

# LANGUAGE TEACHING STRATEGIES, AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS, AND THEIR EFFECTS ON STUDENTS' MOTIVATION

**Lina ABRAITIENĖ**

Vytautas Magnus University  
 Donelaičio str. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania  
 E-mail [lina.avbraitiene@vdu.lt](mailto:lina.avbraitiene@vdu.lt)  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5926-5594

**Asta BALČIŪNAITIENĖ**

Vytautas Magnus University  
 Donelaičio str. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania  
 E-mail [asta.balciunaitiene@vdu.lt](mailto:asta.balciunaitiene@vdu.lt)  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9807-1223

**Aurelija ČĖGLYTĖ**

Vytautas Magnus University  
 Donelaičio str. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania  
 E-mail [aurelija.ceglyte@vdu.lt](mailto:aurelija.ceglyte@vdu.lt)  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5375-0484

**Vaida MISEVIČIŪTĖ**

Vytautas Magnus University  
 Donelaičio str. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania  
 E-mail [vaida.miseviciute@vdu.lt](mailto:vaida.miseviciute@vdu.lt)  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7764-9671

DOI: 10.13165/PSPO-24-36-01

**Abstract.** This study investigates the role of teaching strategies in motivating students within second language (L2) classrooms by examining the perceptions of both teachers and students. Grounded in the L2 Motivational Self-System (L2MSS) framework, it focuses on the L2 Learning Experience, a pivotal but underexplored component of motivation in language acquisition. Data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire administered to 130 university students and 28 teachers in Lithuania. Key findings reveal significant alignment in how teachers and students perceive motivational teaching strategies but also highlight notable differences. While teachers emphasise communicative strategies and group work, students express a preference for individual tasks and vocabulary acquisition. The study further identifies discrepancies regarding the use of native language, supplemental materials, and reading and writing assignments. These findings suggest that teachers need to strike a balance between structured and communicative approaches to address diverse learner needs. Practical implications include fostering a collaborative learning environment and integrating more contextualised vocabulary activities to enhance motivation. The study highlights gaps in current practices and offers recommendations for aligning teaching methods with students' motivational drivers. Limitations of the study include its focus on intermediate and advanced learners, leaving room for further research on beginner levels.

**Keywords:** L2 Motivational Self-System, motivation, student-teacher perceptions, teaching strategies

## Introduction

This study examines motivation in second language (L2) learning, focusing on the L2 Learning Experience, a critical yet under-researched component of the L2 Motivational Self-System (L2MSS), as developed by Dörnyei (see Dörnyei, 1994, 1998, 2003). The L2 Learning Experience encompasses elements such as classroom environment, teaching methods, and student-teacher interaction, all of which are pivotal in shaping students' motivation.

Despite its recognised importance, the L2 Learning Experience has not been extensively studied in the context of how teachers' and students' perceptions align regarding motivational teaching strategies. There is a notable gap in understanding how specific strategies impact students' motivation and whether they foster mutual understanding between teachers and learners. Addressing this gap is essential to optimising language teaching practices.

The purpose of this study is to analyse how language teaching strategies, as perceived by teachers and students, influence students' motivation in L2 acquisition. Specifically, it aims to identify similarities and differences in these perceptions and propose ways to align teaching practices with students' motivational needs. By doing so, the study seeks to contribute to the development of more effective and engaging language teaching methods.

This study aims to address these gaps by analysing teachers' and students' perceptions of motivational strategies to determine their alignment and effectiveness. The research focuses on three key questions: 1) How do L2 teachers and students perceive different teaching strategies? 2) What are the relationships between their perceptions? 3) How can these findings inform L2 instruction?

The L2 Learning Experience involves practical aspects of language acquisition, including the classroom environment, teaching equipment, teaching materials and methods, and interactions between teachers and students. These practical components significantly affect students' engagement and motivation to acquire an L2. Therefore, research in this field is both practically relevant and justified.

Teaching methods and strategies, as central elements of the L2 Learning Experience, are vital for creating a motivational learning environment. Effective and accurate use of these methods allows teachers to enhance students' motivation by tailoring the learning environment to reflect the learners' expectations and needs while fostering progress, skill development, and achievement. However, teachers often face challenges in understanding how students perceive these methods and strategies, particularly regarding their motivational impact and their ability to foster mutual understanding between teachers and learners. As discussed later in the literature review, these aspects have not been thoroughly analysed. Consequently, this article fills a critical gap in the current knowledge and is academically relevant.

The research employed a Likert-scale questionnaire to gather quantitative data, providing insights into whether teachers' perceptions of motivational teaching strategies correspond to those of language students. The chosen methodology is valid for capturing quantitative data about perceptions and opinions which are difficult to express in other forms.

This study answers three key research questions: 1) How do L2 teachers and students perceive different teaching strategies? 2) What are the relationships between students' and teachers' perceptions? 3) How can these findings inform L2 instruction to further motivate students?

The paper is structured as follows: first, a literature review builds the theoretical framework for the research objectives, questions, and methodology. This is followed by an overview of the research results and a detailed discussion to provide answers to the research questions. The final section identifies limitations, gives recommendations and provides overall conclusions.

## **Theoretical approach**

### *Motivation in second language learning*

The question of what role motivation plays in second language (L2) learning has been systematically considered since the 1950s and has resulted in several perspectives (Gardner,

2010). Overall, this field has become a meeting point for sciences such as psychology, pedagogy, human physiology, information technologies, and others. The term “motivation” itself has been defined in many ways, ranging from comprehensive (e.g., Dörnyei & Otto, 1998) to very concise definitions (e.g., Gardner, 1985, p. 10). If an attempt to summarise them is made, motivation in the L2 learning can be described as dealing with why people engage in learning L2, what sustains their interest and will, and how can the motivated learning process be maintained to reach desired goals. In other words, “motivation provides the primary impetus to embark upon learning, and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process” (Ryan, 2013).

The early research on the L2 learning motivation discovered that studying L2 is significantly different from studying other subjects because language, by its nature, contains a variety of social, cultural, and psychological aspects that require additional pedagogical attention. This approach resulted in the further development of Gardner’s (1985) theory of L2 motivation, which considers attitudes towards learning L2, desire to learn and stimuli that can affect the intensity of motivation. Consequently, it allowed the research to branch out into a more specific analysis of the learning environment, teaching methods, social surroundings, and so on and to gain insights into, on the one hand, how L2 learners are motivated by the desire to be part of cultural/social community of L2 speakers (integrative orientation) and, on the other hand, how L2 learners are encouraged by specific personal benefits that L2 proficiency can give, such as the advancement in a professional career (instrumental orientation).

In recent decades, one of the most dominant branches of the L2 learning motivation research has been inspired by searching for a meeting point between social and psychological factors. This shifted the focus from integrative and instrumental orientation concepts to the motivational self-system in the L2 acquisition (L2MSS). The main contributor to these advancements has been the tripartite theory developed by Dörnyei in 2005 (Dörnyei, 2005). At the center of it is an attempt to explain the differences when it comes to L2 learning and motivation to learn it. The assumption underpinning Dörnyei’s theory is that when the learner recognises an inconsistency between their current self and their future self, i.e., their desired future self-states, this inconsistency may become a motivating factor to traverse “the perceived gap and reach the desired end-state” (Al-Hoorie, 2018) in the L2MSS. Exceptionally, the testing of this model and its confirmation germinated in the language motivation field. Within just ten years, the L2MSS generated “an exceptional wave of interest with literally hundreds of studies appearing worldwide” (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015), such as Martinović & Burić (2021), Arslan & Çiftçi (2021) and Yang (2023) to name only a few. Due to its versatility and ability to integrate a variety of perspectives from different theoretical orientations, the L2MSS has become a dominant theoretical framework in the field of L2 learning motivation.

#### *Second language motivational self- system*

Throughout his career, Dörnyei attempted to explain the differences in foreign language learning and the motivation to learn it (see Dörnyei, 1994, 1998, 2003, 2005). An assumption underpinning Dörnyei’s theory in the second language acquisition (SLA) is that the learner recognises an inconsistency between their current self and their future self, i.e., their desired future self-states, and this inconsistency may become a motivating factor to bridge the gap and achieve their learning goals in the second language motivational self- system (L2MSS) (Al-Hoorie, 2018, p. 722). The L2MSS both locates motivation within the self and directs efforts towards L2 learning achievement, ideally oriented towards the L2 future. Therefore, the ideal self is a gradual driver to progress from the present to a more desirable state. One’s willingness to reach the imagined/visualised level of the self-drives to a higher state of self. This possible

future self becomes a motive for future actions and can increase the person's willingness to communicate (WTC).

Dörnyei has identified three constituents in this motivation construct, namely, ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience (Dörnyei, 2009). The ideal L2 self represents one's hopes and wishes, i.e., refers to the state one would ideally like to reach, e.g., to become the person who travels a lot and does business worldwide. Therefore, the ideal L2 self is a powerful motivator when learning a language. On the contrary, the ought-to L2 self is concerned with the states that others would wish one to acquire and reach. Whereas individuals are willing to avoid possible negative outcomes, e.g., at work, learn the language to represent the expectations of others. However, it has little to do with personal desires or dreams. Finally, the third constituent – the L2 learning experience – involves an individual experience in the immediate learning environment where such aspects as the teacher, peers, and the curriculum are included. Dörnyei describes the L2 learning experience as the situated executive motive (Dörnyei, 2009) as well as the causal dimension (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 106) of the model.

Thus, in the L2 Motivational Self System, Dörnyei identifies three sources of the motivation to learn an L2: “(a) the learners’ internal desire to become an effective L2 user, (b) social pressures coming from the learner’s environment to master the L2, and (c) the actual experience of being engaged in the L2 learning process” (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013). Several studies have been carried out to find the associations between student motivation and other student-related variables, e.g., Gardner (1985), Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Clement, Dörnyei and Noels (1994), Schumann (1994), Tremblay and Gardner (1995), Schmidt, Boraie and Kassabgy (1996), Williams and Burden (1997), Dörnyei and Ottó (1998). In his study, Dörnyei (1998) presented a synthesis of different constructs and identified seven dimensions of motivation: (1) affective/integrative dimension, (2) instrumental/pragmatic dimension, (3) macro-context-related dimension, (4) self-concept-related dimension, (5) goal-related dimension, (6) educational context-related dimension, and (7) significant others-related dimension. Moreover, Dörnyei (1994) suggested that language learning can be organised systematically, i.e., moving from intrinsic to extrinsic factors, where extrinsic ones influence motivation and anxiety. Thus, the foreign language teacher (as an external variable) impacts the learner’s progression through the learning stages. As a result, there is a great link between the students’ motivation to learn the languages and the teachers’ teaching style (Dörnyei, 1994), which is also reflected in the L2 learning experience component of the L2MSS.

*The L2 learning experience – one of the three constituents of the L2MSS*

According to Dörnyei (2019), the L2 Learning Experience was “not featured more prominently in either the theoretical or the research developments of the past decade”. As a result, there is a lack of research focused on the L2 Learning Experience and a lack of general conceptualisation of what components the L2 Learning Experience is comprised of, but it does not mean that attempts were not made. For example, You & Dörnyei (2016) state that the L2 Learning Experience is “related to the immediate learning environment/experience such as the impact of the teacher, the curriculum, the peer group, or the experience of success.” Tan et al. (2017) confirm that the key elements in L2 Learning Experience are “the curriculum, the L2 teacher, the peer group, and the teaching materials”. Hiver et al. (2020) argue that “L2 learning experience has been reported as an important predictor of learners’ involvement and [...] that it captures key details about the quality of students’ present engagement in the learning process”. In other words, the L2 Learning Experience is very practical because it deals with seemingly mundane things like the classroom, its equipment, textbooks, teaching methods, the size of the student group and so on.. At the same time, these practical aspects are powerful enough to have an effect on the learning process, students’ engagement, and motivation to acquire L2. Despite

such promising importance, Csizér (2017) states that “there are hardly any studies on [the effect of curriculum and teaching methods on learner motivation], and therefore they should be considered issues for future research”, while Li (2023) calls the L2 learning experience “the underappreciated element of the L2 motivational self-system”.

Consequently, teaching methods and strategies can be considered key elements of the L2 Learning Experience. They allow teachers to increase students’ motivation by creating a learning environment that better reflects the expectations and needs of the learners, as well as reveals their progress, skill development, and achievements. For example, an assignment to make a hotel reservation by phone using L2 can be a teaching method that not only encourages the building of necessary vocabulary and use of specific grammar constructions but also shows how the L2 knowledge can be applied in practice, increasing students’ esteem that they can use L2 to make an achievement and bring a sense of adventure to the classroom which allows them to escape their usual learning routine. Of course, teaching methods and their contents must be tailored to each group of students, but if selected wisely, there is an expectation that their use can result in increased learners’ motivation.

### **Research objectives and questions**

The study analyses the role that teaching strategies play in motivation in a university L2 classroom setting. More specifically, the study aims to understand whether the teachers’ perceptions about the motivating teaching strategies correspond to those of the language students. The study is carried out based on the following objectives: a) to compile and compare a list of teaching strategies that are seen as motivational from L2 teacher’s and L2 students’ perspectives, b) to compare the lists and determine the relationships between student’s and teacher’s perceptions, and c) to propose how to reconcile the differences and how these findings may further inform L2 instruction that is motivational to students.

Based on the motivational strategies discovered through literature review and analysis of the practical implications of previous studies, the tool to measure motivational teaching strategies has been designed for this study. A 33-item questionnaire for teachers and a 36-item questionnaire for students using the Likert scale have been devised.

Based on these objectives, the Likert-scale questionnaire, the following research questions have been formulated: 1. How do L2 teachers and students perceive different teaching strategies? 2. What are the relationships between student’s and teacher’s perceptions? 3. How can the observed differences be reconciled, and how may these findings further inform the L2 instruction so that it motivates students?

### **Methodology**

This study employed a quantitative research design to examine the alignment between teachers’ and students’ perceptions of motivational teaching strategies and their effects on students’ motivation. The Mini-Attitude Motivation Test Battery (Mini-AMTB) developed by Bernaus & Gardner (2008) was adapted and used for this study. The Mini-AMTB is a condensed and validated version of the Attitude Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), specifically designed to measure motivation in L2 learning. It provides a reliable means of assessing key motivational factors such as integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, instrumental orientation, and language anxiety.

The questionnaire included 12 questions measured on a 7-point Likert scale, focusing on various motivational attributes. Data were collected from 130 university students and 28

teachers engaged in L2 learning and teaching at a university in Lithuania. The quantitative design enabled a systematic comparison of perceptions between the two groups.

The study's respondents included:

- **Students:** 57% (73) were first-year students, 35% (45) were second-year students, 4% (5) were third-year students, 2% (2) were fourth-year students, and 3% (4) were fifth-year students. Of the students, 49% were at the B2 proficiency level and 51% at the C1 level, based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).
- **Teachers:** The 28 participating teachers taught at varying proficiency levels: 6% at A1, 24% at A2, 29% at B1, 59% at B2, 41% at C1, and 6% at C2. Regarding teaching experience, 82% (14) had more than ten years of experience, 6% had less than ten years, and 12% had less than five years.

The questionnaire included variables such as integrativeness, attitude toward the learning situation, motivation for the target language, language anxiety, instrumental orientation, and parental encouragement (Gardner, 2010). The Mini-AMTB's readability coefficient is 0.743 (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008), ensuring the instrument's validity for this research.

The quantitative survey was conducted during the spring semester of 2022. Gender distribution among the respondents was as follows: 78% (101) of students were female and 22% (29) were male, while all 28 teachers were female.

The data collected were analysed statistically to identify significant similarities and differences in perceptions between teachers and students, providing insights into how motivational strategies are perceived and their potential impact on students' motivation.

## Results and discussion

The first part of the study aimed to evaluate the difference between L2 teachers' and L2 student's attitudes towards learning/teaching English and other languages. The results are presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Students' and teachers' motivation to learn and teach languages  
(average mean score on the scale of 1-7)**

Aspect	Students	Teachers
Motivation to learn English for communication with English-speaking people	5.91	6.29
Motivation to learn English for practical purposes (e.g., to get a good job)	5.98	6.0
Attitude toward English as lingua franca	5.93	5.44
Interest in studying other languages than English	5.21	5.13

*Source: created by the authors.*

The finding shows that the respondents highly value the role of English learning but are also favourable towards learning other languages. To support the conclusion, the students were asked to evaluate their attitude towards English language courses. With an average mean score of 5.51, students valued their courses positively. This score is contrasted with the teachers' attitude towards teaching English courses, which is 5.72. It could be stated that these findings prove students' and teachers' rather favourable motivation to learn and teach English from work and career perspectives.

The teaching and learning strategies have been analysed among teachers and students. One set of questions addressed the teachers' and students' attitudes towards how

communication is performed in the class: individual, peer, or group work, along with how the questions are posed in the classroom: to the whole group or individual students.

**Table 2. Teachers' and students' attitude towards class communication (average mean scores on the scale from 1-7)**

Type of classwork	Students	Teachers
Peer work	4.89	5.47
Small group work	5.0	6.0
Individual work	5.89	5.47
Questions to the whole class	5.84	6.0
Questions to individual students	5.28	5.14

*Source: created by the authors.*

The results show that, on average, students and teachers are positive about all the types of work in the class. The least popular work among teachers is peer work, while the students dislike small group work the most. Looking at the average numbers, the evaluations of class discussions seem to be similar between teachers and students. Teachers value questions asked to the whole class at 6 and questions to individual students at 5.14. Respectively, students value them at 5.84 and 5.28. Another set of questions refers to developing reading, writing, grammar, or vocabulary skills. Table 3 represents the results below.

**Table 3. Students' and teachers' attitudes towards performing language skills in class (average mean score on the scale of 1-7)**

Language skills	Students	Teachers
Grammar and vocabulary exercises	5.93	5.29
Reading in class	5.36	4.12
Writing in class	5.26	3.88
Long vocabulary lists	3.64	3

*Source: created by the authors.*

Overall, both students and teachers have a favourable attitude towards grammar and vocabulary exercises, reading, and writing tasks. What is evident from the results is that students value all these tasks more than the teachers. Another group of questions addresses homework, project work, and library work. These results are shown in table 4 below.

**Table 4. Students' and teachers' attitudes towards class tasks (average mean score on the scale of 1-7)**

Class tasks	Students	Teachers
Homework	5.92	5.94
Project work	6.06	6.5
Library projects	4.09	4.88

*Source: created by the authors.*

The results show that students and teachers view homework similarly. Regarding project work, both teachers and students show high preference. Library research is less valued among these tasks, yet the teacher average (4.88) is very similar to the student average (4.09). Neither teachers nor students consider library research to be important. It is a highly surprising result

among students, considering that the majority of the respondents study English at B2 or C1 level, and the higher competency in English would require the projects to be more scientific and research-based. For this reason, further research is needed to understand if the students and/or teachers consider Google search to be adequate for project work in B1 – C1 levels or if there are other reasons why library research is so undervalued. Moreover, both students and teachers expressed a strong preference (above 5) for homework assignments (5.92 and 5.94, respectively) and project assignments (6.06 and 6.5).

The study revealed there was considerable overlap in students’ and teachers’ views. At the same time, certain discrepancies emerged as well. Teachers tended to place more emphasis on communicative strategies and group work, whereas students favoured structured activities like vocabulary memorisation and individual work. These findings align with Dörnyei’s (2009) tripartite model of motivation, particularly in the emphasis on the L2 learning experience as a key motivator. The differences observed may be due to the varying expectations and experiences of students and teachers.

*Research question 1: Based on the Likert-scale questionnaire, compile and compare a list of teaching strategies that are seen as motivational from L2 teacher’s and L2 students’ perspectives*

Teacher responses unveiled a wider variation in responses from 1.6 (strongly disagree) to 6.5 (strongly agree) on the 7-point scale, whereas student responses displayed a slighter variation from 3.4 to 6.4, making them less negative about the use of teaching strategies. Among the raw scores, a difference of 0.6 or higher on the seven-point scale was considered significant as it represents a notable difference in opinion. The teacher and student overall means are displayed in Table 5. Out of the 24 questions, 10 questions displayed a significant raw mean difference higher than 0.6, and 13 questions showed almost no difference in opinion with a mean difference of 0.4 or less.

**Table 5. Difference in student and teacher average mean score on the scale of 1-7**

No	Questions	Mean difference (Ss-Ts)	Teachers’ means (n=28)	Students’ means (n=130)
Q21	I worry about speaking in my English class	2.0	1.6	3.6
Q2	Students are allowed to speak their native language for clarification	1.4	4.3	5.6
Q7	Students are given written tasks in class	1.4	3.9	5.3
Q6	Students are given time to read in class	1.2	4.1	5.4
Q20	Students’ textbook is supplemented with other materials	-0.9	6.5	5.6
Q10	Students are required to do library research	-0.8	4.9	4.1
Q17	Students work in small groups in class	-0.8	6.0	5.2
Q9	Students are provided class participation rules	-0.7	6.1	5.4
Q13	Students do peer work in class	-0.6	5.5	4.9
Q18	Students are assigned to memorise long vocabulary lists at home	0.6	3.0	3.6
Q12	Students do individual work in class	0.4	5.5	5.9
Q14	Students do project assignments	-0.4	6.5	6.1
Q19	Students’ linguistic achievements are evaluated using tests	0.4	5.1	5.6
Q1	More emphasis is put on communicative competence than on grammar accuracy	-0.3	5.5	5.3

Q16	Students translate texts into their native languages	-0.3	3.8	3.5
Q22	My desire to learn English is	-0.3	5.9	5.7
Q3	Students are asked questions to the whole class	-0.2	6.0	5.8
Q4	Students are called on in class individually	0.1	5.1	5.3
Q15	Students follow tasks in the paper textbooks in class	0.1	4.2	4.3
Q23	My interest in foreign languages is:	0.1	5.1	5.2
Q5	Students are given opportunities to speak English in class	0.0	6.4	6.4
Q8	Students are given homework	0.0	5.9	5.9
Q24	My motivation to learn English for practical purposes (e.g., to get a good job) is:	0.0	6.0	6.0

Source: created by the authors.

The table displays the difference between the students' and teachers' mean responses ( $S_s - T_s = \text{Mean difference}$ ) in descending order, followed by teachers' and students' overall mean. Additionally, the minus sign has been preserved to show the direction of difference: negative values represent greater teacher agreement than student agreement with the item. Questions 21, 2, 7, 6 and 18 represent higher teacher preference and value for the tasks in those items. On the contrary, questions 20, 10, 17, 9, and 13 show student preferences.

*Research question 2: to compare the lists and determine the relationships between student's and teacher's perceptions*

The results represented in Table 6 display the percentages of low scores (1 and 2) and high scores (6 and 7) among teachers and students, looking only at the questions that had a high mean difference in Table 1. The highlighted items represent the means with a negative value to retain the direction of agreement, whereas negative values represent more significant teacher agreement than student agreement with the item. Obviously, neutral scores (3, 4, 5) were not considered in the analysis as they represent a neutral position – the golden middle – where neither teachers nor students represent a strong position.

**Table 6. Statistically significant teachers' and students' average mean scores with representation of low and high scores (negative values represent greater teacher agreement than student agreement with the item)**

No	Questions	Mean difference (S <sub>s</sub> -T <sub>s</sub> )	Teachers' responses		Students' responses	
			Low scores (6-7)	High scores (1-2)	Low scores (6-7)	High scores (1-2)
Q21	I worry about speaking in my English class	2.0	71	6	30	34
Q2	Students are allowed to speak their native language for clarification	1.4	25	32	6	61
Q7	Students are given written tasks in class	1.4	24	24	5	48
Q6	Students are given time to read in class	1.2	24	18	4	49
Q18	Students are assigned to memorise long vocabulary lists at home	0.6	34	17	33	24
Q20	Students' textbook is supplemented with other materials	-0.9	0	83	2	57
Q10	Students are required to do library research	-0.8	6	32	18	28
Q17	Students work in small groups in class	-0.8	6	69	5	48

Q9	Students are provided class participation rules	-0.6	0	80	7	56
Q13	Students do peer work in class	-0.6	6	64	5	45

*Source: created by the authors.*

The highest mean difference (2.0) between students' and teachers' responses was the comfort level of English language use in the classroom. The result did not reveal much of a surprise as English teachers should feel confident using English, and it is expected that learners should feel nervous when practising a foreign language. However, a deeper look revealed that 71% of teachers did not display any worry at all, while 6% of teachers felt worried about using English in the classroom. 30 % of the students were worried about speaking English in class, and 34% felt comfort in class.

Another significant mean score difference (1.4) concerned native language use for clarification in the classroom. Teachers' responses were significant on both spectrums, with 25% disapproving of native language use and 32% supportive of the role of the native language for clarifications. On the contrary, students found this issue less controversial as 6% disapproved of the native language use, and 61% supported the native language used for clarification. Similarly, teachers and students felt that reading and writing were important in the classroom. Teachers were divided about writing (L 24 and H 24) and reading (L 24 and H 18), whereas students were more supportive of written tasks (L 5 and H 48) and reading (L 4 and H 49). Finally, students' preference for memorising extended vocabulary lists seemed surprising at first. However, a deeper analysis of the high and low scores revealed that the significance was not outstanding. Teachers were reserved about the effectiveness of assigning long vocabulary lists for memorisation (L 34 and H 17), which supports an effective vocabulary teaching methodology. 33% of students negatively valued long list memorisation, and 24% valued it highly. Even though students valued vocabulary memorisation more positively on average, the low and high scores revealed that a more significant number of both students and teachers did not support this strategy. This corresponds to the findings of Hiver et al. (2020) who argue that positive L2 learning experience contributes to learner involvement in the learning process. The same was discovered in the study here. The student seems to be highly motivated by various teaching methods, class environment, and therefore feel fairly motivated to learn the language.

The highlighted items in Table 6 represent significant mean differences where teachers display more value than students to the following question items. A significant mean difference (-0.9) was observed in the value teachers and students give supplemental information to the textbook. Teachers showed a strong need to supplement the existing textbooks (L 0 and H 83), whereas students were more reserved (L 2 and H 57). In other words, most teachers feel strongly about the need to supplement the textbook, and almost half of the students are satisfied with the quality of the textbook. A similar analysis applies to class participation rules. Teachers strongly believe in providing class rules (L 0 and H 80) due to the requirement in the department to provide clear guidelines to the students, whereas almost half of the respondents (L 7 and H 56) did not care so much about the clear class participation rules. These findings do not support the finding that of Tan et al. (2017) that L2 learning experience is influenced by the curriculum and the teaching materials. In fact, the students were satisfied with the books and did not feel motivated by supplemental books or changes in the curriculum. While it is possible to interpret this as a factor related to motivation, it can also be an indirect measure of motivation as the extra materials mean more learning and potentially harder to get a positive grade. Therefore,

when the information is in the book, the students know how much to learn even if the information is old-fashioned and not interesting. Therefore, the quantitative data is not adequate to make strong conclusions about the importance of additional materials or changes in curriculum.

Moreover, a small significant difference was observed in the small group work, peer review, and library research. More teachers than students valued this type of work, and only 6% of teachers and 5% of students did not value group or peer work. A higher difference can be observed in library research, where 6% of teachers did not value library work, and 18% of students did not appreciate it. On the opposite side, 69% and 64% of teachers valued group work and peer work highly, and a much smaller number of students, at 48% and 45%, respectively, valued group and peer work. Rather surprisingly, library work was valued almost equally by teachers (32%) and students (28%).

*Research question 3: to propose how to reconcile the differences and how these findings may further inform L2 instruction that is motivational to students.*

Any conclusions drawn from these data should be considered tentative as it is challenging to interpret quantitative data but the data at large show a strong teachers' motivation not simply to teach English (H 77) but to seek the newest teaching methods and strategies (H 77) to provide practical English skills (H 75) that would allow students to communicate efficiently inside and outside the classroom (further education, travel, career). However, the student's data is conflicting. While students understand the need for practical English (H 73) and want to communicate efficiently (H 65), only half of the students have high motivation to learn English (H 56 and L 2). This may be explained by the fact that C1 level of English completion is compulsory for all the students at the university, so many might not feel the need to acquire English at such a high level (the study featured mainly B2 (49) and C1 (51) student respondents who already manipulate language fairly fluently). The difference in motivation suggests that several L2 learning experience elements require consideration.

## Limitations

It can be acknowledged that the research has several evident limitations. First, the study mainly represents first and second-year students who already have B1 or C1 levels. As a result, the research does not represent the opinions of beginner or advanced-level students. Second, the data could be analysed further by comparing students based on their study year, language level or other characteristics. Third, the questionnaire could be further elaborated to include recently increasingly more discussed frameworks such as mediation, multiculturalism, green issues, climate change, etc. Finally, the quantitative nature of the questionnaire can be criticised as lacking detail and not allowing interpretation of the results' underlying causes.

## Implications & recommendations

The statistically significant differences presented in the previous section suggest the following implications for the classroom:

1. A great number of students (H 70) feel motivated to perform class activities when the native language is used as the means of mediation in more complex language situations, especially when the students get stuck. However, only 37% of teachers support native language use in the classroom. This may be explained by the fact that many respondents teach English in higher proficiency levels and may have perceived this question not as much from a motivational perspective but rather from the practical angle that switching between languages when L2 becomes a struggle slows down acquisition. Moreover, it could be culturally inappropriate if

there are students from different countries. However, this fact may not be known to the students, and teachers should explain that language struggles give self-satisfaction and confidence as well as improve communication skills. Therefore, praising any successful attempt should be stressed in teaching to meet this difference in opinion between teachers and students. On the other hand, it is advisable to hear the students out in their native language and then ask them to try to explain the same in English to create that bridge, at least in the early learning stages that the students can feel engaged and positive while learning a second language.

2. Reading and writing tasks in class are considered motivational by students (H49 and H48) compared to teachers (H18 and H24), respectively. Students felt more strongly, to a statistically significant degree, that teachers should provide reading and writing tasks in class. Unfortunately, due to the ambitious level requirements and time limits, teachers often leave reading and writing classes for homework. Reading is known to have very positive effects on language learning, and due to the popularity of social media, writing is one of the more essential skills today; therefore, priority needs to be given to these tasks in the classroom. It is highly advisable to allot time for reading and writing and turn them into regular classroom routines.

3. A strong connection to reading may be observed in another statistically significant item. Memorisation of long vocabulary lists is viewed more positively by students (H24 and L20) than teachers (H17 and L34). This finding indicates that teachers understand that memorising vocabulary without context is not an effective language learning strategy, yet students understand the importance of vocabulary and are willing to learn words at any cost. The implication of this finding suggests that teachers need to stress the importance of acquiring vocabulary in context. Rather than memorising long vocabulary lists, students need to understand the importance of reading and learning vocabulary from a meaningful context.

4. Students are less supportive of class rules than teachers. On the one hand, university officials strongly recommend clear class rules; thus, this may highly influence teacher preference for rules. On the other hand, class rules provide more order and clarity in the classroom. At the same time, students view class rules as demotivating, so explaining to the students why the rules benefit them is essential.

5. Supplementing textbooks with other materials is viewed more positively by teachers than students. Supplementing materials is a common practice among teachers. For one or another reason, textbooks are limiting as topics age, the books provide inadequate practice, or there is a mismatch between the book and the curriculum. Furthermore, working with the same textbook year after year may become boring. Therefore, supplemental materials are viewed as motivational by teachers (H83 and L0) but contrary for students. In contrast, going beyond the main textbook for students may reduce their motivation (H57 and L2) because it is easier to lose track of what is important, making it easy to get distracted. Arguably, this question presented a conflicting response from the students' side because later in the questionnaire, they voiced an opinion that using only textbooks provides a dull teaching method. It remains unclear if that is caused by the textbook itself or the way it is used in the classroom.

6. Library research is more favoured by teachers than students, yet there is no big enthusiasm for library research in English classrooms on both sides. A small number of teachers valued library research (H32 and L6), and even smaller numbers are seen among students (H28 and L13). While library research has many advantages, it does not clearly and directly connect to the day-to-day aspects of L2 acquisition – skills to communicate and express oneself in social

situations. It might be the main reason why library research is not perceived as motivating by teachers or students.

7. Group and peer work is valued more by teachers (H69 and H64) than students (H48 and H35), respectively. Many earlier studies have observed students' hesitancy toward group and pair work, starting with Shultz (2001). Such mismatch may reflect fundamental differences in perceiving how L2 is acquired. This ambivalent attitude toward group/pair work may simply reflect logistical difficulties that sometimes arise given particular interpersonal dynamics or when teachers engage students in group work within a particular physical space.

The literature review revealed the key elements in creating a motivating the L2 learning experience: the curriculum, the L2 teacher, the peer group, and the teaching materials (You & Dornyei, 2016; Tan et al., 2017). The results of this study confirm the importance of these elements. The data reveal that for L2 learning experience, such motivating L2 key elements as the curriculum, the peer group, and the teaching materials have an important effect on learning. Consequently, teachers seem to be role models for the changing trends in L2 research. While earlier studies suggested teachers' preference to move from discreet grammar points to a communicative teaching approach before their students were ready to do so (Shultz, 2001; Bell, 2005; Brown, 2009), the data today reveal the same trend. The teachers are pioneers in moving teaching beyond simple communication toward English for specific purposes, cross-cultural awareness, social justice, project learning, and academic English. In other words, teachers are more aware of the demands of English today and the need to participate in a turbulent context. Therefore, one important implication is to continue to raise awareness of the more academic demands of English through project work, library research, authentic reading and writing tasks on social media. Another significant implication for the teachers is to make sure that the English language teaching is made practical and communicative, as the students seem to be highly motivated by the demands of the labour market.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, this study highlights that while students and teachers largely agree on the motivational value of certain L2 teaching strategies, notable differences exist in their preferences for specific methods. Teachers tended to prioritise communicative competence and group work, while students placed greater value on individual tasks and vocabulary acquisition. These insights suggest that L2 instruction can be optimised by balancing both structured and communicative approaches tailored to meet the diverse needs of learners.

Some teaching strategies revealed not only different evaluations between teachers and students but also within the group of teachers. This demonstrates that the teaching process is not rigidly structured and controlled but rather creative, allowing each teacher to design their own approach. However, when learners' motivation is considered, it might be useful for the teachers to have a meeting to discuss their strategies. This could result in better mutual understanding and convince some teachers to make adjustments to their teaching plans.

Finally, the conflicting data from students makes a rather obvious point that each group is comprised of people with different L2 skills, coming from different backgrounds and bringing their own experiences. It creates a puzzle for the teacher whether to: a) implement their teaching plan by expecting the students to accept it or by putting effort to convince them that the plan is valuable and efficient, or b) adjust the teaching plan to match the trends and expectations circulating among the students to make them excited and motivated about the L2 acquisition.

Although the study does not resolve this dilemma, the results certainly direct the teachers to seek better communication with the students.

## References

1. Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2018) 'The L2 motivational self system: A meta-analysis', *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(4), p721-754. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.4.2>.
2. Arslan, T., & Çiftçi, H. (2021) 'Second language motivational self system of sixth graders in Turkey: A correlational study', *Tesol Journal*, 12(1)
3. Bell, T. (2005) 'Behaviors and Attitudes of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: Results of a Questionnaire Study', *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), p259–270. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02490.x>.
4. Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2008) 'Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement', *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), p387-401. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00753.x>.
5. Brown, A. (2009) 'Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teaching: A Comparison of Ideals', *The Modern Language Journal* (Boulder, Colo.), 93(1), p46–60. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>.
6. Clement, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels K. (1994) 'Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom', *Language Learning*, 44, p417-448. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01113.x>.
7. Collective (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
8. Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R.W. (1991) 'Motivation: Reopening the research agenda', *Language Learning*, 41, p469-512. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00690.x>.
9. Csizér, K. (2017) 'Motivation in the L2 classroom', in Loewen, S. and Sato, M. (eds.) *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition*. Routledge, p418-432. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968-23>.
10. Dörnyei, Z. (1994) 'Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom', *The modern language journal*, 78(3), p273-284. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x>.
11. Dörnyei, Z. (1998) 'Motivation in second and foreign language learning', *Language teaching*, 31(3), p117-135. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>.
12. Dörnyei, Z. (2003) 'Attitudes, Orientations, and Motivations in Language Learning: Advances in Theory, Research, and Applications', *Language Learning*, 53, p1–213. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.53222>.
13. Dörnyei, Z. (2005) *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. New Jersey Mahwah. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781410613349>.
14. Dörnyei, Z. (2009) The L2 motivational self system. In Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, p9-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003>

15. Dörnyei, Z. (2019) 'Towards a better understanding of the L2 Learning Experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System', *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), p19-30. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssl.t.2019.9.1.2>.
16. Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013) 'Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages', *Language learning*, 63(3), p437-462. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/lang.12005>.
17. Dörnyei, Z. and Otto, I. (1998) 'Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation', *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, p43–69. Thames Valley University, London.
18. Dörnyei, Z. and Ryan, S. (2015) *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>.
19. Gardner, R.C. (1985) *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold Publishers.
20. Gardner, R.C. (2010) 'Motivation and Attitudes in Second Language Learning', in Berns, M. (ed.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Elsevier Science. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00625-8>.
21. Guilford, J.P. (1954) *Psychometric Methods*. 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
22. Hiver, P., Zhou, S.A., Tahmouresi, S., Sang, Y. and Papi, M. (2020) 'Why stories matter: Exploring learner engagement and metacognition through narratives of the L2 learning experience', *System*, 91, p102260. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102260>.
23. Li, Z. (2023) 'The development and validation of a scale for measuring L2 learning experience: The underappreciated element of the L2 motivational self system', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, p1–20.
24. Martinović, A., & Burić, I. (2021) 'L2 motivation: The relationship between past attributions, the L2MSS, and intended effort', *Vestnik za tuje jezike*, 13(1), p409-426.
25. Ryan, S. (2013) Motivation. In Byram, M., & Hu, A. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. Taylor & Francis. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781108290876.016>
26. Schmidt, R., Boraie, D. and Kassabgy, O. (1996) 'Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections', in Oxford, R.L. (ed.) *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, p14–87.
27. Schumann, J.H. (1994) 'Where is cognition? Emotion and cognition in second language acquisition', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, p231–242. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012894>.
28. Schulz, R. (2001) 'Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia', *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), p244–258. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107>.
29. Tan, T.G., Lin, T.H. and Hoe, F.T. (2017) 'Analysing the relationship between L2 Motivational Self System and achievement in Mandarin', *International Academic Research Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), p104–108.
30. Tennant, J. and Gardner, R.C. (2004) 'The Computerized Mini-AMTB', *Calico Journal*, 21(2), pp. 245–263. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/cj.v21i2.245-263>.

- 
31. Tremblay, P.F. and Gardner, R.C. (1995) 'Expanding the motivation construct in language learning', *Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), p505–520. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05451.x>.
  32. Williams, M. and Burden, R.L. (1997) *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
  33. Yang, S. (2023) 'The environmental impact research based on L2MSS', in *2023 7th International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences (ISEMSS 2023)*, p131–138. Atlantis Press.
  34. You, C.J. and Dörnyei, Z. (2016) 'Language learning motivation in China: Results of a large-scale stratified survey', *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), p495–519.