Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

Katedra za metodiku

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING STYLES AND STRATEGIES AND FL
LEARNERS' MOTIVATION

Diplomski rad

Studentica: Marija Trajanov

Mentor: dr. sc. Renata Geld, docent

Komentor: dr.sc. Marko Jurčić, izv. prof.

Zagreb, ožujak, 2016

University of Zagreb

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

TEFL Section

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING STYLES AND STRATEGIES AND FL

LEARNERS' MOTIVATION

Graduation Thesis

Student: Marija Trajanov

Mentor: Asst. Prof. Renata Geld, PhD

Co-mentor: Assoc. Prof. Marko Jurčić, PhD

Zagreb, March 2016

Examining Committee:

Stela Letica Krevelj, PhD, postdoc.

Asst. Prof. Renata Geld, PhD

Assoc. Prof. Marko Jurčić, PhD

Table of contents:

Abstract

This thesis examines the relationship between teaching styles and strategies and FL learners' motivation in the Croatian elementary school context. The theoretical part of the paper gives an overview of literature examining the relation between motivation, teaching styles and teaching strategies. The second part of the thesis presents the study conducted in 2 elementary schools in Zagreb, in which we wanted to find out which teaching style motivated learners the most. We were also interested in seeing if there was a correlation between a particular teaching style and the application of motivational teaching strategies. The results showed that the students whose teacher had a democratic teaching style were more motivated to learn English than the students whose teacher had an autocratic teaching style, which confirmed the first hypothesis. The results also confirmed that the teacher who had a democratic teaching style used more motivational strategies than the teacher who had an autocratic teaching style, which is in accordance with the second hypothesis of the thesis.

Key words: FL learners' motivation, teaching style, autonomy, motivational strategies

1. Introduction

Teachers are often regarded as one of the key elements that determine students' motivation and many researchers have put these two into correlation. There are many studies which have investigated in what ways teachers influence students' motivation by determining the optimal teaching style and teaching strategies. This thesis looks closely into the relationship between teaching styles and strategies and students' motivation to learn a foreign language. The study was put into the context of a Croatian elementary school, where English is a compulsory subject since the 1st grade, and had two main aims. The first aim was to examine the relationship between teaching styles and learners' motivation, and to determine which style would be most motivating one for English language learners. The second aim was to examine if there would be a link between particular teaching styles and the use of motivational strategies in practice.

The theoretical part of this thesis is divided into three main parts, each presenting one of the main concepts: motivation, teaching styles and teaching strategies. Many different theories of motivation are presented in Chapter 2, which is followed by a more detailed look into the self-determination theory, developed by Ryan and Deci (2000), who made the basic distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. What follows next is an overview of the importance of motivation in second language acquisition (SLA) and Gardners' social psychological theory, which was used as a theoretical framework for this study, just like the Attitude/ Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) used in the study as a source for the Student Motivation Questionnaire. Chapter 3 presents a short overview of student-teacher rapport, and introduces teaching style and teaching strategies as two factors that influence students' motivation. Chapter 4 gives us a detailed look into teaching style, its definitions, criteria for determining it and its classification based on the level of authority used in the classroom. This theoretical background was also used in the study for designing the Teaching Style Questionnaire. Chapter 5 deals with teaching strategies, analysing their importance in SLA, defining which strategies were found to be motivational for second language students in previous research and analysing the relationship between teaching strategies and students' motivation, but also between teaching style and teaching strategies.

Chapter 6 introduces the research part of the thesis, which comprises aims, samples, instruments and procedures, results and discussion. Next comes Chapter 7 with the final conclusion.

2. What is motivation?

Motivation is frequently used in both educational and research contexts. However, there is very little agreement of the exact meaning of this concept in the literature (Dörnyei, 1998). Motivation is most often defined as a state in which we feel the need or desire to behave in a certain way in order to achieve a goal (Petz 1992, as cited in Sviben, 2006). But, the concept of motivation can be studied in different ways.

Pintrich and Schunk (1996, as cited in Sandoval Pineda, 2011, p. 32) define motivation as a process which cannot be observed directly, but can be inferred by behaviours as "choice of tasks, effort, persistence, and verbalizations". According to them, motivation involves goals that provide impetus for action and it requires physical or mental activity geared towards attaining goals. Deci and Ryan (2000) claim that most contemporary theories of motivation assume that people initiate and persist at behaviours to the extent that they believe these behaviours will lead them to a desired outcome.

According to Sviben (2006), people see motivation as a unique concept which varies in its quantity. However, people do not differ in how motivated they are, but in that which type of motivation derives their actions (Deci and Ryan, 2000, as cited in Sviben, 2006). Dörnyei and Otto (1998, as cited in Sandoval Pineda, 2011) define motivation as the changing arousal in a person that initiates, directs, coordinates and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes, where initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized and acted out. Dörnyei (2001, as cited in Sandoval Pineda, 2006) claims that motivation is responsible for the reasons people decide to do something, how long they are willing to do it and how hard they are going to pursue it.

According to Sandoval Pineda (2011), Gardner (2010) similarly explains motivation, saying that it is a construct that is difficult to define. It is important to mention that Gardner discusses motivation in terms of second language learning (Kassing, 2011). He claims that motivation drives an individual to put in effort to achieve a goal (Gardner, 2001, as cited in Kassing, 2011). Gardner identifies characteristics that motivated individuals show and, according to him, they "express effort in attaining a goal, show persistence, attend to the tasks that are necessary to achieve the goals, have a strong desire to attain their goal, enjoy the activities necessary to achieve their goal, are aroused in seeking their goals, and have expectancies about their successes and failures" (Sandoval Pineda, 2011, p. 32).

2.1 Self-determination theory

In Self-Determination Theory (SDT), we distinguish between different types of motivation based on different reasons or goals that initiate an action. The most basic distinction in this theory is between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable (Ryan and Deci, 2000). It deals with behaviour performed for its own sake in order to experience pleasure and satisfaction such as the joy of doing an activity or satisfying one's curiosity (Dörnyei, 1998). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome (Ryan and Deci 2000); it involves performing a behaviour as a means to an end, i.e. to receive some extrinsic reward (e.g. good grades) (Dörnyei, 1998). Dörnyei (1998) claims that extrinsic motivation has traditionally been seen as something that can undermine intrinsic motivation; several studies have confirmed that students will lose their natural intrinsic interest in an activity if they have to meet some extrinsic requirement. However, studies have shown that under certain circumstances, for example if they are sufficiently self-determined and internalised, extrinsic rewards can lead to intrinsic motivation.

Deci and Ryan introduced SDT in 1985 (Dörnyei 1998). For them, the need for autonomy is an innate human need, referring to the desire to be self-initiating and self-regulating of one's actions. Therefore self-determination, i.e. engaging in an activity "with a full sense of wanting, choosing, and personal endorsement"' (Deci, 1992, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998, p. 121), is seen as a prerequisite for any behaviour to be intrinsically rewarding (Dörnyei, 1998). Deci and Ryan have also divided extrinsic motivation into four types along a continuum between self-determined and controlled forms of motivation: external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and integrated regulation (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier and Ryan, 1991, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998). External regulation refers to the least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation, coming entirely from external sources such as rewards or threats. It is followed by introjected regulation, which involves externally imposed rules that the student accepts as norms he/she should follow in order not to feel guilty. Identified regulation occurs when the person engages in an activity because he/she highly values and identifies with the behaviour and sees its usefulness, while integrated regulation involves choiceful behaviour that is fully assimilated with the individual's values, needs and identity (e.g. people deciding to learn a language which is necessary for them to pursue their interests) (Dörnyei, 1998).

Many educational activities in schools are not designed to be intrinsically interesting, so the central question is concerned with how to motivate students to self-regulate such activities and carry them out on their own, without any external pressure. Deci and Ryan (2000) describe this problem

within SDT in terms of cultivating the internalization and integration of values and behavioural regulations. Here, internalization is the process of taking in a value or regulation, while integration is the process by which individuals more fully transform the regulation into their own so that it will come from their sense of self (Deci and Ryan, 2000).

2.2 Importance of Motivation in SLA

In second language (L2) learning, motivation has been seen as one of the key factors that determine second language achievement and attainment (Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007). According to Cheng and Dörnyei (2007), motivation serves as an initial engine and an ongoing force that helps acquire a foreign language (FL). Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies in student's language aptitude and learning conditions (Dörnyei, 1998). Mihaljević Djigunović (1995) claims that most models of L2 learning include motivation as one of the key concepts, while Dörnyei (1998) says that motivation to learn an L2 presents a particularly complex and unique situation even within motivational psychology, as language is at the same time a communication coding system, an integral part of individual's identity and a channel of social organization. According to Mihaljević Djigunović (1998), L2 achievement is mediated by two components. The first, cognitive component involves intelligence, language aptitude and cognitive learning strategies, while the other, affective component includes attitude and motivation, personality traits and language anxiety.

Gardner defines three essential components of L2 learning motivation: effort (motivational intensity), the desire to learn the language, and positive attitudes towards learning the language (satisfaction) (Mihaljević Djigunović, 1996). Mihaljević Djigunović (1996) claims that it is important to note Gardner's insistence on the fact that all three components are necessary to explain motivation in language learning properly. However, as Cheng and Dörnyei (2007) claim, Gardner's social psychological approach has never explicitly addressed the classroom implications of motivation theory and did not provide language teachers with direct help in promoting their teaching practice.

2.2.1 Gardner's social psychological theory

Gardner's approach to motivation was developed in the 1960s and is concerned with the role of individual differences in L2 acquisition (Sandoval Pineda, 2011). The starting point in Gardner's

theory is that students' attitudes towards a specific language group will influence their success in incorporating aspects of that language (Gardner, 1985, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998). Gardner (1985, in Dörnyei, 1998, p. 122) defines L2 motivation as "the extent to which an individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity". More specifically, motivation is comprised of three components: *motivational intensity*, *desire to learn the language*, and an *attitude towards the act of learning the language.* According to this theory, motivation refers to a central mental engine that subsumes effort, want/will (cognition) and task-enjoyment (affect). Gardner argues that all three components belong together because the truly motivated individual displays all three (Dörnyei, 1998).

According to Gardner, success in acquiring a second language depends on the learner's attitude towards the other community. Because of this, he includes the following individual differences that influence how well individuals perform in a learning situation: achievement, intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety. The model also accounts for the language environment, both formal and informal (Sandoval Pineda, 2011).

In 2006, Gardner slightly modified his model, where he emphasized motivation as a key tenet in second language acquisition. In this model, he also indicates the educational setting and the cultural context as factors that could have influence on motivation. He further states that preconditions such as cultural beliefs about language learning, family variables, language history, gender and even personality characteristics might also influence a student's levels of motivation. Gardner also claims that the nature of the educational setting could have an influence; the quality of instruction, the teacher, the curriculum, lesson plans, etc. could all influence a student's motivation to learn the language. In this version of Gardner's model, integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation are both correlated variables that serve as the foundation of motivation to learn a L2, while motivation and language aptitude are two variables that have an influence on language achievement. Here Gardner also states that an instrumental orientation (instrumentality) could also support motivation in a certain manner. In his model, he also includes language achievement and language anxiety, which reciprocally influence one another. (Sandoval Pineda, 2011).

2.2.2 Attitude/Motivation Test Battery - AMTB

AMTB is a frequently used standardised instrument with well-documented psychometric properties constructed by Gardner, based on his model of L2 acquisition. It also offers a comprehensive list of motivational factors that have been found to affect learning achievement significantly (Dörnyei, 1998). In it, Gardner included items questioning students' *integrativeness,*

attitudes towards the learning situation, motivation, language anxiety, instrumentality and *parental encouragement* (Sandoval Pineda, 2011).

Integrativeness represents a genuine interest in learning an L2 with the purpose of communicating with members of the other language community and can be measured by integrative orientation, interest in foreign languages and attitudes toward foreign language speakers. *Attitudes toward the learning situation* involves attitudes toward any aspect of the situation in which the language is learned; they could be directed toward the teacher, the course in general, classmates, the course material, extra-curricular activities associated with the course, etc. Gardner (2010, as cited in Sandoval Pineda, 2011) defines *motivation* as the driving force in any situation and it is measured by motivational intensity, the desire to learn the second language and attitudes toward learning a language. *Instrumental motivation* is defined in terms of a financial reward. *Language anxiety* refers to an anxiety associated with learning and using an L2 and it is independent from general anxiety. In the AMTB, *language anxiety* is assessed by measures like language class anxiety and language use anxiety (Sandoval Pineda, 2011). Gardner also explains that *integrativeness* and *attitudes toward the learning situation* are seen as supporters of motivation, but it is motivation that is responsible for achievement in the second language (Sandoval Pineda, 2011).

3. Student - teacher relationship

According to Kassing (2011), many studies show that in FL learning, a number of factors can contribute to differences in learners' academic performance, such as age, gender, attitudes, aptitude, motivation, learning approach, language learning strategies and learning style (Dörnyei, 1994; Dörnyei and Csizer, 1998; Gardner, Tremblay and Masgoret, 1997; Ghenghesh, 2010; Kormos and Csizer, 2008; Liando, et al., 2005; Oxford, 1994). Motivation has been regarded as one of the most vital factors in L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2001; Liando et al., 2005; Oxford, 1994, as cited in Kassing, 2011) and it is acknowledged as a key factor in determining success in L2 learning attainment, so the strategies that maintain language learners' motivation are of interest to educators (Kassing, 2011).

Nakata (2006, in Kassing, 2011) states that, unlike aptitude, which cannot be changed since it is innate, motivation can oscillate over time. Nakata (2006), Brophy (2010) and Dörnyei (2001), as cited in Kassing (2011), claim that the fluctuation of motivation, academic achievement and the amount of effort exerted may be affected by two main factors: internal and external (including teachers, parents, peers and community). This means that students' motivation is something a

teacher can influence (Kassing, 2011). Many authors state that among those external factors that influence students' motivation in learning a FL, teaching strategies and practices play a more significant role than the rest (Chambers, 1998; Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei, 1998; Dörnyei, 2001; Gan, Humphreys and Hamplyon, 2004; Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Trang and Baldauf, 2007, as cited in Kassing, 2011). In order to verify this, Dörnyei (1998) interviewed 50 secondary-school learners studying either English or German as a FL in various schools in Budapest and found that of all demotivating factors ranked by the students, teacher-related factors were ranked as the most important ones. Teacher-related factors included in the study were personality, commitment to teaching, the level of attention teachers paid to students, competence, methods used, teachers' style and their rapport with students (Kassing, 2011).

Because of this, Dörnyei claims that teachers have the responsibility to provide opportunities for learning and to encourage language learners to realize their potential and maximize their progress. It is important for them to realize that providing a safe and non-threatening learning environment is crucial for strengthening and preserving students' motivation (Kassing, 2011). Kyriacou (2001, in Kozina, 2011) notes that the most important task faced by the teacher is to arouse and sustain students' participation during the whole lesson in order to achieve desired pedagogical goals.

In this paper, two teacher-related factors that were found to influence students' motivation will be closely examined: teaching style and teaching strategies. However, in order to see how they influence students' motivation, we first must make a clear distinction between the two, since they are often mixed up and used interchangeably.

4. Teaching style

According to Bašić (2009), there may be many different meanings of the word "style", but some characteristics that are common to all senses of the word can be determined: style is not something transient, but relatively permanent; it refers less to content, and more to the manner of its expression. In other words, style is a relatively permanent, stable pattern of behaviour or expression, which is achieved by selecting different options and resources and their combination.

Staničić (2006, in Kolak, 2010) states that leadership style in teaching can be defined as characteristic individual teaching methods, actions and techniques typical for one teacher in relationship towards students and the tasks realized in the educational process. According to Kozina (2011), it is the general way a teacher behaves or acts; it is more closely determined by his/her relationship with colleagues and subordinates, the manner of setting goals, decision-making,

communication, control, etc. Nevertheless, individual actions still do not make a style, but rather its dominant characteristic and a relatively permanent behaviour towards students (Bašić, 2009). Therefore, the term "teaching style" or the style of social interaction in the classroom can be determined by two main features:

a) a relatively consistent pattern of behaviour

b) the typical (dominant) way of social communication and the combination of forms and means of teaching (Bašić, 2009).

There are different theories of teaching style that are based on personality traits of teachers, however these have not been found to be crucial in determining successful leaders (Kolak, 2010). Behaviourist theories, on the other hand, say that it is the behaviour of an individual and not his/her traits which are of crucial importance when it comes to successful leadership, where teachers either have their focus on the task or on the students (Kolak, 2010). Leadership focused on the task includes setting tasks, organization, setting time frames, supervision and guidance as well as control, whereas leadership focused on relationship with students includes support, communication, improving relationships among members of the class, active listening and feedback (Kolak, 2010). According to Kolak, the leadership style which is focused on students will certainly make students feel more satisfied and create a more positive climate in the classroom. However, we cannot be certain if this satisfaction will produce better results in students' work.

Bašić (2009) states certain criteria when distinguishing between different teaching styles:

1. Who decides what happens in the classroom?

Is it entirely the teacher, or does the teacher negotiate the content and methods with students?

2. How is learning organized (the basic form of teaching and learning)?

Is the learning based on frontal teaching and the dominance of teacher's verbal activity or are forms of learning cooperative? In the first case, the explanation from the teacher is dominant form of teaching, communication is based on questions and answers, where questions come from the teacher and are only used for the assessment of students. In the second case, project learning is dominant and communication is multidirectional (teacher-student, student-student/s); students work independently and learning is experiential and participating.

3. How is students' work evaluated and assessed?

Is the evaluation of teaching and assessing achievement of individual students entirely or mostly performed by the teacher or does the teacher encourage students to analyse the course of teaching what they have done well and poorly and where the causes of their success/failure lie? In the second case, the teacher also encourages students' self-control and peer evaluation, self-evaluation and argumentation of their suggestions.

4. Educational practice and methods dominantly used

Does the teacher predominantly use instructions, requests and orders in the short imperative form ("you should, you must, you must not"), methods of blocking the negative behaviour (warnings, punishment), but also a personal praise of "the best" students or does he/she give instruction in the form of request, recommendation, norm ("it would be desirable, we should")? In the second case, the teacher gives homework explicitly explaining its purpose, avoids punishment and pressure, encourages solidarity, cooperation, mutual friendship, gives I-messages and awakens the responsibility for the group and not just for individual achievement.

5. Educational attitude towards students

Is the attitude towards the possibilities of educational influence dominantly pessimistic or optimistic? In the first case, the teacher believes that children and youth should not be trusted and that they do not want to do anything on their own, hence the belief that the teacher holds all the responsibility and needs to "force" students to learn, so that the students are dependent on the teacher. If the teacher has an optimistic attitude, he/she believes that a positive environment is decisive and that heritage is not critical; he/she trusts the students that they can study independently, has faith in the students' desire for cognition and puts orientation on group achievement and responsibility for the collective.

4.1 Classification of teaching styles

According to Kolak (2010), a typical classification of leadership styles is based on the criteria of using authority in educational process. It provides us with three different styles: autocratic, democratic and *laissez fair*e style.

An autocratic teacher has a teaching style in which all the power and authority is in the hands of one person. It presents an old, traditional teacher who has high expectations of the students. Work, order and discipline govern his/her class. He/she values obedience and the unquestionable execution of the task exactly how he/she sets it (Kozina, 2011). The teacher with an autocratic style of leadership sets firm rules and standards and does not want to discuss or negotiate with students. His/her teaching is clear and well structured, leadership in the class is effective and strict, movement within classroom is restricted, and studying goes on in silence. The teacher is focused on goals, aims and materials; and then on students. He/she applies punishment to achieve discipline and all situations and relationships are focused on the teacher. The teacher is the one who makes most of the decisions, classroom is filled with tension and fear and students, although

successful, are often not satisfied (Kolak, 2010).

A democratic teacher has a leadership style in which he/she allows the students to participate in decision making. He/she knows the students' abilities very well and sets the bar a little bit above their possibilities (Kozina, 2011). Kolak (2010) states that the teacher with a democratic leadership style helps set the rules in the classroom by including the students in creating those rules. He/she is ready to discuss and negotiate the reasons for the students' choices and often encourages the students' task related activities. A democratic teacher uses various teaching forms and methods and offers individual support if needed. He/she allows movement inside the classroom and different ways of learning, tolerates quiet murmur that doesn't disturb others and is focused primarily on students and then on tasks and goals and finds time for individual approach. He/she is motherly or fatherly, encourages the class to be a team, always communicates with students, allows to be interrupted if something is not clear or understandable, takes students' opinion into account and shows great understanding for every problem in the classroom. He/she encourages students' self-esteem and self-confidence, and his/her students make decisions and take responsibility for their own learning (Kozina, 2011).

A *laissez faire* teacher has a leadership style which does not interfere in the work of the students, who have a great deal of freedom and a free hand in their behaviour and work. This teacher is preoccupied with his/her own problems and is not interested in what is happening with the students and the educational process. His/her main goal is to do the work without any conflict (Kozina, 2011). According to Kolak (2010), a *laissez faire* style teacher does not introduce or follow rules, the students' initiative is on a high level and his/her interference with the flow of the teaching process is minimal. He/she does not intervene unless extremely necessary, does not follow every classroom situation closely and leaves decision making largely to the students. There is no clearly structured code of behaviour inside the classroom, the system of awards and punishments is not clear and consistent, the students set the level of noise in the classroom and they move freely around. The teacher intervenes only in extreme situations, does not stick to set discipline norms, does not follow up deadlines and the classroom is a picture of anarchy filled with student conflicts and dissatisfaction (according to Vizek-Vidović, Vlahović Štetić, Rijavec, Miljković, 2003; Kiper, Mischke, 2006, as cited in Kolak, 2010).

According to Bognar and Matijević (2002, in Kozina, 2011), we rarely meet completely democratic and completely autocratic teachers, but we can say that the teachers predominantly have characteristics of these styles. Bašić (2009) also claims that these models (styles) are just a hypothesis, by which we discover an educational reality. In other words, in educational reality we often find smaller or bigger deviations from the ideal type and we do not have a type with all these characteristics. That is why we talk about a predominantly autocratic, a predominantly democratic

and a predominantly *laissez faire* teaching style. Another important thing to mention is that the selection of a teaching style depends on the learning situation. In one situation, a teacher may use an autocratic teaching style and a democratic in another. However, most often we say that a teacher is predominantly democratically or autocratically oriented. This leads us to the question of authority and autonomy and how much a teacher should use and allow one and the other inside the classroom.

4.2 The question of authority

Authority is, much like the entire pedagogical process, inconstant and depends on a number of factors. The quantity and pace of establishing and realizing authority in favour of the increasing students' autonomy and responsibility can only be determined on a case-by-case basis. If the pedagogical relationship has been established with the goal of setting students on their own feet, the main feature of the relationship should be gradual withdrawal of authority until it is no longer needed (Bašić, 2009). Students' autonomy represents an inner endorsement of their actions and the sense that one's actions are one's own (Deci and Ryan, 1987, in Reeve and Jang, 2006). When students are autonomously motivated, they report an internal locus of causality, the feeling of freedom and a sense of choice over their actions (Reeve et al., 2003, in Reeve and Jang, 2006). According to Reeve and Jang (2006), teachers who are autonomy supportive help students develop a sense of congruence between their classroom behaviour and their inner motivational resources (needs, interests, preferences, and goals). Teachers cannot directly give students an experience of autonomy; instead, they can only encourage and support this experience by identifying students' inner motivational resources and creating classroom opportunities for students to match their inner resources with their classroom activity. However, controlling teachers force students to put aside their inner motivational resources and adhere to a teacher-centred agenda instead. In order to encourage students to adhere to their agendas, teachers then impose external goals, utter pressuring communication messages and generally influence students' ways of thinking, feeling and behaving. Bašić (2009) claims that authority is necessary for students in the process of their independence, but not for the "insurance" of teachers. However, she claims that authority includes trust, but excludes intimacy and confidentiality. The authority knows the right distance necessary for the relationship between the teacher and the students (pedagogical tact); in this case, the teacher treats students with sympathy, but does not need strict and constant control because the relationship is based on mutual honesty and truthfulness.

4.3 Motivation and authority

The importance of autonomy over authority on students' motivation has been confirmed in numerous research studies within the school context (Sviben, 2006). In learning situations that allows autonomy, students are offered a choice and an opportunity for self-guidance. There is a minimum amount of pressure, demands and imposed goals. Another person's perspective is taken into consideration (Ryan and Chirkov, 2001, in Sviben, 2006). Several studies have shown that teachers' support of autonomy results in greater intrinsic motivation, curiosity and desire for challenges, as opposed to a controlling style (Deci, Nezlek and Sheinman, 1981; Ryan and Grolnick, 1989, in Sviben, 2006). The studies that dealt with the advantage of supporting students' autonomy, among other things, found that autonomy results in better self-esteem and a sense of competence, greater creativity and flexibility of thought and a better long-term memory (according to Deci and Ryan, 2000, in Sviben, 2006). On the other hand, a controlling style results in lower teaching quality, especially when it comes to more complex and demanding conceptual processing (Ryan and Grolnick, 1987, in Deci and Ryan, 2000). Sviban (2006) states that these findings have been confirmed on all levels of schooling. According to Ilić (2012), research studies have shown that an autocratic teaching style does not motivate students' work and learning or classroom relations. Here students do not have the opportunity to develop communications skills and if something is not clear to them, they will not dare to ask the teacher for clarification. Students mostly do not like autocratic teachers because they say they are too strict and often not objective and work for their own benefit, rather than out of love of work. Ilić (2012) also states that a *laissez faire* teaching style does not allow students to develop social skills and self-control. Students are taught that everything is allowed. They do not know the boundaries of their behaviour or what is socially acceptable. If they are faced with a difficulty, they will have trouble achieving a goal since they are poorly motivated and used to achieving a goal without much effort. On the other hand, teachers with a democratic teaching style have been found to be the most appropriate and the most effective teachers. Such teachers do not impose their own opinion, but know how to listen to the students. Students feel that such teachers understand and accept them; they trust their teachers and often confide in them.

Andrilović and Čudina-Obradović (1996) also concluded that the best result in terms of task achievement is achieved by an autocratic style of management. However, this type of interaction is not good for the development of communication skills, nor does it encourage the motivation for achievement. On the other hand, a democratic style is slightly less efficient in task achievement, but students feel the satisfaction of task performance in democratic teachers' classes (in Šimić Šašić and

Sorić, 2011).

4.4 Previous research on teaching style

In 1981, Deci, Schwartz et al. constructed an instrument for assessing a motivating style for teachers. They constructed a questionnaire featuring eight vignettes that described the motivational-related problems that children face in school (PS questionnaire). Each vignette lists four ways a teacher might respond to children's problems, each representing a point along a continuum that extends from *highly controlling* to *highly autonomy-supportive* (Reeve, Bolt and Cai, 1999). The results suggested that the teachers who scored as relatively autonomy-supportive had students who scored high on the measure of intrinsic motivation toward school (Deci, Nezleck, et. al., 1981; Deci, Schwartz, et.al. 1981, in Reeve, Bolt and Cai, 1999).

In 1996, Reeve and Deci examined the effects of competition within a controlling and non-controlling setting on participants' intrinsic motivation for puzzle solving. Results indicated that pressuring students to win by establishing a competition within a controlling context led to less intrinsic motivation than competition within a non-controlling context (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Reeve, Bolt and Cai (1999) used Deci and Schwartz's PS questionnaire and conducted a study in which they wanted to test in what way autonomy-supportive teachers teach and motivate students. They found that teachers who were said to be autonomy-supportive, compared with their controlling counterparts, listened more, held the instructional materials less, resisted giving the solution and supported the students' intrinsic motivation and internalization. They also showed a tendency to give fewer directives, asked more questions about what the students wanted to do, responded more to the students' questions and proposed more perspective-taking statements.

Black and Deci (2000) conducted a similar study in which they, among others, wanted to examine if having leaders who were perceived to be more autonomy-supportive would lead to students' greater perceived competence and interest in chemistry. The results indicated that students' perceptions of teacher's autonomy support explained significant increases in the autonomy of the students' self-regulation for studying organic chemistry over the semester. Also, the students showed an increase in competence and interest/enjoyment as well as a significant decrease in anxiety during the semester.

5. Teaching strategies

The term *teaching strategy* is often mixed with terms *teaching methods* and *techniques*; however there are certain differences between these terms. A teaching method is the way the information or behaviour is carried forward in the instructional process (lecture, presentation, discussion, debate, etc.). A technique is a detailed list of rules or a guideline for a teaching activity (such as mind mapping or brainstorming) (Mehrgan, 2013).

A teaching strategy defines the basic procedure of how content is elaborated during the teaching process. According to Marton (1987), a language teaching strategy is defined as a conceived set of pedagogical procedures imposing a definite learning strategy on the learners, directed to the development of competence in the target language (Mehrgan, 2013). Hatch and Brown (2000, in Pavičić Takač, 2008) state that teaching strategies refer to everything teachers do or should do in order to help their students learn; which teaching strategy a teacher will use depends on the time available, the content as well as on its value for the learners. Seal (1991, as cited in Pavičić Takač, 2008) makes a distinction between planned and unplanned teaching strategies. Unplanned teaching strategies relate to teachers' spontaneous reactions with the aim to help learners when the need arises, in other words: improvisation. Planned teaching strategies, on the other hand, refer to deliberate, explicit, clearly defined and directed teaching.

Dörnyei (2001, in Kassing, 2011, p. 22) put in a lot of work in defining motivational strategies, stating that they are "motivational influences that are consciously exerted to achieve some systematic and enduring positive effects". In other words, they are steps or techniques employed by teachers in their teaching practices to facilitate students' motivation in learning a second language. Dörnyei constructed a framework of motivational teaching strategies, which is based on his overview of motivational techniques in teaching a second language (Dörnyei, 2001a, in Kassing, 2011). The framework comprises four main dimensions, which include marco-strategies. The dimensions are as follows:

1. *Creating basic motivational conditions* by laying the foundations of motivation through establishing a good teacher-student rapport, creating a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere and generating a cohesive learner group with appropriate group norms

2. *Generating initial motivation*, i.e. "whetting the students' appetite" by enhancing learners' language-related values and attitudes, increasing learners' goal-orientedness, making the teaching materials relevant for learners and creating realistic learners beliefs

3. *Maintaining and protecting motivation* by making learning stimulating, presenting tasks in a motivating way, setting specific learners' goal, protecting learners' self-esteem and increasing their self-confidence, allowing learners to maintain a positive social image, promoting cooperation among learners, creating learner autonomy and promoting self-motivating learner strategies

4. *Encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation* by promoting motivational attributions, providing motivational feedback, increasing learner satisfaction and offering rewards and grades in a motivating manner (Dörnyei, 2001a, in Kassing, 2011).

5.1 Relationship between teaching strategies and students' motivation

We have already mentioned that many external factors influence students' motivation, including teachers, parents and peers (Bernaus and Gardner, 2008; Brophy, 2010; Dörnyei, 1994; Sugita and Takeuchi, 2010, in Kassing, 2011). Among them, teachers' teaching strategies and practices have a more significant role than the rest (Chambers, 1998; Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei, 1998; Dörnyei, 2001; Gan, Humphreys and Hamp-lyon, 2004; Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Trang and Baldauf, 2007, in Kassing, 2011). In 1999, Nikolov found that students' motivation and proficiency in the development of their FL skills were strongly related to experiences they gained in the classroom, so that they affected both the students' motivation in learning and their academic attainment (Kassing, 2011). According to Dörnyei, students may be motivated to learn if their teacher provides them with appropriate conditions to learn and utilizes motivational teaching strategies (Kassing, 2011). Chambers (1998) and Nakata (2006) also argue that teachers and their use of teaching strategies affect a student's attitude towards an academic subject and that teachers carry a large responsibility to motivate their students (in Kassing, 2011). What teachers do is the key determinant of learners' motivation and they carry the responsibility to provide opportunities for learning and to encourage language learners to realize their potential and maximize their progress. Teachers are the ones who have control over learning environment, and they play a crucial role in students' motivation (Kassing, 2011). Lightbown and Spada (2006, in Kassing, 2011) also commented on this issue by saying:

If teachers can make their classroom places where students enjoy coming because the content is interesting and relevant to their age and level of ability, where the learning goals are challenging yet manageable and clear, and where the atmosphere is supportive and non-threatening, we can make a positive contribution to students' motivation to learn (p. 21).

5.2 Motivational strategies in teaching English as a foreign language

Motivational strategies should be seen as an important aspect of L2 motivation in terms of the theoretical analysis. However, most research studies so far have focused more on identifying and analysing various motives and validating motivational theories than on developing techniques to increase motivation. However, in the last two decades, many L2 scholars such as Alison and Halliwell (2002), Brown (2001), Chambers (1999), Williams and Burden (1997) and Dörnyei (2001) have started designing and summarising motivational techniques for classroom application (Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007). In 1998, Dörnyei and Csizer conducted a study on Hungarian teachers of English. They evaluated 51 motivational strategies, indicating how important they considered the techniques to be and how frequently they actually implemented them. Based on the results, Dörnyei and Csizer produced *Ten commandments for motivating learners,* which reflected the teachers' practice in genuine classroom-relevant settings. However, when considering these strategies, we must not neglect cultural context, since Dörnyei and Csizer's strategies were derived from the Western educational context (Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007). Their ten commandments for motivating learners that arose from this study are as follows: set a personal example with your own behaviour; create a pleasant, relaxed atmosphere in the classroom; present the tasks properly; develop a good relationship with the learners; increase the learner's linguistic self-confidence; make the language classes interesting; promote learner autonomy; personalise the learning process; increase the learners' goal-orientedness; and familiarise learners with the target language culture (Dörnyei, 1998).

Gardner and Bernaus (2008), however, claim that there is a possibility that students' and teachers' perceptions about motivational teaching strategies do not correspond with each other. Therefore, they conducted a quantitative study of 31 EFL teachers and 694 students in Catalonia by employing a modified Attitude Motivation Test Battery, aiming to investigate teachers' and students' perceptions of strategy use and the effect of those teaching strategies on students' motivation to pursue foreign language learning. The results showed that students and teachers agreed only on the use of some strategies and most students perceived the strategies used related to their own attitudes and motivation, while teachers did not think the teaching strategies affected students' attitudes and motivation (Bernaus and Gardner, 2008, in Kassing, 2011).

When concerned with motivational strategies, Madrid (2002) discussed them in terms of external and internal motivation and the question of praise. He claims that the external or extrinsic rewards may bribe or force someone into doing something that he/she would not do on his/her own.

Although extrinsic motivation may appear to be effective in keeping the students' interest in the daily classroom activities, several studies have proved the contrary, namely that extrinsic rewards do not produce permanent changes (Madrid, 2002). Deci (1975) and Kohn (1993) state that, when motivating children with extrinsic rewards, the intrinsic value in the task is undermined, while Hitz and Driscoll (1989) conclude that it can be counterproductive or impractical as an external motivator (in Madrid, 2002). However, other research studies indicate that praise can be used effectively if it is used as an encouragement. According to Madrid (2002), praise is used to express approval and admiration, while encouragement refers to a positive acknowledgment response that focuses on student efforts to work completed. According to Hitz and Driscoll (1989, in Madrid, 2002), teachers can express encouragement in the following ways: by offering specific feedback rather than general comment; by focusing on improvement and efforts rather than evaluation of a finished product; by using sincere, direct comments; by helping students develop an appreciation of their behaviours and achievements; by avoiding competition and comparison with others; and by working toward self-satisfaction. Rogers, Ludington and Graham (1999) also claim that extrinsic motivators can be very effective in producing behaviour, but they may result in lower quality of performance and behaviour over time. They tend to be ineffective in improving long-term quality performance, promoting self-directed behaviours, self-confidence and intrinsic motives (in Madrid, 2002).

5.3 Previous research on motivational teaching strategies

As previously mentioned, Dörnyei and Csizer (1998) were one of the first researchers who identified which teaching strategies could increase students' motivation. Their study produced *Ten commandments for motivating learners,* which reflected teachers' practice in genuine classroom-relevant settings in the Western context (Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007).

In 2002, Madrid conducted a study in which he wanted to find out what the students' and teachers' perception about the motivational effect of classroom events was, how powerful the teacher's motivational strategies were, and to what degree the students felt that the following motivational strategies increase their motivation. His study included the following strategies: praise and rewards, scolds or punishment, adequate difficulty of tasks, intellectually challenging exercises, good results and good grades vs. bad results and grades, working cooperatively in pairs or groups, negotiating curricular decisions, taking part in self-evaluation processes, working individually or autonomously, class participation, using the FL/L2 in class, satisfying needs and interests, acting

out in the presence of classmates, competing with others, information about the objectives and contents of tasks, no participation (passive listening), discovering things and drawing personal conclusions, and using audio-visual and technological aids. Motivational strategies which were found to be used the most are: using audio-visual aids and new technologies, encouraging maximum students' participation, satisfying needs and interests, and introducing systematic group work (Madrid, 2002).

Seniye (2007) carried out a study in which he wanted to find out which teaching strategies students found to be motivating. 7 teachers and 138 pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate students were involved in the study. Teachers had to rate 56 motivational strategies, while students reflected on the motivational strategies that they found to be motivating and demotivating in the language classroom. The results suggested that teachers and students shared similar perceptions of motivational behaviour, despite a few mismatches in their answers (in Cheng, 2011).

In 2009, Bernaus, Gardner and Wilson conducted a study in order to investigate students' motivation, second language achievement and their relation to teacher motivation and strategy use in the classroom. The study was conducted on 31 English teachers and 694 students in Spain. Both students and teachers filled a questionnaire with the aim to investigate the frequency of teacher motivational strategies used and their perception of the use of motivational strategies. The researchers also used a mini-AMTB to investigate students' motivation (in Cheng, 2011). According to Cheng (2011), results showed that students tended to involve more actively in classroom and feel more motivated if teachers were motivated as well.

In 2011, Cheng carried out a study in which he wanted to find out what the relationship between teacher motivational strategies and student motivational behaviour in Chinese FL classroom context was. The participants of the study were 3 Chinese FL teachers and 78 students. Cheng used Motivation Orientation of Language Teaching Classroom Observation Scheme, adopted from Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's study (2008), which observed EFL teachers' motivational teaching practice and students' condition of participation. The post-lesson interview with the students was also done to gain extra information on the students' opinion on the learning experience. The results suggested that there was a positive relationship between teachers' use of motivational and students' motivational behaviour. The more motivated practice was used in classroom, the higher students' motivational behaviour was. However, Cheng points out that students' motivational behaviour did not solely and necessarily relate to motivational strategies.

5.4 The relationship between teaching style and the use of motivational strategies

As has been previously mentioned, there are not many research studies investigating the relationship between teaching style and the use of motivational strategies in L2 context. However, the connection between the two can be made since they have both been found to have an important influence on students' motivation. According to Matijević (1998), teachers have to organize the teaching process in which student will participate in different pedagogical episodes and critically examine the world around them. This could be possible if they, instead of teaching oriented on the teacher, planned and performed classroom activities based on strategies of active learning. These strategies are expressed with terms problem-based and research-based teaching, discovery learning, simulation and didactic games. In other words, teachers need to allow students a certain level of autonomy and apply strategies which support this concept. Many other authors also agree with this idea, such as Lendić (2006, as cited in Peko and Varga, 2014). He (2006) claims that contemporary school context requires such learning that enables students to have a high level of autonomy and self-monitoring, referring to active learning. Simons (1997, in Peko and Varga, 2014) points out those students should plan and prepare the learning process themselves, engage in learning, regulate their learning, control it and persist in the learning activities. According to Kyriacou (2001, in Peko and Varga, 2014), active learning should always be present in the classroom, as it enables students to act autonomously and have control over the classroom activities. It plays a significant role in their motivation, since it links problem-based teaching to innate curiosity and the need for exploration of every child.

Kovačević (2005, as cited in Peko and Varga, 2014) claims that it is necessary to introduce new learning strategies that promote active learning. The effectiveness of active learning strategies depends mostly on the teacher and the way in which he/she understands his/her role in the classroom (Peko and Varga, 2014). In a new pedagogical context, their main role starts to be planning and designing classroom situations that promote active learning. As Temple and Brophy (2002, in Peko and Varga, 2014) state, they should make students aware of the teaching goals, the methods applied and the expected learning outcomes. All these authors put an emphasis on students' autonomy in the learning process, which should be evident both in their teaching style and in the application of teaching strategies that promote students motivation.

Cheng (2011) states, in the context of teaching style, that teachers may have a varied pattern in using motivated practice to enhance student's classroom behaviour. He further explains that teachers should not aim to use as many motivating practices as they can, but rather the ones that he/she finds good for his/her classroom context and his/her teaching style. As has been previously

mentioned, teaching style is also something that depends on the learning context and we often find deviations from the ideal style (Bašić, 2009). That is because motivation is a concept that involves qualitative variables, such as teacher-student rapport. It is not something that can be expressed in figures (Cheng, 2011).

6. The study

6.1 Aim

Many research studies have investigated how teaching styles and teaching strategies influence learners' motivation. However, not many researchers have investigated the relationship between teaching styles and the use of motivational strategies in L2 learning context. This study examined these factors in correlation and therefore had two aims. First, we examined the relationship between teaching styles and learners' motivation so as to determine which style would be most motivating one for English language learners. Second, we aimed to investigate whether there would be a link between particular teaching styles and the use of motivational strategies in practice.

Our first hypothesis was that the students whose teacher had a democratic style of teaching would be more motivated than the students whose teacher had an autocratic teaching style. Our second hypothesis was that a democratic teacher would use more motivational strategies than an autocratic teacher in his/her teaching practice.

6.2 Sample

For our study, we needed to find teachers who had predominantly one teaching style in their teaching practice. In order to do so, the researcher contacted six elementary-school English teachers and asked them to participate in the study. Only 2 teachers were found to have predominantly one teaching style. Therefore, our study included only two elementary English teachers from two different schools in Zagreb, one male and one female, and their students in the 7th and 8th grade, in total 39 students.

One teacher was found to have a predominantly democratic teaching style, while the other was found to have a predominantly autocratic teaching style. The democratic teacher taught the 7th grade, which had 20 students, and the autocratic teacher taught the 8th grade, which had 19

students. As we can see, both classes have a relatively small number of students for the Croatian educational context. It is also important to mention that the assessments of teaching styles could only be put into the context of the classes the teachers were observed in, as it has been previously mentioned that teachers tend to change their teaching style depending on the learning context.

6.3 Instruments and procedures

In order to determine the teachers' style, the researcher used a questionnaire taken from Kolak (2010), which included items determining an autocratic, a democratic and a *laissez faire* teaching style, and 6 criteria determining the same, taken from Bašić (2009) (see Appendix A). The researcher observed several classes taught by each teacher and conducted a short interview with the teachers in order to determine his/her teaching style. Also, one person accompanied the researcher in order to ensure the validity of her assessment. A total of 6 teachers were observed. However, as previously mentioned, only 2 were found to have predominantly one teaching style.

After determining the teachers' style, the students were asked to participate in the study. Since students were underage, the researcher asked parental consent for their participation in the study, telling them they would have to fill in an anonymous questionnaire. The students were given 2 questionnaires; the Teaching Strategies Questionnaire (TSQ) and the Student Motivation Questionnaire (SMQ) (see Appendices B and C). Both questionnaires were in Croatian and the students filled them in separately.

The TSQ measured the strategies their English teacher used in classroom. It contained 23 items describing situations in which the teacher used strategies which Dörnyei and Csizer (1998) and Madrid (2002) have found to be motivational. The students had to indicate their responses on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). The strategies covered in the questionnaire were as follows: creating a good relationship with the students (giving advice, encouraging, showing gratitude, giving feedback); creating a good and motivating classroom climate; encouraging classroom cohesiveness (as a group with certain rules that everybody follows); encouraging positive attitudes and values toward the language, and familiarizing students with the culture of the country/countries where the language is spoken; using materials that are relevant for the students; directing students towards achieving a predetermined goal; creating realistic pictures of students' knowledge; presenting the material in an interesting and fun way; defining specific learning goals with the students with regard to their wishes and personal goals; maintaining students' language learning confidence; creating students' autonomy and

encouraging students' self-evaluation; giving motivating feedback (specific, private, direct, focused on advancement and effort and not on evaluation of final product, not comparing students to each other); encouraging students instead of simply praising them; giving tasks that are of adequate weight and intellectually demanding; showing students that their grade is a product of their effort and not luck; determining the content with the students and giving them information about the specific learning goals and aims; encouraging active learning, (pair work, group work, discovery learning, problem solving, debate, cooperative learning); encouraging L2 use in the classroom and giving advantage to communicative approach; using different teaching models and materials (realia, IT, graphics); cross-curricular approach.

The SMQ was adapted from the Croatian version of the AMTB by Gardner and Mihaljević Djigunović (2003). The original version contained 104 items, however the number of items in this questionnaire was reduced to 39. The SMQ covered five subscales: *Integrativeness, Attitudes toward the learning situation, Motivation, Instrumentality*, and *Self-efficiency*. The subscale *Integrativeness* included three categories: *Integrative orientation* (items 1, 2, 12, 15, 27, 28), *Attitudes toward English speaking people* (items 11, 13, 40) and *Interest in FL* (items 3, 31, 32). The subscale *Attitudes toward the learning situation* consisted of two categories: *Attitudes toward the teacher* (items 20, 22, 23, 24, 30), and *Attitudes toward the course* (items 5, 7, 9, 18, 19, 21). The subscale *Motivation* included the following categories: *Motivational intensity* (items 16, 29, 35, 36), *Desire to learn* (items 8, 10, 25, 38), and *Attitudes toward learning English* (items 4, 14, 34, 37). The subscale *Instrumentality* included one category of questions, *Instrumental orientation* (items 6, 33), just like the subscale *Self-efficiency* (items 17, 26). The original questionnaire comprised two more categories, *Language anxiety* and *Parental encouragement*; however they were not relevant for this study, so the researcher excluded them from the questionnaire. Like in the TSQ, here the students also had to indicate their responses on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

For both questionnaires, a Cronbach Alpha test was conducted to check their internal consistency reliability in the SPSS software package. Both questionnaires were found to have excellent internal consistency, having Cronbach's Alpha higher than 0.9 (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: Reliability Statistics Motivation

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,966	,967	39

Table 2: Reliability Statistics Strategies

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,912	,911	23

A descriptive analysis was also performed to provide more detailed information on students' motivation and teachers' application of motivational strategies. A descriptive analysis of SMQ and TSQ results was conducted in the SPSS software package, just like the statistical significance analysis of differences in students' motivation and teaching strategies in relation to the teaching style. For this analysis, a T-test was used.

The researcher conducted the survey in person in October 2015, during students' English or homeroom classes. Both English teachers and headteachers were informed of the rationale of the study, what the questionnaire entailed and how the students should complete it. All parents gave their consent and all students agreed to participate in the study. The students were provided with general information about the researcher and the study, given instructions on how to fill in the questionnaires and were also informed that the questionnaires were anonymous and that only the researcher would see their answers and use them only for the purpose of the study.

6.4 Results and discussion

6.4.1 Descriptive analysis of the SMQ results in relation to teaching style

The students' answers were analysed according to the SMQ subscales in relation to the style of their English teacher, where we examined the most noticeable differences in the students' answers.

In the subscale of *Integrativeness*, we can notice a difference in the students' answers in relation to the style of their English teacher; the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style generally gave more positive answers than students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. The biggest difference in answers was evident on item 2: "I think I will need most of the things we learn in school later in life", where 60% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while only 16.7% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. Also, 38.9 % of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style mostly or completely disagreed with this statement, while none of the students whose

teacher had a democratic teaching style answered negatively. As we can see from Tables 3 and 4, there was no big difference evident in the students' answers on the items questioning *Attitudes toward English speaking people* in relation to the teaching style, however it is noticeable that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style generally gave more positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style.

Table 3: Attitudes toward the people
Autocratic

		Mot11	Mot13	Mot39
N	Valid	19	19	19
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		4,16	3,74	3,63

Table 4: Attitudes toward the people
Democratic

		Mot11	Mot13	Mot39
N	Valid	20	20	20
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		4,30	4,00	3,80

In the category *Interest in FL*, the biggest difference in the students' answers in relation to the teaching style was evident on item 31: "I would like to learn as many languages as possible". 65% of students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while only 31.6% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. It is also important to mention that none of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered negatively, while 10.5% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style completely disagreed with this statement.

As Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 show, a big difference in the students' answers is noticeable among the items questioning students' *Attitude toward the teacher and the course* in relation to the style of their English teacher. The students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. 55% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with the statement, "I like the way my English teacher presents the material", while 21.1% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. Similar results were obtained on items 22: "I think my English teacher expects a lot from me", and 30: "I look forward to my English classes because my teacher is really good".

Table 5: I think my English teacher expects a lot from me (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	1	5,3
	3	10	52,6
	4	3	15,8
	5	5	26,3
	Total	19	100,0

Table 6: I think my English teacher expects a lot from me (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	2	1	5,0
	3	3	15,0
	4	5	25,0
	5	11	55,0
	Total	20	100,0

Table 7: I look forward to my English classes because my teacher is really good (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	3	15,8
	2	3	15,8
	3	7	36,8
	4	2	10,5
	5	4	21,1
	Total	19	100,0

Table 8: I look forward to my English classes because my teacher is really good (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	2	1	5,0
	3	4	20,0
	4	4	20,0
	5	11	55,0
	Total	20	100,0

Also, a noticeable difference in the answers was evident on item 23: "I really like my English teacher". 50% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while only 10.5% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style gave the same answer. It is also important to mention that only one student whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered negatively on one item in the category *Attitudes towards the teacher*, while the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style gave more negative answers (see Tables 9 and 10).

Table 9: Attitudes towards the teacher Autocratic

		Mot20	Mot22	Mot23	Mot24	Mot30
N	Valid	19	19	18	19	19
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		3,11	3,58	3,28	3,42	3,05
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5

Table 10: Attitudes towards the teacher Democratic

		Mot20	Mot22	Mot23	Mot24	Mot30
N	Valid	20	20	20	19	20
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		4,50	4,30	4,20	3,84	4,25
Minimum		3	2	3	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5

We can also notice a difference in the students' answers in relation to the teaching style on the items questioning students' *Attitude towards the course*. A difference in answers was evident on item 7: "I think English is an important school subject". 90% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, and the other 10% mostly agreed. Only 50% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while 11.1% completely disagreed. We can also notice a difference in the students' answers on item 19: "We learn interesting things on our English classes and I am not bored". None of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered negatively, while 26.5% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style completely disagreed with this statement.

In the subscale of *Motivation*, the questionnaire contained items questioning the students' *Motivational intensity*, *Desire to learn the FL*, and *Attitudes toward learning English*. There is a big difference among the students' answers in relation to the style of their teachers. Here, like in other subscales, the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. Among the items questioning *Motivational intensity*, the biggest difference in the students' answers was evident on item 16: "I really try to learn English as best as I can", where 60% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while only 36.8% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. We could also observe interesting answers on item 29: "When I have trouble understanding something on my English classes, I ask my teacher for help". 26.3% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered negatively, while

none of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave a negative answer. Among the items questioning the students' *Desire to learn*, the biggest difference in answers was noticeable on item 25: "I would like to learn more in this subject". Here 70% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement, while only 21.1% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. The items questioning the students' *Attitude towards leaning English* also showed interesting results. We found a big difference in students' answers on item 14: "The things we learn on our English classes will be useful later in life"; 75% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with this statement. On the other hand, only 36.8% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same.

Both groups of students showed high level of *Instrumentality*, although it is noticeable that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. 90% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with the statement "I think it is necessary to know English for my future education and career", while 68.4% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. As Tables 11 and 12 show, the students gave similar answers on item 33.

Table 11: It is important to learn English because other people will appreciate me more if I know it (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	1	2	10,5
	2	1	5,3
Valid	3	3	15,8
	4	5	26,3
	5	8	42,1
	Total	19	100,0

Table 12: It is important to learn English because other people will appreciate me more if I know it (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	1	1	5,0
	2	2	10,0
Valid	3	1	5,0
	4	3	15,0
	5	13	65,0
	Total	20	100,0

The items questioning the students' evaluation of *Self-efficiency* showed lower results than the rest of the questionnaire. However, it was also evident here that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. 60% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style completely agreed with the statement, "I believe that I will successfully master course material by the end of the school year", while 52.6% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same on that question. Similar results are noticeable on item 26: "I am satisfied with my grades in this course" (see Tables 13 and 14).

Table 13: I am satisfied with my grades in this course (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	1	2	11,1
	2	1	5,6
Valid	3	3	16,7
	4	5	27,8
	5	7	38,9
	Total	18	100,0

Table 14: I am satisfied with my grades in this course (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	2	1	5,0
Valid	3	5	25,0
	4	5	25,0
	5	9	45,0
	Total	20	100,0

From the descriptive analysis of the SMQ results in relation to the teaching style, we can notice that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers on all subscales of the questionnaire than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. These results are in accordance with previous research by Deci and Schwartz (1981), Reeve and Deci (1996), and Black and Deci (2000), who investigated the relationship between the level of autonomy the teacher provided in the classroom and the students' intrinsic motivation. Promoting students' autonomy is one of the factors for differentiating between democratic and autocratic teaching styles, and as Bašić (2009) states, the main goal in student-teacher rapport is to allow the students to become independent by gradual reduction of authority. Following this logic, we can conclude that teachers who have a predominantly democratic teaching style no longer need authority as a means to engage students in the learning process as they have already established a relationship with the students that promotes their autonomy. This

autonomy is something that allows the students to develop components of motivation for learning a foreign language that Gardner mentions as essential: effort (motivational intensity), the desire to learn the language and positive attitudes towards language learning (satisfaction). These results confirm this assumption, because the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style gave more positive answers on the SMQ items questioning the students' effort, the desire to learn English and their attitudes towards language learning than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. These students did not only give more positive answers on the items that directly measure their motivation, but also on the subscales that supported it (*Attitudes toward the learning situation, Instrumentality* and *Integrativeness*).

6.4.2 Descriptive analysis of the TSQ results in relation to teaching style

The students' answers were analysed according to the TSQ items in relation to the style of their English teacher, where we examined the most noticeable differences in the students' answers. The results were analysed to gain an insight into the differences in the teachers' application of motivational strategies.

Examining the results of the TSQ, we can notice a difference in the students' assessment of strategies their teachers use in relation to their teaching style. As can be seen from Tables 17 and 18, it is noticeable that the students assessed that the teacher who had a predominantly democratic teaching style used more strategies which previous research had found to be motivational than the teacher who had a predominantly autocratic teaching style.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics Autocratic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Str12	19	1	5	4,42	1,071
Str7	19	1	5	4,42	,961
Str20	19	2	5	4,16	1,119
Str4	19	2	5	4,11	,875
Str1	19	3	5	4,05	,911
Str14	19	1	5	3,95	1,224
Str17	18	1	5	3,83	1,339
Str23	19	2	5	3,74	1,046
Str2	19	1	5	3,74	1,147
Str13	19	1	5	3,68	1,493
Str3	19	2	5	3,53	1,124
Str22	19	1	5	3,53	1,219
Str10	19	1	5	3,47	1,264
Str6	19	1	5	3,42	1,346
Str9	18	1	5	3,22	1,353
Str8	19	1	5	3,16	1,425
Str19	19	1	5	3,11	,994
Str16	18	1	5	3,06	1,211
Str5	19	1	5	2,89	1,049
Str21	19	1	5	2,89	1,197
Str18	19	1	5	2,32	1,455
Str11	19	1	4	1,84	1,015
Str15	18	1	4	1,39	,850
Valid N (listwise)	15				

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics Democratic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Str7	20	2	5	4,85	,671
Str19	20	3	5	4,80	,523
Str20	20	4	5	4,75	,444
Str13	20	2	5	4,75	,716
Str17	20	3	5	4,70	,657
Str3	20	2	5	4,70	,801
Str12	20	3	5	4,65	,671
Str10	20	2	5	4,55	,759
Str11	20	3	5	4,55	,605
Str1	20	3	5	4,50	,607
Str14	20	3	5	4,45	,605
Str2	20	3	5	4,35	,671
Str8	20	3	5	4,25	,716
Str16	20	3	5	4,20	,696
Str6	20	3	5	4,15	,745
Str23	20	2	5	4,00	,918
Str22	20	3	5	4,00	,725
Str21	20	3	5	3,90	,852
Str9	20	2	5	3,80	,951
Str4	20	3	5	3,50	,607
Str18	20	1	5	3,50	1,192
Str5	20	2	5	3,40	1,046
Str15	20	1	5	2,05	1,356
Valid N (listwise)	20				

The students assessed that both teachers used strategy 15: "At the beginning of the school year, we choose with the teacher which book we would like to use" the least often; 77.8% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered negatively, while that number was slightly lower in the other group of students (50%). The students also assessed that their teachers did not use strategy 18: "At the beginning of the school year, we decide with the teacher about the activities and themes we would like to do, and with whom we would like to work in pair, group, etc." very often (see Tables 19 and 20).

Table 19: At the beginning of the school year, we decide with the teacher about the activities and themes we would like to do, and with whom we would like to work in pair, group, etc. (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	9	47,4
	2	1	5,3
	3	5	26,3
	4	2	10,5
	5	2	10,5
	Total	19	100,0

Table 20: At the beginning of the school year, we decide with the teacher about the activities and themes we would like to do, and with whom we would like to work in pair, group, etc. (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	2	10,0
	2	1	5,0
	3	6	30,0
	4	7	35,0
	5	4	20,0
	Total	20	100,0

Among the top strategies that both teachers used was strategy 7: "When our teacher grades us, he is always realistic, and my grade is in accordance with my knowledge". 80% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that this statement always referred to their teacher, while 44.4% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style assessed the same. According to the students' assessment, the autocratic teacher used strategy 12: "The teacher does not grade me only at the end of the school year or when we have tests, but evaluates my effort and work during the whole year (taking notes, tracking my activity, comparing my progress during the year)" the most; 68.4% of his students assessed that this statement always referred to their teacher. Although it was not at the top of the strategies he/she used, 75% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered the same on this question, which was more than the other group assessed. The students also assessed that both teachers used strategy 20: "At the beginning of the school year, the teacher tells us what he expects from us and what we have to master this year" often. 75% of the students whose teacher has a predominantly democratic teaching style stated that their teacher always employed this strategy, while 52.6% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style made the same assessment.

As Tables 21 and 22 demonstrate, the biggest difference in the students' answers was evident on item 11: "The teacher asks me the following questions: Do you feel ready for the test? What do you think, how did you do on the test? What was the hardest/easiest part?" 47.4% of the students

whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered negatively, while 60% of the students whose teacher has had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that this statement always referred to their teacher.

Table 21: The teacher asks me the following questions: Do you feel ready for the test? What do you think, how did you do on the test? What was the hardest/easiest part? (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	9	47,4
	2	6	31,6
	3	2	10,5
	4	2	10,5
	Total	19	100,0

Table 22: The teacher asks me the following questions: Do you feel ready for the test? What do you think, how did you do on the test? What was the hardest/easiest part? (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	3	1	5,0
	4	7	35,0
	5	12	60,0
	Total	20	100,0

Also, a big difference in the students' answers was evident on item 19: "The teacher in his/her English classes does not use only the workbook, but also computer, pictures, videos, songs, realia...". 85% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that their teacher always used this strategy, while only 10.5% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style made the same assessment for their teacher. The difference in the students' assessments was also observed on item 13: "The teacher does not have favourite students, but treats everybody the same". 85% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered that this was always true, while 47.4% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style made the same assessment. Similar assessments were made on item 3: "Our English teacher encourages us to help each other, work together when solving a problem and never to mock others"; 85% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style answered that their teacher always used this strategy, while only 26.3% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered the same. The answers on item 4, "We learn about the culture and customs of English speaking countries on our English classes", are also interesting because this was the only question where the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style gave more

positive answers than the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style (see Tables 23 and 24).

Table 23: We learn about the culture and customs of English speaking countries on our English classes (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	2	1	5,3
	3	3	15,8
	4	8	42,1
	5	7	36,8
	Total	19	100,0

Table 24: We learn about the culture and customs of English speaking countries on our English classes (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	3	11	55,0
	4	8	40,0
	5	1	5,0
	Total	20	100,0

We find an interesting difference in answers to item 8: "The teacher explains the material in a fun and interesting way". 15.8% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style answered that their teacher always employed this strategy, but 21.1% of them answered negatively. On the other hand, 40% of the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that their teacher always used this strategy, while none of them claimed the contrary. The difference was also noticeable on item 17: "The teacher always makes it clear that I got a certain grade because I tried enough, and not because I was lucky". 44.4% of the students whose teacher had an autocratic teaching style assessed that their teacher always used this strategy, while 80% of the students in the other group answered the same.

As we can see in Table 25, the democratic teacher got the most positive answers on item 7: "When the teacher grades us, he/she is always fair and my grade is in accordance with my knowledge", where 95% of the students answered "always", while only one student answered "rarely".

Table 25: When the teacher grades us, he/she is always fair and my grade is in accordance with my knowledge (Democratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	2	1	5,0
	5	19	95,0
	Total	20	100,0

As Table 26 shows, the autocratic teacher got the most positive answers on item 12: "The teacher does not evaluate my work only at the end of the semester or when we have test, but evaluates my effort and work during whole year (takes notes, tracks my classroom activity, and compares my progress during the year)". 68.4% of the students answered that this occurred always.

Table 26: The teacher does not evaluate my work only at the end of the semester, or when we have test, but evaluates my effort and work during whole year (takes notes, tracks my classroom activity, compares my progress during the year) (Autocratic)

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1	1	5,3
	3	2	10,5
	4	3	15,8
	5	13	68,4
	Total	19	100,0

From the descriptive analysis of the TSQ results in relation to teaching style, we can notice that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that their teacher used more motivational strategies than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style. Generally speaking, the biggest difference in answers between the democratic and the autocratic teacher was noticeable on the following items: "The teacher asks me the following questions: Do you feel ready for the test? What do you think, how did you do on the test? What was the hardest/easiest part?", "The teacher in his/her English classes does not use only the workbook, but also computer, pictures, videos, songs, realia...", "The teacher does not have favourite students, but treats everybody the same", "Our English teacher encourages us to help each other, work together when solving a problem and never to mock anyone", "We learn about the culture and customs of English speaking countries on our English classes", "The teacher explains the material in a fun and interesting way" and "The teacher always makes it clear that I got a certain grade because I tried enough, and not because I was lucky". On all items, except on item 4 ("We learn about the culture and customs of English speaking countries on our English classes"), the students assessed that the democratic teacher used strategies more than the autocratic teacher (see Tables 23 and 24). The lowest assessment for both teachers was noticeable on items 15 ("At the

beginning of the school year, we choose the workbook we would like to use with the teacher") and 18 ("At the beginning of the school year, we choose activities and themes we will cover with the teacher, and also decide with whom we would like to work in a group, pair, etc"). The reason for this could be that Croatian teachers do not have a great impact on the teaching materials they will use and the content that will be included in their curriculum, since that is largely determined by the curriculum for primary schools prescribed by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports and the Croatian National Educational Standard.

6.4.3 Statistical analysis of the SMQ results in relation to teaching style

The first hypothesis that this study aimed to confirm was that there would be a difference in students' language learning motivation in relation to the style of their English teacher. More precisely, the researcher hypothesized that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style would be more motivated than the students whose teacher had an autocratic teaching style.

As the results of T-test on students' samples in relation to teaching style from Tables 25 and 26 show, there is a statistically significant difference among the samples (p=0.007, t=2.855), which is in accordance with our initial hypothesis. A further analysis of the arithmetic means showed that the students whose English teacher had a predominantly democratic style achieved better results on the SMQ than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic style (the difference in means is 0.0589).

Table 25: Group Statistics

	Teaching style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Motivation	Autocratic	19	**3,6701**	,80533	,18475
	Democratic	20	**4,2760**	,48995	,10956

Table 26: Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	Mean Difference
Motivation	-2,855	**,007**	-,60589

The results of the T-test on the students' samples confirmed the first hypothesis, which was based on behaviourist models of leadership style, by which a person's behaviour towards others is crucial for determining his/her leadership style, as opposed to his/her personality traits (Kolak, 2010). This model results in the division of styles based on the level of authority allowed in the educational process, where democratic teachers allow more autonomy to their students than autocratic teachers (Kolak, 2010). The results are in accordance with the previous research done by Deci and Schwartz (1981), Reeve and Deci (1996), and Black and Deci (2000), who investigated the relationship between the level of autonomy teachers allowed their students and the students' motivation. It is important to mention that these authors did not separate the teachers into categories according to their teaching style, as was the case in this study, but they divided them on the basis of whether they were controlling (having high level of authority) or non-controlling (allowing students a great level of autonomy).

6.4.4 Statistical analysis of the TSQ results in relation to teaching style

The second hypothesis that this study aimed to confirm was that there would be a difference between the students' assessment of the strategies their teacher used and the style of their English teacher, so that the teacher who had a predominantly democratic teaching style would use more motivational strategies than the teacher who had a predominantly autocratic teaching style.

As we can see in Tables 27 and 28, the results of a T-test on the students' assessment of teachers' application of motivational strategies show that there is a statistically significant difference among the samples (p=0.000, t=4.641), which is in accordance with our initial hypothesis. From further observation of the arithmetic means of the samples, it can be noticed that the students whose teacher had a predominantly democratic teaching style assessed that their teacher used more strategies than the students whose teacher had a predominantly autocratic teaching style (the difference in means is 0.79616).

Table 27: Group Statistics

	Teaching style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Strategies	Autocratic	19	**3,3930**	,67575	,15503
	Democratic	20	**4,1891**	,32849	,07345

Table 28: Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	Mean Difference
Strategies	-4,641	**,000**	-,79616

The theoretical framework for this hypothesis and the TSQ was taken from Dörnyei and Csizer (1998), and Madrid's (2002) research. It is important to mention that these authors studied these strategies in the context of students' motivation. For that reason, we can assume that these strategies will have a motivating effect on the students. Although there is no previous research on the relationship between the teaching style and the application of motivational strategies in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes, Cheng (2011) notes that teachers should not strive to use as many strategies as possible, but should adapt them to the teaching context. Bašić (2009) states that teachers adapt their teaching style to the educational context. Following these assumptions comes a possible explanation that teachers, by adapting their teaching style to the classroom context, also adapt the use of these strategies. It is possible to assume that therefore the democratic teacher used more motivational strategies, because they provided students the experience of autonomy. On the other hand, the autocratic teacher used them less because they offered students more autonomy than they usually had and did not function in his classroom context.

7. Conclusion

This paper had two aims. The first aim was to examine the relationship between teaching styles and learners' motivation so as to determine which style would be the most motivating one for English language learners. The second aim was to determine a link between teaching styles and the use of motivational strategies in teaching practice. Our first hypothesis was that the students whose teacher had a democratic teaching style would be more motivated than the students whose teacher had an autocratic teaching style. Our second hypothesis was that a democratic teacher would use more motivational strategies than an autocratic teacher in his/her teaching practice. Both hypotheses were confirmed. More precisely, the students who had a predominantly democratic teacher gave more positive answers on the SMQ and assessed that their teacher used more motivational strategies than the students who had an autocratic teacher.

These results could be used in future teaching practice as guidelines for improving the same, because they suggest which behaviours and procedures have a positive effect on students' motivation. Both questionnaires used in this study show good metric characteristics and we can consider their application in teaching practice, especially the TSQ, which could be used as a self-evaluation questionnaire for teachers. On the other hand, we need to be careful when generalizing results of this study for several reasons. The first reason is its methodology, more precisely the sample. Since it was conducted on the sample of only 2 teachers and 39 students, it is not possible to generalize the results. This is bound to another reason: a teacher who has predominantly *laissez faire* teaching style was not found for the purpose of this study, so that it only contains the results for a democratic and an autocratic teacher.

Because of the procedure used to collect data in this survey, it was not possible to look into the correlation between the use of motivational strategies and students' motivation. The relationship between students' motivation and the application of motivational strategies in EFL classes arises as an interesting question for further research. The reciprocal influence of students and teachers on each other is yet another research question that arises from this study. As we have already mentioned, teachers adapt their teaching style to the educational context (Bašić, 2009), so it would be interesting to see to what extent students' behaviour affects a teacher's level of autonomy and his/her choice of teaching strategies. Many research studies investigated this problem; however not many have practical implementation in the educational process, so it is important to continue investigating these fields and their implementation in teaching practice.

8. References

1. Alison, J. and Halliwell, S. (2002) *Challenging Classes: Focus on Pupil Behaviour*. London: CILT.

2. Andrilović, V., Čudina-Obradović, M. (1996). *Psihologija učenja i nastave,* (3. izd.). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

3. Bašić, S. (2009). *Disciplina i autoritet. Stvaranje i održavanje poticajne nastavne klime.* Retrieved from http://www.azoo.hr/images/stories/dokumenti/Razredni_menadzment.doc

4. Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2008). Teacher motivation strategies, students perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 08, 387-401.

5. Bernaus, M., Gardner, R. C., & Wilson, A. (2009). Teachers' motivation, classroom strategy use, students' motivation and second language achievement. *Porta Linguarum*, 25-36. Retrieved from
http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero12/2%20Merce%20Bernaus.pdf

6. Black, A., & Deci, E. (2000). The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory perspective. *Science Education, 84(6),* 740–756. Retrieved January 4, 2016, from http://sdtheory.s3.amazonaws.com/SDT/documents/2000_BlackDeci.pdf

7. Bognar, L. Matijević, M. (2002.) *Didaktika.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

8. Brophy, J. (2010). *Motivating students to learn*. New York: Routledge

9. Brown, H.D. (2001) *Teaching by Principles* (2nd edn). New York: Longman.

10. Chambers, G. (1998). Pupils' perceptions of the foreign languagelearning experience. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 231.

11. Chambers, G.N. (1999) *Motivating Language Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

12. Cheng, H., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The Use of Motivational Strategies in Language Instruction: The Case of EFL Teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching,* 1(1), 153-174. Retrieved January 10, 2016, from
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2167/illt048.0#.Vpd46k-xd6c

13. Cheng, W. J. (2011). *Motivating Language Learners: Effects of Motivational Strategies on Student Motivation in Chinese Foreign Language Classroom.* Retrieved from The HKU Scholars Hub
http://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/177240;jsessionid=905DB5C52B9720117893BB9A2AB4F877

14. Chirkov, V. I. & Ryan R. M. (2001). Parent and teacher autonomy-support in Russian and U.S. Adolescents: Common effects on well-being and academic motivation. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology,* 32, 618-635.

15. Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation,* New York, Plenum.

16. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 53, 1024–1037.

17. Deci, E. L., Nezleck, & J. Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and the intrinsic motivation on the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 40, 1-10.

18. Deci, E. L., Schwartz, A., Sheinman, L., & Ryan, R. M. (1981). An instrument to assess adults' orientation toward control versus autonomy with children: Reflections on intrinsic motivation and percieved competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 73, 642-650.

19. Deci, E. L.,Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G. & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: the self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist,* 26, 325-46.

20. Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry,* 11(4), 227–268. Retrieved January 13, 2016, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

21. Deci. E. L. (1992). The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior: a self determination theory perspective. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi & A. Krapp (eds.), *Vie role of interest in learning and development,* 43-70

22. Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284

23. Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching,* 31(3), 117-135. Retrieved January 14, 2016, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=LTA

24. Dörnyei, Z. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Motivation* . Harlow: Longman.

25. Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

26. Dörnyei, Z. & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in Action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 43-69.

27. Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 203–229. Retrieved

January 10, 2016, from http://ltr.sagepub.com/content/2/3/203.abstract

28. Gan, Z., Humphreys, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding successfuland unsuccesful EFL students in Chinese University. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 229-244

29. Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

30. Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition. The socio- educational model*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

31. Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P., & Masgoret, A. (1997). Toward a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 344-362.

32. Gardner, R. C. & Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2003). *AMTB (Croatian-English Version).*

33. Gardner, R.C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 1-19). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

34. Ghenghesh, P. (2010). The Motivation of L2 learners: Does it decrease with age? *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 128-141.

35. Grolnick, W. S. & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent style associated with children's selfregulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 81, 143- 154.

36. Guilloteaux, M., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating Language Learners: A Classroom-Oriented Investigation of the Effects of Motivational Strategies on Student Motivation. *TESOL Quarterly,* 42, 55-77.

37. Hatch, E. & Brown, C. (2000) *Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education* (3rd printing). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

38. Hitz, R. & Driscoll, A. (1989). "Praise in the classroom", *ERIC Digests,* Ericeece@uxl.cso.uiuc.edu.

39. Ilić, I. (2012). Što je zaista važno u odnosu nastavnika i učenika. In *Upravljanje razredom*. Zagreb: Agencija za strukovno obrazovanje i obrazovanje odraslih.

40. Kassing, R. B. (2011). *Perceptions of motivational teaching strategies in an EFL classroom: the case of a class in a private universityin Indonesia.* Retrieved from Victoria University of Wellington Research Archieve http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/handle/10063/9/browse?value=Kassing%2C+Rachmania+Bachtiar&type=author

41. Kiper, H. & Mischke,W. (2008), *Uvod u opću didaktiku*. Zagreb: Educa.

42. Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: the trouble with gold stars, incentives plans, A 's,*

praise and other bribes, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

43. Kolak, A. (2010). Style of managing teaching process as classroom management determinator. *Journal Plus Education,* 6(2), 211-218. Retrieved January 4, 2016, from http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/4060/

44. Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 327-355.

45. Kovačevic, M. (2005). Aktivno učenje u interaktivnom odnosu sa sadržajima iz prirodoslovno-matematičkog područja. *Život i škola*, 13(1), 7 – 15.

46. Kozina, A. (2011). Školski menadžment Stilovi vođenja razreda. *Hrvatski Vojnik PRVI HRVATSKI VOJNO STRUČNI MAGAZIN*, 38-41.

47. Kyriacou, C. (2001.) *Temeljna nastavna umijeća*. Zagreb: Educa.

48. Ledić, J. (2006). *Zašto ulagati vrijeme u aktivno ucenje*? Rijeka: Udruga za razvoj visokoga školstva „Universitas".

49. Liando, N. V. F., Moni, K. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (2005). Student motivation in learning English as a foreign language in an Indonesian context. In J. Yamanashi & I. Milojević (Eds.), *Researching identity, diversity and education*. Brisbane: Post Pressed.

50. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

51. Madrid, D. (2002). The Power Of The FL Teacher's Motivational Strategies. *Revista De Filología Y Su Didáctica,* (25), 369-422. Retrieved January 4, 2016, from http://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/cauce/pdf/cauce25/cauce25_19.pdf

52. Matijević, M. (1998). Didaktičke strategije i razredno-nastavno ozračje na početku obveznoga školovanja. *Školski Vjesnik : časopis za pedagoška i školska pitanja,* 47(1), 23-32. Retrieved January 6, 2016, from http://bib.irb.hr/prikazi-rad?lang=en&rad=14046

53. Mehrgan, K. (2013). Teaching Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. *United States of America Research Journal (USARJ),* 1(3), 32-35. Retrieved January 14, 2015, from http://www.usarj.org/index.php/AAUJ

54. Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (1995). Research on the Affective Domain of EFL Learning: A Study of Motivation. *Studia Romanica Et Anglica Zagrabiensia (SRAZ),* 42, 257-267. Retrieved January 14, 2016, from http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.phpshow=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=178018

55. Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (1996). Learner Motivation as a Source of Variance in Attitudes,

Effort and Achievement. *Studia Romanica Et Anglica Zagrabiensia (SRAZ), 41*, 211-223. Retrieved January 14, 2016, from

http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.phpshow=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=178719

56. Nakata, Y. (2006). *Motivation and experience in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Peter Lang AG.

57. Nikolov, M. (1999). 'Why do you learn English?' 'Because the teacher is short.' A study of Hungarian children's foreign language learning motivation. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 33.

58. Oxford, R. (1994). *Language learning strategies*: An update. Retrieved 10 December 2010 from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/oxford01.html

59. Pavičić Takač, V. (2008). Studies on Vocabulary Learning Strategies. In *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

60. Peko, A., & Varga, R. (2014). Active Learning in Classrooms. *Život i škola,* 60(31), 59-73. Retrieved January 11, 2016, from

http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=185059

61. Petz, B. (1992). *Psihologijski rječnik*, Zagreb: Prosvjeta.

62. Pintrich, P. & Schunk, D. (1996). *Motivation in education*. New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.

63. Reeve, J., & Jang, H. (2006). What Teachers Say and Do to Support Students' Autonomy During a Learning Activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 209–218. Retrieved January 3, 2016, from

http://johnmarshallreeve.org/yahoo_site_admin1/assets/docs/Reeve_Jang2006.4731508.pdf

64. Reeve, J., Bolt, E., & Cai, Y. (1999). Autonomy-Supportive Teacher: How They Teach and Motivate Students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(3). 537-548

65. Reeve, J., Nix, G., & Hamm, D. (2003). The experience of selfdetermination in intrinsic motivation and the conundrum of choice. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 95, 375–392.

66. Reeve, J.,& Deci, E. L. (1996). Elements within the competitive situation that affect intrinsic motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 22, 24–33.

67. Rogers, S., Ludington, J. i Graham, S. (1999). *Motivation and learning,* Peak Learning systems (peakleam@aol.com).

68. Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000a). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54–67-54–67. Retrieved January 15, 2016, from

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0361476X99910202

69. Sandoval Pineda, A. (2011) *Attitude, Motivation, and English Language Learning in a Mexican College Context.* Retrieved from AU Campus Repository http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/145743

70. Seal, B. (1991) Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.) *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language* (2nd edn) (pp. 296-312). New York: Newbury House.

71. Seniye, V. (2007). *Teachers' and students' perception of teacher motivational behavior.* Bilkent University. Retrieved from http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0003431.pdf

72. Simons, P. (1997). Definitions and therories of active learning. In D. Stern & G. Huber (Eds.), *Active Learning for Students and Teachers: Reports from Eight Countries* (pp. 19–39). Frankfurt & New York: Peter Lang.

73. Staničić, S. (2006), *Menadžment u obrazovanju*. Rijeka: vlastita naklada.

74. Sugita, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2010). What can teachers do to motivate their students? A classroom research on motivational strategy use in the Japanese EFL context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(1), 21-35.

75. Sviben, M. (2006). *Percepcija nastavničkog stila ponašanja, samoregulacija učenja i mogući obrazovni ishodi kod studenata.* Retrieved from Repozitorij Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/483/1/SvibenMarina.pdf

76. Šimić Šašić, S., & Sorić, I. (2011). Kvaliteta interakcije nastavnik-učenik: Povezanost s komponentama samoreguliranog učenja, ispitnom anksioznošću i školskim uspjehom. *Suvremena Psihologija, 14*(1), 35-55. Retrieved January 2, 2016, from http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=123719

77. Temple, C., & Brophy, S. (2002). *Critical thinking in higher education*, workshop materials for RWCT course Critical thinking across curiculum, Prague.

78. Trang, T. T. T., & Baldauf, R. (2007). Demotivation: Understanding resistance to English language learning - the case of Vietnamese students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(1), 79-105.

79. Vizek-Vidović, V. Vlahović-Štetić, V, Rijavec, M. & Miljković, D. (2003), Psihologija obrazovanja. *Ekološki glasnik*: DonjaLomnica.

80. W. Marton, *Methods in English language teaching: Frameworks and options*. Prentice Hall. London, 1987.

81. Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997) *Psychology for Language Teachers. Cambridge*, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sažetak

Ovaj rad ispituje odnos između nastavnog stila i strategija te motivacija učenika za učenje stranog jezika u kontekstu hrvatske osnovne škole. Teorijski dio rada daje pregled literature, uključujući koncept motivacije, nastavnog stila, i nastavnih strategija, ispitujući njihovu međusobnu povezanost. U drugom dijelu ovog rada predstavljeno je istraživanje provedeno u dvije osnovne škole u Zagrebu, u kojemu je cilj bio saznati koji nastavni stil najviše motivira učenike. Također smo željeli utvrditi postoji li korelacija između određenog nastavnog stila i korištenja motivacijskih strategija. Rezultati pokazuju da učenici čiji nastavnik ima demokratski stil, imaju veću motivaciju za učenjem engleskog jezika od učenika čiji nastavnik ima autokratski stil, čime je potvrđena prva hipoteza. Rezultati su također potvrdili da nastavnik koji ima pretežito demokratski stil, koristi više motivacijskih strategija od nastavnika koji ima autokratski stil, štoje u skladu s drugom hipotezom ovog istraživanja.

Ključne riječi: motivacija učenika stranog jezika, nastavni stil, autonomija, motivirajuće strategije

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix A – Teacher Motivation Questionnaire

UPITNIK PROCJENE NASTAVNOG STILA

Profesor: _____

Procjenjivač: _____

1- nikad, 2 - rijetko; 3 - ponekad; 4 - često; 5 - uvijek

1. Nastavnik pokušava objasniti razloge svojih pravila i odluka.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Nastavnik uključuje učenike u donošenje odluka u razredu, te uvažava prijedloge učenika.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Nastavnik koristi pretežito frontalni oblik nastave, koja je strukturirana i kontrolirana.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Nastavnik koristi različite nastavne metode i oblike u nastavi (rad u grupama, projektna nastava, iskustveno učenje).	1	2	3	4	5
5. Nastavnik većinu odluka prepušta učenicima.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Nastavnik dopušta da učenici koriste različite tehnike učenja, te tihi žamor koji ne ometa druge učenike se dopušta.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Nastavnik se trudi da svi učenici maksimalno iskoriste svoje sposobnosti.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Nastavnik dopušta kretanje u razredu.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Nastavnik očekuje od učenika da pažljivo prate nastavu i da svi savladaju gradivo bez dodatne pomoći.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Ako učenik ometa nastavu, nastavnik će bez rasprave kazniti učenika.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Nastavnik nema kontrolu nad razredom u kojem često prevladava buka.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Nastavnik kod učenika potiče samoevaluaciju i evaluaciju samog tijeka nastavnog rada.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Nastavnik dopušta da učenici prekinu njegovo predavanje ako imaju relevantno pitanje.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Ako učenik traži prolaznu ocjenu, nastavnik mu je na kraju uvijek zaključi.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Nastavnik ne dopušta kretanje po razredu.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Nastavnik ne reagira osim ako je to krajnje potrebno.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Nastavnik zahtjeva potpunu tišinu u razredu, te učenici najčešće govore samo kada ih nastavnik nešto pita.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Nastavnik ne vidi razred kao kohezivnu grupu, već samo kao određeni broj učenika kojima mora prezentirati gradivo.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Nastavnik donosi odluke u razredu.	1	2	3	4	5

20. Nastavnik se trudi da njegovi učenici surađuju kao tim.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Nastavnik ne dopušta da ga učenici prekidaju za vrijeme predavanja.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Nastavnik nema jasne kriterije kada procjenjuje znanje učenika.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Nastava je fokusirana na ispunjavanje ciljeva, a manje na učenike.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Nastavnik je isključivo taj koji ocjenjuje učenike.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Nastavnik pruža individualnu pomoć učenicima kojima je ona potrebna.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Učenici često prekidaju nastavnika tijekom predavanja, nevezano za ono što on izlaže.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Nastavniku je najbitnije da mirno i sa što manje sukoba obavi svoj rad .	1	2	3	4	5
28. Nastavniku je važnije emocionalno blagostanje učenika nego kontrola nad učionicom.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Nastavnik u razredu nema nikakvih pravila.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Učenici se mogu kretati po razredu bez ikakvih ograničenja.	1	2	3	4	5

Dodatna pitanja za nastavnika:

1. Kako se vrednuje i procjenjuje rad učenika?

2. Potičete li samoevaluaciju učenika ili isključivo vi procjenjujete njihovo znanje?

3. Znaju li učenici kriterije pri vrednovanju (što i koliko točno moraju znati za koju ocjenu)?

4. Popuštate li učenicima pri zaključivanju (kada im treba za prosjek i sl)?

5. Da li dogovarate s učenicima sadržaj i način rada ili sami to određujete?

6. Smatrate li da vaši učenici ništa ne žele i da ih vi morate "prisiliti" na učenje?

7. Kažnjavate li ikad učenike (npr. ako ometaju sat)?

9.2 Appendix B – Teaching Strategies Questionnaire

UPITNIK ZA ISPITIVANJE STRATEGIJA NASTAVNIKA ENGLESKOG JEZIKA

Škola: _____

Razred: _____

Nastavnik: _____

Ovaj upitnik je anoniman. Molimo te da pažljivo pročitaš sve stavke u ovom upitniku te ih ocijeniš (od 1 do 5) ovisno o tome da li se tvrdnja **odnosi za tvog profesora engleskog jezika.** Sljedeća tvrdnja poslužit će kao primjer kako to raditi.

1. Kada dođem kući, prvo napišem zadaću.

_____

1 – nikad, 2 – rijetko, 3 – ponekad, 4 – često, 5 – uvijek.

_____

Na ovo si pitanje trebao/la odgovoriti zaokruživanjem jednog od ponuđenih odgovora. Neki bi ljudi zaokružili "nikad", neki "uvijek", a neki bi zaokružili jedan od preostalih odgovora između njih. Ono što ti odabereš, pokazuje tvoje mišljenje, koje se temelji na svemu što znaš i što si čuo/čula. Pazi: ovdje nema točnih i netočnih odgovora!

1.Nastavnik nam daje savjete, potiče nas da možemo više i ne odnosi se prema nama s visoka.	1	2	3	4	5
2.Osjećam se ugodno na nastavi engleskog jezika.	1	2	3	4	5
3.Nastavnik engleskog nas potiče da pomažemo jedni drugima, zajedno surađujemo kada rješavamo neki problem i nikoga ne ismijavamo.	1	2	3	4	5
4.Na nastavi engleskog jezika učimo o kulturi i običajima zemalja u kojima se govori engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
5.Na nastavi često obrađujemo teme koje su nama zanimljive, a ne samo one iz udžbenika.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Kada nam nastavnik zada neki zadatak, vidim njegovu korist (npr. naučio/la sam 5 novih riječi, znam reći nešto o sebi, znam objasniti nekome put i sl.).	1	2	3	4	5
7. Kada nas nastavnik ocjenjuje uvijek je realan, te je moja ocjena u skladu s mojim znanjem.	1	2	3	4	5
8.Nastavnik na zanimljiv i zabavan način objašnjava gradivo.	1	2	3	4	5

9. Ukoliko želim, na primjer, poboljšati svoj vokabular, gramatiku, znanja vezana uz određenu temu nastavnik će mi to omogućiti tako što će mi zadati dodatne zadatke ili dati dodatne materijale.	1	2	3	4	5
10.Nastavnik me potiče i ohrabruje da mogu više. Govori mi: *Znam ako se još malo potrudiš da ćeš sljedeći put dobiti bolju ocjenu! Vidim da si se potrudio, samo tako nastavi!*	1	2	3	4	5
11.Nastavnik mi postavlja pitanja kao što su: *Osjećaš li se spremnim za test/odgovaranje? Što misliš, kako si napisao test? Koji ti je dio testa bio najteži/najlakši?*	1	2	3	4	5
12.Nastavnik me ne ocjenjuje samo na kraju školske godine ili kada pišemo testove, već procjenjuje moj trud i rad tijekom cijele godine (vodi bilješke, prati moju aktivnost na satu, uspoređuje moj napredak tijekom godine).	1	2	3	4	5
13.Nastavnik engleskog nema "ljubimaca", već prema svima postupa jednako.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Kada nastavnik komentira moj uspjeh na testu/odgovaranju, ne uspoređuje me s drugim učenicima, iskreno mi kaže gdje sam pogriješio i na čemu još moram raditi, ali i pohvali trud koji sam uložio.	1	2	3	4	5
15.Na početku školske godine, zajedno s nastavnikom odlučujemo koji bi udžbenik htjeli koristiti.	1	2	3	4	5
16.Zadaci koje radimo na satu nisu mi preteški, ali ni dosadni.	1	2	3	4	5
17.Nastavnik mi uvijek daje do znanja da sam određenu ocjenu dobio/la jer sam se dovoljno trudio/la, a ne zato što sam imao/la sreće.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Na početku školske godine, zajedno s nastavnikom odlučujemo o aktivnostima i temama koje ćemo raditi, te odlučujemo s kime bi željeli raditi u grupi, paru i sl.	1	2	3	4	5
19.Nastavnik na satu engleskog jezika ne koristi samo udžbenik, već i računalo, slike, video, pjesme, donosi nam stvarne predmete...	1	2	3	4	5
20.Na početku školske godine, nastavnik nam kaže što se od nas očekuje i što bi sve trebali savladati ove godine.	1	2	3	4	5
21.Na nastavi engleskog jezika radimo u grupi, u paru ili na zajedničkom rješavanju nekog problema.	1	2	3	4	5
22.Nastavnik nas potiče da se javljamo i ne ispravlja nas uvijek ako pogriješimo kada nešto kažemo.	1	2	3	4	5
23.Nastavnik povezuje ono što učimo iz Engleskog jezika s gradivom iz drugih predmeta (npr. Geografija, Povijest, Hrvatski jezik...).	1	2	3	4	5

Hvala ti na pomoći! :)

UPITNIK ZA ISPITIVANJE MOTIVACIJE UČENIKA ZA UČENJE ENGLESKOG KAO STRANOG JEZIKA

Škola: _____

Razred: _____

Nastavnik: _____

Ovaj upitnik ispunjava se anonimno. Molimo te da pažljivo pročitaš sve stavke u ovom upitniku te ih ocijeniš (od 1 do 5) ovisno o tome koliko se svaka tvrdnja **odnosi na tebe.**

_____

1 – uopće se ne odnosi na mene, 2 – uglavnom se ne odnosi na mene, 3 – niti se odnosi, niti se ne odnosi na mene, 4 – uglavnom se odnosi na mene, 5 – u potpunosti se odnosi na mene

_____ Pazi: ovdje nema točnih i netočnih odgovora, već zaokružuješ ono što se **odnosi na tebe!**

1. Volim učiti o novim stvarima.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Mislim da će mi većina toga što učimo u školi kasnije trebati u životu.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Sviđa mi se engleski jezik.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Stvarno uživam učiti engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Volio/voljela bih da tjedno imamo više sati engleskog.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Mislim da je potrebno znati engleski jezik za daljnje školovanje i buduću karijeru.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Mislim da je engleski važan školski predmet.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Želim tako dobro naučiti engleski da mi on postane prirodan.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Engleski mi je jedan od najdražih predmeta.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Volim učiti o drugim kulturama.	1	2	3	4	5

11. Volio/voljela bih imati mnogo prijatelja iz zemalja u kojima se govori engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Želio/željela bih komunicirati s izvornim govornicima engleskog jezika.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Volio/voljela bih živjeti u državi engleskog govornog područja.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Ono što učimo na satu engleskog jezika će mi koristiti u životu.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Za mene je važno učiti engleski jer će mi to omogućiti da upoznam i razgovaram s mnogo različitih ljudi.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Stvarno se trudim da što bolje naučim engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Smatram da ću do kraja školske godine uspješno savladati gradivo iz engleskog.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Volim dolaziti na nastavu engleskog jezika.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Na satu engleskog jezika učimo zanimljive stvari i nije mi dosadno.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Sviđa mi se kako nastavnik predaje gradivo.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Uživam u aktivnostima na nastavi engleskog jezika mnogo više nego u aktivnostima na nastavi drugih predmeta.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Mislim da nastavnik engleskog puno očekuje od mene.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Stvarno volim svog nastavnika engleskog.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Ne mislim da je moj nastavnik engleskog jako dobar.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Volio/voljela bih naučiti više iz ovog predmeta.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Zadovoljan/na sam svojim ocjenama iz ovog predmeta.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Bitnije mi je da naučim nešto kako bi mogao bolje komunicirati na engleskog nego da bih samo dobio/la dobru ocjenu.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Učenje engleskog mi je važno jer mogu čitati časopise, novine i knjige, te razumjeti pjesme, filmove i serije na engleskom jeziku.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Kada mi je nešto teško razumjeti na satu engleskog, uvijek tražim svog nastavnika za pomoć.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Radujem se nastavi engleskog jer je moj nastavnik jako dobar.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Htio/htjela bih naučiti što više stranih jezika.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Mislim da je učenje jezika pravo gubljenje vremena.	1	2	3	4	5

33. Važno je učiti engleski, jer će me drugi ljudi više cijeniti ako znam engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Kada završim školu, odustat ću od učenja engleskog jer me on ne zanima.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Odgađam pisanje domaće zadaće iz engleskog koliko god je to moguće.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Stvarno se jako trudim da naučim engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Mrzim engleski.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Uvijek nastojim razumjeti sve što vidim i čujem na engleskom.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Ljudi iz zemalja u kojima se govori engleski mnogo su doprinijeli povijesti čovječanstva.	1	2	3	4	5

Hvala ti na pomoći! :)