

# The Effectiveness of an Engaging Program to Reduce Saudi Female University EFL Students' Foreign Language Anxiety and to Enhance Their Motivation to Learn English at Taif University

Nasrah M. Ismail<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> English Language Center, Taif University, Taif, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Nasrah Mahmoud Ismail, English Language Center, Taif University, P.O. Box 888, 21974, Taif, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Tel: 966-501-66-3146. E-mail: nasrahme@yahoo.com

Received: November 23, 2015

Accepted: December 12, 2015

Online Published: January 13, 2016

doi:10.5539/ijps.v8n1p92

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v8n1p92>

## Abstract

Teaching a language is a complex but interesting process. It involves teacher, learner, curriculum, and learning environment. Also this process is affected by certain social, cultural and psychological factors. This study is aimed at investigating the effectiveness of a proposed program for developing EFL learners' engagement in learning English. The sample of this study consisted of 103 females ( $M = 19.260$ ,  $SD = 0.876$  years), it was divided into two groups; the experimental group consisted of 53 girls and the control group consisted of 50 girls. Students' engagement was measured by the Handelsman, Briggs, Sullivan, and Towler (2005) questionnaire, while their foreign language anxiety was measured by the Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) questionnaire. Students' motivation was measured by Gardner's (1985) Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). The research applied continued for three months which included the proposed program. The data proved that there were statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on the post-test of the engagement questionnaire, the foreign language anxiety scale as well as the students' motivation dimensions, showing a significant increase in students' engagement and motivation in favor of the experimental group. The findings also indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre-test and post-test results for the experimental group on the students' engagement and motivation. This shows that the experimental group had an increase in skills after having participated in the program as seen on the post-test. In light of these results, the study provides a number of procedural recommendations that may contribute to raising the degree of the importance of students' engagement and motivation training for the students with foreign language anxiety. The paper concludes that more training should be given in using all engagement activities by embedding them in regular classroom activities. Suggestions are offered for future research.

**Keywords:** learner engagement, learner motivation, EFL Saudi students' foreign language anxiety, training program

## 1. Literature Review

### 1.1 Introduction

As an educator, the researcher has researched the web and asked our colleagues for ideas on how to engage students while at the same time, the teachers have little access to extra materials and resources. This paper explores ideas for student engagement which require little or no materials, but create effective learning environments through student engagement. Instead of students memorizing or repeating, students learn through experience, even if it is just in the classroom. One example is a simple learning activity. Let's say the students are studying a unit on holidays. The teacher calls out for the next letter of the alphabet, students say J for example and then the students shout out all the words they know starting with the letter J having to do with holidays. The teacher writes all the words on the board. This is a really fun activity and the students build their vocabulary. **Another method is storytelling**—that is story telling by both the teacher and the students. The students become engaged when hearing stories of another country or culture from the teacher. Student storytelling is a way to teach about past tense phrases and words, such as would or used to. How can we measure effective results from this method of teaching? We can use the traditional methods of diagnostic, testing, observation, and monitoring. The key is being interactive

with the students so that they are participating and active. The days of “teacher in front of the class and the students sit and listen” are fast becoming “old school”.

The researcher thinks that student engagement depends a great deal on teacher engagement as sort of contagious. It is a lot like trying to convince someone of something you do not believe yourself. Feeling a connection to the teacher, knowing the purpose of what they are doing in class, variety are classroom practices that can get students engaged! If the topic isn't relevant, it's unlikely to be of interest to the student no matter how many times you tell them it should be.

### *1.2 EFL Students' Engagement in Large Classes*

There is a tendency across educational scholars that poor engagement with the classroom practices translates into reduced learning and performance (Wang, Bergin, & Bergin, 2014). Engagement can be described in various ways. Class engagement refers to active involvement of students to the learning processes (Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012). Malone (1981) defined also engagement as an exciting and enjoyable state of mind in which attention is willingly given and held. For most researchers, “engagement” entails some kind of mindfulness, cognitive effort and deep processing of new information (Salomon & Globerson, 1987). Common in these varied views on engagement is that engaging activities are intrinsically enjoyable, i.e., the activity is performed for intrinsic rewards and is not performed for extrinsic rewards (Deci & Ryan, 2000). A recent definition of student engagement includes behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components (Fredricks, McCloskey, Meli, Mordica, Montrosse, & Mooney, 2011) in addition to feelings of belonging, enjoyment, and attachment.

Studies concerning classroom engagement carry on the discussion over three major axes. Those are affective engagement, cognitive engagement and behavioral engagement (Wang et al., 2014). Sometimes, the fourth dimensions could be added to these major three, that is, agency (Reeve, 2013). In the classroom, emotional or affective engagement corresponds to the positive feelings of students such as interest, excitement and amusement. Cognitive engagement refers to the accompanying processes such as meaningful-processing, strategy use, concentration and metacognition. Behavioral engagement refers to the observable behaviors such as asking questions, being active in team-works and completing tasks on time (Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009).

Research findings revealed that teachers of large classes encounter difficulties in getting their students involved in the learning process. In other words, large class size offers very limited opportunities to students to participate in classroom activities. The choice of the instructional technique the teacher uses can reveal an impediment to students' involvement in their learning process. For instance in Haiti, according to Renaud, Tannenbaum and Stantial (2007) “the educational system is traditionally based almost solely on rote learning and the classroom is a highly competitive place, therefore, convincing students of the necessity of working cooperatively with their peers is not an easy task” (p. 14). This implies that students in that context are more interested in showing their teacher how better they personally constructed the knowledge taught to them. Therefore, the idea of sharing their knowledge with their peers is seen as giving ground to a rival to beat you.

According to Csikszentmihalyi (1997), when learners are involved in an activity that has a balance of challenge and skill, they are more inclined to take risks and become engaged. The freedom that comes from a balance of challenge and skill is what allows learners to immerse deeply enough into an activity to lose sense of time and space. Student engagement in learning is not only an end in itself but it is also a means to the end of students achieving sound academic outcomes (Russell, Ainley, & Frydenberg, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2009).

### *1.3 Engagement and Achievement*

In the process of English teaching, teachers should pay more attention to establishing certain relationship with their students. A harmonious and pleasant climate in the classroom can help to reduce the anxiety of students, maintain the focus of students when learning English and form emotional bonds between students and teachers at the same time. Teachers can create in the classroom a welcoming and relaxing place where psychological needs are met and language anxiety is kept to a minimum (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). According to Gage and Berliner (1991), students learn best in a non-threatening environment. This is one area where humanistic educators have had an impact on current educational practice. The orientation espoused today is that the environment should be psychologically and emotionally, as well as physically, non-threatening.

Student engagement has been proposed as a useful construct in seeking effective ways to address student boredom, disaffection, and disengagement. Engagement has been positively linked with achievement outcomes such as standardized test scores and grades across primary and secondary levels (Skinner, Wellborn, & Connell, 1990; Marks, 2000; Nako, 2015). Finn (1993) and Kahraman (2014) found a strong linear association between engagement and achievement. Engaged students seem to learn more, retain more, and enjoy school activities

more than their disengaged peers (Akey, 2006). Furthermore, school engagement is useful because the attitudes and behaviors associated with engagement seem to be relatively malleable, that is, sensitive to changes in students and/or the classroom environment (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004).

Being actively engaged in a learning activity has repeatedly been shown to be beneficial for learning (Price, Rogers, Scaife, Stanton, & Neale, 2003). Engagement comprises cognitive engagement, which involves attention to the activity and concentration and promotes “useful” learning (Stoney & Oliver, 1999). In conclusion, the study showed that more engaged students demonstrated higher academic achievement (Sbrocco, 2009). In the same line it was found that decline in student engagement statistically correlates to decreased student achievement (Cano, 2015). Students’ lack of engagement hinders their ability to solve complex problems, communicate well with others, and think abstractly. Contrary to the extensive student engagement literature in developed countries, student engagement in out-of-class peer learning and extensive reading did not make any meaningful impacts on student achievement in the present study (Heng, 2014).

#### *1.4 Engagement and Motivation in English Teaching Process*

Skinner and Belmont (1993) defined motivation as the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral indicators of students’ investment in and attachment to education. Researchers, parents, and educators recognize the need for students to be motivated, whether in Grade 1 or in college; however, they disagree over what affects student motivation (Anderman & Anderman, 2009). Educators need to understand what motivation is and what motivates students in the classroom (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002). It is well acknowledged that motivation is very crucial in language learning as Dornyei (1998) mentioned that motivation has been widely accepted by both teachers and researchers as one of the key factors that influence the rate and success of second foreign language learning. Motivation provides the primary impetus to initiate learning the foreign language and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process. Therefore, in class teachers should give their priority to motivation. Students will learn from their experience and keep developing their full potential. Otherwise, classroom realities increasingly ask awareness to an overlooked aspect, i.e., the motivational needs from teachers, since teachers’ motivation has direct influence on students’ language learning efficiency. However, ways to motivate language teachers take little amount of research but it will broaden the research area (Xu & Huang, 2010).

Learner engagement influences student interest and motivation, leading to increased performance and higher school achievement (Goodenow, 1992). Huang and Waxman (1996) added that achievement motivation is “the extent to which students feel the intrinsic desire to succeed...” (p. 211). Students who are engaged in learning because they like it and not because they want to get good grades tend to stay with challenging tasks for longer periods of time and use more complex learning strategies than those who learn primarily to get good grades. Advanced readers showed stronger relations of motivation and engagement with achievement than struggling readers. However, motivation predicted concurrent engagement and growth in engagement similarly for struggling and advanced readers (Klauda & Guthrie, 2015).

#### *1.5 Engagement and College Students’ Anxiety*

Research has indicated that college students experience various levels of anxiety and frustration that range from understanding assignments, completing assignments because of excessive course workload, to personal family-related issues (Ong & Cheong, 2009; Ratanasiripong, Sverduk, Hayashino, & Prince, 2010). In addition to anxiety among college students, the literature indicated that college students experienced a great amount of fear of test taking (Economides & Moridis, 2008), fear of statistics (Onwuegbuzie & Wilson, 2003; Williams, 2010), and fear of presentations in a college setting (Elliot & Chong, 2005). The American Psychological Association (2014) defined anxiety as an emotion characterized by feelings of tension, worried thoughts and physical changes like increased blood pressure. Peters Mayer (2008) defined anxiety as a state of intense agitation, tension, or dread occurring from a perceived threat of danger.

These fears can lead students to believe they will fail even though they have the intellectual level to succeed. The results of the study (Sharifrazi, 2012) conveyed changes in student anxiety from the experimental group who used the engagement program as an intervention. They believed that the engagement program helped them significantly decrease their frustration and anxiety. Igarria and Parasuraman (1989) suggested the importance of training for the students to alleviate their anxiety.

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

The National Research Council and Institute of Medicine found that large numbers of American students are not fully engaged intellectually in the teaching and learning enterprise (Marks, 2000). During my professional career

as an educator, the researcher was consistently confronted with the problem of how to excite student interest and maintain student engagement in the learning process. When the learning process was initiated, it resulted in a learning experience. Desiring to catch initial learner interest, researcher developed some of warm-up activities that were sufficient to attract the interest and curiosity of even the hardest-to-reach students. This researcher discovered that sustaining student engagement and extending that engagement to self-sustaining motivation for deeper learning, however, required a different set of skills. So this is the reason that an engagement program needs to be devised because if the students see no personal relevance in the invitation to learn in the learning process, they will shut down, withdraw, or show signs of distraction.

Educators recognize the need to extend students' engagement. As it is known that making students engaged in class activities is so important as in order to help the students, especially EFL students, increase their achievement and enjoy learning, and in addition, helping the students to reduce their English learning anxiety and absolutely increase their motivation. Choosing tasks that are inherently engaging provides manageable challenges for learners (Malone, 1981). Further. It is widely recognized that students who experience anxiety are less academically successful (Ismail, 2011) and display lower rates of motivation and engagement (Klauda & Guthrie, 2015).

The specific problem is that administrators and professors are not able to identify the factors that motivate college students to engage in their studies, experience academic success, and graduate (Gregory, 2005; Hancock, 2002; Payne, 1999). Creating a learning environment that will motivate students might not be possible if administrators and professors do not have a clear indication of which motivation factors help create a positive classroom experience for students.

Yes the teacher is mostly responsible for helping students to engage. I feel that identifying with the students and helping them to see why what is being learnt is important is key. Everything should be related to the big picture and I always say to my students "if you don't think this is important, then let's not study that..." I ask them what the relevance is of everything we are doing in class. I also try to take a genuine interest in why they are studying and in them as people. A human and approachable teacher with personality makes all the difference.

### **3. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the use of the engagement program assisted graduate students with alleviating frustration and stress and increasing their motivation when attending their classes.

### **4. Study Importance**

The importance of this study emerges in several ways. First, it studies the effectiveness of the engagement training program on increasing students' motivation and on reducing the students' anxiety. Second, it is supposed that it may contribute to a larger body of knowledge related to feedback about classroom motivation. Third, it extends learner engagement and helps the students to become more motivated. Forth, it improves English learner's achievement. Lastly, the researcher believes that the results of this experimental research may provide practical information to teachers in formal educational settings.

### **5. The Research Hypotheses**

**This study addresses the following hypotheses:**

- 1) There are significant differences between the experimental group scores and the control group scores on the post-tests of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation.
- 2) There are significant differences between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation for the experimental group.
- 3) There are no significant differences between the mean scores of the post-tests and follow up of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation for the experimental group.

### **6. Methodology**

#### *6.1 The Pilot Study*

First, twenty EFL students studying at Taif University participated in the pre-pilot testing of the two questionnaires to ensure that the terminology and intent of each question were understood by every respondent and to solicit suggestions to improve the questionnaire. And also the pre-pilot testing served to identify possible problems that might occur when the questionnaire was administered to the larger group of students participating in the study. In addition to completing the instruments, participants were interviewed and they gave their

feedback about the instruments. Then the instruments were revised based upon the feedback provided by the students before they were distributed to the participants of the study.

Thirty-eight students were randomly chosen from the EFL preparatory non-English major students, second level, for the pilot study to determine the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire. Their ages range from 18 to 22 years old,  $M = 18.96$ ,  $SD = 0.77$ . All of them were Saudis.

### 6.2 Participants

The participants in this study included 103 female undergraduate non-English major students. Participants ranged in age from 18-22 years with a mean of ( $M = 19.260$ ,  $SD = 0.876$ ). It was thus assumed that the participants in this study would provide a homogeneous sample in terms of their cultural environment and instructional input. The 51 students who participated were second level scientific students. They were randomly selected and randomly assigned a treatment group. The dependent variables were learner engagement and learner motivation. The independent variable was the training program.

### 6.3 Instruments

#### 6.3.1 Student Motivation Questionnaire

Participants in this study were asked to anonymously fill out three questionnaires, which respectively investigated their motivation concerning learning English, their engagement to learn in learning English and classroom language learning anxiety. The survey questionnaires are listed in Appendixes A-B.

The questionnaire, "Student Motivation Questionnaire", had a total of 33 items. It was adapted from Gardner's (1985) Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), which is the most authoritative and reliable tool to assess students' language learning motivation so far and has been widely used in numerous studies on student motivation. The questionnaire was translated into Arabic as the students are Arabic native speakers. To make sure that the translation of the questionnaire was correct, it was sent to some bilingual experts in the English department and then to some experts in the Arabic Department. Part I had twelve items, and it aimed to investigate students' learning motivation inside class. Part II had nine items and it aimed to explore students' learning motivation outside class. Some specific, self-designed questions were incorporated in Part III to better investigate students' learning motivation in using the Web and the computer to do English assignments which had twelve items.

All the three questionnaires (Engagement, Motivation and Foreign Language Anxiety) were three and five-point Likert-scale items answered by the participants according to the actual performance in their English learning. To ensure that the participants totally understood the survey items, the questionnaires were distributed in Arabic. In this study, the translation was done by researcher. See Appendixes A, B and C.

#### **Item validity and internal consistency for the motivation questionnaire in the current study:**

The corrected item-total correlation ranged from 0.321 to 0.618 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity. While for the corrected item-Subscale 1 (class motivation) correlation ranged from 0.301 to 0.553 ( $p < 0.01$ ), but for the Subscale 2 (participants' lack of confidence in their English study) correlation ranged from 0.311 to 0.545 ( $p < 0.01$ ), but for the Subscale 3 (participants' motivation towards the web-based CALL program) correlation ranged from 0.355 to 0.652 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity.

The internal consistency was high for the total motivation questionnaire ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ), as well as for Subscale 1 ( $\alpha = 0.74$ ) and Subscale 2 ( $\alpha = 0.72$ ), and for Subscale 3 ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ). The mean Total score was 64.262 ( $SD = 8.539$ ). The mean for Subscale 1 was 26.262 ( $SD = 4.468$ ), the mean for Subscale 2 was 20.182 ( $SD = 3.322$ ), the mean for Subscale 3 was 17.568 ( $SD = 4.048$ ). While the correlation between factors ranged from 0.381 to 0.672. ( $P < 0.05$ ) and between factors and total score ranged from 0.704 to 0.850 ( $P < 0.01$ ).

#### 6.3.2 Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

FLCAS was designed by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) and included three domains measured by 33 item statements to be responded to a five-point Likert scale. The three domains are communication apprehension, text anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. To measure communication apprehension, 11 items (numbers 1, 4, 9, 14, 15, 18, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 32) were related to situations where English communication skills would be needed. Similarly, test anxiety, 15 items (numbers 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 28) assessed the degree of anxiety felt when respondents were taking tests. For the fear of negative evaluation domain, 7 items (numbers, 2, 7, 13, 19, 23, 31, and 33) measured anxiety related to criticism or poor scores in their English work.

After reliability and validity, these three factors together included 24 of the 33 items. Nine items were deleted 2, 6, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 24, & 32. So, the first factor entitled communication apprehension includes 9 items

(numbers 1, 4, 9, 14, 15, 27, 29, and 30). The second factor includes 11 items (numbers 3, 5, 8, 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, and 28). For third, the fear of negative evaluation domain, 5 items (numbers, 7, 13, 23, 31, and 33).

#### **Item validity and internal consistency for the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale in the current study:**

The corrected item-total correlation ranged from 0.364 to 0.762 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity. While for the corrected item-Subscale 1 (communication apprehension) correlation ranged from 0.331 to 0.623 ( $p < 0.01$ ), but for the Subscale 2 (text anxiety) correlation ranged from 0.352 to 0.713 ( $p < 0.01$ ), and for the Subscale 3 (fear of negative evaluation) correlation ranged from 0.504 to 0.661 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity.

The internal consistency was high for the total foreign language classroom anxiety Scale ( $\alpha = 0.93$ ), as well as for Subscale 1 ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ) and Subscale 2 ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ), and Subscale 3 ( $\alpha = 0.77$ ), and Subscale 4 ( $\alpha = 0.742$ ). The mean Total score was 62.589 (SD = 18.351). The mean for Subscale 1 was 19.073 (SD = 5.755), the mean for Subscale 2 was 30.075 (SD = 9.579), the mean for Subscale 3 was 13.209 (SD = 4.559). While the correlation between factors ranged from 0.648 to 0.799 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and between factors and total score ranged from 0.837 to 0.942 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

#### **6.3.3 Students' Engagement Questionnaire**

The researcher modified the Engagement Questionnaire that was used in the Handelsman et al. (2005) study on assessing American (Colorado) students' language learning engagement. Participants completed the 23-item questionnaire that assessed the engagement of the students that related to their learning of English. Principal components analysis, followed by varimax rotation, yielded a four-factor solution. These four factors together included 21 of the 23 items. Two items were deleted: 13 & 20. Items (1-9) concern the students' skills engagement about learning English; items (10-14) represent the emotional engagement about learning English; items (15-20) represent the students' participation in the classroom for learning English; items (21-23) deal with the students' performance about the English language. Students answered each item statement using a 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (Not at all characteristic of me) through 5 (Very characteristic of me).

#### **Psychometric conditions of the engagement questionnaire in the current research Item validity and internal consistency for the engagement questionnaire in the current study:**

The corrected item-total correlation ranged from 0.351 to 0.714 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity. While for the corrected item-Subscale 1 (skills engagement) correlation ranged from 0.362 to 0.613 ( $p < 0.01$ ), but for the Subscale 2 (Emotional engagement) correlation ranged from 0.556 to 0.667 ( $p < 0.01$ ), but for the Subscale 3 (participation/interaction engagement) correlation ranged from 0.355 to 0.609 ( $p < 0.01$ ), and for the Subscale 4 (performance engagement) correlation ranged from 0.446 to 0.695 ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting adequate item validity.

The internal consistency was high for the total engagement questionnaire ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ), as well as for Subscale 1 ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ) and Subscale 2 ( $\alpha = 0.77$ ), and Subscale 3 ( $\alpha = 0.716$ ), and Subscale 4 ( $\alpha = 0.742$ ). The mean Total score was 78.130 (SD = 10.664). The mean for Subscale 1 was 33.862 (SD = 4.468), the mean for Subscale 2 was 15.130 (SD = 3.344), the mean for Subscale 3 was 16.587 (SD = 3.739), the mean for Subscale 4 was 12.587 (SD = 1.844). While the correlation between factors ranged from 0.501 to 0.689 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and between factors and total score ranged from 0.608 to 0.903 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

### **7. The Engagement Program**

This program was designed and developed based on the acknowledgement in literature of a need for a program to assist under-graduate students in alleviating their frustration and anxiety and increasing their motivation. The engagement program is comprised of learning activities, drawing, writing on the board, exercises and educational videos that help the students to be engaged in the learning process. These tools were designed to alleviate students' anxiety and to increase the students' motivation. The program is consisted of twenty sessions; two sessions weekly, ten weeks in the semester. This program was developed by this researcher to assist students to understand more clearly how tools can support them in communicating with their instructor and classmates, and achieving the maximum benefits of their English course. The first session of the program included a welcoming comment and an introduction to the program. In the rest of the sessions the students' collaborated and engaged in group activities in selected small groups which were intended to focus on spontaneous brainstorming or gathering of old sayings or other activities meant to make learning English more fun and thus with less anxiety as this program provides a much higher focus on teamwork. In addition, the researcher gave some extra activities that required the students to give personal details, such as talk about the jobs of people in their families or to teach the students the past tense, the researcher asked them to talk about what did they did last weekend. Toward the end of week ten, before the

course ended, students in both groups were given the post-tests. The post-tests were distributed to determine whether there were any changes in students' anxiety and their motivation. The program was evaluated through the pre-tests and post-tests, through the comparison between the experimental and control groups scores and also through the follow up in increasing their motivation and reducing their English language anxiety one month after stopping the program.

## 8. Results

Table 1. The differences between the mean scores of the pre-tests for the experimental and the control group on the motivation questionnaire and its factors

<i>Motivation questionnaire factors</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Class motivation	Experimental	53	27.076	3.573	1.239	101	0.218
	Control	50	27.980	3.835			
Participants' lack of confidence in their English study	Experimental	53	20.736	4.034	1.743	101	0.084
	Control	50	22.000	3.258			
Participants' motivation towards learning English	Experimental	53	17.472	3.349	0.938	101	0.628
	Control	50	18.100	3.448			
Motivation total score	Experimental	53	65.283	8.688	1.556	101	0.123
	Control	50	67.760	7.383			

As shown in Table 1, that there are no differences between the experimental and control groups on pre-test on the motivation factors and the total score. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of motivation.

Table 2. The differences between the mean scores of the pre-tests for the experimental and the control group on the anxiety scale and its factors

<i>Anxiety questionnaire factors</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Communication apprehension	Experimental	53	24.057	5.074	0.797	101	0.127
	Control	50	24.880	5.412			
Text anxiety	Experimental	53	32.151	6.116	0.708	101	0.481
	Control	50	32.980	5.752			
Fear of negative evaluation	Experimental	53	14.113	4.013	0.388	101	0.699
	Control	50	14.420	4.011			
Total score	Experimental	53	65.887	9.559	1.087	101	0.279
	Control	50	63.780	10.104			

Table 2 shows that there are no differences between the control and experimental groups on anxiety questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of anxiety.

Table 3. The differences between the mean scores of the pre-tests for the experimental and the control group on the engagement scale and its factors

<i>Engagement questionnaire subscales</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Skills engagement	Experimental	53	33.226	5.905	0.191	101	0.849
	Control	50	33.000	6.155			
Emotional engagement	Experimental	53	14.585	2.899	0.026	101	0.979
	Control	50	14.600	2.914			
Participation/ interaction engagement	Experimental	53	18.075	3.143	0.467	101	0.642
	Control	50	17.780	3.278			
Performance engagement	Experimental	53	12.094	2.115	0.205	101	0.838
	Control	50	12.180	2.126			
Total engagement score	Experimental	53	65.887	9.559	1.087	101	0.279
	Control	50	63.780	10.104			

Table 3 shows that there are no differences between the control and experimental groups on engagement questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of engagement. The reason for this might be that the two groups had not started the program yet.

Table 4. The differences between the experimental group scores and the control group scores on the post-tests of motivation

<i>Motivation questionnaire factors</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>Effect Size</i>
Class motivation	Experimental	53	29.943	3.195	2.829	101	0.006	0.073
	Control	50	27.980	3.836				
Participants' lack of confidence in their English study	Experimental	53	23.717	3.840	2.440	101	0.016	0.056
	Control	50	22.000	3.258				
Participants' motivation towards learning English	Experimental	53	21.642	5.039	4.139	101	0.000	0.15
	Control	50	18.100	3.448				
Motivation total score	Experimental	53	75.302	8.331	4.851	101	0.000	0.19
	Control	50	67.760	7.383				

Table 4 indicates that there are significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the motivation questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This means that the students' level was different than on the pre-tests where many students reported being unmotivated taking the English course, to the post-tests, where most reported being motivated. Therefore, there was a general increase in students' motivation level found in the post-tests results. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of motivation. This researcher explains that the positive results of the experimental group are due to the effects of the program which include a lot of engagement activities that the students share with each other.



Table 5. The differences between the experimental group scores and the control group scores on the post-tests of engagement

<i>Engagement factors</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	
Skills engagement	Experimental	53	37.076	3.396	4.192	101	0.000	0.15
	Control	50	33.000	6.155				
Emotional engagement	Experimental	53	16.151	2.125	3.099	101	0.003	0.087
	Control	50	14.600	2.914				
Participation/ interaction engagement	Experimental	53	21.396	2.691	6.134	101	0.000	0.27
	Control	50	17.780	3.278				
Performance engagement	Experimental	53	12.943	1.737	2.001	101	0.048	0.038
	Control	50	12.180	2.125				
Engagement total score	Experimental	53	87.566	6.289	5.615	101	0.000	0.24
	Control	50	77.560	11.243				

Table 5 shows that there are significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the engagement questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of engagement. The reason for this change among both groups may be that the control group was not involved in the program, while the experimental group experienced the program which has caused the change in the engagement process.

Table 6. The differences between the experimental group scores and the control group scores on the post-tests of foreign language anxiety

<i>Foreign language anxiety subscales</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Effect Size</i>
Communication apprehension	Experimental	53	22.169	4.349	2.809	101	0.006	0.072
	Control	50	24.880	5.412				
Test anxiety	Experimental	53	26.208	5.499	6.109	101	0.000	0.27
	Control	50	32.980	5.752				
Fear of negative evaluation	Experimental	53	12.585	3.041	2.626	101	0.010	0.064
	Control	50	14.420	4.011				
Total anxiety score	Experimental	53	60.962	9.257	2.333	101	0.022	0.051
	Control	50	65.380	9.963				

Table 6 shows that there are significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the anxiety questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of anxiety. Overall, students' anxiety level decreased on the 53 post-test results. Therefore, after the course and exposure to the engagement program for the experimental group, on the post-test, students' anxiety level decreased and students felt less anxious.

Table 7. The differences between the mean scores of the pre-and post-tests of engagement for the experimental group

<i>Engagement subscales</i>		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>Effect size</i>
Skills engagement	Pre-test	53	33.226	5.905	4.218	52	0.000	0.25
	Post-test	53	37.076	3.396				
Emotional engagement	Pre-test	53	14.585	2.899	3.342	52	0.002	0.18
	Post-test	53	16.151	2.125				
Participation/interaction engagement	Pre-test	53	18.076	3.143	6.090	52	0.000	0.42
	Post-test	53	21.396	2.691				

Performance engagement	Pre-test	53	12.094	2.115	2.327	52	0.024	0.09
	Post-test	53	12.943	1.737				
Engagement total score	Pre-test	53	77.981	10.876	5.510	52	0.000	0.37
	Post-test	53	87.566	6.289				

In Table 7 the data shows that there are differences between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of engagement subscales for the experimental group. As for the engagement questionnaire, the total score was ( $t(53) = 5.510$ , with effect size = 0.37,  $p < 0.001$ ). These differences can be explained according to the perceived importance to the students of engagement and of its training, as well as showing the teaching style that the researcher follows during the program.

Table 8. The differences between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of motivation for the experimental group

<i>Group</i>	<i>Motivation subscales</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>Effect Size</i>
Pre-test	class motivation	27.0756	53	3.573	4.045	52	0.000	0.24
Post-test	class motivation	29.943	53	3.195				
Pre-test	participants' lack of confidence in their English study	20.736	53	4.034	4.037	52	0.000	0.24
Post-test	participants' lack of confidence in their English study	23.717	53	3.840				
Pre-test	Participants' motivation towards learning English	17.472	53	3.349	4.915	52	0.00	0.32
Post-test	Participants' motivation towards learning English	21.642	53	5.039				
Pre-test	Motivation total score	65.283	53	8.688	6.101	52	0.000	0.42
Post-test	Motivation total score	75.302	53	8.331				

Table 8 shows that there are significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the motivation questionnaire and its factors on the pre-tests. This result was shown in all subscales and in the total score of motivation. As for the motivation questionnaire, the total score was ( $t(53) = 6.101$ , with effect size = 0.42,  $p < 0.001$ ). These results showed that motivation is playing an important role to the learning process and to the importance of the engaging training program.

Table 9. The differences between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of EFL students' anxiety for the experiment

<i>Anxiety questionnaire subscales</i>	<i>Pre- and post-tests</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>Effect Size</i>
Communication Apprehension	Pre-test	24.057	53	5.074	2.051	52	0.045	0.07
	Post-test	22.170	53	4.349				
Test anxiety	Pre-test	32.151	53	6.116	5.567	52	0.000	0.37
	Post-test	26.208	53	5.499				
Fear of negative evaluation	Pre-test	14.113	53	4.013	2.491	52	0.016	0.07
	Post-test	12.585	53	3.041				
Total score	Pre-test	65.887	53	9.559	2.771	52	0.008	0.13
	Post-test	60.962	53	9.257				

Table 9 indicates that there are differences between the pre-tests and the post-tests on the language anxiety and its subscales in favor of the pre-tests on the experimental group. As for the motivation questionnaire, the total

score was ( $t(53) = 2.771$ , with effect size (ES) = 0.13,  $p < 0.001$ ). These results demonstrated that anxiety is playing an important part in the learning process that can misguide the students if they have a high rate of anxiety and to affect negatively on their academic achievement and this also showed the importance of the engagement training program that reduce the anxiety level of the experimental group.

Table 10. The differences between the post-tests and follow up on the engagement questionnaire

<i>Engagement subscales</i>	<i>Post-tests and follow up</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Skills engagement	Post-test	53	37.075	3.396	1.792	52	0.079
	Follow up	53	36.509	3.846			
Emotional engagement	Post-test	53	16.151	2.125	1.000	52	0.322
	Follow up	53	16.056	2.061			
Participation/ interaction engagement	Post-test	53	21.396	2.691	1.000	52	0.322
	Follow up	53	21.302	2.826			
Performance engagement	Post-test	53	12.943	1.737	1.000	52	0.322
	Follow up	53	12.868	1.733			
Engagement total score	Post-test	53	87.566	6.289	1.000	52	0.322
	Follow up	53	87.566	6.289			

In Table 10 the study reveals that there are no statistically significant differences between the first post-test and the second (follow up) post-test which was administered a month after the first post-test on engagement. And this shows that the effects of the engagement training program continued and has a great benefit to learners.

Table 11. The differences between the mean scores of the post-tests and follow up of motivation

<i>The post-tests and follow up</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Motivation subscales</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Post-test	53	Class motivation	29.943	3.195	1.729	52	0.090
Follow up	53	Class motivation	29.717	3.134			
Post-test	53	Participants' lack of confidence in their English study	23.717	3.840	1.384	52	0.172
Follow up	53	Participants' lack of confidence in their English study	23.566	3.805			
Post-test	53	Participants' motivation towards learning English	21.642	5.039	1.729	52	0.090
Follow up	53	Participants' motivation towards learning English	21.415	4.979			
Post-test	53	Motivation total score	75.302	8.331	1.000	52	0.322
Follow up	53	Motivation total score	75.283	8.333			

Table 11 shows that there are no differences between the post-tests and follow up on the motivation questionnaire. This finding was shown in all subscales and in the total score of motivation.

Table 12. The differences between the post tests and follow up on the foreign language anxiety questionnaire

<i>Pot tests and follow up</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Anxiety questionnaire subscales</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Post-test	53	Communication apprehension	22.169	4.348	1.352	52	0.182
Follow up	53	Communication apprehension	22.057	4.281			
Post-test	53	Test anxiety	26.208	5.499	0.449	52	0.655
Follow up	53	Test anxiety	26.075	5.014			

Post-test	53	Fear of negative evaluation	12.585	3.041	1.000	52	0.322
Follow up	53	Fear of negative evaluation	12.642	3.006			
Post-test	52	Total score	61.000	9.343	1.588	52	0.119
Follow up	52	Total score	61.500	9.359			

The Table 12 shows that there are no differences between the post-tests and follow up on the foreign language anxiety questionnaire.

## 9. Discussion

This study discussed the development of an engagement program as a tool to help decrease students' anxiety and to increase their motivation to learn the English language. The main purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of a program based on engagement tasks to increase the college students' motivation and to reduce the students' foreign language anxiety. The results of the present study proved that there are statically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group in each of the pre- and post-test administration and the control group in favor of the experimental group. The results of the present study indicated that engagement training program helped to increase the students' motivation and to lessen their foreign language anxiety, because activities encouraged students to interact freely using the target language. In that case of engagement training offers unique contributions to the students' motivation development. The findings of the current study supported earlier research of (Goodenow, 1992) and Huang and Waxman (1996) which showed that students who are engaged in learning because they like it and not because they want to get good grades tend to stay with challenging tasks for longer periods of time and use more complex learning strategies than those who learn primarily to get good grades.

With respect to the first research hypothesis results showed that differences would be found between the means of the experimental group and the control group on the post-tests of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation which confirmed the validity of the first hypothesis; the mean of experimental group was higher than the control group. This result is consistent with the results of many studies (e.g., Renaud et al., 2007; Csikszentimihalyi, 1997) which confirmed that when learners are involved in an activity that has a balance of challenge and skill, they are more inclined to take risks and become engaged. (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Finn 1993; Marks, 2000; Akey, 2006) asserted that the significant relationship between engagement and motivation has a positive impact on achievement. Furthermore, school engagement is useful because the attitudes and behaviors associated with engagement seem to be relatively malleable, that is, sensitive to changes in students and/or the classroom environment (Fredricks et al., 2004). This means that the engagement program is a necessity for students with higher rates of anxiety and less motivation.

With respect to the second hypothesis, the findings indicated that there are significant differences between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation for the experimental group. This result is consistent with the results of (Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, & Pagani, 2009; Willms, Friesen, & Milton, 2009; Boekaerts, 2010; Hinton & Fischer, 2010) that indicated that people learn best when trying to do things that are challenging and of deep interest to them. This result is consistent with the results of (Schlechty, 2002, 2011; Saeed & Zyngier, 2012) that stated students who indicated that their motivation type was either intrinsic or integrated regulated motivation also demonstrated that they were authentically engaged in their education. It also goes in line with the findings of (Zyngier, 2011) who indicated that intrinsic motivation assisted authentic student engagement in learning. Not only that, but this hypothesis agrees with results of the study (Sharifrazi, 2012) which affirmed that conveyed changes in student anxiety from the experimental group who used the engagement program as an intervention. Igbaria and Parasuraman (1989) suggested also the importance of training for the students to alleviate their anxiety.

The third research hypothesis revealed that there are no significant differences between the mean scores of the post-tests and follow up of engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation for the experimental group which was administered a month after the first post-test on the engagement, foreign language anxiety and motivation. Many studies asserted that students make good progress in motivation and their foreign language anxiety was reduced when they have good engagement training (e.g., Igbaria & Parasuraman, 1989; Sharifrazi, 2012).

In short, an engagement training program is important and of great interest to students, at any level, with low motivation and high anxious rate. This facilitates the process of acquiring the English language. The current

findings support previous literature that has suggested that students who are highly engaged in the learning process have good achievement (e.g., Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Finn, 1993; Marks, 2000; Akey, 2006).

## 10. Conclusion

Engaged students perform exceptionally well in their achievement. The present study revealed that students' motivation can enhance their engagement which will lead them to good achievement. Furthermore, low level of students' anxiety can affect positively on their engagement and achievement.

At the end of the program, an exciting learning environment began to emerge in the class. Students found interest in topics, set personal goals for learning, and developed skills to meet those goals. Most importantly, they expressed enjoyment in the process of learning, became less anxious and more motivated. So teachers should know how to and are responsible for the design of such academic activities which will authentically and productively engage students in their learning.

In short, this study highlights the importance of promoting the engagement program of students in the classroom in an effort to improve students' achievement, increase their motivation and to reduce their foreign language anxiety. Alvarez (2002), states that if students are not engaged when doing academic tasks, then they may acquire only a very small amount of knowledge because engaged students are prepared to take a personal risk or chance in the learning task.

## 11. Further Research on the Students' Engagement

Based on the success of the engagement program in the current study, it is recommended that all classes have the opportunity to apply an engagement program in the courses. This study focused on the three constructs: students' engagement, motivation and foreign language anxiety. More research needs to be conducted in this area to research how an engagement program affects students in other universities. Expanding the engagement program to other universities may assist students in other departments with decreasing their anxiety and increasing their motivation in attending class courses.

Previous studies demonstrated that motivation had strong relationship with students' engagement. This study is a good attempt to investigate the relationships among these three constructs - motivation, engagement and anxiety.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the students for their cooperation in this research.

## References

- Akey, T. M. (2006). *School context, student attitudes and behavior, and academic achievement: An exploratory analysis*. Washington, D.C.: MDCR
- Alvarez, D. (2002). Engaging students in their own learning. *Leadership*, 32(2), 12-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2007.10516474>
- American Psychological Association. (2014). *Anxiety*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/anxiety/index.aspx>
- Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2009). *Classroom motivation*. Columbus, OH: Pearson.
- Archambault, I., Janosz, M., Fallu, J., & Pagani, L. (2009). Student engagement and its relationship with early high school dropout. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(3), 651-670. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.06.007>
- Boekaerts, M. (2010). The crucial role of motivation and emotion in classroom learning. In H. Dumont, D. Istance, & F. Benavides (Eds.), *The nature of learning: Using research to inspire practice*. Paris: Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264086487-6-en>
- Cano, D. R. (2015). *The effect of engagement on at risk student achievement: A correlational investigation* (Order No. 3712155). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (1707944557). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1707944557?accountid=30641>
- Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement*. New York, NY: Springer Science. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7>
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. Gunmar, & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 23). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Csikszentimihalyi, M. (1997). Flow and creativity. *NAMTA Journal*, 22(2), 61-97.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation. *Social development, and Well-being, American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
- Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in Second and Foreign Language Learning. In C. Xi (Ed.), *Affective Value of Cooperative Learning in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Shanghai International Studies University. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s026144480001315x>
- Economides, A. A., & Moridis, C. N. (2008). Adaptive self-assessment trying to reduce fear. *Proceedings of IEEE Computer Society, First International Conference on Advances in Computer-Human Interaction*, 158-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ACHI.2008.28>
- Elliot, J., & Chong, J. L. (2005). *Presentation anxiety: A challenge for some students and a pit of despair for others*. Retrieved from [http://www.isana.org.au/files/20051017165939\\_PresentationAnxiety.pdf](http://www.isana.org.au/files/20051017165939_PresentationAnxiety.pdf)
- Finn, J. D. (1993). *School engagement & students at risk*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Fredricks, J., McCloskey, W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., & Mooney, K. (2011). *Measuring student engagement in upper elementary through high school: A description of 21 instruments*. Greensborough, N.C.: REL Southeast.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Gage, N., & Berliner, D. (1991). *Educational Psychology* (5th ed., p. 218). Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: Technical Report*. University of Western Ontario Department of Psychology.
- Goodenow, C. (1992, April). *School motivation, engagement, and sense of belonging among urban adolescent students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Gregory, C. (2005). *Shaping the exceptional student experience: Engagement towards excellence*. Kitchener, Ontario, Canada: Conestoga College, Focus Groups.
- Hancock, D. R. (2002). Influencing postsecondary students' motivation to learn in the classroom. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 63-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87567550209595877>
- Handelsman, M. M., Briggs, W. L., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A Measure of College Student Course Engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(3), 184-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.98.3.184-192>
- Heng, K. (2014). The Relationships between Student Engagement and the Academic Achievement of First-Year University Students in Cambodia. *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*, 23(2), 179-189. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0095-8>
- Hinton, C., & Fischer, K. (2010). Learning from the developmental and biological perspective. In H. Dumont, D. Istance, & F. Benavides (Eds.), *The nature of learning: Using research to inspire practice*. Paris: Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264086487-7-en>
- Huang, S., & Waxman, H. (1996, April). *Learning environment differences between high-and low-achieving minority students in urban middle schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Igbaria, M., & Parasuraman, S. (1989). A path analytic study of characteristics, computer anxiety, and attitudes toward microcomputers. *Journal of Management*, 15(3), 373-388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500302>
- Ismail, N. M. (2011). English Major Students' Achievement, Language Learning Strategies and Speech Apprehension. *THEMATICS JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING*, 1(4), 40-49.
- Kahraman, N. (2014). Cross-grade comparison of relationship between students' engagement and TIMSS 2011 science achievement. *Egitim Ve Bilim*, 39(172).
- Klauda, S. L., & Guthrie, J. T. (2015). Comparing relations of motivation, engagement, and achievement among struggling and advanced adolescent readers. *Reading and Writing*, 28(1), 239-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-014-9523-2>
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an Enabler for Academic Success, *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 69.

- Malone, T. W. (1981). Toward a theory of intrinsically motivating instruction. *Cognitive Science*, 4, 333-369. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0504\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0504_2)
- Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 153-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312037001153>
- Nako, N. (2015). *Factors influencing academic engagement and achievement: Exploration of impact of parentification and poverty in adolescents' student-teacher relationships* (Order No. 3708883). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1697283669?accountid=30641>
- Ong, B., & Cheong, K. C. (2009). Sources of stress among college students: The case of a credit transfer program. *College Student Journal*, 43(4), 1279-1286.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Wilson, V. A. (2003). Statistics anxiety: Nature, etiology, antecedents, effects, and treatments-a comprehensive review of the literature. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2), 195-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1356251032000052447>
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02011.x>
- Payne, J. (1999, February). *Report to Georgian college remediation task force*. Barrie, Ontario, Canada: Georgian College of Applied Arts and Technology.
- Peters Mayer, D. (2008). *Overcoming school anxiety: How to help your child deal with separation, tests, homework, bullies, math phobia, and other worries*. New York, NY: AMACOM, American Management Association.
- Price, S., Rogers, Y., Scaife, M., Stanton, D., & Neale, H. (2003). Using "tangibles" to promote novel forms of playful learning. In *Proceedings of the Interacting with Computers 15, 2, ACM Press* (pp. 169-185). [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0953-5438\(03\)00006-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0953-5438(03)00006-7)
- Ratanasiripong, P., Sverduk, K., Hayashino, D., & Prince, J. (2010). Setting up the next generation biofeedback program for stress and anxiety management for college students: A simple and cost effective approach. *College Student Journal*, 44(1), 97-100.
- Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 579-595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032690>
- Renaud, S., Tannenbaum, E., & Stantial, P. (2007). Student-centered teaching in large classes with limited resources. *English Teaching Forum*, 45(3), 12-17.
- Russell, V. J., Ainley, M., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). *Student motivation and engagement*. Schooling Issues Digest. Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2009). Promoting self-determined school engagement: Motivation, learning, and well-being. In K. R. Wentzel, & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook on motivation at school* (pp. 171-196). New York: Routledge.
- Saeed, S., & Zyngier, D. (2012). How Motivation Influences Student Engagement: A Qualitative Case Study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 1(2), 252-267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v1n2p252>
- Salomon, G., & Globerson, T. (1987). When teams do not function the way they ought to. *Proceedings of International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(1), 89-99.
- Sbrocco, R. (2009). *Student academic engagement and the academic achievement gap between black and white middle school students: Does engagement increase student achievement?* (Order No. 3379401). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304932182?accountid=30641>
- Schlechty, P. (2011). *Schlechty center on engagement*. Retrieved from [http://s3.amazonaws.com/www.schlechtycenter.org/tools/prod/4046/original/sc\\_pdf\\_engagement.pdf?1272415798](http://s3.amazonaws.com/www.schlechtycenter.org/tools/prod/4046/original/sc_pdf_engagement.pdf?1272415798)
- Schlechty, P. C. (2002). *Working on the work an action plan for teachers, principals and superintendents* (1st ed.). San Fransisco, USA: Jossey Bass.

- Sharifrazi, F. (2012). *The Investigation of a Synchronous Engagement System (SES) to Alleviate Anxiety Among eLearning Students in an MBA Program*. Nova Southeastern University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69, 493-525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164408323233>
- Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teachers behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 571-581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.4.571>
- Skinner, E. A., Wellborn, J. G., & Connell, J. P. (1990). What it takes to do well in school and whether I've got it: The role of perceived control in children's engagement and school achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 22-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.22>
- Stoney, S., & Oliver, R. (1999). Can higher order thinking and cognitive engagement be enhanced with multimedia? *Interactive Multimedia Electronic Journal of Computer-Enhanced Learning*, 1(2).
- Wang, Z., Bergin, C., & Bergin, D. A. (2014). Measuring engagement in fourth to twelfth grade classrooms: The classroom engagement inventory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(4), 517-535. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000050>
- Wellborn, J. G. (1991). *Engaged and disaffected action: The conceptualization and measurement of motivation in the academic domain* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester.
- Williams, A. S. (2010). Statistic, anxiety and instructor immediacy. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 18(2), 1-18.
- Willms, J. D., Friesen, S., & Milton, P. (2009). *What did you do in school today? Transforming classrooms through social, academic, and intellectual engagement—First National Report*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Xu, R., & Huang, L. (2010). The Role of Teachers in College English Classroom—From the Perspective of Affect. *International Education Studies*, 3(3), 192-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v3n3p192>
- Zyngier, D. (2011). (Re) Conceptualizing risk: Left numb and unengaged and lost in a no-man's-land or what (seems to) work for at-risk students. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(2), 211-231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603110902781427>

## Appendix A

### Arabic Translation of Foreign Language classroom anxiety Questionnaire

عزيزتي الطالبة

فيما يلي مجموعة من العبارات تحدد قلقك أثناء محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية. أمام كل مفردة خمسة اختيارات وهي (1) غير موافق بشدة، (2) غير موافق، (3) محايد، (4) موافق، (5) موافق بشدة. الرجاء وضع (√) أمام كل عبارة أسفل الاختيار المناسب الذي يعبر عن قلقك أثناء محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية.

العمر \_\_\_\_\_ الاسم \_\_\_\_\_  
المعدل \_\_\_\_\_ التقدير في اللغة الانجليزية \_\_\_\_\_

عبارات المقياس	غير موافق بشدة	غير موافق	محايد	موافق	موافق بشدة
1 لم أكن متأكدة تماما من نفسي عندما أتكلم لغة إنجليزية في القاعة.					
2 أقلق عندما أعرف أن الأستاذة سوف تنادي اسمي للمشاركة في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.					
3 يخيفني عندما لا أفهم ماذا تقول الأستاذة باللغة الإنجليزية.					



4	لا يضايقتني على الاطلاق التحدث باللغة الانجليزية.
5	أظن أفكر أن الطالبات الأخريات أفضل مني في اللغة الإنجليزية.
6	عادة أشعر بالارتياح أثناء اختبارات اللغة الإنجليزية.
7	أشعر بالقلق عندما يكون على التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية بدون اعداد.
8	أقلق بسبب ما سوف يترتب على رسوبي أو فشلي في مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية.
9	أشعر بالإحراج عند تقديم اجابات تطوعية في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
10	لا أشعر بالقلق عند التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية مع الناطقين بها.
11	أغضب عندما لا أفهم ماذا تصحح الاستاذة.
12	أشعر بالقلق تجاه اللغة حتى عندما استعد جيداً لمحاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
13	غالباً أشعر انني لا اارغب في حضور محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
14	أشعر بنبض قلبي عندما تنادي على أستاذتي للمشاركة داخل القاعة.
15	كلما تذكرت امتحان اللغة الإنجليزية كلما ازدادت حيرة من أمرى.
16	أشعر دائما أن الطالبات الأخريات يتحدثون اللغة الإنجليزية أفضل مني.
17	تنمو اللغة الإنجليزية بسرعة لدى زميلاتي داخل القاعة لذلك أنا قلق بشأن التخلف عن عنهن.
18	أشعر بعصبية وقلق أكثر في محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية مقارنة بالمحاضرات الأخرى.
19	أصبح عصبية وارتبك عندما أتحدث لغة إنجليزية في القاعة.
20	أشعر بالثقة والارتياح عندما أكون في طريقي إلى محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
21	أشعر بالعصبية عندما لا أفهم كل كلمة تقولها استاذة اللغة الإنجليزية في القاعة.
22	أشعر بالإرهاق من كثرة القواعد التي يجب أن أتعلمها لتحدث اللغة الإنجليزية.
23	أخشى أن الطالبات الأخريات سوف يضحكن في وجهي عندما أتحدث اللغة الإنجليزية.
24	أصبح عصبية عندما تسأل معلمة اللغة الإنجليزية أسئلة لم استعد لها مسبقاً.

## Appendix B

### Arabic Translation of Motivation Questionnaire

#### عزيزتي الطالبة:

فيما يلي مجموعة من العبارات التي تعبر عن دافيتك لدراسة اللغة الإنجليزية بالجامعة وأمام كل مفردة ثلاث بدائل. برجاء اختيار أحد البدائل الذي يعبر عن دافيتك لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية ، علماً بأنه لا توجد اجابات صحيحة و أخرى خاطئة وإنما يجب أن تعبر عن اهتمامك الفعلي بتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية .

الاسم \_\_\_\_\_ العمر \_\_\_\_\_ المعدل \_\_\_\_\_  
التقدير في اللغة الانجليزية \_\_\_\_\_

#### الجزء الأول: دافعية الطلبة للتعلم داخل الفصل

- |   |   |                                     |                                   |                                   |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | في محاضرة اللغة الانجليزية، احاول ان استمع بحرص وافهم كل شئ:      | أ. كثيراً                           | ب. احيانا                         | ج. في الغالب ابدا                 |
| 2 | في محاضرة اللغة الانجليزية، احاول جاهدة ان اتبع تعليمات المعلمة . | أ. كثيراً                           | ب. احيانا                         | ج. في الغالب ابدا                 |
| 3 | عندما يكون لدى مشكلة في فهم شيئا في اللغة الانجليزية فإننى:       | أ. اطلب على الفور مساعدة المعلمة أو | ب. أطلب المساعدة فقط قبل الامتحان | ج. لا اطلب المساعدة وانسى الموضوع |
|   |   | مباشرة                              | مباشرة                            |                                   |

- 4 في محاضرة اللغة الانجليزية :  
أ. أفضل التحدث باللغة الانجليزية فقط  
ب. أفضل التحدث خليط من اللغة الانجليزية والعربية  
ج. أفضل التحدث باللغة العربية اكثر
- 5 عندما تطلب منا المعلمة المشاركة في المناقشة:  
أ. اشارك بفاعلية مع زميلاتي  
ب. فقط اشترك في النقاش اذا كان لدى شيئا أقوله.  
ج. استمع معظم الوقت
- 6 . اثناء محاضرة اللغة الانجليزية:  
أ. فإننى اتطوع بإجابات قدر الامكان  
ب. أجيب فقط على الأسئلة السهلة.  
ج. نادرا ما اتطوع لقول اى شئ .
- 7 . أثناء محاضرة اللغة الانجليزية ، اكتب ملاحظتي بعناية وارجعها بعد المحاضرة  
أ. كثيرا  
ب. احيانا  
ج. فى الغالب أبدا
- 8 عند عمل واجب مادة اللغة الانجليزية ، فإننى:  
أ. أعمل بحرص جدا، وتأكد أننى أفهم كل  
ب. اعطية عناية ولكن ليست بالدرجة  
شئ المطلوبة.  
ج. فقط اطع عليه بسرعة
- 9 اذا طلبت منا المعلمة واجبات زيادة فى اللغة الانجليزية فإننى:  
أ. بالتاكيد أتطوع لعمل ذلك  
ب. فقط اقوم بعمله اذا طلبت منى المعلمة مباشرة.  
ج. بكل تأكيد لا أتطوع اذا كان ذلك لا يؤثر على معدلى
- 10 عندما ترجع لى أو تعطينى المعلمة الواجب أو الامتحان ، فإننى:  
أ. دائما أعيد كتابته واصحح أخطائى  
ب. أطلع عليه ولا اصحح اخطائى  
ج. فقط القبه فى مكتبى بعد أن أرى الدرجة وانساه.
- 11 . أثناء دراستى لمقرر اللغة الانجليزية، أكون واثقة من أننى استطيع تعلم المحتوى :  
أ. صحيح  
ب. صحيح تقريبا  
ج. ليس صحيح على الاطلاق
- 12 أنا راضية عن أدائى فى محاضرات اللغة الانجليزية.  
أ. صحيح  
ب. صحيح تقريبا  
ج. ليس صحيح على الاطلاق
- الجزء الثانى : دافعية الطلبة للتعلم خارج الفصل**
- 13 أفكر بفاعلية فيما اتعلمه من مقرر اللغة الانجليزية  
أ. كثيرا جداً  
ب. مرة واحدة من حين لآخر  
ج. نادراً
- 14 اذا لم يدرس مقرر اللغة الانجليزية فى الجامعة فإننى:  
أ. سوف أحاول أخذ دروس فى اللغة  
ب. احاول تعلم الانجليزية من المواقف اليومية  
ج. لا يهمنى تعلم الانجليزية على الاطلاق.
- 15 فيما يخص كيفية مذاكرتى لمادة اللغة الانجليزية ، فإننى بأمانة استطيع أن أقول أننى:  
أ. حقا أحاول جاهدة تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية  
ب. لا أبذل جهد كافي لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية  
ج. سوف أنجح على أساس الحظ أو الذكاء لأننى أبذل جهد قليل جداً فى المذاكرة.
- 16 إذا اتاحت لى الفرصة ان اتحدث اللغة الانجليزية خارج الجامعة ،  
أ. فإننى سوف اتحدث اللغة الانجليزية  
ب. فإننى سوف اتحدث اللغة الانجليزية عند  
معظم الوقت كلما أمكن ذلك  
الضرورة فقط  
ج. لا أتحدث ابداً اللغة الإنجليزية.
- 17 إذا وجد نادى للغة الإنجليزية فى الجامعة :  
أ. فإننى سأكون الأكثر اهتماماً فى الانضمام اليه.  
ب. سوف أحضر الاجتماعات من حين إلى حين  
ج. بالتأكيد لا أنضم للنادى.
- 18 مقارنة بالمقررات الأخرى التى أدرسها ،  
أ. فإننى أحب مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية أكثر.  
ب. فإننى أحب مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية كباقي  
ج. فإننى أحب مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية

- المقررات. أقل من المقررات الأخرى.
- 19 إذا كان الامر يرجع لى فى اضافة أو حذف مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية :  
أ. فإننى سوف اصف مقرر اللغة  
ب. لا أعرف إذا كنت سوف اضيفه أم لا  
ج. سوف أحذفه
- 20 أجد أن دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية :  
أ. شيقة جداً  
ب. شيقة ولكن ليست أكثر من معظم  
ج. ليست شيقة على الاطلاق
- المقررات الأخرى
- 21 أعتبر نفسى متعلمة للغة إنجليزية ناجحة  
أ. حقيقى  
ب. حقيقى الى حد ما.  
ج. ليس حقيقى على الاطلاق.
- الجزء الثالث : الدافعية لاستخدام الانترنت والحاسوب فى تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لدى الطلبة**
- 22 فيما يخص واجبات اللغة إنجليزية التى يجب أن أقوم بعملها باستخدام الحاسوب:  
أ. فإننى انجز معظمها.  
ب. انجز العديد منها.  
ج. انهى البعض منا فقط.
- 23 استخدم الانترنت لتعلم اللغة الانجليزية .  
أ. دائماً  
ب. أحيانا  
ج. أبدا
- 24 أثناء عمل واجب اللغة الانجليزية باستخدام الانترنت:  
أ. فإننى اقضى معظم الوقت لإنهاء مهمة  
ب. فإننى أقضى بعض الوقت لإنهاء مهمة  
ج. فإننى اقضى القليل من الوقت لإنهاء مهمة تعلم اللغة الانجليزية.
- 25 استخدم الانترنت فى مقرر اللغة الانجليزية لعمل واجبات زيادة فى القراءة والكتابة:  
أ. دائماً  
ب. أحيانا  
ج. أبدا
- 26 استخدم الانترنت فى مقرر اللغة الانجليزية لعمل واجبات زيادة فى الاستماع والتحدث.  
أ. دائماً  
ب. أحيانا  
ج. أبدا
- 27 اجد نفسى مشتتة عندما يطلب منى انهاء مهمة محددة فى استخدام الانترنت.  
أ. حقيقى  
ب. حقيقى الى حد ما  
ج. ليس حقيقى على الاطلاق
- 28 انا راضية عن ادنى فى بيئة التعلم الجديدة بواسطة الحاسوب  
أ. حقيقى  
ب. حقيقى الى حد ما  
ج. ليس حقيقى على الاطلاق
- 29 اشعر بدافعية اكثر لتعلم اللغة الانجليزية بواسطة الحاسوب  
أ. حقيقى  
ب. حقيقى الى حد ما  
ج. ليس حقيقى على الاطلاق
- 30 مقارنة بالطريقة التقليدية فى التدريس ، فإننى اعتقد أن التعلم بواسطة الحاسوب يناسبنى اكثر  
أ. حقيقى  
ب. حقيقى الى حد ما  
ج. ليس حقيقى على الاطلاق

## Appendix C

### Arabic Translation of Engagement Questionnaire

#### عزيزتى الطالبة

فيما يلى مجموعة من العبارات تحدد مدى اندماجك ومشاركتك اثناء محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية . أمام كل مفردة خمسة اختيارات وهى (1) لا تنطبق على أبداً ، (2) لا تنطبق على ، (3) تنطبق على الى حد ما ، (4) تنطبق على ، (5) تنطبق على جداً. الرجاء وضع (√) أمام كل عبارة اسفل الاختيار المناسب الذى يحدد اندماجك اثناء محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية .

الاسم \_\_\_\_\_ العمر \_\_\_\_\_  
التقدير فى اللغة الانجليزية \_\_\_\_\_ المعدل \_\_\_\_\_

عبارات المقياس	لا تنطبق على أبدا	لا تنطبق على حد ما	تنطبق على حد ما	تنطبق على أبدا
1				التأكد من أنني أدرس بانتظام أو وفقا للخطة الدراسية
2				أبذل مجهود في المذاكرة
3				أعمل كل الواجبات
4				مشاركة على قراءة موضوعات اللغة الإنجليزية
5				ابحث عن الملاحظات بين المحاضرات للتأكد من أنني أفهم مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية
6				أكون منظمة في استذكري لمقرر اللغة الإنجليزية.
7				أدون الملاحظات الجيدة في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية
8				الاستماع جيدا في المحاضرة
9				أواظب على الحضور للدراسة يوميا.
10				أحاول إيجاد طرق لجعل مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية يرتبط بحياتي.
11				أطبق ما أستفيد من مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية في حياتي.
12				أحاول إيجاد طرق لجعل مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية شيقا
13				أرغب بشدة في تعلم مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية
14				أرفع يدي في المحاضرة
15				أسئل أسئلة عندما لا أفهم الأستاذة
16				أستمتع بمحاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
17				أشارك بفاعلية في النقاش في مجموعة صغيرة.
18				أذهب إلى أستاذة اللغة الإنجليزية في الساعات المكتبية لمراجعة الواجبات او الامتحانات أو أسأل أسئلة.
19				أحاول الحصول على درجة ممتازة
20				أعمل بشكل جيد في الامتحانات
21				أكون واثقة من أنني أستطيع التعلم والعمل بشكل جيد في المحاضرة

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).