

T.C.
BOLU ABANT İZZET BAYSAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION



**SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT IN
ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES**

MASTER OF ARTS, ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

NİLGÜN KURU

THESIS SUPERVISOR
Prof. Dr. Abdullah COŞKUN

BOLU, 2025

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL PAGE

The thesis entitled “**SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS’ ENGAGEMENT IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES**” prepared and submitted by **Nilgün KURU** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts** in Department of **FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION** with unanimity is hereby approved. 10/13/2025

Jury Members

Signature

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Abdullah COŞKUN
Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University

.....

Member
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kadir Vefa TEZEL
Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University

.....

Member
Asst. Prof. Dr. Yusuf ŞEN
Düzce University

.....

Institute of Graduate Studies Approval

Prof. Dr. İbrahim KÜRTÜL
Director of Institute of Graduate Studies

ETHICAL DECLARATION

In this thesis study, which I have prepared in accordance with Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Graduate Studies' Thesis Writing Guide and Template;

- I have obtained the data, information and documents presented in the thesis within the framework of academic and ethical rules,
- I have presented all information, documents, evaluations, and results in accordance with the rules of scientific ethics and morality,
- I have cited and referenced all the works I have benefited from in the thesis study,
- I have not made any changes to the data used,
- I declare that the work I have presented in this thesis is original, and in any other case, I declare that I accept all loss of rights that may arise against me.

According to the similarity report obtained by applying the filters determined by the directorate of the institute in the Turnitin program related to the thesis, the similarity index of the thesis does not exceed 30%.

Ethical permission was obtained for this study from Abant İzzet Baysal University Research Ethics Committee with the number 2023/466.

.....

NİLGÜN KURU

ABSTRACT

SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

MA THESIS

NİLGÜN KURU

BOLU ABANT İZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

(SUPERVISOR: PROF. DR. ABDULLAH COŞKUN)

BOLU, 13 OCTOBER 2025

X + 80

The present study aims to explore a group of secondary school students' engagement level in English language classes in relation to different variables in a state secondary school in the Central Anatolia region by means of a mixed method research model. The engagement levels of students were investigated according to the three aspects of engagement: cognitive engagement, social engagement and affective engagement. The study also sought an answer to the question as to whether there are significant differences in the secondary school EFL students' engagement levels depending on gender, grade level and English language course achievement score. Another objective of the study is to reveal English language teachers' opinions about their students' engagement. The quantitative data were collected from 649 secondary school students by using the Language Learner Engagement Scale developed by Oruç and Demirci (2020), and the qualitative data were collected from five volunteer English teachers via semi-structured interview questions designed by the researcher in line with the scale. SPSS was used to analyse students' responses to the scale, and content analysis was utilised to examine teacher responses to the interview questions. The quantitative results demonstrated that the secondary school students' engagement level ranged from moderate to high level. The level of the affective engagement was found to be higher than the other dimension levels. Additionally, 5th graders and female students were found to be the most engaged groups. It was also uncovered that engagement level predicted the English language course achievement score. On the other hand, teacher interviews revealed some problems that may hinder student engagement. Some suggestions were made by the teachers to raise students' engagement in English language classes. These suggestions were discussed with the support of the literature.

KEYWORDS: English, Engagement in EFL Classrooms, Cognitive Engagement, Affective Engagement, Social Engagement

ÖZET

ORTAOKUL ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE DERSİNE KATILIMI YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

NİLGÜN KURU

BOLU ABANT İZZET BAYSAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI
(TEZ DANIŞMANI: PROF. DR. ABDULLAH COŞKUN)

BOLU, 13 EKİM 2025

X +80

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İç Anadolu Bölgesi'ndeki bir devlet ortaokulunda öğrenim gören bir grup ortaokul öğrencisinin çeşitli değişkenlere bağlı olarak İngilizce dil derslerindeki katılım düzeylerini karma yöntem araştırma modeliyle incelemektir. Öğrencilerin katılım düzeyleri bilişsel katılım, sosyal katılım ve duyuşsal katılım olmak üzere katılımın üç boyutu açısından incelenmiştir. Çalışmada ayrıca, ortaokulda İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin katılım düzeylerinde cinsiyet, sınıf düzeyi ve İngilizce dersi başarı puanı değişkenlerine bağlı olarak anlamlı farklılıklar olup olmadığı sorusuna da yanıt aranmıştır. Çalışmanın bir diğer amacı da İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerinin katılımları hakkındaki görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Nicel veriler Oruç ve Demirci (2020) tarafından geliştirilen Yabancı Dil Dersi Katılım Ölçeği kullanılarak 649 ortaokul öğrencisinden, nitel veriler ise araştırmacı tarafından ölçek doğrultusunda tasarlanan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme soruları aracılığıyla gönüllü beş İngilizce öğretmeninden toplanmıştır. Öğrencilerin ölçeğe verdiği yanıtları analiz etmek için SPSS ve öğretmenlerin görüşme sorularına verdiği yanıtları incelemek için içerik analizi kullanılmıştır. Nicel sonuçlar, ortaokul öğrencilerinin katılım düzeyinin orta ile yüksek düzey arasında olduğunu göstermiştir. Duyuşsal katılım düzeyinin diğer boyut düzeylerinden daha yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, 5. sınıf öğrencileri ve kız öğrencilerin en fazla katılım gösteren gruplar olduğu saptanmıştır. Katılım düzeyinin İngilizce dersi başarı puanını da yordadığı açığa çıkarılmıştır. Öte yandan, öğretmenlerle yapılan görüşmeler, öğrenci katılımını engelleyebilecek bazı sorunları ortaya koymuştur. Öğretmenler tarafından öğrencilerin İngilizce derslerine katılımını artırmak için bazı önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Bu öneriler, alanyazınla desteklenilerek tartışılmıştır.

ANAHTAR KELİMELER: İngilizce, Yabancı Dil Dersinde Katılım, Bilişsel Katılım, Duyuşsal Katılım, Sosyal Katılım

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	x
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Importance of Language Learning	1
1.2 Student Engagement	2
1.2.1 Dimensions of Student Engagement	4
1.2.1.1 Cognitive Engagement	5
1.2.1.2 Affective Engagement.....	5
1.2.1.3 Social Engagement.....	6
1.2.1.4 Behavioral Engagement	6
1.2.1.5 Agentic Engagement	6
1.3 Engagement and Motivation.....	7
1.4 Student Engagement and Language Learning Achievement.....	9
1.5 Related Research	11
1.5.1 International Studies on Student Engagement.....	11
1.5.2 Studies on Student Engagement in Türkiye	15
1.5.3 Young Learners and Engagement	19
1.6 Purpose of the Research.....	21
1.7 Research Questions.....	21
1.8 Limitations	22
1.9 Statement of the Problem.....	22
2. MATERIALS and METHOD	24
2.1 Research Design	24
2.2 Population and Sample	25
2.3 Data Collection Tools	25
2.3.1 Language Learner Engagement Scale	25
2.3.2 Demographics Information Form	26
2.3.3 Semi-structured interviews	26
2.4 Collection of Data.....	27
2.5 Analysis of Data	28
2.6 Participant Demographics.....	29
3. RESULTS.....	30
3.1 Analysis of Semi-Structured Interview Questions	40

3.1.1 Affective Engagement	40
3.1.2 Cognitive Engagement	46
3.1.3 Social Engagement	53
4. DISCUSSION.....	61
5. CONCLUSION.....	68
5.1 Recommendations for Teachers	69
5.2 Recommendation for Further Research	69
REFERENCES.....	70
APPENDICES	77
APPENDIX 1	77
APPENDIX 2	80



LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Descriptive findings of demographic information	29
Table 2. Findings of reliability	30
Table 3. Normality test findings.....	30
Table 4. Mean scores of the overall scale and the scale dimensions.....	31
Table 5. Frequency analysis for Language Learner Engagement Scale.....	32
Table 6. The relationship between the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale and the dimension of engagement.....	36
Table 7. T- test analysis of the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale depending on gender variable	36
Table 8. T-test analysis of affective engagement depending on gender variable..	36
Table 9. T-test analysis of cognitive engagement depending on gender variable..	37
Table 10. T- test analysis of social engagement depending on gender variable ...	37
Table 11. ANOVA results of the overall Language Lerner Engagement Scale according to grade level variable	37
Table 12. ANOVA results of affective engagement according to grade level variable	38
Table 13. ANOVA results of cognitive engagement according to grade level variable	38
Table 14. ANOVA results of social engagement according to grade level variable	39
Table 15. T-test results of the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale according to English language course achievement variable.....	39
Table 16. T-test results of affective engagement according to English language course achievement variable	39
Table 17. T-test results of cognitive engagement according to English language course achievement variable	40
Table 18. T-test results of social engagement according to English Language course achievement variable.....	40

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

ESOL: English for Speakers of Other Languages

L2: Second Language

MoNE: Ministry of National Education



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to pass my special thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Abdullah COŞKUN, for his endless guidance, sincere support, professional help and fruitful feedback in the process of writing my thesis.

I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kadir Vefa Tezel and Asst. Prof. Dr. Yusuf Şen for their careful reading of my thesis and constructive feedback about my study. My special thanks also go to the students and colleagues who volunteered to participate in my study. Finally, my children and my husband who always supported me while writing my thesis deserve the biggest thanks.

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is designed to explore a group of secondary school students' engagement level in English language classes depending on different variables. More specifically, it investigates secondary school students' engagement level in English language classes in a state school according to certain variables and their English language teachers' observations about these students' engagement levels as well as suggestions to improve their engagement level.

This chapter starts with the importance of language learning and defines the term 'student engagement' and the dimensions of student engagement. The relationship between engagement and motivation as well as the role of engagement in students' achievement have also been discussed.

1.1 The Importance of Language Learning

It is an undeniable fact that English language has an important place in people's lives as a result of globalization (Crystal, 1997). English is the official language of more than fifty countries, and it has been used as a mother tongue or second/foreign language for many people around the world (Savucu, 2024).

In Türkiye, while French, German and English are seen as the most learned foreign languages, English is often regarded as a common and the most preferred language (Ateş Özdemir, 2006). It is generally observed that Turkish parents give great importance to foreign language learning and to the planning of their children's foreign language education process. The school preferences of many parents have also been affected by their wish for their children to learn one or more foreign languages, especially English (Çakıcı, 2010).

Foreign language learning and teaching in Türkiye have always been supported by Turkish educational system (Ateş Özdemir, 2006). Great effort has been made, and an important amount of investment has been allocated by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE); for example, while Turkish students started learning English when they were in 4th grade after 1997, obligatory foreign language learning has been implemented at an earlier stage in the 2nd grade since 2012 (Savucu, 2024).

According to the 21st decree of the Head Council of Education and Morality in 2024, students in 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades have two hours of English language

classes while students in 5th and 6th grades have three hours. In 7th and 8th grades, students have four hours of foreign language courses a week in public primary and secondary schools. There are also two hours of optional English language classes for 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th graders. Students can have those optional classes when they prefer or when the school conditions are deemed to be appropriate by the school administration.

Although English language teaching has great importance in Türkiye in all institutions from the primary school to university, and the ways of achieving success are sought by a number of important initiatives, the outcomes are not yet at the expected levels (Demirel, 2024). It is argued by Savucu (2024) that even though a student receives more than 1000 hours of foreign language course until graduating from a university, this long period of language learning does not lead to desired outcomes.

Many reasons have been discussed, and various solutions have been proposed in the literature pertaining to learning and teaching English as a foreign language in Türkiye (Taşçı, 2023). Increasing students' engagement is often considered to be one of these solutions (Svalberg, 2009).

1.2 Student Engagement

The ultimate target of education is to foster learning, and there is a widespread belief that engaged learners are more likely to reach this goal; besides, the growing popularity of engagement and engagement theory can pave the way for educational stakeholders to decipher the reasons behind the factors that have a negative contribution to engagement and to improve student engagement (Ebralidze, 2023).

The term student engagement in language teaching is a new concept (Hınız & Çelik, 2025). However, keeping the students active in the education process dates back to Dewey (Finn & Cox, 1992). Pertaining to the importance of active participation in the education process, Dewey (2018, p. 45) believed as follows:

“... the neglect of this principle is the cause of a large part of the waste of time and strength in school work. The child is thrown into a passive, receptive, or absorbing attitude. The conditions are such that he is not permitted to follow the law of his nature; the result is friction and waste.”

The term engagement has been defined in different ways in different context and disciplines as a concept related to institutions, schools, school experiences as well as classroom activities, but there is no agreement about a certain definition of student engagement and types of engagement (Dinçer et al., 2017; Fredricks et al., 2004; Taylor & Parsons, 2011). For instance, Hiver et al. (2024) stated that there are different perspectives and definitions of engagement. Some researchers describe it as a school experience and attendance as well as participation in school activities (Finn, 1989; Philp & Duchesne, 2016).

Marks (2000) and Harris (2008) point out that student engagement is a psychological process embodying students' attention, interest, investment and effort in their learning. Similarly, Kuh (2009) explains the term student engagement as the time and effort students employ in their studies and other educational activities. On the other hand, Astin (1984) used the term 'student involvement' to describe the physical and psychological energy a student dedicates to academic achievement.

In the field of foreign language education, Philp and Duchesne (2016) and Storch (2008) described student engagement briefly by referring to students' interests and participation in a foreign or second language activity. According to Svalberg (2009), student engagement has been defined insufficiently, and cognitive engagement has generally been emphasized in the relevant literature. Therefore, she described the term as follows: "Engagement is a cognitive, and/or affective, and/or social state and process in which the learner is the agent and the language is the object and may be the vehicle (means of communication)" (Svalberg, 2009, p. 244). In her study, it is argued that knowing whether students are engaged or not enables English language teachers to take necessary actions (Svalberg, 2012).

In the Turkish educational sphere, Günüç and Kuzu (2015) described student engagement as a reaction to the learning process both in class and out of class activities to succeed desired outcomes. They studied the effects of students' social space as well as campus life on learning achievement which they considered engagement. Moreover, Hınız and Çelik (2025) viewed the term engagement in the field of EFL as a multifaceted and complex concept requiring sustained effort, focused attention, active involvement and willingness in related meaningful and constructive learning experiences. Therefore, they maintained that student

engagement has the potential to make the language learning process more effective and meaningful.

In the light of the definitions above, student engagement can be defined as cognitively, affectively and socially taking part as a learner in the language learning process.

1.2.1 Dimensions of Student Engagement

There is a consensus that engagement is a multifaceted and multidimensional construct with interrelated dimensions (Hiver et al, 2024; Philp & Duchesne, 2016). Different kinds of engagement were mentioned in the literature (Fredricks et al. 2004; Reeve & Lee, 2014). For instance, Fredricks et al (2004) stated and researched three dimensions of engagement, namely cognitive, behavioral and emotional engagement. In another model, the dimensions which were generally accepted by the researchers working in the field of education are listed as follows: behavioral, emotional and affective engagement (Appleton et al., 2008). On the other hand, two dimensions known as agentic and social engagements received less attention in the literature (Hınız & Çelik, 2025).

According to Philp and Duchesne (2016), behavioral, cognitive, social and emotional engagement were the interrelated components of the construct. Reeve and Lee (2014) studied students' classroom engagement in four dimensions, such as behavioral, emotional, cognitive and agentic engagement. Svalberg (2009) divided the term into three dimensions as cognitive, affective and social engagement. In their research on school engagement, Fredricks et al. (2004) also considered engagement as a multidimensional and multifaceted construct with three components: cognitive, behavioral and emotional.

Dimensions are not isolated, and they are interconnected, and interacting; thus, they influence each other complicatedly (Christenson et al., 2012; Hınız & Çelik, 2025; Svalberg, 2017). Although the aspects of engagement overlap and affect each other, they are conceptualized separately below to allow analysis. The major dimensions are listed in line with the relevant literature, and the importance of educational programs and practice in student involvement is emphasized (Fredricks, et al., 2004; Svalberg, 2009).

1.2.1.1 Cognitive Engagement

Cognitive engagement encompassing other constructs such as student motivation, effort and strategy use in the learning process is known as the mostly cited dimension in the literature (Fredricks et al., 2004). The term is described by Harris (2008) as learning with an aim to reach goals in life and giving value to learning. In another study, Hiver et al. (2024) refer to cognitive engagement as the students' mental effort and activity while learning. On the other hand, according to Reeve (2012), it is the students' use of learning strategies during the activities.

With reference to language learning, Svalberg (2009) stated that the features of cognitively engaged language learners are being alert, having focused attention, problem solving and constructing own knowledge. She also suggested some questions to direct the researcher in measuring the cognitive engagement of individuals: 'How alert?', 'How focused?', 'How reflective?', and 'How critical/analytical?' are the questions to find out how cognitively engaged the language learners are. Even though cognitive engagement cannot be directly observable or measurable in the language classroom, it can be measured by investigating what learners produce while listening, reading, writing or speaking in the target language (Oga-Baldwin, 2019).

1.2.1.2 Affective Engagement

It is believed that aspects of engagement are interdependent; therefore, a close relationship is existent between emotional and cognitive engagement (Svalberg, 2017). Emotional engagement is known to affect the willingness of the learners in their works (Fredricks et al., 2004). In another study, Reeve (2012) described emotional engagement as the existence of task-facilitating emotions, such as enthusiasm and the absence of task-withdrawing emotions, such as anger and anxiety.

From the perspectives of Hiver et al. (2024), emotional engagement in L2 instructional settings refers to learners' affective reactions while they are participating in language-related activities or tasks. On the other hand, Svalberg (2009) argues that emotionally engaged individuals have positive and autonomous disposition towards language learning. She also claims that willingness to interact with the language or the interlocutor is affected by affective engagement. From her standpoint, 'How willing to engage?', 'How purposeful?' and 'How autonomous?' are the questions that can be used to identify students' level of emotional

engagement. She also maintains that emotional engagement in general can include both negative and positive reactions to the teachers, classmates, academics and school, and it is generally supposed to create bonds with an institution.

1.2.1.3 Social Engagement

Social engagement receiving the least attention in ELT requires the following: participating in cooperative learning activities, peer discussions, group work and communicating with the teacher as well as classmates (Hınız & Çelik, 2025).

Socially engaged language learners are known to be initiating and interactive in that they are expected to initiate and maintain the interaction (Svalberg, 2009), and they do not tend to prefer working on their own (Svalberg & Askham, 2020). The questions suggested by Svalberg (2009) for identifying social aspects of engagement and socially engaged language learners are as follows: ‘How interactive?’, ‘How supportive?’, and ‘Leader or follower?’.

Since the dimensions of engagement are interconnected to each other, socially engaged learners are also known to display higher emotional engagement (Hınız & Çelik, 2025).

1.2.1.4 Behavioral Engagement

Positive conduct, involvement in learning and academic tasks and involvement in school-related activities make up the dimension of behavioral engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004). Positive conduct, effort and participation are the signs of behavioral engagement, and it is considered the dimension which is the easiest to observe and measure (Appleton et al., 2008). Participating in classroom activities and obeying the school rules are other signs of behavioral engagement; thus, it is highlighted that when the learners are behaviorally engaged, learning occurs (Harris, 2008). According to Reeve (2012) and Hiver et al. (2024), on-task attention and concentration, high effort and higher task persistence in learning are the indicators of behavioral engagement.

1.2.1.5 Agentic Engagement

Agentic engagement, another dimension of engagement that attracted less attention than the other dimensions in the ELT research history, is regarded as a newly introduced aspect of engagement in the literature and refers to the power of learners to initiate ways to gain academic success (Reeve, 2013). Enriching the

learning experience actively, proactive, intentional, and constructive involvement into learning activities, such as making suggestions in learning, asking questions, stating opinions and interests are the indicators of this dimension (Reeve, 2012).

Specifically, about language learning, Hınız and Çelik (2025) proposed that agentic language learners set their own learning goals, involve in class discussions, try to find opportunities to practice the language outside the classroom, display autonomy and enthusiasm in their language learning process.

1.3 Engagement and Motivation

Motivation and engagement have been studied in the relevant literature to explain the role of engagement in gaining desired outcomes and increased motivation in the language learning processes. According to Ginting (2021), motivation is a promoting and encouraging aspect of learners' active participation in classroom activities, and it is the willingness to learn something new.

The distinction between engagement and motivation was clearly explained by Reeve (2012) who claims that motivation is a special unobservable psychological, neural, and biological process which is an antecedent of engagement; in other words, motivation is the unobservable cause of observable engagement. Motivation is thought to be semantically close to engagement by Svalberg (2009). The relationship between the two has also been studied in various contexts. To illustrate, Reeve and Lee (2014) found out that students' engagement predicted their motivation in a Korean high school setting. In another study, Oga-Baldwin and Nakata (2017) tried to reveal the connection between engagement and motivation in a Japanese elementary school setting. It was observed in the study that engagement predicted the intrinsically regulated motives; however, extrinsic motives were predicted negatively. In the study, it was also revealed that in terms of gender, male students displayed low internally motives; on the contrary, they displayed high externally regulated motives.

In another study, Pandey (2025) explored how ELT teachers improve engagement among secondary school students by implementing motivational strategies. A qualitative approach was conducted, and semi-structured interviews as well as classroom observations of the teachers were utilized to collect data in the study. The key strategies found in the study as a means of fostering student engagement and motivation in language teaching are as follows: personalized

learning, creating supportive classroom environment, promoting autonomy, using technology to increase engagement, enabling peer collaboration and providing clear and timely feedback. According to Pandey (2025), these are some strategies that can positively influence unengaging and unmotivated learners, and thus enhance students' sense of ownership as well as enthusiasm among the students.

Investigating individual differences and motivational characteristics in language learning, Gardner (1985) stated that motivation is a broad construct with its cognitive, affective and conative features, and motivated individuals demonstrate high engagement in the language learning process. His socio-educational model of second language acquisition depends on beliefs such as the following: ability and motivation are two individual characteristics which have an important role in language achievement; individual differences in motivation can be affected by environmental characteristics such as culture, personal features and educational background (Gardner, 2006). According to Sundqvist (2024), language acquisition occurs not only in formal contexts (e.g., language classrooms and language labs) but also in informal settings which can motivate language learners (e.g., television, internet and social settings); moreover, formal and informal language contexts have the potential to lead to both linguistic outcomes (e.g., reading, writing and oral production) and non-linguistic outcomes (e.g., language attitudes, willingness to communicate and self-confidence).

Some important theories that are related to motivation, and thus engagement have also been proposed in the literature. For instance, transformative theory proposed by Mezirow (1991) is based on the analysis of how adults learn to make meaning of their learning experience. According to Mezirow (1991), transformative learning refers to the process of affecting change in a frame of reference, and it improves autonomous thinking. Also, the process leads to elaborating an existing opinion, establishing new opinions, transforming opinions and transforming ethnocentric habits of mind by being reflective of own generalized preconceptions. From Mezirow's perspective, teachers can pave the way for students to be critical of their own and others' assumptions and to set objectives that contain autonomous and discovery learning.

Likewise, self-determination theory is based on the following premises: people have certain psychological needs such as competence, autonomy and relatedness, and self-motivation and mental health increase when these needs are

met, whereas motivation and well-being decrease if these needs are insufficiently addressed (Reeve, 2012). By considering the functional and experimental differences between self-motivation and external regulation, the theory identified different types of motivation resulting in learning, performance, personal experience and well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Furthermore, Legault (2017) stated that the theory outlines very clear, detailed, dynamic and verifiable strategies that can be applicable to the needs and motivation of language learners.

Finally, another related theory is Dörnyei's self-theory. According to Dörnyei (2005), motivation is the primary impetus to start the L2 learning process. From his perspective, long term goals cannot be achieved without having a sufficient level of motivation. When a language learner is motivated to learn the language, a successful engagement learning process is likely to follow (Dörnyei, 2009). Dörnyei (2005) claims that the theory focuses on the L2 Motivational Self System which is composed of three primary components: The first component is the ideal L2 self that reflects the image of a person who aspires to be a self-assured and proficient user of a second language. Because these learners wish to bridge the gap between their current self and their desired self, this concept inspires them. Secondly, ought-to L2 self covers the attributes enabling individuals to believe that they should possess in order to live up to the expectations of others or to keep away from negative outcomes such as social or familial pressure. Thirdly, L2 learning experience refers to the situational factors that are dominant in the learners' surroundings including the curriculum, the way teachers provide feedback and the impact that classmates have on them.

1.4 Student Engagement and Language Learning Achievement

Student engagement and its academic outcomes have recently attracted researchers' attention, and the positive outcomes of student engagement in language learning has been well documented in the literature (Dinçer et al., 2019). For instance, Finn and Cox (1992) studied the relationship between students' active participation and achievement, and the results showed that the group who performed more highly had significantly higher scores in achievement tests. In other studies, Marks (2000) and Fredricks et al. (2004) found that successful students are indeed more engaged learners with positive academic outcomes. Likewise, other studies reached the conclusion that student engagement predicts

course achievement (Ginting, 2021; Hu & Kuh, 2001; Reeve & Lee, 2014). Similar research results have been obtained in the Turkish context. For example, Karabıyık (2019) discovered that all kinds of engagement have positive correlation with the students' exam results in a university setting in Türkiye.

The relationship between student engagement and language achievement was also emphasized by Svalberg (2009) who asserts that engagement could provide ways of justifying why some linguistic or language-related behaviors and attitudes facilitate language learning more than others. From her perspective, involvement, commitment and motivation are the notions that have some similarities with engagement; however, engagement is a more encompassing construct. Another ELT-related research conducted in a university setting by Dinçer et al. (2017) showed a relationship between higher course achievement and higher engagement level in Türkiye. It was concluded in the study that the students with higher achievement, higher attendance and intrinsic motivation had higher classroom engagement than other students. In a more recent study, Eren and Rakıcıoğlu-Söylemez (2023) revealed that the relationship between perceived instrumentality and graded performance was partly mediated by agentic engagement.

In conclusion, most of the studies reviewed above have been conducted in university settings; however, there is a limited number of studies pertaining to young learners' engagement with foreign language learning in secondary school contexts (Hınız & Çelik, 2025). When we consider the strong relationship between student engagement and language learning achievement, young EFL learners' engagement levels should be considered and investigated as well. Therefore, the current study delves into the engagement of a group of secondary school EFL learners in a public school in Türkiye.

After the presentation of the relevant international and national studies as well as the studies related to young language learners' engagement in the next section, the purpose of the current study will be explained in more depth.

1.5 Related Research

1.5.1 International Studies on Student Engagement

It is widely accepted that keeping students active in education processes is vital, and active involvement is a must for the development of the child (Dewey, 2018). As a result, educational researchers have always been interested in the causes of lack of engagement and ways of increasing student engagement in the classroom. To illustrate, Finn (1989) explored the concept of student engagement and the reasons for school dropouts in American public schools. He found that the failure of youngsters to participate in school and class activities and to develop a sense of identification with school have negative effects on their dropouts.

In another study, Finn and Cox (1992) explored student participation in learning activities and past school achievement among fourth grade elementary school students by dividing the participants into three groups (i.e., active participants, passive participants and non-participants). The students in the study were rated by their teachers by using a questionnaire, and these groups were compared in different areas for a period of three years. The close relationship between achievement and participation in the first three years was found essential for learning to occur. According to these researchers, participation in school and in class in early ages may prevent future problems, such as truancy and drop out.

In a similar vein, Marks (2000) collected data from elementary, middle and high school students in mathematics and social science classes. The study uncovered the contribution of students' background to their engagement in instructional activities and revealed the effects of school reform initiatives to improve students' learning. In addition, the subject matter was found to be influential on students' engagement in instructional activities.

In another study, Harris (2008) explored teacher conceptions of student engagement in learning. According to the researcher, most of the research studies delving into the concept of student engagement were quantitative, and these studies cannot always explain how people make sense of this concept. Therefore, qualitative research design was used in her study to get a more complete understanding of the concept from the perspective of teachers. Six different conceptions of engagement were revealed, which shows that teachers do not have unified mental perceptions regarding the student engagement.

Keen et al. (2011) investigated the positive learning outcome of affective engagement on young learners. They developed a questionnaire to identify the strategies that can be useful for the teachers to increase their students' engagement and to have control in the classroom. Some of the proposed strategies are as follows: intensive teaching, task selection, goal-directed learning, teacher responsiveness and learning-environment planning.

Investigating the relationship between student engagement and motivation, Reeve and Lee (2014) tried out the hypothesis that naturally occurring changes in classroom engagement lead to longitudinal changes in students' motivation. The participants of the study were Korean high school students. The four aspects of engagement (i.e., behavioral, emotional, cognitive aspects) were explored in the study. It was stated that the changes in engagement predict the changes in motivation as well as changes in psychological need satisfaction, self-efficacy, and mastery goals.

In another study, Philp and Duchesne (2016) aimed to clarify the term engagement in task-based interaction among language learners. In this review article, they presented an overview of the term and reviewed it in task-based interaction settings. They concluded that task-based teachers and researchers generally acknowledge the importance of engagement in learning; however, they suggest that further research studies should deal with the concept of student engagement in specific contexts as the interpretation of it can vary from participants to participants or from tasks to tasks.

Likewise, Oga-Baldwin and Nakata (2017) aim to find out the relationship between engagement and motivation while learning a new language in a Japanese elementary school. The survey used in the study was completed by the students at the beginning of the term and at the end of the term to measure their engagement and motivation. Students were also observed, and their behaviors were rated. At the end of the term, the students who were engaged in the language learning process were found to be significantly more motivated. Also, boys were found to show a tendency toward lower engagement, lower internally regulated motives and higher externally regulated motives. Therefore, it is suggested by the researchers that teachers should create a more engaging classroom environment to have long-term motivation, and thus positive effects on the English language learning process.

In another study, Tsang (2017) investigated the relationship between learners' engagement and teachers' proficiency. Classroom observations, teacher interviews as well as interviews with proficient tertiary level EFL students were utilized. Native English teachers and non-native English teachers' general language proficiencies and their teaching success were found to be operationalized by learners' engagement. It was also recommended that general linguistic competence has an important role in ELT classroom, and there should be proficiency thresholds for English language teachers.

Svalberg (2017) focused on the meaning of engagement in the field of educational and applied linguistics. She also discussed the interactions of affective and cognitive factors in research studies. From her perspective, in engagement research, meaningfulness is little-known but a very important component, and the age (i.e., developmental stage of the learner) influences meaningfulness. In another review article, Oga-Baldwin (2019) considers engagement as a vital construct to understand the microcosm of the second and foreign language learning classrooms and concludes that through a clear understanding of the engagement processes in a language classroom, language teachers can take action, and thus pave the way for their students to have a smooth entrance to the linguistic world.

Examining the learner engagement by using a narrative inquiry, Zhang (2020) aimed to find out how the learners engage with language learning while learning Cantonese as a second language and the contextual as well as individual factors that affect learners' engagement. In the learning process, three stages of language acquisition were observed: early production and experimentation period, continued development period and communicative competence period. Behavioral, affective and cognitive engagements were identified in each stage in the study. It was also discovered that the combination of these three types of engagement with second language learning goals leads to successful language learning outcomes.

In a study delving into the relationship between learner engagement and feedback, Shi (2021) intended to uncover how learner engagement is affected by three feedback types on L2 writing across different genres. Behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement and affective engagement were focused on in the study. It was revealed that there are some individual factors in learner engagement, and feedback and the dimensions of engagement are interconnected. Furthermore, taking the contextual factors into account while providing feedback and using

automated feedback while giving teacher and peer feedback were recommended in the study.

Pertaining to online and offline student engagement, Ginting (2021) reviewed the factors affecting engagement in both settings. He concluded that students in both online and offline settings can become successful when they can manage their time effectively, learn new subjects collaboratively with peers and learn to benefit from constructive criticisms by their friends and teachers. Delving into student engagement in online learning in the pandemic period, Pratiwi and Priyanka (2023) also concentrated on the factors preventing learners from engagement in online learning from the perspective of both students and the teachers. They suggested that when the barriers in online learning engagement are investigated and dealt with, both students and teachers can perform more effectively.

Another study dealing with online Chinese EFL learners' engagement was carried out by Sun et al. (2023) who explored the relationship between teacher scaffolding, teacher respect and EFL learners' engagement. The participants were online language learners from colleges and universities in China. Questionnaires were used to collect data, and it was revealed that teacher scaffolding and teacher respect affect learners' engagement in online classes. It was also uncovered that there is a correlation between teacher scaffolding, teacher respect and EFL learners' engagement in online classes.

In another study regarding online student engagement, Acosta-Manzano and Mercer (2024) examined teachers' beliefs about adult learners' engagement. The study dealt with how teachers conceive student engagement in adult language education and what their beliefs are about the characteristics of student engagement. The participants were nine English teachers in Austria and Spain. The data analysis yielded the finding that teachers' beliefs influence their practices, and they need training to increase their students' engagement in online classes.

Looking into student engagement in English language classroom activities in an Egyptian preparatory school, Mekki et al. (2022) studied four dimensions of engagement (i.e., behavioral, affective, social and cognitive engagement) by utilizing a mixed method research design. A scale was administered to students, and structured interviews were conducted with teachers in the study. It was found that students suffer from disengagement, and the teachers were not satisfied with the

disengaged students because of classroom management problems. It was also concluded that the rate of disengaged behaviors increases as students get older.

Focusing on motivation and engagement in foreign language learning in China, Li et al. (2022) examined four language learner profiles (i.e., ‘Demotivated and Disengaged’, ‘Motivated and Engaged’, ‘Demotivated but Engaged’ and ‘Moderately Engaged’). It was revealed that demographic factors, such as age, gender and years of learning English predict the profile membership, and male students were generally found to be in the groups of ‘Demotivated but Engaged’ and ‘Demotivated and Disengaged’ groups. On the other hand, older learners were in the ‘Moderately Motivated and Engaged’ and ‘Demotivated but Engaged’ groups.

In a more recent study, Hasdina et al. (2024) delved into the engagement types that occurred in the language learning process of 8th grade students in an Indonesian high school. It was found out that students used cognitive engagement the most, which was followed by behavioral engagement and affective engagement. The five factors, namely school level, teacher support, peers, classroom structure, and tasks characteristics were the factors that have an impact on student engagement. The most important factor was found to be the teacher support factor.

1.5.2 Studies on Student Engagement in Türkiye

There have been many studies both in the general education field and the field of EFL in Türkiye. One of these studies by Günüç and Kuzu (2015) who focused on the factors that influence student engagement and the effects of technology on student engagement. They found that the incorporation of technology in teaching activities plays a vital role in increasing student engagement.

Dinçer et al. (2017) examined the association between multidimensional classroom engagement and some variables, namely course achievement, course absence and motivational orientation to learn English. The participants were EFL learners from a public Turkish university. A self-report questionnaire was used to collect data. The data analysis demonstrated that the highly engaged students in the courses are the most successful ones, and the students who have higher classroom engagement have higher attendance in addition to intrinsic motivation.

In another study, Student Engagement Scale and Student Trust in Professors Scale prepared by Özer et al. (2015) were utilized to collect data from university

students. It was discovered in the study that female students trust in professors and engage in the classroom activities more.

Using an observational study design, Devrim (2018) explored student engagement in a private high school setting through self-determination theory. The relationship between teachers' instructional behavior and student engagement (i.e., behavioral, emotional, cognitive and agentic engagement) was dealt with. It was revealed that while there is a relationship between teachers' relatedness support and behavioral, emotional and agentic engagement, the relationship between relatedness support and provision of structure was not observed in emotional engagement.

Investigating the role of engagement in the self-system model of motivational development as a mediator between context and the self and academically relevant outcomes, Dinçer et al. (2019) collected data from university EFL students. Mixed-methods design was used, and it was discovered that students whose psychological needs were satisfied had higher engagement levels. It was also found that higher cognitive engagement is related to less absenteeism, and higher emotional and agentic engagement are related to higher academic achievement.

Another study was conducted by Talan and Gülseçen (2019) aiming to compare flipped classroom with blended learning and face to face learning environments. The effects of these environments on students' achievements, academic engagement and satisfaction levels were also sought in the study. The research was conducted in a university setting by means of the 'Academic Engagement Scale' used to assess students' academic engagement levels. The researchers concluded that the flipped classroom has a positive effect on the students' academic achievements and engagements.

The relationship between student engagement and achievement was also explored by Karabıyık (2019) whose participants were the students at an intensive English language program of a preparatory school in a Turkish university. A student engagement scale was utilized to evaluate in and out of class engagement behaviors. Students' midterm results were also used to assess their English language achievement. As a result, it was concluded that there is a positive correlation between the students' exam scores and all types of student engagement.

Another study carried out in a university setting by Karafil and Oğuz (2019) who had the main objective to find out the engagement level of students in foreign

language preparatory classes and the factors affecting their engagement. A classroom engagement scale which was developed by Eryılmaz (2014) for university students was used. The researchers focused on behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement and emotional engagement. They also tried to investigate students' perceptions of teacher-provided autonomy support, the relationship between perceived autonomy support and students' engagement level. It was uncovered that emotional engagement and cognitive engagement were at a high level, and behavioral engagement was at a moderate level. The autonomy support from the teacher was also at a high level. This autonomy support from the teachers caused the increase of the students' engagement level. Therefore, the role of the teachers to raise student engagement in the classroom was emphasized by the researchers in the study.

In another study, Oruç (2020) studied the mediating role of student engagement and the relationship between foreign language anxiety and English language achievement in a university's preparation class. Foreign language classroom engagement scale, language engagement scale and students' English language exam scores were used to collect data. As a result of the study, the mediating role of student engagement in EFL classes was observed.

In a similar vein, Bodur (2021) delved into the relationship between perceived instructional environment, student engagement and English course achievement in a secondary school setting including 6th grade students. The relationship between demographic features and achievement was also investigated. The engagement scale prepared by Reeve and Tseng (2011) was utilized to gather data in the study. To measure English course achievement, an achievement test was also used. As a result, it was found out that there is a positive significant relationship between the perceived instructional environment, student engagement and achievement. English course achievement was also found to differ depending on some variables, such as gender, the education levels of parents, participation in projects and frequency of reading a book.

Additionally, Eren and Rakıcıoğlu-Söylemez (2023) studied the relationships between EFL learners' language mindsets and graded performance by considering the mediating roles of students' perceived instrumentality and four dimensions of engagement with English classes. The participants were university students in a state university. An exploratory correlational design was used. It was

found out that agentic engagement and perceived instrumentality predicted the graded performance of the learners. The students' incremental mindsets were also found to be related to their graded performance in EFL learning.

In another study, Kartal (2023) examined the level of EFL learners' engagement, foreign language motivation, and foreign language anxiety in a university setting during online and hybrid education periods. Another aim was to reveal whether factors such as gender and university type are influential. The participants were university students, and the research design was mixed method design. It was found that online learners were more engaged and motivated. Female learners were also found to be more engaged in both online and hybrid education period than male learners. Girls were also more motivated in online courses. The only negative predictor of achievement was anxiety in two education modes.

Likewise, Berber (2023) studied engagement in a mixed method design in a university setting to find out the relationship between teacher autonomy support and four aspects of student engagement (i.e., behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and agentic engagement). The extent to which student engagement explains the variance in perceived teacher autonomy support was also focused. The longitudinal increase of teacher autonomy support in relation to student engagement was investigated as well. A significant relationship was discovered between teacher autonomy support and student engagement. The result demonstrated that only agentic engagement showed the differences in teacher autonomy support. It was also revealed that perceived teacher autonomy support was not explained by student engagement, and there were some other factors affecting student engagement and teacher autonomy support.

In a more recent study, Hınız and Çelik (2025) made a bibliometric and content analysis of student engagement in the field of ELT. The data was received from the Web of Science and Scopus databases. The methodological and conceptual characteristics of the obtained articles were dealt with. It was discovered that there is an increase in the number of articles pertaining to student engagement in the field of ELT. The research gaps on some topics were also mentioned in the article; for example, the definition and the differences of engagement types need to be clarified.

1.5.3 Young Learners and Engagement

The engagement of young learners in their language courses have also been studied in different contexts. For example, Huang et al. (2017) adopted digital story telling in language learning to increase motivation and engagement at different proficiency levels of young learners. The study examined how students at different language proficiency levels engaged in collaborative digital story telling activities and examined their engagement patterns, learning strategies and storytelling performance by using a mixed method research design. The data were collected from the students in an urban elementary school in Taiwan. The results revealed that students' proficiency level has an influence on students' engagement patterns, language learning strategies and pair performance.

In a similar vein, Setiawan et al. (2019) aimed to describe the students' engagement in the creative teaching practices by using a qualitative research method. The researchers observed and recorded 7th grade students' engagement, and their behaviors were categorized as 'engaged' or 'disengaged'. A correlation between creative teaching practice and student engagement was revealed in the study, and it was recommended that creative teaching practices can improve student engagement.

Minalla (2023) aimed to reveal whether personalizing classroom activities by means of meaningful and realistic situation can encourage beginner EFL students. The data were collected via a pre- and post-test in addition to interviews with students' parents. The study found out that the experimental group that employed personalized learning methods outperformed participants in the control group whose class used a traditional method based on the one-size-fits-all instruction. It was suggested that using personalized learning is an effective way of stimulating EFL learners to initiate speaking; therefore, EFL teachers should use personalized classroom activities to engage them in verbal classroom activities.

In another study concentrating on young learners' engagement, Azkarai and Kopinska (2020) explored the patterns of interaction and the level of engagement. The data were collected from 62 young EFL learners during a written dictogloss task. The findings demonstrated that learners showed positive attitudes towards the dictogloss task, which reveals the benefits of collaborative tasks and dictogloss tasks for young learners.

To create a more interesting, lively and more engaging learning atmosphere for young learners by using game-based learning tools during online teaching sessions, Lastari et al. (2020) analyzed the use of Quizizz in the classroom. According to the researchers, teaching English to young learners in online classes can be challenging because they often have difficulty in focusing their attention after a certain period. They collected data from a group of 5th and 6th graders by using observations, questionnaires and interviews. The result of the study revealed that students generally hold positive attitudes towards Quizizz which was also found to be effective in enabling students' engagement in online English courses.

Another study dealing with young EFL learners' engagement in foreign language classes during the past pandemic period was carried out by Hung (2022). Their teachers responded to an online questionnaire dealing with students' engagement before the pandemic and at present as well as the challenges of online flipped learning and suggestions for more effective ways of keeping learners more engaged. The study indicated that learning environment in the post-pandemic period is safe and positive; moreover, the period offered new opportunities for appropriate adaptations of engagement practices in foreign language classes.

Likewise, Chen and Cai (2022) aimed to reveal young EFL students' engagement in online EFL courses based on four dimensions (i.e., emotional, behavioral, cognitive and agentic engagement). The data were collected from young learners and their mothers. As a result of the data analysis, a complex relationship was uncovered among the four dimensions of engagement; however, agentic engagement was not found to be the predictor of cognitive engagement. On the other hand, the researchers revealed other factors affecting engagement in online classes, such as students' motivation, goal orientation, teachers' praise and parental involvement.

A systematic review on young learners' engagement in vocabulary learning through games and learning applications was conducted by Firliantama and Rokhayani (2023). They discussed the benefits of games and learning applications in vocabulary learning. The data were collected from different sources of articles, and it was discovered that using games and learning applications improve vocabulary learning. It was also found that some of the most used applications and games are Wordwall, Quizizz and Quizlet.

Investigating EFL teachers' perceptions of young learners' engagement to ensure effective learning and teaching practices, Kieu and Hung (2023) collected data from young EFL learners through an online questionnaire and semi structured interviews. The study revealed that the learners were not emotionally engaged in listening classes although they were behaviorally and cognitively engaged; as a result, supporting classroom environment and incorporating activities related to learners' interest and emotions into the classroom were recommended.

In a more recent study, Yuan and Dao (2025) explored young learners and their teachers' perceptions of online learner engagement by focusing on the definitions, influential factors and the strategies to increase engagement. Semi structured interviews, classroom video stimulated recalls and questionnaires were utilized to collect data. The study demonstrated that learners and their teachers have different perspectives, and they generally consider online learner engagement as multifaceted. Although both groups believe that engagement can be observable, there may be pseudo-engagement which makes it difficult to determine.

1.6 Purpose of the Research

The current study aims to find out secondary school students' engagement level (i.e., cognitive engagement, affective engagement and social engagement) in English language classes depending on certain variables (i.e., gender, grade level, English language course achievement score). Additionally, it has the objective to reveal teachers' observations about students' engagement levels in English language classes as well as suggestions to improve students' engagement level.

1.7 Research Questions

In this study, answers to the following three questions were sought:

1. What is the overall engagement level of secondary school EFL learners?
2. Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of gender?
3. Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of grade level?
4. Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of English language course achievement scores?

5. What do English language teachers think about their students' affective engagement, cognitive engagement and social engagement in their lessons?

1.8 Limitations

This research is limited to the perceptions of EFL learners and their teachers in a public secondary school in the Central Anatolia region of Türkiye.

1.9 Statement of the Problem

It is observed by the researcher of the current study that secondary school students generally tend to keep a low profile and do not take active part in classroom activities. They mostly prefer listening to the teacher or expect the teacher to do most of the talking during English classes. Therefore, the topic of this research study was shaped in line with the researcher's interest as a teacher. The aim of the study is to reveal the student engagement patterns among secondary schoolers so that some suggestions can be made to deal with the lack of student engagement and to increase their engagement. This is deemed to be important because student engagement is known to be a strong predictor of achievement in the relevant literature (Ginting, 2021; Hu & Kuh, 2001; Reeve & Lee 2014; Svalberg, 2009).

In parallel with the researcher's observation, the Turkish ELT community is striving to justify why English language learning is not very successful and why Türkiye is often ranked a low proficient country in international reports by EF EPI (2024). According to a report published in 2013, the reason lies in the curricula which fail to consider varying needs and levels of students and neglect communication in the English language classroom (British Council & Tepav, 2013). Similarly, especially with speaking English in the classroom, both teacher and students have a problem, and it is generally associated with the foreign language policy of the country (Dağtan & Cabaroğlu, 2021). Even though necessary precautions and actions are taken by the MoNE and despite many hours of foreign language classes till graduation from the university, students proficiency levels do not increase significantly (Oruç, 2020; Savucu, 2024). Lowering the English language learning age, designing a new national English curriculum and developing more effective coursebooks were some of the actions taken by the Ministry; however, these are not sufficient to come to the desired level of proficiency in

Türkiye (Tuzcu Eken, 2021). Therefore, the current study has the main objective to uncover EFL learners' engagement patterns depending on different variables in a secondary school environment as it is believed that the students' participation can be one of the solutions to problems encountered in EFL classes in our country.

The study is significant as it delves into a novel concept, student engagement, which has not been thoroughly studied (Hınız & Günüş, 2025). Although a wide range of research was carried out about student engagement in different fields, there is a limited number of research studies in the field of foreign language or second language settings both in Türkiye and in other contexts (Dinçer et al., 2017; Philp & Duchesne, 2016). Moreover, as Hiver et al. (2024) point out, most of the research pertaining to engagement has been conducted in university settings with adult learners. These researchers also state that when the number of research studies about student engagement are considered in 20 years of language engagement research, it is realized that younger participants make up the minority, and only 14.3% of the research participants were the secondary school students. Thus, the participants of the present study are secondary school EFL learners in a public school in the Central Anatolia region of Türkiye.

Moreover, teachers' views about EFL learners' engagement in Türkiye has often been a neglected area (Çakır Sarı, 2023). To the best knowledge of the researcher, there has not been a study involving teachers' perspectives and suggestions about student engagement in the Turkish EFL setting. Therefore, English language teachers of the participating students were also interviewed in the current study as they are the ones who know how to create an active and dialogic learning atmosphere in the classroom (Walsh, 2011). Their suggestions are expected to lead to better student engagement in the context of the present study and in other public secondary school contexts similar to the current one.

2. MATERIALS and METHOD

This section presents the research design, population and sample, data collection tools, data collection and analysis procedures as well participant demographics.

2.1 Research Design

Mixed methods research design is used for the present study. It is defined as an approach that involves collecting, analysing, and intentionally integrating qualitative and quantitative data in a study (Toraman, 2021). According to Creswell and Clark (2017), both qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analyzed in mixed method studies by integrating these data, and their results are used to respond to the research questions and hypothesis. They also claim that through triangulation, which is generally defined as using multiple datasets, researchers can deal with the research bias arising from utilizing only a single dataset and increase the validity of their findings by collecting data by means of different tools. Among basic mixed methods design, a convergent design was adopted for the present study as the quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed over a similar time period (Fetters et al., 2013).

Quantitatively, this research study investigated a group of secondary school students' engagement level in English language classes depending on different variables in a state secondary school in the Central Anatolia region. To seek answers to the research questions 1-4, students responded to the Language Learner Engagement Scale designed by Oruç and Demirci (2020). The quantitative data were collected by this scale consisting of Likert-type items which allow respondents to reflect their views in a standardized manner and to express different degrees of opinion instead of binary options (Koo & Yang, 2025).

On the other hand, qualitative data were collected through semi structured interviews to capture teachers' opinions and suggestions regarding their students' engagement in English language classes. The semi-structured interview format was selected because it paves the way for deeper analysis of specific issues, and the interviewer has the flexibility to use linguistics nuances and can make classifications when needed during the interviews (Berg, 2009; Dörnyei, 2007).

2.2 Population and Sample

The data were collected from 649 volunteer secondary school students enrolled at a state secondary school in the Central Anatolia region of Türkiye. Their grade levels ranged from 5th to 8th grades. Additionally, five English language teachers in the same school volunteered to take part in individual face-to-face semi-structured interviews.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

2.3.1 Language Learner Engagement Scale

The quantitative data were collected by the Language Learner Engagement Scale (Oruç & Demirci, 2020) (Appendix 1). The scale was developed in Turkish as a 5-point Likert type scale including 18 items in three factors (i.e., affective, cognitive and social engagement). While preparing the scale to measure students' engagement levels in English language classes, the researchers took the key characteristics of language learner engagement and the theoretical model proposed by Svalberg (2009) as a basis to label the three factors in their scale. According to Oruç (2020), although different dimensions of engagement have been addressed in the literature on foreign language education, the concept of engagement has been operationally defined in few studies or is generally focused as a single dimension. Instead, Svalberg (2009) suggested an operational definition of the term in language teaching by stating three dimensions of engagement. Therefore, Oruç and Demirci (2020) labelled the factors in their scale as affective engagement, cognitive engagement and social engagement.

In the Language Learner Engagement Scale, there are 18 items, six of which are categorized in the affective engagement dimension (e.g., I am willing to attend English classes). In the cognitive engagement dimension, there are seven items (e.g., I find out the rules by examining the language structures in English classes), and five items are present in the social engagement dimension (e.g., I communicate with my friends to learn English better). Items 1-6 are for affective engagement, items 7-13 are for cognitive engagement, and items 14-18 are for social engagement. Participants rated items on a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), and the scale scores interpreted by the originators of the scale are

as follows: 1.00-1.80 = a very low level, 1.81-2.60 = a low level, 2.61-3.40 = a moderate level, 3.41-4.20 = a high level, 4.21-5.00 = a very high level.

The internal consistency assessment carried out by Oruç and Demirci (2020) about the scale showed that the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient is $\alpha = .86$. On the other hand, for individual dimensions, it was found that the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient is .76 for the cognitive engagement, .83 for the affective engagement and .73 for the social engagement dimension.

2.3.2 Demographics Information Form

The scale starts with self-reported background information questions, such as students' gender, grade level and the English language course achievement score written in the first term school report. This demographic information part was designed by the researcher.

2.3.3 Semi-structured interviews

The qualitative data were collected through the semi structured interviews. Semi structured interview questions (Appendix 2) were conducted in Turkish to obtain data from five English language teachers teaching in the same school where the quantitative data were collected. The interview questions were developed by the researcher in parallel with the scale items. The aim of these questions is to elicit teachers' opinions about students' engagement levels in each dimension focused on in the scale and to discover their suggestions to enhance students' engagement in the English language classroom.

After the interview questions were prepared, two lecturers with PhD in ELT and a lecturer in the field of educational sciences were conferred with to check whether the questions were compatible with the dimensions of the scale. Also, an English teacher investigated the interview questions to determine whether the questions were clear to understand. Necessary revisions were made in line with their feedback, and 13 semi-structured interview questions for English language teachers (questions 1-4: affective engagement; questions 5-8: cognitive engagement; questions 9-13: social engagement) were finalized as follows:

1. Do you think students are willing to participate in English classes? Why/why not?
2. Do you think students' attitudes towards the English they have learnt is positive? Why/why not?
3. Do you think students aim to make progress in English classes? Why/why not?
4. What do you suggest to enable your students to approach English in a positive manner?
5. Do you think students are focused during English classes? Why/why not?
6. Do you think students question the English language? Why/why not?
7. Do you think students are aware of their knowledge of the English language? Why/why not?
8. What do you suggest to enable your students to participate in English classes by being more mentally active?
9. Do you think students interact with each other in English in English classes? Why/why not?
10. Do the students have suggestions for English classes? Why/why not?
11. Do the students ask lesson-related questions to their friends or the teacher during English classes? Why/why not?
12. Do the students believe they can use the English they have learnt in the class in their lives? Why/why not?
13. What do you suggest to enable your students to interact with their peers in English classes?

2.4 Collection of Data

Permission to use the Language Learner Engagement Scale was obtained from Oruç (2020). Then, an application was made to the university's research ethics committee, and the research was approved to be appropriate to the ethical guidelines. On the other hand, an application was made to the MoNE for permission, and the permission was obtained to conduct the necessary procedures with the secondary school students in the context of the study. The scale was distributed to each class after giving necessary information to the students. The

scales were distributed by the researcher to each class at appropriate times agreed upon by the school administration in order not to disrupt the flow of the lessons. It took approximately five minutes for students to fill out the scales.

On the other hand, the interview session times with five English teachers were decided upon by the individual teachers and the researcher depending on their availability. Each interview, which was recorded for later analysis, lasted 10 to 20 minutes.

2.5 Analysis of Data

The quantitative data were analysed by using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. During the analysis, the descriptive statistics were examined. Then, reliability analysis of the responses was carried out to check whether the data was suitable for analysis. After that, normality test was carried out to determine whether the methods to be used were parametric or non-parametric. Afterwards, the frequencies and percentages showing level of agreement for each scale item was calculated. Then, significance tests and correlational analysis were carried out for relational analysis. Significance level (p) was 0.05 in all analysis. It is accepted that there is a statistical significance when the p level is below 0.05; otherwise, it is considered that there is no statistical significance (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017). T-test was used to uncover whether gender and English language course achievement influence student engagement in English language classes. Besides, ANOVA was utilized to find out whether students' grade level has an impact on classroom engagement.

For the qualitative data analysis, content analysis was used to analyse the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The recorded interviews were transcribed first. Then, the data were read and re-read carefully to grasp a general understanding of what the teachers mentioned during the interviews about students' engagement levels and possible ways to increase their engagement in the English language classroom. All the relevant quotations related to each interview question are presented and common patterns emerging as a result of the analysis are summarized. Codes (e.g., Teacher 1: T1) were assigned to maintain participant anonymity.

2.6 Participant Demographics

In this study, the data were collected from 649 participants for the quantitative part. The participants' demographic data were received by using the Demographic Information Form which was created by the researcher. The participants were secondary school EFL learners of different grades. Of the 649 participants, 314 participants were female and 335 were male. In addition, 143 students were 5th graders, 166 were 6th graders, 157 were 7th graders and 183 were 8th graders. When their first term English language course achievement scores were considered, 74 students were categorized as low-achievers (i.e., self-reported English language course achievement score written in their first term school report was below 50) and 575 students were high-achievers (i.e., above 50). On the other hand, interviews were conducted with five English language teachers, four of whom were female while one of them was male. All the teachers had more than 15 years of teaching experience.

The descriptive findings of students' demographic information are below in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive findings of demographic information

Demographic Information	Category	Number(n)	Percent(%)
Gender	Female	314	48.4
	Male	335	51.6
Class	5th grade	143	22.0
	6th grade	166	25.6
	7th grade	157	24.2
	8th grade	183	28.2
English language course achievement	High-achievers	74	11.4
	Low-achievers	575	88.6

3. RESULTS

In this section, firstly, the findings of reliability and normality test findings were presented. Afterwards, the mean scores of each dimension and their standard deviation as well as the frequencies and percentages for each item in the scale were illustrated. Then, the relationship between the engagement scale and the dimensions of the scale was provided. Also, the T-test analysis related to the gender variable and the ANOVA results revealing whether classroom engagement level differs depending on the grade level variable were demonstrated. Finally, the T-test results pertaining to whether English language course achievement has an influence on student engagement were summarized.

The findings of reliability analysis (i.e., Cronbach's Alpha (α) value) of the whole scale and the dimensions are demonstrated in Table 2. When Cronbach's alpha values were examined, it was found that the reliability value of the overall Engagement Scale, affective engagement and cognitive engagement are at a good level ($0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$) while the reliability level of social engagement is at an acceptable level (George & Mallery, 2001).

Table 2. Findings of reliability

Scale and Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
<i>Overall Engagement Scale</i>	.898
Affective Engagement	.878
Cognitive Engagement	.763
Social Engagement	.629

The normality test was applied to find out whether the dataset followed a normal distribution and to determine the types of tests to conduct. The findings were displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Normality test findings

Scale and Dimensions	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Shapiro Wilk	(Kurtosis (Skewness))	
	p	p		
<i>Overall Engagement Scale</i>	.005	.000	-.326	-.071
Affective Engagement	.000	.000	-.486	-.348
Cognitive Engagement	.010	.001	-.110	-.302
Social Engagement	.000	.000	-.344	-.137

After the normality tests, it was realized as a result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk Test that the dimensions of the scale were not distributed normally ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, the skewness and the kurtosis values were examined. Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) state that when the skewness and the kurtosis values are between -1.50 and +1.50, the distributions of answers can be considered normal. According to the skewness and the kurtosis values, the whole scale and all the dimensions of engagement have normal distribution.

Related to the first research question (What is the overall engagement level of secondary school EFL learners?), Table 4 illustrates the means of the overall scale and its dimensions. It was found that the mean score of the overall Engagement Scale is 3.424, and the standard deviation is 0.769. It means that the secondary school EFL learners' level of engagement in English language classes was between medium and high. Affective engagement mean score is 3.609, and standard deviation score is 0.951, which are slightly higher than the overall scores. Cognitive engagement mean score is 3.290, and the standard deviation is 0.815, which means that the participants cognitive engagement level is at a medium level. On the other hand, social engagement mean score is 3.389, and the standard deviation score is 0.854. The participants' social engagement level was found to be between medium and high level.

Table 4. Mean scores of the overall scale and the scale dimensions

Scale and Factors	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Overall Engagement Scale</i>	3.424	.769	1.000	5.000
Affective Engagement	3.609	.951	1.000	5.000
Cognitive Engagement	3.290	.815	1.000	5.000
Social Engagement	3.389	.854	1.000	5.000

The frequency analysis, mean scores (X) and standard deviation (SD) of the responses given by the participants to each item in the Language Learner Engagement Scale are as in the Table 5.

Table 5. Frequency analysis for Language Learner Engagement Scale

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Strongly Agree		$\bar{X}$	SD
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1. I feel ready in English classes.	32	4.9	61	9.4	187	28.8	196	30.2	173	26.7	3.64	1.12
2. I feel energetic in English classes.	48	7.4	94	14.5	143	22.0	187	28.8	177	27.3	3.54	1.24
3. I feel well in English classes.	44	6.8	71	10.9	153	23.6	206	31.7	175	27.0	3.61	1.19
4. I am willing to attend English classes.	46	7.1	67	10.3	170	26.2	176	27.1	190	29.3	3.61	1.21
5. I enjoy learning new things in English classes.	48	7.4	60	9.2	129	19.9	211	32.5	201	31.0	3.70	1.21
6. I think I am making progress in English classes.	64	9.9	74	11.4	143	22.0	182	28.0	186	28.7	3.54	1.28
7. I express the subject with my own sentences while learning something new in English classes.	81	12.5	124	19.1	176	27.1	158	24.3	110	16.9	3.14	1.26
8. I realize the aspects of myself that need to be improved in English classes.	58	8.9	91	14.0	142	21.9	192	29.6	166	25.6	3.49	1.26
9. I relate what I learn in English classes to my previous learning.	70	10.8	108	16.6	173	26.7	166	25.6	132	20.3	3.28	1.26
10. I find out the rules by examining the language structures in English classes.	102	15.7	141	21.7	194	29.9	123	19.0	89	13.7	2.93	1.26
11. I evaluate how I perform in English classes.	41	6.3	88	13.6	140	21.6	227	35.0	153	23.6	3.56	1.17
12. I ask lesson-related questions to my friends in English classes.	103	15.9	113	17.4	146	22.5	144	22.2	143	22.0	3.17	1.37
13. I think about how I can use what I learn in English classes in real life.	63	9.7	93	14.3	146	22.5	180	27.7	167	25.7	3.45	1.28
14. I ask for help from my teacher when I have difficulty in English classes.	52	8.0	58	8.9	110	16.9	186	28.7	243	37.4	3.79	1.26

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Uncertain		Agree		Strongly Agree		$\bar{X}$	SD
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
15. I ask lesson-related questions to my teacher in English classes.	60	9.2	70	10.8	143	22.0	196	30.2	180	27.7	3.56	1.25
16. I communicate with my friends to learn English better.	117	18.0	122	18.8	167	25.7	122	18.8	121	18.6	3.01	1.36
17. I stay silent unless someone asks me something during classes.	122	18.8	111	17.1	108	16.6	101	15.6	207	31.9	3.25	1.52
18. I express my suggestions about the classes.	87	13.4	82	12.6	161	24.8	164	25.3	155	23.9	3.34	1.33

According to Table 5, when the responses for the item (I feel ready in English classes) were examined in the affective engagement dimension, it was understood that 30.2% of the participants marked 'agree', and 26% of the participants marked 'completely agree'. The mean score of this item is 3.64, and its standard deviation is 1.12. As for the item (I feel energetic in English classes), 28.8% of the participants indicated 'agree', and 27.3% 'strongly agree'. The mean score is 3.54, and standard deviation is 1.24. The item 'I feel well in English classes' was agreed by 31.7% and was strongly agreed by 27.0% of the participants. The mean score of this item is 3.61, and the standard deviation is 1.19. The item 'I am willing to attend English classes' was similarly responded as follows: 27.1% 'agree' and 29.3% 'strongly agree'. The mean score of this item is 3.61, and the standard deviation is 1.21. With the item 'I enjoy learning new things in English classes', 32.5% of the participants agreed, and 31.0% strongly agreed. The mean score is 3.70, and the standard deviation is 1.21. When the item 'I think I am making progress in English classes' was analysed, it was realized that 28.0% of the participants marked 'agree' while 28.7% of them 'strongly agree'. The mean score is 3.54, and the standard deviation is 1.28 for this item.

In summary, when the affective dimension is evaluated in general, it can be concluded that the affective engagement of the participants is at the moderate-high level, and the most frequently marked options are 'agree' and 'strongly agree'. The

obtained mean scores vary between 3.54 and 3.70, which reveals that affective engagement is generally consistent and positive. In addition, the standard deviation scores of the items vary between 1.12 and 1.28, which shows that although there is a certain variety in the participants' responses, the general tendency is gathered around the mean and is far from the extremes.

On the other hand, in the cognitive engagement dimension, when the item 'I express the subject with my own sentences while learning something new in English classes' was examined, it was seen that 24.3% agreed, and 16.9% strongly agreed with this item. The mean score is 3.14, and the standard deviation is 1.26. As far as the item 'I realize the aspects of myself that need to be improved in English classes' is concerned, nearly half of the participants expressed agreement (29.6% 'agreed', 25.6 'strongly agreed'). The mean score of the statement is 3.49, and the standard deviation is 1.26. When it comes to the item 'I relate what I learn in English classes to my previous learning', 25.6% of the participants 'agreed', and 20.3% of them 'strongly agreed'. The mean score of the item is 3.28, and the standard deviation is 1.26. In terms of the item 'I find out the rules by examining the language structures in English classes', 19.0% of the participants marked 'agree', and 13.7% indicated strong agreement. The mean score of the item is 2.93, and the standard deviation is 1.26. When the statement 'I evaluate how I perform in English classes' was examined, it was also realized that more than half of the participants expressed agreement with it (35.0% 'agree' and 23.6% 'strongly agree'). The mean score of the statement is 3.56, and the standard deviation is 1.17. On the other hand, with the item 'I ask lesson-related questions to my friends in English classes', 22.2% of the participants agreed, and 22.0% strongly agreed. The mean score of the item is 3.17, and the standard deviation is 1.37. The item 'I think about how I can use what I learn in English classes in real life' was responded positively by more than half of the students (27.7% agreed and 25.7% strongly agreed). The mean score is 3.45, and the standard deviation is 1.28 for this item.

In conclusion, when the cognitive engagement dimension is evaluated in general, it would be fair to state that the cognitive level of the participations is at the moderate level. When the responses given to the items are examined, it is observed that the options 'agree' and 'strongly agree' are dominant in many items. The fact that the mean scores vary between 2.93 and 3.56 reveals that although it varies from item to item, cognitive engagement is generally at a moderate level.

Finally, in the social engagement dimension, as for the item ‘I ask for help from my teacher when I have difficulty in English classes’, most of the participants indicated agreement (28.7% agreed and 37.4% strongly agreed). The mean score of the item is 3.79, and the standard deviation is 1.26. Related to the item ‘I ask lesson-related questions to my teacher in English classes’, more than half of the participants expressed agreement (30.2% agreed and 27.7% strongly agreed). The mean score is 3.56, and standard deviation is 1.25. Pertaining to the item ‘I communicate with my friends to learn English better’, 18.8% marked ‘agree’, and 18.6% marked ‘strongly agree’. The mean score of the item is 3.01, and the standard deviation is 1.36. On the other hand, ‘I stay silent unless someone asks me something during classes’ was responded positively by nearly half of the participants (15.6% agreed and 31.9% strongly agreed). The mean score is 3.25, and the standard deviation is 1.52. Likewise, nearly half of the participants expressed agreement with the item ‘I express my suggestions about the classes’ (25.3% agreed and 23.9% strongly agreed). The mean score is 3.34, and the standard deviation is 1.33.

To sum up, secondary school EFL students’ responses to the items related to their social engagement in English classes uncovered that their social engagement level is at moderate and high level. The options ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ are the most frequently opted options among the students. The fact that the mean scores vary between 3.01 and 3.79 demonstrates that social engagement dimension varies according to the items; however, the general tendency is at the positive direction.

Pearson Correlation analysis of the relationship between the overall scale and the dimensions of engagement is shown in Table 6. In order to show the relationship between the Language Learner Engagement Scale and its sub dimensions, Pearson Correlation analysis was used. According to the table, positive significant relationship is observed between the overall engagement scale and dimensions of engagement and between the three dimensions of engagement ($p < 0.05$). There is a strong relationship between the overall engagement scale and affective engagement $r = 0.889$, between the overall engagement scale and cognitive engagement $r = 0.909$, and between the overall engagement scale and social engagement $r = 0.839$. The relationships between each of the dimensions are strong and positive. The relationship between affective engagement and cognitive

engagement is $r = 0.700$, and the relationship between affective engagement and social engagement is $r = 0.612$.

Table 6. The relationship between the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale and the dimension of engagement

Scale and Factors	Engagement Scale	
Overall Engagement Scale	Pearson Correlation	1
	p	
Affective Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.889
	p	.000
Cognitive Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.909
	p	.000
Social Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.839
	p	.000

Regarding the second research question (Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of gender?), T-test was used to assess the difference between engagement scale scores and three dimensions of engagement scores depending on the participants' gender. Table 7 demonstrates the T-test analysis of the overall scale depending on gender variable. According to Table 7, there is a significant difference between the engagement scale scores and participants' gender ($p < 0.05$). Girls' engagement level was found to be significantly higher than that of the boys.

Table 7. T- test analysis of the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale depending on gender variable

Gender	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Female	314	3.535	.746	3.604	.000
Male	335	3.319	.777		

As presented on Table 8, affective engagement scores were found to have significant differences depending on the gender variable ($p < 0.05$). Girls' affective engagement scores were found to be significantly higher than those of the boys.

Table 8. T-test analysis of affective engagement depending on gender variable

Gender	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Girls	314	3.696	.909	2.262	.024
Boys	335	3.527	.984		

As can be realized on Table 9, there is a significant difference in the cognitive engagement scores of the students depending on gender ($p < 0.05$). Girls' cognitive engagement scores are significantly higher than boys' scores.

Table 9. T-test analysis of cognitive engagement depending on gender variable

Gender	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Girls	314	3.416	.765	3.875	.000
Boys	335	3.171	.842		

As demonstrated on Table 10, there is a significant difference in the social engagement scores depending on the gender variable ($p < 0.05$). Girls' social engagement scores were found to be significantly higher than boys' scores.

Table 10. T- test analysis of social engagement depending on gender variable

Gender	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Girls	314	3.508	.8701	3.477	.000
Boys	335	3.277	.8244		

To seek an answer to the third research question (Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of grade level?), ANOVA test was used. The analysis of variance of the overall engagement scale and participants' grade levels is presented on Table 11 which demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference in the engagement scale scores ($p < 0.05$). According to Post-hoc test, the justification of this difference is that the 5th graders' scores are significantly higher than the other grade levels. According to the findings, 5th and 7th graders have high level of engagement while 6th and 8th graders are at a more moderate level of engagement.

Table 11. ANOVA results of the overall Language Lerner Engagement Scale according to grade level variable

Class level	n	M	SD	F	p	Post-hoc (Tukey)
5th grade ^a	143	3.779	.649	15.483	.000	b, c, d < a
6th grade ^b	166	3.263	.721			
7th grade ^c	157	3.430	.824			
8th grade ^d	183	3.287	.764			

As can be understood from Table 12, there is a statistically significant difference in affective engagement scores according to the grade level variable ($p < 0.05$). According to Post-hoc test, the reason for this difference is that the 5th graders' scores are significantly higher than the other grades' scores.

Table 12. ANOVA results of affective engagement according to grade level variable

Class level	n	M	SD	F	p	Post-hoc (Tukey)
5th grade ^a	143	4.177	.772	26.918	.000	b, c, d < a
6th grade ^b	166	3.403	.844			
7th grade ^c	157	3.608	.998			
8th grade ^d	183	3.353	.949			

As illustrated on Table 13, in terms of the grade level variable, there is a statistically significant difference in the cognitive engagement scores ($p < 0.05$). According to Post-hoc test, the reason behind this difference is that the 5th graders' scores are significantly higher than those of the other grades.

Table 13. ANOVA results of cognitive engagement according to grade level variable

Class level	n	M	SD	F	p	Post-hoc (Tukey)
5th grade ^a	143	3.574	.734	7.785	.000	b, c, d < a
6th grade ^b	166	3.184	.774			
7th grade ^c	157	3.222	.901			
8th grade ^d	183	3.221	.788			

As can be seen on Table 14, according to the grade level variable, there is a statistically significant difference in the social engagement scores ($p < 0.05$). According to Post-hoc test, the justification of this difference is that the 5th graders' scores are significantly higher than the 6th and 8th graders' scores, and the 7th grade students' scores are higher than the 6th grade students' scores.

Table 14. ANOVA results of social engagement according to grade level variable

Class Level	n	M	SD	F	p	Post-hoc (Tukey)
5th grade ^a	143	3.5860	.74177	6.990	.000	b, d < a b < c
6th grade ^b	166	3.2048	.83265			
7th grade ^c	157	3.5083	.89198			
8th grade ^d	183	3.2995	.88053			

Concerning the fourth research question (Does the engagement level of secondary school EFL students differ in terms of English language course achievement scores?), T-test was used to assess the difference between the overall Engagement Scale scores and three dimensions of engagement scores depending on the participants' English language course achievement. Table 15 illustrates the T-test results of the difference in the overall student engagement according to student achievement. According to the table, the scores show a significant difference depending on participants' English language course achievement ($p < 0.05$). High-achievers' engagement scores were found to be higher than low-achievers' scores.

Table 15. T-test results of the overall Language Learner Engagement Scale according to English language course achievement variable

English Language Course Achievement	n	M	SD	t	p
Low-achievers	74	2.893	.731	-6.497	.000
High-achievers	575	3.492	.748		

According to Table 16, affective engagement scores show a significant difference depending on the participants' English language course achievement ($p < 0.05$). High-achievers' affective engagement scores were found to be significantly higher than low-achievers' scores.

Table 16. T-test results of affective engagement according to English language course achievement variable

English Language Course Achievement	n	M	SD	t	p
Low-achievers	74	2.950	.983	-6.524	.000
High-achievers	575	3.694	.914		

As illustrated on Table 17, cognitive engagement scores show a significant difference depending on students' English language course achievement ($p < 0.05$). High-achievers' cognitive engagement scores were found to be significantly higher than those of the low-achievers.

Table 17. T-test results of cognitive engagement according to English language course achievement variable

English Language Course Achievement	n	M	SD	t	p
Low-achievers	74	2.786	.760	-5.794	.000
High-achievers	575	3.355	.799		

Finally, according to Table 18, social engagement scores show a significant difference depending on the participants' English language course achievement ($p < 0.05$). High-achievers' social engagement scores were found to be higher than those of the low-achievers' scores.

Table 18. T-test results of social engagement according to English Language course achievement variable

English Language Course Achievement	n	M	S	t	p
Low-achievers	74	2.976	.783	-4.487	.000
High-achievers	575	3.442	.849		

3.1 Analysis of Semi-Structured Interview Questions

In order to find an answer to the fifth research question (What do English language teachers think about their students' affective engagement, cognitive engagement and social engagement in their lessons?), a total of 13 questions about three dimensions of student engagement (i.e., cognitive, affective, social) were asked to five English teachers in the research context of the current study.

3.1.1 Affective Engagement

In terms of the affective engagement dimension, the first question posed during the interviews was "Do you think students are willing to participate in English classes? Why/why not?". In response to this question, T1 stated that 5th and 6th graders are willing while only some 7th and 8th graders are so. As can be realized

from the following comment, she also indicated that some students would like to participate so much that when she calls on the same students, those who would like to participate have a complaining attitude:

“Yes, especially 5th and 6th grade students are willing. In the upper grades, in the 7th and 8th grades, only some specific students are willing. When we talk about the girls and the boys, there is no difference between them about their willingness since they have the same readiness. They love English and they are successful. If I concentrate on the same students during classes, 5th and 6th graders who would like to participate are usually offended. They protest me till the break time. They complain and say, ‘My friend spoke more than me’.” (T1)

Unlike T1, T2 holds a negative stance about students’ willingness to participate by claiming that the problem with lack of willingness to participate in English classes is not only limited to the English classes but also the other classes. As illustrated in the following comment, the teacher believes that there are only a few students who would like to engage in her classes:

“No, they aren’t. I think not English only; they aren’t willing to learn maths or science, either. It is not about the English class, I think. Generally, they aren’t willing. In the classrooms, there are two or three students who are willing. They are very successful, they are focused on English, they learn English grammar, they watch movies and videos. For example, I have a student who is willing in English classes, and I know he is the same in all the other classes”. (T2)

Similar to T1, students are mostly believed by T3 to be willing to participate as they are aware of the importance of the English language for their future career. However, as can be understood in the following comment, the teacher also pointed out that there are those with no goals, and thus keep a low profile in her classes:

“Most of the students are willing to participate in lessons because they know the importance of foreign language for their future jobs. However, others who have no goals about their future don’t participate in the lessons willingly. They have difficulty in understanding its importance.” (T3)

Agreeing with the superiority of 5th graders like T1, T4 also asserted in the following comment that they are more willing to participate, and upper graders in their teenager years have issues such as shyness and unwilling attitudes towards reading or taking part in class discussions:

“In fact, it changes from grade to grade. In the 5th grade, students are willing to participate, but in upper grades when they become 7th or 8th grades, participation decreases because they are becoming shy, they don’t want to read, or they don’t want to participate. These students think if they make mistakes, the teacher can be angry, or their friends can laugh at them. If I call on these students, they do the activities, but If I don’t call on them, they never want to read or speak.” (T4)

Holding a positive stance in response to the question, T5 also stated as follows that her students are willing because she included games in her classes, which is a novelty for students:

“They are willing because it is a different thing for them. I use a lot of games in my lessons. Games and game-like activities can make the lesson more entertaining.” (T5).

To conclude, the question as to whether students are willing to participate in EFL classes led to mixed feelings among the participating English teachers. For instance, it was argued by some teachers that younger students are more willing than their older peers as older students in secondary schools are shyer and more afraid of being laughed at by their friends. Furthermore, students with goals and awareness about their future carrier are believed to be more willing than the ones with no future prospects.

The second interview question relevant to the affective engagement dimension is “Do you think students’ attitudes towards the English they have learnt is positive? Why/why not?” As a reaction to this question, T1 responded positively by indicating that students know that they need the language at the university for their academic studies; therefore, they have positive attitudes towards the English language:

“Students have positive attitudes. I mean they are aware that the language will be helpful for them for their occupation and for their academic studies. When they go to university, they will need the English language.” (T1)

In the same vein, T2 also responded positively to the question, but she argued in the following comment that 5th graders have more positive attitudes than older students as language learning is interesting for them:

“Especially the 5th graders, they are positive, I think. They learn the language for fun.” (T2)

Unlike T1 and T2, T3 maintained in the following comment that most of the students have negative attitudes as they tend to be afraid of making mistakes, and thus are not confident enough to speak in front of their friends:

“I think they don’t have positive attitudes towards it because they are reluctant to participate in. They are not brave to speak in front of their peers. They are afraid of making mistakes in front of them and being unsuccessful.” (T3)

On the other hand, T4 have a more neutral stance in response to the question and state that some students have positive attitudes while other do not. As can be realized from the following comment, some students keep asking questions like “Why are we learning English?” and believe that it is difficult and different, whereas other students not only learn the English language but also learn other languages, such as German and Japanese:

“They say, ‘Why are we learning English?’ They haven’t got positive attitudes towards the language because it is difficult and different for them. It is true for most of the students. Of course, some of them have positive attitudes. It’s about interest. They are interested in English, Japanese and German. They like languages.” (T4)

Finally, drawing attention to the exams, T5 claimed that students have positive attitudes because what is taught is tested in the exams:

“They would like to learn English because it is tested on the exams. They think it is necessary.” (T5)

Briefly, from the perspective of teachers, secondary school EFL students’ attitudes towards what they have learnt can be either positive because of the fun nature of English classes and its necessity not only for academic studies in the future but also for the current exams or negative due to the difficulty of the English language and their fear of making mistakes in English classes.

The third interview question connected to the affective dimension of engagement is “Do you think students aim to make progress in English classes? Why/why not?”. T1 gave examples from her students to support her argument that students intend to make progress in English classes:

“I can see this when they come back from summer holiday. They say, ‘We went on holiday last summer. We talked to foreign people. It is good that we had English courses and participated in English classes.’ I receive such feedback from my students. They always aim to make progress in English. Another example is that when I was in Aksaray, there was a caravanserai. Students took a class there each week and they had face to face interactions in English with the tourists. As they used the words and the sentences they learned in the class, they became happier.” (T1)

Similar to T1, T2 also said that students would like to make progress in English, but their motivation is to pass exams:

“Yes, but their aim is to pass the exam. They just want to pass the exam.” (T2)

Unlike T1 and T2, T3 held the idea that especially the ones who do not have future plans do not aim to progress in the English language:

“Not all the students aim to make a progress in English classes because they don’t have a goal in their mind about their future plans.” (T3)

Making an association between aiming to make progress in English and enjoyment of learning the language, T4 stressed in the following comment that only the ones who like the lesson have an aim like that:

“Some of them like the lesson so they aim to make progress but some of them are easily bored in the lesson. It changes from students to students. Also, if they understand the lesson, they aim to make progress, and if they don’t understand the lesson, they just wait for the end of the lesson without doing anything.” (T4)

Like T3, T5 referred to the lack of aims for some students and explained that it is the reason for their lack of progress in the English language, as mentioned

by some teachers beforehand. T5 also underlined the superiority of 5th graders in terms of the intention to make progress in English classes:

“They don’t have an aim for all the courses. But 5th graders seem to be more interested while 8th graders are only worried about the exam. The other graders see English classes as only a course.” (T5)

To summarize, it would be fair to conclude that from teachers’ perspectives, some students do not have clear aims related to progress in English classes and are concerned about passing exams while others continue being exposed to the language even outside the classroom as they have an aim to make progress.

When it comes to the fourth interview question (What do you suggest to enable your students to approach English in a positive manner?) aiming to reveal teachers’ suggestions to increase students’ affective engagement, T1 emphasized out-of-class language learning activities and exemplified as follows how she enabled students to get involved in the English activities out of the classroom walls:

“I take the students to places where people speak English. For example, I took my students to museums. As they use the language and have an interaction with the people who are speaking this language, they realize why they learn the language. They become more eager to learn and say, ‘The real language is here.’” (T1)

Another teacher (T2) attracted attention to the importance of raising students’ awareness about the international status of the English language, as can be seen in the following comment:

“Firstly, they should believe that they can learn, then they should accept that English is necessary. It’s an international language.” (T2)

Likewise, T3 recommended students to research why English is important for their future life, which would lead to positive attitudes towards the English language:

“I suggest students to research the importance of learning a language for future goals and future jobs so that they can have a positive manner towards English.” (T3)

Advising students not to be afraid of making mistakes, T4 pointed out that students should learn how to play with the language and learn from their mistakes:

“They shouldn’t be afraid of making mistakes. They should play with English. My teacher at the university always said, ‘If you want to learn English, you should play with English. You should try to do your best. You should learn from the mistakes, so do not be afraid of making mistakes’”. (T4)

Finally, similar to T1, T5 made the following suggestion that students should be interested in English outside the classroom, and thus see the language learning process as a pastime activity rather than a ‘nightmare’:

“I suggest students to be interested in English, even when the class is over. This will help them see English not as a nightmare, but as a hobby that they do as a pastime activity for fun.” (T5)

To sum up, English teachers’ recommendations to raise secondary school EFL learners’ affective engagement ranged from enabling students to continue being exposed to the English language outside the classroom to increasing their awareness about how important the English language is in today’s world.

3.1.2 Cognitive Engagement

As a response to the fifth question (Do you think students are focused during English classes? Why/why not?) dealing with the cognitive dimension of student engagement, T1 drew attention to the changing level of student focus in English language classes depending on their grade levels and their background related to certain topics integrated into the secondary school EFL curriculum. For instance, as can be realized from the following comment which she based on her observation, 5th and 6th grade students focus better than 7th and 8th graders, and students with sufficient background knowledge about specific topics such as animals can concentrate in the activities more effectively than the ones with insufficient knowledge:

“Yes, I think they are focused but the focusing level is different. For example, in the 5th and 6th grades, while two students among three students are focusing, trying to answer the questions and raising hands, the rate decreases in the 7th and 8th grades. In addition, the students who are ready to learn are more willing to join the course and join the classroom activities more. For instance, there is a unit about animals in the 7th grade syllabus. Nearly most of the

students in the class joined the course in this unit. In the other units, the involvement of the 7th graders was very low. Because they had enough background knowledge about it, and it was easier than other units, they liked the subject. I think the students who are not focused don't have enough background information." (T1)

On the other hand, T2 took a more pessimistic stance on students' focus during EFL classes by asserting in the following comment that students have a negative mindset about the English language in that they think they cannot learn English as it is difficult and not necessary:

"Students aren't focused because they think that English is hard, and they can't learn English. Also, students are prejudiced. They think that it is hard, and they can't learn. They think that it is unnecessary for them." (T2)

T3, on the other hand, have mixed feelings about students' focus during English language classes, and stated that "sometimes" students have something else in their minds. She underlined that the level of focusing during English language classes varies from one student to another because of their different levels of alertness, and similar to T1, she acknowledged that 5th and 6th graders are more focused in English classes. As can be understood from the following comment, she also emphasized that girls focus better than boys:

"I think they are not always focused during the lessons, and they sometimes have something different in their minds. Each student has different alertness in learning language, and alertness level is vital for learning improvement and focusing on the language. Also, some students don't have an aim in English learning. Moreover, girls are more focused during the lessons more than the boys. Moreover, 5th and 6th grade students are more focused." (T3)

Attracting attention to the fact that students can focus only for a short time in English classes, T4 justified this by maintaining that they get bored, and thus do not understand the lesson well. As can be seen in the following comment, she indicated that when they get bored, they lose focus and start doing things, such as looking around and chatting with their friends:

“I think they aren’t focused during the classes. They are focused in a short time. Because they are bored when they don’t understand class. Sometimes when they don’t understand lesson, they are beginning to get bored. They are looking around, reading another thing. They are beginning to speak with their friends, or they are writing something on their books.” (T4)

Unlike T1 and T3, T5 regarded 8th grade students’ focus during English classes higher than other grade levels by arguing that exams such as LGS make students more focused and careful. In the following comment, T5 pointed out that although 5th, 6th and 7th graders see the English lesson as just a normal class, 8th graders approach it more seriously because of the exam:

“5th, 6th and 7th graders regard it as just a course because there aren’t exams like LGS. The 8th graders are more careful and focused because of English part in the exam.” (T5)

In conclusion, English teachers generally hold the opinion that students do not focus sufficiently, and thus not cognitively engaged during English classes. The reasons for their ideas range from students’ boredom to negative attitudes towards the lesson or lack of exams, such as LGS to make them more focused. Still, it is argued by some teachers that girls and 5th and 6th graders are more focused in English classes.

The sixth interview question (Do you think students question the English language? Why/why not?) was also pertaining to the cognitive engagement of students in EFL classes. T1 asserted that students rarely question the English language, and only the successful students care about the question ‘why is it like that?’. As can be realized from the following comment, the teacher answers such questions when asked in the classroom:

“This happens rarely. Generally, same students ask, ‘Teacher, why is it like that?’ once or twice a month. And the others do not care about the answer. I try to answer their questions. I observed that more successful and hardworking students want to join the lesson and question the language while other students don’t. There is a big gap between these two groups of students. Successful students ask, ‘Teacher, why did this happen?’” (T1)

On the other hand, T2 stated that students do not question the English language as they are mostly concerned about exams, as can be seen in the following comment:

“I don’t think they question the language. They focus only on exams.” (T2)

Similar to T1, T3 also pointed out in the following comment that only some students ask questions about the language, especially about the structure of the English language (e.g., ‘Why is the verb here, teacher?’):

“Yes, some students really question the language. Especially, the structure of it. They criticize the structure of the language. For example, they ask, ‘Why is the verb here, teacher?’ and also, they question the language because they compare it with their native language. But not all the students do this.” (T3)

Contrary to T2 and similar to T3, T4 responded positively to the question as to whether students question the language by maintaining in the following comment that students generally question the reason why they are learning English, and when they cannot make sentences, they start to question the language, especially its structure:

“Yes, they always say, ‘Why are we learning English? Why aren’t the others learning Turkish?’. The structure of English is also different from Turkish. When they can’t make sentences, they begin to question the English language. They criticize the language.” (T4)

Arguing that students see the English classes like the other mainstream classes such as maths instead of approaching it as a language, T5 emphasised in the following comment that students are not language-conscious and are not aware of the place of the English language spoken all around the world:

“I think they aren’t conscious. They don’t regard English as a language; they regard it as a course. I mean, they aren’t exposed to it enough, so they don’t think that it is necessary. To me, they don’t question the language. Maybe a bit more enjoying lessons are important for them. To me, 5th graders don’t know that it is a language that is spoken. It is a course like maths, physics and chemistry. They sometimes ask me, ‘Who invented it?’ and ‘What is the use

of it?’ They regard it like a maths course. I think they don’t think that it is a language spoken all over the world and it is very useful.” (T5)

In brief, the question dealing with whether and why students question cognitively the English language was responded positively by some English teachers and negatively by some. The English teachers with positive responses stated that they question the language, especially the structure of the language and their purpose of learning English. However, the ones with negative responses believe that students are not language-conscious; instead, they are mostly concerned about exams.

On the other hand, the seventh question (Do you think students are aware of their knowledge of the English language? Why/why not?) concerning the cognitive dimension of student engagement was answered by T1 with a clarification between 5th-6th graders and 7th-8th graders. From her perspective, higher grade learners have a good understanding of their knowledge of their English language, as can be illustrated in the following example:

“This doesn’t occur in 5th and 6th grades. It occurs in 7th and 8th grades. For example, they had a competition among themselves, and something attracted my attention. Some higher graders made sentences such as ‘my English level is A2’, ‘my level is B1’, ‘I am better than you’ or ‘I will be more successful than you.’ But as I said before, this happens among the upper graders. I have observed that if consciousness increases, the awareness of English level also increases.” (T1)

Contrary to T1, T2 who associated knowledge about the language with their self-confidence believed that 5th graders are more positive about English and make more effort to learn it, as can be realized from the following comment:

“Some of the students are aware because they are self-confident about their English. But some of them aren’t. They don’t speak English; they don’t make effort about learning English. Especially 5th grades are positive about the English. They make effort. But when they become 7th or 8th graders, they think that it is unnecessary, and they don’t study well. I always suggest that they should study regularly, practice English more, listen to English songs and watch English movies.” (T2)

T3, on the other hand, blamed themselves as teachers for their priority to complete the curriculum instead of providing students with opportunities to gain awareness about their knowledge of the English language and came to the following conclusion that her students are not aware of their knowledge of the English language:

“I think, our students aren't aware of knowledge of the English language or their background knowledge because unfortunately, they can't find enough time or opportunities to recognize their knowledge of English language as we, teachers, try to finish the English language curriculum.” (T3)

Similar to T3, T4 emphasized another problematic aspect of EFL classes, which is memorization, as the reason why most students cannot become aware of their knowledge of the English language by giving the following example:

“In fact, most of them are not aware. They memorize the rules and the words, but they cannot combine these or make sentences. They can sometimes make sentences, and they are surprised and say, ‘Oh, how did I succeed it?’. So, they aren't aware of their knowledge, and they are not aware of their level.” (T4)

Highlighting the necessity to take care of each student individually to pave the way for the awareness of English knowledge, T5 stated as follows that if continuous revisions are made and students' progress are revealed, they can become aware of their knowledge:

“Certainly, if you take care of them, they become aware of it. Of course, it is tiring but if you care about each of them individually, they are aware of whether they know or not. If you continuously do revisions, they become aware of it. If you do revision at the beginning of each lesson, they become aware of their knowledge. How much do they make progress? How much do they know? But it is teacher's duty. The teacher must always question this.” (T5)

To sum up, one aspect of cognitive engagement, which is students' awareness about their knowledge of the English language, led to different responses by the English teachers. From the promising examples provided by some teachers, it is realized that some students know CEFR levels, such as A2 or B1. Nevertheless,

negative responses of the teachers are generally related to the concern of the teachers to catch up with the curriculum or the fact that memorization is still dominant in EFL classes.

The eighth question (What do you suggest to enable your students to participate in English classes by being more mentally active?) aims to uncover English teachers' recommendations to increase students' engagement cognitively. T1 underlined the importance of some activities, such as games and dialogues which can create a livelier classroom environment, and thus lead to more cognitive engagement in EFL classes:

“Our students are children, so games, dialogues and the activities which make the lesson entertaining are effective. When we have a boring activity in the book, I try to make it more entertaining by saying, ‘I have some activities for you.’ Then, they join the activities willingly. When we integrate some games into our classes, they become more attentive to finish the activities successfully and learn the subject well.” (T1)

To raise students' cognitive engagement, T2 listed as follows some activities students can engage in outside the classroom (e.g., watching English movies) as a means of practicing the English language:

“I suggest that they should study regularly. Also, they should practice English more. They should listen to English songs. They should watch English movies. I think some of them can do that, but some of them don't.” (T2)

On the other hand, to increase mental activeness of language learners, T3 advised to introduce the importance of the English language and to ask students to make suggestions about the course in line with their needs, as illustrated in the following comment:

“I think we can mention the importance of English language to them. Then, they can come to class, enjoy the concepts or subjects and become more mentally active. We can give them some opportunities to make some suggestions about the course content to reveal their interests and prepare materials accordingly.” (T3)

Another recommendation made by T4 as follows is to give students the awareness that making mistakes is not something to be afraid of:

“They shouldn’t hesitate to participate in the activities. They should try to do their best, try to speak, make sentences, and they shouldn’t be afraid of making mistakes. They should know that making mistakes is a good way of learning the language.” (T4)

Finally, T5 suggested that continuous revisions have the potential to keep students cognitively engaged during English classes. As exemplified in the following comment, she emphasised the importance of regular quizzes as useful ways to make students cognitively active:

“What do I suggest? It isn’t studying too much. I suggest that all the students must be taken care of individually. Revisions should be done continuously. For example, if you’re in unit 5, you must do the revision of earlier units. You must help students realize that revision is useful. If we have quizzes regularly, English lesson will be a lesson that students will study for.” (T5)

Considering the suggestions made by the teachers to increase cognitive engagement in English classes, it can be concluded that the following issues are deemed to be useful: incorporating activities such as games into the lessons, enabling students to carry out extracurricular English practice activities, orienting students to the importance of the English language as a global language, giving students the awareness that making mistakes is normal in English classes and doing regular revisions, such as quizzes.

3.1.3 Social Engagement

The last component of student engagement dealt with during the interviews is social engagement, and the ninth interview question is “Do you think students interact with each other in English in English classes? Why/why not?”. As can be realized from the following comment, T1 claimed that students generally do not get into genuine communication with each other in English; instead, they interact with each other to increase their exam scores, and they would like to interact with the teacher rather than their peers:

“They have an interaction but how? They mostly try to get information from each other to increase their marks. In addition, they raise their hands and say, ‘Me, me’. They don’t want to give opportunities to their friends. They always want to talk to the teacher.” (T1)

Drawing attention to a personality problem, T2 underlined that some students are ambitious and egotistical, and thus not very cooperative during their interactions with their peers:

“Especially, overambitious and egotistical students say, ‘I am the leader, I know the best, I want to do the best, I want to be in the front.’ So, they do not want to interact with their friends or help them. I think it is a problem of personality.” (T2)

In the same vein, responding negatively to the question as to whether students interact with each other in English, T3 stressed in her following comment that she did not observe such interaction except for two students:

“In fact, I don’t generally witness interaction in English between students. I have just two students who speak English together, they share their ideas in English and can even talk about ways to improve their English.” (T3)

On the other hand, as can be realized from the following comment, T4 pointed out that some students are involved in interaction, but generally they tend to use their mother tongue during interactive activities:

“Yes, they sometimes interact with each other thanks to pair works or questionnaire activities. Unfortunately, they generally prefer using their native languages.” (T4)

Finally, T5 maintained that if the activities are entertaining or about topics appealing to their interests, they would like to get involved in interaction:

“They can interact with each other in particular if our subject is interesting for them. For instance, boys always interact with each other about football or digital games. Besides, if the activity is fun, they want to interact with each other. For example, ‘Who am I game’ requires some students to describe their friends and the others to make predictions about who is described. They interact with their friends in case of such entertaining activities.” (T5)

In conclusion, teachers explained that because of exam concerns or their personality features (e.g., being overambitious), genuine interaction between students in English do not often emerge in the classroom while activities, such as pair-work or interesting and fun topics can pave the way for interaction in the classroom.

The tenth interview question focusing on the social engagement is “Do the students have suggestions for English classes? Why/why not?”. In response to this question, T1 said that students do not generally make any suggestions as they know that she comes to class well-prepared:

“I come to class well-prepared. They do not generally make any suggestions for English classes.” (T1)

Unlike T1, T2 stated that one student made a relevant suggestion and exemplified it as follows:

“A student did it. He is a 5th grade student. He said, ‘When we were in 3rd and 4th grades, we used to put words in a basket and take them out of the basket, and you used to ask its meaning. We don’t play these kinds of games any more. They were amusing. We should play them again’. But I explained to the student that the curriculum is more intense this year and do not have much time for such games.” (T2)

Responding positively to the question, T3 also stated that especially 5th graders make suggestions for English classes and gave the following example:

“Yes, they have suggestions, especially in the 5th grade. They say sentences like ‘How about learning a new song?’ or ‘Why don’t we do a cinema activity like last year?’” (T3)

In a similar vein, T4 responded positively to the question by saying as follows that students make some suggestions and she takes these into account:

“Of course, they have important suggestions like ‘Let’s play games’ or ‘Let’s listen to songs’, and I happily take their suggestions into consideration.” (T4)

Similarly, T5 asserted that students make suggestions that are considered by the teacher:

“Sure, they have suggestions. Our lessons have a routine. It is a three-hour lesson. In the first two hours, we cover the subject for the day. Then, in the last lesson, if we finish everything earlier, they say, ‘Let’s do this’, and I generally accept their suggestions.” (T5)

To summarize, from the teachers’ comments, it was discovered that some students make suggestions, such as playing games and some teachers accept these suggestions.

In response to the eleventh question pertaining to the social engagement, (Do the students ask lesson-related questions to their friends or the teacher during English classes? Why/why not?), T1 pointed out that only the students who are interested in English classes do this:

“The students who are interested in English classes do this. But the students who aren’t interested in the course don’t do this.” (T1)

On the other hand, T2 maintained that students do not ask lesson-related questions to their friends, but to the teacher, and when they ask questions, they generally ask them about cultural topics rather than grammar:

“They generally don’t ask to their classmates, but they ask me. Also, when we read a text about a festival about England, they ask question about its cultural features. They usually ask questions about the culture of other countries. They do not ask questions about grammar.” (T2)

Claiming that students mostly prefer listening to their teachers, T3 believed that they seldom ask lesson-related questions:

“I think they seldom ask lesson-related questions. They mostly prefer listening and understanding the lessons.” (T3)

Unlike T2, T4 underscored in the following comment that students generally ask questions about the grammatical topics covered during the lessons:

“If they are confused about the grammatical subjects, they ask questions for clarification.” (T4)

Associating between asking lesson-related questions to success, T5 indicated in the following comment that only successful students ask such questions:

“In fact, they ask. It happens in the classes whose success level is higher than the others. I mean, asking lesson-related questions are only true for successful students.” (T5)

In summary, teachers mostly underscored that interested and successful secondary school EFL learners tend to ask lesson-related questions, and generally cultural or grammatical issues lead to such questions.

The twelfth interview question about the social dimension of student engagement is “Do the students believe they can use the English they have learnt in the class in their lives? Why/why not?”. T1 responded positively to this question by explaining that some students actively use English in their lives:

“Some students watch videos from the Internet. They see that it is useful. And some of them say there are some international student portals where they interact with people around the world.” (T1)

Unlike T1, T2 took a negative stance by stating in the following comment that students have prejudice against the real-life use of the English language:

“They certainly have a prejudice against English as they don’t believe that it is an international language and they can use it in their life.” (T2)

Likewise, T3 stated that students do not believe in the merits of English as a real-life tool, and thus do not get exposed to the English language outside the classroom:

“To me, they don’t believe they can use the language in real life, so they don’t spend time with English outside.” (T3)

Moreover, T4 stated that most of the students do not believe that they can use the English in their real lives as they are mostly worried about exams:

“Most of them don’t believe so because they study only for exams and memorize the words or the grammar rules. So, they know it’s not something to use out there.” (T4)

Finally, contrary to T4, T5 underscored as follows that there are some students who believe in the usefulness of what they have learnt for real life by giving examples of extracurricular English practice opportunities students engage in outside the classroom:

“Some of them play digital games in English or listen to English songs. Some others watch English series. I think they believe that what they have learnt is useful for real life.” (T5)

To sum up, teachers who gave positive responses to the question as to whether students believe that they can use the English they have learnt in real life provided examples of real-life English use of some students outside the classroom, such as watching content in English or digital gaming. Other teachers responding negatively to the question argue that some students have prejudice against the English language or only concerned about exams.

In reaction to the last interview question regarding the social dimension of engagement (What do you suggest to enable your students to interact with their peers in English classes?), T1 recommended that teachers should give realistic scenarios in which students can interact in English and gave the following example:

“We must give students real scenarios. For example, when I say, ‘Make a dialogue together’, they don’t care. However, when I say, ‘I will take you to a museum and you will meet foreigners there. They will ask you your name, hometown or your favourite food or colour. Make a dialogue about it’, they get ready and start to talk. We can even take students to real places and encourage them to speak there; they can become more willing.” (T1)

In a similar vein, T2 highlighted the importance of roleplay activities as a means of boosting students’ English interaction skills:

“I think the best way to encourage students to speak English in the classroom is roleplay. When we have a roleplay activity, they act the role they are doing. So, they interact with each other and improve themselves socially in an entertaining way.” (T2)

On the other hand, arguing that most of the subjects in the English language curriculum are not interesting for students, T3 recommended that as teachers, they could incorporate some topics and content into the lesson, which can raise students’ interest, and thus lead to interaction:

“Most of the subjects and activities in our curriculum aren’t interesting for them. We can find subjects or content as a teacher to attract their attention.” (T3)

Similar to T1 and T2, T4 also agreed that enabling students to practice the English language and helping them get rid of their prejudice against English will help them interact with their peers:

“I always say that practicing is very important. Also, they shouldn’t have prejudice against English language, and they should be willing to learn English. Then, they can start interacting in English with their peers.” (T4)

Finally, as can be realized from the following comment, T5 suggested that teachers should increase students’ level of English, which will lead to interaction in the classroom:

“We should first increase students’ level of English. By doing so, we can create interaction in the English classroom.” (T5)

In brief, to raise secondary school EFL learners’ social engagement, teachers made suggestions, such as providing students with real scenarios, roleplays and interesting topics as well as increasing students’ level of English.

Considering English language teachers’ reactions to all the interview questions related to different dimensions of student engagement, it can be concluded that regarding the affective engagement dimension, some of the issues voiced by the teachers as factors negatively affecting students’ affective engagement are the exam pressure and the fear of making mistakes in English classes, while some of the promising teacher observations about this dimension are that younger students, especially 5th graders are more willing to participate in class activities and have positive attitude towards the English language similar to the students with clear future prospects about the importance of English. Their recommendations to raise students’ affective engagement are paving the way for extracurricular English activities outside the classroom and raising students’ awareness about the importance of the English language as a global language.

When it comes to the cognitive engagement dimension, some of the problems are students’ boredom in English classes, unfavourable attitudes towards the lesson, concern about exams, and thus their memorization of things they learn

during English classes as well as teachers' priority to catch up with the curriculum. On the other hand, some of the positive teacher reflections related to this dimension are that some students can question the structure of the English language, and some of them have an awareness of their level of English (e.g., B1). Solutions suggested by the teachers to raise cognitive engagement are using games, encouraging students to get involved in out-of-class English activities, introducing the importance of the English language in today's world, suggesting that making mistakes is not something to be afraid of and integrating regular revisions (e.g., quizzes) into the lessons.

Finally, as far as the social engagement dimension is concerned, teachers commented drawbacks, such as some students' personality features or prejudice against the English language not allowing them to socialize with their peers in English classes. Some activities, such as pair-work and entertaining activities, such as games were considered to positively influence young EFL learners' engagement in English classes; therefore, as for ways to increase social engagement, it was advised by the teachers that incorporating realistic scenarios, interesting topics and roleplays into the lesson may contribute to social engagement levels of the students.

It is noteworthy to mention that as can be realized from the aforementioned analysis of the interview questions, participating English teachers sometimes make similar comments about questions dealing with different dimensions of student engagement. This can be because of the fact that dimensions of student engagement are interconnected and can influence one another (Christenson et al., 2012; Svalberg, 2017).

4. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore EFL learners' engagement level (e.g., cognitive, affective and social) in English language classes at a public secondary school in the Central Anatolia region by means of the Language Learner Engagement Scale (Oruç & Demirci, 2020) administered to students and interviews with English teachers. Students' engagement level was also investigated to discover whether it differs according to students' gender, grade level and English language course achievement. 645 participants from 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades volunteered to fill out the scale. Five English teachers were interviewed to reveal what they think about students' cognitive, affective and social engagement and what they suggest to raise students' engagement in English classes.

As a result of the analysis of data collected from students through the Language Learner Engagement Scale, it was found out that the mean score of the scale is 3.424 and the standard deviation is 0.769, which means that the secondary school EFL learners' engagement level is between moderate and high level. Similar findings were revealed by Oruç (2020) who collected data from university students. The current finding that EFL learners' engagement level is moderate to high was also supported by the results of Arıyürek and Yurtseven (2024) whose participants were private and public secondary school students. It is discussed in the literature that when students are engaged in a lesson, they have an interest in learning, pay attention to what they are studying, improve their abilities to direct their learning, take initiative to learn new topics, cooperate with their peers and finish their projects on the stated time (Ginting, 2021).

Another finding of the present study is that students have high level of affective engagement. The finding concurs with Lam et al. (2014) who found a higher degree of affective engagement mean score. In the Turkish EFL context, similar findings and conclusions were reached. To illustrate, Bodur (2021) investigated the relationship between perceived instructional environment, student engagement and English achievement of the 6th grade students in a secondary school setting and concluded that students' affective engagement was higher than the other dimensions. Dinçer et al. (2017) argued that when the students engage in the class with pleasure and excitement, they become more affectively engaged. On the other hand, Hasdina et al. (2024) discovered that affective engagement was the

least frequently observed dimension of engagement in their study in a high school setting.

Similar views related to the affective dimension of engagement were echoed by the English teachers who took part in the interviews as well. For instance, it was revealed by some teachers that 5th grade students are more engaged than the others, and issues such as exam pressure and fear of making mistakes negatively affect students' engagement. According to Svalberg (2009), affectively engaged students have a positive, purposeful and autonomous disposition towards the language. However, it was claimed by Panhwar and Bell (2022) that shy and introverted students have difficulty in participating in class, and thus need time to formulate their ideas and work in pairs. They also argue that cooperative learning help students diminish their shyness and enjoy classroom activities. Similarly, according to Marks (2000), a positive school environment based on respect, fairness, safety and positive communication also promotes the engagement of students from all grade level. Moreover, Pandey (2025) maintains that a classroom environment based on trust and emotional support should be provided to the students to help them sustain their engagement affectively.

On the other hand, participants' cognitive engagement dimension mean of the scale in the present study was found to be the lowest among other dimensions. In a similar vein, Mekki et al. (2022) who worked with older students discovered that the cognitive engagement score of the students was very low as teachers in their study were complaining about the difficulties of managing cognitively disengaged student behaviours. In another study, Fredricks et al. (2004) drew attention to the importance of cognitive engagement because of its positive influence on achievement, especially in middle and high school. In the Turkish EFL contexts, similar findings were echoed. For instance, Bodur (2021), whose participants were 6th graders, found in her study that the cognitive engagement level of the learners in English language classes was only at an acceptable level. Conversely, Arıyürek and Yurtseven (2024) found out that the cognitive engagement level of the students was the strongest one, and the mean scores of cognitive engagement level in public schools is higher than those of private school students. Likewise, exploring student engagement and the factors that affect high school English language learners' engagement level, Hasdina et al. (2024) revealed that cognitive engagement level of the learners was higher and more dominant when compared to other dimensions

of engagement. This finding in their study was justified by referring to teachers' teaching method in which they frequently ask questions to students and force them to give answers by making explanations.

Interviews with participating English language teachers also revealed some noteworthy findings about students' cognitive engagement. For example, it was found that teachers generally complain about their students' not being sufficiently focused during the English language courses. Reasons behind this are often associated with factors such as boredom, and it was recommended by some teachers that aligning the lessons with real-life activities such as games and dialogues can boost students' cognitive engagement. This finding concurs with the results of Karafil and Oğuz (2019) who uncovered that students listed various factors affecting their engagement such as the curriculum, monotonous instruction and teachers' behaviours. Therefore, they advised the teachers to make more attempts to make their classes more enjoyable. Likewise, Pandey (2025) argues that understanding the factors which motivate students and sustain their engagement as well as adapting the lessons to their needs and proficiency levels have the potential to increase classroom engagement by also reducing boredom.

Pertaining to the cognitive engagement, participating teachers also emphasised the importance of students setting goals about their English language learning process. This suggestion was also supported by Pandey (2025) who advised teachers to give opportunities to students to set goals and make personal choices about their learning journey so that they can become autonomous learners. Likewise, Dweck et al. (2014) underlined that purposeful learners do not just memorize to pass exams; instead, they learn for the sake of self-actualization. Also, as commented by some teachers in the interviews, extracurricular activities outside the classroom and raising students' awareness about the place of English as a global language are deemed to be effective in leading students to be more engaged in the English language classroom (Sundqvist, 2024; Zakhir, 2019).

One of the teachers participating in the current study also highlighted that students are not very language conscious, and they are generally concerned about exams, which contradicts with Gardner's socio-educational model of motivation in language acquisition in that second language courses encompass a different social environment and are shaped in line with individual differences as well as affective factors (Gardner, 1985). Another participating teacher recommended that students

should not be afraid of making mistakes. Similarly, Ebralidze (2023) proposed that classroom climate is an important factor in increasing engagement and underlined the importance of feeling comfortable because a supportive classroom environment has the potential to promote engagement.

When it comes to the social engagement level of students in the present study, it was found out that the mean score of social engagement was 3.389 which is between moderate and high level. According to Svalberg (2009), socially engaged students are interactive and initiating, and thus this dimension is critical. Turkish researchers also argue that socially engaged learners show higher emotional engagement (Hınız & Çelik, 2025). In the interviews, it was also revealed that learners' personality characteristics and prejudices towards the English language prevent them from socializing with their peers in English classes. In a similar vein, personality features of learners are often considered as an affective factor in engagement, and it is argued that socially engaged learners display higher interest in learning by asking questions and stating their own opinions, whereas passive learners are known to have difficulty focusing and are often ashamed of asking questions (Abdullah et al., 2012; Karafil & Oğuz, 2019). Moreover, teachers focused on students' prejudices towards the language as a reason why their interactions with their classmates are limited. The importance of positive attitudes towards the language was also mentioned by Gardner (1985) who argue that positive attitudes towards learning a second language and the second language community have correlations with high proficiency in that language.

To increase the engagement level of the students in English classes, participating teachers also suggested the inclusion of realistic scenarios, interesting topics, entertaining activities, pair works, role plays and games in the lessons. Some of the teachers also revealed that young learners have a short attention span, and they get bored easily. It is discussed in the literature that young learners are holistic learners who need to use the language for authentic communication, and games are the most effective activities to promote student engagement (Aeni et al., 2024; Azkarai & Kopinska, 2020; Pandey 2025; Peck, 2001). According to Setiawan et al. (2019), English language classes for young EFL learners do not always run as planned, and their engagement can be limited because of factors, such as their short attention span and boredom; therefore, some creative teaching activities such as starting the lesson with interesting brainstorming activities is ideal. To attract young

learners' attention and make the lesson more entertaining, authentic and relevant materials suitable for their needs and interests should be used (Minalla, 2023). Enabling learners to personalize lesson materials through realistic activities such as pair works, role plays and games can pave the way for filling the gap between the classroom and the real world and for encouraging collaboration among students to be more socially engaged and to improve their linguistic competence, confidence and sense of belonging (Pandey, 2025).

The current study also examined whether there are significant differences in students' engagement levels according to different variables. For instance, in terms of the gender variable, it was found out that girls' engagement scores are higher than the engagement scores of the boys, which means that girls are more engaged than the boys in English language classes. When the quantitative data are analysed across all dimensions, it is realized that girls are cognitively, affectively and socially more engaged than boys. This finding shows similarity with the results of Marks (2000) who explored student engagement in instructional activities. In the study involving elementary, middle and high school students taking social and math courses, it was found that girls were significantly more engaged in instructional activities than boys in all three grade levels. This finding overlaps with the results of another study carried out by Oga-Baldwin and Nakata (2017). In their study including Japanese elementary school students, it was discovered that male students had a tendency for lower engagement, and girls were found to be more engaged than their male counterparts in English language classes. Another finding in line with the present study is of Azevedo et al. (2023) who revealed that fourth grade female students are more cognitively and emotionally engaged than male students. In the EFL context of Türkiye, similar findings were yielded. To illustrate, Arıyürek and Yurtseven (2024) arrived at the conclusion that the total school engagement mean scores of female students were higher than the mean scores of male students. Likewise, one of the teachers participating in the present study pointed out that girls are more focused during English language classes.

Moreover, related to the question whether engagement level differs depending on the grade level of the students, significant differences were observed for each group. The mean score of the scale for 5th grade students was found to be 3.779, which means that 5th graders are more engaged in English language classes than the other grade level students. The high level of engagement among 5th graders

was also mentioned by some English language teachers who took part in the interviews. Additionally, some of the teachers commented in the interviews that 5th graders are more willing to participate in activities and have positive attitudes towards the English language while older students are shyer and more afraid of making mistakes. Not only the scale results but also other studies in the literature are consistent with this comment (Mark, 2000; Özer et al., 2018). In the same vein, Li et al. (2022) found out that younger students tend to be more motivated and engaged in English language classes and added that engagement declines with age. However, contradictory findings were revealed in the local EFL context of Türkiye. To illustrate, Arıyürek and Yurtseven (2024) found that the cognitive engagement scores of 8th graders were the highest of all the other graders' scores, which was justified by the high-school entrance exam (LGS) administered in the 8th grade.

The English language course achievement of the students was also investigated in the current study, and the results demonstrate that the scale scores of the high-achievers are higher than the low-achievers' scores. A significant difference depending on participants' English language course achievement was observed in all the three dimensions of engagement (i.e., cognitive, affective and social). Although the low-achievers' engagement level was at the moderate level, high-achievers were found to have higher level of engagement. Similar reflections were also made by the participating teachers during the interviews. This result concurs with the findings of Reeve and Lee (2014) who concluded that changes in engagement predicted course achievement. The more engaged students are considered by many researchers to be more successful in English language classes (Fredricks et al., 2004; Harris, 2008; Reeve, 2013; Svalberg, 2009; Taylor & Parsons, 2011). In the Turkish EFL context, Karabıyık (2019) also revealed a positive correlation with all types of engagement and learners' achievement in English at a university setting. In the same vein, investigating the relationship between the multidimensional classroom engagement and some variables (e.g., course achievement, course absence and motivational orientation to learn English), Dinçer et al. (2017) reached the conclusion that students who have higher achievement also have higher engagement. The positive relationship between the engagement and secondary school students' English language achievement was also emphasized by Bodur (2021) who found that the perceived instructional environment and student engagement predict English language achievement

significantly. Additionally, in a more recent study, Eren and Rakıcıoğlu-Söylemez (2023) discovered a significant relation between language mindsets, aspects of engagement, perceived instrumentality and graded performance. Conversely, in another study including participants of three secondary school classes in Canada, Irvine (2020) did not find a significant relationship between engagement and achievement in mathematics course.



5. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to explore a group of secondary school students' engagement level in English language classes depending on different variables such as gender, grade level and English language course achievement. The quantitative part of the study is based on the Language Learner Engagement Scale (Oruç & Demirci, 2020) including 18 Likert-type items. 649 young EFL learners in grades between 5th-8th in a public secondary school in the Central Anatolia region of Türkiye rated items on the scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Their responses were analysed using SPSS, and it was found that their engagement level was between moderate and high level. It was also uncovered that the level of affective engagement was found to be higher than the other dimension levels. Moreover, it was found that the most engaged groups were 5th graders and female students, and the engagement level of the students predicted the English language exam score.

On the other hand, the qualitative data were collected by means of 13 semi-structured interview questions designed by the researcher in line with the scale items. Five English language teachers teaching in the same school were interviewed, and the data were analysed using content analysis. The comments made by the teachers yielded some valuable observations and suggestions about young learners' engagement in English language classes. For instance, the fear of making mistakes, exam pressure, boredom in English classes, some personality features, unfavourable attitudes towards the lesson are regarded by the teachers as some of the factors preventing students from engaging in the classroom activities. As for suggestions to raise student engagement, teachers recommended that students' awareness about the importance of the English language and the fact that making mistakes is normal while learning English should be increased. In addition, it is suggested that entertaining activities, such as games and more realistic activities such as roleplays should be incorporated into the English classes for young learners.

5.1 Recommendations for Teachers

In line with the opinions of participating teachers and students as well as the relevant literature (Abdullah et al., 2012; Arıyürek & Yurtseven, 2024; Marks, 2000; Pandey, 2025; Svalberg, 2009), it would be fair to conclude that although secondary school EFL learners have high levels of engagement in English language classes, the following suggestions are expected to contribute to the engagement level of English language teachers:

- Teachers should consider students' age, needs and interests to create a more supportive classroom atmosphere.
- Activities, such as games should be integrated into English language classes.
- EFL learners should be enabled to be involved in out-of-class English activities.
- The crucial place of the English language as a global language should be discussed with students.
- The awareness that making mistakes is normal should be increased in EFL classes.
- Regular quizzes should be incorporated into English language classes.
- Realistic activity scenarios should be provided to the students.
- Interesting topics, pair work and roleplay activities should be used in EFL classes.

5.2 Recommendation for Further Research

This study is limited to a group of students in a specific secondary school and is based on data obtained by means of a scale and interview questions; therefore, similar research can be conducted with larger groups using other data collection instruments, such as classroom observation.

Gender differences in engagement level should be explored more deeply by means of different research techniques to find out the reasons for the girls' tendency towards higher engagement.

In order to understand the differences in students' engagement depending on the grade level, factors such as personal traits, individual differences and classroom environment should also be investigated.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. Y., Bakar, N. R. A., & Mahbob, M. H. (2012). Student's participation in classroom: What motivates them to speak up?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51, 516-522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.199>
- Acosta-Manzano, I., & Mercer, S. (2024). English foreign language teachers' beliefs about adult learners' engagement. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2370977>
- Aeni, N., Nur, S., Limbong, S., & Yunus, M. (2024). Promoting EFL students' engagement by using bamboozle: Digital game- based learning in Indonesian higher education. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 8(3), 508-527.
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S., & Furlong, M. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 369-386. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303>
- Aryürek, E. A., & Yurtseven, N. (2024). Examining the relationship between school engagement and learning Responsibility in middle school students. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 14(2), 220-250. <https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.1500085>
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Ateş Özdemir, E. (2006). Türkiye'de İngilizce öğreniminin yaygınlaşmasının nedenleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 28-35.
- Azevedo, R., Rosário, P., Núñez, J.C., Vallejo, G., Fuentes, S., & Magalhães, P. (2023). A school-based intervention on elementary students' school engagement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102148>
- Azkarai, A., & Kopinska, M. (2020). Young EFL learners and collaborative writing: A study on patterns of interaction, engagement in LREs, and task motivation. *System*, 94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102338>
- Berber, G. (2023). *Student engagement and teacher motivating style: A focus on agentic engagement and teacher autonomy support from a longitudinal and multilevel perspective* (Publication no, 806652) [Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Berg, B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (pp. 101-157). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bodur, Z. Y. (2021). *Investigation of the relationship between perceived instructional environment, student engagement and achievement in EFL classrooms* (Publication no, 689062) [Doctoral dissertation, Balıkesir University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- British Council & Tepav. (2013). *Turkey national needs assessment of state school English Language teaching*, Ankara: British Council and TEPAV. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/sites/default/files/turkey_national_needs_assessment_of_state_school_english_language_teaching.pdf
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Kılıç, E., Akgün, Ö.-E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (23. baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Chen, K., & Cai, J. (2022). A case study of student engagement in online EFL courses for young learners in China. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 34, 65-108.
- Creswell, J.W., & Clark, V.L.P. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (Third ed.). Sage Publications.

- Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of Student Engagement*. Springer.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Çakıcı, D. (2010). Parents' and English language teachers' views about early foreign language education in Turkey. *Participatory Educational Research*, 1, 33-42.
- Çakır Sarı, H. (2023). Engagement strategies in Turkish classrooms: An appraisal theory Perspective. *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture*, 8(23), 2300-2318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoecc.767>
- Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Türkiye'de anadili eğitimi ve yabancı dil öğretimi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(21), 285-307.
- Dağtan, E., & Cabaroğlu, N. (2021). Status of English speaking skills in Turkish ELT departments: A nationwide survey. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 359-382. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911454>
- Demirel, Ö. (2024). *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi: Dil pasaportu, dil dosyası, dil biyografisi* (14th ed.) Pegem Akademi.
- Dewey, J. (2018). *Moral principles in education and my pedagogic creed by John Dewey: With a critical introduction by Patricia H. Hinchey*. Myers Education Press.
- Devrim, N. (2018). *An observational study of the relationship of teachers' instructional behavior and student engagement* (Publication no, 502890) [Master's thesis, Ihsan Doğramacı Bilkent University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Dinçer, A., Yeşilyurt, Y., & Demiröz, H. (2017). Multidimensional classroom engagement in EFL contexts. In D. Köksal (Ed.), *Researching ELT: Classroom methodology and beyond* (pp.91-102). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., Noels, K. A., & Vargas Lascano, D. I. (2019). Self-Determination and Classroom Engagement of EFL Learners: A Mixed-Methods Study of the Self-System Model of Motivational Development. *SAGE Open*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019853913>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410613349>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). 2. The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003>
- Dweck, C.S., Walton, G.M., & Cohen, G.L. (2014). *Academic tenacity mindsets and skills that promote long-term learning*. Bill & Melinda gates Foundation.
- Ebralidze, P. (2023). Engagement Theory: Fostering a Meaningful Learning Experience. *Anthropology*, 11, 297.
- Eren, A., & Rakıcıoğlu-Söylemez, A. (2023). Language mindsets, perceived instrumentality, engagement and graded performance in English as a foreign language student. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(3), 544-574. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820958400>
- Eryılmaz, A. (2014). Üniversite öğrencileri için derse katılım ölçeklerinin geliştirilmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 203-214.

- Fetters, M., Curry, L., & Creswell, J. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs-principles and practices. *Health services research*, 48, 2134-56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
- Finn, J. (1989). Withdrawing from school. Review of Educational Research. *American Educational Research Association (AERA)*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059002117>
- Finn, J., & Cox, D. (1992). Participation and withdrawal among 4th-grade pupils. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(1), 141-162. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312029001141>
- Firliantama, M.R., & Rokhayani, A. (2023). Young learners' engagement in vocabulary learning taught by games and learning application: Systematic review. *International Journal of English Education*, 1(1).
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. (2006). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: A research paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook*. 6. 237-260. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.6.14gar>
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2001). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 10.0 update*. (3rd ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Ginting, D. (2021). Student Engagement and Factors Affecting Active Learning in English Language Teaching. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, 5(2), 215-228. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v5i2.3968>
- Günüç, S., & Kuzu, A., (2015). Student engagement scale: development, reliability and validity. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(4), 587-610.
- Hasdina, N., Sofyawati, E. D., Dewi, S., & Oktarina, H. (2024). Students' engagement in English language course. *English Education and Applied Linguistics Journal (EEAL Journal)*, 7(1), 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.31980/eeal.v7i1.225>
- Harris, L. R. (2008). A phenomenographic investigation of teacher conceptions of student engagement in learning. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 57-79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03216875>
- Hınız, G., & Çelik, Ö. (2025). A bibliometric and content analysis of student engagement research in English language teaching. *Language Awareness*, 34(1), 43-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2024.2367970>
- Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A., Vitta, J., & Wu, J. (2024). Engagement in language learning: A systematic review of 20 years of research methods and definitions. *Language Teaching Research*, 28, 201-230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211001289>
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2001). Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities: The Influences of Student and Institutional Characteristics. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 555-575. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020114231387>
- Huang, Y.-Y., Liu, C.-C., Wang, Y., Tsai, C.-C., & Lin, H.-M. (2017). Student engagement in long-term collaborative EFL storytelling activities: An analysis of learners with English proficiency differences. *Educational Technology & Society*, 20(3), 95-109.
- Hung, L. (2022). Enhancing young learner engagement in English classes in post-pandemic times: Current practices at a center of foreign languages in Vietnam. *World Journal of Educational Research*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v9n5p118>

- Irvine, J. (2020). A mixed method study of students' engagement, attitude, and achievement in grade 10 mathematics. *Journal of Mixed Method Studies*, 2, 26-46. <https://doi.org/10.14689/jomes.2020.2.3>
- Karabıyık, C. (2019). The relationship between student engagement and tertiary level English language learners' achievement. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 6, 281-293.
- Karafil, B., & Oguz, A. (2019). Examining Factors Affecting Student Engagement in English Preparatory Classes According to Student Opinions. *Üniversitepark Bülten*, 8(2), 117-133.
- Kartal, M. G. (2023). *The role of student engagement, foreign language motivation, and foreign language anxiety on foreign language achievement in online and hybrid education systems* (Publication No.815558) [Doctoral dissertation, Bahçeşehir University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Keen, D., Pennell, D., Muspratt, S., & Poed, S. (2011). Teacher self-report on learner engagement strategies in the early years' classroom. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 38, 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-011-0029-5>
- Kieu, N., & Hung, L. (2023). EFL teachers' perceptions of young learners' engagement in listening lessons. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v8i4.5007>
- Koo, M., & Yang, S.-W. (2025). Likert-type scale. *Encyclopedia*, 5(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia5010018>
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(1), 683-706.
- Lam, S., Jimerson, S., Wong, B. P. H., Kikas, E., Shin, H., Veiga, F. H., Hatzichristou, C., Polychroni, F., Cefai, C., Negovan, V., Stanculescu, E., Yang, H., Liu, Y., Basnett, J., Duck, R., Farrell, P., Nelson, B., & Zollneritsch, J. (2014). Understanding and measuring student engagement in school: The results of an international study from 12 countries. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(2), 213-232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000057>
- Lastari, D. S., Mustafa, S.M., & Nur'ani, Y. (2020). Using game based learning tool to engage young learners in the EFL online classroom. iNELTAL Conference Proceeding (*the International English Language Teachers and Lecturers Conference*), 26-33.
- Legault, L. (2017). *Self-determination theory*. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1162-1
- Li, J., King, R., & Wang, C. (2022). Profiles of Motivation and engagement in foreign language learning: Associations with emotional factors, academic achievement, and demographic features. *System*. 108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102820>
- Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 153-184.
- Mekki, O. M., Ismail, A. M., & Hamdan, D. M. (2022). Student Engagement in English Language Classes: An Evaluative Study. *Sohag University International Journal of Educational Research* 6, 15-52.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1997) Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 74, 5-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

- Minalla, A. A. (2023). EFL learners' engagement: Empowering EFL young learners to initiate speaking through personalizing meaningful EFL classroom activities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 410-415.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Okul Öncesi Eğitim ve İlköğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliğinde değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Yönetmelik, *Resmi Gazete* 32339 (14 Nisan 2023). Erişim 18 Haziran 2025. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2023/10/20231014-1.htm>
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2017). Engagement, gender, and motivation: A predictive model for Japanese young language learners. *System*, 65, 151-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.01.011>
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q. (2019). Acting, thinking, feeling, making, collaborating: The engagement process in foreign language learning. *System*, 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102128>
- Oruç, E. (2020). *The mediating role of student engagement on the relationship between foreign language anxiety and English language achievement in English language Curriculum* (Publication no. 617208) [Doctoral dissertation, Eskisehir Osmangazi University]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Oruç, E., & Demirci, C. (2020). Yabancı dil dersinde katılımın ölçümü: yabancı dil dersi katılım ölçeği. *Turkish Studies - Education*, 15(2), 1113-1126. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.40025>
- Özer, N., Atik, S., Şad, S. N., & Kış, A. (2015). Relationship between student engagement and trust in professors: a study on Turkish college students. *EERA Network: 22. Research in Higher Education, Budapest*.
- Özer, N., Atik, S., Şad, S.N., & Kış, A. (2018). Turkish college students' trust in professors and engagement: "I trust therefore I engage!". *Kuram Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 24(3), 553-578. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2018.014>
- Pandey, G. P. (2025). From Motivation to engagement in ELT: Evidence based strategies for transformation. *Journal of Critical Studies in Language and Literature*, 6(1), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jcsll.v6i1.318>
- Panhwar, A., & Bell, M. (2022). Enhancing student engagement in large ESL classes at a Pakistani university. *Educational Action Research*, 31, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2022.2089191>
- Peck, S. (2001). Developing Children's Listening and Speaking in ESL. Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.), in *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Heinle & Heinle
- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring Engagement in Tasks in the Language Classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 50-72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094>
- Pratiwi, H., & Priyana, J. (2022). Exploring Student Engagement in Online Learning. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 28(2), 66-82. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um048v28i2p66-82>
- Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_7
- Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 579-595. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032690>

- Reeve, J., & Lee, W. (2014). Students' classroom engagement produces longitudinal changes in classroom motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(2), 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034934>
- Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(4), 257-267.
- Ryan, R. L., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Savucu, Y. (2024). Eğitim sisteminde yabancı dil öğreniminin önemi (Derleme ve durum çalışması). *Spor ve Bilim Dergisi*, 2(2), 73-88.
- Setiawan, A., Munir, A., & Suhartono, S. (2019) Students' engagement in EFL class through creative teaching. *Journal Education and Development*, 7(3), 26-30. <https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v7i3.1143>
- Shi, Y. (2021). Exploring learner engagement with multiple sources of feedback on L2 writing across genres. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.758867>
- Soner, O. (2007). Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitiminin dünü bugünü. *Öneri Dergisi*, 7(28), 397-404. <https://doi.org/10.14783/maruoneri.684553>
- Storch, N. (2008). Metatalk in a pair work activity: Level of engagement and implications for language development. *Language Awareness*, 17(2), 95-114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410802146644>
- Sun, Y., Shi, W., & Fu, L. (2023). Improving Chinese EFL learners' engagement in online classes: the role of teacher scaffolding and teacher respect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2180009>
- Sundqvist, P. (2024). Extramural English as an individual difference variable in L2 research: Methodology matters. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190524000072>
- Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2009). Engagement with language: interrogating a construct. *Language Awareness*, 18(3-4), 242-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197264>
- Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2012). Language awareness in Language Learning and teaching: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 376-388
- Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2017). Researching language engagement; current trends and future directions. *Language Awareness*, 27(1-2), 21-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2017.1406490>
- Svalberg, A. M.-L., & Askham, J. (2020). Teacher and learner perceptions of adult foreign language learners' engagement with consciousness-raising tasks in four languages. *Language Awareness*, 29(3-4), 236-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1785483>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Talan, T., & Gülseçen, S. (2019). The Effect of a Flipped Classroom on Students' Achievements, Academic Engagement and Satisfaction Levels. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 20, 31-60. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.640503>
- Taşçı, S. (2023). A comprehensive study on the problems of English language teaching in Turkey: Reflections from pre-service ELT teachers. *Trakya Journal of Education*, 13(3), 1656-1672.
- Taylor, L., & Parsons, J. (2011). Improving Student Engagement. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1).

- Toraman, S. (2021). Karma yöntemler araştırması: Kısa tarihi, tanımı, bakış açıları ve temel kavramlar. *Nitel Sosyal Bilimler*, 3(1), 1-29.
- Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL teachers' general language proficiency and learners' engagement. *RELC journal*, 48(1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368821769006>
- Tuzcu-Eken, D. (2021). English education in Turkey: Why are we 'very low level'? *RumeliDE Dil Ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 23, 804-822. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.949700>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Yuan, Y., & Dao, P. (2025). Young learners' online engagement: Exploring learners' and teachers' perspectives. *Language Awareness*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2025.2502427>
- Zakhir, M. (2019). Extracurricular activities in TEFL classes: a self-centered approach. *Sisyphus Journal of Education*, 7(2), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.17590>
- Zhang, Z. (2020). Learner engagement and language learning: a narrative inquiry of a successful language learner. *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(3), 378-392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786712>
- https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/kurulkararlari/fihristler/fihrist_2012.pdf
- https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2025_02/10103210_ilkogretimkurumlari_hdc_2024_21.pdf
- <https://www.ef.com/assetscdn/WIBIwq6RdJvcD9bc8RMd/cefcom-epi-site/reports/2024/ef-epi-2024-english.pdf>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Yabancı Dil Dersi Katılım Ölçeği

Değerli katılımcı, bu anket, İngilizce dersinde yabancı dil katılımınız hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmek amacıyla yapılan çalışmanın bir parçasıdır. Katılım tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır ve size bağlıdır. Lütfen ankette size yönlendirilen 18 soruyu dikkatlice okuyun ve size en uygun seçeneği işaretleyin. Her sorunun yanında aşağıdaki seçenekler yer almaktadır: 1. Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 2. Katılmıyorum, 3. Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum, 4. Katılıyorum, 5. Kesinlikle Katılıyorum. Sorulara dikkat etmeniz ve hiçbirini boş bırakmamanız önemlidir. Cevaplarınız gizlilik ilkelerine uygun olarak işlenecek ve sadece araştırmacı tarafından erişilecektir. Anketin tamamlanması yaklaşık 5 dakikanızı alacaktır. Katılarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Bölüm A:

Cinsiyetiniz

Kız	
Erkek	

Sınıfınız

5.sınıf	
6.sınıf	
7.sınıf	
8.sınıf	

1.dönem İngilizce dersi karne notunuz.

--

The Language Learner Engagement Scale

Bölüm B: Size en uygun seçeneği işaretleyin

		1. Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	2. Katılmıyorum.	3. Ne katılıyorum, ne katılmıyorum.	4. Katılıyorum	5. Kesinlikle Katılıyorum.
1	İngilizce dersinde kendimi öğrenmeye hazır hissedirim.					
2	İngilizce dersinde kendimi enerjik hissedirim.					
3	İngilizce dersinde kendimi iyi hissedirim.					
4	İngilizce dersine katılmaya istekliyimdir.					
5	İngilizce dersinde yeni şeyler öğrenmekten zevk alırım.					
6	İngilizce dersinde ilerleme kaydettiğimi düşünüyorum.					
7	İngilizce dersinde yeni bir şey öğrenirken konuyu kendi cümlelerimle ifade ederim.					
8	İngilizce dersinde geliştirilmesi gereken yanlarımı fark ederim.					
9	İngilizce dersinde öğrendiklerimi önceki öğrenmelerimle ilişkilendiririm.					
10	İngilizce dersinde dil yapılarını inceleyerek kuralları kendim çıkarırım.					
11	İngilizce dersindeki performansımın nasıl olduğunu değerlendiririm.					
12	İngilizce dersinde arkadaşlarıma konuyla ilgili sorular sorarım.					

13	İngilizce dersinde öğrendiklerimi gerçek yaşamda nasıl kullanabileceğimi düşünürüm.					
14	İngilizce dersinde zorlandığım yerlerde öğretmenimden yardım isterim.					
15	İngilizce dersinde konuyla ilgili öğretmenime sorular sorarım.					
16	İngilizceyi daha iyi öğrenmek için arkadaşlarımla iletişim kurarım.					
17	Derste bana bir şey sorulmadığı sürece sessiz kalırım.					
18	Ders hakkındaki önerilerimi dile getiririm.					

APPENDIX 2

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

- 1.** Do you think students are willing to participate in English classes? Why/why not?
- 2.** Do you think students' attitudes towards the English they have learnt is positive? Why/why not?
- 3.** Do you think students aim to make progress in English classes? Why/why not?
- 4.** What do you suggest to enable your students to approach English in a positive manner?
- 5.** Do you think students are focused during English classes? Why/why not?
- 6.** Do you think students question the English language? Why/why not?
- 7.** Do you think students are aware of their knowledge of the English language? Why/why not?
- 8.** What do you suggest to enable your students to participate in English classes by being more mentally active?
- 9.** Do you think students interact with each other in English in English classes? Why/why not?
- 10.** Do the students have suggestions for English classes? Why/why not?
- 11.** Do the students ask lesson-related questions to their friends or the teacher during English classes? Why/why not?
- 12.** Do the students believe they can use the English they have learnt in the class in their lives? Why/why not?
- 13.** What do you suggest to enable your students to interact with their peers in English classes?