

Change in Motivation through Task-Based Language Teaching in the Japanese context

Okamura Akiko

Abstract

This paper reports a preliminary study to find the impact of collaborative work on the motivation of the students with different levels of proficiency in English over one academic year, set within the framework of complex dynamic systems theory. A questionnaire was administered twice to 521 college students on the same Task-based English course, together with their teachers. To encourage the students to respond candidly, the questionnaire responses were submitted and analyzed anonymously, showing the findings only by class. However, the findings suggest potential benefits of collaborative work in raising motivation, in particular, among lower intermediate college students who were not motivated in high school. While upper intermediate students could bring their pre-existing personal interest to the class, these lower intermediate students discovered motivation in class deriving from their enjoyment of collaborative work over the year. It was found that the interest in the task created enjoyment and a state of 'flow'. However, enjoyment of the task did not induce extra work outside class hours for the majority of the lower intermediate students. Collaborative work can be a potential motivator, but the students still need to regulate their activities to transform the enjoyment to learning.

Highlights

Group work can effect change in less motivated, lower-intermediate students
The motivation of upper-intermediate students is supported by their interest in English
Lower-intermediate students discover motivation in class through collaborative work
Tasks induce a state of 'flow' that increases motivation

Key words

complex dynamic systems, motivation, proficiency levels, collaborative work, socially shared regulation

1. Introduction

Learners' motivation to study English can be influenced by various external and internal variables in the learning process (Dornyei, 2009b; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011). Large scale studies have been carried out to identify the influential variables for motivation in the language learning context (e.g. Dornyei & Csizer 2002; Kormos, Kiddle & Csizer, 2011; Kozaki & Ross, 2011; Ryan, 2009).

In Japanese high schools, teaching methods have often been geared towards the university entrance examination, and a focus on grammar translation seems to be a prevalent approach, according to university students' recollection of their high school education (Falout, Elwood, Hood, 2009; Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Hamada & Kito, 2008; Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009; Kikuchi, 2009; Murphey, Falout, Elwood, Hood, 2009). Thus collaborative work in the English language class tends to be a new experience for most Japanese college students.

Because motivation is not a stable construct (Dornyei 2001), it can be hypothesized that a different teaching approach focusing on interaction and communication, such as a Task-based collaborative learning approach, can change learners' motivation. The change can also be influenced by learners' proficiency levels and their past experience. Thus considering both proficiency levels and high school experience, this study investigates whether Task-based collaborative work can bring about changes in the motivation of 521 non-English major students over one academic year within complex dynamic systems. To encourage the students to respond candidly, in this study the questionnaire responses were collected and analyzed anonymously, showing the findings only by class. Thus for the investigation of an individual student's change in motivation, the study was very exploratory in nature and requires further research.

2. Previous studies

2.1. Collaborative learning

Studies in educational psychology have shown that collaborative learning is an effective learning tool in the classroom as it can help to create a psychologically and cognitively supportive network among students (Aziz & Hossain, 2010; Azmitia, 1988; Arvaja, Hakkinen, Rasku-Puttonen, Etelapelto, 2002; Slavin, 1996).

With regard to second language acquisition, although collaborative work had been carried out in the educational context for some time, Long & Porter (1985) initiated the inquiry into collaborative learning as a resource for learning a second language. To distinguish

collaborative learning from the single or occasional use of group work in class, Dornyei (1997) provided three key criteria: 1) learners mostly work in a group numbering between 3 and 6 members in class; 2) learners need to work together to achieve the shared instructed goal; 3) evaluation is made not only of individual contributions but of the achievement as a whole.

Although collaborative work can be useful in education, some negative aspect in implementing it needs some attention. “Social loafing” or free riding, whereby some members may not make their optimal effort and instead rely on the work of other members (Harkins & Petty, 1982). In fact, reducing social loafing in an activity has been tackled in various ways, for example by identifying individual contributions (Linden, Wayne, Jaworski & Bennett, 2004) and creating a group identity to consolidate coherence and the motivation of the members (Chang, 2010; Dornyei & Malderez, 1997; Dornyei, 1997). Chang (2010) showed the operation of group work seems to be highly related to the motivation of individual members; thus, individual learners’ motivation needs to be considered in the understanding of collaborative learning.

2.2. Task-based collaborative work in the Japanese context

One approach to employing collaboration has been adopted by the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) syllabus (e.g. East 2012; Leaver & Willis 2004; Shehadeh & Coombe 2012; Van den Branden, Bygate, & Norris, 2009; Willis & Willis 2007), which is based on a meaning-focused activity that aims to achieve an outcome through the use of both linguistic and non-linguistic resources (Ellis 2009). As a collaborative task can prepare the students for their future job environment, it can also help to enhance motivation as an external source to induce learning.

However, some questions about the effectiveness of TBLT have also been raised in the foreign language context (East 2012; Littlewood 2007). For example, using English can be unnatural in interaction when the learners share a mother tongue. Also, there may be ‘incompatibility with public assessment demands’, in particular in the Asian context, including Japan (Littlewood 2007, p.243).

Thus without a preparation for the entrance examination, the university seems to be a place where TBLT can be applied to raise motivation to learn English in the Japanese context.

2.3. Studies on motivation

In educational psychology, Deci & Ryan (1985) proposed three basic innate psychological needs that underlie human behavior, that is, competence, autonomy and relatedness. They argued, as the foundation of Self Determination theory,* that human beings are motivated to fulfill these needs in relation to their environment (Deci, Nezlek & Sheinman, 1981). In their

Organismic Integration Theory, they presented a subsystem which represents motivations as lying on a continuum from extrinsic to intrinsic,* rather than presenting these as totally discrete entities (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Dornyei (2005, 2009a) has pointed out the importance of the L2 learning environment and experience for the analysis of motivation in classroom teaching. Teachers can also represent another motivational source in a foreign language context (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008). It can be said that learners discover motivation through working with their fellow classmates in a classroom environment (Dornyei, 2009a,b; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011).

When motivation was absent, Ryan & Deci (2000) defined this as amotivation or low-motivation, due to a lack of competence and will, while Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011) listed reduced self-confidence and a negative attitude towards the foreign language as sources of demotivation (loss of motivation, Dornyei 2001), caused by the students' experience and their learning environment. To fully understand the loss and lack of motivation in students, it seems necessary to consider both learners' competence, and their learning experience and environment.

2.4. Complex dynamics systems framework

As the learning process is a lengthy one, complex dynamic systems theory has been adopted in education and language learning to grasp the influence of multivariate factors and non-linear change in the learning process (e.g. de Bot, Lawie & Verspoor, 2007; Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006; de Bot, Lowie, Thorne, & Vespoor, 2013; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008; Lenzing, 2015). This theory tries to understand a change in motivation considering the whole situated learning experience (Dornyei 2009b; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011; Dornyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015). When the system is in a stable situation to resist a change, an attractor is said to maintain the preferred stability or a repeller to keep away a dispreferred one (Dornyei 2009b). Future self-guides have been proposed as one potential candidate for attractors for the analysis of sustaining motivation over time (Dornyei 2009b). They are concerned with hopes, advancements and achievements, and have been presented to be more associated with the ideal self* than the ought-to self* (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011; Dornyei, 2009a). Indeed, the interviews carried out with 12 students in collaborative work in Chang's (2010) study showed that the motivated students were guided by their *future self-guides*, in contrast to other group members.

To analyze the maintenance of motivation within this framework, Dornyei & Ushioda (2011) looked into *interest*, *motivational flow*, and *the motivational task processing system*. *Interest* was used to mean cognitive curiosity, engagement and the joy associated with it by Dornyei & Ushioda (2011). Krapp (1999) provided three perspectives on interest to help understand this broad area of research: *personal interest*, *interestingness*, and *interest* as a

psychological state (including situational interest). *Personal interest* is a stable individual disposition that represents a personal characteristic. It can often be considered to be similar to a general liking for the subject area, such as expressed in the phrase “I like English” (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). Through a large survey of 2,397 Japanese college and high school students and interviews with four of them, Ryan (2009) found that “liking English” was a common response from Japanese students when asked about the reason for learning English. Although “liking English” is an attitude and interest (Schiefele, Krapp & Winteler, 1992), rather than a motivation, both seem to be crucial constructs in learning foreign languages (Kormos, Kiddle, Csizer, 2011).

Interestingness represents characteristics of the context/situation such as the text, materials, content tasks, activity, and classroom. *Personal interest and interestingness* can be closely related, as is expressed in the phrase “I enjoy working on the task in English class” (Schiefele, Krapp & Winteler, 1992). Thus the third perspective of interest can derive from the integration of *personal interest* and the *interestingness* of the context/situation, making a close link between *personal interest in English* to “liking English” and “enjoying English class” as characteristics of person and context. However, *personal interest* can come with the learner, *interestingness* and *interest* can emerge in the context. *Personal interest* can be more highly related than *interestingness* and *interest* to learners’ proficiency levels and their self-confidence in the language classroom (Falout & Maruyama, 2004). Collaborative work can materialize *interest*, as it is where individuals with different personal interests come together to work to complete the task.

Based on the concept introduced by Csikszentmihalyi (1990), Dorynei & Ushioda (2011, p.94) describe *motivational flow* as a heightened level of motivated task engagement, referring to a specific type of intrinsic* motivation. We can find *motivational flow* when classroom tasks are manageable, and intrinsically interesting and authentic (Egbert, 2003), which again might depend on the learners’ proficiency levels in the language classroom.

Then Dornyei & Ushioda (2011) proposed *the motivational task processing system* to show a link between the task completion and the motivation, consisting of three interrelated mechanisms: *task execution*, *appraisal* and *action control*. Execution involves the learners’ interest, while appraisal needs to consider the enjoyment of and learning from collaborative work. Action control, in the form of *self-regulation in educational psychology, has been studied as a mix of motivational and cognitive processes (Boekaerts, Pintrich & Zeidner, 1999; Boekaerts & Corno, 2006; Pintrich, 2004; Zimmerman, 2008), which can be related to the differences between students with different proficiency levels.

2.5. Self-efficacy and socially shared regulation

To analyze the differences between lower intermediate and upper intermediate students, self-regulation needs to be considered in relation to self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to expectancies with regard to personal capabilities for organizing and executing courses of action (Bandura, 1977, 1991, 2012; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). According to Usher & Pajares (2008), self-efficacy beliefs influence various aspects of students' self-regulation. self-efficacious students use more cognitive strategies to cope with the situation and work longer in the face of the adversity.

Self-regulated learning and self-efficacy investigates individual learner's internal process (Bandura 1977; Zimmerman & Schunk 2011; Zimmerman 1990). Collaborative learning has paid attention to socially shared regulated learning, referring to the processes by which group members regulate their collective activity; it has been found that successful groups share in regulating group processes for motivating and stimulating others (Hadwin, Järvelä & Miller 2011; Panadero & Järvelä, 2015). Studies on collaborative work in relation to socially shared learning have shown that collaboration can provide support to the individual learners' self-regulated learning process (e.g. Järvelä, Naykki, Laru & Luokkanen, 2007; Järvelä & Järvenoja, 2011; Järvelä, Järvenoja, Malmberg, Hadwin, 2013; Molenaar & Järvelä, 2014; Malmberg & Hadwin, 2011; Rogat & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2011).

According to Järvelä & Järvenoja (2011) who investigated the social dimension of regulation among four groups of first-year graduate students, at the beginning of the collaborative work, the students experienced more challenges that were due to different personal priorities, whereas they found challenges in the area of collaboration increased toward the end. Therefore, to investigate a change in the learning process in relation to collaborative work and motivation, it seems necessary to take a longitudinal approach to identify both influential external and internal forces over the time (Dornyei, 2009b; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011).

3. The present study

3.1. The purpose

This study aims to discover whether Task-based collaborative work motivates 521 students with different proficiency levels to learn English speaking skills over a year. To identify the change in motivation in relation to individual tasks, the analysis will be carried out within a complex dynamic systems framework (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011).

3.2. The language course and the textbook

The course was a weekly obligatory English class following a Task-based syllabus for

first year economics major students. The researcher worked as the course coordinator and one of the teachers. The aim of the language course was to provide an opportunity to speak English as a means of getting a message across, rather than pursuing grammatical accuracy. Thus the Task-based textbook 'Widgets' (Benevides & Valvona, 2008) based on collaborative work was chosen as it requires students to engage in the creation and selling of a new product as a trainee in an international company; all the students had to go through the same tasks over the year. The textbook has six stages, four of which focus on collaborative work tasks, which count for 50% of the assessment in each semester. Among the four collaborative work stages (Stage 1, 3, 4, 5), the first collaborative task (Stage 1) is the least demanding cognitively and linguistically as it consists of the presentation of an informal talk called a 'water cooler chat' taking place among the members in front of the class. Then as the second collaborative task (Stage 3), the members choose the best product out of four proposed and explain the reason for their choice through a poster presentation, a medium intended to create a friendly and informative interaction between the presenter and the audience, as a preparation for the formal presentation required at Stage 4. The workload becomes more demanding as the course proceeds in semester 2, with the third collaborative task (Stage 4: carrying out market research) being the most demanding, followed by a final collaborative task of creating an infomercial (Stage 5), to sell the product to target customers.

For all stages, the students needed to present their task orally without reading from a script. The teachers also corrected their English as immediate feedback and/or through a process of revising it, in order to produce comprehensible discourse. The length of the group presentation was between 3 to 5 minutes per group. For the market research presentation, most of the students used the Microsoft Power Point program, but this was not obligatory. Although it was necessary to practice as a group outside class hours to be able to present fluently, this was also not a mandatory requirement.

3.3. Piloting

The main study was preceded by a piloting phase to obtain students' comments on their motivation and on collaborative work with open-ended questions. This was to avoid imposing the preconceptions that would have shaped a multiple choice design. The pilot phase took place in the preceding year with a different set of 500 students in both first and second semesters. The analysis of responses showed that nearly a third of students gave more than one reason for their motivation and amotivation in collaborative work in the first semester. Thus for the first semester of the main study, it was decided to allow the option of selecting up to two choices of response for questions on these topics.

3.4. The Main Study

3.4.1. Students and teachers

The respondents were 521 first year economics majors, spread across 21 classes with about 23 to 26 students per class, forming about 6 groups of 3 to 5 members, working together throughout the academic year. These 21 classes were formed into three different proficiency groups, based on their scores in English language test in their national level university entrance examination (University Center Examination). The top five classes were called UPPER INTERMEDIATE classes and the next ten classes were INTERMEDIATE classes, followed by the bottom six classes, labelled LOWER INTERMEDIATE classes, as shown in Table 1. As the streaming test did not involve a speaking section, the division can only indicate differences in the reading and listening skills tested.

Six Japanese teachers of English, including the researcher, taught two to four weekly classes for a duration of 15 weeks each semester. They all had significant experience of studying in English speaking countries and an understanding of TBLT. Although one teacher was not too keen on a meaning focused approach, she agreed to follow the textbook 'Widgets', as did the other teachers. They were asked to use mainly English in class, with some Japanese, to create a bilingual context rather than an English only one. The inclusion of Japanese was to avoid miscommunication between the teacher and the students, and among the students.

Table 1 shows the number of classes and teachers, and the mean score on the entrance examination English tests for the three different proficiency-level groups. To avoid the confounding variable of the teacher's effect on the students, most teachers, with the exception of the researcher, taught at more than one proficiency-level group such as UPPER INTERMEDIATE classes and LOWER INTERMEDIATE classes.

Table 1: Three Groups of classes

	UPPER INTERMEDIATE	INTERMEDIATE	LOWER INTERMEDIATE
Number of classes	5	10	6
Number of teachers	2	5	3
Mean score of entrance examinations out of 100	78/100	64/100	54/100

3.5. Data

3.5.1. Types of data

To understand the changes in motivation and learning that took place through the students' collaborative work in class, this study collected questionnaires from the students at the end of each semester (see Appendix A) in order to collect students' candid opinions on the course and their attitude to learning. Thus this study is very exploratory in nature and calls for further research. It was decided to make the questionnaire anonymous, that is,

identifiable only by class. In addition, data were collected from 5 teachers in the form of a questionnaire at the end of the course and two meetings before and after the course.

3.5.2. Questionnaires for the students

In semester 1, students were given questions about a) motivation in high school English class, b) motivation about tasks and the reasons for motivation and amotivation, c) interest and enjoyment of speaking English and of collaborative work in class, and d) the group's extra work outside class hours.

In semester 2, similar questions were also asked, but motivation was asked about with regard to two tasks separately, at both individual and group levels. A question was also asked about learning from the presentations of other groups and important factors in operating the group.

3.5.3. Questionnaire for teachers and teachers' meetings

A questionnaire was also administered to the teachers (excluding the researcher) to ask for their comments on and problems with the collaborative tasks (see Appendix B). Meetings were held twice, one prior to the start of the academic year to clarify the common syllabus and approach to the evaluation of students' work. The other one took place just after the end of semester 2 to review the course and discuss the problems the teacher had confronted to improve the course.

4. Results

4.1. Differences in reported motivation between high school and semester 1 of university study, in relation to proficiency level

Students were asked about their degree of motivation in high school and semester 1 of the TBLT course in the university (TBLT) at the end of semester 1. To compare a difference in motivation between the two situations, a conversion was carried out from the five point scale on TBLT to the three point one "yes", "no" and "difficult to decide" used on high school motivation.

Then to analyze the stability and change in motivation between the two, students were divided into four types (see Table 2): Type 1 being those motivated both in both high school and TBLT; Type 2 being those amotivated (lack of motivation) in both high school and TBLT; Type 3 being those motivated in high school but demotivated (loss of motivation) in TBLT; and Type 4 being those amotivated in high school but motivated in TBLT. Here those who chose "neither motivated nor amotivated" and who did not respond to the question were excluded, making 313 out of 521 students.

LOWER INTERMEDIATE students tend to increase their motivation at the university

Table 2: Change in Motivation from high school to TBLT course at the university

Motivation types	University proficiency levels		
	UPPER INTERMEDIATE	INTERMEDIATE	LOWER INTERMEDIATE
Type 1 Motivated in both high school and university 143 (27.3%)	39 (30.5%)	82 (33.9%)	22 (14.9%)
Type 2 Amotivated in both high school and university 43 (8.2%)	20 (15.6%)	25 (10.3%)	7 (4.6%)
Type 3 Motivated in high school but demotivated in university 52 (10.0%)	11 (8.6%)	18 (7.4%)	14 (9.3%)
Type 4 Amotivated in high school but motivated in university 75 (14.4%)	13 (10.2%)	20 (8.3%)	42 (27.8%)
Total numbers analyzed 313, excluding those stating "difficult to respond to the questions".	83	145	85

The difference between the four types and three groups is significant (Chi-Square=49.78, df=6, $p < 0.001$, Cramer's $V = 0.282$)

Table 3: Type 1 Motivated both in high school and TBLT in university

	UPPER INTERMEDIATE ATE		INTERMEDIATE ATE		LOWER INTERMEDIATE ATE		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Useful	13.5	34.6	16	19.5	7.5	34.1	37	25.9
Interesting	3	7.7	16	19.5	3.5	15.9	22.5	15.7
Liking English	12	30.8	26.5	32.3	4	18.2	42.5	29.7
Liking to talk to foreigners	1.5	3.8	12	14.6	2	9.1	15.5	10.8
Others members' motivation	5	12.8	6	7.3	5	22.7	16	11.2
Other	3	7.7	4.5	5.5	0	0.0	7.5	5.2
No response	1	2.6	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	1.4
Total	39	100	82	100	22	100	143	100

Table 4: Type 2 Demotivated both in high school and TBLT in university

	UPPER INTERMEDIATE ATE		INTERMEDIATE ATE		LOWER INTERMEDIATE ATE		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
University entrance exam over	1.5	13.6	2.5	13.9	2.5	17.9	6.5	15.1
Interesting	4	36.4	0	0.0	1	7.1	5	11.6
Liking English	4.5	40.9	6	33.3	4.5	32.1	15	34.9
Liking to talk to foreigners	0	0.0	3	16.7	2	14.3	5	11.6
Others members' motivation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	1	9.1	2.5	13.9	1	7.1	4.5	10.5
No response	0	0.0	4	22.2	3	21.4	7	16.3
Total	11	100	18	100	14	100	43	100

Table 5: Type 3 Motivated in high school but demotivated in TBLT in university

	UPPER INTERMEDIATE ATE		INTERMEDIATE ATE		LOWER INTERMEDIATE ATE		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
University entrance exam over	7	35.0	5.5	22.0	2	28.6	14.5	27.9
Boring	7.5	37.5	3	12.0	0	0.0	10.5	20.2
Disliking English	2	10.0	0	0.0	2	28.6	4	7.7
Not wanting to think in English	1.5	7.5	3.5	14.0	0	0.0	5	9.6
Others members' demotivation	0.5	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.5	1.0
Other	1.5	7.5	3	12.0	1	14.3	5.5	10.6
No response	0	0.0	10	40.0	2	28.6	12	23.1
Total	20	100	25	100	7	100	52	100

Table 6: Type 4 Demotivated in high school but motivated in TBLT in university

	UPPER INTERMEDIATE ATE		INTERMEDIATE ATE		LOWER INTERMEDIATE ATE		TOTAL	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Useful	1.5	11.5	5	25.0	8.5	20.2	15	20.0
Interesting	0	0.0	3.5	17.5	6.5	15.5	10	13.3
Liking English	2.5	19.2	1	5.0	2.5	6.0	6	8.0
Liking to talk to foreigners	0.5	3.8	0.5	2.5	5	11.9	6	8.0
Others members' motivation	3.5	26.9	6.5	32.5	12	28.6	22	29.3
Other	5	38.5	3.5	17.5	7.5	17.9	16	21.3
No response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	13	100	20	100	42	100	75	100

much more than INTERMEDIATE AND UPPER INTERMEDIATE students. Indeed, a chi-square test demonstrated statistical significance (chi-square, 49.79) at $df=6$, $p<0.0001$, Cramer's V, 0.282 between the three proficiency groups of students.

Next questions were asked about the reasons for motivation or amotivation in TBLT in the form of a multiple choice selection to select up to two reasons.

If one student chose only one reason, one point was given to a choice, while if two reasons were selected, each choice was given 0.5 of a point, to maintain an equal share of points (one point) per student. Thus the total number of points is identical to that of the student responders. However, relatively few students chose two (UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 5, INTERMEDIATE: 4, LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 8) and the second choice often included the open category of 'others', with some specific comments, describing their anxiety or fear of dropping out of the course. Thus it was found that the extra responses did not form

major reasons for motivation.

For stable motivation types: Types 1 (Table 3) and 2 (Table 4), both UPPER INTERMEDIATE and LOW INTERMEDIATE students shared similar reasons. For Type 1, the students tended to choose a reason that is related to *future self-guides*, “useful for future work” 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE, 13.5 (34.6%); INTERMEDIATE, 16 (19.5%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE, 7.5 (34.1%)】. In fact, when all the students were asked about any extra item that should be included in the course, 319 students requested the preparation for an English test, the *TOEIC*, which they need to take as part of their efforts towards job hunting. However, as can be expected, “liking English” was less likely to be chosen by less proficient students 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE, 12 (30.8%); INTERMEDIATE, 26.5 (32.3%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE, 4 (18.2%)】.

For Type 2, a different picture emerged. The two strong reasons for amotivation in this type were “disliking English” 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 4.5 (40.9%); INTERMEDIATE: 6 (33.3%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 4.5 (32.1%)】 and “the end of the entrance examination” 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 1.5 (13.6%); INTERMEDIATE: 2.5 (13.9%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 2.5 (17.9%)】.

By contrast, for changed motivation types, Types 3 (Table 5) and 4 students (Table 6), showed a sharp contrast to Type 1 and 2. For Type 3, when motivation changed negatively from high school to university, the strongest reason “the end of the entrance examination” was common among all the groups 【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE, 7 (35.0%); INTERMEDIATE, 5.5 (22.0%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 2 (28.6%)】.

But “disliking English” was chosen mainly by LOWER INTERMEDIATE students 【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 2 (10.0%); INTERMEDIATE: 0 (0%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 2 (28.6%)】 , while “boring” was predominantly the choice of UPPER INTERMEDIATE and INTERMEDIATE students 【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 7.5 (37.5%); INTERMEDIATE: 3(12.0%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 0(0%)】 .

It is interesting that only 1 out of 152 amotivated students stated that their lack of motivation was related to the working with the other group members for this type.

For Type 4 students who changed positively from high school to university, collaborative work was the strongest reason across the groups 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 3.5 (26.9%); INTERMEDIATE: 6.5 (32.5%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 12 (28.6%)】 , except “others” for UPPER INTERMEDIATE students: 5 (38.5%), supporting the role of collaboration as extrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci 2000). The collaborative tasks seemed to cause a change in motivation more for LOWER INTERMEDIATE students who were not motivated and disliked English in the examination oriented high school English class.

“Others” here also represented extrinsic motivation such as “to catch up with the course” and “not to fail the course.” The importance of group members, in particular for LOWER INTERMEDIATE, was supported by a comment from one teacher. She wrote “The students seem to make the best use of what they can do,” when asked about the benefit of collaborative work in a questionnaire.

With type 4 students, the choices of UPPER INTERMEDIATE and LOWER INTERMEDIATE show a sharp contrast for the second reason. UPPER INTERMEDIATE students chose “liking English” (2.5: 19.2%) but not the task being “interesting” (0: 0%), while this was reversed by LOWER INTERMEDIATE students, that is, they were less likely to be motivated by *personal interest*, “liking English” (2.5: 6.0%) but more by *interestingness of the situation*, an “interesting” task (6.5: 15.5%). Proficiency levels seem to affect the source of motivation.

4.2. A change in students’ motivation and demotivation in semester 2

In semester 2, the students engaged in two collaborative tasks: carrying out *Market research* and making *an Infomercial*. A question on motivation was asked separately for each task, on a 4 point scale. A chi-square test was employed to compare the difference in motivation between the two tasks and found no statistical significance among the three Groups (chi-square: 0.15, df=2, $p < 0.9277$, Cramer’s V: 0.0134) (Appendix C). However, when the chi-square was applied to compare the difference between the top three reasons for motivation among the three groups of students, the results showed a statistical significance for both tasks: *Market Research*: chi-square: 10.90, df=4, $p < 0.0277$, Cramer’s V=0.119; *Infomercial*: chi-square: 16.64, df=4, $p < 0.0023$, Cramer’s V=0.1466. Students were asked in this instance to choose only one reason for motivation or demotivation because it was found that few students chose two in semester 1 (Appendix D). As can be expected, the proportion of students in UPPER INTERMEDIATE selecting the “I like English” response to both tasks [21 (21.4%) and 19 (19.4%)] was much greater than those in LOWER INTERMEDIATE making this choice [9 (7.5%) and 5 (4.0%)].

However, compared to the response to the tasks in semester 1, those proportion of choosing “the task was interesting” response in semester 2 increased sharply in the three groups from the *Market research* to the *Infomercial* task. It seems that some students with reasons related to “liking English” and “useful for my future career” in relation to *Market research* seem to have switched to “the task is interesting” for the *Infomercial*. In other words, the source of motivation seems to have changed from *personal interest* and *future self-guides* to *interestingness of the task for Infomercial* in all the three groups (Appendix D). The students became motivated by the task itself, creating a *flow of heightened interest*.

Regarding the reasons for demotivation in semester 2 (see Appendix E), across the

groups “disliking English” seems to be the strongest reason for *Market research*, but this decreased considerably for the *Infomercial* 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE:10 (35.7%) to 4 (15.4%); INTERMEDIATE:10 (24.4%) to 6 (12.8%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE:13 (50.0%) to 7 (31.8%)】 .

An individual student’s motivation was also analyzed from their perception of motivation of other members in a group, as explored in the following section.

4.3. Students’ individual motivation as opposed to other members’ motivation in semester 2

In semester 1, working with other group members was found to be a strong motivating force to change those who were not motivated in high school, in particular those in LOWER INTERMEDIATE. Semester 2 investigated both the individual student’s own motivation (IM) and his/her perceptions of the motivation of other group members (perceived Group Motivation: GM) on the four point scale (Appendix F). As relatively few students chose “not so motivated” and “not motivated at all”, these two were amalgamated to create one “non-motivated” category.

The cross-tabulation shows that the number of individual students saying that “most were motivated in the group” or “all were motivated in the group” was much higher than that of “non-motivated” category, regardless of the degree of motivation and the students’ proficiency levels, although more so in LOWER INTERMEDIATE (see Appendix G). In other words, the students seem to be positively rather than negatively influenced by collaborative work, which confirms the results of semester 1. In fact, when asked about the most important factor in operating a group in semester 2, the majority of students in all groups rated the motivation of individual members 【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 93 (72.2%); INTERMEDIATE: 211 (87.2%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 111 (73.5%)】 rather than their English proficiency levels 【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 5 (3.9%); INTERMEDIATE: 5 (2.1%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 8 (5.3 %)】 (see Appendix H).

According to the students, collaborative work seems to function as long as the members of the group have a will to collaborate. The next question is about the emotional aspect of collaborative work, as motivation involves both cognitive and emotional dimensions.

4.4. The change in the students’ enjoyment and socially shared regulation from semesters 1 to 2

Questions were asked first about whether the students enjoyed speaking English in semester 1 and the collaborative work in both semester 1 and 2 on the scale of “yes”, “no”, “difficult to decide” (Appendix I). Regarding enjoyment of speaking English, about a half the students in each group 【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 68 (53.1%); INTERMEDIATE: 136 (56.2%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 87 (57.6%)】 opted for “yes”. When asked about the reason for

responding “yes”, responders were allowed to choose up to 2 choices in semester 1, based on the results of the pilot study. If one student chooses only one reason, one point was given to a choice, while if two reasons were selected, each choice was given 0.5 points again to maintain one point per student. The results did not show any statistical difference among the three groups with respect to both positive and negative reasons. It was found that the most common reason across the groups was “it is interesting to hear other students' opinions” **【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 20.5 (30.1%); INTERMEDIATE: 44.5 (32.7%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 34 (39.1%)】** .

It was interesting that the main reasons for “no” to this question (Appendix J) were neither to do with the topic being uninteresting **【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 2.5 (17.9%); INTERMEDIATE: 1.5 (7.5%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 1 (6.7%)】** nor with sharing the same L1 **【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 0.5 (3.6%); INTERMEDIATE: 1 (5.0%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 1 (6.7%)】** . Respondents tended to report instead that they did not feel they had sufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge **【(UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 6 (42.9%); INTERMEDIATE: 9 (45.0%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE, 7.5 (50.0%)】** which is more related to their competence rather than to amotivation in the classroom.

With respect to the enjoyment of collaborative work, mirroring the results for motivation, as the task became more demanding, the proportion responding “yes” to this question waned from semester 1 **【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 80 (62.5%); INTERMEDIATE: 164 (67.8%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 99 (65.6%)】** to semester 2 **【UPPER INTERMEDIATE: 50 (39.4%); INTERMEDIATE: 106 (43.6%); LOWER INTERMEDIATE: 70 (47.9%)】** in the three groups.

To improve their group presentation, some groups seem to have put in extra work outside class hours, or to put into the language of the studies discussed in section 2.5 above, they operated socially shared regulation. Thus the students were asked about this for each semester (see Appendix K). Although students were not asked to report the length of each practice session, given that the presentation was supposed to be less than 5 minutes in duration, one practice session could be expected to last no more than 20 minutes. More students across all the groups spent time practicing outside class hours in semester 2 than semester 1. In semester 2, UPPER INTERMEDIATE and INTERMEDIATE students seem to have increased time for out-of-hours practice more than LOWER INTERMEDIATE students. Indeed, when a chi-square test was applied, the difference between semester 1 and 2 was statistically significant in UPPER INTERMEDIATE and INTERMEDIATE students (UPPER INTERMEDIATE: chi-square:49.17, df=1, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer's $V = 0.4494$; INTERMEDIATE: chi-square:47.97, df=1, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer's $V = 0.3196$), but not in LOWER INTERMEDIATE: (chi-square:2.98, df=1, $p = 0.0414$, Cramer's $V = 0.1257$). LOWER

INTERMEDIATE students did enjoy the tasks in semester 2 but their enjoyment did not seem to lead them to invest extra time for improving their collaborative work, raising a question about the link between socially shared regulation in the form of extra practice and its effect on learning. Thus it was asked whether the students actually felt that they had learned English through the classes at the end of semesters 1 & 2.

4.5. A change in the students' awareness of learning through collaborative work

Between the two semesters, the number of students who stated that they learnt English from collaborative work differed considerably among UPPER INTERMEDIATE students, depending on whether they did extra work outside class hours (see Appendix L). At the end of semester 1, when they worked outside class hours, no more than 15% of UPPER INTERMEDIATE students stated having learnt from other students; but the numbers jumped up to 34% at the end of semester 2. In sharp contrast, the proportion of LOWER INTERMEDIATE students who stated that they learnt English from collaborative work remained low and even decreased between semester 1 and 2 (11.0% to 10.0% among those with extra work; 16.0% to 5.9% among those without extra work), when the work became more demanding in semester 2. A chi-square test was applied to compare the difference between the awareness of learning English from collaborative work between semesters 1 & 2. According to a chi-square test, statistical significance was only found in the UPPER INTERMEDIATE group (UPPER INTERMEDIATE: chi-square:6.03, df=1, $p < 0.0141$, Cramer's $V = 0.444$) but neither in the INTERMEDIATE (chi-square:2.63, df=1, $p < 0.1049$, Cramer's $V = 0.3208$) nor the LOWER INTERMEDIATE group (chi-square:0.85, df=1, $p < 0.3566$, Cramer's $V = 0.2077$).

4.6. The teachers' perspectives on the collaborative work

In the form of a questionnaire at the end of the second semester, the teachers (excluding the researcher) stated that to cope with the problems they confronted in group work they adopted particular strategies: 1) approaching the group individually to mediate a problem, such as encouraging an irresponsible student to take on a special role in a group and 2) asking students to keep a record of their contribution to acknowledge the hardworking students. One flexible approach was pointed out by teacher F, who stated that she changed the team members at the end of semester 1, as all of them were rather introverted in nature. The teachers were fully aware of the problem of collaborative work and seem to have taken their own approach to it.

On the plus side the teachers pointed out the benefits of collaboration: the students learnt 1) to put the abilities that individual members brought to the group to the best use towards achieving the common goal; 2) to effect an increase in confidence that individual students cannot achieve on their own; 3) to take the initiative without relying too much on the

teacher. These reasons go some way to explaining the high motivation scores among the low proficiency-level classes. One teacher, E, who did not give a clear yes to the usefulness of collaborative work, also stated that collaborative work creates a precious opportunity to work with others to learn from each other and prepare for the future work context. Indeed, the students in all her classes were positive in response to the question of the enjoyment of collaborative work.

5. Discussion

This exploratory study sought to establish whether collaborative work can effect a change in motivating 521 students with different proficiency levels, in one Japanese university over one academic year, within the framework of complex dynamic systems (Dorynei & Ushioda, 2011). Dorynei & Ushioda proposed (2011) four dimensions: *future self-guides*, *interest*, *a flow and control* to maintain and induce a change in motivation.

In semester 1, among those who maintained motivation from high school to the TBLT course at the university (TBLT), the *future self-guides* seem to work as an attractor ((Dorynei, 2009b), as was shown in the interviews with successful learners in collaborative work (Chang, 2010). For those who maintained motivation from high school to TBLT, the strongest reason for motivation was its usefulness for their future regardless of their proficiency levels. Thus when students are directed by *future self-guides*, lower-proficiency level itself did not seem to cause amotivation among the students.

On the other hand, when the students were amotivated in both high school and TBLT, a strong repeller state seems to be created by “disliking English” across the proficiency levels. Thus although “disliking English” was often associated with those who have experienced failure in tests and English classes (Falout, Elsewood and Hood 2009, Falout and Maruyama 2004), even the relatively successful students had the attitude of “disliking English.” that made them amotivated. The result demonstrates a difficulty of causing a change to those with a strong attractor or repeller state themselves.

The analysis of the reasons for those who moved motivation negatively from high school to TBLT seems to be related to the role of the university entrance examination. As it is one strong source of motivation to learn English in Japan (Kozaki & Ross 2011; Ryan 2009), once learners have passed it, they seem to lose their extrinsic and ought-to self L2* motivation (Kikuchi 2009). Another aspect for the change revealed a difference due to proficiency levels. It was found that “liking English” tended to be a reason for motivation among the upper intermediate students. Thus when they felt demotivated in TBLT, they tended to blame external resources such as textbooks, as shown in the response “boring”, which was

also found by Falout & Maruyama 2004. On the other hand, the students tend to attribute demotivation to themselves instead, possibly relating to their reduced self-confidence as was also found among the college students reflecting their high school English class shown in Falout & Maruyama (2004).

When their motivation has been enhanced from high school to TBLT, it was interesting to note that a change was caused by collaborative type of task, in particular among the lower intermediate students who were not motivated in high school. Thus although TBLT was said to be unsuitable for the lower-proficiency level learners (Bruton 2002; Swan 2005), the adoption of collaborative work seems helpful for increasing motivation among these students. Because the upper intermediate students tend to say they “like English”, it can be said that they brought interest in English to class, while the lower intermediate students discovered motivation through *the interestingness* of collaborative work.

A positive change in motivation due to collaborative work implies a movement on the continuum from amotivation to extrinsic motivation, supporting what Ryan and Deci (2000) proposed in their Organismic Integration Theory.

In semester 2, in order to sustain and raise motivation when it was declining, *interestingness* of the task appears to have played a role to create a *flow* to most of the students. Indeed, a sharp increase in interest in the last task, *infomercial* seems to have created a *flow* (Dornyei & Ushioda 2011). The finding suggests that although “liking English” or *future self-guides* enables the students to sustain motivation from high school to university, the task itself should be interesting to create a flow. In other words, *interestingness* of the task rather than personal interest in English seems to contribute to a flow. It may also be related to the amount of challenge the students faced. As the last task *Infomercial* was less linguistically and cognitively demanding than *Market research*, the type of the task might have given lower proficiency-level students some confidence and enjoyment. Thus the task itself may have contributed to a flow and thus making them feel less “disliking of English”.

Although Chang (2010) found that cohesiveness of a group was crucial to the motivation of the members, this study indicates that collaboration itself motivates the students. Furthermore, collaborative work taking place in the foreign language learning situation was found to represent the similar experience in the mother tongue context; one was the decrease in enjoyment in concert with the increase in challenges the students faced (Jarvela & Jarvenoja 2011). Another common feature was that hearing other people’s opinion is what they found most useful in collaborative work (Jarvela and Jarvenoja 2011). In the current Japanese individualizing context (Suzuki et al. 2010), collaborative work could offer not only motivation for learning English, but also social skills that are necessary in the working

environment.

Finally this study showed that although collaborative work would cause a change to the stability of amotivation among the lower intermediate students, their enjoyment did not always seem to guide them to adopt socially shared regulation. In order to transform motivation to the actual learning outcome, “enjoyment” alone may not be sufficient, as it can originate from complex sources such as a lighter workload and keen interest in the task.

The students need to regulate their activities – exercise action control – to observe a change in their learning. Proficiency levels seem to be related to the use of socially shared regulation and *self-efficacy. Arai (2004) showed that one of the strategies of successful learners was to cope with demotivating experience, through, for example, working out the problem by oneself. In this study, the upper intermediate students seem to be ready to apply socially shared regulation to the task, with confidence in English possibly as the manifestation of self-efficacy (Bandura 1977, 1991, 2012) and “liking English” as *personal interest* (Schielefe, Krapp & Winteler, 1992). When the students find the task interesting, upper intermediate students can combine their *personal interest* and the *interestingness* of the task to form a strong *interest* that encourages them to apply socially shared regulation to complete the task, which was in line with the findings of Falout, Elwood & Hood (2009).

On the other hand, a lack of confidence may make lower intermediate students feel that they cannot contribute to the collaborative work and can learn from others. Indeed compared to upper intermediate students, lower proportions of lower intermediate students stated they learnt English from collaborative work. An extra push from outside, such as through the intermediation of a teacher, might be necessary to transform motivation to action for the lower intermediate students.

6. Conclusions

As this study did not individually identify students in relation to their response to the questionnaire, the findings are exploratory, in that they represent the characteristics of successful use of collaborative work by class alone. Further research would be necessary to identify individual students’ motivation. However, it still has shown that collaborative work helped to instigate a positive change in motivation among lower intermediate, university-level English learners who had not been motivated in high school. The creation of a *flow* to produce a change seems to be brought about by the *interestingness* of the task rather than through a stable internal motivation, such as “liking English”.

Within this limit, it can be concluded that although collaborative work can increase motivation and produce enjoyment, this external source of motivation does not always

seem to lead to the use of shared regulation to improve speaking skills. The application of shared regulation, that is, extra work outside class hours did divide upper intermediate, intermediate learners from lower intermediate learners, and seems to be one factor that caused a change in speaking skills. To make the best use of collaboration, lower intermediate learners may need to be made aware of the benefits of using of shared regulation to complete the task. For further study, to overcome the limitation of this work, it seems necessary to find an individual change in motivation over one academic year.

Notes

- 1 Self Motivation Theory*: this is a perspective postulated by Deci, Ryan, Connel, Skinner and their colleagues and holds that humans have a need to be autonomous and engage in particular activities because they want to. Intrinsic motivation is “the human need to be competent and self-motivating in relation to the environment”(Deci 1980, p.27).
- 2 Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation*: extrinsic motivation means motivation originating from outside of the self or the task (such as reward or punishment); while intrinsic motivation means inherent to the self or the task (such as enjoyment of learning). Intrinsic motivation includes both affective and cognitive components, so that learners should find the task both entertaining and challenging to engage in (Dornyei and Ushioda 2011, p94).
- 3 The ideal self* and the ought-to L2 self*: to analyze individual learners’ motivation in second language acquisition, Dornyei (2005) proposed the L2 Motivational Self System that suggests three primary sources of motivation in learning a foreign/second language – 1) ideal L2 self; 2) ought-to L2 self; 3) L2 learning experience. The ideal L2 self refers to those wishing to become a competent speaker of L2 as an idealized self for both integral and instrumental purposes, while the ought-to L2 self refers to the attributes that the learners ought to possess in order to avoid negative consequences.
4. Studies on self-regulatory processes in human development have started in educational psychology since the 1960s by focusing on metacognitive and cognitive issues such as strategies to enhance learning (Zimmerman and Schunk 2011).

References

- Arai, K. (2004). What ‘demotivates’ language learners?: Qualitative study on demotivational factors and learners’ reactions. *Bulletin of Toyo Gakuen University*, 12, 39-47.
- Arvaja, M., Hakkinen, P., Rasku-Puttonen, H., & Etelapelto, A. (2002). Social processes and knowledge building during small group interaction in a school science project.

Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 46, 2, 161–179.

- Aziz, Z., & Hossain, A. (2010). A comparison of cooperative learning and conventional teaching on students' achievement in secondary mathematics. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 53–62.
- Azmitia, M. (1988). Peer interaction and problem solving: When are two heads better than one? *Child Development*, 59, 87–96.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248–287.
- Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, 38, 9–44.
- Benevides, M., & Valvona, C. (2008). *Widgets*. Longman.
- Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R., & Zeidner, M. (eds.) (1999). *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Theory, Research, and Applications*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- Boekaerts, M., & Corno, L. (2006). Self-regulation in the classroom: A perspective on assessment and intervention. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54, 2, 199–231.
- Bruton, A. (2002). From tasking purposes to purposing tasks. *ELT Journal*, 56, 3, 280–288.
- Chang, L. Y-H. (2010). Group process and EFL learners' motivation: A study of group dynamics in EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 129–154.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10, 7–21.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., Thorne, S. L., & Verspoor, M. (2013). Dynamic Systems Theory as a Theory of Second Language Development. In M. Mayo, M. Gutierrez-Mangado, & M. Adrián (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 199–220). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic motivation of the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1–10.
- Dörnyei Z. (1997). Psychological Processes in Cooperative Language Learning: Group Dynamics and Motivation Reviewed work(s), *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 4, 482–493.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow, England: Pearson

Education

- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Dornyei, Z. (2009a). Individual Differences: Interplay of Learner Characteristics and Learning Environment. *Language Learning*, 59, Suppl. 1, 230-248.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dornyei, Z., & Malderez, A. (1997). Group dynamics and foreign language teaching. *System*, 25, 65-81.
- Dornyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 203-62.
- Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Second Edition, Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Dornyei, Z., MacIntyre, P.D. & Henry, A. (Eds). (2015). *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- East, M. (2012). *Task-based Language Teaching from the Teachers' Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eccles, J.S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 215-225.
- Egbert, J. (2003). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 4, 499-518.
- Ellis, N. C., & Larsen-Freeman, D.(2006). Language Emergence: Implications for Applied Linguistics. Special issue. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 4, 558-589.
- Ellis, R. (2009).. Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 3, 221-246.
- Falout, J., & Maruyama, M. (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation. *The Language Teacher*, 28, 3-9.
- Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37, 3, 403-17.
- Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dornyei, Z. (2008). Motivating Language Learners: A Classroom-Oriented Investigation of the Effects of Motivational Strategies on Student Motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 1, 55-77.
- Hadwin, A., Järvelä, S., & Miller, M. (2011). Self-regulated, co-regulated, and socially shared regulation of learning. In B. Zimmerman & D. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 65-84). New York: Routledge.

- Hamada, Y., & Kito, K. (2008). Demotivation in Japanese high schools. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT 2007 Conference Proceedings* (pp.168-178). Tokyo: JALT.
- Harkins, S. G., & Petty, R. E. (1982). Effects of task difficulty and task uniqueness on social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 6,1214-1229.
- Järvelä, S., & Järvenoja, H. (2011). Socially Constructed Self-Regulated Learning and Motivation Regulation in Collaborative Learning Groups. *Teachers College Record*,113, 2, 350-374.
- Järvelä, S., Näykki, P., Laru, J., & Luokkanen., T. (2007). Structuring and Regulating Collaborative Learning in Higher Education with Wireless Networks and Mobile Tools. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10, 4, 71-79.
- Järvelä, S., Järvenoja, H., Malmberg, J. & Hadwin, A. (2013). Exploring socially-shared regulation in the context of collaboration. *The Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 12 (3), 267-286.
- Malmberg, J., & Hadwin, A. F. (2011). Exploring Socially Shared Regulation in the Context of Collaboration. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 12, 3, 267-286.
- Molenaar, I. & Järvelä, S. (2014). Sequential and temporal characteristics of self and socially regulated learning. *Metacognition Learning*, 9:75-85.
- Kikuchi, K. (2009). Listening to our learners' voices: what demotivates Japanese high school students? *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 4, 453-471.
- Kormos, J. Kiddle, T., & Csizer, K. (2011). Systems of Goals, Attitudes, and Self-related Beliefs in Second-Language-Learning Motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32, 5, 495-516.
- Kozaki, Y., & Ross, S. J. (2011). Contextual Dynamics in Foreign Language Learning. *Language Learning*, 61, 4, 1328-1354.
- Krapp, A. (1999). Interest, motivation, and learning: An educational-psychological perspective. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 14, 1, 23-40.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leaver, B.L., & Willis, J.R. (2004). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Lenzing, A. (2015). Exploring Regularities and Dynamic Systems in L2 Development. *Language Learning*, 65, 1, 89-122.
- Linden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A.,& Bennett, N. (2004). Social Loafing: A Field Investigation. *Journal of Management*, 30, 2, 285-304.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40, 243-249.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Collaborative work, inter- language talk, and second

- language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Murphey, T., Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). *Inviting student voice. Accepting Alternative Voices in EFL Journal Articles*. Busan, Korea: Asian EFL Journal Press: 211-235.
- Panadero, E., & Järvelä, S. (2015). Socially shared regulation of learning: A review. *European Psychologist*. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000226
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning in College Students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 4, 385-407.
- Rogat, T, K., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., (2011). Socially Shared Regulation in Collaborative Groups: An Analysis of the Interplay Between Quality of Social Regulation and Group Processes, *Cognition and Instruction*. 29, 4, 375-415
- Ryan, S. (2009). Ambivalence and commitment, Liberation and challenge: investigating the attitudes of young Japanese people towards the learning of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30, 405-420.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37: 57-69.
- Shiefele, U. Krapp, A., & Winteler, A. (1992). Interest as a predictor of academic achievement: A meta-analysis of research. In K.A. Renninger, S. Hidi, and A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 183-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shehadeh, A., & Coombe, C. A. (Eds.) (2012). *Task-Based Language Teaching in Foreign Language Contexts Research and implementation*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 43- 69.
- Suzuki, M., Ito, M., Ishida, M., Nihei, N., & Maruyama, M. (2010). Individualizing Japan: searching for its origin in first modernity.. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61, 3, 513-538.
- Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: the case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 3, 376-401.
- Usher, E. L. & Pajares, F. (2008). Self-Efficacy for Self-Regulated Learning: A Validation Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68, 443-463.
- Uziel, L. (2007). Individual differences in the social facilitation effect: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 579-601.
- Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, J. (Eds.) (2009). *Task-Based Language Teaching: A reader*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers.

- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: An Overview, *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 1, 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating Self-Regulation and Motivation: Historical Background, Methodological Developments, and Future Prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45, 1, 166 -183.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*. New York: Routledge.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all the teachers and students involved in this project.

Appendixes

Appendix: A

Semester 1 Questionnaire (English translation) Class :

This questionnaire will be about your feedback on the course in semester 1.

“Choose up to 2” for your response below means that you can choose either 1 or 2 responses. As it remains anonymous, please do not hesitate to write your honest opinion about the course.

Q1. When you were in high school, were you motivated in English class?

1. Yes () 2. No () 3. Neither (difficult to say) ()

Q2. Were you motivated in this course?

1. Yes very much () 2. Yes () 3. Not so motivated ()
4. Not motivated at all () 5. Neither (difficult to say) ()

-----If you answered 1,2 (motivated) for Q2, what were the reasons? Choose the most appropriate one(s). You can choose up to 2.

1. I would like to use English for my future job. ()
2. The content of the course was interesting. () 3. I like English. ()
4. I would like to talk to foreigners. () 5. Group members were motivated. ()
6. Others ()

Describe “Others” in more detail.

-----If you answered 3,4(not motivated) for Q2, what were the reasons? Choose the most appropriate one(s). You can choose up to 2.

1. The university entrance examination was over. ()
2. The content of the course was boring. ()
3. I do not like English. () 4. It was onerous to think in English. ()
5. Group members were not motivated. () 6. Others ()

Describe “Others” in more detail.

Q3. What would you like the course to include? Choose the most appropriate option(s).

You can choose up to 2.

1. Nothing ()
2. Preparation for the TOEIC ()
3. Preparation for the English Proficiency tests (EIKEN) ()
4. Reading English ()
5. Writing English ()
6. The explanation of English grammar ()
7. Explaining English vocabulary ()
8. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q4. Do you have any opportunities of being exposed to English? Yes/No

-----If yes, please describe these

Q5. Did you enjoy talking in English in the class and group?

1. Yes ()
2. No ()
3. Neither ()

-----If you chose Yes in Q5, what was the reason? Choose the most appropriate option(s).

You can choose up to 2.

1. I wanted to practice speaking English. ()
2. I was able to use my vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. ()
3. My interlocutors were able to speak with good vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. ()
4. The topic was interesting. ()
5. It was interesting to hear other people's opinions. ()
6. Others. ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

----- If you chose "No" in Q5, what was the reason? Choose the most appropriate option(s). You can choose up to 2.

1. I was not good at speaking English. ()
2. I did not have sufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. ()
3. My interlocutors did not have sufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. ()
4. It was unnatural to use English with somebody who speaks Japanese. ()
5. The topic was boring. ()

6. Other group members did not try to speak in English. ()

7. Others. ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q6. Did you practice English with your group outside of class?

1. Yes () → How many times? → 2. No ()

Q7. Did you enjoy collaborative learning in semester 1?

1. Yes () 2. No () 3. Difficult to say ()

----If you chose 1 "Yes" in Q7, what was the main reason? Choose one answer from the options below.

1. To be able to take a different perspective () 2. Good for learning English ()

3. To be able to learn the importance of cooperation ()

4. To be able to make friends ()

5. Others

Describe "Others" in more detail.

----If you chose 2 "No" in Q7, what was the main reason? Choose one from the below.

1. Some members did not come to class ()

2. It was difficult to get in touch with some members. ()

3. Some members did not do their work ()

4. Some members did not attend meetings outside of class () 5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q8. What do you think was the most important factor for a group to function well?

Choose one factor from the options below.

1. Motivation of group members ()

2. Good leadership of the group by members ()

3. The content of the topic () 4. Members' English proficiency ()

5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Please give any other comments on the course

Thank you very much.

Semester 2 questionnaire (English Translation) Class :

This questionnaire will be about your feedback on the course in semester 2.

As it remains anonymous, please do not hesitate to write your honest opinion about semester 2, which mainly deals with the *Market Research* and *Infomercial* tasks.

Q1. How did you approach the market research task? Choose one from the options below.

1. Very motivated ()
2. Motivated ()
3. Not so motivated ()
4. Not motivated at all ()

----if you chose 1 or 2 in Q 1, what was the reason for the choice? Choose one from the options below.

1. The content was interesting ()
2. I like English ()
3. It looks like being useful for my future ()
4. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

----if you chose 3 or 4 in Q 1, what was the reason for the choice? Choose one from the options below.

1. The content was boring ()
2. I do not like English ()
3. It was onerous to think in English ()
4. It was not useful for my English learning ()
5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q2. How did you approach the infomercial task? Choose one from the options below.

1. Very motivated ()
2. Motivated ()
3. Not so motivated ()
4. Not motivated at all ()

----if you chose 1 or 2 in Q2, what was the reason for the choice? Choose one from the

options below.

1. The content was interesting ()
2. I like English ()
3. It looks like being useful for my future ()
4. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

----if you chose 3 or 4 in Q2, what was the reason for the choice? Choose one from the options below.

1. The content was boring ()
2. I do not like English ()
3. It was onerous to think in English ()
4. It was not useful for my English learning ()
5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q3. How did other members in your group approach the two tasks?

Choose one from the options below.

Market research:

1. All were motivated ()
2. Most were motivated ()
3. Most were not motivated ()
4. None were motivated ()

Infomercial:

1. All were motivated ()
2. Most were motivated ()
3. Most were not motivated ()
4. None were motivated ()

Q4. Were there any group presentations that impressed you in your class?

Market research presentation: Yes () · No ()

Infomercial presentation: Yes () · No ()

Q5. What impressed you most? Choose one from the below.

Market research presentation:

1. The good use of visual aids (including powerpoint) ()
2. Clear English ()
3. Group cohesion ()
4. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Infomercial presentation:

1. The good use of visual aids (including powerpoint) ()
2. Clear English ()

3. Group cohesion () 4. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q6. Do you think that collaborative work helped your English learning?

Market research: 1. Yes very much () 2. Yes () 3. Not so much () 4. Not at all ()

—What was the reason ?

Infomercial: 1. Yes very much () 2. Yes () 3. Not so much () 4. Not at all ()

—What was the reason ?

Q7. Do you think you learnt anything that helped to improve your English in semester 2?

Yes () • No ()

----if you chose YES in Q7, what do you think you learnt? Choose up to 2 items from the options below.

- 1. Expressions for presentation () 2. Terms for business () 3. Grammar ()
- 4. Expressions for conversation () 5. Expressions for explaining data ()
- 6. Pronunciation () 7. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q8. Did you enjoy collaborative learning in semester 2?

1. Yes () 2. No () 3. Difficult to say ()

----If you chose "Yes" in Q8, what was the main reason? Choose one from the below.

- 1. To be able to take a different perspective () 2. Good for learning English ()
- 3. To be able to learn the importance of cooperation ()
- 4. To be able to make friends () 5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

----If you chose "No" in Q8, what was the main reason? Choose one from the below.

1. Some members did not come to class ()
2. It was difficult to get in touch with some members ()
3. Some members did not do their work ()
4. Some members did not attend meetings outside of class ()
5. Others ()

Describe "Others" in more detail.

Q9. Did you practice English with your group outside of class?

1. Yes () 2. No ()

----if you chose yes in Q9, how many times in semester 2? Choose one from the options below.

1. Once () 2. Twice () 3. 3 to 4 times () 5. More than 5 times ()
6. More than 10 times ()

Please give any other comments on the course Thank you very much.

Questionnaire Japanese original

Semester 1 Class :

このアンケートでは授業についてあなたの感想を聞きます。以下の2つまでとは1つ、または2つという意味です。

無記名ですので、学んだこと、感じたことをそのままお答えください。

問1. 高校時代、英語の学習に意欲的でしたか。

1. はい 2. いいえ 3. どちらとも言えない

問2. Practical Englishで英語を学習する努力をしたと思いますか。

1. 熱心に勉強した 2. 勉強した
3. あまり熱心ではなかった
4. 全くしなかった 5. どちらとも言えない

問3. 問2で1, 2の回答をした[努力した]理由は何ですか。最も当てはまるものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 英語を将来仕事で役に立てたい
2. 内容が面白い 3. 英語が好き
4. 外国人と話がしたい

5. グループのメンバーが意欲的だった 6. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問4. 問2で3、4の回答をした[努力しない]理由は何ですか。最も当てはまるものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 大学受験が終わった 2. 内容がつまらない 3. 英語が嫌い
4. 自分で英語を考えるのが面倒くさい
5. グループのメンバーが意欲的でない 6. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問5. どんな点をこれからの授業で取り入れてほしいですか。最も当てはまるものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 特にない 2. TOEIC対策 3. 英検対策
4. 英語を読むこと 5. 英語を書くこと
6. 英文法の説明 7. 英語の語彙の説明
8. 英語を話す前に必要な表現の練習 9. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問6. 大学の英語の授業以外で英語に触れる機会がありますか。 はい いいえ

問7. はい の場合、それはどんな機会ですか。

具体的に記入して下さい。

問8. グループ内、クラスで自分たちで英語を話すことは楽しかったですか、嫌でしたか。

1. 楽しかった 2. 嫌だった
3. どちらともいえない

問9. 問8で1. 楽しかった理由は主に何だと思いますか。最も当てはまるものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 英語で話す練習がしたかった
2. 自分の単語力、文法力で話せた

3. 話す相手の単語力、文法力があった
4. 話す内容が面白かった
5. 他の人の意見を聞くのが興味深い
6. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

問10. 問8で2. 嫌だった理由は主に何だと思いますか。最も当てはまるものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 話すことは得意ではない
2. 自分の英語の単語力、文法力不足
3. 話す相手の英語の単語力、文法力不足
4. 日本語が通じる相手に英語は不自然な感じ
5. 話す内容がつまらない
6. 他のメンバーが英語で話そうとしない
7. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

問11. グループ・クラスで英語の使用を高める要因は話す相手同士の英語力以外に何が関係していると思いますか。最も関係があると思うものを2つまで選びなさい。

1. 話す話題
2. 話す相手との仲
3. 先生がそばにくる
4. 成績
5. 話す相手同士の意欲
6. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

問12. 授業以外でもグループで会って英語の練習したことはありますか。

1. ない
2. ある →それは何回ですか。 回

問13. グループ学習は良い点と大変な点の両方があると思いますが、この授業ではあなたはどちらのほうが大きかったと思いますか。

1. 良い点
2. 大変な点
3. どちらともいえない

問14. 問13で 1. 良い点を選択した主な理由を1つ選んでください。

1. 別の見方ができる
2. 英語の勉強になる
3. 協力する大切さがわかる
4. 友達になれる

5. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

問15. 問13で2. 大変という点を選択した主な理由を1つ選んでください。

1. 授業にこない人がいる
2. 連絡が取れない人がいる
3. 自分の分担をしない人がいる
4. 授業以外の会合にこない人がいる
5. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

問16. 授業のグループ活動がうまく機能するには何が一番大切だと思いますか。1つ選んでください。

1. メンバーの意欲
2. マネージャーの指導力
3. 課題の内容
4. メンバーの英語力
5. その他

その他について具体的に記入して下さい

この授業全般について感想や意見などがあったら自由に記載してください

以上ご協力ありがとうございました。

Semester 2 Class :

学年に○を付けてください。学年：1, 2, 3, 4, 5年以上

このアンケートでは後期のPractical Englishについてあなたの感想を聞きます。この結果は来年度の授業の向上、学生の英語学習の理解のためにのみ利用され、無記名です。で、学んだこと、感じたことをそのままお答えください。

後期はマーケットリサーチ発表とインフォマーシャル作成を主に扱ったと思います。

問1. あなたはマーケットリサーチ発表にどのような態度(気持ち)で参加しましたか。1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. とても意欲的
2. 意欲的
3. あまり意欲的でなかった
4. 全く意欲はなかった

-----問1で、1・2の回答をした[意欲的だった]理由は何ですか。主な理由を1つ選び○を

つけなさい。

1. 内容が面白い
2. 英語が好き
3. 将来役に立ちそうだから
4. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

—問1で、3・4の回答をした[意欲的でなかった]理由は何ですか。主な理由を1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. 内容がつまらない
2. 英語が嫌い
3. 自分で英語を考えるのが面倒くさい
4. 英語学習に役に立たない
5. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問2. あなたはインフォーマーシャル作成にどのような態度(気持ち)で参加しましたか。1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. とても意欲的
2. 意欲的
3. あまり意欲的でなかった
4. 全く意欲はなかった

—問2で、1・2の回答をした[意欲的だった]理由は何ですか。主な理由を1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. 内容が面白い
2. 英語が好き
3. 将来役に立ちそうだから
4. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

—問2で、3・4の回答をした[意欲的でなかった]理由は何ですか。主な理由を1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. 内容がつまらない
2. 英語が嫌い
3. 自分で英語を考えるのが面倒くさい
4. 英語学習に役に立たない
5. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問3. あなた以外のグループメンバーはどのような態度(気持ち)で参加してたと思いますか。1つ選び○をつけなさい。

マーケットリサーチ発表:

1. 全員が意欲的だった、
2. ほとんどは意欲的だった

3. 意欲的でない人が多かった
4. 全員が意欲的ではなかった

インフォマーシャル作成：

1. 全員が意欲的だった、2. ほとんどは意欲的だった
3. 意欲的でない人が多かった
4. 全員が意欲的ではなかった

問4. グループの発表はうまくできたとあなたは満足していますか。1つ選び○をつけなさい。

マーケットリサーチ発表：

1. とても満足、2. やや満足、3. あまり満足していない
4. 全く満足していない

インフォマーシャル作成：

1. とても満足、2. やや満足、3. あまり満足していない
4. 全く満足していない

問5. あなたのクラスの他のグループの発表で良い意味で印象に残るよくできた発表はありましたか。

マーケットリサーチ発表：あった・なかった

インフォマーシャル作成：あった・なかった

問6. それは主にどの点がよかったのでしょうか？ 1つ選び○をつけなさい。

マーケットリサーチ発表：

1. visual aids (powerpoint 含む)がうまく使えて内容が分かりやすかった、
2. 英語が分かりやすかった、3. グループとしてまとまっていた、4. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

インフォマーシャル作成：

1. visual aids (powerpoint 含む)がうまく使えて内容が分かりやすかった、
2. 英語が分かりやすかった、3. グループとしてまとまっていた、4. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問7. 英語学習に関するグループ活動、グループ内でのやり取りは英語を学ぶことに役立ちましたか。

マーケットリサーチ発表：

1. はいとても、2. はい少し、3. 余り役に立たない 4. 全く役に立たない

—その理由は何ですか。

インフォーマーシャル作成：

1. はいとても、2. はい少し、3. 余り役に立たない 4. 全く役に立たない

—その理由は何ですか。

問8. どちらが英語学習には役立ったと思いますか。1つ選び○をつけなさい。

1. 両方、2. マーケットリサーチ発表、3. インフォーマーシャル作成、4. どちらも言えない、
5. どちらも役に立たない

—その理由は何ですか。

問9. 後期の授業では今まで知らなかった英語を学んだと思いますか。はい・いいえ
—問9で[はい]の場合、どのような英語を学んだと思いますか。2つまで○をつけなさい。

1. 発表するための表現、2. ビジネスの用語、3. 文法、4. 会話で使う英語、
5. データを説明するための英語、6. 発音、7. 文法、8. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問10. 後期のグループ活動は大変な面と楽しい面とどちらが大きかったですか。1つ選んで○をつけなさい。

1. 大変な部分、2. 楽しい部分、
3. どちらも言えない

—問10で1の回答[大変な部分]を選択した人は、主な理由を1つ選んで○をつけなさい。

1. 授業にこない人がいる 2. 連絡が取れない人がいる
3. 自分の分担をしない人がいる
4. 授業以外の会合にこない人がいる 5. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

一問10で2の回答[楽しい部分]を選択した人は、主な理由を1つ選んで○をつけなさい。

1. 別の見方ができる
2. 英語の勉強になる
3. 協力する大切さがわかる
4. 友達になれる
5. その他

その他 について具体的に記入して下さい。

問11. グループでの会合は授業以外でしたか。

はい・いいえ

一[はい]の場合、後期はどのくらいしましたか。1つ選んで○をつけなさい。

1. 1回
2. 2回
3. 3回以上5回未満
4. 5回以上10回未満
5. 10回以上

問12. この授業全般について感想や意見などがあったら自由に記載してください

以上ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix: B: English Translation of the questionnaire to the teachers

Name _____

1 Do you think that collaborative learning in your classes were useful for students to learn English? If yes, in what respect? If no, what were the negative aspects in your classes?

2. How did you cope with the minus side of collaborative work?

3. Do you think that your students learned to speak English? If so, what were they?

4. Any comments on the course and the use of Task-based language teaching.

Thank you very much.

Japanese original of the questionnaire to the teachers

Widgets を担当してのコメント (教員用)

おなまえ _____

1. 今回のような学生自身を動かせるグループ学習は先生の担当されたクラスでは英語学習にプラスだったと思われますか? Yes,の場合、どんな点で? NO, の場合、どんなマイナス面が目立ちましたか?

2. グループ学習のマイナス面に対してどのように対処されましたか?

3. 学生は授業で英語を話すことを学んだと思いますか? 学んだとしたらどんな点だとお考えですか?

4. このコース、学生、コース担当者、大学について何かコメントがありましたらお願いします。

ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix C: The number of motivated students in three groups in semester 2

	Motivated?	MR in semester 2	Info in semester 2
Group A	yes	98	98
	no	28	26
Group B	yes	202	196
	no	41	47
Group C	yes	120	124
	no	26	22

Chi-square among those responding to YES: 0.15, df=2, p<0.9277

Appendix D: Reasons for motivations for Market research and Infomercial in semester 2

Reasons	Group A				Group B				Group C			
	M		I		M		I		M		I	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Interesting	28	28.6	42	42.9	64	31.7	98	50.0	48	40.0	72	58.1
Liking English	21	21.4	19	19.4	37	18.3	19	9.7	9	7.5	5	4.0
Useful for my future career	37	37.8	25	25.5	87	43.1	65	33.2	54	45.0	42	33.9
Others	12	12.2	8	8.2	11	5.4	10	5.1	8	6.7	5	4.0
No response	0	0.0	4	4.1	3	1.5	4	2.0	1	0.8	0	0.0
Total	98	100.0	98	100.0	202	100.0	196	100.0	120	100.0	124	100.0

Note. Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermediate
M: Market research, I: Infomercial

Difference among Group A, B, C students' motivation between the top three reasons
Market Research: significantly different: chi-square: 10.90, df=4, p<0.0277, Cramer's V=0.119
Infomercial: not significantly different: chi-square: 16.64, df=4, p<0.0023, Cramer's V=0.1466

Appendix E: Reasons for not being motivated in Market research and Infomercial in semester 2

Reasons for not being motivated.	Group A				Group B				Group C			
	M		I		M		I		M		I	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Boring	8	28.6	10	38.5	9	22.0	12	25.5	4	15.4	3	13.6
Disliking English	10	35.7	4	15.4	10	24.4	6	12.8	13	50.0	7	31.8
Not wanting to think in English	5	17.9	4	15.4	10	24.4	15	31.9	5	19.2	6	27.3
Not useful for learning English	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	2.4	1	2.1	1	3.8	0	0.0
Others	5	17.9	6	23.1	11	26.8	12	25.5	3	11.5	6	27.3
No response	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	28	100.0	26	100.0	41	100.0	47	100.0	26	100.0	22	100.0

Note. Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermediate
M: Market research, I: Infomercial

Appendix F: The influence of group motivation on individual motivation

Market Research			
Individual Motivation: IM (number of students)		Perceived Group motivation: GM (number of students)	
Very motivated	105 (20.3%)	Motivated	102 (19.8%)
		Not motivated	3 (0.6%)
		No response	0
Motivated	315 (61.0%)	Motivated	294 (57.0%)
		Not motivated	21 (4.1%)
		No response	0
Not so much or not motivated at all	95 (18.4%)	Motivated	62 (12.0%)
		Not motivated	33 (6.4%)
		No response	0
No response	1 (0.2%)	No response	1 (0.2%)
Total	516 (100%)	Total	516 (100%)
Infomercial			
Individual Motivation: IM (number of students)		Perceived Group motivation: GM (number of students)	
Very motivated	118 (22.9%)	Motivated	113 (21.9%)
		Not motivated	4 (0.8%)
		No response	1 (0.2%)
Motivated	301 (58.3%)	Motivated	277 (53.7%)
		Not motivated	22 (4.3%)
		No response	2 (0.4%)
Not so much or not motivated at all	94 (18.2%)	Motivated	60 (11.6%)
		Not motivated	33 (6.4%)
		No response	1 (0.2%)
No response	3 (0.6%)	No response	3 (0.6%)
Total	516 (100%)	Total	516 (100%)

Appendix G: The most important factor in operating group in semester 2.

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Total
Members' motivation	93 (72.2%)	211 (87.2%)	111 (73.5%)	415
Manager's leadership	11 (8.6%)	5 (2.1%)	9 (6.0%)	25
Topic of the task	12 (9.4%)	10 (4.1%)	7 (4.6%)	29
Group's scores in class	6 (4.7%)	9 (3.7%)	15 (9.8%)	30
Members' English proficiency	5 (3.9%)	5 (2.1%)	8 (5.3%)	18
Others	0	0	0	0
No response	1 (0.8%)	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	4
Total	128	242	151	521

Appendix H: The proportion of students who stated that they learnt English with and without practice outside class

	Group A		Group B		Group C	
	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
No. of students	128	127	242	243	151	146
I can learn English	22 (17.2%)	18 (14.2%)	24 (9.9%)	14 (5.8%)	27 (17.9%)	11 (7.5%)
With practice outside class:	12 (54.5%)	17 (94.4%)	13 (54.2%)	12 (85.7%)	11 (40.7%)	7 (63.6%)
Without practice outside class:	10 (45.5%)	1 (5.6%)	11 (45.8%)	2 (14.3%)	16 (59.3%)	4 (36.4%)

Note. Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermediate
S1=semester1; S2=semester2

Difference among Group A, B, C students' awareness of learning English from collaborative work between semester 1 and 2

Group A: chi-square:6.03, df=1, $p < 0.0141$, Cramer's $V = 0.444$

Group B: chi-square:2.63, df=1, $p < 0.1049$, Cramer's $V = 0.3208$

Group C: chi-square:0.85, df=1, $p < 0.3566$, Cramer's $V = 0.2077$

Appendix I: The proportion of students who enjoyed speaking English, collaborative work (%)

Groups	Enjoyable?	Speaking English in Collaborative work in	
		S1	S2
Group A	yes	68 (53.1%)	80 (62.5%)
	no	14 (10.9%)	23 (18.0%)
	Difficult to say	46 (35.9%)	86 (35.5%)
Group B	yes	136 (56.2%)	164 (67.8%)
	no	20 (8.3%)	39 (16.1%)
	Difficult to say	24 (18.7%)	39 (16.1%)
Group C	yes	87 (57.8%)	99 (65.6%)
	no	15 (9.9%)	26 (17.2%)
	Difficult to say	36 (28.3%)	70 (28.8%)

Notes: S1=semester 1, S2=semester 2.

Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermediate

Difference among Group A, B, C students who enjoyed speaking English in semester 1, and collaborative work in semester 1 and 2: chi-square: 0.4, df= 4, $p < 0.9825$, Cramer's $V = 0.1253$

Appendix J: Reasons for enjoying speaking English in semester 1 (%)

	Group A	Group B	Group C	TOTAL
I wanted to practice speaking English.	15(22.1%)	40.5 (29.8%)	19.5 (22.4%)	075
I was able to speak with my vocabulary and grammar	7(10.3%)	11.5 (8.5%)	6 (6.9%)	24.5
Members had sufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge	5(7.4%)	3.5 (2.6%)	5 (5.7%)	13.5
The topic was interesting	15.5 (22.8%)	33.5 (24.6%)	21.5 (24.7%)	70.5
It is interesting to hear about other people's opinion	20.5 (30.1%)	44.5 (32.7%)	34 (39.1%)	99
Others	5 (7.4%)	2.5 (1.8%)	1 (1.1%)	8.5
No response	0	0	0	0
Total	68	136	87	291

Notes: Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermediate
Difference among Group A, B, C students' enjoyment: chi-square:11.27, df=8, $p < 0.01869$, Cramer's $V = 0.0999$

Appendix K: Reasons for not enjoying speaking English in semester 1 (%)

	Group A	Group B	Group C	TOTAL
I am not good at speaking English	5.0. (35.7%)	6.0. (30.0%)	3.5 (23.3%)	14.5
I do not have sufficient vocabulary and grammatical knowledge	6.0. (42.9%)	9.0. (45.0%)	7.5 (50.0%)	22.5
Members lacked vocabulary and grammatical knowledge	0	0.5 (02.5%)	1.0.(6.7%)	1.5
It is unnatural to use English when we share the same L1	0.5 (3.6%)	1.00(05.0%)	1.0.(6.7%)	2.5
The topic is not interesting	2.5 (17.9%)	1.5 (07.5%)	1.0 (6.7%)	5.0
Other members in my group did not try to use English	0	2.0 (10.0%)	0	2.0
Others	0	0	1.0 (6.7%)	1.0
No response	0	0	0	0
Total	14.0	20.0	15.0	49.0

Notes: Group A=upper intermediate; Group B=intermediate; Group C=lower intermedia
Difference among Group A, B, C students' non-enjoyment: chi-square:2.98, df=6, $p < 0.8114$, Cramer's $V = 0.1294$

Appendix L: The number of the students who worked outside class hours as a group for practice sessions

	Shared regulation	semester 1	semester 2
Group A	yes	61 (47.6%)	113 (89.0%)
	no	66 (51.6%)	13 (10.2%)
Group B	yes	130 (53.7%)	201 (82.7%)
	no	112 (46.3%)	40 (16.4%)
Group C	yes	81 (53.5%)	95 (65.0%)
	no	70 (46.5%)	49 (33.6%)

Group A: chi-square:49.17, df=1, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer's $V = 0.4494$

Group B: chi-square:47.97, df=1, $p < 0.0001$, Cramer's $V = 0.3196$

Group C: chi-square:2.98, df=1, $p < 0.0414$, Cramer's $V = 0.1257$

(おかむら あきこ・本学経済学部教授)