group (Solomon. et al., 1997), or participation. Students’ participation includes beyond just their class attendance. Students may exhibit two types of participation during a class: students’ voluntary verbal participation or active listening participation. Students usually choose the one that they feel comfortable, which is often largely influenced by students’ previous language teachers’ teaching style and educational culture. Some language teachers and their educational cultures encourage active listening participation while others encourage students’ voluntary verbal participation. To encourage verbal participation, reciprocal teaching may be a useful strategy to encourage students’ participation as it allows group members who are not capable of full participation can learn from those are more expert in full participation (Brown. 1994).

Lastly, perceived competence and sense of belonging seems closely related: The more students feel a sense of belonging, the more participation increases (Watkins. 2005); Participation is essential for the students’ sense of belonging to be realised (Finn. 1989); the more actively students engaged in learning, the more their sense of competence for academic tasks are (Harter. 1981 and 1982).

**The Pedagogies Used in this Experimental Study**

Sample students were exposed to a learning environment which combines of 1) perceived competence, 2) autonomy and 3) belonging as follows.

Firstly, 1) perceived competence was achieved by giving students “challenging tasks” that are usually one step beyond their current skills so that they can develop to cope with the skills. When new learning contents were introduced, the teacher always reviews the concept of learned past concept for students to make a clear connection with the present learning content. Students were encouraged to ‘participate’ in class, especially in the form of voluntarily verbal participation. The teacher used ‘turn-taking’ to give all students an opportunity to participate in the class.

To encourage students’ participation and also their continued participation, the following four points to supportive learning environment are included in the experimental class: i) where students feel comfortable asking questions in class; ii) where the students’ ideas and opinions are welcomed, valued and seen helpful and effective community members; iii) where students do not feel ridiculed or punished for providing the wrong answers; and iv) the use of teacher’s instructions such as appropriate praises, encouraging words in front of other students.

Secondly, 2) autonomy was achieved by “practice sheet” and giving students choices and decision making. The purpose of ‘practice sheets’ is to remember the information (e.g. vocabulary) without any deadline for students and pressure. The practice sheets are not checked by the teacher. Students check the answers by themselves using textbooks, which give them a reflective process. Students get autonomy but at the same time, autonomy shifts responsibility of learning from the teacher to students. Therefore, students are not compared with other students, but what is
Autonomy was also achieved by providing opportunities for autonomous decision-making should foster the development of positive belief about personal autonomy and competence (Ryan and Powelson. 1991). The teacher made sure that she gave choice and encouraged students to make decisions during the class so that students felt autonomy. For example, teacher asked the students which task they wished to do first or which day of the week they wished to have an formative assessment, etc.

Lastly, 3) belonging was achieved by use of i) pair work and ii) reciprocal teaching which includes collaborative learning and group learning as these allow students’ interactions. Pair work is commonly used in the language teaching approach called Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT is a teaching approach used in all over the world; it helps students’ interaction by doing pair works. CLT was also combined with “elicitation of students’ thinking”, “reciprocal teaching” and “cooperative learning” in this study.

Typical Experimental Class
The students were exposed to typical experimental classes for spring term in 2019. The duration was for three months. The typical experimental class starts with Practice Sheets for about 15 minutes. The Practice Sheets are quizzes asking various sets of vocabulary in English and students are expected to answer them in Japanese. The content is challenging as there are a number of vocabulary they have to remember, however students are expected to learn these in the modules. Students are free to check their answers by looking at the textbook once they finished or feel that they cannot answer any more, which aims to enhance students’ autonomy.

After the Practice Sheet session, the teacher gives students main grammar of the lesson in the whole class instruction. During the class, students are given choices by the teacher as to the order of content they wish to learn. In order to promote the perceived competence, the teacher revises the previous learning content so that students can make a clear connection with the present learning content. The teacher asks questions during the class to elicit students thinking, which students are expected to take part in as a form of voluntary verbal participation. After the teacher’s whole class instruction, students are usually asked to work in pairs to do oral exercises. Sometimes, a weaker student and a strong student are asked to be a pair for the purpose of reciprocal teaching. The pair work allows students to elicit students’ thinking and it also supports students’ sense of belonging, according to the contact hypothesis.

METHODOLOGY
Participants
The total number of sample students is 19 who are learning Japanese in an IWLP context. The nationalities of 19 students were: 6 British, 3 Hong Kongnese, 2 Chinese, 2 German, 1 French, 1 Danish, 1 Greek, 1 Vietnamese, 2 Romanians. These students were randomly assigned to three groups (two Ab initio groups and one advanced group) and three experimental classes were taught separately. One student is registered as RAs in this study, but it was anticipated that there were other RAs who do not wish to disclose their issues.

Data Collection
Questionnaires
The questionnaires were chosen for data collection as it is difficult to measure and discuss about the three motivational constructs which students may have perceived. To increase the validity of the result, the same questions were sometimes reiterated differently to ensure the consistency of the results.

A pilot study was conducted on 02/05/2019 prior to the present study. Looking at the results of the preliminary results pilot study, the researcher found some issues in analysing the data, which resulted in changing the format of questionnaire presentation. The questionnaires for the present study were administered and collected during the class on 09/05/2019. The questionnaires consisted of 33 questions and it consisted of two parts and it is two pages in length. The contents of the questionnaires were regarding perceived competence, autonomy and belonging and other pedagogies related to the three motivational constructs.

The questions are all statements. In the first part (Q1–Q19), students were asked to tick the only the statements which they agreed and were applicable. Q18 invited students to provide comments. In the second part (Q20–Q33), students were asked to tick either statement A or B (Appendix). They were also asked to provide their nationalities.

Data Analysis
As 33 statements in the questionnaire were randomly presented with regards to the themes, they were reorganised into the three headings of perceived competence, autonomy and belongings before analysis. When analysing the data, student’s nationalities and whether the student was a RA or a non-RA was also noted in all students’ answers including both statement A and B in Q20–33. It should be noted that the RA student is not the main focus of this study.

In analysing the data, the following qualitative techniques were used: noting the patterns and themes, seeing plausibility, counting and clustering for classes and categories. To achieve conceptual coherence, other tactics such as making contrast/comparison, subsuming particulars into the general, building a logical chain of evidence were employed. In the early stage of data analysis, each statement was compared against the concept of enjoyment, motivation and self-esteem were made. This was followed by noting particular findings to build a logical chain of evidence (Miles and Huberman. 1994).

RESULTS

Autonomy

Overall, students agreed that experimental Japanese classes were autonomy supportive environment. Whether students felt autonomy was asked twice in Q23 and Q19. All students agreed that the teacher supported students’ autonomy (Q23). However, 2 students did not agree in Q19 ‘The teacher was responsive to my autonomy (accepted who I am).

Results of students’ current learning environment (Japanese class)
It is significant that all students answered that they felt supported their autonomy in the experimental class (Q23) and that the teacher was warm (Q24). These answers also mirrored the result of the previous studies which claimed that teachers who supported autonomy were rated by students as ‘warmer’ than those who were more controlling (Harter, 1981 & 1982).

Results of students’ previous learning environment (high school) at home
Previous studies indicate that students’ past learning environment is an influential factor to the students’ motivation. “Teachers in my high school were autonomy supportive” (Q25) and “My parent/s is/are autonomy supportive” (Q26) were designed to understand the causal effect of students’ answer between previous and present learning environment. 63% (12 out of 19 students) agreed with that their high school teachers were autonomy supportive (Q25) while 37% (7 out of 19 students) answered that the high school teachers were controlling and given them pressure (Q25)[The nationality of these 7 students are: 3 British, 1 German, 1 Hong Kongese, 2 Romanian].

Generally, students answered higher autonomy supportive environment in their home (15 out of 19 students) than high school (12 out of 19 students), but it should be noted that 3 students felt autonomy supportive neither at home or at high school. The nationalities of these 3 students were 2 British and 1 Chinese. One of the 3 students is RA. This result makes the result of Q23 (The teacher supported student’ autonomy) and Q24 (The teacher was warm) significant as all students agreed on both Q23 and Q24.

Practice Sheet Quiz
79% (16 out of 19 students) agreed that Practice Sheets was autonomy-supportive and they can learn at their own pace (Q28). 3 students answered that Practice Sheets gave them pressure. The nationalities of these 3 students are 2 British and 1 Greek. 95% (18 out of 19 students) answered that Practice Sheets were helpful for them to monitor their own Japanese ability over time (Q16).

Giving Choices
95% (18 out of 19 students) agreed that students felt that the teacher gave them choices and encouraged them making decisions during class (Q27).

Sense of Belonging
16% (3 out of 19 students) answered that they do not have any close friends in the Japanese class (Q8). However, 95% (18 out of 19 students) answered that they feel that they fitted in the class (Q22). These results indicate that friends are not necessarily the most influential factor for students to feel the sense of belonging. One student agreed with the statement: ‘I felt psychological discomfort and alienation in the class’. This student was RA, who may not experience the sense of belonging.

It is claimed that acceptance and respect with others is conducive to develop a sense of belonging (Solomon. et al., 1997). 89% (17 out of 19 students) answered that there was mutual acceptance and respect among students (Q5), which indicates that almost 90% students felt a sense of belonging.

Student-Centred Class and Cooperative Learning
95% (18 out of 19 students) were aware that cooperative learning was used (Q15). 95% (18 out of 19 students) agreed that the Japanese classes were student-centred (Q21). 2 students agreed that the Japanese classes were teacher-centred (Q21). One student answered that Japanese classes were both student-centred and teacher-centred (Q21). This question may depend on students’ definition of student-centred and teacher-centred.

**Interaction**

All the students agreed that many opportunities for students to interact were given in class (Q14). 89% (17 out of 19 students) answered that they enjoyed the interaction with their classmates using pair work and small groups to improve their speaking practice (Q3). 2 students (both British) answered that they did not enjoy the interaction with their classmates using pair work (Q3), which was unexpected. Among these two British students who did not enjoy the interaction with their classmates, one of them is a RA, which may explain the RA student’s preference for teaching and learning where they do not like personal interaction.

**Perceived Competence**

All the students agreed that they think that their Japanese ability has improved over time (Q7) and also agreed that built up their confidence by studying Japanese (Q31). 79% (15 out of 19 students) answered that they were satisfied with the outcome of their Japanese language abilities and feel competent (Q2). In Q2, 4 students think that they did not achieve any goals when the question asked about specific goals.

**Challenging Tasks**

84% (16 out of 19 students) answered that competitive or challenging activities make them more motivated (Q1). 79% (17 out of 19 students) answered that the goal they set initially was challenging but was an achievable goal and felt confident and satisfied once they achieved each goal (Q17), which indicates about 80% perceived their competence.

**Participation**

An unexpected result was that 58% (11 out of 19 students) answered that they were not comfortable participating in the class at first, but they plucked up their courage and gradually became comfortable participating in class (Q12). This result indicates that more than half of the students made effort to participate in the class. 84% (16 out of 19 students) felt that their participation increased over time (Q32). 16% (3 out of 19 students) felt that their participation has not increased and they feel that they still cannot make enough contribution compared to other students (Q32). The nationalities of these 3 students were all British, which includes 1 RA. This result indicates that all students monitor if their participation increases and that those who increased their participation were happy about their changes. 58% (11 out of 19 students) of students answered that they constantly engaged in participating in every class (Q29). This result needs to be cautiously analysed as students’ definition of participation differs whether it is active listening or in verbal participation. 53% (10 out of 19 students) answered that they were trained to actively listen to the teacher than verbally participating in class. The results may have included both active listening and verbal participation. 58% (11 out of 19 students) answered that in high school, students were encouraged to participate voluntarily.

**Reason for Not Verbally Participating In the Class**

Three statements were given as options as to why student did not verbally participate in class: 1. Students just did not know the answer (Q30); 2. Students feel uncomfortable contributing their answers or opinions in class (Q30); and 3. Students think that the teacher should assign their turn to speak (Q29). 32% (6 out of 19 students) of students answered that they did not participate in class because they just did not know the answer (Q30). 16% (3 out of 19 students) of students answered that they did not participate in class as they feel uncomfortable contributing their answers or opinions in class (Q30). The nationalities of these 3 students were all British, which includes 1 RA. This was an unexpected result considering that British students must have been taught in a British learning environment where they were encouraged voluntary verbal participation. 8 students answered that they did not participate very much as they usually answer when the teacher assigned their turn to speak (Q29).

Students are asked about active listening in high school twice in Q20 and Q4 but there is inconsistency in the students’ results. With regards to Q20 (in my high school, I was trained to actively listen to the teacher than verbally participating in class). We did not need to express our opinions and we were all just listening to the teacher during the class), 42% (8 out of 19 students) agreed. On the other hand, in Q4 (I was
trained to actively listen to the teacher than verbally participating in class when they were in high school, 89% (10 out of 19 students) answered. The breakdown of the 10 students were 3 British students and 4 non-British students (1 German, 1 Danish, 2 Romanians, 2 Hong Kongese, and 1 Chinese). 7 students agreed with both Q4 and Q20. 2 British students ticked ‘In my high school, I was in learning environment where students were encouraged to participate voluntarily in class’. The RA student’s answer showed discrepancy with Q4 and Q20, as the student agreed with the statement: ‘In my high school, I was trained to actively listen to the teacher than verbally participating in class. We did not need to express our opinions and we were all just listening to the teacher during the class (Q20)’ but did not agree with the statement: ‘In my high school, I was trained to actively listen to the teacher than verbally participating in class’ (Q4).

Supportive Learning Environment
There were 4 statements to ask whether the experimental class provided supportive learning environment and the results confirms success in providing students supportive learning environment:
89% (17 out of 19 students) of students answered that they felt comfortable and safe to ask questions or answer teacher’s questions in class (Q9). 95% (18 out of 19 students) of students answered that their answers, ideas or opinions were welcomed and seen as helpful by the teacher and that they felt they were effective community members in Japanese class (Q10). 95% (18 out of 19 students) of students answered that they did not feel ridiculed or punished for providing the wrong answers (Q11). 95% (18 out of 19 students) of students answered that the teacher gave other students appropriate praises and encouraging words in front of other or to them personally in class (Q13).

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION
A review of the RQs will enable the key conclusion of this study to be summarised.

RQ1. What motivates students?
Perceived competence, autonomy and a sense of belonging are the three fundamental factors conducive to motivation, some of which are often intertwined with each other.

RQ2. Does the experimental class facilitate motivation to students which include the RA student?

The results showed that the majority of students agreed that the experimental class was successful in facilitating students’ perceived competence, autonomy and sense of belonging.

From the result of this study, the RA did not feel a sense of belonging and participation (perceived competence) was also an issue. When policy makers or language practitioners wish to support students who do not feel a sense of belonging, study abroad in a collectivist society be one option. A sense of belonging should be usually established through consistent experience in family, schools and work. Examples of collectivist languages include East Asian languages (e.g. Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Thai, Taiwan, Indonesian, and Malaysian), Arabic which is spoken in Muslim countries and languages of former-Soviet Union (Russian, Romanian, Slovenian, Bulgarian and Croatian), Hindi, Bangladeshi, Greek, Turkish and Portuguese etc. (Hofstede et al., 2010). In addition, Spanish speaking countries (including mainland Spain and South America) are more collectivist than individualist, considering that Britain is in the top third of the Individualist countries (Hofstede et al., 2010). If RA students study abroad at one of these collectivist countries, students may experience collectivist culture where student-to-student interaction during the class may be rare and turn-taking is often used to encourage all students equally participate in class. As active listening rather than voluntary verbal participation is preferred in collectivist education, students are not asked to speak up unless they have been asked or assigned to speak up by the teacher. All students may be able to feel a sense of belonging through native speakers and university which adopts collectivist educational systems. Study abroad is not just about language fluency and intercultural experience for RAs, but it could give them feel for a sense of belonging, which may be difficult to feel in the individualist educational system.

In this study, some British students and the RA student did not feel comfortable in class participation. This may be due to some students’ belief that teacher should assign the students to answer. Students’ past learning environment may prevent them from verbal voluntary participation. However, this study’s finding showed that language teachers are able to manipulate the teaching and learning environment to facilitate students’ motivation. If the language teacher is successfully executed at the beginning of phrase, students are able to engage for the remaining stages of the teaching cycle. That does not mean...
that the language teachers need to devise their own motivation inducing learning environment on their own. In fact, language teachers who use CLT have been partly executing motivational-driven learning environment. CLT’s student-centred pedagogy contributes students’ sense of belonging. However, it is unlikely to facilitate students’ motivation itself, as CLT’s underlying pedagogies only cover sense of belonging and some points of autonomy (The Author. 2019). Therefore, language teachers may consider combining pedagogies such as giving challenging tasks or turn-taking to cover to support students’ perceived competence. If these three factors were provided to students together, motivation seems to be triggered and would work effectively. It is often forgotten that students are in different motivational stages – some have already motivated while others have not yet experienced motivation. Any students have potential to experience motivation whether they have experienced it or not, and they may be subject to the language teachers’ pedagogical knowledge and skills.
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