Students' motivation and engagement in the learning process of literature teaching using imaginative re-creation technique
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Abstract
This article investigates the influence of imaginative re-creation techniques on students' motivation and engagement within the context of literature teaching. Traditional pedagogical methods often struggle to maintain high student involvement in literature classes. This single-case research employed a mixed-methods approach combining observation and questionnaire data to assess students' motivation and engagement. A total of forty-five participants were involved in the study. Quantitative analysis of the questionnaires revealed an average level of motivation and engagement. However, a qualitative analysis of observations demonstrated that students exhibit a heightened sense of enthusiasm and engagement during class sessions that incorporate imaginative re-creation techniques. The findings suggest that while questionnaire responses might not fully capture the extent of students' enthusiasm, the classroom atmosphere is positively affected by the implementation of imaginative re-creation techniques. This implies that students' active participation and emotional connection with the literature are better reflected in their in-class behaviors than in self-reported questionnaire responses. In conclusion, this article highlights the complex relationship between students' self-reported motivation and engagement and their observable behavior during literature classes incorporating imaginative re-creation techniques. It underscores the need for a comprehensive assessment considering quantitative and qualitative data to understand students' educational experiences better. By integrating imaginative re-creation techniques into literature teaching, educators can foster a dynamic and engaging learning environment that goes beyond average questionnaire results and cultivates a genuine passion for literary exploration among students.
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INTRODUCTION
Effective teaching methodologies are still challenging in this dynamic education era. Educators need to be more creative in creating a yielding environment for students to acquire knowledge and develop an innate connection and interest in the subject they learn. This effort is very complex
and challenging in literature teaching. The complicated nature of narratives, characters, and themes needs a total engagement beyond conventional/traditional pedagogical approaches because teaching literature is not merely to transmit information.

Traditionally, literature education has often been approached as a linear transmission of facts and interpretations. However, this traditional paradigm frequently struggles to captivate the hearts and minds of students, leaving them disengaged and detached from the profound richness that literature can offer. In today’s digital age, where attention spans are fragmented, and distractions abound, educators are faced with the formidable task of imparting knowledge and nurturing a genuine enthusiasm for literary exploration. In this context, innovative teaching techniques emerge as potential solutions, offering novel pathways to foster student motivation and deep engagement.

The compelling notion of imaginative re-creation techniques is at the heart of this discussion. These methodologies harness the innate power of human imagination to transcend the limitations of static text, inviting students to become active co-creators of the literary worlds they encounter. Through these transformative techniques, literature ceases to be a distant artifact and transforms into a living, breathing entity that resonates intimately with students personally. Mentally constructing vivid scenes, envisioning dialogues, and even reimagining alternative narrative trajectories empowers students to participate in the creative process actively.

Basically, imaginative re-creation bridges the perceived gap between academic rigor and experiential learning. Students are no longer passive recipients of information; they evolve into collaborators in constructing emotional landscapes within stories. This approach redefines the traditional classroom into a dynamic space of exploration and creativity, where analytical thinking seamlessly intertwines with imaginative leaps, fostering a holistic and profound understanding of literary works.

Integrating imaginative re-creation techniques into literature education is deeply rooted in a nuanced understanding of student motivation and engagement. Motivation, often considered the impetus to initiate and sustain an activity, is a multifaceted construct. It encompasses intrinsic factors like curiosity, personal relevance, the innate drive for mastery, and extrinsic elements like rewards and recognition. Engagement, on the other hand, reflects the depth of connection students establish with the subject matter. When students are genuinely engaged, they invest their cognitive and emotional resources, leading to deeper comprehension, critical thinking, and longer-lasting learning outcomes.

Imaginative re-creation techniques artfully tap into these psychological dimensions by aligning seamlessly with students’ inherent desires for exploration, curiosity, and self-expression. Educators can catalyze intrinsic motivation by creating an environment that empowers students to interact with literature on their terms, thereby transforming reading and analysis from obligatory tasks into fulfilling and deeply satisfying endeavors. Furthermore, these techniques promote cognitive engagement by necessitating active
participation, critical thinking, and emotional investment, enhancing the learning experience.

This article embarks on a voyage to meticulously dissect the intricate dynamics of students' motivation and engagement within literature education. It is aimed at illuminating the transformative potential of imaginative re-creation techniques through a comprehensive exploration of theoretical frameworks, practical implementations, and empirical studies. By delving into this innovative approach's cognitive, emotional, and pedagogical dimensions, it is expected that educators are equipped with valuable insights to reinvigorate their teaching strategies and fundamentally reshape the trajectory of literature education.

**Learning motivation in ELT**

The word motivation is very familiar in our daily life. It is like a magic word for a person's success. Motivation is generally known as something that drives someone to do a thing. Without motivation, a person will do something reluctantly. Many scholars agree that motivation is essential in determining a learner's success in the language learning and teaching field. Harmer (2001) defines motivation as an "internal drive that pushes someone to do things to achieve something." For example, if we think something is valuable and worth doing, we try to achieve the objective. This action is driven by motivation. Likewise, Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) define motive as something that moves someone to decide a particular choice, get involved in a specific action, make efforts, and keep on doing something. They also admit the complexity of motivation.

Douglas Brown, as cited by Harmer (2001), points out that motivation comprises the need for exploration, activity, stimulation, new knowledge, and ego enhancement. Furthermore, as cited in Harmer, Marion William, and Richard Burden also state that motivation is a "state of cognitive arousal" that causes the decision to do/act due to "sustained intellectual/or physical efforts" to achieve an initial set goal.

There are two categories of motivation in language learning based on the set goal, i.e., short-term and long-term (Harmer, 2001b). A short-term goal is a motivation to reach a specific goal soon, such as passing a grammar test. In contrast, a long-term goal motivates a learner to achieve plans, such as working in a multinational company or overseas. Gardner (in McDonough, 2007) categorizes motivation into 'integrative' and 'instrumental' motivations. The integrative basis of language learning is the learners' willingness to integrate with the speech community of the language they learn.

In contrast, instrumental motivation is the usefulness of the language learned in the learners' community. Gardner only assesses the strength of motivation from questionnaires on a hidden psychometric trait. In this research, the learners' attitudes toward English learning through literature were evaluated using modified questionnaires. The questionnaires contained questions about the modified implementation of imaginative re-creation with blended learning (see the appendix). Besides using these questionnaires, the data from other sources like direct oral interviews, field observation of the
learners’ engagement during the teaching-learning process, and the students’ creative response/writing were also used comparatively.

According to Gardner, as cited by Harmer (2001a), learners with strong integrated motivation will be more successful than those with instrumental motivation. However, Harmer emphasizes that students with strong motivation will be more successful than those with less or no motivation. He also reminds us that teachers play an essential role in the classroom in encouraging students’ involvement and interest even though students do not have any motivation at the beginning. Teachers can influence students through their exciting and appropriate topics, entertaining teaching style, and attention to the individual student’s needs.

Considering that previous researchers and scholars from different parts of the globe with different cultural backgrounds used literary texts (i.e. short stories), it was fascinating to put this idea forward in the researcher’s language classroom.

**Imaginative Re-creation**

Imaginative re-creation refers to an art creation process. The creation is based on the artists’ experiences or social lives (Evans, n.d.; Hodgson, 1967; Atfield, 1997; Banaji & Burn, 2007; Dewey, 2010). It can also be based on the cultural form (Koch, 2012; Dukor, 2019), action, thought, and feeling (Stegner, 2002). In addition, the creation is related to historical events (Muecke, 2011) or other literary works (Hacker, 2006; Ischik & Hutcheon, 2015). It also refers to the creative work of language art (Ajayi & Iwuagwu, 2012).

More specifically, imaginative re-creation is defined as a creative process of re-creating a (part of) literature text in such a way that helps learners to expand their understanding and appreciation of a specific text and to express a considered response to it. In line with the above definition, Matrix Education (2018) also defines imaginative re-creation, sometimes called "a creative reimagining task," in which the learners are assigned to re-create a text imaginatively by exploring and utilizing their knowledge of a text or a series of texts.

This creation helps the learners to grasp the text’s ideas and content. The learners can change the angles from major to minor. Settings, characters’ traits/qualities, and potential conflict can also change. Even producing different genres of literature (i.e., from narrative to poetry or vice versa) is possible. Another response is to write a letter to a character or write a diary based on a character’s experience. They are involved in an activity called imaginative re-creation. This idea was initially coined by Leslie Stratta, John Dickens, and Andrew Wilkinson in England in 1973 (Manuel & Carter, 2009).

Stratta et al. (1973) developed their idea of imaginative re-creation to respond to how literature was brought into the classrooms and used as learning materials. They observed that using literary works (especially novels) had never been finished during one semester. Many teachers only reached some parts of the novel at the end of the semester. It was because the teachers only focused on words or sentences within the texts through guided reading. This kind of approach was very time-consuming and caused boredom to the students.
Considering this situation, they tried to find a way out and treated their students differently. They began the lesson by instructing their students to watch a short movie to trigger their interest. The movie was about an old Polish man called Paul Tompkovitz who lived in Winnipeg. During watching the short film, the students were asked to take notes about their impressions. Stratta, Dixon, and Wilkinson found that their students took notes on various things, such as comparing the character's experience, recent life, and attitude. After that, they were assigned to work in a group to discuss the movie based on their notes. Stratta et al. observed their students discuss the film using the personal impression they recorded while watching the movie. The discussion ran vividly; they actively participated and exchanged responses about the movie. While in other groups, some students had fierce and intolerant arguments with one another. Next, the students in groups were asked to talk in front of their fellow students and clarify their ideas. The interesting thing from the discussion they observed was that several students tended to be closer and more relaxed with each other as they talked about their responses and impression as the discussion could bring them into everyday life situations. In the next phase, the students were assigned to write their answers in verse or prose. They then continued their practice in different genres of literature like poetry, prose (novel), and drama. The idea of imaginative re-creation was then further developed by Peter Adams, Wayne Sawyer, and Ken Watson—Australian educators.

In the forthcoming sections, we will plunge into the depths of theoretical underpinnings concerning motivation and engagement, meticulously dissect the diverse array of imaginative re-creation techniques, and analyze real-world case studies that vividly illuminate their tangible impact. As we navigate through the complexities and nuances of this innovative approach, we cordially invite educators, researchers, and stakeholders to embark on this intellectual odyssey with us—a journey of unraveling the profound synergy between imaginative re-creation, motivation, and engagement within the captivating realm of literature education.

**METHOD
Respondents**
The research participants (subjects) consisted of a class of third-semester students majoring in English Literature taking the "English Prose Appreciation" course at Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, during one semester (6 months) in 2020. Forty-five students participated in the study during the odd 2020/2021 academic year semester.

The object of the study included the learning process in internalizing and responding to literary texts (short stories), the process of composing written responses in re-creating imaginative text, and the participants' works of imaginative re-creation. The learning process within the context of blended learning was observed in applying literary texts as learning material in teaching English as a foreign language context to the participants and how they worked and responded to the text or even developed their ideas in re-creating an imaginative text. The participants' works of imaginative re-creation
were investigated to find what parts of the original texts triggered their interests.

**Instruments**

**Observation: The Researcher as the Main Instrument of Data Collection**

The data were collected through classroom observations (field). During the observation, the researcher made field notes on the teacher-student and student-student interactions and the applications of lesson plans regarding the imaginative re-creation task on the student's response in the course. Considering the application of imaginative re-creation in students' responses during the teaching and learning process, the researcher also observed the students' attitudes during the class discussion. In addition, the participants responded to questionnaires developed to investigate their perceptions of using short stories, the teacher, and blended learning.

**Questionnaires/survey**

A set of questionnaires were developed to collect data about the participants' motivation. The questions deal with their attitude on reading literary works, blended learning, their teacher, and the imaginative re-creation task. These criteria were based on what might influence the learner's motivation developed and recommended by Gardner (1985). All the surveys/questionnaires were done online. This instrument was intended to collect the data to provide the analyses for research question dealing with the students' motivation and engagement. The list of questions in the questionnaire is attached.

**Procedures**

**Procedures for Collecting Data**

Before starting the research, the researcher involved the participating teacher in a short training about the reader-response approach and developing a lesson plan that applied reader-response theory and imaginative re-creation technique. The teacher provided interesting short stories for the students to discuss during the semester.

The short stories were used in the lesson since short stories were more comfortable for the learners in terms of the text length. It was because a short story was one of the learner's best choices besides a novel in learning (Hirvela & Boyle, 1988). The text length was also to avoid frustration, especially for struggling students. Besides, this subject, "English Prose Appreciation," was intended for 3rd-semester students whose English was approximately still at the pre-intermediate level. There were five titles of the short story used, such as the following: Anton Chekhov's "The Death of an Official", Guy de Maupassant's "Love", Hector Hugo Munro's (Saki) "Laura", O Henry's "Hearts and Hands", Guy de Maupassant's "Rose" The lengths of the short stories range from 1000 to 2000 words. This length is expected to be comfortable and not frustrating for the participants.

From meeting 1 to 7, the class discussion focused on the elements of prose to provide the student with knowledge of literary elements. The class discussion
covered characters/characterization, plot and its parts, settings (place, time, and social), point of view (the narrative angle), theme, and language styles.

Reader-response approach implementation commenced from the 9th meeting to the 16th meeting. It lasted for seven weeks. The last meeting (the 16th) was used to review the students' work. The following is the breakdown of the steps done during this phase.

The students were grouped into five, consisting of 8 to 12. The teacher assigned each group to discuss one short story and prepared a literary analysis for one week. Besides, they must provide a classroom presentation about literary analyses in a class discussion. The question-and-answer session then offered the class to respond to the presentation. This step was applied to other groups with a different short story until all the story discussions were completed.

**Data analysis**

The first and the second responses were collected from Google Forms. The researcher transferred Google Forms data to Microsoft Excel, i.e., student reaction to short stories, imaginative-re-creation technique, teachers, students' engagement, and blended learning. They were analyzed by mean/index formula. This formula was to know the degree of the attitude toward each question item in questionnaires. In addition, the student's reactions to the short stories were classified based on the similarities of their reactions. The responses were analyzed to identify how they responded to each question related to the text they read.

The data were collected using questionnaires after the course was accomplished. The questionnaires were composed using the Lickert scale consisting of the choices from "strongly disagree" up to "strongly agree" with intervals from 1 to 5.

Forty-five respondents responded to the questionnaires (attached at the end of this document). The data were then analyzed by using descriptive statistics. A formula for finding mean/index was applied in counting students' responses to the statements (Kostoulas, 2013):

\[
I = \frac{(S_1 x f_1) + (S_2 x f_2) + (S_3 x f_3) + (S_4 x f_4) + (S_5 x f_5)}{N}
\]

Equation 3.1 Index/ Mean Formula

Where:  
- \(I\): Index (obtained from the mean of the spread numbers)
- \(S_n\): Scale point
- \(N\): Number of respondents

The index intervals were classified then into five categories to conclude, i.e.,

- Very weak: 0 – less than 1.8
- Weak: 1.8 – less than 2.6
Average: 2.6 – less than 3.4  
Strong: 3.4 – less than 4.2  
Very strong: 4.2 – 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. The indexes of questionnaire responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Index/ Mean</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Num of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>0 1 15 15 14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>4 9 16 11 5</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>2 11 22 9 1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>2 9 20 9 5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>0 3 4 21 17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>16 15 11 2 1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>5 9 17 8 6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>0 1 4 21 19</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>8 6 14 11 6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>13 7 8 9 8</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General conclusion** 3.24 Average

Notes:
Answer options:
1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral/Average
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

Intervals range for conclusion drawing:
Very weak: 1 – less than 1.8
Weak: 1.8 – less than 2.6
Average: 2.6 – less than 3.6
Strong: 3.6 – less than 4.2
Very strong: 4.2 – 5

Statements/indicators:
D1. I enjoyed and relaxed during the class.
D2. I am actively involved in the class discussion.
D3. I am disappointed if I have something to say (like a question or response to other students’ opinions), but I can’t because the time is limited.
D4. I frequently respond to the presenting group in the class discussion/presentation.
D5. I believe the class interaction will improve my English proficiency.
D6. I only respond or ask a question whenever the teacher(s) ask me to.
D7. I voluntarily ask a question or respond to other students’ ideas/opinions without waiting for the teacher(s) to call me.
D8. I do not care about the topic discussed during class.
D9. I prefer to keep silent even though I have questions or answers during class because I am shy.
D10. I am afraid of making mistakes, so I keep silent during class.

Discussion of the Students’ Engagement in the Learning Process
Table 1 demonstrates the data recapitulations of 45 survey questionnaire responses counted for students’ engagement in the lesson. All the responses were scored and analyzed. There were ten statements/indicators (labeled D1 to D10) that the respondents had to respond to the options from extremely disagree to extremely agree with scores 1 to 5, indicating the scales of attitudes beginning from "Strongly disagree," "Disagree," "Neutral," "Agree," and "Strongly agree." Then, the frequency of all scales was calculated to find the mean/index by the index formula shown in Equation 3.1. Each indicator was indexed to conclude, i.e., "Very weak," "Weak," "Average," "Strong," and "Very Strong" with the intervals shown above. The conclusions of indicators range from "Weak" to "Very strong." There is only one indicator (D8) with a "Very Strong" index, two indicators (D1 and D5) with a "Strong" index, and six indicators (D2, D3, D4, D7, D9, and D10) with "Average" index. In contrast, only one indicator (D6) has a "Weak" index. Finally, the general conclusion is an "Average" attitude with a 3.24 index. So, it can be concluded that the respondents had an average attitude toward their engagement with the lesson in the classroom when Imaginative Re-creation was implemented. The explanations of the indicators are presented below.

Indicator/Statement D1. I enjoyed and relaxed during the class.
The response of disagreement to this statement was 1% (N=2), neutral 33% (N=15), and 64% (N=29) of the respondents agreed. These figures meant that 64% of respondents had a very positive/strong attitude while only 1% had a negative/weak one. This statement showed how they perceived whether they enjoyed and relaxed during the lesson. Since the index/mean of this indicator was 3.93, it was classified as a "strong" attitude. It can be concluded that the students perceived their state of being during the lesson positively.

Indicator/Statement D2. I am actively involved in the class discussion.
In responding to the second statement (D2), most respondents (36%) agreed, 36% were neutral, and 29% did not agree. It can be said that the respondents considered themselves to have an average attitude toward their involvement during the literature class, with a 3.09 index.

Indicator/Statement D3. I am disappointed if I have something to say (like a question or response to other students’ opinions), but I can’t because the time is limited.
The third statement scores indicated that 22% (N=10) of the respondents agreed and exceptionally agreed with the statement about the chance for oral response in the classroom. The score was relatively equal with those with a negative attitude (29%, N=13), while neutral was 49% (N=22). With a 2.91 index, it is classified as "Average." They did not bother if they had no chance for oral responses in the classroom.

Indicator/Statement D4. I frequently respond to the presenting group in the class discussion/presentation.
The index of the fourth statement (D4) is 3.13. This index can be inferred that the respondent sometimes responded to the presenting group. They were not too enthusiastic in responding to other group presentations.

**Indicator/Statement D5.** "I believe the class interaction will improve my English proficiency."

The respondents' percentage with a positive attitude was 84% (N=38), the average was 9% (N=4), and the negative attitude was 7% (N=3). These figures showed that they agreed that class interaction would improve their English proficiency. In other words, most respondents thought that their participation in the class interaction affected their English proficiency. To sum up, the students have a strong attitude toward active participation in class interaction, with an index of 4.16.

**Indicator/Statement D6.** "I only respond or ask a question whenever the teacher(s) ask me to."

The sixth statement indicated a negative attitude with a 2.04 index. Since the statement has a negative sense, the scores must be inverted to get the above index. The index score means teachers must encourage students to interact actively in class.

**Indicator/Statement D7.** "I voluntarily ask a question or respond to other students' ideas/opinions without waiting for the teacher(s) to call me."

The response to the seventh statement showed an "Average" attitude with a 3.02 index score. This score can be inferred that the students were not active in class interaction with other presenting groups. Interviews with the respondents also support this situation. The students said they did not have any preparation because they received the content summary the night before the presentation, so they did not have sufficient time to learn it.

**Indicator/Statement D8.** "I do not care about the topic discussed during class."

Indicator D8 contained a negative statement, so the response scores must be inverted. The student's responses showed a positive/assertive attitude toward this statement, with a 4.29 index score. This index is classified as a "very strong/positive" attitude toward the statement. This index score can be inferred that the respondents cared about the classroom discussion topics. It is the highest score among the ten indicators. The researcher must be careful in seeing the responses to the three statements, D6, D7, and D8 because they have similar senses.

**Indicator/Statement D9.** "I prefer to keep silent even though I have questions or answers during class because I am shy."

The index score of statement D9 is 3.02, classified as average. It can be inferred that the respondents' perception was between agreement and disagreement with the statement. The number of respondents who agreed and extremely agreed with the ninth statement was 17 or 38%. The respondents'
percentage who disagreed with the statement was 31% N=14, and a similar percentage for those who were neutral.

**Indicator/Statement D10.** "I am afraid of making mistakes, so I keep silent during class."

The student’s response to statement D10 has a 2.82 index score. This score was classified as average. It means that the student’s attitude was in the middle. Table 1 shows that the percentage of respondents agreeing with the statement is 38% (N=17), while 40% disagreed and 18% were neutral. During the observation, some students were active in the class discussion while others kept silent. The teacher sometimes stimulated the quiet students by asking questions about the discussion topic.

The discussion about the students' engagement showed that most students had average attitudes among the ten statements/indicators used to determine their attitudes toward their engagement with the lesson. In other words, they had a moderate attitude toward their engagement, shown by the overall index of 3.24. It can be concluded that the student's attitude is classified as average.

The score of the student's attitude toward their engagement is average. It is interesting to discuss because it has the lowest index scores compared to the other attitudes in this research. The discussion is based on classifying the attitude from weak, average, strong, and very strong attitudes toward their engagement with classroom activities. To yield the best result for student achievement, Chu et al. (2023) assert the importance of a learning environment that can promote students' engagement in the learning process. Thus, teachers must be aware of their students' engagement, possibly affecting their performance.

As mentioned earlier at the beginning of this subheading, the students' attitudes range from weak to very strong. The student's attitude was weak in the engagement to the class interaction. Considering this, the teacher must anticipate the situation by stimulating the students to participate in class activities. It can be done by asking the quiet students to respond to the discussion. This action can empower them. Additionally, from the interview with students, it was found that they did not prepare for a topic because the presenting group shared their material only a few times before the discussion started. A teacher should also emphasize that the submission time is not too close to the discussion to give other students sufficient time to prepare/read the material.

The next classification is an average attitude that covers statements/indicators D2, D3, D4, D7, D9, and D10. These indicators/statements show their involvement or participation, anxiety, self-confidence, and worry about making mistakes in-class activities. Even though the students' attitude on the above matter was not too weak, the teacher must be careful to handle the students so that they can gain the expected results. Sometimes, a few students dominate the class, which is imbalanced. In this case, the teacher has to find a way to make other students participate actively, such as calling the students' names and giving them chances to respond to the discussion topics.
Sometimes, students prefer to keep silent because they are not confident to speak or express their ideas. They worry about making mistakes. In this situation, the teacher must interrupt the activity by giving less active students chances to balance the case. However, the teacher should handle this carefully so active students are not discouraged.

Furthermore, the extreme attitudes shown in the analysis Table 1 are indicators/statements D1, D5, and D8. These indicators concerned students' relaxed feelings, belief in the interaction benefit, and attention to the lesson. Students can get the maximum yield in learning if they feel comfortable. That is why teachers must be sensitive in observing how the class goes on and create a conducive situation for productive learning. Likewise, J. Wang et al. (2022) remind us of teachers' engagement in the learning process. They claim this issue is widely neglected and less studied in the EFL/ESL research. According to them, this issue is vital and should be paid attention. It is equally important with the student's engagement affecting learning achievement. In addition, Aguilar-Cruz (2022) also asserts that modifying the learning methods can increase student engagement in learning, as has been done through this research.

CONCLUSION
The students' beliefs about class interaction can help improve their English proficiency. This matter is good because it can cause the self-driven learner. The self-driven learner knows what he needs to develop his language skills. He needs less direction from the teacher. In this case, the teacher can benefit from this self-directed learner to help other students learn so that more students can succeed. To sum up, with an overall index of 3.24, it is classified as having an average attitude. Students' attitudes toward engagement should be taken seriously for maximum learning yield.
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APPENDIX
Research Instrument (Learning Motivation)
Research Data Collection Instrument (Learning Motivation) modified from (Gardner, 1985)
Please respond to the following statement related to the application of the Imaginative Re-creation Task. Choose the best answer from 1 to 5 that best suits you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I enjoyed and relaxed during the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am actively involved in the class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am disappointed if I have something to say (like a question or response to other students' opinions), but I can't because the time is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I frequently respond to the presenting group in the class discussion/presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe the class interaction will improve my English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I only respond or ask a question whenever the teacher(s) ask me to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I voluntarily ask a question or respond to other students' ideas/opinions without waiting for the teacher(s) to call me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I do not care about the topic discussed during class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I prefer to keep silent even though I have questions or answers during class because I am shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am afraid of making mistakes, so I keep silent during class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>