TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FLOW IN SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Burcu AK ŞENTÜRK
Zonguldak Karaelmas University
English Language Preparatory School
burcuak@mynet.com

ABSTRACT

Recently, there has been a growing interest in the study of flow experience in the language classroom. However, the existence of the flow experience while performing different tasks in speaking lessons remains unknown. Flow theory is described as an experiential state characterized by intense focus and involvement that leads to improved performance on a task (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988, 1990). This study was designed to investigate teachers' and students' perceptions about the existence of flow experience in speaking courses.

The qualitative and quantitative analyses indicated that flow exists in speaking classes; however, there is a significant difference among each task in terms of the perception of flow. Results also showed that there is a significant relationship between the type of the activity and affective engagement in terms of students' perception of task control, task appeal, focused attention and challenge. The findings also revealed that teachers could facilitate the flow experience for students by developing tasks that might lead to flow.

Keywords: *Flow, Flow Experience, Affective Engagement / Affective Response, Task*

İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA DERSLERİNDE KULLANILAN AKTİVİTELER ÜZERİNDEKİ "FLOW" ETKİSİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, İngilizce konuşma derslerinde sekiz farklı aktivitede öğrencilerin ne ölçüde "flow"" etkisi yaşadığını incelemiştir. Çalışmada kullanılan aktiviteler tartışma, drama, dil oyunları, mülakat, bilgi, sorun çözme, resim anlatımı ve hikaye anlatma.

Nitel ve nicel analizler "flowun" dil sınıflarında mevcut olduğunu fakat aktiviteler arasında önemli farklılıklar olduğunu göstermektedir. Sonuçlar ayrıca gösterdi ki aktivitelerle öğrencilerin "flow" deneyimi arasındaki ilişkiyi öğrencilerin aktivite üzerindeki kontrolü, aktivitenin ilgi çekici olması, öğrencilerin konuya odaklanması ve güçlük seviyesi etkilemektedir. Analizler gösterdi ki eğer aktivite dört "flow" boyutunu içeriyorsa, öğrencilerin "flow" yaşama olasılığı artmaktadır. Sonuçlar ayrıca gösterdi ki öğretmenler "flow" yaşamayı sağlayıcı aktiviteler hazırlayarak öğrencilerin "flow" yaşama olasılığını artırabilirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler*: "Flow", Duygusal Motivasyon, Aktivite, Flow Deneyimi*

1. Background

1.1. Review of Literature

Recent years have seen a steady interest in the number of publications about flow experience in the language classroom. However, the existence of the flow experience while performing different tasks in speaking lessons remains unknown.

Flow theory is described as an experiential state characterized by intense focus and involvement that leads to improved performance on a task (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988, 1990). The theory posits that intrinsically motivating experiences lead to "optimal experience" identified as "flow" during total engagement in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988, 1990). When in the flow state, people are absorbed in an activity, their focus of awareness is narrowed, they lose self-consciousness, and they feel in control of their environment (Rettie, 2001).

While experiencing flow, the person feels that the task at hand is very challenging and s/he is functioning at his or her fullest capacity. Flow experiences are characterized by feelings of enjoyment, interest, happiness and satisfaction. Therefore, flow theory postulates that people who engage in an activity for their own sake even when the task is perceived as difficult or dangerous experience flow more frequently and more intensely than others. The perfect balance between the challenges afforded by the activity and the individual's available skills are believed to contribute to this optimal experiential state. Those experiencing flow describe it as being "in the zone," "in the groove (Jackson & Marsh, 1996), "blinking out" or "having the touch" (Abbott, 2000).

Flow theory holds that the intrinsically rewarding experience leads people to "higher levels of performance" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 74) which result in exploratory behaviors and constant repetition of the activity (Trevino & Webster, 1992). Csikszentmihalyi suggests that in this way, flow contributes to optimal performance and learning (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 1997b; Egbert, 2003; Larson, 1988). Flow researchers have found that some preconditions must exist for flow experience to occur: (a) a balance of skills and challenge, (b) intense concentration, (c) clear goals, (d) immediate feedback, (e) a sense of control, and (f) interest (Egbert, 2003). Other conditions of flow might include "a deep sense of enjoyment," "a lack of self-consciousness," "awareness," and "the perception that time passes more quickly" (Egbert, 2003). Although these flow dimensions have been more widely examined to explain the quality of subjective experience in leisure activities and work environments, flow theory has recently been extended to language education research (Abbott, 2000; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Egbert, 2003; Tardy & Snyder, 2004). Csikzentmihalyi (1993) points out that "almost every activity has the potential to produce flow" (p. 189). In fact, studies investigating flow in everyday life have revealed that flow experiences are reported more frequently in work and study than in leisure activities.

Flow theory predicts that high challenge and high skill activities lead to a state in which intrinsic motivation peaks (Moneta, 2004). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations have been widely addressed in much second language learning research. Intrinsic motivation is the tendency to engage in a task just because one finds it enjoyable and interesting, whereas extrinsic motivation is the tendency to engage in tasks because of the expectation of reward or punishment (Deci & Ryan, 1985). People differ in their

general tendencies to be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated across situations and times (Moneta, 2004). Although many activities in educational settings are extrinsically motivating, internalization and integration of the activity with one's own self can also be fostered.

Flow is something individuals experience during a task, it does not occur in isolation. It depends on both individual characteristics and conditions in the environment. It may even be related to other participants in the environment (Egbert, 2003). Csikzentmihalyi (1997b) proposes that while examining flow in learning, it is crucial to investigate not only students' experiences but also teachers' experiences as well since the motivation provided by the teachers' sense of flow may be essential for effective teaching. Moreover, as flow occurs at peak moments, these moments motivate teachers in their work, shaping their classroom practices (Tardy & Snyder, 2004).

Language learners' interest, engagement in the learning process and flow experience can be enhanced by designing motivating tasks. The research literature on the use of tasks reveals particular application of tasks in the development of oral skills (Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001, cited in Willis, 2003). Since spoken language production is a difficult aspect of language learning, designing and presenting meaningful activities, which promote a flow experience, are helpful to develop communicative competence. People report that they experience flow while they are performing activities in which they have an intense interest (Abbot, 2000). However, it is unclear in what educational contexts and during what kinds of tasks flow might occur and what effects this experience might have on learning and learners (Egbert, 2003). Although several researchers have conducted research concerning the existence of flow experiences in "educational" activities such as reading or using the computer (Abbot, 2000; Egbert, 2003; Trevino & Webster, 1992), flow has not yet been a focus of much research involving speaking activities in the language classroom.

This research study seeks to investigate the degree to which flow occurs in different kinds of tasks in speaking courses by exploring teachers' and students' perceptions about which activities promote flow.

2. Research Questions

1. What are students' perceptions concerning the types of activities to promote flow in speaking lessons?

2. What are teachers' perceptions concerning the types of activities to promote flow in speaking lessons?

3. According to teacher and student perceptions what are the flow promoting characteristics of the activities?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants & Setting

The study was conducted at Zonguldak Karaelmas University English Language Preparatory School. The participants were 163 elementary level students and eight instructors of English. The students were from eight different classes. Students who fail the proficiency test must attend the one-year preparatory school of English before

studying in their department. In the 2009/2010 academic year there were three levels of students, intermediate, lower intermediate, and elementary, which were determined according to the results of the placement test conducted at the beginning of the school year. There were 83 female students and 80 male students. The age range of the participants was between 17 and 19 years of age. Each class had a different instructor for their speaking courses and the entire participant teachers had at least five years of experience in teaching. While deciding on the classes, the classes' success rate and the willingness of their speaking teachers to participate in the study were taken into consideration. Because the study was carried out with elementary level students in the fall semester, classes' success rates were taken into consideration. Furthermore, as eight different classes participated in the study, to be consistent, the classes whose success rates were similar were chosen.

The classes, participated in the study were the most successful classes of the 33 elementary level classes according to their second mid-term exam results, which was given at the end of the fall semester. Four mid-term exams were carried out in 2009-2010 academic year: two in the fall semester and the other two in the spring semester.

Students are exposed to 30 hours of English every week. They have their primary English course for 16 hours. In addition to that, they have two-hour writing, two-hour speaking and two-hour video courses in which they learn to produce language. In addition to all these courses, they have eight hours of laboratory classes which provide students the opportunity of self-study. Students can listen to the reading passages in a native person's voice, or check their answers while doing grammar exercises or pronunciation exercises on computer. It is compulsory for the students to attend 70 percent of these classes. At the end of the year, the students must pass the final exam in order to be certified by the prep school. Students who fail this exam can enter their departments, but they cannot take the vocational English course in the departments in the third and fourth year. In order to take these lessons and graduate, students must take and pass the proficiency test that is conducted at the beginning of each school year.

3.2. Instruments

A perception questionnaire to measure students' affective responses to tasks, a short survey on teachers' perceptions about each task and interviews with these eight teachers about their perceptions about flow theory, their flow experiences in their lessons and the degree to which students experience flow in the activities were the three instruments which were used to collect data in this study.

First, the perception questionnaire was the main instrument which was used to collect data in this study. This questionnaire was administered during the two weeks of this study, immediately after the completion of each designated task. The questionnaire was designed to measure both students' and teachers' perceptions of the students' flow experiences concerning the tasks they were engaged in. The perception questionnaire which was used in this study was taken directly from Egbert's (2003) study, which investigated flow in language learning. In her study, she had adapted this questionnaire from another questionnaire used in computer-mediated environments by Webster, Trevino and Ran (1993, as cited in Egbert, 2003). She adapted the questionnaire by

changing the content from computer-focused items to learning tasks and by adding two more items to the original scale. No changes were made related to the structure of the items. The reported alpha reliability of Egbert's adapted perception questionnaire was measured at α = .88 which shows that it is reliable.

Egbert's (2003) questionnaire consists of 14 items, which reflects the four-faceted framework of flow including the dimensions of challenge, attention, interest, and control. The items in the questionnaire are associated with each of four flow dimensions of interest (2, 9, 10, and 12), control (3, 4, 8, and 11), focus (6, 7, and 14) and challenge (1, 5, and 13). The alpha reliability of the interest scale was measured at α= .61, the control scale was measured at α= .50, the fun scale was measured at α= .81, and the challenge scale was measured at α= .86 which shows that the scales were generally reliable.

Participants responded to each item on a seven-point Likert scale, which provides the respondents with 7 possible responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Two open-ended questions were added to the questionnaire to see students' reasons why they liked the activity or they did not like the activity. As the students are elementary level students, in order to prevent possible language interference during implementation, the original questionnaire, written in English, was translated into Turkish through a back translation process. First, the questionnaire was translated into Turkish by the researcher and then a colleague in the MA TEFL program at Bilkent University and another colleague at ZKU were asked to translate the Turkish version into English. By comparing the back translation received from the colleagues with the original questionnaire, the researcher made the necessary changes to the Turkish version of the questionnaire. Before administering the first questionnaire, an informed consent form that provided students with general information about the study and the questionnaire was given. Students were ensured that participation in this study was voluntary and their responses would be kept confidential.

In order to ensure the comprehensibility and clarity of the translation, the translated version of the questionnaire was pilot-tested with a class consisting of 22 elementary level students. This pilot group was chosen because the success rate and the student profile in this group were similar to those of the experimental group and also their teacher was willing to participate in the study. The pilot participants were encouraged to ask any questions about the items that were not clear and report any problems in understanding the questionnaire. In response to the pilot students' questions, comments, and feedback, the format of the questionnaire and the wordings of some items were changed to minimize comprehension difficulties.

Instructors were also given questionnaires after each task to measure their perceptions about the extent to which students experienced flow during each task. The teacher perception questionnaire was also adapted from Egbert's (2003). The items in the Egbert's questionnaire were rewritten for teachers.

Lastly, the third instrument that was used for data collection in the study was the semi-structured interview. The instructors of these eight classes were interviewed to understand their perceptions and attitudes about flow after completing the activities they were supposed to do in their classes. The questions on the semi-structured interviews

were adapted from Tardy and Snyder (2004). In Tardy and Snyder's study, the aim was to examine EFL teachers' flow experience at work. There were two questions in the original interview. They gave three quotations about flow which were examples of people describing their own experiences of flow. Then, they asked whether the participants had ever had such an experience in their lives and asked to describe it. As the researcher's aim was similar in this study, she used the same questions, but she changed the quotations to include educational experiences. Then, she added three more questions examining teachers' perceptions about the students' experiences of flow in these activities. Oral interviews with the teachers were conducted at the end of the two-week treatment. First, the teachers were provided with the description of flow and then asked about their attitudes towards flow in their lessons. The interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed and translated for data analysis soon after.

The difficulty of measuring a complex construct such as flow has been acknowledged by motivation and flow researchers (Carli & Massimini, 1988; Csikszentmihalyi, 1988; Egbert, 2003). However, questionnaires have been widely used in measurements of flow in different areas, and these studies have revealed the use of questionnaires to be reliable data-collecting tools for exploring subjective experiences such as flow (Carli & Massimini, 1988; Csikszentmihalyi, 1988; Egbert, 2003; Wilkinson & Foster, 1997). In this study, the perception questionnaire used by Egbert (2003) was the main instrument for gathering data about students' affective responses during task engagement because it had been used in a similar way in Egbert's study.

3.3. Speaking Activities

The researcher prepared eight different activities which include a sample of role-play, interview, class-discussion, problem-solving, story-telling, picture narration, communication games, and information-gap activities. These activities are described as "a goal-specific, meaningful, and purposeful endeavor that is self-contained" (Egbert, 2003, p. 508). These tasks were selected and distributed according to the focus of each unit across the speaking course syllabus.

Each class had two different activities and two classes performed the same activities. For instance, while D8 and D9 had the same role-play and interview activities, D3 and D4 had the same story-telling and picture narration activities. The activities were conducted over a period of two weeks. In the first week, activities number 1, 3, 5, and 7 were presented and in the second week activities 2, 4, 6, and 8 were completed by two different classes. After conducting the pilot study, the researcher prepared the activity files of the instructors which consisted of the instruction for the activities, the materials to be used in the activities, the requirements, and the procedure with the steps the instructors should follow and student consent forms. These were given to the instructors.

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

On December 31, 2009, Turkish translation of the questionnaire was pilot-tested with a class of 22 elementary level students. This pilot group was chosen because the success rates and the student profiles in this group were similar to those of the experimental group. The participant teacher was also willing to participate in the study.

The respondents gave feedback on the comprehensibility of the items in the questionnaire and changes were made accordingly.

Also, on January 4, 2010, a meeting was held with the course instructors. The teachers were given an orientation on the administration of the perception questionnaire. The perception questionnaire would be administered to the participants after each designated task during the treatment period. While students answered their questionnaires, the instructors would also fill in the teacher perception questionnaires. It was emphasized that the perception questionnaires of the students and the teachers would be administered immediately after the task was completed in order to collect more reliable data. It was also decided with the teachers that it would be better if the task descriptions and number of participants who responded to the questionnaire were recorded systematically in the teacher perception questionnaire. A list of guidelines was prepared for the instructors to assist them with the procedures to be followed during the study. All the documents and materials needed for the study were compiled in a folder and the teachers were introduced to an easy-filing system to collect, organize and record the data. Before that meeting, a list of tasks to be covered in the course was also negotiated and prepared with one of the instructors. The tasks were selected from the speaking activity files that are used by the instructors for speaking courses.

The designated tasks for this study included a sample of role-play, interview, class-discussion, problem-solving, story-telling, picture narration, communication games, and information-gap activities. During the sessions, students had only one task to complete. Over the course of the study, students were engaged in two designated tasks.

After determining the task types with the instructors, the study started on January 4, 2010. On the same day, the teachers gave an orientation about the study to the students. The orientation included information about the purpose and duration of the study, and the procedures for completing the perception questionnaire. Then, the teachers explained the aim of the study to the students and emphasized the importance of marking all the items in the questionnaire and giving honest responses. Then, they distributed consent forms to the students, and all the students willingly agreed to participate in the study and signed up the forms.

After instructors finished conducting their activities and the questionnaires, the instructors of these eight classes were interviewed to understand their perceptions and attitudes about flow after completing the activities they were supposed to do in their classes. Oral interviews with the teachers were conducted at the end of the two-week treatment on January 20. The interview was accompanied with a consent form that provided detailed information about the purpose of the study, the participants' rights and the contact information of the researcher in case of questions that could arise after the interviews. During the interview, first, teachers were provided with the description of flow and then asked about their attitudes towards flow in their lessons. The interview protocols were tape-recorded, transcribed and translated for data analysis soon after.

The files were collected from the instructors at the end of the second week after all instructors finished conducting their activities and perception questionnaires. Students' and teachers' responses to the perception questionnaires were entered using

the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 11.05). The data entry started in the third week of January and continued until March. The implementation lasted for two weeks in total.

4. Data Analysis

The data for this study was composed of both qualitative and quantitative data collected from multiple administration of the perception questionnaire. The data collected from both the pilot and the actual study were statistically analyzed using SPSS 11.05. Before running any statistical tests on the data, negative items in the questionnaire (3, 4, 10, and 12) were reverse scored.

At the analysis stage of the actual study, first, the averaged mean scores for each task were calculated and ranked. By examining the mean scores of the highest ranking and lowest ranking tasks, the tasks which stimulated the highest level of flow-like experience and which resulted in apathy across participants were determined. Teachers' perception questionnaires were also analyzed to see their perceptions about the degree to which flow occurred in each activity.

The qualitative data collected from the interviews with the instructors were also analyzed. In order to analyze the interviews they were transcribed, and then the basic themes in these interviews were identified. The interviews with the instructors revealed their perceptions and attitudes about flow. After transcribing the relevant parts of the interviews, these parts were translated into English by the researcher since some of the interviews were originally conducted in Turkish according to the participants' preferences.

5. Results

5.1. Quantitative Data

5.1.1. Analysis of Questionnaires

The quantitative data for this study was gathered through a perception questionnaire. This instrument was administered to all students and teachers immediately after their completion of each designated task. The aim was to measure the flow promoting potential of these tasks. The analysis of the data gathered from the questionnaires shed light on the first research question which examines students' perceptions concerning the types of activities to promote flow in speaking lessons. The questionnaire reflects four flow dimensions: control, focus, interest and challenge. Questions 3, 4, 8, 11 addressed control, questions 6, 7, 14 were concerned with focus, questions 2, 9, 10, 12 were about interest and questions 1, 5, and 13 dealt with challenge.

Instructors were also given questionnaires after each task to measure their perceptions about the extent to which students experienced flow during each task.

In order to explore which task stimulated the highest level of a flow-like experience in participants; first, responses to individual items on the questionnaire were averaged for all participants. Based on the averaged mean scores, the means for each task for all students and for teachers were computed separately. Table 1 presents the mean scores of all tasks from student and teacher perception questionnaires.

Table 1: Mean Scores For Each Task For All Student and Teacher Questionnaires

Task	N	Students Mean	Sd	N	Teachers mean
Task 1-Role-Play	33	5.01	.92	8	5.50
Task 2-Class Discussion	34	5.40	.89	8	6.00
Task 3- Information-Gap	37	4.59	.92	8	3.75
Task 4-Com. Games	38	5.07	.93	8	5.00
Task 5-Interview	38	4.76	.83	8	5.25
Task 6-Storytelling	38	5.07	1.11	8	5.75
Task 7-Problem Solving	39	4.94	1.01	8	5.60
Task 8 -Picture Narration	41	5.00	1.16	8	4.50

Note. N: number of participants Sts mean: Sd: standard deviation

(The seven possible Likert scale answers were as follows: strongly agree= 7, moderately agree=6, agree slightly=5, not sure=4, disagree slightly=3, moderately disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.)Figures in red: the highest score among tasks, Figures in purple: the lowest scores among tasks

The mean value for the highest ranking task (class discussion) was calculated as 5.40 for students, and the lowest ranking tasks (information-gap, interview, and problem-solving) had mean values of 4.59, 4.76, and 4.94 for students. It is interesting to note that the mean scores for all of the activities were above the mid-point of 4.00. The reason for this may be because of the fact that all tasks that were chosen were selected because they were thought to be especially engaging.

According to the teacher perception questionnaires, the task creating the highest level of flow was class discussion with a mean score of 6.00 and the lowest ranking task was the information gap activity with a mean score of 3.75.

After examining the mean scores of all activities, the questions in the student perception questionnaires were also analyzed in terms of the four flow dimensions. The mean scores of each flow dimension (control, focus, interest, challenge) were also calculated. Class discussion, the highest ranking task, had the highest mean scores on three of the four flow dimensions. However, the information-gap activity (for two flow dimensions: 3.79 for control and 4.22 for challenge) and the interview (for four flow dimensions: 4.88 for control, 4.65 for focus, 4.60 for interest, and 4.96 for challenge), the two lowest ranking tasks had lower scores than the cut-off point 5.00. The cut-off point for the scales was 5.00. This cut-off point was determined since it represents "agree" on the Likert-scale. Table 2 shows the overall means of all scales for each task.

Table 2: Mean Scores Of Four Flow Dimensions For Each Task For Student Questionnaires

	Control	Focus	Interest	Challenge
Class Discussion	**5.35**	**5.58**	5.31	**5.29**
Communication Games	4.85	5.32	5.19	4.76
Storytelling	5.17	5.42	5.07	4.49
Role-Play	4.81	4.98	5.05	5.19
Picture Narration	4.68	5.37	5.25	4.70
Problem-Solving	5.03	5.23	5.44	4.86
Interview	4.88	4.65	4.60	4.96
Information-Gap	3.79	4.96	5.08	4.22

The class discussion activity, the highest ranking task, was a whole class activity with a mean value of 5.40 for students and 6.00 for teachers and had the highest scores for three of the four scales: 5.35 for control, 5.58 for focus, and 5.29 for challenge. However, the information-gap activity (for two flow dimensions: 3.79 for control and 4.22 for challenge) and the interview (for four flow dimensions: 4.88 for control, 4.65 for focus, 4.60 for interest, and 4.96 for challenge), the two lowest ranking tasks had lower scores than the cut-off point 5.00.

A one-way ANOVA test was run in order to explore the differences in the experience of flow among the eight different activities. Table 3 illustrates the mean values of the overall affective responses of students on the questionnaires to tasks on a 7-point Likert scale.

Table 3: ANOVA Results For All Tasks

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Sig.
Class Discussion	14.03	7	2.084	.045
Communication Games	278. 99	290		
Problem Solving	293. 02	297		

ANOVA test results (Table 5) point out that there is a significant difference among different activities (p<. 045). The post-hoc test reveals that the bottom three activities which were problem-solving, interview and information-gap are significantly different from the class discussion activity (p<. 002) and the top three activities which were class discussion, communication games and storytelling are significantly different from the information gap activity (p<. 002). There is a significant difference between the first activity, which is class discussion and all the other activities (p<. 004). There is no significant difference among the activities in the middle which are role-play, and picture narration.

5.2. Qualitative Data

The qualitative data for this study was gathered using two kinds of instruments. The first set of instruments comprised open-ended questions in Part B of the student questionnaires. The second set of instruments was semi-structured interviews held with teachers. The results of open-ended questions and the interviews will be presented in this part according to recurring comments from each task and the comments from the open-ended questions that match with those in interviews.

5.2.1. Analysis of Open-Ended Questions in Student Questionnaires

The respondents to the questionnaire were asked to write their responses in the space provided for each question. The responses to these open-ended questions range from short phrases (the most common response) to sentences. The responses for each open-ended question were analyzed by coding the data and identifying sub-categories into which they fell. Table 4 presents the information about the open-ended questions and the number of responses given for each question.

Table 4: Open-Ended Questions

The Questions	N	Missing Responses	Responses Received
1. This task was fun for me because	298	61	234
2. This task was boring for me because	298	217	78

While analyzing the responses, it was noticed that the second question was not answered by the majority of the participants whereas the first question was answered by most of the participants, which suggests that generally students liked all the activities. In the process of the qualitative data analysis, it was found that there are some recurring comments about flow promoting characteristics of the activities in the open-ended questions and these comments match the teachers' comments in their interviews. The answers students gave to the open-ended questions are presented under several headings. Table 5 shows the responses to the open-ended questions.

Table 5: Student Responses to Open Ended Questions Used in Student Questionnaires

The activity was fun because…	Number of respondents	The activity was boring because…	Number of respondents
Fun	62	Lack of communicative competence & English Knowledge	15
Practice Speaking	41	Not creative	20
Group work	30		
Different from course-book	14		
Informative & interesting	15		

5.2.1.1. Positive Responses

5.2.1.1.1. Fun

One of the recurring comments about the reasons why students liked the activities was that it was fun. A significant number (62) of students who responded to this question from eight different classes indicated that they found the activities enjoyable or fun. One student mentioned:

We had fun all together, and since we tried to speak English, it was beneficial.(Student 1)

5.2.1.1.2 Practice Speaking

The other most commonly made comment was related to students' chance to practice speaking. Many respondents (42) thought the activities were creative and allowed them to practice their speaking skills. As they liked the activities, they wanted to participate in the activity which resulted in practicing speaking and vocabulary development. Furthermore, as the activities required students to be creative and produce language, they had the chance to use the language structures they had previously learnt. One of the students commented:

It was an activity which enabled us to improve our speaking skill and our imagination. I enjoyed it a lot and laughed a lot. (Student 2)

5.2.1.1.3. Group Work

In the open-ended questions, one of the most commonly mentioned aspects of the activities was the chance to share ideas and personal experiences. Students found working in groups very motivating because this type of activities the meant sustained feeling of engagement during the task completion process. Moreover, students also mentioned that they enjoyed working in groups and sharing their ideas with their friends. One of the students commented:

Preparing a project with a group was very beneficial and funny. (Student 3)

Since they had the chance to prepare their products with their friends in their groups and share their ideas during preparation, they believed that they benefited from it. Not only did it enhance their interpersonal skills, but it also enabled them to express themselves in their groups and prepare a good quality product with their friends. They also had fun while working with their friends. As one student commented:

Group work activities are generally entertaining and informative.(Student 4)

5.2.1.1.4. Being Different from Course Book

In the open-ended questions, some students (14) agreed that these activities were different than the ones in their course books. A cursory look at the speaking book used by students provides some context for understanding these comments. The text does not provide a large number of speaking activities, but is loaded with many listening activities. For example, in Unit 3, the title of the unit is "I'll have pizza, please". Eight sections of the unit are listening and only two are speaking. In the first speaking section, students learn three expressions to ask about what is on a menu in a restaurant. Then, in

the second part, by looking at the menu, they ask the waiter to explain what those dishes are. Their responses are limited to only forming sentences. In the other speaking section, they learn three more phrases to ask for and express opinions about food, and afterwards they use these phrases to ask their friends' opinions about the given food. However, they only form separate sentences in this part, as well. In speaking exercises in another unit, Unit 5, students are required to put the words in the correct order. In another example again from the same unit, the students are shown how to ask about services by giving an example, then they form their questions by using the same structure with different verbs. Verbs are also given in each question. Therefore, students do not produce anything new, but only reproduce the structure and repeat it.

Since the book does not present a variety of speaking activities which enable them to express themselves well, but mostly gives mechanical speaking activities, students stated that the activities used in the study were different from their book. One of the students commented:

The activity was better than the ones in the speaking course book. (Student 5)

Students' comments about how the task activities are different from the ones in their books may be reflecting this lack of opportunities to practice speaking. Furthermore, speaking activities in their book are mostly mechanic exercises in which students are required to rewrite sentences or fill in the blanks. They do not produce language; they do not use their creativity or perform different roles as they were asked to do in the task activities they studied. For the most part, these activities do not seem to reflect any of the four flow dimensions: control, focus, interest or challenge. It is not surprising, then, that, students found these activities were different from the ones in their speaking course books. One student indicated that:

Speaking lessons are really very boring, doing these kinds of activities is entertaining, we should do it more frequently. (Student 6)

5.2.1.1.5. Informative and Interesting

The other most commonly made observation was related to these tasks being informative. During the analysis of qualitative data, it was noted that students made lots of similar comments about how they learnt new vocabulary items and practiced daily use of language. They stated that they learnt new vocabulary items while performing those tasks. They also learnt the use of daily language with different phrases and vocabulary. One student indicated a specific structure he learnt:

I learnt how I could form questions in daily language. (Student 7)

In the open-ended questions, one of the most commonly mentioned aspects of the activities was their content. The majority of the students responded positively to the activities to a great extent because they found the topics of the activities very current and these tasks addresses their interests.

As can be inferred from all these comments, these activities were highly flow promoting for the students and they were able to describe these flow promoting characteristics in their own words.

5.2.1.2. Negative Responses

5.2.1.2.1. Lack of Communicative Competence and English Knowledge

In the open-ended questions, one of the most commonly mentioned negative aspects of these activities were difficulties students had because they lacked communicative competence. Several students explained that they did not like the activities because they lack communicative competence to express themselves well in English. The quotation below is a good example:

I got really bored because I don't know English well. (Student 8)

They also pointed out that they did not have enough vocabulary knowledge to express their ideas. One student indicated this by commenting:

Sometimes, I couldn't find the suitable word and I couldn't express myself well. (Student 9)

5.2.1.2.2. Lack of Opportunities for Creativity

Students mentioned that one of the negative aspects of the information gap activity was that it was not creative. As students were already given the information and were asked to exchange it with the other group, they were not asked to produce anything new. Students noted that they did not find it challenging or interesting. Students also indicated that they did not have control over the activities and they were not curious about it. One student mentioned that:

It was not interesting, we weren't active. We did not do anything else rather than asking and answering questions. (Student 10)

5.2.2. Analysis of the Interviews with Teachers

This section presents the answer to the second research question which seeks teachers' perceptions concerning the types of activities that promote flow in speaking lessons. The speaking instructors of these eight classes were interviewed to understand their perceptions and attitudes about flow after completing the activities they were supposed to do in their classes. Oral interviews with the teachers were conducted at the end of the two-week treatment. First, they were provided with the description of flow and then asked about their attitudes towards flow in their lessons. The interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed and translated for data analysis soon after. As Seidman (1998) suggests, some themes and categories were searched for and identified by the researcher while analyzing the interviews. These themes were suggested by the questions asked of the teachers and the common points that they focused on in the interview. In order to keep the confidentiality of the participants, all the participants' ideas will be referred to by their pseudo names throughout this chapter.

5.2.2.1. Flow Promoting Characteristics of the Activities

The analysis of the responses to the interviews revealed seven main categories regarding the characteristics of flow promoting activities. The categories that emerged were interest, fun, opportunities to speak and engaging topic, divergence from the textbook, group work, challenge, and creativity.

5.2.2.1.1. Interest

A great majority of the respondents said that their students experience flow at times of high interest and involvement in the activity. When this interest and involvement were not present, they did not experience flow. Özlem expressed this idea by saying:

> If the task is a bit difficult, but interesting and manageable, if they are interested in the activity, they experience flow.

As can be seen from teachers' responses, flow tended to occur when students were more personally interested in the activity.

5.2.2.1.2. Fun

Some teachers thought that students were more likely to experience flow when the activity was fun for them. Özlem pointed out this by saying:

> They had the same kind of restaurant role-play and they really enjoyed it. They brought plates, meals and soup into the classroom and it was really enjoyable for them and I had the feeling that they wanted to do it, and they did it. And I could observe flow.

5.2.2.1.3. Practice Speaking

Most teachers stated that their students liked those activities since they enabled them to practice speaking. They also pointed out that as they were bored with doing grammar exercises or doing listening, as their speaking book requires, these activities gave them the chance to speak in English, and practice their speaking skills. One teacher responded:

> It (flow experience) happens a lot during speaking activities, they try to speak, but they get bored during grammar activities. I prefer speaking activities if I want to feel flow. (Sevil)

5.2.2.1.4. Being Different from Speaking Course Book

All teachers stated that their students were bored with the activities in their speaking course books. They indicated that this was a reason for which the students found these activities motivating. Their speaking course book is loaded with listening activities. Speaking parts are presented like grammar exercises, and the book is organized so that activities are presented in the same way and in the same order. Teachers also stated that, after some time, students got accustomed to the activities in their book and they found the classes monotonous. Teachers also stated that students liked the activities since they were different from the book. Some example extracts from the responses are as follows:

> Doing these activities after doing the exercises in the book really drew their attention. They were really lost in the activity. (Şenay)

She also added:

> When compared to the course book, sometimes giving this kind of activities really motivates students, they find it interesting, and it enables the flow of the

lesson. While doing the exercises in the book, there can be some students who do not listen or participate, but everybody listened to this activity, everybody was willing to participate.

As it is clearly seen from the teacher interviews and the students' answers to the open ended questions, both students and teachers express that students do not like the activities in their course book since they are more likely to be grammar exercises and focused upon listening. Also, they state that students do not produce language, they do not express themselves in English and they cannot use their creativity, as all activities are the same in the course book, which tends to promote listening and grammar. Therefore, students and teachers think that all activities were flow promoting since they are different from their course book.

5.2.2.1.5. Group Work

Some of the teachers pointed out that students liked working in groups. They said that when students share their ideas with their friends, they enjoyed the activity more and they got pleasure from it. Rather than working alone, students prefer working in groups. As one teacher noted:

Everybody was willing to participate and they all like group work activities. They perform something with their groups, they use their creativity.(Şenay)

As seen from the teacher responses, like students, teachers also believe that when students work in groups, when they share their ideas and exchange information, they are more eager to participate in the activity and practice more.

5.2.2.1.6. Challenge

Some of the teachers stated that, when the activity is challenging, and there is a balance between students' existing skills and the challenge, flow is more likely to occur. Özlem expressed this point by saying:

Actually, maybe challenge is the right word here. If they, if it is a bit difficult, but it is interesting and manageable, flow is more likely to occur.

As teachers mention, there should be a balance between the available skill of the students and the challenge. If the activity is more challenging than the existing skills, students think that they cannot manage it, so anxiety occurs and students feel apathy instead of flow. Or, if the activity is less challenging than the available skills of the students, students get bored and they feel apathy.

5.2.2.1.7. Creativity

Most teachers think that students should be free to express themselves and use their creativity in speaking activities. When they find the topic interesting, and use their imagination, they are more focused on the activity. One teacher said this in this way:

When they work in groups, they are more eager to participate. They use their imagination and share it with their friends in the group. (Şenay)

As is seen from teacher responses, students are more eager to participate in the lesson and are more likely to experience flow, if they have the chance to produce

language, and if they use their creativity. When the topic is interesting for them and when it arouses their creativity, students focus on the activity more and are more curious about the topic. Therefore, it leads them to be involved in the activity.

5.2.2.2. What Prevents Flow in the Activities?

The analysis of the responses to the interviews revealed two main categories regarding the characteristics of flow preventing activities. The categories that emerged were lack of sufficient vocabulary and grammar knowledge and uninteresting topics.

5.2.2.2.1. Lack of Enough Vocabulary and Grammar Knowledge

All teachers stated that lack of knowledge of grammar and vocabulary prevents flow. Since students do not know a variety of vocabulary items or all grammar topics, they are not self-confident. They do not want to participate in the lesson as they think that they will not be able to express themselves well. Another point was the level of support students needed to participate in the activity. Teachers said that since they could not help all students, it prevents flow. One teacher expressed this in the flowing way by saying:

> When they lack the necessary vocabulary items to accomplish the task, they ask a lot of questions. I try to help all of them, but when I can't do it, they cannot express themselves well. (Şenay)

These responses by teachers are consistent with the students' answers to the open-ended questions. As may be remembered, students did not experience flow when they were not able to express themselves well because of lack of communicative competence, vocabulary knowledge and grammar knowledge. Even if they knew what do, they did not feel comfortable if they could not use the right words or if they could not express what they wanted to say.

5.2.2.2.2. Topic

Some of the teachers pointed out that students are not eager to participate when the topic is not interesting to them. Bengü expressed this point by saying:

> If the topic is not interesting for the students, they get bored easily.

This is similar to student comments where they mentioned that, if they do not find the topic interesting, they do not want to participate in the lesson.

6. Discussion

6.1. Flow versus Apathy Results

In order to investigate the overall flow conducing potential of the designated tasks in this study, individual item scores for the questionnaires were averaged for each participant in order to calculate mean values for each task. Then, means for the 8 tasks for all students were rank ordered and analyzed for their flow promoting impact. The mean value for the highest ranking task (class discussion) was calculated as 5.40 for students and 6.00 for teachers, and the lowest ranking tasks (information-gap, interview, and problem-solving) had the mean values of 4.59, 4.76, and 4.94 for students. Moreover, class discussion activity, the highest ranking task, had the highest mean

scores for three of the four flow dimensions whereas information-gap activity and the interview, the lowest ranking tasks, had lower mean scores for the flow dimensions: the information-gap activity (for two flow dimensions: 3.79 for control and 4.22 for challenge) and the interview (for four flow dimensions: 4.88 for control, 4.65 for focus, 4.60 for interest, and 4.96 for challenge).

The findings revealed that the class discussion activity produced more flow for both teachers and the students, whereas the information-gap, the interview and the problem solving activities resulted in more apathy. However, none of the activities resulted in complete apathy among students since all activities were chosen among the best activities of the speaking file in Zonguldak Karaelmas University speaking office. Therefore, it can be assumed that all activities were good examples of their type. Also, there is a close relationship between the mean scores of each activity and the mean scores of each flow dimension. The higher the mean scores for each dimension, the more flow promoting the activity is. This finding supports Egbert's (2003) study by indicating that the four flow dimensions can index the flow experience.

The findings for students and teachers were the same for the most flow conducing activity, which was class discussion, the second highest flow promoting activity, which was communication games, the fourth flow promoting activity, which was role-play, and the least flow producing activity, information-gap. It suggests that the results are consistent.

Eckard (1981) states that students need linguistic as well as communicative skills to participate in the discussion. For that reason, the use of discussions in the language class can aid language learners in improving their conversational skills. The findings of the current study supports that class discussion activities are good source of practice, enabling learners to experience flow (Eckard, 1981; Florez, 1999; Folland & Robertson, 1978; Knowles & Sasaki, 1980; Nunan, 1989; Nunan, 2000; Reuben, 1999; J. C. Richards, 2008; Schneider, 2001).

The reason that the class discussion activity was the most flow producing may be that using activities like class discussion in class encourages active learning, as well as collaboration, and interactivity (Eckard, 1981; Florez, 1999; Nunan, 1989; Reuben, 1999). Also, the class discussion activity might have created higher levels of emotional arousal because the channel of communication involved tactile modes and the task allowed for dynamic interaction among participants (Dörnyei, 2001b). Furthermore, because students were required to express their thoughts in English effectively, and they successfully did it, they may have perceived this activity as relevant and of value to their future needs (Assor, Kaplan, & Roth, 2002; Dörnyei, 1994; Pintrich, 1989; Woolfolk, 1993). All of these may have resulted in the class discussion activity being regarded as flow producing by the learners and the teachers.

Communication games were the second highest ranking task with the mean score of 5.07 for students and 5.75 for teachers. As Eckard (1981) suggests, the current study seemed to indicate that games are important in language classrooms since they motivate learners, lower their anxiety and provide opportunities for real communication. Through well-prepared communicative activities such as class discussion and communication games, teachers can encourage students to experiment and innovate with the language,

and create a supportive atmosphere. This will contribute to their self-confidence as speakers and to their motivation to learn more (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Ryan & Deci, 2000a; Wilkinson & Foster, 1997). Using games in class encourages active learning, as well as collaboration, and interactivity (Reuben, 1999). The findings revealed that most flow promoting tasks were group activities.

Group work activities yielded significant positive results during task completion in this study. The reasons for the strong impact of interactional pattern on overall affective engagement and on the flow dimensions can be linked to the influence of peer collaboration and active involvement, and opportunities for task control and focused concentration. Learning situations which grant students opportunities to interact with each other, which enable them to share responsibility and learn from each other, and which encourage the active involvement of all participants are believed to enhance learner motivation (MacIntyre, 2002; Nunan, 1989; J. Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Robinson, 2002; Tudor, 2001). The interactive and supportive nature of group work tasks might have caused students to perceive these tasks as stimulating.

The literature also provides evidence for the contribution of dynamic classroom interaction on motivational processing and co-construction of task-motivation (Dörnyei, 2002). This process-oriented approach recognizes the importance of peer influence on learners' motivational disposition towards the task when the activity provides opportunities for cooperative work. If one of the task participants is highly motivated in a group activity, it is likely that this person will affect the motivation of other participants. This study showed that group work tasks resulted in the most positive affective responses. Because group work supposedly enabled students with different levels of motivations to interact, it might have caused relatively unmotivated learners to become more motivated owing to the co-constructed nature of task motivation. Tasks including group work may also have resulted in significant differences in affective responses because they gave students a sense of control and enhanced their concentration. When learners are provided with a sense of responsibility and when they perceive themselves as the controllers of their behaviors (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000a), they become more self-determined, and thus more autonomous. The results also show that group activities enhanced learners' focused attention to greater degrees. Even in a classroom environment where many distracters exist, learners seem to be more focused when they have clearly defined roles (Dörnyei, 2001b), such as in group tasks.

The information gap activity, the interview, and the problem-solving activities were the lowest ranking tasks with a mean score of 4.59, 4.76, and 4.94 for students. Also, the information gap activity and the interview had lower mean scores then the cut-off point of 5.00 for the flow dimensions: the information-gap activity (for two flow dimensions: 3.79 for control and 4.22 for challenge) and the interview (for four flow dimensions: 4.88 for control, 4.65 for focus, 4.60 for interest, and 4.96 for challenge). Although they are popular in textbooks, students did not respond favorably to them in this study.

The reason for the information-gap activity being one of the least flow conducing activity could be related to task challenge. If students felt that the task was not challenging enough or that it offered challenge that was beyond their available

skills, it may have produced boredom or apathy among participants (Abbott, 2000; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975, 1988, 1990, 1997a, 1997b; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Egbert, 2003; Massimini & Carli, 1988; Wilkinson & Foster, 1997). It is likely that for the information gap activity, the students felt the task was not challenging enough. The optimal balance between challenges and skills is essential for students to perceive control over the activity and find it appealing. Since optimal challenge is closely related to intrinsic motivation, it is possible that students did not experience flow as the activity did not match their available skills and was not interesting for them, which is also attributed to the significant correlation between flow and task appeal.

6.2. The Characteristics of Flow Promoting Activities

The analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data showed that flow promoting activities share several important features like (a) a balance between challenge and available skills, (b) focused attention and intense concentration, (c) a sense of control, and (d) learner interest. These findings are consistent with previous research (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997b; Egbert, 2003). The results also suggested that if these four flow dimensions are met in the activity, students are more likely to experience flow.

According to students' answers to the open-ended questions, in addition to the dimensions discussed above, there are other aspects of flow promoting activities. These include a deep sense of enjoyment, creativity, self-confidence, learner interest, and being informative. Several students indicated that the topic should be interesting and informative, and the activity should create self-confidence and enable students to practice speaking and use their imagination to be more flow conducive.

Finally, the analysis of the teacher interviews showed that flow promoting activities have other characteristics. Specifically, practice speaking, working in groups, challenging, focus, being real life like, being different from book, and topic and creativity emerged from the analysis. As seen from Table 1, the characteristics of flow promoting activities are the same for students and for teachers. Therefore it can be concluded that flow promoting activities share several important features like:

1. a balance between challenge and available skills;

2. focused attention and intense concentration;

3. a sense of control;

4. learner interest;

5. enjoyment;

6. creativity;

7. supporting self-confidence;

8. being informative;

9. working in groups, and

10. enabling students to practice speaking.

These results imply that if students have control in the activities, if they focus on the activity, if the activity is interesting and if the students are curious about the activity, they may experience higher levels of flow. Also, if students produce language, and share their opinions, it may affect their affective responses during task engagement in different ways.

If these characteristics are met in an activity, students are more likely to experience flow; and participate in the lessons and improve their communicative competence.

6.3. Pedagogical Implications

The results of this study are consistent with the propositions of flow theory (Abbott, 2000; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997a; Egbert, 2003) concerning the impact of learners' perception of task appeal and control. When tasks are interesting and enjoyable, and they provide students with a sense of control, they are perceived as more flow promoting. Ultimately, different activities support the experience in varying degrees. The findings also indicate that the higher the observed opportunities for flow on the four flow dimensions, the more likely it is that participants would perceive flow on the questionnaire. This finding suggests that the four dimensions can index the flow experience.

The study shows that it is worth encouraging dynamic interaction in language classes in order to promote students' affective engagement. The findings also suggest that teachers can facilitate the flow experience for students by developing tasks that might lead to flow. For example, the current study shows that class discussion activities are the most flow promoting activity among the others. Therefore, teachers can include class discussion activities in their classes. The second flow promoting activity is communication games as they are good sources of meaningful communication in courses. In speaking courses, teachers can present different communication games to make students participate in the lesson and practice speaking more. Although information gap activities, interviews, and problem-solving activities are popular in textbooks, students did not respond favorably in this study. Therefore, rather than using information-gap activities or interviews, teachers can choose role-play activities which is the fourth most flow promoting activity for teachers and students. This, in turn, may direct students towards more intrinsically motivated learning. The results have further implications for including interactive group activities in educational contexts in order to promote affective engagement. Group activities may involve students more in the learning process and give them a sense of responsibility and ownership, which can possibly support the internalization of behaviors.

The findings of this study also indicate that, although participants' perceptions of flow differ, the patterns of flow across tasks are relatively similar and that one can, therefore, talk about tasks that support flow.

This study may also have implications for course design in educational instruction. The findings from the study can assist syllabus designers and material developers in setting criteria for choosing and evaluating learning tasks. While they could include more class discussion activities and communication activities in the syllabus, they could use information-gap activities or interviews less. For teachers, they

may include activities that this study finds as flow promoting, like class discussion activity. Teacher training programs may also benefit from the findings of this study and emphasize the importance of presenting different activities that may lead to flow experience in their classes to enhance learner motivation. Adopting a learner-centered approach and developing autonomy-supportive learning environments can further be accepted as an educational policy at both local and national levels. Learners can be included more in decision-making processes, even in issues concerning assessment. Thus, students' motivation and interest in the subject matter can be enhanced and they could exhibit more positive attitudes towards language courses.

6.4. Limitations of the Study

The study had certain limitations in examining different tasks to promote flow. The limitations of this study resulted from the absence of different level students, duration of the study, the inability of the researcher to observe the implementation of the treatment, the deficiency of qualified qualitative data, the novelty affect, and the nature of tasks.

The study was conducted with 163 elementary level students in eight different sections of speaking course. Rather than comparing student affective responses across different groups, this study explored the differences in responses to different tasks in the same level of students. The results showed that the elementary level students were engaged in more positive emotional states during the class discussion activity in comparison to the other activities. However, since there was no other level of students, whether the same tasks when implemented in different groups would produce similar results is unknown.

The length of the study was short, which is an important limitation of the study. The time given for the implementation of the tasks was limited to two weeks. Over a longer period of time, the researcher could have had the opportunity to implement the same task type more than once. This might have given more reliable results related to the impact of presentation variables on different aspects of language production.

Due to time constraints, the researcher could not implement the study herself, but the participant teachers were given a list of the guidelines on how to implement the tasks. Additionally, collecting qualitative data from one-on-one interviews with the students at the end of each task could have given more insight into the impact of each task on their affective responses, which would have gone beyond the few phrases provided on the open-ended questions. Collecting qualitative data could also have provided explanations for the activities which promoted flow to a great extent and which produced less flow in anomalous cases.

The novelty affect was another limitation of the study. Since students generally do the activities of the book, which they find very boring, doing different activities may lead them to react more positively to these activities. If the same types of activities were presented after students got used to them, the results may be more reliable.

6.5. Future Research

Drawing on the findings and limitations of the study, suggestions for future research can be made. Interesting areas of research might include investigations into the

effect of flow on language learning outcomes, a longitudinal study on different tasks that could enhance affective engagement with support from qualitative data, and a detailed study focusing on one task with different topics.

First of all, the results of this study show that different tasks promote the flow experience to different degrees. Flow theory recognizes the contribution of flow experiences to optimal performance and learning (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997a; Egbert, 2003; Larson, 1988). The current study, however, did not address language outcomes except by assuming that when students are in flow, learning is occurring. Therefore, future research may wish to focus on exploring the relationship between flow and language outcomes.

Future research can also be directed toward a longitudinal investigation of other tasks that could enhance affective engagement, with support from qualitative data. Since the current study examined class discussion activity, communication games, role play, interview, storytelling, picture narration, information gap and problem solving activities, a similar study can be done with the focus of exploring the flow experience in other speaking tasks. It could also be interesting to conduct a study examining the experience of flow in different activities in different skills.

Furthermore, since there was a limited number of intermediate level students and pre-intermediate students, the study could not be carried out with different proficiency levels. Therefore, future research can be done with three different proficiency levels, investigating the differences in the perception of flow experience among different proficiency levels on the same activity. Moreover, one type of task could also be examined in detail in three different proficiency levels to understand whether the nature of the activity or other aspects promote flow.

References

Abbot, J. (2000). "Blinking out" and "having the touch": Two fifth-grade boys talk about flow experiences in writing. *Written Communication, 17*, 53-92.

Carli, M., Delle Fave, A., & Massimini, F. (1988). The quality of experience in flow channels: Comparison of Italian and U. S. Students. In M. Csikszentmihalyi & I. Csikszentmihalyi (Eds.), *Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness* (pp. 288-306). New york: Cambridge university Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988). *The future of flow*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997a). *Intrinsic motivation and effective teaching: A Flow analysis*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997b). Flow and education. *NAMTA Journal, 22*(2), 2-35.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I. S. (Eds.). (1988). *Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. London: Plenum Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, J. (2003). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 87*(4), 499-518.

Eckard, R. (1981). *Teaching conversation skills in ESL*. Washington: Need publisher.

Jackson, S., & Marsh, H. (1996). Development and validation of a scale to measure optimal experience: The flow state scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 18*, 17-35.

Larson, R. (1988). *Flow and writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). *Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Moneta, G. B. (2004). The flow model of intrinsic motivation in Chinese: Cultural and personal moderators. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5*(2), 181-217.

Reuben, B. D. (1999). Simulations, games, and experience-based learning: The quest for a new paradigm for teaching and learning. *Simulation & Gaming, 33*(3), 316-329.

Robinson, P. (Ed.). (2002). *Introduction: Researching individual differences and instructed learning*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Class definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54-67.

Tardy, C. M., & Snyder, B. (2004). 'That's why I do it': Flow and EFL teachers' practices. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal, 58*(2), 118-128.

Trevino, L., & Webster, J. (1992). Flow in computer-mediated communication: Electronic mail and voice mail evaluation and impacts. *Communication Research, 19*, 539-573.