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Abstract

There are students who are motivated to learn while others who are not in any language classrooms. Students in this study include not only motivated and unmotivated but also a Reasonable Adjustment (RA) student who have various issues. The aim of this study is to examine if the undergraduate students who learn language at a British university were motivated by three factors which are considered as the fundamental to motivation in psychology studies. The participants were 19 students who learn Japanese language in the Institution Wide Language Program (IWLP) a university of South of England. The participants studied in the experimental classes for one semester during the spring term of 2019. Then, students were asked to fill in a questionnaire at the end of the term, which became the data for this study. The questionnaires were analysed based on the three factors using qualitative analysis. The results showed that the majority of students agreed that they experienced three factors, which indicated facilitating students' motivation. It was concluded that it is possible to manipulate the learning environment and make the majority of students motivated and facilitate language learning, but the RA student experienced only two of the three factors and was unable to feel motivated.

1. Introduction

A learning environment nowadays includes students' diversity and language classrooms are no exception. Language classrooms consist of students with a variety of ability, cultural, physical and mental disabilities. As an example of variety of ability in language classrooms, there are students of high and low track. Students who learn languages come from various different cultural background and nationalities. Students who learn languages also include students with physical disabilities and students with depression and anxiety. This study includes students with different abilities, cultural background and a Reasonable Adjustment (RA) and was in response to the researcher's professional challenges in language teaching due to an increasing number of RAs in recent years. The researcher is also the teacher of the Japanese class at a British university in the South of England. RAs refer to students who have issues with depression, anxiety and learning difficulty and are usually registered with Student Support Office at the University. Various studies suggest that motivation is the key word for RAs: 'motivation is sometimes a problem for people with psychiatric disabilities' (Mesgivern et al., 2013, 227–228). The effect of negative emotions (anxiety, depression, anger) is shown on cognition, drains off attentional and motivational resources' (Roeser et al., 1998, p.166). Therefore, motivation will be discussed in the next section.

This study was guided by two Research Questions (RQs):

RQ1. What motivates students?

RQ2. Does an experimental learning environment facilitate students' motivation including RAs?

2. Three factors fundamental to motivation

According to psychology studies, 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). These three conditions are considered as essential constructs to be discussed as basis of the
experimental study. Persons in this condition are intrinsically motivated, able to fulfil their potentialities and able to see out progressively greater challenge’ (Selingman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). In this paper, motivation refers to academic motivation, which is defined as ‘a student’s energy and drive to learn, work effectively and achieve their potential’ (Bulger, McGeown & Clair-Thompson, 2015, p. 541).

2.1 Autonomy

The term autonomy is used interchangeably with “self-determination” (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 1987) and it means regulating one’s own behaviour and experience as well as governing the initiation and direction of action. Students have an innate and natural tendency toward assimilating new information, exploring novel terrain and internalising an integrating ambient practices and values. According to Ryan & Powelson (1991), one feel most related to those who are responsive to one’s autonomous expressions. The people who allow one’s autonomous expression may be parents, teachers and friends. In language classrooms, students’ autonomy is largely determined by teachers’ teaching style and orientation. Teacher’s teaching style has two types: autonomy-supportive and controlling/authoritarian. We first look at the finding of controlling teachers, followed by that of autonomy-supportive teachers.

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 & 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 & 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. Language teachers’ emphasis of accuracy and use of reward system in their language teaching 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 &1982); 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 & Connell, 1989). However, too much emphasis on autonomy and freedom may lead to dissatisfaction and depression (Martin & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) for some students. However, in general, if students feel that their teacher cares for them, students can foster feelings of belongingness as well as the adoption and internalisation of goals and values of caregivers (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Connel & Wellborn, 1991; Noddings, 1992). 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 & Powelson, 1991) and behave cooperatively to the teacher. Autonomy seems to be closely related to sense of belonging, which will be discussed next.

2.2 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, 2). 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, Anderman & Jensen, 2007).

In language teaching classrooms, students may feel sense of belonging through two types of interactions: one-to-one and/or one-to-group interaction. We first discuss one-to-group (teacher-centred) interaction using whole class instruction, followed by one-to-one (student-centred) interaction using pair work.

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-centred
classroom is preferred teaching pedagogies in collectivist countries (Winch, 2013). Although students’ interaction and exertion of influence are key factors for students’ sense of belonging in group (Schaps & Solomon, 2003), teacher is usually regarded as the main exertion of influence in teacher-centred whole class instruction. On the other hand, pair work as well as 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 (Winch, 2013). (Winch, 2013). The strength of student-centred activities is elicitation of students’ thinking in the form of discussion (Brown, 1994). Solomon et al. (1997) also point out that elicitation of students’ thinking is positively associated with sense of belonging. Student-centred may give an addictive effect to people who perceive an environment as caring, and also fulfil their need to belong (Baumeister & 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).

2.3 Perceived competence

One of the definitions of competence may be having control over outcomes (Crandall, Katkovsky & Crandall, 1965). Using this definition of competence, “perceived competence” is “the level of one’s control over the environment and one’s action” (Koufaris, 2002, 208), which may be captured by the term “perceived control”. Individuals perceive “a more positive mood when experiencing higher level of control over situations” (Whitson & Consoli, 2009, 44).

Two other definitions of competence are introduced related to this study. The first definition of competence is ‘confidence’ (Dweck, 1986). Confidence can be gained from sense of accomplishment, which is “derived from the exercise of one’s capacities under condition of optimal challenge” (Ryan & Powelson, 1991, 52). In other words, language teachers should provide students’ optimal challenge so that students perceive their competence. 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 (Beveridge & Milner, 2006; Lumby, 2011), as correct optimal challenge level elicits students’ thinking.

The second definition of competence is effective and meaningful contribution to the group (Solomon et al., 1997). In other word, it is 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 in class, 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 encouraging 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 who are more expert in full participation (Brown, 1994).

Similar to the relationship between autonomy and sense of belonging, perceived competence and sense of belonging are also 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 & 1982).

2.4 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 compared is his/her previous work as to how much they have made progress. The teacher is an advisor and monitors students’ individual progress and gives positive feedback rather than negative ones.

Autonomy was also achieved by providing opportunities for autonomous decision-making should foster the development of positive belief about personal autonomy and competence (Ryan & 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 popular teaching approach used in all over the world, which helps students’ interaction by doing pair works. CLT was also combined with “elicitation of students’ thinking”, “reciprocal teaching” and “cooperative learning” in this study.

The pedagogies in the experimental class that are used in this study are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived competence</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-challenging tasks;</td>
<td>-practice sheet; -giving choices in students’ decision- making during the class</td>
<td>-encourage interaction; -use of pair work(CLT); -reciprocal teaching; collaborate learning; group learning; -student-centred; -mutual acceptance and respect; -elicit students’ thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-participation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-supportive learning environment;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-turn-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Summary of pedagogies used in the experimental class

2.5 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.

3. Methodology

3.1 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 Kongese, 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.

3.2 Data collection: Questionnaire

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.

3.3 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 & Huberman, 1994).
4. Results

4.1 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).

4.2 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 (Anderman, 2003; 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.

**4.3 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 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’ (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 either other or to them personally in class (Q13).

5. 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 think of support for RAs, they may advise students to study abroad in a collectivist society as sense of belonging is provided consistently in family, schools and work. Examples of collectivist languages include East Asian languages (e.g. Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Thailand, Taiwan, Indonesian, and Malaysian), Arabic which is spoken in Muslim countries and languages of former-Soviet Union (Russian, Romanian, Slovenian, Bulgarian and Croatian), Hindu, Bangladesh, 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, it may give students an experience of collectivist education where all students are taught in a whole one group instruction and in teacher-centred class. Student to student interaction during the class is 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 should 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. However, it may be possible for RAs to feel sense of belonging and eventually motivated through study aboard at a collectivist educational culture.

Some British students and the RA student were uncomfortable participating in class. This was due to some students’ belief that teacher should assign the students to answer. It seems that the students’ past learning environment prevented 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 (Winch, 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 work effectively. It is often forgotten that students are in different motivational stages – some are already motivated while others have not yet experienced motivation. Any students have potential to experience motivation and language teachers may be able to change students who have not yet experienced motivation to reach to the motivated level.
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