ISSN 1798-4769
Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 266-273, January 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1601.27

# The Relationship Between Students' L2 Engagement and Learning Success

Ibrahim H. Alzahrani
Jubail English Language and Preparatory Year Institute, Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu, Jubail, Saudi Arabia

***Abstract*—Engagement is a crucial part of language learning as it shows how much a learner is involved in the learning process. Language learning with engagement is considered meaningful. This study measured Saudi male college EFL students' L2 engagement levels while learning English as a foreign language in their preparatory year. The relationship between students' scores in the English course and their L2 engagement was also discovered. An L2 engagement scale with three engagement domains (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive) created by Hiver et al. (2020) was utilized to measure students' L2 engagement levels. Pearson correlation was administered to explore the relationship between students' learning success (scores) and L2 engagement. The results indicated high behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement levels. In addition, the results showed a statistically significant positive relationship between students' scores and their L2 engagement. Implications for educational establishments and language teachers were presented, as well as the impact on future research and limitations.**

***Index Terms*—EFL learners, L2 engagement scales, L2 learning engagement, learning success**

## I. Introduction

As English language teachers, we always notice individual differences between our students and how they vary in terms of interaction, participation, interest in activities and homework, and desire for language learning. This variation among students might be attributed to the level of foreign or second (L2) language learning engagement. According to Barkley (2010, p. xi), "For many of us teaching today, competing for the attention of our students and engaging them in meaningful learning is a profound and ongoing challenge." Therefore, what language teachers experience in their classrooms concerning their students' actions and attention is a problem in engagement (Hiver et al., 2021). Engagement contributes to learning success and better outcomes (Hattie, 2009). Hiver et al. (2021) emphasize that "there is an explicit awareness that in order to increase learners' L2 development, we must increase learners' engagement" (p. 283). Thus, if we better understand language learning engagement, we might contribute to more engaged students and consequently have students with better language competence.

Though engagement has received attention in different fields, such as mathematics, engineering, and science, engagement in language learning is still in its infancy, as Reschly and Christenson (2012) state. They believe engagement is still a "new kid in the block" (p. 4). This is obvious, particularly in the Saudi context, where very few studies have been conducted that are relevant to L2 engagement. Some scholars, such as Dörnyei (2019) and Philp and Duchsen (2016), call for more investigation into the relationship between engagement and L2 learning. Furthermore, Mercer et al. (2021, p. 146) state that there is still "limited empirical research on learners' engagement in language learning." Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the field with more studies and discover to what extent Saudi college students are engaged in learning English in their English courses. Moreover, it examines the relationship between L2 engagement with its three domains (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive) and students' general scores in one of their preparatory year English courses.

## II. Literature Review

Research in L2 engagement started recently at the beginning of this millennium. Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) ignited the flame of L2 engagement by referring to highly involved L2 learners as "engaged" learners. Since then, engagement research has continued due to the recognition of the importance of engagement (Hiver et al., 2021). Sinatra et al. (2015, p. 1) describe engagement as "the holy grail of learning." This has attracted Hiver et al. (2021) to stress that L2 engagement as a new area of research has become an essential topic. Engagement is now "one of the trending topics in both general education and language education" (Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2021, p. 225).

One of the early definitions of engagement was by Skinner et al. (2009, p. 225), who defined engagement as "energized, directed, and sustained actions." Lawson and Lawson (2013) included the aspect of action when they view school engagement as "extra-classroom energy in action, observable and measurable in school-sponsored activities and tasks" (p. 439). Philp and Duchesne (2016, p. 51) define engagement as "a state of heightened attention and involvement, in which participation is reflected not only on the cognitive dimension but in social, behavioral, and affective dimensions as well." However, scholars are likely similar in defining engagement; most share the aspects of action, such as Sang and Hiver (2021), Lawson and Lawson (2013), and Skinner et al. (2009), and involvement, such as Dörnyei and Kormos

(2000) and Reeve (2012). This action aspect makes it different from motivation, as Reschly and Christenson (2012) explain that "motivation represents intention and engagement is action" (p. 14). This means motivation starts first, and then engagement takes place. Another important definition of engagement is by Reeve (2012, p. 150), who states that engagement can be "the extent of student's active involvement in a learning activity." In their volume, Hiver et al. (2021, p. 3) define engagement as "a dynamic, multidimensional construct comprising situated notions of cognition, affect and behaviors including social interactions in which action is a requisite component." This last definition is crucial as it refers to the three dimensions of engagement (behavior, emotional or affect, and cognition), as explained below.

Although it is easy to recognize L2 engagement, it is "a notoriously slippery construct" that is always "multidimensional" (Hiver et al., 2021, p. 1). There is no consensus among scholars on what engagement major domains or components are. For example, Fredricks et al. (2004) and Mercer (2019) point out three dimensions of engagement: behavioral, affective, and cognitive, whereas Philip and Duchesne (2016) include four components: behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and social. In her "Engagement with Language (EWL)", Svalberg (2009) suggests three engagement domains: cognitive, affective, and social, while Reeve (2013) referred to four domains of engagement: behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and agentic.

The present study will focus on the three main domains, behavioral, emotional, and cognitive, because they were included in most previous literature and the survey to measure engagement in the present study. Behavioral engagement refers to the quantity and quality of the student's classroom participation and the time spent on a specific task (Reschly & Christenson, 2012). Behavioral engagement indicators include active involvement, persistence, and degree of effort (Philp & Duchesne, 2016).

Emotional or affective engagement refers to "students' affective reactions in the classroom" (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 63). Positive emotions such as enjoyment, enthusiasm, and anticipation are examples of affective engagement (Reeve, 2012). Positive relationships between students, their peers, and their teachers are other indicators of affective engagement (Mercer, 2015).

Cognitive engagement is maintaining deliberate attention and extending mental efforts to achieve learning goals (Helme & Clarke, 2001). Indicators of cognitive engagement may include exchanging ideas, developing explanations, evaluating opinions, providing further information (Helme & Clarke, 2001), suggesting, reasoning, hesitating, and repeating (Reschly & Christenson, 2012).

Successful L2 learning was attributed to engagement (Oga-Baldwin & Nakata, 2017; Philip & Duchesne, 2016; Svalberg, 2009). Previous studies on language learning engagement refer to a positive relationship between engagement and student performance. In a study on immigrant youth, Suarez-Orozco et al. (2009) found that behavioral engagement strongly predicted academic performance. Hodge et al. (2018) also found a positive relationship between academic productivity, grit, and engagement, where students with higher grit are anticipated to have higher engagement and consequently have better academic productivity. Dincer et al. (2019) explored the relationship between engagement and achievement. The findings of this study indicated that emotional and agentic engagement predicted achievement. In another study, Hamedi et al. (2019) found that cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement significantly predicted reading comprehension. Keenan et al. (2008) found that whenever engagement in reading a text is successful, reading comprehension will be accomplished.

Similarly, Cheung et al. (2016) identified a possible relationship between reading engagement and learners' reading performance. In another study deploying mobile learning, Chen et al. (2022) found that utilizing the Reading Engagement-Promotion Strategy approach helps improve learners' reading achievement and facilitates the engagement of higher achievers. In another study that investigated the associations between motivation and engagement in language learning from one side and emotional factors, academic achievement, and demographic features from another side, Li et al. (2022) found that motivated and engaged learners gained higher outcomes than demotivated and disengaged learners. However, this positive relationship between engagement and language achievement does not always exist. In a study that investigated the relationship between engagement and language achievement in an online setting, Kiatkeeree and Ruangjaroon (2022) demonstrated no link between online engagement and language achievement. Consequently, more studies are needed to investigate this relationship, which is one of the aims of the present study.

## III. Methodology

This study aims to examine the relationship between L2 engagement and students' language performance among preparatory year college students who were studying in a general English program that includes reading, writing, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar courses where a predictive impact of engagement may likely positively affect students' general performance in the program. In this respect, research in this area is still in its early stages, and there are calls for more research to investigate this relationship (Hiver et al., 2021; Hiver et al., 2024). One reason for this shortage of research can be the lack of a proper measuring instrument that measures engagement, as there is still no consensus among scholars on how to measure engagement appropriately (Zhou et al., 2021). Another reason might be that the field of engagement has not attracted the attention of researchers until recently, as the focus was highly on motivation, as Mercer and Dörnyei (2020) stated. Thus, the present study is trying to contribute to this area, which has not been fully discovered, by trying to answer the following research questions:

1) To what extent were learners behaviorally, emotionally, and cognitively engaged in learning English?

2) Is there a relationship between behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement and students' learning success?

### *A. Participants*

The sample of the present study consisted of 86 preparatory year college students who were learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in a general English program following the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) at Jubail English Language and Preparatory Year Institute (JELPYI) in Saudi Arabia. They attended the preparatory year to gain sufficient English proficiency to enable them to pursue college studies, as English is the medium of instruction after their preparatory year. The respondents were mainly from different levels of English proficiency based on the CEFR, as the sample included A2, B1, and B1+ students. The participants were involved in a quarter learning system where they had to finish their assigned language level in eight weeks and then move to the following upper level if they had successfully passed their assigned level. The participants were introduced to the study, and their participation contests were taken. They were informed that they can draw from the study whenever they like. By the end of the second quarter of the 2022 academic year, a survey link was posted on Blackboard, and the participants were asked to complete it online.

### *B. Instruments*

To assess engagement in its three domains (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive), a recent survey by Hiver et al. (2020) (cited in Zhou et al., 2021) was deployed to measure engagement as there is still a need for more appropriate instruments. This survey consisted of 24 items divided into eight items to measure behavioral engagement (e.g., I participated in all the activities), eight items to measure emotional engagement (e.g., I felt good while I was in the class), and eight items to measure cognitive engagement (e.g., I thought about different ways to solve problems in my work). This survey used a six-point Likert scale where one equals 'Disagree very strongly' and six equals 'Agree very strongly.' The internal reliability in this survey was measured, and Cronbach's alpha showed high reliability (a = 0.87).

### *C. Analysis*

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, there is no agreed way to assign L2 engagement in levels with particular numerical order. Therefore, the researcher adopted Fisher's (1992) calculation to decide the number of created subgroups and the separation ratio based on the reliability level (Al-Hoorie & Hiver, 2022). Derived from Fisher (1992), the reliability (a = 0.87) of the scale in the present study matches the creation of three subgroups or strata. Therefore, the researcher categorized L2 engagement into low, moderate, and high levels, as shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
L2 ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

| Likert Scale | Score | Range | Engagement Level |
|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree very strongly | 1 | 0.00 – 2.00 | Low |
| Disagree strongly | 2 | | |
| Disagree | 3 | 2.01 – 4.00 | Moderate |
| Agree | 4 | | |
| Agree strongly | 5 | 4.01 – 6.00 | High |
| Agree very strongly | 6 | | |

Their grades measured the participants' language performance at the end of the quarter in which they completed the survey. As Table 2 shows, students' grades in English varied from Excellent (A) to Fail (F).

TABLE 2
STUDENTS' SCORES AND GRADES

| Score | Weight | Grade | Code |
|---|---|---|---|
| Below 60 | 0 | Fail | F |
| 60 – 69 | 1 | Pass | D |
| 70 – 79 | 2 | Good | C |
| 80 – 89 | 3 | Very good | B |
| 90 – 100 | 4 | Excellent | A |

The L2 engagement scale used in the present study contains 11 reversed items (3 behavioral, four emotional, and four cognitive) to reduce response bias (Suárez-Álvarez et al., 2018). Therefore, before running descriptive statistics and other tests in SPSS, the entries of these reverse-worded items were reverse-coded (i.e., 1 becomes 6, 2 becomes 5, 3 becomes 4, 4 becomes 3, 5 becomes 2, and 6 becomes 1).

Pearson correlation was run to examine the relationship between students' scores and the three domains of engagement (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive) and the relationship between students' scores and general L2 engagement.

## IV. RESULTS

### *A. First Research Question: To What Extent Were Learners Behaviorally, Emotionally, and Cognitively Engaged in Learning English?*

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of participants' responses on the behavioral engagement items. Participants' behavioral engagement was high in all items under this domain, as the means ranged between M = 4.04 and M = 4.93. The level of behavioral engagement was high, with an overall mean M = 4.58, as Table 3 shows.

TABLE 3
BEHAVIORAL ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

| No | Behavioral Engagement Items | Mean | SD | Engagement Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I stayed focused even when it was difficult to understand | 4.51 | 1.37 | High |
| 2 | I participated in all the activities | 4.54 | 1.20 | High |
| 3 | I kept trying my best even when it was hard | 4.79 | 1.03 | High |
| 4 | I continued working until I completed my work | 4.93 | 1.01 | High |
| 5 | I just pretended like I was working (R) | 4.55 | 1.49 | High |
| 6 | I didn't participate much in class (R) | 4.44 | 1.60 | High |
| 7 | I did other things when I was supposed to be paying attention (R) | 4.04 | 1.73 | High |
| 8 | I paid attention and listened carefully | 4.81 | 1.18 | High |
| Overall | | 4.58 | 0.81 | High |

Participants reported high emotional engagement in six items (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8) under this domain; however, they reported moderate emotional engagement in two items (1, 6), as Table 4 shows. The means of high emotional engagement ranged between M = 4.06 and M = 4.98. On the other hand, the means of moderate emotional engagement ranged between M = 3.50 and M = 3.80, as shown in Table 4. Emotional engagement was high, with the overall mean reported at M = 4.39.

TABLE 4
EMOTIONAL ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

| No | Emotional Engagement Items | Mean | SD | Engagement Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I looked forward to the next class | 3.50 | 1.46 | Moderate |
| 2 | I enjoyed learning new things | 4.75 | 1.35 | High |
| 3 | I wanted to understand what I was learning | 4.98 | 1.26 | High |
| 4 | I felt good while I was in the class | 4.06 | 1.46 | High |
| 5 | I felt frustrated while I was in the class (R) | 4.60 | 1.56 | High |
| 6 | I found it boring to be in the class (R) | 3.80 | 1.58 | Moderate |
| 7 | I didn't want to be in the class (R) | 4.63 | 1.53 | High |
| 8 | I felt that I didn't care about learning (R) | 4.82 | 1.56 | High |
| Overall | | 4.39 | 1.04 | High |

Table 5 shows that participants reported high cognitive engagement in seven items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) and moderate cognitive engagement in only one item (8). The means of high behavioral engagement ranged from M = 4.04 to M = 5.04. The mean of the only moderate cognitive engagement item was M = 3.40, as presented in Table 5. The overall mean of cognitive engagement was M = 4.41.

TABLE 5
COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

| No | Cognitive Engagement Items | Mean | SD | Engagement Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I went through my work carefully to make sure it was done right | 4.29 | 1.35 | High |
| 2 | I thought about different ways to solve problems in my work | 4.48 | 1.34 | High |
| 3 | I tried to connect new learning to the things I already learned before | 5.00 | 1.06 | High |
| 4 | I tried to understand my mistakes when I got something wrong | 5.04 | 1.06 | High |
| 5 | I preferred to be told the answer than do the work (R) | 4.04 | 1.55 | High |
| 6 | I didn't think too hard while I was doing the work (R) | 4.36 | 1.37 | High |
| 7 | I only studied the easy parts because the class was hard (R) | 4.66 | 1.46 | High |
| 8 | I did just enough to get by (R) | 3.40 | 1.72 | Moderate |
| Overall | | 4.41 | 0.73 | High |

Table 6 shows that behavioral engagement was the highest (M = 4.58), followed by cognitive engagement (M = 4.41) and emotional engagement (M = 4.39). Participants reported high engagement levels in all three domains, with an overall high level of L2 engagement (M = 4.46).

TABLE 6
OVERALL L2 ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

| No | L2 General Engagement | Mean | SD | Engagement Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Behavioral Engagement | 4.58 | 0.81 | High |
| 2 | Emotional Engagement | 4.39 | 1.04 | High |
| 3 | Cognitive Engagement | 4.41 | 0.73 | High |
| Overall | | 4.46 | 0.70 | High |

*B. Second Research Question: Is There a Relationship Between Behavioral, Emotional, and Cognitive Engagement and Students' Learning Success?*

To answer this research question, Pearson Correlation analysis was administered to explore the relationship between students' scores and each engagement domain (behavioral, emotional, cognitive) separately. Then, the relationship between students' scores and the general L2 engagement was deployed. Table 7 below shows descriptive statistics of students' scores.

TABLE 7
STUDENTS' SCORES, MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

| | Min | Max | Mean | SD | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students' Scores | 0 | 4 | 2.85 | 1.18 | 86 |

Table 8 below shows a statistically significant positive correlation between students' scores and behavioral engagement (r = 0.307, p = 0.004). This suggests that students' scores tend to increase as behavioral engagement levels increase.

TABLE 8
CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES AND BEHAVIORAL ENGAGEMENT

| | | Score | Behavioral Engagement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.307** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.004 |
| | N | 86 | 86 |
| Behavioral Engagement | Pearson Correlation | 0.307** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.004 | |
| | N | 86 | 86 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Pearson Correlation analysis presented a positive correlation between students' scores and emotional engagement (r = 0.070, p = 0.521), as shown in Table 9 below. This means students' scores tend to increase as emotional engagement levels increase. However, the correlation between the two variables is not significant.

TABLE 9
CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES AND EMOTIONAL ENGAGEMENT

| | | Score | Emotional Engagement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.070 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.521 |
| | N | 86 | 86 |
| Emotional Engagement | Pearson Correlation | 0.070 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.521 | |
| | N | 86 | 86 |

Table 10 below shows a statistically significant correlation between students' scores and cognitive engagement (r = 360, p = 0.001). Therefore, students seem to score higher when they are more cognitively engaged.

TABLE 10
CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES AND COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT

| | | Score | Cognitive Engagement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.360** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.001 |
| | N | 86 | 86 |
| Cognitive Engagement | Pearson Correlation | 0.360** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.001 | |
| | N | 86 | 86 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between students' scores and general L2 engagement (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive) is positive and statistically significant (r = 250, p = 0.009), as Table 11 below shows. This indicates that as L2 engagement levels increase, students' scores also tend to increase.

TABLE 11
CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES AND GENERAL L2 ENGAGEMENT

| | | Score | L2 General Engagement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.280** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.009 |
| | N | 86 | 86 |
| L2 General Engagement | Pearson Correlation | 0.280** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.009 | |
| | N | 86 | 86 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## V. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to examine the levels of students' L2 engagement and to see if there is any relationship between students' L2 learning success and their L2 engagement based on their scores. The participants reported high levels of behavioral engagement (M = 4.58). This finding suggests that learners might utilize their behavioral attention, which enables their understanding of given tasks (Reeve, 2013). This finding is congruent with Oga-Baldwin and Fryer (2021) and Alqarni (2023), where behavioral engagement was reported higher than emotional, cognitive, and agentic engagement, and with Carver et al. (2021), where behavioral engagement was reported higher than cognitive and affective engagement in both face-to-face and synchronous computer-mediated communication groups. This highest level of behavioral engagement in the present study might be attributed to students' perception of the benefit of doing given tasks and participation in the classroom (Philp & Duchesne, 2016). Moreover, learners might gain advantages from their persistence and efforts to learn without distractions (Fredricks et al., 2016) to be highly involved in their L2 learning.

The cognitive engagement level was also high, coming in second place after behavioral engagement with a mean of M = 4.41. This finding is similar to Alqarni (2023) and Carver et al. (2021), where the means of cognitive engagement came immediately after the means of behavioral engagement and before the means of emotional (affective) engagement. However, means of cognitive engagement were reported higher than behavioral engagement in other studies, such as Hiver et al. (2020) and Dincer et al. (2019). This high level of cognitive engagement in the present study and other studies is likely attributed to the desire of learners to collaborate in the classroom through presenting additional information, assessing materials and opinions, and exchanging ideas (Helme & Clarke, 2001). Another possible explanation for this high cognitive engagement level in the present study might be linked to learners' active self-regulation strategies facilitating L2 learning (Philp & Duchesne, 2016).

Although emotional engagement came with the least mean (M = 4.39), it is still a high level of engagement. Other studies like Khajavy (2021) and Kiatkeeree and Ruangjaroon (2022) showed that emotional engagement surpassed behavioral, cognitive, and social engagement. This high emotional engagement in the present study might be linked to learners' positive feelings toward the L2 classroom, including their teachers and classmates (Mercer, 2015). Additionally, enjoyment, interest, and enthusiasm (Skinner et al., 2009) might be important three factors that might be linked to the participants' high level of emotional engagement in the present study. Learners' encouragement to learn (Baralt et al., 2016) might be another reason for learners' high level of emotional engagement.

The findings of the Pearson Correlation analyses indicated a statistically significant positive correlation between students' learning success (scores) and behavioral engagement ($r = 0.307$, $p = 0.004$). Similarly, a statistically significant positive correlation was found between students' scores and their cognitive engagement ($r = 360$, $p = 0.001$). Furthermore, the findings indicated a positive correlation between students' scores and their emotional engagement ($r = 0.070$, $p = 0.521$), but it was insignificant this time. The findings showed a statistically significant and positive correlation between students' scores (learning success) and their general L2 engagement ($r = 250$, $p = 0.009$). These findings suggest that general L2 engagement positively and significantly predicts students' learning success. These findings support the results of previous studies such as Suarez-Orozco et al. (2009), Hodge et al. (2018), Dincer et al. (2019), Hamedi et al. (2020), and Keenan et al. (2008). These findings of the present study emphasize the essential impact of engagement on students' L2 learning success, presumably reflected in how an L2 should be learned and instructed.

## VI. Conclusion

The present study attempted to measure L2 engagement levels among Saudi college students learning EFL in their preparatory year. It investigated the relationship between students' learning success and their L2 engagement. Based on the study findings, the following conclusions can be drawn. First, L2 engagement in its three domains (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive) was reported at a high level. Second, a statistically significant and positive relationship was reported between students' learning success (scores) and their L2 general engagement. Thus, it can be claimed that L2 engagement predicts L2 learning success.

### *A. Implications*

Accordingly, some pedagogical implications should be taken into account by stakeholders of teaching English in Saudi and similar contexts. First, since the high behavioral engagement level in the present study might be attributed to learners' concentration while achieving a task, participation in the classroom, and persistence to learn, curriculum designers, besides L2 teachers, have some responsibilities over their shoulders to provide more appropriate materials and tasks that not only enhance learning but also encourage students to participate more and continue their persistence to learn. Second, cognitively engaged students represent activating cognition, an essential part of the learning process. Therefore, L2 teachers are assumed to assist students in taking advantage of this cognitive engagement with no limits. This can be achieved by allowing students to comfortably express themselves and their opinions in the classroom, comment and criticize while discussing a topic, share ideas, and agree or disagree with other ideas or students in a free classroom environment. It is also important to raise students' awareness about using self-regulation strategies and encourage them to utilize such strategies for having more effective L2 learning. This can also be accomplished through integrating strategy instruction programs. Third, evidence of students' positive feelings about their L2 classrooms in the present study was a high level of emotional engagement. Undoubtedly, students' emotions and feelings are indispensable in the learning process. Hence, it is the role of educational establishments, including L2 teachers, to consider this pivotal issue. On the

one hand, teachers should be aware of their students' mental and psychological status to enhance the classroom environment and mood. On the other hand, they should create more comfortable and safe classrooms where students can enjoy learning, encourage students to continue learning in and out of the classroom, motivate students using different incentives to enhance their learning, and talk about students' strengths and positive characteristics in order to assist them continue good learning practices.

### *B. Limitations*

The present study has its limitations. One limitation is that only adult male college students participated, whereas female students were absent due to difficulty reaching them. If female students were among the participants, this might contribute to the findings. Thus, it would be beneficial if another study investigated L2 engagement in the same context, including both female and male students. The sample size is another limitation of the present study, where only few students took part in this quantitative study. The results of the present study cannot be generalizable since many aspects of students' engagement need to be discovered through qualitative data. Future studies should mix methods to collect data about L2 engagement and hopefully provide comprehensive explanations. L2 engagement lacks a unified or agreed scale to measure engagement, as many researchers used or created different scales. It would be a good idea if future research makes a consensus on a well-designed scale to measure L2 engagement, agree on engagement domains included, and categorize L2 engagement levels.

## REFERENCES

[1] Al-Hoorie, A. H., Hiver, P. (2022). Complexity theory: From metaphors to methodological advances. In A. H. Al-Hoorie & F. Szabó (Eds.), *Researching language learning motivation: A concise guide* (pp. 175-184). Bloomsbury.

[2] Alqarni, N. (2023). Language learning strategies and learning engagement as predictors of language learning achievement: An investigation of Saudi EFL learners. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, *3*(3), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-12-2022-0084

[3] Baralt, M., Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Kim, Y. (2016). Engagement with language: How examining learners' affective and social engagement explains successful learner-generated attention to form. In M. Sato, & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning. Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 209–240). John Benjamins.

[4] Barkley, E. (2010). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. Jossey-Bass.

[5] Chen, M. R. A., Hwang, G. J., Lin, Y. H., Abou-Khalil, V., Li, H., & Ogata, H. (2022). A reading engagement-promoting strategy to facilitate EFL students' mobile learning achievement, behaviour and engagement. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*, *16*(4), 489-506. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMLO.2022.125968

[6] Cheung, K. C., Mak, S. K., Sit, P. S., & Soh, K. C. (2016). A typology of student reading engagement: Preparing for response to intervention in the school curriculum. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *48*, 32–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.12.001

[7] Carver, C., Jung, D. & Gurzynski-Weiss, L. (2021). Examining learner engagement in relationship to learning and communication mode. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 120–142). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923613-010

[8] Dincer, A., Yeşilyurt, S., Noels, K. A., & Vargas Lascano, D. I. (2019). Self-Determination and classroom engagement of EFL learners: A mixed-methods study of the self-system model of motivational development. *Sage Open*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019853913

[9] Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 motivational self-system. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2.

[10] Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 275–300.

[11] Fisher, W. (1992). Reliability, separation, strata statistics. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, *6*(3), 238. Retrieved March 15, 2024, from https://www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt63i.htm

[12] Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., & Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*, 59–109.

[13] Fredericks, J., Filsecker, M., & Lawson, M. (2016). Student engagement, context, and adjustment: Addressing definitional, measurement, and methodological issues. *Learning and Instruction*, *43*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.02.002

[14] Hamedi, S. M., Pishghadam, R., & Fadardi, J. S. (2020). The contribution of reading emotions to reading comprehension: The mediating effect of reading engagement using a structural equation modeling approach. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *19*, 211–238. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-019-09256-3

[15] Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses related to achievement*. Routledge.

[16] Helme, S., & Clarke, D. (2001). Identifying cognitive engagement in the mathematics classroom. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, *13*, 133–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03217103

[17] Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Mercer, S. (Eds.) (2021). *Student engagement in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters.

[18] Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., Vitta, J. P., & Wu, J. (2024). Engagement in language learning: A systematic review of 20 years of research methods and definitions. *Language Teaching Research*, *28*(1), 201-230. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211001289

[19] Hiver, P., Zhou, S., Tahmouresi, S., Sang, Y., & Papi, M. (2020). Why stories matter: Exploring learner engagement and metacognition through narratives of the L2 learning experience. *System*, *91*, 102260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102260

[20] Hodge, B., Wright, B. & Bennett, P. (2018). The role of grit in determining engagement and academic outcomes for university students. *Research in Higher Education*, *59*, 448–460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9474-y

[21] Keenan, J. M., Betjemann, R. S., & Olson, R. K. (2008). Reading comprehension tests vary in the skills they assess: Differential dependence on decoding and oral comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *12*, 281–300. https://doi.10.1080/10888430802132279
[22] Khajavy, G. (2021). Modeling the relations between foreign language engagement, emotions, grit and reading achievement. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 241–259). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923613-016
[23] Kiatkeeree, J., & Ruangjaroon, S. (2022). Unveiling the relationship between the grit of Thai English language learners, engagement, and language achievement in an online setting. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *15*(2), 602-624.
[24] Lawson, M. A., & Lawson, H. A. (2013). New conceptual frameworks for student engagement research, policy, and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*, 432–479.
[25] Li, J., King, R. B., & Wang, C. (2022). Profiles of motivation and engagement in foreign language learning: Associations with emotional factors, academic achievement, and demographic features. *System*, *108*, 102820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102820
[26] Mercer, S. (2015). Learner agency and engagement: Believing you can, wanting to, and knowing how to. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, *17*(4), 1–19.
[27] Mercer, S. (2019). Language learner engagement: Setting the scene. In Gao, X. (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 1–19). Springer.
[28] Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
[29] Mercer, S., Talbot, K. R., & Wang, I. K. H. (2021). Fake or real engagement–Looks can be deceiving. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 143–162). Multilingual Matters.
[30] Oga-Baldwin, W. Q., Fryer, L. K. (2021). Engagement growth in language learning classrooms: A latent growth analysis of engagement in Japanese elementary schools. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 224–240). Multilingual Matters.
[31] Oga-Baldwin, W. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2017). Engagement, gender, and motivation: A predictive model for Japanese young language learners. *System*, *65*, 151-163. https://doi.10.1016/j.system.2017.01.011
[32] Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *36*, 50-72. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094
[33] Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). Springer.
[34] Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(3), 579–595. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032690
[35] Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3-19). Springer.
[36] Sang, Y., & Hiver, P. (2021). Engagement and companion constructs in language learning: Conceptualizing learners' involvement in the L2 classroom. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 17–37). Multilingual Matters.
[37] Sinatra, G.M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychology*, *50*, 1–13.
[38] Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (2009). Engagement and disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In H. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223-245). Routledge.
[39] Suárez-Álvarez, J., Pedrosa, I., Lozano, L. M., García Cueto, E., Cuesta Izquierdo, M., & Muñiz Fernández, J. (2018). Using reversed items in Likert scales: A questionable practice. *Psicothema*, *30*.
[40] Suárez-Orozco, C., Pimentel, A., & Martin, M. (2009). The Significance of relationships: Academic engagement and achievement among newcomer immigrant youth. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(3), 712-749. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810911100308
[41] Svalberg, A. M. L. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct. *Language Awareness*, *18*, 242–258.
[42] Zhou, S., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2021). Measuring L2 engagement: A review of issues and applications. In P. Hiver, A. H. Al-Hoorie, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 75–98). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923613-008

**Ibrahim H. Alzahrani** is an assistant professor at Jubail English Language and Preparatory Year Institute, Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu, Saudi Arabia. He is a PhD holder in applied linguistics and English language teaching from University of Southampton, UK. His research interests are language learning styles and strategies, strategy instruction, and self-regulation.