วารสารอิเล็กทรอนิกส์
ทางการศึกษา

การสำรวจรูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจที่ครูชาวไทยผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศใช้กับนักเรียนระดับมัธยมศึกษา

A SURVEY ON MOTIVATING STYLES ADOPTED BY THAI EFL TEACHERS TOWARDS STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVELS

นายมรุพงศ์ สิงห์วิรัตน์ *

Marupong Singwirat

ผศ.ดร.จันทร์ทรงกลด คชเสนี **

Asst. Prof. Chansongklod Gajaseni, Ph.D.

บทคัดย่อ

      การวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อ (ก) เพื่อศึกษารูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจที่เป็นที่นิยมใช้ในครูชาวไทยผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศที่มีต่อนักเรียนในระดับมัธยมศึกษา และ (ข) เพื่อศึกษาเหตุผลที่อยู่เบื้องหลังพฤติกรรมการเรียนการสอนของครูที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบควบคุมและการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบสนับสนุนการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเอง กลุ่มตัวอย่างของงานวิจัยนี้คือครูชาวไทยผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศในระดับมัธยมศึกษาจำนวน 30 คน ในกรุงเทพและปริมณฑล การเก็บข้อมูลของงานวิจัยนี้ได้จากแบบสอบถามและการสัมภาษณ์ การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ ใช้สถิติเชิงพรรณนา และการทดสอบค่าที การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพ ใช้การวิเคราะห์เนื้อหา ผลการศึกษาพบว่าผู้กลุ่มตัวอย่างมีการใช้รูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบสนับสนุนการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองอยู่ในระดับสูง ในขณะที่การสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบควบคุมถูกนำมาใช้ในระดับปานกลาง ทั้งนี้สามารถตีความได้ว่าครูกลุ่มตัวอย่างที่ใช้รูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบสนับสนุนการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองมากกว่าการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบควบคุม ผลลัพธ์ที่ได้จากการสัมภาษณ์ชี้ให้ความหลากหลายในเหตุผลส่วนบุคคลที่อยู่เบื้องหลังพฤติกรรมการเรียนการสอนของครู อย่างไรก็ตาม พบว่าข้อจำกัดเรื่องเวลาเป็นสาเหตุสำคัญที่ทำให้ครูใช้รูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจแบบควบคุม

* Master's Degree Student, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

E-mail Address: marupong-tom@hotmail.com

** Adviser and Lecturer, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

E-mail Address: chansongklod@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims 1) to investigate the motivating style that is commonly used among Thai EFL teacher towards students in secondary school levels and 2) to examine rationales behind teachers' instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive motivating styles. The participants of this study were 30 Thai EFL teachers in secondary schools levels in Bangkok and vicinity. The data collection was based on the information obtained from questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and t-test. The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews was analyzed using content analysis. The results showed that the participants had a high rate of autonomy-supportive motivational usage, while the controlling motivating style was used moderately. This can be interpreted that the teachers commonly used autonomy-supportive motivating style in their classes more than controlling motivating style. The results from the interview provided a wide range of teachers' personal rationales behind their instructional behaviors; however, time limitation was considered a major cause that enforced teachers to adopt controlling motivating style.

คำสำคัญ: รูปแบบการสร้างแรงจูงใจ/ ครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ/ ระดับมัธยมศึกษา

KEYWORDS: MOTIVATING STYLES/ EFL TEACHERS/ SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVELS

Introduction

English, an international means of communication, is an important subject matter in schools in many countries where English is not the native language, including Thailand. Regarding factors affecting students' achievement in English language learning, motivation has been considered one of the most influential factors that affect outcomes of language learning of the students. Gardner (1985) defined motivation as the extent that people are eager to learn the language due to the desire or the satisfaction from learning. Spolsky (1990, p. 157) also stated that students with higher motivation are likely to learn a second language more completely and learn more quickly than students with less motivation. By this, students' motivation about English learning can certainly affect their learning outcomes. Teachers, therefore, are responsible for increasing students' motivation in language learning in order that students can be successful language learners. However, the way teachers motivate students in their classes can be varied; each teacher may have different styles to motivate students to learn in their class.

According to Reeve (2009), what teachers enact in class in order to motivate students to learn can be divided into two categorical styles: a controlling style and an autonomy-supportive style. Reeve (2009) explained that a controlling motivational style is composed of

three conditions. They include enforcing only the teacher's points of view; invading into students' thoughts, feelings, or actions; and pressuring students to think, feel, or act in particular ways. In contrast, an autonomy-supportive motivating style refers to conditions that include accommodating students' perspectives; accepting students' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors; and promoting students' motivational development and ability for autonomous self-regulation (Reeve, 2009). Reeve also provided lists of instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive motivating styles. When teachers act in a controlling way, they tend to rely on these five instructional behaviors, including 1) relying on external sources of motivation, 2) neglecting explanatory rationales, 3) relying on pressure-inducing language, 4) displaying impatience for students to produce the right answer, and 5) asserting power to overcome students' complaints and expressions of negative affect. In contrast, when teachers instruct in an autonomy-supportive way, their instructional behaviors are opposite to ones associating with controlling styles. They include 1) nurturing inner motivational resources, 2) providing explanatory rationales, 3) relying on non-controlling and informational language, 4) displaying patience to allow time for self-paced learning, and 5) acknowledging and accepting expressions of negative affect.

Each motivating style influences students' success in learning; students who are taught by different teachers who adopt different motivating styles will display different learning outcomes. The style that teachers employ is crucial since it has been shown that students taught by teachers who adopt an autonomy-supportive style display particularly more positive classroom functioning and educational outcomes than do students taught by teachers who adopt a controlling motivating style (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Reeve & Jang, 2006; Ryan & Deci, 2000 as cited in Reeve 2009). Along this line of thought, it is obvious that teachers should rely on an autonomy-supportive motivating style to motivate their students since such a style positively affect their students' learning outcomes. However, studies such as Hansen (2010), Assor et al., (2002) and Newby (1991) showed that a controlling motivating style is more commonly used during instruction. Hansen (2010) investigated the motivating styles of teachers by comparing elementary, middle, and high school teachers' orientation toward motivating students. The study showed that that high school teachers used more controlling motivational style when compared to middle and elementary school teachers. Newby (1981) observed first-year teachers' instruction and found that new teachers commonly used controlling strategies such as offering rewards, but seldom used autonomy-

supportive strategies such as explaining reasons why students had to do particular activities. Assor et al., (2002) found that teachers usually used a combination of both autonomy-supportive and controlling behaviors during instruction; however, controlling behaviors were more commonly used. The conclusion indicates that teachers often adopt a controlling motivating style during their instruction. And this might be one of the influential factors that cause failure in English language learning.

In Thailand there is a study related to this issue. The study, conducted by Loima and Vibulphol (2014), examined the external and internal motivation in learning of students in basic education in Thailand. The results from the study that is related to this issue indicated that teachers' motivational approach was commonly controlling. Therefore, it seems that researches related to the topic in question in Thai context have just started. This present study, therefore, will help confirm or oppose the results from related previous studies especially in Thai context whether Thai EFL teachers prefer using controlling or autonomy-supportive motivating style in their class. In addition, this study attempts to find the reasons why teachers choose to adopt particular instructional behaviors associated with controlling and with autonomy support, which have not been investigated yet in Thai context.

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the motivating style that is commonly used among Thai EFL teacher towards students in secondary school levels.

2. To examine rationales behind teachers' instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive motivating styles.

Methodology

Participants

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative research methods to examine the motivating styles adopted by Thai EFL teachers towards students in secondary school levels. The population of this study was Thai EFL teachers in secondary school levels in Bangkok and the surrounding vicinity. The samples of this study were 30 Thai EFL teachers in secondary schools levels in Bangkok and vicinity. The samples were from both public and private schools and were selected using snowball sampling technique.

Research Instruments

1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire format consists of two main parts.

Part 1: General demographic information of participants.

Part 2: Teachers' instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive styles.

To investigate the motivating style that Thai teachers use in their classrooms, a 5 point Likert Scale checklist was used. There were 20 items in the second part of the questionnaire; the items were in form of statements reflecting teachers' instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive styles. The statements in the questionnaire were developed based upon other researchers' (Assor et al., 2005; Reeve, 2009; Reeve & Jang, 2006; Reeve et al., 2004; Reeve, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Ryan, 1982; Schraw & Lehman, 2001) 10 items (items 3, 4, 7, 8, 14, 16 – 20) stated instructional behaviors reflecting autonomy-supportive styles while another 10 (items 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 – 13, 15) reflected behaviors associated with controlling styles. As Reeve (2009) provided lists of instructional behaviors; 5 of them were most closely associated with controlling styles and 5 were most closely associated with autonomy-supportive styles, every two of the questionnaire items were also constructed to reflect each instructional behavior. The participants were asked to rate each item based on their own teaching experience on how often they had done each particular behavior in their class. The scale ranged from almost always (5) to never (1).

2. Semi-structured interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to obtain deeper understanding of the reasons why teachers used particular instructional behaviors that associated with a controlling motivating style and an autonomy-supportive motivating style in their classes. There were two sets of questions and each set was composed of 5 questions. One was used to interview the controlling teachers, and another set was used to interview the autonomy-supportive teachers. The target interviewees were those who had the highest degree of use of each instructional behavior.

The questionnaire and semi-structured interview questions were validated by three experts in the English-as-a-foreign-language field.

Research Procedure

Data collection was divided into two main phases. In the first phase, the questionnaires were distributed to 30 participants using the snowball sampling technique. The participants were given clear instructions and explanations as to complete the questionnaire. In the second phase, the data collection was carried out through semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted with the target participants after the information derived from the questionnaire was analyzed. To investigate the rationale behind the usage of each instructional behavior, the participants who had the highest mean score of each instructional behavior, meaning that they most frequently used that particular instructional behavior, were interviewed.

Data analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaires were computed using the SPSS program. A five-point Likert scale was used to measure the level of frequency of instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive styles that the teachers had used in their classes. The scale was interpreted using the criteria adapted from Best (1981) as cited in Akkawibul (2015) as follows:

Mean Range	Level	Interpretation
1.00 – 1.49	Lowest	The lowest usage
1.50 – 2.49	Low	Low usage
2.50 – 3. 49	Moderate	Moderate usage
3.50 – 4.49	High	High usage
4.50 – 5.00	Highest	The highest usage

Descriptive statistics were used to show the mean score and standard deviation of the overall usage of motivating styles that the teachers rely on. Information from the questionnaire was divided into two parts: information obtained from 10 items (1, 2, 5, 6, 9 – 13 and 15) which corresponded to instructional behaviors associated with controlling style, whilst information obtained from the other 10 items (3, 4, 7, 8, 14, and 16 – 20) corresponded to instructional behaviors associated with autonomy-supportive style.

T-test analysis was then conducted to compare the mean scores between the usage of controlling motivating style and the usage of autonomy-supportive motivating style.

After the overall usage of the teachers' motivating styles was analyzed, the data obtained from the questionnaire were also used to specify the degree of frequency of the usage of each instructional behavior, using the same criteria as the overall usage of motivating styles. Finally, information obtained from the interview was analyzed using content analysis method.

Results

The findings of this study derived from two research questions: (1) what is the motivating style—controlling versus autonomy-supportive—that is most commonly used among Thai EFL teachers in secondary school levels? And (2) what are the reasons that teachers choose to adopt their motivating styles? Therefore, the findings were summarized into four main parts including the motivating styles used by research samples, the comparison between the overall usage of controlling motivating style and the overall usage of autonomy-supportive motivating style, usage of each instructional behavior, and the results of semi-structure interview.

Motivating styles used by research samples

This result was meant to identify the usage level of motivating styles—controlling and autonomy-supportive—in the research samples' classes.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for overall usage of motivating styles used by research samples

	Mean	S.D.	Interpretation
Overall usage of controlling motivating style	3.34	.551	Moderate usage of controlling motivating style.
Overall usage of autonomy-supportive motivating style	4.03	.334	High usage of autonomy-supportive motivating style.

Table 1 shows the overall usage of controlling teaching style and the overall usage of autonomy-supportive teaching style used by research samples. The findings reveal that research samples had a moderate usage of controlling teaching style (mean = 3.34), but had a high usage of autonomy-supportive teaching style (mean = 4.03).

Comparison between the overall usage of controlling teaching style and the overall usage of autonomy-supportive teaching style

This result compares the usage levels between controlling teaching style and autonomy-supportive teaching style of the samples.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for comparison of motivating styles used by research samples

Variable	Motivating style	N	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig.
Motivating	Controlling	10	3.34	.551	-3.378	.003
Style	Autonomy-supportive	10	4.03	.334		

Table 2 shows the comparison between the overall usage of controlling teaching style and the overall usage of autonomy-supportive teaching style. The results reveal that the use of autonomy-supportive teaching styles adopted by the samples was statistically different from the use of controlling teaching style at 0.05 significant level, meaning that the research samples preferred using an autonomy-supportive teaching style rather than a controlling teaching style in their classes.

Instructional behaviors used by research samples

The findings are divided into two sections: instructional behaviors associated with controlling teaching style and instructional behaviors associated with autonomy-supportive teaching style.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics for the usage of instructional behaviors associated with controlling teaching style

Motivating Style	Instructional Behaviors	Mean	S.D.	Interpretation
Controlling	1. Rely on outer sources of motivation.	3.47	1.016	Moderate usage
	2. Neglect explanatory rationales.	3.10	0.933	Moderate usage
	3. Rely on pressure-inducing language.	3.47	1.033	Moderate usage
	4. Display impatience for students to produce the right answer.	3.92	0.829	High usage
	5. Assert power to overcome students' complaints and expressions of negative affect.	2.77	1.047	Moderate usage

Table 3 shows that displaying impatience for students to produce the right answer was used at a high level (mean = 3.92) while the rest of the behaviors—relying on external sources of motivation, neglecting explanatory rationales, relying on pressure-inducing language, and asserting power to overcome students' complaints and expressions of negative affect—were used at a moderate level.

Table 4

Descriptive statistics for the usage of instructional behaviors associated with autonomy-supportive teaching style

Motivating Style	Instructional Behaviors	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Autonomy-supportive	1. Nurture inner motivational resources.	3.68	.833	High usage
	2. Provide explanatory rationales.	4.47	.724	High usage
	3. Rely on non-controlling and	4.07	.660	High usage

Motivating Style	Instructional Behaviors	Mean	SD	Interpretation
	informational language.			
	4. Display patience to allow time for self-paced learning.	3.98	.725	High usage
	5. Acknowledge and accept expressions of negative affect.	3.95	.811	High usage

Table 4 reveals that all instructional behaviors associated with autonomy-supportive motivating style were used at a high level.

Rationale behind the use of each instructional behavior

Instructional behaviors associated with controlling motivating style

1. Rely on external sources of motivation.

The interviewee claimed that using external motivational resources such as rewards, punishment and discipline could help teachers to manage the class well and could apply to motivate all students. The interviewee indicated that the lesson could not be designed to match interests of all students and that made some students who did not have interest in the lesson likely to interrupt the class. Therefore, outer motivation resources were more effective for all students to be obliged to obey rules.

2. Neglect explanatory rationales.

The interviewee said that the interviewee rarely explained the reasons before the lessons because it spent a lot of time and some students might not perceive the provided reason as valuable as the teacher thought. The interviewee always let student learn first and thought that students would understand the reason through the lesson by themselves.

3. Rely on pressure-inducing language.

The interviewee preferred to use phrases such as "let's do it this way" or "quickly" to let students do their tasks more enthusiastic. The interviewee thought these kind of pressure-inducing words seemed to have power in themselves and could gain more student attention during class. They (he/she?) especially believed, this could prevent students from becoming drowsy during lessons. Sometimes the interviewee used 'forceful' language with misbehaving students or when students got off of the topic too far. The main reason for this was that the interviewee didn't want to waste time on topics not related to the subject.

Moreover, the interviewee thought that such forceful language could make students respect the teacher while teaching.

4. Display impatience for students to produce the right answer.

The interviewee explained that since the number of students per class was around 40-50, it was impossible to allow time for every single student to learn to get the right answer by themselves. The interviewee also indicated that the amount of time per period was limited; therefore, the time limit for doing tasks and activities was important when the interviewee wanted to complete the lesson in time.

5. Assert power to overcome students' complaints and expressions of negative affect.

The interviewees said that if all negative student feedback was accepted, it would seem like the interviewee was fostering the laziness of the students. The interviewee claimed that Thai students naturally tend to complain about things since they are often treated with comforts and amenities. Once there is something difficult to do or something that requires students to put in some effort, they will complain first. The interviewee, therefore, thought that students needed to experience hardships in study, so they will gradually learn and grow in their exact knowledge and experience.

Instructional behaviors associated with autonomy-supportive motivating style

1. Nurture intrinsic motivational resources.

The reason for the interviewee to use intrinsic motivational resources was that the interviewee wanted the lesson to be fun and memorable. The interviewee claimed that without students' interest or challenging activities, students would find nothing worth doing or remembering.

2. Provide explanatory rationales.

The interviewee claimed that it is necessary to let students know the objectives before running an activity because students would realize the benefits that they were going to derive. Without telling them, students will not have any clue and overlook the importance of having activity. Providing rationales can also prompt students with readiness so that students could prepare themselves for what they will learn.

3. Rely on non-controlling and informational language.

The interviewee said that the reason for not using controlling language was that the interviewee didn't want to make students feel pressured during the class. If students are pressured, they might get so anxious that they cannot work fully by their minds. Also, the interviewee claimed that that the interviewee tries to give hints or clues instead of immediately explaining when students seem troubled, because the interviewee wants to encourage students to express their ideas and think critically by themselves.

4. Display patience to allow time for self-paced learning.

The reason for allowing more time for students was that the interviewee wants to allow each student to notice their own gap in learning. The interviewee said that the gap of each student is not the same and the students themselves are the best ones to know the gap or things to be learned than the teacher tell them what to learn. The interviewee gives feedback to students to ensure their correct understanding. The interviewee thought that to allow time for self-learning makes students take charge of their own learning making them pay more attention to what they are learning.

5. Acknowledge and accept expressions of negative affect.

The interviewee accepted students' negative feedback because the interviewee thought that each student would have different ideas and there might be something substantive behind their negative feedback. The interviewee allows chances for students to give feedback and asks for reasons why students complained since the interviewee thought students' perspectives might reveal something that the teachers couldn't realize by themselves.

Discussion

According to the first research question, what is the teaching style—controlling versus autonomy-supportive—that is more commonly used among Thai EFL teachers in secondary school levels?, the results of this study revealed that Thai EFL teachers in secondary school levels in Bangkok and vicinity had a high usage of the autonomy-supportive motivating style while the controlling motivating style was used moderately. This can be interpreted that the teachers commonly used autonomy-supportive motivating style in their classes more than controlling motivating style. The result from this study was opposed to some previous studies such as Assor et al., (2002), Newby (1991) and Loima and

Vibulphol (2014) who concluded that a controlling motivating style was more commonly used during instruction. One plausible explanation for this circumstance might be that this study investigated solely from the teachers' perspectives, therefore, there might be some bias from the teachers themselves. Another possible explanation is that about a half of the research samples who participated in this study were new generation teachers who had experience in teaching less than 5 years, so they might not value the Thai traditional ways of teaching, featuring teachers that expect the class to be well-managed, expect students to keep quiet and listen to the lecture, and pressure students to think, feel, or behave in particular ways, reflecting the controlling style. Instead, the new generation of teachers might realize the importance of autonomy support, so they might try to take and integrate students' perspective into the flow of the instruction.

According to the second research question, what are the reasons behind teachers' particular instructional behaviors associated with controlling and autonomy-supportive motivating styles?, the results provided a wide range of personal reasons why the teachers used particular instructional behaviors in their classes. The reasons for adopting an autonomy-supportive teaching style revealed that teachers were likely to realize the benefits of the autonomy-supportive classrooms and taught in line with autonomy-supportive methods, such as building the lessons upon students' interests, allowing time for students to learn by themselves, accepting negative feedback from students and etc. As for the reasons why teachers used controlling motivating style, the results showed personal reasons of each teacher. All reasons showed that that teachers behaved in controlling ways because they thought what they did was good for students. The teachers had good will towards students but it seemed they didn't realize that what they did might prevent students from being as successful as they could be if the teachers relied on autonomy-supportive techniques. However, there was an explicit condition that forced teachers to act in a controlling way. According to the interview, time limitation was mentioned as a reason why teachers had to enact particular instructional behaviors. Such behaviors—neglecting explanatory rationales, relying on pressure-inducing language, and displaying impatience for students to produce the right answer—were used during instruction due to time limitation. Therefore, to reduce the condition that might cause teachers to use controlling instructional behaviors, time allowance should be appropriate for the content that a teacher is

responsible to teach or the assigned tasks and activities. Otherwise, teachers have to rush, which pushes them to employee controlling instructional behaviors.

Recommendation for further research

Regarding the findings discussed in this study, there are some suggestions for further studies. First, the number of research samples should be bigger so that it can generalize the validity of the data. Second, investigation of teachers' teaching styles should include other people's perspectives such as student feedback or the researcher's observation in order to prevent the bias of the results.

References

Akkawibul, B. (2015). A survey on vocabulary learning strategies of Thai students at Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology. *An Online Journal of Education, 10(1),* 118-130

Assor, A., Kaplan, H., Kanat-Maymon, Y., & Roth, G. (2005). Directly controlling teacher behaviors as predictors of poor motivation and engagement in girls and boys: The role of anger and anxiety. *Learning and Instruction*, *15*, 397–413.

Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teaching behaviors predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *27*, 261–278.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Hansen, M. (2010). A comparison of Elementary, Middle, and High School Teachers' Orientation toward Motivating Students. ProQuest.

Loima, J. and Vibulphol, J. (2014). Internal interest or external performing?: A qualitative study on motivation and learning of 9th graders in Thailand basic education. *Journal of Education and Learning, 3,* 194–203.

Newby, T. J. (1991). Classroom motivation: Strategies of first-year teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*, 195–200.

Reeve, J. (2009). Why Teachers Adopt a Controlling Motivating Style Toward Students and How They Can Become More Autonomy Supportive. *Educational Psychologist*, *44*(3), 159–175.

Reeve, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Self-determination theory: A dialectical framework for understanding the sociocultural influences on student motivation. In D. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning: Big theories revisited (Vol. 4, pp. 31–59). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Press.

Reeve, J. & Jang, H. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students' autonomy during a learning activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *98*, 209–218.

Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Barch, J., & Jeon, S. (2004). Enhancing high school students' engagement by increasing their teachers' autonomy support. *Motivation and Emotion*, *28*, 147–169.

Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*, 450–461.

Spolsky, B. (1990). *Conditions for second language learning*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Schraw, G., & Lehman, S. (2001). Situational interest: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, *13*, 23–52.