

Factors Predicting Motivation for and Engagement in Production Tasks among Japanese University Students

Satoko Suzuki*

(Received October 1, 2018)

Abstract

Since speaking competence, in particular, varies among students in an EFL setting such as Japan, motivation for and engagement in textbook-based production tasks vary noticeably as well. This study examined 1) factors such as autonomy, competence, value, relatedness, and pressure that predict intrinsic motivation/effort toward production tasks, and 2) to what extent those factors differ between focused and unfocused tasks. After engaging in both focused and unfocused production tasks, 66 first-year Japanese university students from various majors took the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory questionnaire. The results showed that both intrinsic motivation and effort are predicted by autonomy, value, and relatedness. Only three factors—intrinsic motivation, relatedness, and pressure—were significantly higher for unfocused tasks. The implication of the results is that it is important to give students a task that they can control, that allows them to communicate with classmates, and that is regarded as a tool to improve English (speaking) proficiency. Furthermore, both focused and unfocused tasks are appropriate for the classroom setting, but unfocused tasks might be necessary to increase students' intrinsic motivation.

Keywords: Task motivation, intrinsic motivation inventory, task-supported instruction, assisted repeated reading, focused task

Introduction

When discussing language learning, the individual differences among students cannot be ignored. Although teachers provide students classroom tasks to promote all four types of English skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills), it is always intriguing to notice that students' motivation to engage in those tasks varies. Since speaking competence, in particular, varies among

* Institute for Liberal Arts Education, Ibaraki University, 2-1-1 Bunkyo Mito-shi 310-8512 Japan.

students in an EFL setting such as Japan, engagement in production tasks is expected to vary noticeably as well. The question that must then be answered is: what are the factors that affect engagement in production tasks? This study aims to examine the factors that predict intrinsic motivation and effort toward production tasks in order to draw conclusions about what teachers can do to motivate students to speak more during class time.

Literature Review

Task-Supported Language Teaching

Task-supported language teaching is a weak version of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and uses tasks as a means to practice structures and functions after they are presented (Ellis, 2003). When teaching from commercially published textbooks, tasks that are used in classrooms are typically unrelated to students' real-world activities, and they also often provide only linguistically simplified materials for students to practice structures and functions (Long, 2015). However, since task-supported language teaching is easy to implement and works as a bridge between traditional approaches of memorization of linguistic knowledge and task-based approaches that promote authentic communication, it is worth investigating what kinds of experiences students have while being taught through this method.

In general, tasks in the classroom can be categorized as *focused tasks* and *unfocused tasks* (Ellis, 2003). Both types of tasks focus on meaning, but the difference between them is that focused tasks are designed to focus on a particular linguistic feature (e.g., a grammatical structure, a phoneme). Unfocused tasks, on the other hand, are intended only to elicit students' free production of the target language.

There are two theoretical rationales regarding focused tasks (Ellis, 2003). First, in order to develop the automatic processing that is necessary for smooth face-to-face communication, providing tasks to practice linguistic features that were first presented explicitly and then giving feedback on mistakes is necessary. Second, explicit explanation of linguistic features helps students notice the gap between how they use the features and how the features are used correctly.

Intrinsic Motivation Inventory and L2 Task Motivation

Deci and Ryan's Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (<http://selfdeterminationtheory.org/intrinsic-motivation-inventory/>) is a questionnaire that assesses the subjective experiences of participants regarding an activity in which they engage. This instrument measures seven concepts: 1) students' interest (intrinsic motivation), 2) perceived competence, 3) effort to complete the task, 4) perceived choice during the task (autonomy), 5) value or usefulness of the task, 6) pressure to complete the task, and 7) relatedness to others during the task. The concepts of perceived choice (autonomy) and perceived competence have been found to be positive predictors of intrinsic motivation, while pressure has been a negative predictor of intrinsic

motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Relatedness affects intrinsic motivation but to a lesser degree compared to autonomy and competence (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004). The complete questionnaire consists of 45 items. However, depending on the research questions being posed, individual items can be chosen for inclusion and modified as needed.

In the field of second language acquisition research, Agnesia (2010) and Mozgalina (2015) used the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory to investigate motivation for and engagement in classroom tasks. Agnesia (2010) investigated students' motivation and effort for *target* tasks (Long, 1990), activities to practice linguistic features and/or to express academic knowledge (e.g., group discussion, self selected listening & speaking project, short individual presentation, essay writing), offered in an online EAP course. A total of 141 Intrinsic Motivation Inventory questionnaires were analyzed from ESL students who were taking the online EAP course at a university in Hawaii. The results showed that students' intrinsic motivation toward the target tasks was stronger when they had a choice, had competence to do the task, and regarded the task as valuable. Regarding effort to complete the task, students' value toward the task and relatedness to other people during the task predicted student' effort level to complete the tasks.

Mozgalina (2015) investigated students' motivation and task engagement depending on the task structure. The participants were 120 beginner learners of Russian at a German university who completed a writing presentation task. The task was to write about and present on a famous person from Russia. In study 1, all the students were given contents to write about. However, there were three possible conditions regarding who to write about: 1) no choice, 2) choice from four famous people, and 3) free choice. In study 2, the three conditions of whom to write about were the same as study 1, but students were free to write anything. The results showed that students' perceived choice (autonomy), motivation, and task engagement, measured by the number of words written by the students, were highest when the students had no choice of whom to write about but were free to write anything. It is intriguing that less choice increased perceived choice (autonomy), motivation, and task engagement, but since autonomy is a willingness to complete a task, whether the person initiated the task or responded to being told to complete the task (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004), this result is understandable.

Given that task-supported language teaching is prevalent elsewhere, it is important to investigate students' subjective experiences regarding textbook-based production tasks in order to discern what features facilitate engagement of a task in the classroom setting. Previous literature has shown that the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory helps to determine factors that predict motivation and effort in an online English course and in writing tasks, but not for production tasks used in the EFL classroom. In addition, no studies have used the Inventory to compare students' subjective experiences between focused tasks (to produce particular linguistic features) and unfocused tasks (to produce free opinions). Thus, considering the literature above, this study intends to answer three research

questions:

1. What factors predict students' motivation toward production tasks?
2. What factors predict students' effort to engage in production tasks?
3. To what extent do students' subjective experiences of the seven concepts in the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory differ between focused and unfocused tasks?

Methods

Participants

Participants were 66 first-year Japanese university students from various majors (10 Science majors, 12 Humanities and Social Science majors, 22 Engineering majors, 10 Agriculture majors, and 12 Education majors) who were taking a four-skills integrated English course and agreed to answer the modified and translated version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory described above. Originally, 73 participants submitted the inventory. However, 13 incomplete or careless inventory responses were found and deleted during the analysis. All students had at least 6 years of formal English language instruction and, according to the institutional placement test, they had TOEIC scores of around 400 on average.

Materials

In the present study, four kinds of production tasks were conducted. *Assisted Repeated Reading* and *Assisted Repeated Reading Combined with Interaction* are considered focused tasks because the intention in assigning them is to have students practice linguistic features, such as phonemes, word stress, rhythm, and intonation. *Timed Speaking Practice with Classmates* and *Psychiatrist-Patient Interaction* are considered unfocused tasks because there is no intent to have students use specific linguistic features.

Assisted Repeated Reading. Assisted repeated reading is based on automaticity theory (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974) and is a task in which students repeatedly practice reading with the assistance of an audio model. It has been found to improve reading fluency, reading comprehension, and speaking fluency by engaging the student in repetition and allowing them to receive comprehensible input (Taguchi, Gorsch, Lems, & Rosszell, 2016).

In this study, students first read a conversation dialogue taken from unit 2 of *World English 3, 2nd Edition* (Chase & Johannsen, 2015) while recording their voice using their smart phones (pre-oral reading). Then, they listened to the dialogue and checked the pronunciation of each word, word stress, sentence rhythm, and intonation on their own. After checking these pronunciation features together with the whole class, students practiced reading while listening at least five times (assisted repeated reading) and recorded their oral reading again (post-oral reading). Finally, each student compared the pre-oral reading and post-oral reading in terms of volume of voice, overall fluency, pronunciation features (stress, rhythm, intonation, individual phonemes), and pause location

using rubric on a self-evaluation sheet. This task is a focused task and is done individually.

Assisted Repeated Reading Combined with Interaction. In this task, students were assigned to act as one speaker out of four. There are five steps to complete the task. First, the students were given a handout with the listening texts of four speakers with some blanks. The listening texts were taken from unit 2 of *World English 3, 2nd Edition* (Chase & Johannsen, 2015). Second, after each student was designated as one of the speakers, each listened to an assigned monologue using his or her own smart phone to check pronunciation and the words that belonged in the blanks. Third, together with group members who were designated as the same speaker, the students practiced oral reading. Fourth, the students formed a new group with other students who were designated as different speakers. Finally, they read aloud with each other and filled in the blanks. This task is a focused task and requires interaction.

Timed Speaking Practice with Classmates. In order to activate students' background knowledge related to a topic in the textbook *World English 3, 2nd Edition* (Chase & Johannsen, 2015), they were given a set of questions. In addition, in order to build speaking fluency, a modified version of the 4-3-2 activity (Nation, 2007) was adopted: students were allowed to discuss the answers to the questions within a given amount of time, 2 minutes with the first partner, 1 minute with the second partner, and 30 seconds with the last partner. When one person was talking about his or her opinion, the other person was listening. The reason for this modification from 4 min-3 min-2 min to 2 min-1 min-30 sec was that students could concentrate better and talk the entire time when a shorter time was given. This task is an unfocused task without interaction.

Psychiatrist-Patient Interaction. In order to practice vocabulary related to psychology learned in the textbook *World English 3, 2nd Edition* (Chase & Johannsen, 2015), an advising task was conducted. In this task, one student acted as a psychiatrist and another student as a patient. The psychiatrist asked the patient to describe their symptoms, diagnosed them, and gave advice regarding how to get better. Students were given questions and vocabulary to complete the task. This task is an unfocused task with interaction.

Procedure

Participants attended a four-skills integrated course twice per week for 15 weeks (a total of 30 classes). During the course, they engaged in the four kinds of production tasks: assisted repeated reading (in the 18th class), assisted repeated reading combined with interaction (in the 9th class), timed speaking practice with classmates (in the 17th class), and psychiatrist-patient interaction (in the 19th class). At the end of the course (in the 30th class), the participants took a Japanese translation of a modified version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory for each task. Thus, a total of 264 questionnaires (4 tasks from each of 66 students) were collected. While answering the Inventory, a set of handouts that explained the features and examples of the four kinds of production tasks (e.g., assisted repeated reading, assisted repeated reading combined with interaction, timed speaking

practice, and psychiatrist-patient interaction) was distributed to help participants remember the experience of the tasks. Table 1 describes the modified version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory, which consisted of 35 items (5 items for each of the 7 concepts). The responses for this inventory used a 6-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Slightly Disagree*, 4 = *Slightly Agree*, 5 = *Agree*, 6 = *Strongly Agree*).

Table 1
Example Questionnaire Items for the 7 Variables of the Modified Version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory

Variable	Example questionnaire items
Intrinsic motivation	I enjoyed this task very much. I thought this was a boring activity. (R)
Effort	I put a lot of effort in order to complete this task very well. I didn't put much energy into completing this task. (R)
Perceived competence	I am satisfied with my task performance. I couldn't do this task very well. (R)
Perceived choice	I had enough opportunities to prepare while completing this task. I did this activity because I had no choice. (R)
Value	I believe that this task is useful for improving English communication. I thought this task was not useful. (R)
Relatedness	This task promotes communication with classmates. I felt distant from classmates during this task. (R)
Pressure	I felt very tense while doing this task. I did not feel nervous at all while doing this task. (R)

Note. (R) denotes items that are reverse-scored.

Results

To start, reliability analyses of all seven of the concepts were conducted to check the reliability of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory. Except for perceived choice, all of the concepts met the acceptable threshold. Two items in the perceived choice category were deleted to achieve reliability. The results in Table 2 show that the overall reliability was good ($\alpha = .88$) (George & Mallery, 2003). Regarding each of the seven concepts, pressure was the most reliable ($\alpha = .87$), followed by intrinsic motivation ($\alpha = .86$), effort ($\alpha = .83$), value ($\alpha = .80$), relatedness ($\alpha = .77$), and perceived competence ($\alpha = .75$), while perceived choice was the least reliable ($\alpha = .61$).

Table 2
Reliability Statistics for the Outcome and Predictor Variables

Variable	α	N
Intrinsic Motivation, Effort, Perceived Competence, Perceived Choice, Value, Relatedness, & Pressure	.88	33
Outcome Variable		
Intrinsic Motivation	.86	5
Effort	.83	5
Predictor Variable		
Perceived Competence	.75	5
Perceived Choice	.61	3
Value	.81	5
Relatedness	.77	5
Pressure	.87	5

Descriptive statistics for the two outcome variables and five predictor variables are shown in Table 3. The results of the descriptive statistics showed that, overall, students were slightly more motivated ($M = 4.22$), put more effort ($M = 4.07$), chose to do ($M = 4.04$), saw value ($M = 4.70$), and felt related to others ($M = 4.42$) during the production tasks. On the other hand, they felt slightly less pressured ($M = 3.18$) and felt slightly less competent ($M = 3.36$). Pressure had a higher variance compared to other variables, which indicated that the answers to the pressure-related questions were relatively unstable.

Table 3

Means with Confidence Intervals (CIs) and Standard Deviations of Outcome and Predictor Variables (N = 264)

Variable	$M(SD)$	95% CI
Outcome variable		
1. Intrinsic Motivation	4.22 (.74)	[4.13, 4.31]
2. Effort	4.07 (.75)	[3.97, 4.15]
Predictor variable		
1. Perceived competence	3.36 (.75)	[3.27, 3.45]
2. Perceived choice	4.04 (.70)	[3.95, 4.13]
3. Value	4.70 (.75)	[4.58, 4.75]
4. Relatedness	4.42 (.80)	[4.32, 4.51]
5. Pressure	3.18 (.96)	[3.07, 3.30]

Correlations for the two outcome variables and five predictor variables are shown in Table 4. Intrinsic motivation was significantly correlated with all the variables: a strong positive correlation was found with relatedness ($r = .63, p < .001$), perceived choice ($r = .61, p < .001$), and value ($r = .61, p < .001$); a moderate positive correlation was found with perceived competence ($r = .41, p < .001$); a weak negative correlation was found with pressure ($r = -.15, p < .05$).

Effort was significantly correlated with all the variables except for pressure: a strong positive correlation was found with perceived choice ($r = .68, p < .001$), value ($r = .64, p < .001$) and relatedness ($r = .53, p < .001$); a weak positive correlation was found with perceived competence ($r = .29, p < .001$).

Table 4

Intercorrelations for Outcome and Predictor Variables (N = 264)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Outcome variable							
1. Intrinsic Motivation	—						
2. Effort	.60***	—					
Predictor variable							
3. Perceived	.41***	.29***	—				

competence							
4. Perceived choice	.61***	.68***	.51***	—			
5. Value	.61***	.64***	.12*	.52***	—		
6. Relatedness	.63***	.53***	.25***	.52***	.52***	—	
7. Pressure	-.15*	-.05	-.58**	-.29***	-.03	-.10	—

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Factors that Predict Intrinsic Motivation for Production Tasks

Based on previous literature and the correlation analysis, stepwise regression analysis was conducted to find the best model for predicting intrinsic motivation of production tasks. The results in Table 5 show that the fourth model with four variables (relatedness, perceived choice, value, and perceived competence) predicted 59% of students' intrinsic motivation for production tasks. Relatedness accounted for 40% of the variance, perceived choice 11%, value 5%, and perceived competence 3%. Thus, students were intrinsically motivated when production tasks required communication with classmates, gave a sense of choice or autonomy, promoted English proficiency, and were of an appropriate difficulty level.

Table 5

Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis with Intrinsic Motivation as Outcome Variable

Step and predictor variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:						.40***	
Relatedness	.59	.05	.63	13.13	.001		
Step 2:						.51***	.11***
Relatedness	.40	.05	.43	8.41	.001		
Perceived choice	.38	.05	.39	7.59	.001		
Step 3:						.56***	.05***
Relatedness	.31	.06	.33	6.46	.001		
Perceived choice	.29	.05	.29	5.63	.001		
Value	.31	.06	.28	5.52	.001		
Step 4:						.59***	.03***
Relatedness	.30	.05	.32	6.45	.001		
Perceived choice	.17	.06	.17	2.95	.003		
Value	.35	.06	.33	6.44	.001		
Perceived competence	.22	.06	.20	4.28	.001		

*** $p < .001$.

Factors that Predict Effort for Production Tasks

Based on the literature reviewed above and the correlation analysis, stepwise regression analysis was conducted to find the best model for predicting effort. The results in Table 6 show that the third model with

three variables (perceived choice, value, and relatedness) predicted 58% of students' effort to complete production tasks. Perceived choice or autonomy accounted for 46% of the variance, value 11%, and relatedness 1%. Thus, students put an effort toward completing production tasks when they felt a sense of choice or autonomy, valued the task as a tool to improve English proficiency, and felt they could relate to classmates.

Table 6
Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis with Effort as Outcome Variable

Step and predictor variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
Step 1:						.46***	
Perceived choice	.68	.05	.68	15.04	.001		
Step 2:						.57***	.11***
Perceived choice	.48	.05	.48	10.11	.001		
Value	.42	.05	.39	8.19	.001		
Step 3:						.58***	.01*
Perceived choice	.44	.05	.44	8.76	.001		
Value	.38	.06	.35	6.93	.001		
Relatedness	.11	.05	.12	2.43	.015		

p* < .05. **p* < .001.

Differences across the Seven Variables between Focused and Unfocused Tasks

Table 7 shows descriptive statistics of students' subjective experience across the seven variables investigated for both the focused and unfocused tasks. Overall, students had more intrinsic motivation, effort, relatedness, and pressure during the unfocused task. On the other hand, students felt more competent, valued the task more, and felt a sense of choice or autonomy during the focused task. Answers for competence and value varied more for the unfocused task.

Table 7
Means with Confidence Intervals (CIs) and Standard Deviations for Seven Variables between Task Types

Variables	Focused task (<i>N</i> =132)		Unfocused task (<i>N</i> =132)	
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	95% CI	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	95% CI
Intrinsic motivation	4.09 (.72)	[3.97, 4.22]	4.35 (.75)	[4.23, 4.48]
Effort	4.02 (.77)	[3.89, 4.15]	4.11 (.74)	[3.98, 4.24]
Perceived competence	3.37 (.64)	[3.26, 3.48]	3.35 (.76)	[3.22, 3.48]
Perceived choice	4.07 (.78)	[3.94, 4.21]	4.01 (.73)	[3.88, 4.14]
Value	4.68 (.65)	[4.57, 4.80]	4.65 (.72)	[4.52, 4.77]
Relatedness	4.19 (.80)	[4.05, 4.32]	4.65 (.74)	[4.52, 4.78]

Pressure	3.03 (.95)	[2.87, 3.20]	3.33 (.95)	[3.16, 3.49]
----------	------------	--------------	------------	--------------

According to Table 4 above, no variables showed a correlation of higher than $r = .70$. Thus, no variables were redundant. In order to compare students' subjective experiences across these seven variables between focused and unfocused tasks, MANOVA was conducted: task type acted as the independent variable (two levels: focused and unfocused) and the seven variables (intrinsic motivation, effort, perceived competence, perceived choice, value, relatedness, and pressure) acted as dependent variables. Significant differences were found among the seven concepts, Wilks's $\Lambda = .80$, $F(7, 256) = 9.00$, $p < .001$, with the partial $\eta^2 = .20$, which was a large effect size.

As a follow-up test to MANOVA, ANOVA was conducted for the dependent variables. Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .03 level. The ANOVA on the three dependent variables (intrinsic motivation, relatedness, and pressure) was significant. Regarding intrinsic motivation between focused and unfocused tasks, ANOVA was significant, $F(1, 262) = 8.31$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. Thus, students were more intrinsically motivated during unfocused tasks, although the effect size was small. Regarding relatedness between focused and unfocused tasks, ANOVA was significant, $F(1, 262) = 23.68$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$. Students felt more relatedness during unfocused tasks, with a medium effect size. Regarding pressure between focused and unfocused tasks, ANOVA was significant, $F(1, 262) = 6.01$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Students felt more pressure during unfocused tasks, although the effect size was small.

Since other dependent variables showed no significant differences, it can be concluded that students put similar effort into and felt competence, autonomy, and value during both focused and unfocused tasks.

Discussion

Based on the results, the answers to the three research questions above were as follows: 1) intrinsic motivation for production tasks was predicted by relatedness, perceived choice, value, and perceived competence; 2) effort for production tasks was predicted by perceived choice, value, and relatedness; 3) intrinsic motivation, relatedness, and pressure were significantly higher during unfocused tasks compared to focused tasks, whereas no significant differences were found regarding effort, perceived competence, perceived choice, or value.

In this section, comparisons with previous research and implications for classroom settings are discussed. First, the results for factors that predict intrinsic motivation suggest that teachers should provide tasks that require communication, give a sense of autonomy, are intended for improving English communication, and fit students' competence levels. This finding confirms self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004), indicating that the basic needs of intrinsic motivation are autonomy, competence, and relatedness. It was also similar to Angesia's (2010) findings, except for relatedness. Angesia's study investigated an online ESL course. Thus, relatedness might not have predicted intrinsic motivation. In this study, relatedness accounted for 40% and perceived choice 11% of the variance in predicting intrinsic motivation. Ideally, students should be given enough time and opportunity to engage in communication during class.

Second, the results for factors that predict effort suggest that teachers should provide tasks that students have enough time to complete autonomously, those that they regard as helping improve English communication, and those that allow them to communicate with classmates. Students put effort into completing a task when they have enough time and are willing to do so, when they value the task, and when they can communicate with classmates. This finding is somewhat different from Agnesia's study because relatedness predicted effort. This difference might be because Agnesia's study was held in an online EAP course that mostly required students to complete individual projects, whereas this study was held in an EFL four-skills integrated course in a classroom setting where students usually interacted with classmates.

Third, the results for the differences between focused and unfocused tasks regarding the seven concepts suggest that both focused and unfocused tasks are appropriate for the classroom because students put forth a similar effort, felt capable of completing the tasks, had enough time and willingness to do so, and regarded the tasks as valuable. Nonetheless, unfocused tasks were more interesting to them, gave them more communication opportunities, and created more pressure. The fact that unfocused tasks with more freedom were seen as more interesting confirms self-determination theory but is somewhat different from Mozgalina's (2015) finding that less choice increased intrinsic motivation and effort. The nature of Mozgalina's (2015) writing tasks on the topic of a famous person required students' personal opinions and less choice was available to facilitate the task. On the other hand, since the focused tasks used in this study were repeated reading, which focuses on accurate pronunciation of text, they basically did not require any originality. Thus, pronunciation-focused tasks were less interesting than unfocused tasks, which required students' opinions. Furthermore, since students felt similarly competent during both focused and unfocused tasks, they were able to make a similar effort during the tasks, regardless of choice.

Conclusion

In this article, factors that are important for a successful production task in a classroom setting were investigated. The findings showed that it is important to give students a task that they can control, that allows them to communicate with classmates, and that they regard as a tool to improve English (speaking) proficiency. Both focused and unfocused tasks are appropriate for classrooms, but unfocused tasks might be necessary to increase students' motivation.

There are three important limitations for this study. First, reliability of three of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory variables was below .80, the threshold that indicates good reliability. Thus, the results of this study need to be treated cautiously. Future studies can address this problem by creating new items. Second, students' answers to the questionnaire might be somewhat different because the questionnaire was not conducted immediately after they engaged in each task. Future studies should conduct questionnaires while the memory of participants is fresh. Third, this study only examined students' subjective experiences of production tasks. Future studies should be conducted to investigate perception tasks and other language skills, such as listening, reading, and writing.

Autonomous attitude predicts motivation and effort for production tasks in classroom settings. Given that learner autonomy predicts motivation and effort, instruction that intends to activate learner autonomy should

be implemented and studied. In the era of advanced internet communication, autonomous learning can also happen outside of the classroom. The hope is to develop instruction that promotes autonomous learning both inside and outside the classroom. In this way, the language classroom experience will be more authentic, especially in the EFL setting, where resources are limited.

References

- Agnesia, R. H. (2010). Features affecting task-motivation in English for academic purposes online learning. *Second Language Studies*, **29**(1), 1-34.
- Chase, B. T. and Johannsen, K. L. (2015). *World English 3* (2nd ed.). National Geographic Learning.
- Deci, E. L. and Vansteenkiste, M. (2004). Self-determination theory and basic need satisfaction: Understanding human development in positive psychology. *Ricerche di Psicologia*, **1**(27), 23-40.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, UK: University Press.
- George, D. and Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Intrinsic motivation inventory (IMI). (n.d.). *Self-Determination Theory*. Retrieved June 1st, 2018 from <http://selfdeterminationtheory.org/intrinsic-motivation-inventory/>
- LaBerge, D. and Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, **6**, 293-323.
- Long, M. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan (Ed.), *Language teaching methodology for the nineties* (pp. 31-50). Singapore: Regional English Language Centre/ Singapore University.
- Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mozgalina, A. (2015). More or less choice? The influence of choice on task motivation and task engagement. *System*, **49**, 120-132.
- Nation, P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, **1**(1), 1-12.
- Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, **55**(1), 68-78.
- Taguchi, E., Gorsch, G., Lems, K. and Rosszell, R. (2016). Scaffolding in L2 reading: How repetition and an auditory model help readers. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, **28**(1), 101-117.