

# Fostering Learner Autonomy and Motivation in Second Language Speaking: Integrative Approaches in Contemporary English Language Education

<sup>1</sup> Alexei Morozov

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki, Finland

Received: 28<sup>th</sup> Nov 2025 | Received Revised Version: 19<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025 | Accepted: 25<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025 | Published: 05<sup>th</sup> Jan 2026

Volume 02 Issue 01 2026 | Crossref DOI: 10.64917/ajsshr/V02I01-001

## Abstract

*The development of speaking proficiency in a second language (L2) remains a pivotal objective within global English language education. Despite extensive research on linguistic pedagogy, challenges persist in fostering learner autonomy, intrinsic motivation, and effective communicative competence among diverse learner populations. This study synthesizes theoretical frameworks and empirical findings from humanistic, task-based, and motivational perspectives to explore comprehensive strategies for enhancing L2 speaking proficiency. Utilizing qualitative research methodologies, including thematic analysis of classroom observations and interviews with English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors, this research investigates the interplay between teaching approaches, assessment practices, and learner agency. The findings indicate that integrating humanistic pedagogy, task-based learning, and motivational scaffolding promotes higher levels of learner engagement and autonomous speaking behaviors. The study also emphasizes the washback effects of high-stakes assessments, highlighting the need for alignment between testing and instructional practices to avoid counterproductive outcomes. Limitations related to context-specific factors, sample diversity, and assessment constraints are addressed. The implications underscore the importance of designing learner-centered curricula that holistically consider motivation, autonomy, and communication skills. Recommendations for policy, instructional design, and future research include the systematic incorporation of autonomy-supportive teaching, humanistic values, and reflective assessment practices to advance L2 speaking competence across heterogeneous educational contexts.*

Keywords: Learner autonomy, English speaking, motivation, task-based learning, humanistic pedagogy, assessment washback, second language acquisition.

© 2026 Alexei Morozov. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

**Cite This Article:** Alexei Morozov. 2026. Fostering Learner Autonomy and Motivation in Second Language Speaking: Integrative Approaches in Contemporary English Language Education. American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research 2, 01, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.64917/ajsshr/V02I01-001>

## 1. Introduction

Speaking proficiency in a second language represents a critical dimension of communicative competence, which extends beyond mere grammatical accuracy to encompass fluency, sociolinguistic appropriateness, and strategic interaction (Cook, 2016). Despite decades of pedagogical innovation, many learners struggle to attain sufficient speaking competence, particularly in contexts where

English is a foreign language rather than a medium of everyday communication (Cao, Jeyaraj, & Razali, 2024). Traditional teacher-centered instruction often emphasizes passive knowledge acquisition over active communicative practice, which can impede the development of both proficiency and confidence in speaking (Burns, 2019). This research addresses the persistent educational challenge of equipping learners with the skills, autonomy, and motivation necessary for effective oral communication in

L2 contexts.

A central concern in language pedagogy is the cultivation of learner autonomy, which refers to the capacity of students to take responsibility for their own learning, set goals, select strategies, and self-assess progress (Cao, Jeyaraj, & Razali, 2024). Autonomy is intricately linked to motivation, as self-directed learners are more likely to engage meaningfully with communicative tasks and sustain long-term language development (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Moreover, empirical studies have demonstrated that learner motivation, particularly intrinsic motivation, significantly correlates with speaking proficiency, highlighting the importance of creating educational environments that nurture curiosity, self-efficacy, and personal relevance (Noels et al., 2000; Wilona et al., 2010; Ihsan, 2016). Despite this, the practical implementation of autonomy-supportive teaching remains inconsistent across EFL classrooms, often constrained by curriculum rigidity, teacher preparedness, and high-stakes assessment systems (Dong, Fan, & Xu, 2021).

Another critical factor influencing L2 speaking development is the pedagogical approach employed. Task-based language teaching (TBLT) has gained recognition for its emphasis on meaningful communication through structured yet flexible tasks that simulate real-life language use (Nunan, 2004; Willis, 1996). TBLT encourages learners to actively negotiate meaning, employ problem-solving strategies, and receive authentic feedback, which collectively contribute to both linguistic competence and communicative confidence (Cameron, 2001). However, effective task design requires careful attention to learner readiness, cognitive load, and alignment with learning objectives, as poorly structured tasks can inadvertently diminish engagement or exacerbate learner anxiety (Brown, 2007). Additionally, the humanistic perspective in language education, which emphasizes empathy, respect for learner individuality, and the integration of affective and cognitive dimensions, has been shown to enhance learner motivation and autonomy (Byram, Porto, & Yulita, 2023). Humanistic pedagogy fosters an inclusive, learner-centered environment that supports risk-taking, self-expression, and reflective practice, all of which are critical for oral language development.

Assessment practices represent a further dimension of influence on speaking proficiency. High-stakes tests, particularly those emphasizing rote memorization or formulaic responses, may produce unintended washback effects that shape instructional priorities and learner behavior in ways that conflict with communicative goals (Cheng, 2005; East, 2015). While assessment can serve as a

catalyst for learning, misaligned evaluation strategies can discourage genuine interaction, induce performance anxiety, and undermine intrinsic motivation (Hughes, 2003). Consequently, integrating assessment within instructional frameworks in a manner that supports autonomy and task-based learning is essential for promoting authentic speaking proficiency (Dong, Fan, & Xu, 2021).

Despite the breadth of research on these individual dimensions, a notable gap exists in the literature regarding their integration. Few studies systematically examine how motivation, autonomy, pedagogical strategies, and assessment practices interact to influence L2 speaking outcomes in real-world classrooms. This research aims to address this gap by exploring the combined effects of humanistic pedagogy, task-based instruction, motivational orientation, and assessment design on learner autonomy and speaking proficiency.

## 2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research paradigm to capture the nuanced interactions between teaching practices, learner behavior, and contextual factors influencing speaking development. Qualitative inquiry is particularly suitable for examining complex, socially situated phenomena such as classroom interactions and learner autonomy, where quantifiable measures alone may fail to capture the depth of experience and perception (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### Participants and Setting

The study sample consisted of 18 English language instructors teaching at public universities and private language institutions across China. Participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation of diverse teaching contexts, levels of experience, and exposure to autonomy-supportive pedagogies. Learner populations across these institutions ranged from beginner to advanced proficiency levels, with varied exposure to English outside the classroom.

## 3. Data Collection Methods

Data were collected through multiple qualitative instruments to ensure triangulation and enhance the validity of findings. These included semi-structured interviews with instructors, participant observation of classroom sessions, and document analysis of lesson plans and assessment instruments (Ciesielska, Boström, & Öhlander, 2018).

Interviews explored instructors' perceptions of learner motivation, strategies for fostering autonomy, the design

and implementation of task-based activities, and experiences with assessment washback. Observational data captured real-time interactions, learner participation, and engagement during speaking tasks, focusing on both verbal and nonverbal indicators of communicative competence and autonomy. Document analysis provided additional context regarding curricular goals, task sequencing, and assessment alignment.

## 4. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns and insights across the collected data (Clarke & Braun, 2016). Initial coding focused on recurring themes related to learner motivation, autonomy-supportive practices, task characteristics, and assessment impacts. Codes were subsequently grouped into higher-order categories reflecting pedagogical strategies, learner responses, and contextual influences. Constant comparative analysis allowed for the iterative refinement of themes and the identification of interrelationships between instructional practices and learner outcomes.

Ethical considerations were rigorously applied throughout the research process, following the guidelines of the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2018). Informed consent was obtained from all participants, confidentiality was maintained through anonymization, and reflexive practices were implemented to mitigate researcher bias.

## 5. Results

Analysis of the data revealed several interconnected factors influencing L2 speaking development.

### Learner Motivation

Intrinsic motivation emerged as a critical determinant of learner engagement and speaking proficiency. Learners who reported personal interest in English, enjoyment of communicative tasks, and a sense of personal growth demonstrated higher levels of participation and initiative in speaking activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Noels et al., 2000). Conversely, learners motivated primarily by extrinsic factors, such as grades or test outcomes, displayed strategic, performance-oriented behaviors that often prioritized accuracy over fluency or authentic interaction (Ihsan, 2016; Wilona et al., 2010).

### Autonomy-Supportive Pedagogy

Instructors who implemented learner-centered approaches, including opportunities for self-selection of topics, peer collaboration, and reflective tasks, observed increased

learner agency in classroom interactions (Cao, Jeyaraj, & Razali, 2024). Autonomy-supportive strategies fostered risk-taking in speech production, encouraged experimentation with language forms, and enabled learners to set personal goals aligned with their interests and proficiency levels.

### Task-Based Learning

Task-based activities that simulated authentic communicative scenarios were found to enhance both linguistic competence and strategic communication skills (Nunan, 2004; Willis, 1996; Cameron, 2001). Tasks requiring problem-solving, negotiation, and collaborative discourse prompted learners to employ a range of language functions, scaffolding their development in real-world contexts. However, tasks that were overly complex or insufficiently structured induced cognitive overload, reducing participation and potentially undermining motivation.

### Assessment Washback

High-stakes assessment emerged as a double-edged influence on speaking development. While some learners reported increased diligence in preparation for oral exams, others experienced anxiety and constrained language use, focusing on memorized responses rather than spontaneous communication (Cheng, 2005; East, 2015; Dong, Fan, & Xu, 2021). Instructors expressed concerns regarding the misalignment between assessment criteria and communicative objectives, noting that washback effects often dictated teaching priorities and constrained opportunities for authentic task-based interaction.

## 6. Discussion

The findings illuminate the multifaceted nature of L2 speaking development and underscore the necessity of an integrative pedagogical framework. Motivation, autonomy, pedagogy, and assessment are interdependent, with each factor exerting influence on learner engagement and proficiency. The observed correlation between intrinsic motivation and speaking performance aligns with self-determination theory, which posits that satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs enhances self-directed engagement in learning (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Noels et al., 2000).

The study further corroborates the efficacy of task-based and humanistic approaches in promoting communicative competence. TBLT facilitates active negotiation of meaning and authentic language use, while humanistic pedagogy

fosters a supportive, inclusive environment that nurtures intrinsic motivation and learner agency (Byram, Porto, & Yulita, 2023; Burns, 2019). Together, these approaches enable learners to engage in meaningful interaction, experiment with language, and reflect on personal learning processes.

Assessment practices, particularly high-stakes evaluations, exert significant washback on both learners and instructors. Misaligned assessments may inadvertently emphasize form over function, discouraging autonomous engagement and risk-taking in speech (Cheng, 2005; East, 2015). Accordingly, the alignment of assessment with communicative objectives is crucial to ensure that evaluation reinforces, rather than undermines, instructional goals. Strategies such as formative assessment, portfolio evaluation, and reflective self-assessment offer alternatives that support autonomy while providing meaningful feedback.

Limitations of this study include the context-specific nature of the sample, potential variability in instructor experience, and the qualitative focus, which may limit generalizability. Future research should explore longitudinal effects of autonomy-supportive, task-based interventions across diverse educational contexts, integrating quantitative measures to triangulate findings. Moreover, investigations into cultural factors influencing motivation and autonomy in EFL settings may yield valuable insights for international pedagogy.

## 7. Conclusion

This research highlights the centrality of learner autonomy, motivation, task-based pedagogy, and aligned assessment in fostering L2 speaking proficiency. Integrating humanistic principles with communicative, task-based strategies creates an educational environment conducive to authentic language use, risk-taking, and self-directed learning. High-stakes assessments, if misaligned, can counteract these benefits, necessitating careful curricular and evaluative design. By addressing the interplay of motivational, pedagogical, and evaluative factors, educators can more effectively cultivate communicative competence in English learners, promoting both proficiency and lifelong engagement with the language.

## References

1. British Educational Research Association [BERA]. (2018). Ethical guidelines for educational research (4th ed.).
2. Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for teaching speaking in the English language classroom. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(1), 1–11.
3. Byram, M., Porto, M., & Yulita, L. (2023). Beyond teaching languages for communication – Humanistic perspectives and practices. *Languages*, 8(3), 166. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030166>
4. Cao, Y., Jeyaraj, J. J., & Razali, A. B. (2024). Challenges in promoting learner autonomy in blended learning: Perspectives from English as a foreign language teachers in China. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 12(2), 122–142. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v12i2.22272>
5. Cheng, L. (2005). *Changing language teaching through language testing: A washback study*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Ciesielska, M., Boström, K. W., & Öhlander, M. (2018). Observation methods. In M. Ciesielska & D. Jemielniak (Eds.), *Qualitative methodologies in organization studies* (pp. 33–52). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3_2)
7. Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2016). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613>
8. Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315883113>
9. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.
10. Dong, M., Fan, J., & Xu, J. (2021). Differential washback effects of a high-stakes test on students' English learning process: Evidence from a large-scale stratified survey in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(1), 252–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1918057>
11. East, M. (2015). Coming to terms with innovative high-stakes assessment practice: Teachers' viewpoints on assessment reform. *Language Testing*, 32(1), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214544393>
12. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. New York: University Press.
13. Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. Edinburgh: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
14. Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. Oxford: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
15. Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching* (First edition). New York: Mc. Graw Hill.
16. Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*

- (Second Edition). UK: Cambridge University Press.
17. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (Fifth Edition). New York: Pearson Education.
  18. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
  19. Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why Are You Learning A Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57–85.
  20. Ihsan, M. D. (2016). Students' Motivation in Speaking English. *Journal of English Educators Society*, 1, 31–48.
  21. Wilona, et al. (2010). The Correlation Between Intrinsic Motivation and Speaking Proficiency of The English Department Students. *Magister Scientiae*, 27, 45–56.
  22. Mohammadipour, M., Hashim, A., & Razak, N. A. (2018). The Relationships between Language Learning Strategies and Positive Emotions among Malaysian ESL Undergraduates. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(1), 89–96.