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Editor’s Introduction

Danko Šipka
Arizona State University

The present volume of the Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages comprises six papers from various fields of LCTL teaching and with wide language coverage. The first paper authored by Mingzhen Bao and Lucia Lee titled Personality, motivation, and language attitudes of learners of CTLs and LCTLs places the practice of LCTLs into a broader context comparing it with CTLs. In the next paper, Rimma Garn discusses Teaching the five Cs with Cinema. The next two papers address heritage speakers of LCTLs. Ghazi Abuhakema writes about Heritage and Non-Heritage Language Learners in Arabic Classrooms: Inter and Intragroup Beliefs, Attitudes and Perceptions while An Chung Cheng discusses Community-level Language Planning for Chinese Heritage Language Maintenance in the United States. In the paper written by Jing Wang and Christine H. Leland focus on an increasingly important teaching technology in their paper titled Exploring Mobile Technologies for Learning Chinese. Finally Julie Damron and Justin Forsyth provide a case study of one particular LCTL in their paper titled Korean Language Studies: Motivation and Attrition.
Personality, motivation, and language attitudes of learners of CTLs and LCTLs

Mingzhen Bao
Lucia Lee
University of Kentucky

Abstract

Research has explored various characteristics of foreign language learners. However, little research has investigated how personality traits, motivation, and language attitudes are similarly or differently described between learners of Commonly Taught Languages (CTLs) and Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs). The current study examined the correlations of academic achievement, personality, and motivation of learners in CTLs, LCTLs and Non-foreign languages (NFLs), respectively, and the extent to which learners in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs may differ in these perspectives. The results indicated correlations between overall academic achievement and foreign language achievement of students in CTLs and LCTLs. In addition, students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs also experienced their unique correlations in personality and motivation factors. Significant differences were noticed in neuroticism and motivation of the target language: students studying LCTLs were less nervous and more motivated than those in CTLs. Strong tendencies occurred in integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation: students in LCTLs attained a more integrative orientation and a more positive attitude toward the learning environment.

Introduction

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are over 329 different languages spoken in the United States (Lee, 2005). Schools encourage students to take an interest in learning foreign languages (FL). Many high schools require students to take two-year FL courses. In universities, many departments or colleges also require students to take three-to-four semesters of FL courses in addition to their high-
school FL background. Thus, students register for FL courses with various intentions of satisfying language requirements, learning about other cultures, communicating with non-English speaking countries, facilitating career planning and so forth. While previous studies examined the individual differences in FL learning, little research has investigated the characteristics of students in Commonly Taught Languages (CTLs) and Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) in aspects of personality and motivation. In the present study, the authors examined students’ personality traits, motivation and language attitudes, as well as their academic performance in three groups of CTLs, LCTLs and students without college-level foreign language learning.

Commonly Taught Languages and Less Commonly Taught Languages

FLs are usually categorized as Commonly Taught Languages (CTLs) and Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs). While definitions vary, LCTLs in the United States typically encompass low-enrollment and infrequently taught languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. CTLs refer to FLs that are commonly known and widely taught in high schools and colleges, such as Spanish and French (Brecht & Walton, 1994; Brown, 2009; Furman, Goldberg & Lusin, 2007; Ging, 1994). It is important to note that while LCTLs are spoken by over 80% of the world's population, they are taught in only 1% of the secondary schools in the United States, and only 10.2% of the postsecondary institutes (“Report of the MLA Task Force on the Less Commonly Taught Language,” 2006). Due to limited resources, teaching LCTLs becomes a difficult task: more often LCTLs are not offered beyond intermediate-level courses; LCTLs are usually taught to achieve fluency rather than applying the languages to social and historical settings (Joseph, 2006).

In recent years, a rapidly changing world order has prompted renewed interest in providing a national capacity for dealing with languages and cultures beyond those of Western Europe (Brecht & Walton, 1994). The Foreign Language Assistance Act focuses on
introducing Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Korean into schools with support for instructional programs, study abroad opportunities, teacher training, material development, and so forth (“Report of the MLA Task Force on the Less Commonly Taught Languages,” 2006). Private foundations have also joined this movement to introduce LCTLs into the K-12 education system. More students were enrolled in non-European language courses from 2003 to 2006 (Furman, Goldberg & Lusin, 2007). According to the U. S. Institutions of Higher Education, a total of 204 LCTLs were offered in 2006, which was 42 (25.9%) more LCTLs than reported in 2002. The largest increases in enrollment were in Middle Eastern and African languages, where enrollment grew by 55.9%, and in Asian and Pacific languages, which reported a 24.6% increase.

Little research has examined learners of CTLs and LCTLs as separate groups or compared differences and similarities between them (Brown, 2009; Ramage, 1990; Ueno, 2005). Ueno (2005) investigated learners’ motivation of LCTLs and found that it changed over time. The results showed that students initially studied the target LCTLs due to their attraction to an uncommon language and the challenge to learn the language. Then over time, students became intrinsically motivated and obtained a sense of satisfaction and pleasure in learning the language. Brown (2009) examined the academic and demographic aspects of students of LCTLs and CTLs. 1st- or 2nd-year FL students were recruited in a survey including Personal Data, Current Academic Data, and Foreign/Second Language Data. Results showed that 73% of students studying LCTLs had a GPA of 3.0 or higher, 36% chose personal interest as their primary motivation and 31% considered FL requirement as the best description of their reason for taking FL courses. For students of CTLs, 63% achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher, 13% were interested in the languages they studied and 65% took the courses as a language requirement.

**Personality and motivation in foreign language learning**

Psychologists have often used personality traits to examine human behaviors (e.g., Ramsdal, 2008; Zuckerman, Eysenck, S. &
Eysenck, J., 1978). Studies on learners’ personalities have been conducted in the field of language acquisition. Onwuegbuzie, Bailey and Daley (2001) examined cognitive, affective, and personal aspects of students enrolled in foreign language courses with measures of the Self-Perception Profile for College Students, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, the Social Interdependence Scale, and the Study Habits Inventory. The authors found that higher foreign-language anxiety influenced participants’ ability of foreign-language learning; cooperativeness was associated with students’ foreign-language achievement. Oya, Manalo and Greenwood (2004) investigated the influence of personality and anxiety on English oral performance among Japanese L2 speakers of English. Seventy-three Japanese speakers were recruited from intermediate-level English courses. Personality and anxiety were examined with the Japanese version of the Maudsley Personality Inventory reflecting extraversion and neuroticism (Komatsu, 1969), the Japanese version of the Spielberger State and Trait Anxiety Inventory measuring anxiety (Mizuguchi, Shimonaka & Nakazato, 1991), and a story-retelling task using six picture cards from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Picture Arrangement subtest to analyze language fluency, accuracy, complexity, and impression of language performance. Results indicated that impression of language performance was correlated with extraversion at a significant level: the more extraverted the participants, the better the impression they made in oral performance. Accuracy was negatively correlated with the participants' anxiety at a significant level: the more anxious the participants, the less accurate their sentences became.

Recent studies applied the Big Five Inventory (BFI) to examine the relation between personality traits, learning styles, and academic achievement (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a, b, 2004, 2005; Clark & Schroth, 2010; Farsides & Woodfield, 2006; Furnham, Swami, Aertche & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2008; Landra, Pullmann & Allick, 2007). BFI is a personality assessment used to examine differences in human behaviors that relate to personality traits. The personality dimensions were initially labeled by Norman (1963). The original format of the BFI has 5 dimensions, 44 items, and 5 subscales. The 5 dimensions are Extroversion, Agreeableness,
Cronbach’s alpha for reliability coefficient is 0.82 for Extroversion, 0.75 for Agreeableness, 0.81 for Conscientiousness, 0.84 for Neuroticism, and 0.80 for Openness to Experience, which indicates good intercorrelations among test items measuring each dimension (Engvik & Føllesdal, 2005). The 5 subscales are from 1 to 5, with rating 1 being disagree strongly, and rating 5 being agree strongly.

Researchers suggested some of the BFI traits, such as Neuroticism and Openness to Experience, have been applied frequently to language learning, and are significantly correlated with academic performance and learning styles. Neuroticism has been found to be a negative predictor of academic performance in most learning settings (Landra et al., 2007). Emotional Stability (contrasting Neuroticism) has been significantly correlated with course grades (Ridgell & Lounsbury, 2004). Openness to Experience has been significantly associated with academic outcomes and is a consistently significant contributor to the variance in exam grades in some studies (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a, b, 2004, 2005; Furnham, Monsen & Ahmetoglu, 2009; Lievens, Coetsier, de Fruty & de Maeseneer, 2002; Phillips, Abraham & Bond, 2003; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush & King 1994), but not others (Bauer & Liang, 2003; Conard, 2006; de Fruyt & Mervielde, 1996; Duff, Boyle, Dunleavy & Ferguson, 2004; Farsides & Woodfield, 2003; Goff & Ackerman, 1992; O’connor & Paunonen, 2007; Paunonen, 1998; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995). Busato, Prins, Elshout and Hamaker (1999) examined the correlations between personality and learning styles. Results showed that the meaning-directed learning style (in which students wish to find out what is meant exactly in their study materials) and the application-directed learning style (when students employ what they learn to actual, real-world settings) were correlated highly with Openness to Experience. The reproduction learning style (when students’ behavior is directed mainly at reproducing what is learnt at examinations in order to pass these successfully) was correlated negatively with Neuroticism. The undirected-learning style
(when students have problems with processing the materials for study or experience difficulties with discriminating what is important and what is not) was correlated positively with Neuroticism.

Motivation, another important factor in foreign-language learning, has been examined with various dimensions (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005, 2009; Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Tremblay, Goldberg & Gardner, 1995; Papi, 2010; Yu, 2010). Gardner and Lambert (1959) asked a French instructor to rate students on oral skills and aural comprehension using a 5-point scale with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent. Students were also asked to take the measure of the Orientation Index, which contained integrative orientation (i.e., the motivation is to learn about the FL groups and to meet more people from different cultures) and instrumental orientation (where the reasons reflect a more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement). Researchers found a significant positive correlation between the orientation index and learners’ achievement in French. The integratively oriented students were generally more successful in learning French than those who were instrumentally oriented. Also, students with the integrative orientation had more positive attitudes toward the target language group and were more motivated to learn the language.

Tremblay et al. (1995) recruited Eighty-eight students without knowledge of Hebrew to investigate the relation of motivation and achievement in learning Hebrew. The Attitude Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) originally developed by Gardner & MacIntyre (1993) and the self-reported anxiety level were applied to measure students’ motivation and anxiety. The Mini-AMTB, a brief form of AMTB, has 6 dimensions: Integrativeness, Attitudes toward the Learning Situation, Motivation of the target language, Language Anxiety, Instrumental Orientation, and Parental Encouragement in Table 2. The published readability coefficient is 0.743 (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008). Participants were measured by AMTB and paired in learning tasks. They rated how anxious they felt about the task before the learning tasks; they estimated how motivated they were to learn the items on the trial and how anxious they felt before and after each trial. The last part of the experiment was the same AMTB questionnaire presented at the beginning of the experiment. The results of this
study suggested that positive attitudes toward the learning language resulted in successful learning; the number of correct Hebrew words from participants was positively associated with motivation; achievement in learning the Hebrew words was negatively related to anxiety. Bernaus and Gardner (2008) also used mini-AMTB to examine L2 students of English. Students were first asked to rate the extent to which their teachers used the teaching strategies listed in the questionnaire. In the second part, the mini-AMTB was applied to measure students’ motivation. In the last part, students completed two tasks that measured reading skills and listening comprehension skills. The results indicated attitudes toward the learning situation and instrumental orientation predicted the motivation to learn English and that motivation was a positive predictor of English achievement, whereas language anxiety was a negative predictor of English achievement.

In addition to research lines of personality and motivation, correlations between the two have also been investigated recently. Clark and Schroth (2010) examined relationships between academic motivation and personality among college students. The results suggested that students with different personality characteristics had different reasons for pursuing college degrees: those who lacked motivation tended to be disagreeable and careless; intrinsically motivated students tended to be extraverted, agreeable, conscientious, and open to new experiences; extrinsically motivated students tended to be extraverted, agreeable, conscientious, and neurotic.

**Research questions**

This study examined correlations among academic performance, personality, motivation and language attitudes, and compared similarities and differences among learners of CTLs, LCTLs and students not taking university-level FLs (NFLs). Four research questions were addressed:

1. How are academic performance, personality traits, motivation and language attitudes correlated among students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs, respectively?
2. To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their academic achievement?
(3) To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their personality?
(4) To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their motivation and language attitudes?

Method

Participants

Sixty-one undergraduate students ($M = 32$, $F = 29$) between the ages of 18 and 26 ($M = 21.79$, $SD = 1.61$) were recruited from a large, public university in the United States. Twenty-five of the participating students were solicited from foreign language courses among the CTLs, such as Spanish, Latin, French, Italian, and German; seventeen from the LCTLs, such as Chinese and Japanese; and nineteen were NFLs. All participants were randomly selected and studied in various programs. None of them were heritage speakers or studied multiple FLs in the university. 48% (29/61) of students had the two-year language requirement, whereas 52% (32/61) of students did not. 57% (24/42) of CTL and LCTL students were enrolled in 1st- or 2nd-year FL classes, and 43% (18/42) registered for advanced-level FL courses. All FL classes were of similar size with a maximum of 30 students. Students with study abroad experience were placed at the right level of FL courses at the beginning of each semester.

Questionnaire

The student questionnaire was designed by the authors to include four sections: personal data, academic data, personality, and language attitudes and motivation. Personal data asked participants to report their gender, age, and family language background. Academic data requested information such as major, years in foreign language courses at the university, self-reported overall GPA, and current GPA for the foreign language course (CTL and LCTL students only). Personality included two dimensions of the BFI: Openness to Experience and Neuroticism. The section entitled language attitudes and motivation included questions concerning participants’ attitudes to the target language and their learning motivation. The Mini-AMTB
was employed to examine six factors in integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation of the target language, language anxiety, instrumental orientation of the target language, and parental encouragement. Questions of attitudes toward the learning situation were not included in the NFLs’ questionnaire. Word modifications, such as changing the target language to any foreign language, were also applied to the NFLs’ version.

**Coding of personality**

Personality was coded with the BFI dimensions of Openness to Experience and Neuroticism (in Table 3). Responses were collected with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. In this study, Openness to Experience reflected students' interest in learning new languages. Higher scores on this trait were interpreted to be more interested in accepting new languages (Example 1).

Example 1 Questions of Openness from the BFI questionnaire
(a) Is curious about many different things.
(b) Is ingenious, a deep thinker.
(c) Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature.

Neuroticism reflected how well students coped with stress (Example 2). High scores on questions of stability (in 2a and 2b) and low scores on anxiety (in 2c and 2d) were interpreted as ability to cope with stress.

Example 2 Questions of Neuroticism from the BFI questionnaire
(a) Is relaxed, handles stress well
(b) Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
(c) Gets nervous easily
(d) Worries a lot

**Coding of language attitudes and motivation**

Language attitudes and motivation were coded with dimensions of the mini-AMTB. Responses were collected in a 5-point scale, with rating 1 being least, and rating 5 being most. Examples 3 and 4 showed questions of Integrativeness and Attitudes toward the learning.

Example 3 Questions of Integrativeness from the AMTB questionnaire
(a) My attitude toward the target language speaking people is
(b) My interest in the target language is

Example 4 Questions of Attitudes toward the learning situation from the AMTB questionnaire
(a) My attitude toward my target language teacher is
(b) My attitude toward my target language course is

Procedure
Research data were collected in 4-8 weeks using anonymous survey procedures. Participants were scheduled to complete the student questionnaire in a department conference room without the presence of the authors. They left the finished form in an envelope placed on the front table, and the authors collected the envelope 20 minutes later.

Data Analysis
In order to compare CTL, LCTL and NFL students’ responses to the questionnaire, a univariate general linear model (GLM) was used, followed by post hoc tests across student groups. Grades from A to D were transformed to numeric scales in a sequence of 4 to 1 due to the internal relation across the grade categories (with A the highest grade and D the lowest) and the nature of GLM analyses (to examine numeric variables). Responses to personality and motivation sessions were ordinal degrees from strongly disagree to agree strongly, or from very little to very much. Degrees were formed in numeric scales of 1 to 5 with 1 strongly disagree (or very little), 5 strongly agree (or very much) and three scales of disagree (or little), neutral, and agree (or much) in between. Multiple questions were included in a majority of the BFI and the AMTB dimensions, and thus, means of relevant responses were employed in the analyses of each dimension. A significance level of .05 was used for all analyses.
Results

Within the 61 responses received from students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs, 2 responses of self-reported overall GPA were excluded from analyses, as the students were first-semester freshmen without GPA records. Both of these students were studying NFLs. Students in CTLs and LCTLs were included in the analyses of language GPA and attitudes toward the language learning situation, except that one student in CTLs was excluded from the language GPA analysis as she was in her first semester of language learning when data were collected and had no language GPA record.

Research Question 1: How do academic performance, personality traits, motivation and language attitudes correlate among students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs, respectively?

Positive correlations were noticed between overall GPA and FL GPA of students in CTLs and LCTLs which suggested that higher academic achievement be a predictor to higher FL achievement and vice versa (Tables 4 and 5). Academic achievement for those in NFLs was positively correlated to instrumental orientation and negatively correlated to integrativeness (Table 6). Neuroticism was negatively correlated to motivation factors such as instrumental orientation for CTLs, and integrativeness and attitudes for LCTLs. Integrativeness was positively correlated to motivation of the target language across groups and to attitudes of learning situations in CTLs and LCTLs.

Besides the similar trends across student groups, students of CTLs and NFLs presented some unique correlations in personality traits and factors of motivation and language attitudes (Tables 4 and 6). Openness was positively correlated to parental encouragement for students in CTLs but a negative correlation was found for those in

---

1 Only significant results were showed in Tables 4, 5, and 6.
NFLs, which suggested more open students in CTLs received more parental encouragement whereas more open students in NFLs received less parental encouragement. Parental encouragement, instrumental orientation and motivation were also positively correlated to each other for those studying CTLs: they became more motivated when they received more parental encouragement and instrumental orientation.

Research Question 2: To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their academic achievement?

Students’ self-reported GPA was transformed to numeric scales with 4 as a Grade of A, 3 as a Grade of B, 2 as a Grade of C, and 1 as a Grade of D. Descriptive analyses showed that students in LCTLs scored the highest overall GPA rate (M = 3.47, SD = .51), followed by CTLs (M = 3.16, SD = .69) and NFLs (M = 3.12, SD = .70). The difference across CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs was not significant (p = .215, n.s.) (in Fig 1).

For students currently registered in CTLs and LCTLs, their GPA for language courses was examined. Both groups received a GPA higher than 3 (Grade B) on average, and students in LCTLs (M = 3.41, SD = .62) over-performed those in CTLs (M = 3.29, SD = .62). No significant difference was noticed between the two groups (p = .546, n.s.). Numerically, those in LCTLs received a higher overall GPA than their language GPA, while students in CTLs received a lower overall GPA than their language GPA.

Research Question 3: To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their personality?

Students, in general, reported that they were open to new ideas with a score of Openness higher than 3 in the 5-point scale. Descriptive analyses showed that students in LCTLs (M = 3.86, SD = .50) tended to be more open-minded than those in CTLs (M = 3.80, SD = .48) or NFLs (M = 3.55, SD = .64). The difference of Openness across students of CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs was not significant (p = .193, n.s.). Students also viewed themselves as
emotionally stable with a score of Neuroticism less than 3. Students in CTLs ($M = 2.82, SD = .73$) received higher scores of Neuroticism than those in NFLs ($M = 2.46, SD = .56$) and LCTLs ($M = 2.33, SD = .40$). The difference across groups was significant ($p = .029$), and post hoc tests showed that students in CTLs were more likely to get nervous or upset than those in LCTLs at a significant level (in Fig 2).

**Research Question 4: To what extent do students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differ in their motivation and language attitudes?**

The mini-AMTB inventory was employed to examine six factors in Integrativeness, Attitudes toward the learning situation, Motivation of the target language, Language anxiety, Instrumental orientation of the target language, and Parental encouragement. Descriptive statistics for each factor was listed in Table 7. Descriptive analysis showed that students in LCTLs, compared with those of CTLs and NFLs, experienced higher integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, instrumental orientation of the learning language, and lower language anxiety or parental encouragement.

Univariate general linear model (GLM) analysis showed that motivation of the target language was the only significant factor that differentiated students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs ($p = .035$). Further post hoc tests indicated that students in LCTLs had significantly more desire to learn languages than those in CTLs. There was a strong tendency in integrativeness ($p = .061$) and attitudes toward the learning situation ($p = .082$). No significant difference was observed in language anxiety, instrumental orientation of the target language, or parental encouragement (in Fig 3).
Discussions

Research question 1 examined the correlations in academic achievement, personality, motivation and attitudes in groups of students in CTLs, LCTLs, and NFLs. Correlations were noticed between overall GPA and FL GPA of students in CTLs and LCTLs. Thus, overall academic achievement might be a possible predictor of student achievement in FLs. This finding was consistent with previous studies on the correlation between students’ overall academic achievement and their foreign-language achievement (Brown, 2009; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995). Academic achievement for students studying NFLs was negatively correlated to integrativeness. It was consistent with studies that claimed students who had lower integrative orientation would have lower achievement in FLs (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959).

Some studies have suggested that students who experienced higher anxiety were likely to conduct poorer overall FL performance (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995; Ganschow, Javorshy, Sparks, Skinner, Anderson & Patton, 1994; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2001; Oya et al., 2004). Though comparisons between students in CTLs and LCTLs showed that those in CTLs with a higher average of anxiety received a lower FL GPA than students of LCTLs, no significant correlation was observed between FL achievement and neuroticism.

Correlation between integrativeness, motivation of the target language and attitudes toward the learning situation was found across student groups. The result was consistent with studies showing that integrative orientation was a very good predictor of academic adaptation. Students who had strong integrative orientation sustained more positive attitudes, stronger desire and a higher level of interest in language learning, and were more likely to contribute to better socio-cultural adaptation toward the target language group in the long run (Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Yu, 2010).

Openness was positively correlated to parental encouragement for students in CTLs but negative correlation was found for those studying NFLs in the present study. This result was consistent with a study of students' motivation as a function of language learning by Inbar, Donitsa and Shohamy (2001), where
researchers found parental reasons being part of the motivation factors for studying foreign languages along with instrumental, cultural, and political reasons.

Research question 2 examined to what extent students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differed in their academic achievement. The descriptive statistics indicated a discrepancy of overall student GPAs across LCTLs, CTLs and NFLs, as well as of the GPA of students studying foreign language between LCTLs and CTLs. Students in LCTLs on average achieved the highest overall GPA and those in NFLs achieved the lowest. Foreign language achievement was also higher for students in LCTLs than in CTLs. The result between LCTLs and CTLs was consistent with previous findings that students in both CTLs and LCTLs had a language GPA higher than B on average, and students in LCTLs over-performed those studying CTLs (Brown, 2009).

Research question 3 investigated personality of students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs. Those in CTLs experienced higher negative anxiety than students of LCTLs at a significant level \((p = .029)\). The result may be explained in terms of the early exposure to CTLs. Students with high anxiety may choose CTLs, as they may have more access to CTLs through the K-12 programs, and languages are more familiar to them compared to LCTLs which are less widely taught. The descriptive statistics indicated that students in LCTLs were more open-minded and more likely to accept for new ideas and changes, followed by those in CTLs and NFLs. The finding was consistent with previous findings that CTLs were more commonly taught, and students felt more conformable to learn; whereas LCTLs and their cultures were considered unfamiliar to English speakers, and students of LCTLs were more open to less familiar cultures and languages (Oya et al., 2004).

Research question 4 investigated motivation and language attitudes across students in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs. Motivation of the target language was the only significant factor that differentiated CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs \((p = .035)\). Students in LCTLs had significantly more desire to learn languages than CTLs. The descriptive statistics also indicated a strong tendency in integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation that
students in LCTLs were more interested in foreign languages and cultures, and attained a more positive attitude to the language course and the language teacher.

To discuss this in more general terms, LCTLs attract academically more successful learners and the learners maintain their good performance in language classes. The overall achievement of students in NFLs is lower than FL learners, and students with comparatively good GPAs have little interest toward FL groups. The correlation between instrumental orientation and the overall GPA of students in NFLs indicates that FL teachers may increase language enrollment and attract higher caliber students into NFLs by advertising practical purposes of acquiring FLs.

Students studying CTLs are more anxious and less open-minded than those studying LCTLs. Neuroticism for students of CTLs is negatively correlated to instrumental orientation and parental encouragement. Promoting a better understanding of practical purposes of learning CTLs and receiving more parental encouragement and guidance may lower learners’ anxiety level. Teachers may serve as outreach facilitators and communicate more actively with parents. Students of LCTLs are comparatively emotionally stable. Teachers may focus on their integrative orientation and their attitudes toward the learning situation to further lower their anxiety level.

Students studying CTLs and NFLs are less motivated in language learning than those studying LCTLs. As motivation, integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation are correlated in all student groups, teachers may have a better understanding of curriculum design that will improve students’ attitudes and motivation. Real materials with cultural elements may be introduced to raise students’ interest in FLs, the people who speak the FLs and groups related to them.

From a language program perspective, language goals, rewards, and study abroad opportunities may be established to promote students’ further education in the target country. Teachers’ professional development may be supported to recognize factors that affect students’ motivation. Right-size language classes may be
scheduled to increase teacher-students interactions and to improve the learning situation.

**Conclusions**

The current study investigated the correlations of academic achievement, personality, motivation, and language attitudes among learners in CTLs, LCTLs, and NFLs and the extent to which learners in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs differed in these aspects. The results indicated correlations between overall academic achievement and foreign language achievement in CTLs and LCTLs. Neuroticism was negatively correlated to motivation factors such as integrativeness, motivation, and instrumental orientation. Integrativeness was positively correlated to motivation of the target language and attitudes toward the learning situation. Students in CTLs, LCTLs, and NFLs also experienced different correlations in their personality and motivation factors. Significant differences were noticed in neuroticism and motivation of the target language between students in LCTLs and CTLs: those in LCTLs were less nervous and more motivated than students studying CTLs. Strong tendencies in integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation were also observed, which suggested that those studying LCTLs attained a more integrative orientation toward target cultures and a more positive attitude toward language learning environment. Given the small sample size, the findings of the current study should be interpreted modestly. Clearly, continued research is called for with a larger sample size to help us further understand students’ individual differences in FL learning and the relationship between academic achievement, personality and motivation. Consistency of grading across FL classes also needs to be examined to interpret language GPA in a more accurate manner.
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Table 1. BFI dimensions, definitions and examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from the 44 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>is an energetic approach toward the social and material world. It includes traits such as sociability, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotionality</td>
<td>&quot;Generates a lot of enthusiasm.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>contrasts a pro-social and communal orientation toward others with antagonism and includes traits such as altruism, tender-mindedness, trust, and modesty</td>
<td>&quot;Likes to cooperate with others.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>describes socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates goal directed behavior, such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, and planning, organizing, and prioritizing tasks</td>
<td>“Makes plans and follows through with them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>contrasts emotional stability and even-temperedness with negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous, sad, and tense</td>
<td>&quot;Worries a lot.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life</td>
<td>“Is original, comes up with new ideas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>Attitudes toward the target language group; Interest in foreign language; Integrative orientation</td>
<td>&quot;My attitude toward the foreign language (FL) speaking people is&quot; &quot;My interest in FL is&quot; &quot;My motivation to learn FL in order to interact with FL speaking people is&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward the learning situation</td>
<td>teacher and class evaluation</td>
<td>&quot;My attitude toward my target language (TL) teacher is&quot; &quot;My attitude toward my TL course is&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of the target language</td>
<td>Motivation intensity; Desire to learn the target language; Attitudes to learn the target language</td>
<td>&quot;My attitude toward learning TL is&quot; &quot;My desire to learn TL is&quot; &quot;My motivation to learn TL is&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language anxiety</td>
<td>The target language class anxiety; The target language use anxiety</td>
<td>&quot;I worry about speaking in my TL class&quot; &quot;I worry about speaking TL outside of class&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental orientation of the target</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;My motivation to learn TL to practical purposes (e.g., to get a good job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>is&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental encouragement</td>
<td>&quot;My parents encourage me to learn FL.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Questions of openness to experience and neuroticism in BFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. 2 &quot;Is original, comes up with new ideas&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 1 &quot;Is depressed, blue&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 4 &quot;Is curious about many different things&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 3 &quot;Is relaxed, handles stress well&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 6 &quot;Is ingenious, a deep thinker&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 5 &quot;Can be tense&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 8 &quot;Has an active imagination&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 7 &quot;Worries a lot&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 10 &quot;Is inventive&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 9 &quot;Is emotionally stable, not easily upset&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 12 &quot;Values artistic, aesthetic experiences&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 11 &quot;Can be moody&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 14 &quot;Prefers work that is routine&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 13 &quot;Remains calm in tense situations&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 16 &quot;Likes to reflect, play with ideas&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 15 &quot;Gets nervous easily&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 17 &quot;Has few artistic interests&quot;</td>
<td>Q. 18 &quot;Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversed scales were applied in questions 3, 9, 13, 14 and 17.
Table 4. Correlations among academic performance, personality traits, motivation and language attitudes in CTLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FL GPA</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Instrumental orientatio</th>
<th>Parental encourageme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.425*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.872**</td>
<td>.477*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.399*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** indicates significant correlations at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * indicates significant correlation at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.409*</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td>.459*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Correlations among academic performance, personality traits, motivation and language attitudes in LCTLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FL GPA</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Integrativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.532*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>- .511*</td>
<td>-.585*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.575*</td>
<td>.889**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Correlations among academic performance, personality traits, motivation, and language attitudes in NFLs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Integrative Motivation</th>
<th>Instrumental Orientation</th>
<th>Parental Encouragement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.514*</td>
<td>.502*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation Correlation</td>
<td>.820**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Descriptive analysis of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation of the target language, language anxiety, instrumental orientation of the target language, and parental encouragement in the mini-AMTB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>CTLs</th>
<th>LCTLs</th>
<th>NFLs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>$M=3.77$</td>
<td>$M=4.37$</td>
<td>$M=3.65$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.11$</td>
<td>$SD=.84$</td>
<td>$SD=.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward the</td>
<td>$M=3.54$</td>
<td>$M=4.17$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning situation</td>
<td>$SD=1.22$</td>
<td>$SD=.99$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of the</td>
<td>$M=3.40$</td>
<td>$M=4.29$</td>
<td>$M=3.61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target language</td>
<td>$SD=1.35$</td>
<td>$SD=.86$</td>
<td>$SD=.86$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language anxiety</td>
<td>$M=2.50$</td>
<td>$M=2.41$</td>
<td>$M=2.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.24$</td>
<td>$SD=.71$</td>
<td>$SD=1.09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental orientation</td>
<td>$M=3.12$</td>
<td>$M=3.76$</td>
<td>$M=3.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.39$</td>
<td>$SD=1.30$</td>
<td>$SD=1.39$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental encouragement</td>
<td>$M=2.56$</td>
<td>$M=2.41$</td>
<td>$M=2.58$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD=1.58$</td>
<td>$SD=1.50$</td>
<td>$SD=1.49$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Overall GPA means out of the 4-point grading scale in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs and foreign language GPA means in CTLs and LCTLs.
Figure 2. Openness and neuroticism out of the 5-point BFI scale in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs. * indicates significant difference at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Figure 3. Motivation and attitude factors out of the 5-point mini-AMTB scale in CTLs, LCTLs and NFLs. * indicates significant difference at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Teaching the Five Cs with Cinema

Rimma Garn
University of Utah

Abstract

This paper discusses teaching the five Cs (as noted in the following introduction), delineated in the “National Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century,” through a college content course based on cinema. It provides an overview of a 2009 Berkeley workshop, “Teaching Language and Culture with Film,” that addressed larger issues related to such courses within the curriculum, their design and teaching. The paper goes on to describe three Russian courses based on the same textbook, KinoTalk, yet designed for different student audiences: for traditional third year students and for various kinds of non-traditional students, for heritage speakers, and for former missionaries with two-years experience in the target country but minimal formal training in the language. In conclusion, the paper suggests ideas for further courses taught using the same textbook and for teaching the five Cs through language and cinema in general.

Introduction

To reach your destination, whatever it is, you have to have a clear goal in mind and a good map in hand (or these days, a GPS). Specialists in foreign language education have developed a roadmap for the study of foreign languages in America: Standards for Foreign Language Learning. They have identified aspects and levels of language acquisition as well as desirable language learning outcomes and boiled them down to the five Cs: COMMUNICATION (communicate in languages other than English), CULTURES (gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures), CONNECTIONS (connect with other disciplines and acquire new information), COMPARISONS (develop insight into the nature of language and culture), and COMMUNITIES (participate in multilingual communities at home
This document, in addition to outlining a comprehensive approach to teaching a foreign language, also offers ideas for teaching specific languages, including Russian, both in secondary and postsecondary institutions.

Now that a comprehensive and insightful plan of action has been developed, how should it be implemented? Foreign language learning and teaching in this country faces an array of problems: financial, psychological and administrative.

Recent budget cuts have affected most areas of today's American economy and have severely impacted academia. Perhaps no other part of the university curriculum has been hit as hard as foreign language programs, particularly in the case of the "less commonly taught" languages. Many programs are struggling to survive on smaller budgets, with fewer faculty and more limited resources. The financial crisis in foreign language study in the United States is recognized by educators and politicians alike. This state of affairs has lasted a number of years and is not likely to change for the better. Yet budget cuts are not the only problem facing foreign language programs in American colleges today. There are also problems of a psychological nature.

A 2010 article published in The Chronicle of Higher Education argued for the cognitive benefits of language study, especially when it is begun early and continued long-term, and offered a realistic description of the present situation surrounding foreign language studies in America. This article was aptly titled "English is Not Enough":

Many Americans have come to believe, consciously or not, that it's just too hard to learn a second language... College students often perceive language requirements as obstacles to be avoided or impositions to be endured... Thus, generation after generation, our society produces large numbers of adult citizens who have never tried to

---


learn another language or who see themselves as having tried and failed.³

While learning a foreign language in America often appears as an unnecessary and doomed endeavor, the teaching side is also plagued with problems: schools do not offer many foreign languages, quite rarely “less commonly taught” ones; at the college level the number of contact hours is not related to the complexity of a language and the educators are either insufficiently prepared to be language teachers or end up as language instructors by default, forced into such positions by the tough competition in the job market.

The teaching of non-Western European languages, like Russian, in schools is more the exception than the rule, and college instructors usually have to start from the very beginning, teaching this language, with its particular set of phonetic and grammatical challenges, to students who have never studied any foreign language whatsoever.

The situation is further fraught with complications, namely, the complexity of the Russian language for English native speakers and the ambiguous role of instructors of foreign languages, including Russian. Russian is a more complex language for native-speakers of English than languages like Spanish, and thus it takes more hours of instruction to reach a comparable level of proficiency, a fact that is not recognized by college administrations and not reflected in curricula. Military and government language programs categorize languages in terms of relative difficulty for English native speakers, placing Russian in the third category out of four. The first category includes the least difficult languages for English native speakers to learn and acquire, like French and Spanish; the second, languages such as Indonesian and German; the third, Hebrew and Russian; and the most difficult, the fourth category, languages like Arabic and Japanese.⁴ According to their categories of difficulty, languages

---

⁴ While Defense Language Institute operates with a 4-categories classification of languages, the Foreign Service Institute uses a 3-tier division merging the first and second DLI’s groups into “languages closely related to English” (that includes French and Spanish, as well as Indonesian and German). In this system, Russian belongs to the
require various numbers of contact hours to achieve comparable levels of proficiency, and government military language schools design their programs on this principle. This is not the case within the academy.

Furthermore, there is another sensitive issue involved – the self identity of those college language instructors who are usually specialists in literature and culture, but whose job description and the needs of the language programs force them to serve predominantly or exclusively as language teaching specialists. This is not a new problem – it was also examined in a 1993 article by Sylvie Debevec Henning, in which she points out: “By virtue of our degrees and accomplishments, we are fundamentally not language instructors and tend to resist attempts to comprehend our careers largely in terms of a paradigm appropriate to secondary school instruction.”

Thus, instructors of Russian in today’s American colleges are facing the following dilemma: at a time when budget cuts are complicating our lives and endangering and/or eliminating Russian language programs. When students come to us with no previous knowledge of Russian, and, often, no other foreign language, we are expected, with limited resources and too little time, to produce language learners aware of cultural issues who are able to communicate with native speakers of the language and to apply this knowledge to other disciplines. How can we do that? The cluster of problems that afflicts college studies of Russian may appear insurmountable, and I do not have a magic potion for our students or a magic wand to fix the problem once and for all. And yet I believe that advanced "content" courses in the language, specifically, cinema and language courses, can help teach these five Cs and provide a unique window onto another culture that will help our students enormously in their motivation, knowledge and language proficiency.

second category – of “languages with significant linguistic and/or cultural differences from English.”

5 See H. Byrnes, "Perspectives on Curriculum Construction."

6 See S. D. Henning, "The Integration of Language, Literature, and Culture.”
The development of such courses, and the steadily increasing role of technology in them, is reflected in research and critical literature.⁷ "Content" courses, the advanced language courses that combine language as a tool and subject matter as content are popular and are considered desirable additions to college curricula today. Among "content" courses, the ones that deal with video are usually the most widespread and well-liked. They are popular with our students, who seem to prefer video input to any other; they are popular with some instructors, often younger ones, as well as junior faculty. "Serious" professors look down on these content courses as "selling out" to the new generation of attention-deficit kids who want to be entertained at any cost. However, there are dedicated teachers of various languages out there who believe in teaching language and culture with film and who approach this subject as a respectable research field.⁸

The interest in such courses and materials is growing not only among students and educators, but among textbook authors and publishers as well. One publishing house, Focus, for example, has published a number of textbooks on cinema in foreign languages over the past decade. There are textbooks for Spanish, French and German as well as books for some of the less commonly taught languages: there are textbooks on Italian, Portuguese and Russian cinema, all released in the last few years (see Appendix A for a list of video-based Russian textbooks).⁹ Moreover, besides the series “Cinema for [specific language] Conversation,” Focus has launched another impressive series, focused specifically on culture: “[specific language] Culture through Film.” There is no book on Russian culture through film yet, but Russian is the “leading” language among less commonly taught languages as represented by this publishing house: while Italian and Portuguese each have only one textbook

---


⁸ See articles by J. L. Stephens, M. J. Raby, C. Herron et al.

⁹ A similar textbook exists for Polish as well - W. Oleksy and O. E. Swan, Labyrinth of Life, 1993.
devoted to cinema, Russian has three – two that deal with feature films, and one that deals with animation.

But that is not all: other publishers have begun offering additional educational materials for teaching cinema. A textbook on Russian cinema from Hermitage Publishers offers background on, and materials for, teaching 18 films for advanced learners. 10 And finally, a textbook released by Slavica in 2006, Mesropova’s KinoTalk: Russian Cinema and Conversation, focuses on eleven films from the 1990s and offers activities for high-intermediate and advanced students of Russian, allowing them to develop their language proficiency and work on the five Cs, particularly on the culture component.

Richard Blakely argues for the need for courses that can introduce a foreign culture at its most authentic, that is, in the original language, wryly making the point that: "At a more devout time in human history ... anyone who practiced the diabolical art of dubbing would be burned at the stake. For the ‘monstruosité’ of putting one person's voice into the soul and body of another is certainly ‘against all divine and human law.’” 11 Neither dubbing nor subtitling can adequately render the richness and all implications of foreign humor and cultural allusions, and studying films in the target language is one great way towards a better comprehension of the culture that produced it.

This paper offers some insights into how one and the same textbook for teaching Russian cinema and language, namely KinoTalk, can be used as the foundation for a variety of content courses. It discusses three university courses based on this book – a course for "traditional" third-year-language students; a course for heritage speakers; and a fourth-year course for another type of "non-traditional" student – those who have spent about two years in Russia on a religious mission. Not only was each course designed for a specific student audience, each had its own theme, and this textbook allowed for and supported a variety of options. This compact book offers chapters on eleven Russian films from the 1990s and a wealth

10 Unfortunately, Pichugina’s Advanced Russian Through Film is no longer in print.
of material to choose from. After incorporating films into my language courses, and teaching film courses in the target language, for many years, I was fortunate to have an opportunity to attend a workshop on this topic. This opportunity came before my third course based on *Kinotalk*, and it helped me resolve many issues that, with only my intuition to guide me, I had never resolved to my satisfaction in the past. A cinema and language course can be tailored to students with the most varied of backgrounds and levels and can be an ideal way to teach the five Cs outlined in the "Standards." Before discussing my three courses based on *Kinotalk*, I will give a brief overview of this unforgettable workshop on teaching cinema.

The Workshop

This four-day workshop explored various practical issues that arise when a nation’s cinema is used as a mine of linguistic and cultural information in college foreign language "content" courses. It featured an array of dedicated and knowledgeable professionals working with the most varied facets of films who came to share their insights on the possible implications of using cinema for teaching.

Marilyn Fabe, from UC Berkeley, delivered a presentation entitled "The Language of Film" that discussed film terminology, the issue of definitions, and offered memorable, vivid examples of the key concepts from some films familiar to her audience. Mark Kaiser, also from Berkeley, entitled his presentation “Teaching with Film Clips,” and shared information about a monumental project – the creation of a UC Library of Foreign Language Film Clips, an unusual and useful resource for instructors of many languages made available to faculty working for the University of California system. Sabine Levet, from MIT, presented “Cross-Cultural Comparison through Film,” a session describing a ground breaking web-based project for developing intercultural competence. Her students had virtual contact with their peers in the target country, enabling them to

---

12 This workshop, “Teaching Language and Culture with Film,” was organized by the UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching, UC-Berkeley, June 15-18, 2009.
14 Levet is one of the creators and developers of the *Cultura Project*. 


analyze French films and their American remakes, draw their own conclusions on the differences between the films, and analyze the "what" and "why" behind these differences. Rick Kern, from Berkeley, presented a paper entitled "Making Connections between Film and Literacy" that discussed narratives in various kinds of media and ways to develop our students' interpretation and critical thinking skills, thus contributing to their overall literacy.

Only one of the workshop's presenters dealt with Russian language and cinema. Thomas J. Garza, from the University of Texas, Austin, entitled his presentation “Film as (Con)Text: Using Visual Media in Russian Language and Culture Classes.” He outlined the ideas behind the project *Rockin' Russian*, which offers videos of recent Russian songs, complete with lyrics and accompanying instructional materials for every level of language proficiency. Garza shared some fun-filled clips, entertaining even for those of us who are decades older than our students.

And finally, there was Anne-Christine Rice from Tufts University, whose presentation, “Implementing a Curriculum Built around Film,” was perhaps the most immediately practical in this workshop. Her list of considerations involved in designing film-based courses included the nature and purposes of the course, the choice and number of films, the practical matters of film availability, activities based on the films, and finally, the creation of the syllabus. Working through such questions places both long-standing advocates and new converts to the use of film in language teaching in a much better position as they design new courses. As she outlined in her presentation, there are a number of new textbooks for just such cinema and language courses for students of various foreign languages. In short, the interest is there and the textbooks exist as well. But what should the next step be for someone with the luxury of designing a course to teach, and an interest in teaching, just that, a language and cinema course? In the pages that follow I will describe my three Russian language and cinema courses based on *KinoTalk*.

---

15 Kern is the author of *Literacy and Language Teaching* (2000).
16 Rice is the author of *Cinema for French Conversation* (2007) and *La France contemporaine à travers ses films* (2010).
and offer some insights and suggestions that I hope will be useful to my colleagues in the field.

**Traditional Third Year**

*A Composition and Conversation Course Based on Russian Cinema: Topics in Russian 20th-Century History* (see Appendix B for the course description and semester plan)

As outlined in works by L. Dee Fink, course design should not start from its "end," from the textbook. Rather, it should start with its most crucial elements, namely, its topic, purpose and the target audience. The number and selection of films, the number of screenings, and the specific tasks to be assigned – all these elements of course design will be dictated by the purpose of the course. In designing my course for traditional third-year students in a university program, I was motivated by an awareness of the desperate need for a conversation course that actually helps third-year students speak the language, given the fact that they rush through the first and second year trying to deal with all four language skills plus grammar, spiced with just a dash of culture. By the third year, they are starting to wonder what the point of it all is if they cannot say anything in the language they have been trying so hard to learn. For them, a sense of accomplishment is most closely tied to one skill: speaking. And, in most cases, this is the very skill they most obviously lack.

Although the course was listed in the catalogue under the heading "composition and conversation," it focused predominantly on speaking, and to a lesser degree, on listening and writing. Having decided which skills the course would focus on, I had to determine what we wanted to talk about, and cinema was a logical and attractive candidate. I chose four films out of *KinoTalk* for a 16-week-long semester: *Burnt by the Sun, The Thief, Adam's Rib,* and *Window to Paris.* Rather than arranging the films chronologically in terms of the year they were produced, I sequenced them in accordance with the time period they depicted: the first one, *Burnt by the Sun,* focuses on the

---

17 L. D. Fink, "Integrated Course Design" and *Creating Significant Learning Experiences.*
1930s and Stalin's purges; the second, *The Thief*, on the post-war devastation of the 1950s; the third, *Adam's Rib*, depicts the country in the late 1980s and early 1990s, that is, the lead-up to the fall of the Soviet Union. The last film, Jurii Mamin’s satirical masterpiece, *Window to Paris*, is the film I like to include as the last one in my cinema courses: not only does it address the crucial issue of new Russia's self-identity and deal with the centuries-long conflicting views of Slavophiles and Westernizers on the essence and the right path for Russia; this film, in a way that is both accessible and entertaining, offers a comforting note of hope for the future of this long-suffering country whose children so often want to abandon it.

Christine Rice, in her workshop presentation, suggested that no more than eight films should be included in a semester-long-course. I chose "only" four films for a number of reasons. And this choice proved its validity – the pace was comfortable enough both for the students and for me. My hope was to be able to dedicate three weeks to each film. In these three weeks I assigned two screenings of the same film, each time with a different specific task to focus on, concentrating on “Who, What, Where?” with the first screening, and on “Why, What For, How and Why So?” during the second. We were able to work with each film first on the factual and then on the abstract level, thus expanding not only the students' vocabulary, but also working on “text type,” advancing from awkward, timid separate sentences to minimal coherent paragraphs.

The textbook itself did an excellent job of supporting this increasingly complicated work and promoting student progress as we worked with the first three or four sections of each chapter in depth. The first section in each chapter (“Preparing for the Screening”) offered general information about the film and the most useful vocabulary, and served as an advance organizer. The second section (“Let’s Talk About the Film”) contained specific factual questions that the students had to find answers to during the first screening and that could be answered with short sentences. The following section (“Discussing the Film”) contained more abstract open-ended questions that encouraged more elaborate, paragraph-length answers about the characters, their behavior, motivations, and socio-cultural context. These questions were assigned for the second screening, preparing students for a discussion that went beyond the factual and
obvious. The subsequent sections of each chapter (critics’ reviews, various opinions on films, their context, and sociological questionnaires) offered more opportunities for advanced discussion, however, they were not appropriate for the traditional students at this level. With the non-traditional students, however, we were able to delve into these opportunities and found them very helpful and stimulating.

This schedule allowed us to have two weeks at the beginning of the semester to work on the introductory chapter of the textbook and cinema terminology and to figure out practical issues of accessing and watching the films. Two weeks at the end of the semester provided an opportunity to work on the textbook’s concluding chapter, give all students a chance to make oral presentations, complete a final review, and address thematic and language-related issues that required attention.

Three of the twelve students in this course were at a higher proficiency level. There were not enough of these heritage speakers to justify a separate course, so to provide additional individualized help, I arranged to offer separate sessions for these more advanced students once a week.

Overall, this course proved to be a successful addition to the existing Russian program: the students got to practice and develop their speaking, many of them encountered the first Russian films they had ever seen, and the thematic thread of the course, the historical and political changes in the USSR, made it possible to present new cultural information in a personal way. They learned to care about the characters in the films and often would try to put themselves "in their shoes."

Some additional comments on the linguistic and technical aspects of teaching such a course might be helpful. When it became obvious that some of the students were considerably more comfortable speaking than others and an additional weekly hour was arranged for the hesitant ones, classes began to flow more smoothly. *KinoTalk* offers motivating and useful exercises of increasing difficulty that help develop speaking. Listening and writing assignments were related to those in the book and did not take much time on the part of the instructor to design. Grammar points were
addressed as needed, usually when some construction presented a common difficulty for a number of students.

When I taught this course back in 2007, the films were not digitized and I placed the copies I was able to obtain in the language lab for students to watch. Most of the copies were on video cassettes, so if some of them had English subtitles it was not possible to switch them on and off, an advantage later offered by DVDs. I tried to obtain copies of the films for this course without subtitles, but naturally it was not always possible. There is no single ideal way for all students to work with subtitles given their varied language backgrounds, learning styles, and strategies. Unless my students could understand the plot of the film and the motivation of the characters well enough to care about them, they were not comfortable talking about them in class. So if some copies of our films had no subtitles, I had no problem suggesting that students find a copy with subtitles and watch it at some point. Since there were two assigned screenings of each film I believe that a variety of experiences and varied ways of working with films was the key to successful language learning.

*KinoTalk* does not contain detailed information on specific scenes for screenings and discussion in class as some other textbooks do, for example, *Cinema for Russian Conversation*. But it would be easy for an instructor to dedicate a lesson to particular clips, and this activity adds both variety and greater specificity to the process of studying a film. The classical sequence of previewing, viewing, and post-viewing exercises, as well as double screening of the same scene, are not difficult to prepare for a busy instructor. In addition, they provide some of the most memorable moments in the course and help further motivate the students.

This course was taught a few years ago, but one exercise we did in that class was so successful that it is still alive in my memory. After the second screening of the film *Adam’s Rib*, at which point students were already focusing not on “what” but on “why,” “how” and “what for,” I asked them to reenact the key scene at the table, when the teenage girl reveals her pregnancy to her family, and each character reacts to this shocking news in a unique, character-driven way. My students blossomed – in spite of the halting pace and searching for words, they enjoyed role-playing enormously, and one
bulky athlete who asked to play the part of the teenage girl delivered such an original comic rendering of this scene that many students wrote about it in their end-of-semester evaluations and regretted this type of activity was not done more often.

Heritage Speakers:

Language and culture course: *Two Genders, Two Worlds: Masculine and Feminine in Russian Cinema* (see Appendix C for the course description and semester plan)

Before I arrived at the university where I designed this course, heritage speakers were "rare birds," and there were no courses in the catalogue specifically for them. However a small group of these unusual students, five of them, appeared in the Department at the same time, all looking for an appropriate course to take, a course that would inform them, challenge their intellectual abilities, and help them develop their Russian language skills. I was given an opportunity to design and teach such a course.

As usual, this small group of "heritage" speakers was extremely varied, but we were compelled to find a way to fit them all into the same mold. In fact, two students out of the five were actually not heritage speakers, but they were not traditional students either. One was an international student from Yugoslavia, a native speaker of another Slavic language, who had studied Russian for a number of years. The other was an American, a talented language student, who spent a few years in Russia with his parents, then on a mission there, and attended a Russian school during that time. The remaining three students were "real" heritage speakers, yet they represented a broad range of backgrounds, from the one who came to America as a preschooler and barely knew the Russian alphabet, to another who graduated from high school in Russia and thus had proficiency close to that of an educated native speaker.

This was my group, and I had to face the challenge of designing a language and content course appropriate and useful for them all. I decided to turn once again to *KinoTalk* and to supplement it with a language textbook, Kagan’s *Russian for Russians*, created specifically
for heritage speakers, as well as a book on Russian culture, Genevra Gerhardt's *The Russians' World*.

An article by Herron, Cole, Corrie and Dubreil, “The Effectiveness of a Video-Based Curriculum in Teaching Culture,” provides a helpful overview of the two facets of culture: "culture with a capital 'C'" and "culture with a small 'c'". The article defines the former as "cultural products, artifacts and institutions," and the latter as "cultural practices, daily life, and acceptable behavior (what to do, where and when)." It describes a study where beginning students of French were taught a course based on a video program, "French in Action," after which they were tested on these two aspects of culture. There were noticeable gains in students' knowledge of both.

My second course taught using *KinoTalk*, the one for heritage speakers, was a very different course from the previous one, yet also a successful one. It strove to present various aspects of a "culture with a small 'c,'" and the book about everyday life in Russia was a huge help and a fount of information on this topic. The films provided an excellent illustration of the most varied elements of people's attitudes and behaviors. The thematic selection and grouping of the films allowed a novel approach to the social dynamics in Soviet and emerging post-Soviet society. The inclusion of a specially tailored language textbook for heritage speakers was also justified – it facilitated a concise overview of those language aspects that were familiar to the students and a thorough examination of more difficult aspects of the language. The whole group was interested and very satisfied with all three textbooks, which complemented each other in terms of course content and helped the students reach their goals. We met twice a week, with one day focused on our films (discussing them, going over cultural issues raised in them, related homework and exercises from *KinoTalk*), and the other dedicated to language and culture study. For this second class they worked on assignments from *Russian for Russians* and Gerhart's book.

Since two of the five students could not yet read or write in Russian, I arranged for one additional hour to meet only with them to work on the alphabet, on cursive, then on spelling, and finally, their emerging reading and writing skills. Although this placed an
extra burden on me as the language instructor, the students' accelerated progress paid off. Because of their passionate involvement with the subject matter and enthusiasm for learning the aspects of the language they needed to communicate with their families as educated adults, this was a truly rewarding educational experience, both for them and for me.

Other Non-Traditional Students – Former Missionaries

Russian 20th-Century History through Film (see Appendix D for the course description and semester plan)

This course grew out of the need for the Russian program to offer a challenging and informative course for a unique group of students that had one-and-a-half to two years of experience in the target country. The group consisted of seventeen outspoken, motivated, and genuinely interested students. Most of them had a rather advanced level of language proficiency in speaking. The course had to deal with deficiencies in their language skills and at the same time, offer interesting content. I chose to design one more cinema and language course, once again using KinoTalk as my primary textbook. But this course was to focus on the content aspect, and thus the topic of the course became "20th-Century Russian History through Film." The language component was to deal predominantly with speaking and listening.

While my earlier course on Russian history through film for traditional students was focused mostly on the language and touched on selected topics in Russian history as an overview and introduction to them, we were able to delve more deeply into each historical period of the 20th century and to focus not only on the facts, but on the complex array of issues connected to each tumultuous historical event.

The eight films chosen for this course were ordered according to the times depicted in them: from the 1920s (Heart of a Dog) to the post-Soviet period represented by three films: Peculiarities of the National Hunt (1995), Brother (1998) and Window to Paris (1993). KinoTalk did not offer films dealing with the 1960-1970s, and so I brought one film “from outside”; from another similar textbook,

Supplementing the screenings and discussions with background information on Russian history, we discussed the burning issues of every period of Soviet history depicted in our films. Thus, for the 1920s (*Heart of a Dog*) we reviewed the wars and revolutions of the tumultuous beginning of the 20th century in Russia, as well as the drastically changing ideas and cultural norms of that period. For the film depicting the 1930s (*Burnt by the Sun*) we looked into the nature and practices of Stalin's cult of personality and purges, into the contrasting ideas circulating in the aftermath of the revolution, and the implications these ideas had for specific characters. The post-WWII period (1940s and 1950s) is memorably depicted in *The Thief*; and the film that I included in this course even though it was not covered in *KinoTalk, Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears*, allowed us to see and discuss the issues confronting the Soviet Union in the 1960s and '70s. *Adam's Rib*, made in 1990, is a great choice for delving into the uncertainty and confusion of the time that immediately preceded the fall of the Soviet Union in December of 1991.

It would have been possible to address the post-Soviet period with just one or two films, but I felt it was important for my students to understand as much as possible the issues that shaped the mentality and behavior of the Russians they encountered when in Russia and to be exposed to various viewpoints about those historical transformations. Any one film on post-Soviet Russia I might have chosen would offer only a limited perspective on today's Russia and culture. So I chose to show three films, and the order in which I showed them, I realized, had to be carefully considered. Even though Mamin's *Window to Paris* (1993) was made before the other two films (*Peculiarities of the National Hunt* [1995] and *Brother* [1998]), it is the film that best shows how genuinely concerned Russians continue to be about the centuries-old question of Russia's identity. It best shows the tension Russians feel between West and East and is the only film out of these three that offers glimpses of hope for the future. The other two films depict a depressingly recognizable world of violence and drunken resignation.

---

18 W. J. Comer's "Russia's History," in Gerhart's *The Russian Context.*
As for the language component of this course, we worked on expanding the students’ vocabulary using the concise and very helpful topical word lists provided in each chapter and had regular vocabulary quizzes. To develop their writing skills, there were regular essays with constructive feedback and obligatory rewrites. And most importantly, in order to further develop the students’ ability to express their thoughts coherently, both in speaking and in writing, I provided them with a list of cohesive devices that we worked on throughout the semester in addition to the materials in KinoTalk (see Appendix E for the list of cohesive devices).

By the end of the semester, my students reported noticeable progress in their language skills, as well as improved listening comprehension and speaking and writing ability. Judging by the end-of-semester evaluations, the students enjoyed watching the movies and discussing them; they found the course exciting; and they appreciated an opportunity to learn about Russian culture through film. Most gratifying of all, some of them reported to have "learned a lot." Most importantly, in my opinion, they acquired not only additional knowledge about the language and country, its history and culture, but a deeper, more compassionate understanding of the people living there.

Conclusion

When the goals of the course, dictated by the needs of the students and the program, are clearly defined, one and the same textbook can become the cornerstone of a number of great courses, one that teaches the five Cs in an efficient and memorable way. Hardly any other resource we use in our foreign language programs offers the vividness, impressiveness, and effectiveness of cinema. Teachers of Russian have the luxury of choosing, at this point, from five recent textbooks dealing with Russian cinema and even animation. Using just one of them, KinoTalk, a busy instructor can create a number of exciting cinema courses, thematically focused on Russia’s history and social issues, as in the courses I have described. There is a wide array of organizing principles around which cinema-
based courses can be designed, such as literary adaptations, music in Russian cinema, or comedy, to name just a few (see Appendix F for ideas on further possible courses based on KinoTalk).

If we want the situation with foreign language study in this country to change, if we want to contribute to the national effort to promote the five Cs, yet another "c," for cinema, offers us a highly effective means to this end.

---

19 See V. Béguelin-Argimón, "Faciliter l'accès aux textes littéraires par le cinéma" (2007).
Appendix A

Video-Based Russian Textbooks for Various Levels of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Animation for Russian Conversation</em>, 2008</td>
<td>This is an unusual textbook: not only is it based on animation (I have not seen animation used in textbooks for any other languages yet), it is designed for less advanced students than other similar textbooks (Novice High to Intermediate Mid on ACTFL scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Advanced Russian through Film (A Collection of Transcripts and Exercises)</em>, 2005</td>
<td>This book is difficult to obtain, and it is not designed like similar textbooks, but it can be a helpful reference in a cinema course or used as a supplement in an advanced Russian grammar course. It is designed for heritage speakers and traditional advanced students (beyond third and fourth year of instruction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cinema for Russian Conversation (Volumes 1 &amp; 2)</em>, 2005</td>
<td>Designed for Intermediate to Advanced Plus students (on the ACTFL scale), this two-volume series offers individual chapters on a number of popular films (7 in each volume) from the 1930s to the 1990s and can be used for a variety of topic-oriented courses on Russian cinema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>KinoTalk</em>, 2006</td>
<td>Designed for high-intermediate to advanced students of Russian, this book examines 11 prominent post-Soviet films and, as this paper strives to demonstrate, can serve as the basis for a number of varied cinema courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

TRADITIONAL THIRD-YEAR: A Composition and Conversation
Course Based on Russian Cinema: Topics in Russian 20th-Century History

Course Description

This Intermediate Russian course will improve your written and spoken Russian and will provide you with a rich depository of cultural material. We will watch and discuss four films (The Thief, Window to Paris, Adam's Rib, Burnt by the Sun,) which will enable us to explore the impact of the Soviet state on Russians' mentality and behavior. This course focuses primarily on speaking and writing, but we will also devote attention to listening and reading, and we will address relevant grammar whenever necessary. This course strives to enrich your vocabulary and improve your fluency by providing you with an opportunity to speak Russian. Our discussions will range from concrete to abstract topics and will improve your ability to communicate in Russian. Weekly writing assignments will hone your ability to express yourself more lucidly on paper.

Tentative Semester Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks &amp; Dates</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Films &amp; Stuff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 August 20-24</td>
<td>Chapter 1: Introduction</td>
<td>Introduction to the Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quiz on cinema terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 August 27-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 Sept 3-7</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>Burnt by the Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 Sept 10-14</td>
<td>Lexical Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 Sept 17-21</td>
<td>Chapter Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 Sept 24-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Thief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7 Oct 1-5</td>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8 Oct 8-12</td>
<td>Lexical Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9 Oct 15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam's Rib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10 Oct 22-26</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11 Oct.29 -</td>
<td>Lexical Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2</td>
<td>Chapter Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12 Nov 5-9</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13 Nov 12-16&lt;br&gt;Week 14 Nov 19-23</td>
<td>Lexical Quiz&lt;br&gt;Chapter Test</td>
<td><em>Window to Paris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15 Nov 26-30&lt;br&gt;Week 16 Dec 3-7</td>
<td>Chapter 13: Conclusion</td>
<td>Oral Presentations&lt;br&gt;Review&lt;br&gt;Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Week Dec 10-14</td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>Time and date according to the University schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

HERITAGE SPEAKERS: Language and culture course

*Two Genders, Two Worlds: Masculine and Feminine in Russian Cinema*

**Course Description**

This course is designed with the particular needs of heritage speakers in mind. Unlike traditional courses for students who learn Russian as a foreign language, this course takes advantage of the strengths of heritage speakers (speaking and oral comprehension) while working to improve typical weaknesses (reading, writing, recognition of register, formal grammar and cultural knowledge). This course will help you develop reading and writing skills while providing a concise introduction to grammar and fine-tune your stylistic repertoire. At the same time, it will help you deepen your knowledge of Russian culture in its various aspects through the Russian films of 1990s we will watch and discuss and through the readings on Russian culture. The goal of the course is to help you fill in the gaps in your practical skills and in your knowledge of the language, country and culture – an essential step in attaining a higher level of proficiency in Russian, one that more closely resembles that of educated native speakers. The final presentation will allow you to use your language skills in a meaningful way – in order to gain new information as well as a deeper understanding of Russia’s past and present.
### Tentative Semester Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Mondays: Chapters in <em>KinoTalk</em> &amp; Films</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Introduction to the course; Chapter 1: Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART I: MEN, MACHO, MASCULINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Chapter 7: <em>Peculiarities of National Hunt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>A documentary on alcoholism in Russia <em>War in a Glass</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Chapter 8: <em>Prisoner of the Mountains</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8 &amp; Week 9</td>
<td>Chapter 11: <em>Brother</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Week 10 – Spring break)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART II: WOMEN, MOTHERHOOD, FEMININE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Chapter 3: <em>Adam's Rib</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td>Chapter 5: <em>Anna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Chapter 6: <em>Land of the Deaf</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 16</td>
<td>Chapter 13, Conclusion &amp; Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FINAL EXAM</strong>: Time and date according to the University schedule**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

OTHER NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS - FORMER MISSIONARIES:
Russian 20th-Century History through Film

Course Description

This advanced Russian course will improve your written and spoken Russian and will provide you with a rich depository of cultural material. We will watch and discuss Russian films (among them the classic melodrama of the Soviet epoch, Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears, a gangster drama Brother, and a fantastic comedy Window to Paris) that will enable us to take a closer look at the dramatic history of twentieth-century Russia, and at how it shaped Russians' mentality and behavior.

This course focuses primarily on speaking and writing, but we will also devote attention to listening and reading, and we will address relevant grammar points whenever necessary. It strives to enrich your vocabulary and improve your fluency by providing you with an opportunity to speak Russian and by working on coherent discourse of paragraph length. Our discussions will range from concrete to abstract topics and will improve your ability to communicate in Russian. Writing assignments will hone your ability to express yourself more lucidly on paper. Hearing authentic Russian dialogue in the films will, over the course of the semester, improve your listening skills.
## General Semester Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Films &amp; Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1 | Introduction to the course / Chapter 1 in *KinoTalk*  
Part I, 1920s-1970s |
| Week 2 | 1920s: Chapter 2, *Heart of a Dog* |
| Weeks 3&4 | 1930s: Chapter 6, *Burnt by the Sun* *Test 1* |
| Weeks 5&6 | 1940s-1950s: Chapter 9, *The Thief* |
| Week 7 | 1960s – 1970s: *Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears* *Test 2* |
| Week 8 | NO CLASSES: fall break: October 12-17, Monday-Saturday |

**Part II: 1990s: Pre- and Post-Dissolution of the USSR**

*Test 3* |
| Week 16 | Presentations and Review, Chapter 13, Conclusion |
| Week 17 | *Final Exams (day and time according to the University schedule)* |
Appendix E

Cohesive Devices / Приемы согласования (связки)\textsuperscript{21}

1. Порядок (время) \hspace{1cm} Sequence/Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Русский</th>
<th>Английский</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>во-первых, во-вторых</td>
<td>in the first place, to begin with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в первую очередь</td>
<td>first of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>до сих пор</td>
<td>until now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>до тех пор, пока... не</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>до того, как</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>за... (неделю) до того, как...</td>
<td>before (event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>когда</td>
<td>when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>между тем</td>
<td>meanwhile, in the meantime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>перед тем, как</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>по мере того, как</td>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>после того, как</td>
<td>after (an event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прежде чем</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сначала</td>
<td>at first, first, at the beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с одной стороны... с другой стороны...</td>
<td>on the one hand, on the other hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с тех пор как</td>
<td>since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>через (неделю) после того, как</td>
<td>in, after (time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21} This list was published in one of professional publications a number of years ago and I have been revising it to make it clearer and more complete.
2. **Условия**

**Conditions**

в соответствии с (тем, что) in connection with the fact that

если if (not whether)

согласно (чему, с чем) according to, in accordance with

3. **Эмоциональное отношение, оценка**

**Emotional**

безусловно absolutely

благодаря тому, что owing to (due to) the fact that

вместо того, чтобы instead of (doing something)

все-таки after all

действительно actually, really, truly, indeed

кажется it seems

как будто as if (also apparently)

к сожалению unfortunately

мало того, что... not only, its not enough that

на самом деле actually, in point of fact
несмотря на то, что
despite (the fact that)

несомненно
undoubtedly, unquestionably

но
but
однако
however, but
по крайней мере
at least
тем не менее
nevertheless
честно говоря
to be honest, in all honesty, frankly speaking

хотя
although, though

4. Суммирование
Summarizing

в конце концов
in the end, when all is said and done

вообще (говоря)
generally, in general

в результате
as a result of
значит
so, then
как ни
however, no matter how

как оказалось
it turned out that

одним словом
in a word
таким образом
thus, this way, like this
5. Заполнение паузы

значит
как говорится

tак сказать

6. Причины

благодаря тому, что
ведь
в виду того, что
в связи с тем, что

dело в том, что
несмотря на (то, что)
по следующим причинам
потому что
tак как

тем более, что

7. Введение дополнительной информации / Introducting

кроме того

мало того, что...
в таком случае
из-за чего
на всякий случай
по сравнению с...
с точки зрения
судя по тому, что
tогда
что
чтобы

междущем
напримеp

8. Разное

Miscellaneous

not enough that
meanwhile, in the meantime for example

in that case because of, on the account of just in case compared to, in comparison with from someone's point of view judging by the fact that then, at that time, in that case that in order to, so as to, so that
### Appendix F

Further Possible Courses Based on *KinoTalk*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Films, Texts and Additional Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fathers & Sons                   | **FILMS:** Adam's Rib, Window to Paris, Anna, Prisoner of the Caucasus, The Thief  
                                       ADDITIONAL READINGS: on the dynamics of inter-generational relationships and changing values, recent sociological articles on Russia.                                                                                       |
| Film Comedy                      | **FILMS:** Window to Paris, Peculiarities of the National Hunt, Friend of the Deceased, Adam's Rib, Heart of a Dog  
                                       ADDITIONAL READINGS: on irony, humor, black humor, various kinds of comedy and comic plots.                                                                                                                                 |
| Language and (Mis) Communication | **FILMS:** Window to Paris, Peculiarities of National Hunt, Prisoner of the Caucasus, Land of the Deaf, Brother  
                                       ADDITIONAL READINGS: on translation, interpretation, on French and American English in Russian culture, on sign language.                                                                                               |
| Music                            | **FILMS:** Brother, Prisoner of the Mountains, Window to Paris, Heart of a Dog, Burnt by the Sun  
                                       **MUSIC:** Songs by “Nautilus Pompilius,” Louis Armstrong, Spirituals, Edith Piaf, Tchaikovsky, Verdi's *Aida*, Tango (*The Tired Sun*)                                                                                       |
| Screen Adaptations of Literary Texts | **FILMS:** Heart of a Dog, Prisoner of the Mountains, Anna, Window to Paris  
                                        **TEXTS:** Bulgakov's *Heart of a Dog*, Tolstoy's *Prisoner of the Caucasus*, Goncharov's *Oblomov*, Pushkin’s *The Queen of Spades*  
                                       ADDITIONAL READINGS on the concept of “fidelity” of screen adaptations; on this cinematic genre on Russian soil.                                                                 |
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Heritage and Non-Heritage Language Learners in Arabic Classrooms: Inter and Intra-group Beliefs, Attitudes and Perceptions
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Abstract

This study examines how Arabic heritage language learners (HLLs) and non-heritage language learners (non-HLLs) perceive each other, and the class dynamics in a combined classroom setting. Two groups of HLLs and non-HLLs completed a separate questionnaire and answered follow-up open-ended questions. The results show that learners do not feel strongly about mixing or separation, but they also acknowledge that just as there are disadvantages to combining, there are advantages as well. While instructors need to capitalize on the advantages to create a more engaging and more successful teaching environment for both groups, they also need to be aware of the disadvantages in order to counteract them. The study also shows that the particular diglossic situation of Arabic seems to have impacted students’ perceptions and attitudes. The implications and recommendations of the study are quite relevant to schools similar to where the study was conducted. The study makes it possible for the voices of HLLs and non-HLLs to reach educators and administrators and empower them in their research processes to inform the teaching of heritage languages.

Key words: Heritage language education, student beliefs, less commonly taught languages, combined and separate classroom setting, language classroom management
Introduction

Arabic is one of the fastest growing Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) in American schools and universities. In its 2009 annual report, the Modern Language Association (MLA) survey of US higher education reported that the total number of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in Arabic programs was 35,083, a significant increase from 23,974 in 2006. Arabic had the largest percentage growth (46.3) and it became the eighth most studied language in the US. According to the report, students’ incentives for learning Arabic varied. Some wanted to pursue a military or diplomatic career, others wanted to learn more about the Quran and Islamic culture, and many simply loved the language, some students aimed at higher levels of proficiency that would allow them to function more appropriately and effectively in professional settings. In addition, many heritage students wanted to learn the language of their indigenous culture and ancestors.

The U.S. Department of State classifies Arabic as one of thirteen critical languages, and Federal Government Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP), identifies Arabic as a “language of the future.” The teaching of Arabic as a Foreign Language (TAFL) has witnessed an unprecedented expansion, especially after the tragic events of 9/11. Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies departments witnessed a significant increase in the number of enrolled students. Additionally, more programs were founded and more course offerings were added. (MacDonald, 2005; Gordon, 2006; Morrison, 2003; Murphy, 2004).

For many native English speakers, learning Arabic can be a daunting task. To accomplish proficiency in Arabic, the Foreign Service Institute estimates that it would take double the amount of class time needed for other languages such as Hebrew, and four times that for Romance languages such as Spanish. Morrison (2003) discussed three difficulties in teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL) in the United States: Diglossia, the difference between Arabic and other languages, and the scarcity of appropriate teaching materials.
Arabic as a Heritage Language

The increase in the number of students wanting to learn Arabic poses a specific challenge when heritage language learners (HLLs) and non-heritage language learners (non-HLLs) learn together. Many schools and universities in the United States do not offer special classes for Arabic heritage students. Hence both groups end up learning in the same classroom using the same materials and are assessed based on the same criteria. As with other languages, program coordinators simply consider “the background of heritage students and try to accommodate their needs to the best of their ability” (Geisherick, 2004) despite their mixed abilities.

The term heritage languages (HL) has been defined in narrow and broad senses. While, for instance, Cho, Shin, and Krashen (2004) use the term narrowly to refer to the language spoken by immigrants who immigrated at a young age, or by their children, Valdes (2005) uses it broadly to refer to languages spoken by nonsocietal linguistic minorities, in particular, “languages of immigrant, refugee, and indigenous people” (Cummins, 2005, p. 586). To these, Wiley (2005) adds “former colonial languages” (p.595), and Fisherman (2001) emphasizes personal relevance in defining HLLs.

Arabic heritage students are a heterogeneous group of learners. They bring to the classroom diverse competences, motivations and learning goals. They also come with varying levels of proficiency in their respective dialects. HL proficiency can be the result of interconnected factors: age, exposure rate to heritage language, family or household exposure, dialect, social networks, connection to the country of origin, and prior formal or literacy training. Consequently, Ryding (2006) emphasized the need to research those literary skills before articulating any goals and methods, or designing curricula. Since heritage education is a relatively new field, instructors are not well equipped with the necessary skills to successfully function in such an environment. Moreover, instructional materials targeting HLLs are lacking. Li and Duff (2008) noted that “the foreign language textbooks produced in North America are ill-suited for HL learners, with their coverage of basic grammar, survival vocabulary, and everyday routines such as
greetings” (p. 26). In a review of Scalera’s documentary film *I speak Arabic*, S’hiri (2004: 2) wrote, “Another challenge learners and teachers of heritage Arabic face is a scarcity of resources and, until very recently, the absence of a methodology oriented toward teaching heritage learners.”

Few studies examined the issue of heritage students in Arabic classrooms from different perspectives. Ibrahim and Allam (2001) investigated the motivation, linguistic levels, and parents’ motivation of the Arabic heritage students enrolled in Arabic classes at the American University in Cairo. The study highlighted the difficulty of combined classes, and concluded that “addressing the concerns of one type of students was impossible” (p. 437).

From a broader perspective, Ayoubi (2004) examined the history, development, and significance of AFL to the Arab immigrant population in Dearborn, MI. Meanwhile, Bale (2010) examined Arabic as a heritage language in the US; focusing on its history, its current status, and future prospects.

The field of Arabic studies in the United States is a highly sensitive field, and can be problematic for pedagogical and political reasons. Most of the Arabic heritage learners speak a variety of Arabic that is different from that which is taught in schools. These dialects have different lexicons, phonological variations, and morphological and syntactic rules. Moreover, most of these heritage learners are not aware of the formal grammatical rules, and may have a broader vocabulary inventory. Qualified teachers who know how to address these characteristics of HLLs are a rarity. These challenges are even more problematic for teachers who are nonnative speakers of Arabic. Heritage Arabic speakers may not identify with or appreciate a nonnative speaker of Arabic as a teacher. On the other hand, HLLs of Arabic may be stigmatized due to the tragic events of 9/11 or due to overwhelming negative stereotypes presented by media sources.
Rationale of the Study

Combining HL and non-HL learners is a common phenomenon in many foreign language classrooms. Marcos (1999) and Kondo-Brown (2003), for instance, noted that most HL learners who desire to learn their home language in higher education institutions have usually had no choice but to study the language in traditional foreign language classrooms alongside non-heritage learners. Many educators and language professionals believe that the presence of these heritage students can impede the progress of traditional learners by intimidating them and their instructors (Kagan & Dillon, 2001). Additionally, non-heritage students may also resent heritage speakers, since some or even many are studying a language they already know (Peytpon, Lewelling, & Winke, 2001).

This phenomenon has been investigated in several languages and in different contexts. Language educators and practitioners have proposed theoretical frameworks to conceptualize the challenges and the differences in language skills between both groups. Despite this, the teaching of HL learners as a field of study is still not well established. (Kono & McGinnis, 2001). More importantly, the empirical studies that support the claim that the linguistic behavior of HL and non-HL learners is different are few, have been done on a small scale, and are still in their early stages (Kondo, 2003). At the same time, the two-track-classes, although supported by study findings, cannot be easily implemented due to the unavailability of needed infrastructure (Xiao, 2006), and only exist for students with beginning or intermediate proficiency levels (Kondo-Brown, 2003). HLLs with higher proficiency will still be placed with non-heritage learners in high level language classes.

Li and Duff (2006) emphasized the need to research whether there are advantages (or disadvantages) in mixed classes and how to make use of the advantages and counteract the disadvantages. Using an adapted version of the Dörnyei (2002) and Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) survey, Weger (2006) investigated Chinese students’ beliefs by looking at how heritage influenced construction of their social identities, motivation, and classroom activities.
In combined Arabic classrooms, it is assumed that non-HLLs will feel intimidated by HLLs who may have a higher proficiency. It should be borne in mind, however, that MSA is, in most formal instructional settings, the variety that is being taught. Just as non-HLLs may struggle with Arabic as a new language, HLLs may struggle with MSA since it is not their mother tongue, and they lack the necessary literacy skills needed to learn it. MSA is a variety that most heritage students may not have learned or to which they were not exposed in their households.

Through examining these aspects, and other dynamics of the Arabic classroom, the present study will help Arabic program coordinators and language instructors make adjustments in ways that enable them to accommodate heritage students and their needs, use appropriate resources for each group, and decrease the degree of intimidation among traditional language learners (or even both). This study will also provide information to instructors as to how non-HLLs feel and what they believe about a unified class where other students may have higher language proficiency. The research questions that guide this study are:

1. How do HLLs and non-HLLs view each other, the language classroom, and instructors’ pedagogy and behavior in the same teaching setting?
2. What pedagogical implications can be drawn from understanding students’ beliefs and perceptions in a combined classroom setting?
3. Based on students’ beliefs and perceptions, what can educators, language instructors, and policy makers do to deal with this situation and alleviate any concerns either or both groups may exhibit?

Setting
The study took place at a major US university. The Arabic program at this university, like many Arabic language programs in the United States after the tragic events of September 11, was formally established in a post-9/11 context. Previously, Arabic was taught, but no degrees were granted. Arabic courses were only offered as service courses. Recently, the university approved a minor proposal in the Arabic language. The region where the university is located has one
of the largest Arabic-speaking communities in the country, and remains a favored destination for new arrivals from the Arab world (Arab American Institute Foundation, 2003). Thus, it is not surprising to find that about 60-70\% (sometimes more) of the students in the Arabic classes at the university are heritage students. Although introductory courses in Arabic are designated as heritage or non-heritage courses, students tend to register for what fits their schedule, or, in many cases, to obtain good grades due to their prior language background in Arabic (an assumption yet to be examined). The Department that oversees the program, like all other academic units and divisions at the university, does not have the right to override students’ decisions regarding enrollment. Recently a placement test was implemented to attempt to solve the problem of “mixed” classrooms. The test focuses on vocabulary, grammar and reading comprehension. A listening and speaking placement test is yet to be created. In addition to assessing students’ language proficiency in general, one goal of the test was to keep advanced heritage students out of first year classes. Still, there is the concern that some (if not many) may intentionally perform poorly on the test to be placed at a lower level hoping for a good grade. The test remains part of the solution, and other issues such as appropriate material and teachers’ preparedness still need to be addressed. The problem persists, and the combination of heritage and non-heritage remains inescapable.

Method

Participants
Fifty Seven students, enrolled in five courses of Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL), took part in the study. Two of these courses were beginning, two were intermediate and one was advanced. Thirty four participants were HLLs, while twenty three were non-HHLs. At the beginning level, there were sixteen HLLs

\[1\] The term \textit{Arab} as an ethnic group is not listed on the U.S. Census Bureau. Therefore, the author cited this source.
and twelve non-HLLs; at the intermediate level, there were thirteen HLLs and nine non-HLLs, and at the advanced level, there were five HLLs and 2 non-HLLs. Among the HLLs, only five students were pursuing a degree in Arabic; twenty four were not, and two were undecided. Three students did not provide a response. Of the thirty four heritage students, eighteen spoke Arabic at home while four did not, and fourteen spoke it “sometimes”. The majority of the heritage students had studied Arabic in a formal setting for one year, while seven had done so for two or more years. A larger number of non-HLLs (9 students) were pursuing a degree in Arabic, although none spoke or practiced Arabic outside the classroom. All teachers were native speakers of Arabic. Table 1 shows the biographical data for both groups.

Table 1. Participants’ Biographical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heritage Learners</th>
<th>Non-Heritage Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue degree in Arabic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Arabic at home</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Studying Arabic</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Interest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Requirement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical: Reading Koran</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey

Two slightly different surveys were administered: One for HLLs and the other for non-HLLs. Each survey consisted of two sections. The first section in both surveys consisted of six items soliciting biographical data: The students’ intended use of Arabic, whether they spoke Arabic at home or not, whether they spoke Arabic with relatives and friends, how long they had studied Arabic, their motivation for studying Arabic, and for what skills they wanted to use the language. The second section included seventeen items for both groups. This section solicited students’ feelings, beliefs and perceptions about studying Arabic alongside traditional learners. The major areas of the survey solicited students’ responses with regard to their views of 1) intimidation and motivation in a combined setting, 2) language skills, culture and separate tracks, 3) instruction and class management, and 4) course difficulty and pace. Possible responses ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) on a Likert scale. In addition to the first two sections, eight open ended questions were asked (see appendix 1 and 2). Students were asked to comment on any statements in the survey, expanding their opinions and feelings on any other advantages or disadvantages of studying in a combined class. Students were also asked to argue for or against combined courses, and to comment on practices they found both helpful in managing the combined class and catering to the needs of both groups. They were also asked to compare their Arabic courses with other language courses they had taken previously and to give advice for heritage or non-heritage students who may find themselves in similar situations. Finally, students were asked to comment on what they thought professors and peers should know about their own experience learning the language in a mixed setting.

The questionnaires were devised for this study as no similar instrument was readily available to measure all the items under investigation. To ensure validity, the questionnaires were administered after receiving feedback form colleagues in the field who have taught combined language classes. Based on feedback, the topics and the wording of some items were modified. The questionnaires were piloted on a group of students, and changes were
made based on their responses. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained to formally administer the questionnaires.

**Procedure**

Based on a preliminary questionnaire, instructors divided students into two groups (HLL and Non-HLL) in regards to whether or not Arabic was spoken in the student’s household. The questionnaires were administered by a third party, a teaching assistant (TA) from another program, during class hours in the spring semester of 2009. Participation was voluntary and students were asked to sign a consent form. As one of the course instructors, the principal investigator had access to the results after students were assigned their final grades. Before administering the questionnaires, the TA explained to the participants that there were no right or wrong answers; and that the goal of the study was to improve the quality of teaching Arabic at the institution and to overcome some of the difficulties students may encounter while studying Arabic. The TA also assured students that they could withdraw from the study at any time and that their responses would be kept confidential. All students present in classes chose to participate. Due to the difficulty of assembling students as a focus group, they answered the focus group questions on paper during the same week.

**Data Analysis**

Frequencies were used to determine the percentage of learners’ degree of agreement or disagreement with each item in the questionnaires. A response of 1 or 2 was categorized as Agree. Responses of 4 and 5 were categorized as Disagree, and a designated response of 3 was considered Neutral. No responses were entered as 0’s. Table 2 shows the results obtained from HLLs, while Table 3 shows those obtained from non-HLLs. Secondly, a t-test was used to determine whether the two populations differ significantly in twelve similar items in the two questionnaires. Other items applied to one group but not the other, and thus were not included in calculating the t-tests (see Table 4 for a list of these items). Finally, the open-ended questions were analyzed through developing categories for the common themes that emerged from the answers and coding such themes to match the major areas covered in the survey.
Results

The following three tables show the results of the study. Items are numbered under separate subheadings. Table 2 shows the percentages of heritage participants who agreed or disagreed with each statement in the survey, Table 3 shows the percentages of non-heritage participants. Table 4 provides a summary of the statistical analysis.

Table 2. Heritage Language Learners’ Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think that mixing non-HLLs with HLLs is beneficial particularly for lower-level language non-HLLs.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The non-heritage speakers seem intimidated by the fact that there are many heritage speakers in the language class.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The presence of non-heritage speakers decreases my motivation to learn Arabic.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intimidation and Motivation
4. I am as happy to work in a group with non-HLLs as I am to work with other HLLs.
   88%
   9%
   3%

5. My non-HL classmates respect me and appreciate my contributions to class.
   85%
   15%
   0.0%

Language Skills, culture and separate tracks

6. The mix of students in my course allows us to learn a lot about our classmates’ cultures.
   88%
   6%
   6%

7. I believe that I can learn from the insights and contributions of the non-heritage speakers in my courses.
   79%
   15%
   6%

8. I sympathize with the non-heritage speakers in my classes because of their limited language skills in Arabic.
   68%
   12%
   20%

9. I feel impatient when non-HL learners express
   9%
   12%
   79%
There should be separate sections of language courses for heritage speakers and non-heritage speakers.

Instruction and Class Management

The teacher involves HL learners more.

The teacher calls on HL and non-HL learners equally.

HLLs try to help the non-HLLs.

There has to be two sets of standards for grading assignments and tests.

Course Difficulty and Pace

The presence of non-HL learners seems to affect my professors’ expectations as to pace and material coverage.
16 The pace of the course is slower than it should be because of the presence of the non-HLLs.
8%
15%
77%

17 The level of the course is less challenging because of the presence of the non-HLLs.
8%
15%
77%

Agree = responses 1 and 2; Disagree = responses 4 and 5; Neutral = 3

Table 3. Non-heritage Language Learners’ Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimidation and Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel intimidated by the presence of HLLs.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The presence of HLLs decreases motivation.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 I think that mixing non-HLLs with HLLs is beneficial.  
69%  
22%  
9%

4 Having HL learners makes me feel good because I’m reminded that even their language skills need polishing.  
74%  
13%  
13%

5 I feel that my HLL peers respect my contributions.  
65%  
17.5%  
17.5%

Language Skills, Culture and Separate Tracks

6 The presence of HLLs is good for language skills.  
65%  
22%  
13%

7 I learn about Arab culture from my HLLs.  
78%  
9%  
13%

8 The presence of HL learners has helped me understand and feel more comfortable with a variety of dialects.  
52%  
26%  
22%

9 I have difficulty understanding HLLs’ speech.  
57%  
98%  
39%
10  There should be separate courses for HL and non-HL learners.
   44%
   17%
   39%

Instruction, Class Management

11  The presence of HL learners impedes instruction.
   52%
   39%
   9%

12  The teacher calls on HL learners more than non-heritage.
   4%
   4%
   92%

13  The teacher involves HL and non-HL students equally.
   92%
   4%
   4%

14  There should be two different sets of standards in grading assignments and tests.
   22%
   17%
   61%

Course Difficulty and Pace

15  The fact that there are HL learners in class affects my professors’ expectations in terms of material coverage.
   26%
   22%
   52%
16 The course pace is faster due to HL learners’ presence.
26%
13%
61%

17 The course level harder due to HL learners’ presence.
13%
13%
74%

Agree = responses 1 and 2; Disagree = responses 4 and 5; Neutral = 3

Intimidation and Motivation

The study shows that a slight majority of the HL (65%) and non-HL learners (69%) believe that mixing is beneficial for non-HLLs, particularly in lower level classes. In terms of feeling intimidated, for example, only 35% of non-HLLs feel intimidated working in a class that has HLLs. A higher percentage (48%) of HLLs disagrees and does not feel intimated. However, 42% of these HLLs indicated that non-HLLs appear intimidated by their presence, especially when they spoke, or when “the questions are answered so easily by the Arab students,” as one HLL commented on the non-HLLs’ attitudes over classroom interaction. For some of the non-HLLs, the problem is not the pure presence of HLLs, but rather the presence of those who previously studied the language in earlier stages.

One student commented:

I do not have a problem with heritage speaking students [as individuals]. I have a problem with people who already have known language material starting in a beginning section [referring to heritage students with previous language background]. I feel it changes the way the course is taught whether this is done overtly or not is a different question.

In fact, a heritage student confessed of his and other HLLs’ linguistic limitations and said, “Non-native students should not be
intimidated by heritage/native speakers. Being a native speaker myself, I have many difficulties that the non-native speaker is excellent in.”

The data revealed that the presence of the HLLs in the classroom can be a motivating factor. Among non-HLLs, 48% disagree that the presence of HLLs decreases their motivation. Only 26% agree. On the other hand, HLLs do not regard the presence or absence of non-HLLs as a motivating factor; 62% had no strong opinion. Only 24% agreed that the presence of non-HLLs decreases their motivation. In a similar vein, 74% of non-HLLs feel good about having heritage students as classmates because they are reminded that “heritage” does not mean “proficient”. One student comments:

I am motivated by non-Arab students because it shows me that even people who aren’t heritage students appreciate and want to learn my language. It makes me want to learn it so much more (and appreciate it more).

In general, a majority of non-HLLs (65%) believe that having HLLs in the same class can be beneficial for their learning skills. Moreover, 69% of non-HLLs and 88% of HLLs are happy to work in a group with each other.

Additionally, the study shows that 65% of non-HLLs feel that heritage classmates respect their contribution to the class. 85% of HLLs feel that their non-heritage peers do the same. At the same time, 68% sympathize with non-HLLS in their classes because of their limited language skills in Arabic, while 94% indicated their desire to help non-HLLs.

Language Skills, Culture, and Separate Tracks

The current study shows that non-HLLs are roughly equally divided regarding separation: 46% agree, while only 39% disagree. For the HLLs, the numbers are even more closely aligned: 47% of HLLs agree that the two groups should be placed in separate tracks while 44% of them disagree.

The study shows that 65% of non-HLLs report that having HLLs in their classes is good for their language skills. In particular, 52% say that this exposure makes them more comfortable with a
variety of Arabic dialects (when presented). Yet such exposure does not always increase understanding, since 57% of non-HLLs state that they have difficulty understanding HLLs when they speak. On the other hand, 68% of HLLs showed sympathy with non-HLLs due to their limited language skills, but expressed that “…. Also the pronunciation will be better by the heritage students and that allows the non heritage student to hear the words being said correctly more often, enabling them to then repeat them,” as one HLL put it.

In terms of cultural awareness, 78% of non-HLLs and 88% of HLLs agree that mixing allows them to learn about each other’s cultures and offers an invaluable opportunity for cultural exchange by providing “cultural/religious insights,” as one student wrote. Moreover, 79% of HLLs indicate that they can learn from the insights and contributions of non-HLLs in their courses, as one student puts it, “Both have something to bring to the table. Non heritage students usually ask questions that I would never think of asking and this helps in my understanding of the grammar of Arabic.”

Class Management and Students’ Participation

As for class management, both groups agree that teachers involve students equally: 91% of the heritage and 91% of the non-heritage indicated that professors called equally on both student types. Also, 71% of HLLs disagree that the teacher involved non-HLLs more than HLLs. As for professors’ expectations, 52% of non-HLLs and 44% of HLLs disagree that heritage speakers of Arabic in the class affects professors’ expectations in terms of material coverage and thoroughness.

Assessment

This study found that 61% of non-HLLs and 53% of HLLs disagree that there should be two different sets of standards in grading assignments. A student comments:

... as far as the grading system be corrected, it must be understood that although we are heritage speakers what I understand from this is that we have absorbed much of our culture and colloquial language only because we have been
exposed to it. But as far as I actually learn the language reading and speaking it fluently for that matter, we are very much at the same level as those non-heritage students. Students are neutral about their grades.

HLLs are aware of, and sensitive to, the limitations of non-HLLs learning Arabic. As a result, 79% of HLLs disagree that they feel impatient sometimes when non-HLLs try to express their ideas in Arabic.

**Course Pace, Difficulty and Material Coverage**

In terms of course pace and difficulty, 77% of heritage students disagree that the pace of the course is slower due to the presence of non-heritage students. “A few of the non-heritage students believe the course is too hard and fast because heritage students are present. Non heritage or heritage, Arabic isn’t the easiest subject, and without dedication, studying it makes it even harder.” said a heritage student. 74% of non-HLLs expressed as similar sentiment.

Also, 61% of non-HLLs disagree that the course would be faster without heritage learners, and, moreover, 74% disagree that it would be harder. As for presentation and content, non-heritage students are divided. 77% of HLLs disagree that the level of the course is less challenging because of the presence of the non-heritage students.

**T-Test Results**

To find out if there are any significant differences between heritage and non-heritage learners when compared in terms of the items that overlap between the two questionnaires, independent sample t-tests were used. Table 4 shows the t-tests results.
Table 4. Independent Sample T-Test for Equality of Means Results (HLLs and Non-HLLs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig (2 tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>-5.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Others</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor’s Expectations</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Tracks</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Criteria</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling on Students</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Students</td>
<td>-10.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Pace</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Difficulty Level</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ Contribution</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The independent samples t-tests results show that there is a significant difference between the two groups at the level of $p<0.05$ in four factors. There is no significant difference in the motivation level between the two groups’ perceptions of being mixed. Also, the difference is insignificant when it comes to professor’s calling on students of either type equally, or involving heritage students more than non-heritage students. Finally, the two groups do not differ significantly in the course pace variable. Both feel that the pace would still be the same if they were to be separated. There was no significant difference in the remainder of the factors.

**Discussion**

Research suggests that one of the drawbacks of mixing heritage and non-heritage students is the intimidation experienced by non-heritage students, especially when they want to speak. This is because of HLLs’ familiarity with the language sound system and/or more advanced oral proficiency level (Kagan & Dillon, 2001; Mazzoco, 1996). Results of the current study suggest that the presence of HLLs in the classroom intimidates 9 non-HLLs students, and does not intimidate 12 students. While the intimidation can be justified for the former as previously shown, the lack of intimidation for the latter may be a result of the exposure these students may receive outside the classroom being friends or acquaintances with HLLs. Since 60-70% of the Arabic class population comes from an Arabic-speaking background, their presence in the university is salient, and they do not constitute a marginalized group. Such interaction may result in satisfactory learning experience as suggested by Li & Duff (2000). Secondly, lack of intimidation may be related to the fact that heritage students struggle with speaking and learning MSA, just as non-HLLs do, since it is not their mother tongue. MSA is a variety that most heritage students may not have learned or experienced and constitutes a common challenge for both groups alike. Valdes (2005) pointed out that there was a similar problem with Spanish heritage students who had difficulty learning grammar and textbook vocabulary, a result of the sociolinguistic situation of
diglossia. While it is true that some heritage students can speak Arabic, they are still on the same or similar level with non-heritage learners when it comes to MSA. Heritage students may feel intimidated too, because the emphasis is on MSA, which may create a conflict in student's confidence and motivation to learn and retain the language (S'hiri, 2004). Furthermore, non-HLLs may have come to the conclusion that this is the reality of the language classroom, and thus feeling intimidated and uncomfortable will not resolve any discrepancies or gaps in the language levels. Although the results are not certain, the suggestion of an impact warrants further study to provide more definitive conclusions.

Since many of HLLs come with a language background (18 always spoke Arabic at home, 14 spoke it sometimes, and only 4 did not speak it), non-HLLs may have felt or even found their presence beneficial, at least in the lower level classes. More exposure to the sound system and pronunciation is warranted. Although HLLs do not view much benefit in having non-HLLs present in their class, they do not see any harm. To HLLs, the presence of non-HL learners is part of the classroom setting. In fact they may have felt motivated, since they witnessed other students from other backgrounds learn their language, despite the negative stereotypes with which Arabic is associated.

It is interesting, however, and may seem contradictory, that non-HLLs think that the presence of HLLs impedes their learning. This is in agreement with what was proposed by Kagan & Dillon (2001). In this situation, it is assumed that HLLs with a higher level of proficiency in one of the dialects may feel more comfortable speaking their dialects, at least with each other, and even with non-HLLs. It is harder for them “to break the habit” as one student put it. To the latter, this proved to impede their learning. Non-HLLs do not have the same level of proficiency HLLs may have. Furthermore, they may feel embarrassed to speak in front of someone who spoke the language for some time, or even their whole life. Beyond the dialect issue, students may sense that the teacher is taking extra time to address the needs of two separate groups, or that HLLs are bored with the material or pace of the class. Finally, since the focus is on MSA, the teacher may be focused on correcting HLLs’ errors that are
of a different nature as that of non-HLLs’ errors, and encourage them to conform the rules of MSA.

As for involving either group more than the other, it is clear that the three teachers (at least in this institution) are aware that even unintentional bias towards either can be detrimental. The focus on heritage students will alienate non-heritage students and make them feel that they do not belong. On the other hand, focusing attention on non-heritage students will give heritage students the impression that the class is not designed to accommodate their needs.

As for the course pace, difficulty and material coverage, and with more than half of the student population being heritage, both groups had similar beliefs to a great extent. The majority believe that the pace, difficulty, and material coverage would not be different without heritage learners. As noted earlier, to many of these HLLs, MSA is a new subject with which they struggle, since they come from households where dialects may be spoken. Even if some have more advanced oral skills in their dialects, this may even hinder their language learning, since the focus of instruction in the classroom is to develop proficiency in MSA. Spoken dialects may interfere negatively in the learning process. It also seems that instructors may also have been aware of this yet did not assume that heritage learners knew about their lesson more than non-HLLs and thus both groups had similar beliefs.

Having two sets of assessment criteria in grading students’ assignments was not an attractive idea. Students do not feel strongly about having two sets of assessments or criteria in grading assignments. One reason for this is that students did not witness any major difference in their grades factoring in their prior oral linguistic background. The assumption by some HLLs that enrolling in Arabic language course will guarantee a good grade is not founded. As one of their instructors, the researcher found that their overall grades had normal distributions. Outliers did exist, but that is the case in most language and non-language classes.

As for having separate classes, post-secondary institutions tend to separate HL and non-HL learners into two separate tracks when possible. First, it is assumed that HL learners have more advanced linguistic skills. Secondly, HL learners are assumed to be able to learn the target language at a more accelerated pace (Kondo,
Placement tests have been created to identify HLLs who have advanced language skills (Xiao, 2006). Nonetheless, Kondo suggested that most of these tests are descriptive, and research investigating the effectiveness and appropriateness of these tests is minimal. In a study of Japanese Heritage and Foreign Language learners, Kondo (2005) found striking similarities in language use and skills among the two groups. Moreover, separate tracks usually exist at lower language levels and emphasize literacy skills. According to Ke (1998), the creation of separate tracks is based on an uninvestigated assumption, namely, that HLLs learn literacy skills quickly and their skills will match those of non-HL learners in a short period of time. This assumption needs to be validated through empirical data (Ke, 1998; Kondo, 2005). Mazzocco (1996) maintained that heritage learners come with a linguistic and cultural wealth that should not be neglected. Valuing the cultural resources of the HLLs will increase their self-esteem and will make them appreciate their skills. According to Scalera (2004):

> recognizing what students know, asking for their contributions and support, helpseveryone. As teachers, we can learn more about the language and culture we are teaching, other students will learn to have respect for an actual speaker of the language, and heritage speakers will feel recognized and supported for the cultural knowledge and linguistic skills they bring to the class (p.3-4).

However, not all heritage learners are culturally well-versed. In fact, some may be unaware of the basic facts about their culture. The fact that some may know about the food and clothing items does not make them rich cultural resources. In this study, the fact that slightly over half (65%) of HLLs feel mixing is beneficial and that 52% of non-HLLs feel the presence of HLLs with advanced language skills impedes their instruction may indicate that that either group does not feel strongly about mixing or separation as a necessity and that they could adjust to either situation.
Conclusion and Implications

The current study examined the students’ inter and intra-group beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions in combined Arabic classrooms. Although the focus of the study was the students of Arabic, its implications may be relevant to other Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs), languages where heritage and non-heritage language learners are combined and taught in the same language setting. The study showed that as there are disadvantages to combined Arabic classes, there are also benefits. On the one hand, HLLs start to appreciate their heritage skills and thus increase their self-confidence. They also learn from the input non-HLLs may bring to the classroom as foreign language learners. On the other hand, non-HLLs will be exposed to native or near native pronunciation and speech, will experience a type of immersion environment (at least in lower level classes), and will acquire cultural knowledge (when and if available). The study showed that Arabic combined classrooms are peculiar and are different from other languages in that the focus is on MSA. HLLs and non-HLLs learn the same language and thus both may struggle, and feel intimidated.

The study showed that students are divided on the issue of separation, and it seems that the diglossic situation plays a big role in students’ perceptions of separation. While non-HLLs may believe that they should be separated from HLLs due to their assumed advanced language proficiency, particularly in listening and speaking, HLLs may not feel the same as their proficiency in MSA is basic, and therefore should take beginning classes with non-HLLs. Secondly, since heritage students are numerous on this campus, they may have a strong connection with non-heritage learners and thus would welcome having them in the same classes.

The results of the current study may alleviate some of the educators’ concerns about combined Arabic classes, and all languages in which there is a balanced population of HLLs and Non-HLLs (which are essentially all LCTLs), as HLLs come to the classroom with similar linguistic backgrounds. However, research may not solve all the issues discussed in this study completely, since part of the problem can be related to students’ needs, expertise in heritage language development, budgets or the availability of infrastructures.
required to meet each group’s needs. Also, until educators agree on the best way to teach combined classes, teachers will need to develop and pilot materials based on the existing research findings and best teaching practices. They will also need to educate themselves on the principles of heritage language education. Differentiating instruction to some extent to suite each group can be implemented to resolve the problem even partly and temporarily. However, differentiating instruction requires performing background assessment, differentiating content, and means of evaluation.

As the role of instructors is instrumental in combined language classes, one implication of the study is that teachers can create a more engaging environment in a combined language classroom setting by using the “situated learning” model. Through this model, learning becomes a process of engagement that creates a “community of practice,” where learning becomes a social activity rather than an individualistic task (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wegner, 2000). In so doing, HLLs and non-HLLs will interact regularly regarding a passion or a concern they both share.

However, as Arabic curricula design witnesses a major shift where dialects are being integrated, the dynamics of the combined classroom will inevitably change. While HLLs may not shy away from using their dialects in the classes anymore, non-HLLs may find HLLs’ presence more useful to their learning as they are learning a variety their classmates use. They may also feel intimidated due to their peers’ higher oral proficiency. Furthermore, the fact that Arabic dialects vary lexically, morphologically, syntactically, and phonologically, HLLs who have a language background in a different dialect from the one being taught or that their peers may use will find themselves at a disadvantage. Arabic educators and practitioners will find a different dilemma to address.
Limitations of the Study and Future Research

This study surveyed students’ beliefs and feelings in combined Arabic classes in only one institution where the rate of HLLs in language classrooms is high. Results may not be generalizable to other combined classes of Arabic. Future research should examine beliefs of students who experienced both separated and mixed language classes. Research will also need to focus on the learners’ needs so that instruction can be differentiated to suit the needs of each group independently.

In the setting where the study was conducted, non-heritage learners may have had a bias and thus skewed responses due to their exposure to heritage students and Arab culture. Studies in other areas where the same rate of exposure does not take place are also needed. Since the conclusions of the study are based on students’ beliefs and perceptions, heritage and non-heritage teachers’ perspectives and attitudes towards HLLs and their language varieties in speaking and writing as well need to be researched to validate such conclusions.
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Appendix 1

Open Ended Questions
Heritage Language Learners Participants

1. Are there any statements on the written questionnaire that you want to respond to in more detail? If so, what is your opinion about those statements?
2. Describe the interactions you have observed between heritage and non-heritage students in your Arabic course.
3. Do you see any advantages to mixing together non-heritage, and heritage students in Arabic courses? Any disadvantages?
4. Would you rather study with only heritage speakers? Why or why not?
5. What do professors do that is helpful/not helpful to you as a heritage speaker?
6. Have your feelings about the mixing of heritage and non-heritage students changed during your years at the university (or respective institution)?
7. What advice do you have for other heritage students in your upper-level Arabic courses? Do you have any advice for non-heritage speakers in your upper-level courses?
8. What, if anything, do you want your professors to know about your situation as a heritage speaker in the language courses? What, if anything, do you want your non-heritage speaking peers to know?
Appendix 2

Open Ended Questions
Non-Heritage Language Learners Participants

1. Are there any statements on the written questionnaire that you want to respond to in more detail? If so, what is your opinion about those statements?
2. Describe what it feels like to be a non-native Arabic speaker in Arabic courses at your institution. How would you describe the interactions you have observed between heritage and non-native students in Arabic courses?
3. Do you see any advantages of studying with a large number of heritage speakers? Any disadvantages?
4. Would you rather study in a class that does not have non-heritage population? Why or why not?
5. What do professors do that is helpful/not helpful to you as a non-heritage speaker? What would you like professors to do?
6. Have your feelings as a non-heritage Arabic speaker changed during your university language experience?
7. What advice do you have for other non-heritage speakers who are just starting to take Arabic courses? Do you have any advice for your heritage/native-speaking peers?
8. What do you want your professors to know about your situation? What do you want your heritage language peers to know?
9. Have you studied another language with heritage students in class? How was it compared to this class?
Community-level Language Planning for Chinese Heritage Language Maintenance in the United States
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Abstract

This paper investigates the development of Chinese heritage language in the United States from the perspective of language policy and planning. The case study examines the Chinese heritage language maintenance through community-based Chinese schools (CHS), and CHS’s relationships with Chinese American community, as well as governments and non-government organizations in China, Taiwan, and the United States. The paper starts with a theoretical discussion on the definition of language policy and planning, and then describes the history and heritage language education of Chinese Americans in the United States. The paper also presents micro-level planning activities initiated by CHSs in the Chinese American community and non-government organizations. Special focus is placed on the interaction between non-government organizations in the US and governmental bodies in Taiwan and mainland China and in the United States. This paper suggests that micro planning of heritage language maintenance is beneficial when initiated in the community, but it can only be developed and sustained within the wider scope of macro-level planning from governments.
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Introduction

Chinese immigration to the United States dates back to the nineteenth century, particularly after the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill also known as the California gold rush. As the oldest and largest Asian American community, the Chinese American community has grown rapidly in size and influence since the 1980s. To maintain the culture and language heritage, the number of Chinese heritage programs (also known as Chinese schools or Chinese weekend schools) in the United States has grown steadily as the immigrants from Chinese-speaking areas increased. While Chinese Americans assimilated into American mainstream society, they also strove to keep the language and cultural identity of their homeland. Chinese heritage language schools or programs (CHS hereafter) emerged in light of the needs of Chinese Americans’ language and culture maintenance in the local communities. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the roles played by local communities, non-government organizations, and governments in the host and source countries in the maintenance and development of Chinese heritage language and culture in younger generations in the United States from the perspective of language policy and planning. Traditionally, language policy and planning are undertaken by governments on a national scale in a top-down approach. However, when the activities of language planning go across diplomatic boundaries and beyond the governance of a nation, the language planning agent, who has the power to change language policy and planning, will affect language development differently in the new context of language ecology. Under the theoretical framework of language policy and planning (Baldauf, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), this paper shows that micro-level language planning activities are initiated and realized in communities, whereas the macro-level planning is essential in providing resources and guidelines. Both micro- and macro-levels of language policy and planning are vital for the continuous development of heritage language and culture and pivotal for building multi-language capacity in the United States.
Theories of language policy and planning

Language planning is traditionally considered large-scale (macro) planning projects, often undertaken by governments with the purpose of influencing ways of speaking or writing within a society. Language policies are bodies of ideas, laws, regulations, rules, and practices intended to achieve some planned language change (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 3). They are usually associated with the state and with political decision making. Language policy may be in a form of official language planning documents and announcements (e.g. constitutions, legislation, policy statements, or educational directives). It could also be realized in informal statements of intent, or even be left unstated. Language planning, on the other hand, refers to “a set of concrete measures taken within language policy to act on linguistic communication in a community” (Bugarski, 1992 cited in Schiffman, 1996, p. 3). Language planning is about influencing the language behavior of local communities. While most language planning is described as a large-scale activity, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 52) proposed that language planning occurs at several levels: the macro (government level), the meso (regional level), and the micro (local level). In traditional macro-planning, the fundamental planning is conceptualized and carried out in a top-down approach and language policy decisions are implemented via meso- and micro-level involvement and support. On the other hand, non-governmental organizations and various institutions can be important “actors” in language planning in a bottom-up approach and play a crucial role in the initiation and implementation of such policies. Baldauf (2006) argues:

“micro planning refers to cases where businesses, institutions, groups or individuals hold agency (who has the power to influence change) and create what can be recognized as a language policy and plan to utilize and develop their language resources; one that is not directly the result of some larger macro policy, but is a response to their own needs, their own ‘language problems’, their own requirement for language management.” (p. 155)
The purpose of this paper, then, is to demonstrate a case of micro planning for the Chinese immigrants in the United States, which involves local communities, non-governmental organizations, governments in the context of immigrants’ source and host countries. Micro-level planning initiatives complement macro-level language planning while macro-level and micro-level planning coexist to carry out activities. Fishman (1991) has argued that immigrants’ heritage language behavior can only be influenced to benefit the minority language if the community itself is motivated to do so. The Chinese heritage language maintenance is supported by governments in Taiwan and in Mainland China, but the activities of the local communities and non-governmental organizations are realized through micro-level language planning activities in the United States. Micro-level language planning is initiated in the community, but can only be understood within the larger scope of macro-level planning. Micro-planning activities in the Chinese American Community cannot be sustained simply by the local communities themselves in the long run. They rely on communities having access to, and links with, expert support for both content and methodology.

Using a framework of language policy and planning, Baldauf (2006) proposed that the practice of explicit and implicit language policy and planning can take the form of any four major types: status planning (about society); corpus planning (about language); language-in-education (acquisition) planning (about learning); and prestige planning (about image). Each of these four types of language planning can be realized under one of two approaches: (1) a policy approach, which emphasizes form (basic language and policy decisions and their implementation), or (2) a cultivation approach, which emphasized function (language development and use). The language planning activities described in this paper fit in large part under the categories of status planning (planning of language use in the society), corpus planning (about language form), and acquisition planning (the planning of the learning of the selected language by the community). These activities aim at the maintenance of mostly Mandarin Chinese in the first generation among younger learners and transmitting the language to the second and third generations. Some of the cultural activities may not directly relate to the use of Chinese
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heritage language but aim at strengthening the community spirit and networking through traditional festivals and holiday celebrations. The maintenance of Chinese heritage language is seen by the community as a crucial tool in identity maintenance and inheritance of traditional culture. The following is an outline of the paper: the first section reviews the waves of Chinese immigrants to the United States and the Chinese heritage language maintenance in the community, the second section examines the micro-planning in the United States, the third section discusses the macro-planning in the context of host and source countries, and final section discusses micro-level language planning initiatives in the Chinese community of the United States.

Chinese in the United States and Chinese heritage education

The term Chinese Americans, in this paper, refers to people who were born in Chinese speaking areas (mostly in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and East and Southeast Asia) residing in the United States, or people born in the United States with at least one parent of Chinese origin. The term of Chinese heritage speakers refers to those who have access to Chinese speech community, either listening or speaking Chinese heritage language(s) (Mandarin Chinese, Cantonese, Southern Min/Taiwanese, or other dialects spoken in China) at home but use English in other domains.

There were few Chinese immigrants in America before 1848 and they were mainly merchants, students, and sailors. In general, Chinese immigrants came to the US in three major waves that corresponded to and reflected Chinese history and US immigration laws. These waves were the migration after the California Gold Rush in the mid-1880s, after the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965, and after 1980.

The first wave of Chinese arrived in the US was mostly male laborers from southern China, fleeing from a civil war known as the Taiping Rebellion, for the California Gold Rush between 1848 and 1860, and for the first transcontinental railway construction between 1860 and 1870 (Takaki, 1989; Tuan, 1998). At the time the Chinese were treated far worse than most other ethnic minorities, as evident in a series of discriminatory laws, e.g. the Nationality Act of 1870, the
Page Law of 1875, the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, and the Immigration Act of 1924 (Chen, 1993; Hing, 1993; Lyman, 1974; Sung, 1967). In particular, the Chinese Exclusion Act passed by Congress in 1882 prohibited skilled and unskilled Chinese laborers from entering the United States for ten years and was the first Federal law that excluded a single group of people on the basis of race. This law was then extended by the Geary Act in 1892. The Chinese who approached American society then were sojourner strangers, who clung to their Chinese culture and ethnic group and remained unassimilated into mainstream American society, which was largely because of the hostile environment, cultural differences, and racial discrimination (Chen, 1993; Chin, 1996). Chinese Americans were segregated from the mainstream society and their children were not allowed to attend public schools outside of Chinatowns before 1884 (Yung, 1995). The offspring of Chinese immigrants learned Chinese to maintain Chinese language skills that would be needed for continuing education upon returning to China, to survive racial discrimination, and to adjust to life in Chinatowns. Many early Community-based Chinese schools were concentrated in Chinatowns, particularly in the San Francisco area before the 1880s (Lai, 2000; Wang, 1982). As stated by Iris Chang (2003), “Chinese-language schools represented the hope and efforts of first-wave immigrant parents’ eager to maintain in their American-born children some vestige of their Chinese heritage” (p.182). After WWII, more Chinese heritage schools were established outside of Chinatowns in suburban areas by religious groups, local civic groups, and groups of parents, but the instructional hours were reduced by half, to only 2-3 hour weekend classes, due to the distance between Chinese schools and homes of Chinese Americans. Nevertheless, these schools were few in number compared to the CHSs, which ran on a daily basis, in Chinatowns (Lai, 2001). After WWII, the number of Chinese schools was reduced to a record low, due to the changing attitudes of immigrants toward Chinese language and the increasing job opportunities in the U.S. (Chen, 2009).

With the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965, the second wave of immigration presented more diverse demographics from different Chinese-speaking areas. The immigration laws passed in 1970 and 1976 gave preference to those
with professional skills or those seeking family reunification, so well-educated intellectuals, highly skilled workers, and professionals from Taiwan and Hong Kong made up the second wave of Chinese immigration (Espiritu, 1997; Hing, 1993; Takaki, 1989). In addition to relieved US immigration laws, political situations such as the Chinese Communist Revolution in 1949, the replacement of People’s Republic of China (PRC) over Republic of China (ROC, Taiwan) in the United Nations in 1971, and the end of the Vietnam War in 1975, all contributed to the influx of Chinese into the United States. There was no immigration from mainland China from 1949 to 1977 due to restrictions on emigration in China. There was a large influx of refugees from Southeast Asia, many of them ethnic Chinese, who arrived from 1974 to 1984 as a result of the US policy in the area (Wong, 1988). The increasingly heterogeneous first- and second-generation Chinese Americans did not cluster in old urban Chinatown, but spread into suburban areas. The demographic traits of these immigrants could be characterized as young, educated, and entrepreneurial (Chen, 2006). A new trend of cultural assimilation into mainstream American culture among the new immigrants, coupled with the pressure to achieve scholastic excellence in English-language schools at the expense of Chinese lessons, caused the operation of Chinese schools to gradually shift to weekend classes as an alternative to daily ones after the 1960s. By the 1970s, many parents’ attitudes regarding sending children to CHSs changed because their main objective had become acquiring awareness of their ancestral heritage. Due to the movement of Chinese families to suburban areas, the number of schools continued to multiply across the United States (Li, 1997).

The third wave of immigration started around the 1980s. While the United States recognized the People’s Republic of China (PRC, mainland China) and broke diplomatic relations with Republic of China in Taiwan in 1978, the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979 gave Taiwan and China separate immigration quotas. With the open door policy, an increased number of students from China arrived at graduate schools and found employment after graduation in the US. There was also a steady stream of working-class Chinese, both legal and illegal, who arrived in the U.S. from China. Under British rule, Hong Kong was considered a separate jurisdiction for the purpose of
immigration, and this status continued after the handover in 1997 as a result of the Immigration Act of 1990. The fact that the United States maintained separate quotas for Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, aided the increase of Chinese immigrants and Chinese American communities. The more affluent people emigrating from Hong Kong and Taiwan have created modern versions of Chinatowns such as the “Little Taipei” in Monterey Park (California), Flushing (Queens, New York), or in many suburbs in California and New Jersey in the 1980s (Cao & Novas, 1996; Hung, 2007; Takaki, 1989). The last group includes professionals, students, and their families who came from China around and after the Tiananmen Square protests in 1989 (Zweig & Chen, 1995). Ethnic Chinese from China started to outnumber those from Taiwan and other areas in the 1990s. In terms of language use, because of the influx of more diverse Chinese immigrants in the 70s, Mandarin Chinese gradually superseded Cantonese (a major language of communication in the Chinese American community since the 19th century) as the predominant language of instruction in the Chinese heritage programs in the 1980s. Most immigrants from Taiwan clustered around southern California and new Chinese heritage programs were established each year since 1971 to the peak time in the 1990s (Chen, 2009). While the number of Chinese heritage programs with children of parents from Taiwan decreased gradually after the 1990s, the number of Chinese heritage programs with children from mainland China continues to grow as new immigrants continue arriving in the United States.

Currently, Chinese American immigrants are the fourth-largest immigrant group in the United States after Mexican, Filipino, and Indian immigrants. The Chinese immigrant population grew rapidly during the 1990s and 2000s. Today there are almost as many native-born US citizens who claim Chinese ancestry as there are Chinese immigrants. In 2010, there were 3,538,407 Chinese Americans, which constitutes 1.2 percent of the entire U.S. population and 22.2 percent of Asian Americans. With regard to language use, of the 281 million people who were five years and older in the United States in 2007, 55.4 million, or 19.7 percent, reported speaking a language other than English at home. After English and Spanish, Chinese was the language most commonly spoken at home.
From 1980 to 2007, the percentage of speakers of Chinese (age five and older) grew by 290 percent, at nearly 2.46 million. Chinese Americans are overwhelmingly bilingual; 83.4 percent speak more than one language at home (Cantonese, Mandarin, Taiwanese, or other languages) (U.S. Census, 2010). There are currently over 1,000 Chinese heritage programs across the US, with concentration in major metropolitan cities such as Los Angeles, New York City/Northeast New Jersey, and San Francisco. (Cheng, 2011)

**Grass-root micro-planning in the United States**

This section describes some of the main organizations as ‘actors’ of micro-planning and some of the main activities as micro-planning initiatives. The central micro-level language planning agents for the Chinese Americans in the United States are the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS) and the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS). These two are voluntary, non-profit organizations operating at national level. The former maintains a working relationship with Taiwan, the latter with mainland China. The NCACLS, established on April 16th, 1994, is composed of 15 regional associations within or across states, under which individual community-based Chinese heritage schools (CHS) participate as member schools. NCACLS was led by educators who strongly favored teaching traditional characters and using phonetic symbols. Thus CHSs advocating simplified characters and Hanyu Pinyin decided to organize a separate group. In May 1994, the same year NCACLS was founded, representatives from five schools met in Washington, D.C. to establish the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS) to promote the Chinese language using simplified characters and Hanyu Pinyin Romanization (CSAUS, 2008). In spite of different preferences of Chinese written scripts, both organizations share similar goals of promoting Chinese language and culture in the Chinese American community and society in the United States.

NCACLS has about 400 CHSs with approximately 70,000 students in 2009 (Lu, 2010). Although some regional associations had organized cultural events and activities prior to 1994, the
establishment of the national organization enabled them to consolidate their resources and share experiences within a larger network. These CHSs, favoring the instruction of traditional Chinese characters, were established after WWII and were most numerous in the U. S. before the 1990s. The NCACLs initiated short- and long-term language planning activities for member regional associations across the United States by publishing newsletters, organizing annual national conferences in major cities and an annual symposium at the Convention of the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and coordinating teacher professional development workshops, student summer camps, SAT II practice tests, culture knowledge contests, as well as major cultural and social events. With the support from the Overseas Compatriot Affairs Commission in Taiwan, NCACLs has led the editorial team to design and develop textbook series and supplementary materials, Mei Zhou Hua Yu, targeted at Chinese heritage speakers in the United States (Chang, 2006; Mao, 2011).

The other national organization, the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS), was established on May 10th, 1994. It has about 400 CHSs as members with approximately 100,000 students in 2009. Unlike OCACLs, CSAUS has no member of regional associations; individual Chinese heritage schools belong to the CSAUS directly. The CSAUS publishes newsletters twice a year, holds biannual conferences for school members across 43 states since 1995, and organizes student roots-seeking summer camp trips to China since 2002. It has coordinated national-level culture contests and standardized language tests such as China's Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi, known as HSK or the Chinese Proficiency Test, and Youth Chinese Test (YCT), as well as social and cultural events (CSAUS, 2008; CSAUS Newsletter, 2011). With support from the Chinese government, the CSAUS initiated and helped edit a Chinese textbook series “Zhong Wen/Chinese,” a widely used textbook in Chinese heritage schools, published by Jinan University in China (CSAUS, 2008).

The crucial role that the NCACLs and CASUS play is representing the Chinese heritage community's interests at all official levels. For instance, numerous school districts have approved the high school foreign language credits be awarded to students of CHSs
since 1986 (Chen, 1996; Lai, 2001; Liu, 1996). The NCACLS and CASUS, with support from source countries, lobbied for the addition of a Chinese language and culture subject to the Advance Placement test (commonly known as AP Chinese), which started in 2007. The input from these national organizations regarding Chinese language education was sought out by government officers in the United States and overseas.

Government and Non-government Institutions in the Source Countries

Micro-level planning initiatives involve maintaining a close cooperation with several government bodies and non-government organizations in source counties, ROC in Taiwan and PRC. One of these key government organizations is the Taiwan Overseas Compatriot Affairs Commission (OCAC). Because the founding father of the Republic of China, which overthrew the Qing Dynasty in 1911, was a Chinese American, overseas Chinese (also Chinese diaspora) have always been considered a wealth of resource and support for the Chinese homeland. In October 1926, considering the importance of overseas Chinese affairs, the Kuomintang government then established the "Overseas Compatriot Affairs Commission" as the single administrative agency in the government for the welfare of Chinese overseas. After the communist party took over China in 1949 and the Kuomintang government moved to Taiwan, overseas Chinese became even more important for the government in Taiwan to form allies and international support. In 1971, the People’s Republic of China replaced the Republic of China in the United Nations; Taiwan became more isolated from the international communities. After the United States recognized the People’s Republic of China (PRC, mainland China) and broke diplomatic relations with the Republic of China in Taiwan in 1978, the OCAC shifted its focus from Asia to the United States in order to continue Taiwan’s relationship with the U.S. through non-diplomatic relationships. With the increase of Taiwanese immigrants to the US, due to the unstable political situation in Taiwan, the OCAC has assisted the CHSs by subsidizing textbooks teaching traditional Chinese characters, and by sending master teachers to conduct
training workshops since the 1980s (Hong, 2006). The OCAC has also hosted teacher training workshops on e-learning since 1990, established twelve “Overseas Chinese Culture Center” in major cities in the US since 1985, hosted the “E-learning Huayu of Taiwan (http://www.huayuworld.org ),” an online resources for Chinese teaching and learning center. It has sponsored the publication of instructional materials for overseas Chinese, international conferences on Overseas Chinese and Chinese language education, Youth Chinese language and culture seminars in Taiwan since 1970 as well as subsidizing CHS summer camps in the United States since 1985 (Chang, 2006; Li, 1997).

Not until the 1970s did the government of the People’s Republic of China reconsider the role of overseas Chinese in economic and cultural exchange in international affairs. The central governmental body “Overseas Chinese Affairs of State Council,” established in 1978, is an administrative office which assists the Premier in handling overseas Chinese affairs for forming liaisons with Chinese residing abroad or returning to China. Under the state office, there are thirty “Municipal Government Offices for Overseas Nationals” in major cities across China (Overseas Chinese Affairs of State Council, n.d.). Since the 1990s, they have engaged more actively in supporting the development of instructional materials for Chinese heritage speakers, Chinese teacher training workshops, and organizing Roots-seeking Summer Camps in China for the younger generation of Overseas Chinese, hosting the Overseas Chinese Language and Culture Education Online (http://www.hwjiyw.com/), selecting Models Chinese Heritage Schools, Outstanding teachers and personnel in promoting Chinese language education, and sponsoring Chinese language and culture contests (Overseas Chinese Language and Culture Education Online, n.d.) Though the governmental language policy and planning for Chinese heritage language maintenance started 20 years later than that of Taiwan, the scope and support for Chinese heritage language education is unprecedented (Kao, Kao & Kao, 2010; Rao, 2010).

Micro-planning also involves building contacts with non-government organizations. Such organizations include the World Chinese Language Association (WCLA), established in 1972 in Taiwan, with the goals of promoting research on Chinese language
and Chinese language teaching and encouraging scholarly exchange of Chinese language education in the world. With 2000 members around the globe, the WCLA has provided pivotal services in providing Chinese language teacher training workshops since 1977. These services also include the publication of a Chinese teaching magazine, Chinese teaching research journal, Chinese learning textbooks, and books on Chinese language teaching for professional development, and organizing the triennial International Conference on Teaching Chinese as a Second Language since 1984 (World Chinese Language Association, n.d.). Another major non-government organization in China is the “China Overseas Exchange Association” (COEA), which was established in 1990, aiming at connecting overseas Chinese and their organizations and promoting culture exchange and collaboration in trade, business, technology, education, culture, news media, travel, sports and social welfare. Collaborating with governmental organizations in China, the COEA has served as a bridge between governmental organizations in China and the Chinese School Association in the United States with a wealth of resources and supports for the micro-planning activities in the U.S.

**Acquisition Planning: Chinese schools in the United States**

Micro-level language planning, particularly acquisition planning plays a crucial role in ensuring that new immigrants, and second and third generation Chinese American children have access to Chinese courses in the United States.

Chinese American children have two options for studying Chinese in the United States. One is in the mainstream educational system from Kindergarten to grade twelve. Because of insufficient numbers of Chinese language programs in public elementary schools, such programs are usually found in private schools, and few immersion or bilingual schools. In spite of the increasing number of Chinese programs at high school level, the Chinese program goals in the mainstream education sector do not generally consider the special linguistic needs of Chinese heritage speakers. The second option of the Chinese American Children is community-based Chinese heritage schools, which are generally funded by religious groups, local civic
groups, and groups of parents, the majority of whom are suburbanites, scientists and other educated professionals. School administrators and teachers are typically volunteers with little or limited training or preparation in curriculum and instruction in the Chinese language. These programs are generally of three types: weekend, after-school, and summer, but the majority of them are weekend programs, which last mostly two or three hours per week and the classes include not only language but also culture and, sometimes, tutorial lessons in English, mathematics, music or arts (Wang, 1996). These Chinese teachers often do not fully understand the different culture values and classroom management styles of the American schools to which the students of CHSs are accustomed (Li, 2010; Schrier, 2009). Thus, students in the CHSs often are not highly motivated and they attend CHSs for the sake of their parents, rather than intrinsic motivation (Li, 2010; Zhang, 2009; Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009). In the same time, the CHSs often serve as hub of social and cultural activities of local Chinese American communities, particularly for new immigrants who wish to remain connected with their cultural heritage and socialized with people from the same ethnic background. The development of CHSs is often related to the demographic evolution of local Chinese American communities (Cheng, 2010).

The CHSs associated with the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS) have strongly favored teaching traditional characters and have generally adopted textbooks and materials designed by scholars in Taiwan. Because of the decline in the number of age-school children from parents of Taiwan and the use of simplified Chinese characters in the Chinese programs in public school system, the number of students learning traditional Chinese characters has declined in recent years, as evident in the decreasing number of CHS schools associated with NCACLS over the past 10 years (Lu, 2010). Many of these CHSs have started to teach simplified Chinese characters as well. On the other hand, the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS), typically connected with the People’s Republic of China, generally use textbooks, designed and published in China, with simplified characters (Chao, 1997). While the instructional materials produced overseas are often provided free or at a minimal cost, which is ideal
for CHSs on a tight budget, other problems are present. For example, the theme or subject matter of many lessons differs from the students' perspectives and daily experiences in North America. Other lessons are too elementary and are not suited to the age or mental development of Chinese American teenagers (Lai, 2004). Some of the exciting instructional materials created overseas may not help Chinese American students better understand Chinese culture as it exists in the American context. Nevertheless, recent publications of Chinese textbook series and supplementary materials of Mei Zhou Hua Yu and Zhong Wen, successfully exemplified the collaboration between the national Chinese heritage school organizations, NCSACLS and CSAUS, and governmental and non-governmental organizations in source countries. While additional materials available for Chinese language education exist, a systematic approach to evaluating appropriate materials for heritage Chinese learners suitable to meet the needs of various age groups is in strong demand.

Traditionally, students in community-based CHSs are from Chinese heritage families. However, there have been increasing numbers of students from typical English-speaking families attending local Chinese community schools in recent years due to the lack of Chinese language programs in existing formal school systems (Wang, 2007). CHSs with enough student enrollments from heritage families and families with adopted children from China could create different tracks for students learning Chinese as heritage speakers and for students learning Chinese as a foreign language. However, the diverse student backgrounds in the CHSs often present a consistent challenge for teachers and administrators for smaller CHSs where all students are mixed in one class. In addition, the continuity of these schools is largely dependent on the number of Chinese American children in the local community and their level of motivation to maintain or learn Chinese. Given the decreasing immigrants from Taiwan and larger numbers of Chinese programs teaching simplified Chinese characters in the Chinese programs of K-12 mainstream schools, recruiting new students to these classes teaching traditional Chinese characters is one of the challenges and main micro-planning activities that the community undertakes.

One of the recurring problems of the quality of Chinese heritage schools is the qualification of Chinese teachers, resulting
from the nature of part-time teaching staff in community-based programs. While many heritage language teachers are typically native Chinese parents and professionals in other disciplines, or graduate students who need teaching experience, they often have little experience or training in the pedagogy of foreign languages or Chinese instruction and curriculum. Furthermore, isolated within their local community, they are often not connected to language resources. Given the situation in which teachers of Chinese community schools have become the pool of human resources for the K-12 formal school system, a dialogue between educators in both heritage sector and the mainstream education sector is much needed. Some CHSs have actively sought out collaborative opportunities with educators in the mainstream education system. The STARTALK program, a presidential Initiative started in 2007 to fund summer programs in critical languages in the US, has provided a new venue for teachers in CHSs in professional development and in building dialogues with educators in the mainstream. Several regional associations of Chinese heritage schools, in collaboration with local school districts and universities, have been awarded with grants in organizing student programs and teacher training programs in the summer since 2007. With federal funding, the CHSs such as Consortium of Illinois Language Schools, Consortium of Texas Chinese Language Institutes, Delaware Valley Chinese School, Southern California Council of Chinese Schools, Consortium of Chinese Heritage Language Schools in Southern California, and Association of Chinese Schools successfully initiated and implemented micro-planning activities to enhance CHS teacher quality and to promote Chinese language and culture not only in the Chinese American community, but also in general public education.

Discussion and Conclusion

From the various organizations and activities described in the previous sections, it is clear that micro-planning in the Chinese American community is diverse and has demonstrated a unique case of language planning which operates on multiple levels: involving local communities, government, and non-government organizations both in the host country (the United States) and in the source
countries (Taiwan and PRC). The major goals of the micro-planning activities are to maintain Chinese language and culture heritage in the Chinese American community and promote language and culture exchange in national and international domains, even though the language learning needs and opportunities of the community are often not met by the mainstream education system of the host country. From the networking activities that the community has initiated, the motivation to transmit Chinese culture and language to the next generations will continue to be strong for several decades.

Chinese Americans have a large number of community-based Chinese heritage schools which help them preserve their culture and language heritage. Despite the Chinese Americans’ relative demographic weaknesses – such as the numerical weakness as ethnic minorities in the U.S. and geographic dispersion, particularly in regions other than coastal areas – the community has maintained a variety of activities through various government and non-government organizations in both host country and source countries. Language policies do not necessarily bring the desired effects on the linguistic environment of migrant communities. It is essential that the Chinese American community take initiatives for the maintenance and development of the cultural and linguistic heritage, although differences exist among individual CHSs. This is especially true for some CHSs with decreasing student enrollment and shifts of instruction in Chinese written scripts. In the context of national security in the U.S. and rising demands for professional functional speakers in the global economy, it is clear that macro-planning and government level language policy need to be supported by such micro-planning in order to tap into the rich linguistic resources of heritage language communities.

From the case of the micro-planning activities in the Chinese American community, it is also crucial that the community has access to and connect with expert support for both content and methodology. In this regard, the development of instructional materials, teacher training workshops and conferences, as well as social/cultural events organized by regional CHS associations and national organizations (NCACLS, and CSAUS) are exemplary. These micro-planning activities address the need to articulate the desired outcomes of the Chinese heritage education, the need for shared
thinking, planning and action in order to cultivate the future of the Chinese American community in the United States. Some initiatives have come to fruitful results in preserving cultural traditions, building Chinese language capacity, and creating connections and opportunities for personal enrichment and career advancement. While the Chinese American community as a whole is successful in addressing various language needs, the planning activities seem somewhat loose at the local community level, particularly in smaller Chinese heritage schools. There is no explicit and consistent policy which describes language planning goals regarding curriculum and instruction in many small CHSs. Attracting young members of the community to the various community-based CHSs, managing programs on a tight budget and maintaining high quality teaching staff and curriculum are still found to be challenging tasks for language planners. Still, the numerous initiatives on the micro level are to some extent guided by the national and regional level networking, mainly through two CHS national non-government organizations.

As shown earlier, both the source countries and the host country have an essential part to play in micro-planning activities. While the support from source countries seems to be more accessible than that from the host country in the case of the Chinese American community, it is evident that language policy and macro-planning at government level create opportunities and provide resources and support for the implementation of activities in maintaining heritage language and culture in local community-based Chinese heritage schools. Non-government organizations also play a critical role in this dynamic process by identifying common needs, planning activities, linking various groups, and reacting to constant changes in the Chinese heritage schools and local communities. Clearly, the case of Chinese American community in language planning can provide a useful example for other critical language communities. In spite of the success of STARTALK initiatives in recent years, consistent national macro-level language policy and diverse planning activities are still much needed for sustainable and lasting effects on heritage language maintenance in the United States.
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Abstract

The present study aimed to reveal how learners of Chinese as a foreign language use mobile technology to study Chinese outside the classroom. Researchers used sociocultural perspectives to frame the study and grounded theory to analyze data. Eleven English-speaking students who had learned Chinese for different years at a midwestern university participated in the study. They answered 23 major questions by submitting journal entries and participating in an interview.

Compared with computer assisted language learning, mobile devices bring changes to tutorial functions, social computing, and gaming. Participants heavily explored tutorial functions, used mobile devices differently from computers for social computing, and showed interest in gaming. Although participants were enthusiastic about using mobile devices to learn Chinese, the number of applications they used and the variety of activities they engaged in were limited. Findings suggest that the effective incorporation of mobile devices to learn Chinese depends on collaboration and scaffolding.

Introduction

Mobile technologies are becoming more accessible and popular. Meanwhile, the number of students learning Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) has increased steadily. More than 60,000 students studied Chinese at American colleges and universities in the fall of 2009, representing an increase of more than 18% since 2006 (Modern Language Association, 2010). Within this context, it is crucial to consider the role mobile devices might play in helping students to learn Chinese. Researchers in the field of computer assisted language learning (CALL) agree that the use of technology in specific language learning situations is more significant than the technology itself (Kern,
The purpose of this study was to explore how CFL learners use mobile devices to learn Chinese.

**Literature Review**

Blake (2011) describes CALL in terms of the following three categories: “tutorial CALL, social computing CALL, and CALL gaming” (p. 21). Blake summarizes that tutorial CALL is conducive to vocabulary development. Within tutorial CALL, Blake also discusses the availability of some programs for intelligent CALL, which can specifically respond to individuals. In terms of social computing CALL, Blake notes that computer-mediated communication (CMC) has been a focus of study. Synchronous CMC means students engage in communication through the use of computers at the same time. Earlier studies by Beauvois (1992), Chun (1994), Kelm (1992), and Kern (1995) provide evidence of synchronous CMC facilitating language learning. As to gaming, Blake (2011) characterizes it “as a viable way to stimulate learning a second language” (p.27).

**Sociocultural Theory**

Taking the socio-cognitive approach, Kern, Ware, and Warschauer (2004) summarize CALL research into “three key themes: (1) linguistic interaction, (2) intercultural learning, and (3) literacy and identity” (p. 244). Warschauer (2005) applies Vygotsky’s theories of learning to CALL and concludes that “mediation, social learning, and genetic analysis” (p. 41) are all of great relevance. From sociocultural theory into the field of second language acquisition, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) introduce key concepts, “namely mediation and regulation, internalization, and the zone of proximal development …” (p. 216).

Kern (2006) argues for diversified theoretical frameworks for CALL. For sociocultural theory, he points out that it focuses on “the social and cultural situatedness of learner activity, learners’ agency in co-constructing meanings (as well as their own roles), and the importance of mediation by tools and signs” (p. 187). Blyth (2008) summarizes four major theoretical frameworks for CMC research: “technological, psycholinguistic, sociocultural, and ecological” (p. 55). Because sociocultural theory constitutes an important framework for
CALL research, the interpretation of data in the present study is framed by sociocultural perspectives.

**Mobile Devices and Language learning**

Mobile technology brings its own special features. Chinnery (2006) discusses the availability and portability of mobile devices and also identifies some accompanying problems. Godwin-Jones (2011) points out the new features of mobile devices and the importance of their associated software.

Various studies have investigated the use of mobile technology for language learning. Kukulska-Hulme and Shield (2008) summarize that mobile research has focused on either content (i.e., “the development of activity types and learning materials,” p. 274) or design (i.e., “design issues and learner needs,” p. 278). They point out that content-related research has focused on studies which delivered materials to students without studying “learner collaboration or communication,” while design-related research does not fully explore the unique features of mobile devices (p. 280). Stockwell (2010) compares the use of mobile devices to that of computers. He finds no major distinctions between the two kinds of devices in terms of student learning although mobile devices require more time than computers. He further asserts that “mobile learning for language learning has reached a stage where it is starting to move out of the classroom and into the real world” (p. 107). Lan, Sung, and Chang (2007) conclude that mobile devices can help learners of English as a second language collaborate in reading in addition to bringing other benefits. As suggested by Kukulska-Hulme (2007), the ways people actually use mobile technology will ultimately determine its effectiveness.

**CALL for Learning Chinese**

Because of specific features of character orthography, pronunciation, and meaning (detailed in Wang & Leland, 2011), learning characters and words requires a lot of time for CFL learners whose native languages use Roman alphabetic letters. Consequently, research has focused on tutorial CALL, with CMC and gaming yet to be explored further. Specifically, researchers conclude that e-dictionaries (i.e., an online pop-up dictionary) can help beginning
CFL learners improve reading and comprehension of simple materials (Wang & Upton, 2012), and e-dictionaries (i.e., an application that is downloaded) can help intermediate CFL learners learn vocabulary and improve reading comprehension (Wang, 2011).

Mobile devices also bring interesting features to the study of Chinese. Godwin-Jones (2011) describes the possibility of using one’s finger to write characters on the screen and typing pinyin to input characters into mobile devices. The feature of finger writing characters is unique to mobile devices. The existence of innovations underscores the importance of studying learners’ self-initiated activities related to language learning outside the classroom.

**Methods**

**Participants**

Participants came from a large urban university in the Midwest. The university provides excellent infrastructure for technology use. Besides taking Chinese language courses on campus, students can study abroad in China through the summer study abroad or regular semester programs. Students also have chances to interact with native Chinese speakers on campus.

Around 50 students who were taking, or had recently taken, Chinese language courses were contacted about the research project of studying the use of mobile devices for learning Chinese. Fifteen out of the 50 students (around 30%) stated that they had used mobile devices to learn Chinese, and 13 of them actually signed the consent forms and were offered a stipend. At the end of the study, 11 participants answered questions in six journals and in an interview and were given another stipend.

The 11 participants, four females and seven males, came from seven Chinese language courses ranging from the first to the third year of language learning. Specifically, two were in the first year of language study, five were in the second year, and four were in the third year. Some of the participants had studied abroad either in mainland China or Taiwan. Among the 11 participants, there was one heritage learner who came to the U.S. at an early age. In summary, the participants represented the students who used mobile devices for learning Chinese at that university well.
Methodology

The present study uses grounded theory, which is described as “the discovery of theory from data” by Glaser and Strauss (1967, p. 1). Grounded theory is a research method based on “inductive strategies of theory development” (Patton, 2002, p. 125). The main steps of this method are as follows: “Data go to concepts, and concepts get transcended to a core variable, which is the underlying pattern” (Glaser, 2000, p. 840). Grounded theory methodology has been used widely in a variety of disciplines, and it is beginning to be adopted by researchers in second language acquisition. For example, this method has been used to study learners’ perceptions on effective activities to learn Chinese characters (Wang & Leland, 2011).

“Grounded theory depends on methods that take the researcher into and close to the real world so that the results and findings are grounded in the empirical world” (Patton, 2002, p. 125). Applying grounded theory methodology, the two researchers in the present study worked closely with the participants so that their understanding of the research area was situated in the reality of the use of mobile technology.

As a starting point, the researchers were interested in knowing some basic features of mobile devices for learning Chinese. Subsequently, their main focus was to find out how students use mobile devices to facilitate their learning of Chinese. They generated some initial questions and met regularly to raise more questions in the process of doing the study. Based on the existing literature, their research goals, and student responses, the researchers generated 23 major questions. The questions mainly asked students about the kinds of mobile devices and applications they use, the frequency of usage, the reasons for using the applications, their main activities related to learning Chinese, their perceptions about the effects of applications on learning Chinese, the advantages and disadvantages of using mobile devices, and their knowledge of specific applications and plans to use them in the future.
Procedure for Data Collection

During a fall semester, one researcher created a project site on the university’s existing course management system and added all the participants in the study. Every week, she posted three or four questions on the site and asked participants to answer them. In addition, she piloted potential questions with one student to determine their appropriateness and to seek additional information. She asked all of the 11 participants two questions. When she was not clear about journal answers, she sought clarification with the specific students. In the following, pseudonyms are used for student participants. The whole project lasted for about five months.

Results

Responses from the 11 participants to journal and interview questions revealed that they used different mobile devices such as iPhone, iPod touch, Android, Blackberry, and iPad. Some of them had more than one device and most of them used mobile phones. Based on participants’ journal responses and the transcripts of additional interviews, four themes emerged.

Theme One: Participants were Enthusiastic about Mobile Technology

Participants pointed out that mobile devices were convenient, easy to use, fun, and offered innovative features. In addition, they stated that mobile devices were effective for learning Chinese.

Convenient. Participants pointed out the convenience of using mobile devices. In answering the question “What are the advantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese? ” (week 12), ten participants pointed out the convenience of mobile devices. For example, Gil wrote, “I don’t have to carry around several heavy books everywhere I go, I can use it anytime and anywhere, and it is easy to begin studying by just opening an application.” In an interview, Abbi said that mobile devices suited the life style of college students because “most of us college students are mobile.”
Easy to use. Participants also noted that they could easily get the meaning and pronunciation of unknown characters from mobile devices. In answering the question “How do you look up an unknown character in the mobile devices?” (week 10), nine students reported that they used their fingers to write the unknown characters on the screen, and then got the meaning and pronunciation. In answering the question “Generally speaking, how do you feel about using mobile technology to help you study Chinese?” (week 12), Simon wrote, “Personally, I wouldn’t know how to even begin how to use traditional Chinese language dictionaries.” During an interview, Lisa demonstrated that it only took her 15 seconds to identify an unknown character on her iPhone.

Fun. In addition, some participants noted that it was fun to use some applications. In answering the question “What are the advantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese?” (week 12), Jay stated it was “a fun and innovative way to connect the youths of today in learning a language.” In answering the question “Which mobile devices do you see as being most useful to students at various proficiency levels?” (week 12), Gale answered, “I believe the I-phone is the most useful mobile devices for studying Chinese ….Not only do they have educational applications, but also students can play games in Chinese.”

During interviews, some participants demonstrated specific applications they saw as fun to play with. For example, Lisa demonstrated the application of “trainchinese Chinese Writer: Learn Characters by Playing.” She said she was excited to play the game and mentioned that other students who saw the game also wanted to play it.

Innovative. Some participants noted the innovative features of mobile devices for connecting oral with written language. In answering the question “Have you explored any unconventional uses of mobile devices and applications in studying Chinese? If so, please describe these experiences” (week 12), Gale replied:

Google has an application for the iphone that you can speak either Chinese or English into the mobile, and it will translate to the other language. Sometimes I will use this application with
a Chinese student if we can’t figure out how a word should be said or written [sic].

Two students also wrote about using mobile devices to watch TV or movies in Chinese. For example, in answering the question “For what activities do you use mobile technology for learning Chinese?” (weeks 8-9), Jay answered as follows:

The reason I use video streaming sites such as Tudou and Youtube is because I use it [sic] to learn Chinese from the news, songs, and learning programs on them. I also stream Chinese movies from them to improve my Chinese.

**Effective.** More than half of the participants reported that the use of mobile devices improved their language learning. In answering the question “What are the total effects of using mobile devices for learning Chinese?” (week 13), seven clearly pointed out that the use of mobile devices improved their learning of Chinese. For example, Jay wrote:

Due to the convenience in using mobile devices, I find learning Chinese to be much easier because it is a much more contemporary method to learn a language. It is using something that youths of today are familiar with and making it much more integrative and innovative to learning Chinese.

Specifically, some participants reported that it is highly likely that they will remember the characters they looked up. In answering the question “What is the likelihood that you will recognize the character when you encounter it at a later date?” (week 10), five participants wrote that it would be very likely that they would recognize the characters they looked up.

**Theme Two: Participants Mainly Used Mobile Devices for Quick Reference and Sometimes for Practice**

In terms of how participants used mobile devices to learn Chinese, the data suggest that they did not fully make use of the special features offered by mobile devices. Participants were limited in their use of applications to learn Chinese. They mainly used
dictionary and translation applications for quick reference to help with course assignments or overcome communication and comprehension barriers. Sometimes they used mobile devices to practice vocabulary, pinyin, and Chinese numbers.

**Applications.** Participants frequently used dictionary and translation applications, but used other applications less often. In answering the question “On your mobile devices, what applications (e.g., e-dictionary, etc.) do you use?” (weeks 8-9), with the possibility of using more than one application, ten mentioned the use of a dictionary, three mentioned a translator, and two mentioned a flash card application. Other applications were mentioned only once.

Participants used the same dictionary applications. In answering the question “On your mobile devices, what applications (e.g., e-dictionary, etc.) do you use?” (weeks 8-9), nearly all iPhone (iPod touch) users talked about KTdict C-E, while all Android users wrote about the Hanping Dictionary. They specifically mentioned that KTdict C-E is free and very easy to use.

**Quick reference.** Participants mainly used mobile devices to identify unknown characters and get Chinese words from English or pinyin. In answering the question “For what activities do you use mobile technology for the learning of the Chinese language?” (weeks 8-9), with the possibility of engaging in more than one activity, eight wrote about looking up unknown characters and words, five wrote about translating English into Chinese, three mentioned memorizing characters, and two referred to texting or typing in Chinese. For example, Simon wrote:

I usually use these applications to search for the meaning of certain characters I have not encountered before. I also type in pinyin sometimes for the characters I forget how to write. When I need to make a sentence, sometimes I need to look for words I know in English but not in Chinese...

Participants mainly used mobile devices to aid in course assignments. All of the students indicated either in interviews or journal responses that they used mobile devices for coursework. For
example, in answering the question “How often do you use mobile devices to learn Chinese?” (weeks 8-9), Gwen wrote, “I usually use my phone at least every time I work on my homework in the workbook. Even if I can finish my homework without my phone, I still like to use it to check my work.”

In addition, six participants clearly expressed in either interviews or journal responses that they used mobile devices to overcome communication barriers. Some participants stated that they used mobile applications to find Chinese words they needed in the process of oral communication. Simon said in the interview that he used his mobile devices to find Chinese words when he communicated with someone who did not know English. Some participants used mobile applications to get the meaning and the written form of a word when they heard it during face-to-face conversation. For example, in responding to the prompt “Describe the ways you use mobile devices to learn Chinese by interacting with people” (week 13), Gale wrote, “I usually hand my iphone to other people to write the Chinese character into my iphone’s Chinese dictionary to understand what word they are mentioning.” Abbi also added in the interview that if she heard some words she did not know in a conversation with her Chinese friend, she entered pinyin to get the characters.

In addition, two participants expressed in either interviews or journal responses that they used mobile devices to overcome comprehension barriers. They used mobile applications to aid the reading process and to help them read menus and street signs in China.

**Practice.** Sometimes participants used flashcard and game applications for practice. For example, in answering the question “How is your mobile device most helpful to you when you are studying Chinese? (Specifically, do you use your mobile devices more often to identify a Chinese character or to translate an English word into Chinese?)” (week 10), Gil wrote, “I use my iPhone mostly to translate an English word to Chinese, to find a simple phrase, or for flash cards to help memorize Chinese, as I am still learning characters.” In addition, in asking them about their plan to use game applications to practice writing characters, Chinese numbers, and pinyin, most of them confirmed that they plan to do so.
Theme Three: Despite Overall Positive Feelings, Participants Revealed Some Disadvantages and Problems

While maintaining an overall positive tone about using mobile devices to learn Chinese, participants nevertheless pointed out disadvantages and some worried about possible overreliance on mobile technology. In addition, journal responses reveal participants’ limited knowledge of applications and lack of language proficiency.

**Inadequacy and distraction.** Participants pointed out the inadequacy and the distraction of mobile devices and applications. In answering the question “What are the disadvantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese?” (week 12), five pointed out the inadequacy of mobile devices or applications and one mentioned the distraction of mobile technology. In terms of inadequacy, Martin wrote: “The only disadvantage I can think of is in the apps themselves. If grammar and examples of the use … could be found in an app the disadvantages would be mitigated.” Gil identified “running out of battery” as a problem. In regard to distraction, Gale wrote, “It’s easy to get distracted when a text message, email, or a phone call pops up during your study session.”

**Overreliance on technology.** Some participants pointed out potential problems of relying too much on mobile technology for learning Chinese. In answering the question “What are the disadvantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese?” (week 12), four participants pointed out this kind of problem. Lisa stated, “It’s possible that students could rely too heavily on things such as mobile dictionaries, and instead of learning the word, they merely look it up to find meaning for an assignment.” Gwen wrote:

Computer translators tend to translate word-for-word and they don’t always know the correct context for a certain word. It’s easy to learn a word that’s wrong from mobile technology and take it for granted that it’s correct. Also, if you rely on mobile technology too much to translate, you may not actually learn why the sentence is translated the way it is.
Similarly, in answering the question “What are the total effects of using mobile devices for learning Chinese?” (week 13), two participants pointed out the limitation of technology. For example, Bell wrote, “The total effects are perhaps a dangerous benefit on language learning. Mobile technology is a great tool, but easy to become too dependent upon.” Similarly, in an interview, Lisa worried that students may simply look at characters without committing them to memory.

Lack of knowledge and limited proficiency. Some participants may not be aware of the existence of applications which might satisfy their needs. In answering the question “Looking to the future, are there any applications not available now that you think would be helpful? If so, please describe what they would do” (week 13), Martin wrote, “An app that could scan text by taking a picture of a character and then offering the meaning and pinyin would be very useful.” Yet, the application was already available. Applications such as CamDictionary and Pleco can scan characters and give their pinyin and meaning.

Participants’ limited knowledge of the language and low proficiency level may prevent them from using certain applications. For example, in finding the meaning and pronunciation of an unidentified character from a dictionary application, Lisa pointed out that students may not get the character if they are not able to write it in the correct stroke order. Another example is iFlyDictation which can turn dictated Chinese sentences into written form. Several participants read passages to iFly, but the application did not accurately transcribe oral words into written characters because of their imperfect pronunciation and/or intonation.

Theme Four: Collaboration and Teaching Facilitated the Knowing and Using of Mobile Applications.

Participant responses revealed that collaboration helped them to know about applications and how to use them. In addition, it is helpful when instructors teach about the availability and use of applications and incorporate mobile devices into the overall language learning curriculum.
Collaboration. Collaboration was reflected in knowing about the availability of certain devices either indirectly through looking at the reviews of applications posted by other people or directly through getting advice from friends and classmates. In answering the question “How do you typically find out about new applications? (From friends, searching the Internet, advertisements, online stores)” (week 16), with the possibility of giving more than one answer, ten reported searching in online stores and six mentioned learning about applications from other people. Specifically, among the ten who talked about searching in online stores, most of them read reviews by other people; for the students who got their applications from friends, they often learned not only of an application but also about how to use it at the same time.

Teaching about applications. Since individual participants did not know about the existence of many good applications, teaching about the availability of applications would no doubt be helpful to them. For example, none of the participants knew about HanZi Reader. When the researcher introduced this application to the participants, they were all excited about using the application for reading Chinese texts. For example, in answering the question “Do you plan to use it in the future? Why or why not?” (week 18), Jay answered, “Definitely, especially since this can cut and paste from other texts, while providing the English translations and pinyin. It is very handy.”

Since participants may not know how to use certain applications, it might be appropriate to teach them. For example, in answering the question about Hanzi Reader “Do you plan to use it in the future? Why or why not?” (week 18), Martin answered, “This was another very useful app. Reading through the idiom stories with the aid of instant translations was great. Adding text would be even better if you could import from outside the app.” It is possible to copy and paste an e-text into the application, yet the student did not know it.

Participants had different opinions on the effects of mobile devices for different proficiency levels. In answering the question “Students at which proficiency level could benefit most from using mobile devices, why?” (week 13), three participants mentioned that lower level students could gain the most advantage, five thought that
intermediate to advanced participants could get the most, while three thought that all students could benefit from using the devices. In sum, participants lacked overall vision on language learning at different stages, making it relevant and appropriate for instructors to incorporate the use of mobile devices into the language learning curriculum.

**Discussion**

**Special Features of Mobile Devices for Learning Chinese**

Mobile devices offer distinctive features for tutorial functions, mediating communication, and gaming. In terms of tutorial functions, mobile devices may provide more convenient access to vocabulary than computers. For example, one can scan a character and get its meaning and pronunciation. As to intelligent applications, mobile applications can transcribe speakers’ spoken language into written characters. In terms of social computing, mobile devices can provide aid at any time and in any place. In regard to gaming, mobile devices provide engaging games to practice pinyin, Chinese numbers, and characters, because a user can easily interact with applications on the screen.

At the present stage, there are some aspects of mobile devices and applications which need to be improved. Dictionaries on mobile devices usually do not provide usages of words and the Internet connection is often slower than with computers.

**Participants’ Use of Mobile Devices**

With varying frequency, participants used all three functions of mobile devices. Specifically, they used the tutorial functions heavily. They used dictionary and translation applications to get the meaning and pronunciation of unidentified characters and to get characters from English or pinyin. They also used flashcard applications to practice vocabulary, focusing on the written form, meaning, and pronunciation.

As to using mobile devices for social computing, some participants used dictionary and translation applications to facilitate face-to-face communication and to learn Chinese characters in the communication process. Participants used mobile devices differently
from using computers when doing social computing. This finding indicates that mobile devices could mediate face-to-face interaction and facilitate the connections among character written form, meaning, and pronunciation. This finding is new because most studies on mobile technology “in the areas of speaking and listening….focus on asynchronous speaking and listening activities” (Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008, p. 281). This finding is important because as Warschauer (2005) points out, an important area of CALL research is to study “how medium shapes the linguistic interaction” (p. 47). The present research suggests that mobile devices shape the way students engage in communication and the way they learn characters.

In regard to gaming, participants generally had positive attitudes. Some of them have already played games to practice character writing, pinyin, and numbers; the rest plan to play with games in the future.

**Discrepancy between Enthusiasm and Actual Use**

Participants enthusiastically pointed out various advantages of using mobile devices to learn Chinese. The findings agree with Stockwell (2008) who found “over two-thirds of the learners expressed an interest in using mobile phones for language learning in either the short or long terms” (p. 269).

Participants, however, mainly used dictionary and translation applications and did not fully tap into the potentials of mobile devices. There might be several explanations for the lack of use of a wide range of applications. First, participants may not know all the good applications for learning Chinese because of their open and growing nature. Take Hanzi Reader, for example. None of the Apple device users knew about the availability of this free application. In addition, their proficiency levels may deter them from using some applications. Only two participants talked about watching Chinese TV or movies on their mobile devices. It might be because most of the participants had difficulty in understanding Chinese movies and TV. Another example is iFly. Although the students were excited to know about this application, many of them could not use it efficiently. Next, mobile applications may not be perfect. For example, some participants pointed out that dictionary applications often do not provide good examples of usage.
As to actual activities, participants mainly used mobile applications for quick reference to aid their coursework. Although some of them used mobile devices to facilitate face-to-face communication, not everyone had explored this aspect. Researchers have established that CMC is conducive to language learning. Similarly, mobile-mediated communication is also conducive to language learning.

Although participants frequently used mobile devices for quick reference, most of them did not regularly review the characters and words they looked up; only a few mentioned using flashcards to review the learned vocabulary. In sum, the discrepancy between appeal and use highlights the necessity of collaboration and scaffolding.

**Social Learning is Crucial**

Collaboration is important for learning to use mobile technology. In the present study, some participants clearly expressed that they knew about applications from their peers. Obviously collaboration facilitates the knowing of useful applications. Because it is time consuming to go through all the applications to find the needed one, learning from others provides a quick way to know about a good application. In addition, collaboration may provide help on the effective use of applications. Some participants expressed that they learned how to use a certain application from their peers. Furthermore, students may use an application unconventionally, yet effectively. For example, one participant said that she used a translation application to check if her translations in Chinese conveyed the same meaning as the original English sentences. It might be beneficial to let students share their experiences of using mobile applications.

Besides peer collaboration, it is important for instructors to provide scaffolding for students on the use of mobile devices so they may become savvy users of these technologies. First, because students may not know about the availability of good applications, instructors can suggest different applications to students at different proficiency levels. Second, students may not know how to use different language applications effectively, and instructors can provide scaffolding on the effective use of different applications.
With flashcard applications, for example, instructors may remind students to use the applications to practice the characters and words they looked up. Third, instructors may design different communicative tasks for students and ask them to use mobile devices to facilitate face-to-face communication.

As a product of this research, the two researchers created Table 1, which summarizes some useful free applications and their basic functions. It also addresses the question of how helpful these applications might be for students at different proficiency levels. The table might be useful for both instructors and learners.

**Conclusion**

Participants frequently used dictionary and translation applications for quick reference, used mobile devices to aid face-to-face communication, and showed interest in gaming. Although they were enthusiastic and often used mobile devices to learn Chinese, the frequently used applications and the variety of activities were limited. Collaboration and scaffolding are crucial for the effective use of mobile devices to learn Chinese.

When talking about computer technology, Kern and Warschauer (2000) point out, “these new technologies do not only serve the new teaching/learning paradigms, they also help shape the new paradigms” (p. 12). Similarly, the development of mobile technology may also cause changes in instructional practice. Instructors may need to pay special attention to character recognition for the following two reasons. First, the recognition of characters may become more important and relevant than the writing of characters. Besides using a finger to write characters, there are different ways to input characters: using keyboard and using voice input. Hence, the deficiencies in the knowledge of how to write a character may be compensated by technology. Second, unidentified characters can be quickly looked up in mobile devices, yet CFL learners still need to recognize characters and words in order to read texts proficiently.

Furthermore, the advance of mobile devices may make it more relevant for instructors to teach some specific skills. For example, learners need to transcribe sounds with pinyin in order to look up
words which they hear. They also need to know stroke orders to find out an unidentified character quickly from their mobile applications.

This research found an interesting phenomenon that CFL learners use mobile devices to mediate face-to-face communication. For future studies, it would be interesting to further explore this aspect.

The small number of participants limits this study in terms of conclusions that can be drawn. However, the present study yielded some interesting findings that can guide future research and support Chinese language instructors who seek to incorporate mobile technology into their curricula.
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Table 1. List of Free Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proficiency Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTdict C-E (iPhone)</td>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTdict C-E is very easy to use. One can input a character by hand to get its meaning in English, pinyin, and other words which embody the character; one can input pinyin to get characters; and one can input English to get Chinese corresponding words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanping (Android Phone only)</td>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HanZi Reader (iPhone, iPod, iPad only)</td>
<td>Provides pinyin and translations for words in the reading process. Hanzi Reader is a useful pop up Chinese dictionary. A user can copy and paste Chinese texts into the application.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CamDictionary (iPhone and Android Phone only)</td>
<td>Scans written characters and translates</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlideShark (iPad only)</td>
<td>Shows PowerPoint presentations</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Translate</td>
<td>Transcribes oral language into written language, and translates into another language; can also read out in another language</td>
<td>Beginning to Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iFly</td>
<td>Shows dictated Chinese words in written form</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Speak pad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese number Trainer by trainchinese (iPhone, iPod, iPad only)</td>
<td>Provides practice for learning Chinese numbers When playing the game, five numbers appear on the screen with one number read out. If the correct number is chosen, a green check will appear on the number and the box will turn green; if a wrong number is chosen, the red cross will be put on the number with the correct choice entry highlighted in green; and if no choice is made, the numbers will stay on the screen. A string attached to a firecracker keeps on burning, indicating the passing of time. At the end of the game, the firecrackers burned, and the gained scores appear.</td>
<td>Beginning to Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinyin Trainer</td>
<td>Provides practice for learning Pinyin</td>
<td>Beginning to Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Writer</td>
<td>Provides practice for writing characters At the beginning of the game, a character drops from the top. When the character is tapped on, the character is pronounced and enlarged for a player to write the character on</td>
<td>Beginning to Intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the screen with a finger. If the character is written with the correct stroke order, the player can get points; otherwise, the player cannot get any points.

| To Do Two Things at the Same Time—JoyOrange | Tells an idiomatic story in both Chinese and English | Intermediate to Advanced |
| 唐诗三百首豪华版 [300 Tang Poems] (iPad only) | For a total of 300 poems, provides reading of each sentence, reading of each character, self recording, etc. | Advanced |
Appendix
Questions

Journal One
1. What mobile devices (e.g., i-phone, android phone, etc.) do you use to learn Chinese? On your mobile devices, what applications (e.g., e-dictionary, etc.) do you use?
2. For what activities do you use mobile technology for learning Chinese?
3. How often do you use mobile devices to learn Chinese?

Journal Two
4. How is your mobile device most helpful to you when you are studying Chinese? Specifically, do you use your mobile devices more often to identify a Chinese character or to translate an English word into Chinese?
5. How do you look up an unknown character in the mobile devices?
6. What aspects of vocabulary knowledge (the way a character is written, radical, meaning, pronunciation, and frequently co-occurring character) do you pay special attention to after you find the unknown character and why?
   Please rank the following in the order of importance for you after you identify the character.
   - The way a character is written
   - Meaning
   - Pronunciation
   - Frequently co-occurring character
   - Radical
   - Other (please specify)
7. What is the likelihood that you will recognize the character when you encounter it at a later date?

Journal Three
8. When you use mobile devices to translate English words into Chinese, what are your criteria for picking a Chinese word if there is more than one choice?
9. Which aspects of vocabulary knowledge (the way a character is written, radical, meaning, pronunciation, and frequently co-occurring character) do you pay special attention to after you obtain a Chinese
character? Why?
Please rank the following in the order of importance for you after you obtain the character.
_____The way a character is written
_____Meaning
_____Pronunciation
_____Frequently co-occurring character
_____Radical
_____Other (please specify)
10. What is the likelihood that you will recognize a character you looked up when you encounter it at a later date? What is the likelihood that you will use the Chinese word on your own?
11. Which mobile devices do you see as being most useful to students at various proficiency levels? Why?

Journal Four
12. Generally speaking, how do you feel about using mobile technology to help you study Chinese?
13. What are the advantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese?
14. What are the disadvantages of using mobile technology to learn Chinese?
15. Have you explored any unconventional uses of mobile devices and applications in studying Chinese? If so, please describe these experiences.

Journal Five
16. Looking to the future, are there any applications not available now that you think would be helpful? If so, please describe what they would do.
17. Describe the ways you use mobile devices to learn Chinese by interacting with people?
18. What are the total effects of using mobile devices for learning Chinese?
19. Students at which proficiency level could benefit most from using mobile devices, why?
20. How do you typically find out about new applications? (From friends, searching the Internet, advertisements, apple store.)
Interview Questions
21. How do you typically find out about the usage of new applications? (From friends, searching the Internet, advertisements, apple store.)
22. Do you mainly use mobile devices to help you with course work? What else do you do concerning learning Chinese?

Journal Six
23. For the 11 applications, the following two questions are asked: Did you know about this application before? Do you plan to use it in the future? Why or why not?
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Abstract

The purposes of this study were to determine attrition rates of students learning Korean in university courses, their motivations to study the target language, why many drop out, and what educators can do to address and decrease high rates of attrition. A survey was administered to 129 students enrolled in lower-level (101–202) Korean language classes during the years 2005–2010 at a large, private university in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States. Self-identifying heritage students comprised 45.7% of those who completed the survey. Surveys were administered to students via email and returned in the same manner; as such, they represent a response and convenience sample. Five of the 12 survey questions utilized a 5-point Likert scale. The overall attrition rate from class to class during this time period was 85%. Students identified that the most motivating factors in their decision to take Korean were “It’s an important language,” “Future career benefits,” and “I have Korean heritage.” More students desired to learn only basic words and phrases than any one other proficiency category. The most common reason for quitting Korean was that it didn’t fit students’ schedules. Likewise, students indicated that had a following course been offered at a different time or if a language lab offering tutoring were made available, they might have been influenced to continue taking Korean. Surveys also addressed language-learning anxiety. Based on the results gathered, this study makes suggestions for improving Korean language instruction in order to reduce student attrition.
Introduction

Korean is one of many Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) in America, distinguishing it from Spanish, French, and German. Since the start of the Korean War and the related diaspora of Koreans to the United States and elsewhere, it has become more common for major universities to offer Korean classes to their students. However, Korean is difficult for most native English speakers to learn—perhaps more so than Germanic or Romance languages. This is due in part to a very different sentence structure and a non-cognate vocabulary base. The United States’ Defense Language Institute, for example, puts Korean in the Category IV language class with Arabic and Chinese; at the Institute, 64 weeks of instruction are expected to bring a native English speaker to limited working proficiency in these languages, compared to the 26 weeks required for the same proficiency in Spanish, French, Portuguese, or Italian.¹

The difficulty of Korean versus other languages is clearly evident as the attrition rate for Korean language classes is very high, even among the over 80% of students who are heritage language learners in Korean programs throughout the United States (You, 2001, as cited by Lee and Han, 2007, p. 35). For example, between the years of 2005 and 2010 at Brigham Young University, language attrition in the first four semesters of the Korean language course was 85% compared to attrition rates in languages such as Spanish, French and German, that range from about 12% to about 24% depending on the university and the source. In order to better understand these trends, this study sets out to determine the attrition rates of students learning Korean in university courses, their motivations to study the target language, why many drop out, and what educators can do to address and minimize relatively high rates of attrition.

Literature Review

Initial Motivations for Enrolling

There are many reasons why students decide to enroll in language courses. These motivating factors often include the following (in no particular order):

1. To connect with their heritage
2. To communicate with family members (grandparents, etc.) or a significant other
3. To fulfill general education or graduation requirements
4. To satisfy an interest (inspired by pop culture, the media, other academic disciplines, etc.) in the language of choice
5. To follow the suggestion of a friend or acquaintance
6. To learn a language for the sake of language study itself
7. To enhance future career opportunities
8. To prepare for future study and academic work (e.g., comparative literature, history, linguistics, or Asian studies)
9. Because the language seems important and/or to obtain communication skills in that language
10. To enhance “one’s own personal culture though the study of the literature and philosophy of another people” and/or “to increase one’s understanding and appreciation of another culture” (Zelson 1973, p. 79)

Certainly, students will experience and express various motivating factors for enrolling in language study courses, and these students will each be motivated by different factors.

A current trend in second-language research is to study heritage language learners (HLLs) and non-heritage language learners (non-HLLs) separately because their experiences and motivations before entering the classroom (as well as in the classroom) are

---

2 This list is derived from professional literature, including Zelson (1973), as well as the authors’ thoughts and experiences teaching and learning Korean.

3 According to Valdés (2000), an HLL is a “student of the language raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language” (p. 375).
different. Reynolds et al. (2009) suggested that heritage is “a widespread motivator for choice of language study” (p. 107). Certainly this is true in Korean language courses across the United States, where, as was mentioned, over 80% of students are HLLs (You, 2001, as cited by Lee and Han, 2007, p. 35). Of the participants in our survey, however, only 45.7% indicated having at least one Korean parent.

Many studies have addressed the experiences of Korean HLLs in the language classroom (Jo, 2001; Kim, 2006; Kim, 2001; Kim, 2002; Lee & Kim, 2008; Yang, 2003, to name a few). Korean HLLs enter “the heritage language classroom with high levels of integrational (i.e., to communicate with family and friends) motivation” (p. 122) and cultural connectedness (Damron & Forsyth, 2010; Reynolds et al., 2009). Non-HLLs experience lower levels of cultural connectivity and integrational motivation (and alternatively, higher levels of instrumental motivation, which refers to motivations such as career benefits) (Kim, 2006; Yang, 2003; Kim, 2002). While this comparison provides valid insight into the experiences of students in the second-language classroom, the primary purpose of the present study does not seek to address distinctions between these two types of learners.

**Reasons for Dropping Out**

Horwitz (1988) boldly states, “large scale attrition in foreign language programs is a well-known phenomenon” (p. 292). Just as students enroll in second-language classes for a variety of reasons, a combination of factors likely contributes to many students dropping out -85% of students in the case of Korean in the present study. These reasons include the following (in no particular order):

1. Anxiety or stress related to language learning
2. Loss of interest in the target language or more interest in the art, culture, and/or history of countries where the language is spoken than in the language itself
3. Satisfaction with what has already been learned and a corresponding lack of desire to learn more
4. Graduation from the university or program

---

4 Aida (1994) listed interest in other aspects of the country besides language as a possible cause for student attrition (p. 165).
5. Choice of an alternative way to complete general education or graduation requirements
6. Perception of the course or the language as too difficult or too easy
7. Dissatisfaction with what was being learned compared to what students expected or hoped to learn
8. Lack of confidence in the target language ability (uncomfortable moving up to the next class)
9. Friend or significant other who spoke the target language no longer available
10. Coursework was too time consuming or the next level of the course didn't fit into the student's schedule
11. Incompatibility with the teacher
12. Unavailability of resources for extra help, such as a learning lab offering tutoring
13. Dislike for classroom environment or learning activities

One of the factors that likely contributes to a student’s decision to drop out is language-learning based anxiety. Bailey (2003) found that “students who dropped out of their foreign language classes tended to report statistically significant higher levels of anxiety”; their data “suggest moderate to large relationships between components of foreign language anxiety and student attrition” (Cohen, 1988, p. 189).

As cited by Aida (1994, p. 156), Horwitz et al. (1991) noted three types of anxiety in the second-language classroom: (1) communication apprehension, (2) test anxiety, and (3) fear of negative feedback. However, Aida cited another study (Macintyre and Gardner, 1989) that found that the second of these, test anxiety, was “a general anxiety problem; it was not significant to foreign language learning” (p. 162). Identifying the real sources of student anxiety that contribute to attrition help the educator address the specific concerns of the anxious language-learner.

In a study of students in the Japanese language classroom, Saito and Samimy (1996) found anxiety to be a more significant

---

5 For example, see Horwitz (1998), p. 291 for a discussion of attrition resulting from discrepancies in expected and actual proficiency and effort expended.
factor in intermediate and advanced courses than it was in beginning courses. (In Saito and Samimy’s study, in the beginning-level Japanese classes, a student’s year in college was a better predictor of performance than was language anxiety.) This difference is attributed to less pressure to perform in a beginning class than in intermediate or advanced classes. Thus, heightened anxiety may accompany heightened expectations. Saito and Samimy even found increased levels of anxiety during different seasons: “students became more anxious and/or felt more embarrassed and awkward about speaking Japanese in class in the spring quarter than in the autumn” (p. 241). Students who experience communication apprehension or fear of negative feedback, it appears, are more apt to choose not to have the language learning experience over the anxiety or embarrassment associated with those aspects of our classrooms.

A student’s year in college, and not anxiety, was the primary predicting factor for success in beginning levels of Japanese. Saito and Samimy cite Macintyre and Gardner (1989), who found that “at the earliest stages of language learning, motivation and language aptitude are the dominant factors in determining success. During the first few experiences in the foreign language, anxiety plays a negligible role in proficiency” (p. 245).

However, language anxiety leads to less risk taking in language-learning activities, lower grades, and “negative attitudes toward the class” (p. 246). In fact, Aida (1994) explored the relationship between performance (indicated by student grades) and anxiety, and found that “while students having a high anxiety level were more likely to receive a grade of B or lower, those with a low level of anxiety were more likely to get an A” (p. 162). Many studies in addition to this have found and addressed the relationship between anxiety and performance; Bailey (2003) cited some of these (Horwitz et al., 1986; Macintyre & Gardner, 1989, 1991b, 1991c; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). In these studies, anxiety was found to relate to several factors, including whether students had experience in Japan (the country of the language being studied), whether the class was an elective or was required, and whether the students were satisfied with their grades in the courses of the language of study. Students who were taking the course as an elective, had been to Japan, and/or were satisfied with their grades in Japanese courses were shown to experience less anxiety (p. 163). This is notable because of the
established correlations between anxiety and both performance and attrition mentioned earlier.

Unrealistic expectations of teacher and student also have a role in student attrition (Lemke, 1993, pp. 14–15). Students who enter the foreign language classroom expecting to become fluent in an unreasonable amount of time and without expending the necessary effort will be disappointed when they do not reach the level they desire. Horwitz (1988), in a study of first-semester language students, found that her subjects generally believed that some people have a greater aptitude for foreign languages; many also had unrealistic expectations about the amount of time it would take them to reach their desired or anticipated level of proficiency (pp. 286–87). This discrepancy may lead to frustration in students who perceive early on that fluency will require much more time and effort than they expected when they enrolled in the class. When this occurs, Horwitz writes, “the majority will probably quit language study as soon as permitted” (p. 291). This frustration may be related to the aforementioned anxiety associated with language learning.

Furthermore, teachers who expect all students to perform at the same high levels and who fail to make accommodations for students whose natural abilities make language learning a slower but perhaps deeper process than that of their peers also likely contribute to the high attrition rates associated with second language learning. Lemke (1993) writes that some high school second language teachers “cope with slower, less able students by allowing them to drop out” (p. 12). When teachers fail to recognize variability in student learning, slower students can become discouraged and quit. According to Smith (1968, as cited by Zelson, 1973), “teachers who are expected to teach for mastery before proceeding to new materials may be at least 1.6 times ‘more effective in their teaching than teachers who are not held responsible’” (p. 107). Therefore, perhaps teaching at a slower pace would be an effective method of improvement for the foreign language teacher, along with implementing methods for teacher accountability.

Researchers have also identified other causes for student attrition in foreign language courses. One of these is choosing another option for general education requirements (Lemke, 1993, who also cites Myers et al., 1979). Another reason was teacher-student incompatibility. In Lemke’s study, where students selected
their top three to five reasons for discontinuing foreign language study, incompatibility was the fifth most common reason listed (pp. 37–8).

As is evident, previous studies have addressed student motivations for language study, why students drop out, and the rate at which they drop out. However, a comprehensive analysis of these questions as they relate to Korean language programs with both heritage and non-heritage student experiences together is lacking.

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine the actual attrition rate from Korean language classes at the university where the research was to take place, to find out why students take Korean, why they drop out and what can be done to reduce high levels of attrition.

To find the attrition rate of students taking Korean, the investigators conducting this study tracked student enrollment using university generated class rosters. Starting with Korean 101 in the fall of 2005, the investigators followed the enrollment of students for two years until they were to enroll in Korean 202. This procedure was replicated starting with the students who enrolled in Korean 101 in the fall of 2006, the fall of 2007, the fall of 2008, the fall of 2009, and the fall of 2010. The total number of students who were enrolled in Korean 101 between 2005 and 2010 was 131. To answer the questions regarding motivating factors for taking Korean and factors that promote attrition, surveys were sent to 129 undergraduate students from Brigham Young University, a large private university in the western United States. All 129 research participants completed the survey.

Because Brigham Young University (BYU) is owned and operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, some may wonder what role religious motivation plays in student enrollment in language classes (i.e., are students learning Korean at BYU in preparation for a church mission in Korea?). While many students work as missionaries around the world for periods of 18 or 24 months, language preparation for missionaries requiring language instruction typically takes place at missionary training centers at the start of their service. Because prospective missionaries may submit application...
subjects were students at BYU at the time they took Korean classes. They ranged in age from eighteen to twenty years old. Of the 92 subjects who responded to the survey, 32 were male (35%) and 60 were female (65%). Students ranged from beginning to high intermediate learners. Students were from a variety of majors, including economics, management, biology, and business, as well as students with no officially declared major. Of the 92 students who answered the question pertaining to heritage background, 50 students (54.3%) had no Korean parents, 26 students (28.3%) had one Korean parent, 16 students (17.4%) had two Korean parents, and none were adopted from Korea.

All students enrolled in Korean language classes by choice, although completion of two years (four semesters) of a foreign language fulfills a university core requirement for graduation. First- and second-year Korean language courses involve five contact hours per week and meet on a daily basis. Two of these (Tuesday and Thursday) are with a professor and a class of about 30 students. For the remaining three (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) two sections of 15 students each meet with one TA. The University of Hawaii Press’s KLEAR textbooks are used. As part of the course, students are required to meet with a Korean-speaking study buddy for ten hours each semester outside of class.

Surveys were sent via email to students who had taken Korean classes between 2005 and 2010 and who had current contact information on file with the university. Not every question of the survey was answered by every student. Data here represents only data that was reported. One of the surveyors was a professor in the Korean Department; the other was an undergraduate research assistant. The students represent a response and convenience sample.

The survey, which is reproduced with formatting edits in packets only up to 120 days in advance, BYU students would generally not have enough time to take a formal, semester-long language class at BYU after receiving their assignment. Additionally, prospective missionaries do not self-select where they will work or what language(s) they will be expected to work in. Not a single student identified religious reasons on their survey as a motivating factor for taking Korean.
Appendix A, asked 12 questions, with 5 of the questions utilizing a 5-point Likert scale. Numerical results were input into a Microsoft Excel file. Results of questions implementing the 5-point Likert scale were analyzed based on “high,” “mid,” and “low” responses, where 5=high, 2-4=mid, and 1=low. Results were then graphed and percentage, mean, and standard deviation calculations were done using Excel.

**Results**

**Overall Attrition Rate**

Student attrition from first semester through fourth semester Korean classes averaged 85%. This means that from the beginning of the fall semester in 2005 to the beginning of the winter semester in 2012, the overall average attrition rate for all groups that started each fall was 85%. The number of students (16) who started Korean 101 in Fall 2005, for example, decreased by approximately 88% by the beginning of the fourth class (see Figure 1). In this 2005 cohort, the number of students decreased by 57% from 101 to 102 and 72% from 102 to 201 and zero percent from 201 to 202, leaving only two students in the 202 class from the original 2005 cohort.

Figure 1. Student Attrition in Korean Classes From 2005 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attrition from 101 - 102</th>
<th>Attrition from 102 - 201</th>
<th>Attrition from 201 - 202</th>
<th>*Overall attrition from 101 – 202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88% (16 Ss→2 Ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75% (20 Ss→5 Ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85% (20 Ss→3 Ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Motivators

Figure 2 shows, in a comparative format, the degree to which several ideas or factors motivated students to take first-semester Korean. Students were presented with (or identified themselves) a possible factor and given the choice of 1 (low) to 5 (high) regarding the strength of that factor as a motivation in their decision to enroll. The factors ranked highest are “It looked interesting,” which had the largest number of “high” responses (54); followed by “It’s an important language” (40); “Future career benefits” (39); and “I have Korean heritage” (38). The factors with the largest number of “low” responses (less effect on student motivation) were “I have Korean heritage” (46), “It fulfills an academic requirement” (42), and “I have a Korean friend/significant other” (42).
These factors can be analyzed further by breaking them up into three categories: integrational motivation, instrumental motivation, and other interest.

Integrational motivation includes having Korean heritage or having a Korean friend/significant other. As would be expected, students had either high (42%) or low (51%) heritage association and most were not highly motivated to enroll in the class because of a friend or significant other (31% were).

Instrumental motivation refers to the extent to which students expect that having Korean language ability would be beneficial to them in their careers, in school, and so on. The vast majority of students were motivated (“high” or “mid” answers)

---

7 Percentages are based on the number of students who answered each question, which is usually different from the number of students who returned a survey. Not all students answered every survey question.
because the language seemed important for future career benefits (85%), while fulfilling academic requirements was a lower-level motivator for most students (69% answered “mid” or “low”). Instrumental motivation seemed to be the highest motivator for students to enroll in Korean as can be seen in a cursory glance of data presented in Figure 2.

Whether the class looked interesting, the student heard it was interesting, or the student liked Korean pop culture, these factors together create a third category of initial motivation identified as other interests. Students weren’t particularly motivated to take Korean because they heard it was interesting; however, most were highly motivated because it looked interesting, with 36% and 64% recording “high” responses, respectively. Students were split on Korean pop culture as a motivator. Interestingly, a significantly small number of students chose to mark this factor at all: 66 students (mean: 87, standard deviation: 9). Of the students who answered, they were highly motivated (42%) to take the class because of their interest in pop culture, or pop culture was a low motivator (40%) for them. Interest in pop culture is likely correlated with exposure to it.

Students also indicated their desired level of proficiency when they first started taking Korean 101. Thirty-nine percent of students responded that they desired “only basic words and phrases.” This was followed by, in order of number of responses, “somewhat conversational” (27%), “fluent” (22%), “like a native” (9%) and “no expectations about proficiency” (3%) (see Appendix B, Figure 1).

Reasons for Discontinuing Studies

When presented with 11 possible factors for deciding to stop taking Korean (see survey in Appendix A), students were again asked to rank each factor. The factor with the greatest number of “high” responses (more than twice that of any other factor) was “It didn’t fit my schedule.” Other factors with 16 or more responses included “It was too time consuming,” “I wasn’t comfortable moving up to the next class,” “I fulfilled my requirement,” “I wasn’t learning as much as I wanted,” and “It was too difficult.”

Likewise, the factors with the highest number of “low” responses were “I no longer had a Korean friend/significant other” (80), “I lost interest in Korean” (66), and “It wasn’t challenging
Surprisingly, the responses relating to why students discontinued their Korean studies, the total number of “low” responses (570) more than doubled the total number of “medium” responses (216) and more than tripled the total number of “high” responses (165). This result suggests that students may have stopped taking Korean on account of one or two major concerns and/or several minor concerns.

Figure 3. Factors for Quitting Korean Classes
When asked if they received satisfactory grades in Korean classes, 90.5% of respondents answered affirmatively, while 9.5% answered negatively, suggesting that grades are not a major factor for quitting Korean language study.

**Would-be Motivators**

The survey also addressed factors that would have influenced students to continue taking Korean classes—in other words, would-be motivators. The factors with the largest number of “high” responses were “Offered at a different time” (36) and “The addition of a language lab offering tutoring” (31).

As occurred in the previous section with reasons for discontinuing studies, the “low” category received a notably large number of responses—more than double that of both the individual “high” and “mid” categories.
Factors Related to Language Anxiety

Students also answered questions pertaining to anxiety associated with language learning. Anxiety is well recognized as a contributing factor in students’ decisions to discontinue language studies. More students responded to the question “How good do you consider yourself at learning languages?” with “high” meaning the students believe themselves to be a good language learner (22) than with “mid” (18) or “low” (5).

Students were also asked to rate how stressful three activities were in learning Korean: speaking Korean in class, taking written tests, and being evaluated orally on their Korean ability. Data is presented in Appendix B, Figure 2. The most stressful activity as reported by students was being evaluated on their Korean oral ability—44 students (out of 90 total respondents to the question) indicated that this was a high-stress activity. Students indicated that
speaking the target language in class and taking tests\textsuperscript{8} were mid- to low-stress activities.

**Discussion**

This study had four purposes: 1) to determine levels of attrition in first- and second-year Korean courses, 2) to better understand why students decided to study Korean in the first place, 3) why so many quit studying the language at the university, and 4) to determine what can be done to reduce student attrition. Results for the first three points have been presented. In this section, researchers will address what can be done to reduce attrition rates in Korean language programs.

According to research on the topic, there are many things educators can do to reduce student attrition in the foreign language classroom. These may include: providing an option to minor in the language, implementing activities that allow students to make practical use of the language, discussing misconceptions about language learning with students, and addressing anxiety (discussed in more detail below). This study then suggests three additional things educators can do to increase enrollments and/or reduce student attrition.

First, educators can make foreign language classes more available to students of many disciplines. Zelson (1973) suggested that this can be accomplished by providing, in addition to the major option, a minor option for study. Zelson writes, “foreign language study as a major field has a somewhat limited appeal for large portions of the student body, but as a minor field, languages may present quite a different picture.” (p. 177). The university where the present study was conducted offers both a Korean major and a Korean minor; therefore, attrition rates probably reflect such

\textsuperscript{8} The survey question for this result asks students to rate how stressful each activity was in learning Korean, including speaking Korean in class, taking tests, and being evaluated on oral Korean ability. Being evaluated on oral Korean ability refers to oral evaluations. Depending on the course, one to three individual oral exams were administered by teaching assistants to class members of each course.
conditions as Zelson suggests.

Just as providing a minor option for students who study the language for reasons other than pure academic motivation may decrease attrition, providing practical applications and activities in foreign language courses may also help maintain student interest and motivation. Citing Sims (1981), Lemke (1993) suggested that “lack of practical use of the foreign language may also help explain the large number of students electing to drop from the program” (p. 13). Krashen (1984) found that students in the 1990s were “more interested in ‘using’ the language, not just learning about it” (p. 13). Korean language educators are at a slight disadvantage with Korean resources in The United States because there are fewer native Korean speakers with whom students may interact on any given day. Students learning languages such as Spanish may have more opportunity and access both to written material and native speakers of the language. Consequently, Korean language educators may adjust to students’ practical interests by providing language activities and materials relative to their majors (perhaps through independent projects), and by suggesting and providing ways for them to integrate themselves into local and/or online communities that use the target language.

Horwitz (1988) suggested that educators can reduce attrition rates by correcting or addressing student beliefs about foreign language learning, including the apparent belief that attaining fluency requires “relatively little effort” and that “acquiring another language is a special ‘gift’ that some people have and that most people do not have” (p. 283). The value of this “deconditioning” is argued by Holec (1981), as cited by Horwitz, who claims that “psychological preparation or ‘deconditioning’” rids them of “preconceived notions and prejudices which would likely interfere with their language learning,” and that it allows students to “become effective self-directed learners” (pp. 283–284, 292). Horwitz suggests that students who continue with language learning are those whose beliefs about it are probably different from their dropout peers (p. 291).

Correcting the misconception that language learning requires little time and effort may be an effective method in combating attrition due to students’ unrealistic expectations. Both non-HLLs

---

9 Horwitz takes the second quote from Acheson (1987) and Simon (1980).
and HLLs may enroll in language courses with unrealistic expectations, but these beliefs can be particularly intense for HLLs. In one qualitative study of Korean HLLs, Damron and Forsyth (2010) found that frustration was an emotional factor that affected some students’ motivation in studying their heritage language—they were frustrated that enrolling and completing a single class was not leading to the fluency and literacy they expected, and that “becoming literate in Korean would be in some ways just as difficult and time-consuming” for them as it was for their non-HLL counterparts (p. 89). To address these concerns, Horwitz suggested, “it would probably be useful for teachers to discuss with students reasonable time commitments for successful language learning and the value of some language ability even if it is less than fluent” (p. 286).

Anxiety can be addressed in the language classroom through positive reinforcement of the students’ self-esteem. Aida (1994) suggested that anxious students who possess high self-esteem “may be able to handle anxiety provoking situations” (p. 164). Greenberg et al. (1992, as cited by Aida) “proposed a terror management theory which posits that ‘people are motivated to maintain a positive self-image because self-esteem protects them from anxiety’” (p. 164–65). Teachers might reinforce student’s self-worth in language classes by correcting mistakes kindly, with an accompanying compliment and by pointing out that mistakes students make in class are common to most learners of the language. Educators may also, as Bailey (2003) recommends, discuss anxiety with students to determine causes.\(^\text{10}\) Students with particularly serious cases of anxiety may be identified\(^\text{11}\) and given particularly positive attention and/or referred to a professional counselor. Educators should also be sensitive to learning-related disabilities.

Lemke (1993) also found that the introduction of an outcomes-based approach was successful, and attrition levels varied

---
\(^{10}\) Bailey refers the educator to Bailey, Daley, & Onwuegbuzie (1999); Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, & Daley (2000); Horwitz & Young (1991); and Young (1999) for more information.

\(^{11}\) Bailey (2003) lists some behavioral signs of anxiety, including “avoiding class, not completing assignments, and a preoccupation with the performance of other students in the class” (citing Bailey, 1983; Horwitz et al., 1986).
according to who taught classes in a given year (p. 43) and that, as mentioned earlier, teaching at a slower pace may increase effectiveness of principle mastery.

Based on results from the present study, three additional suggestions will be made for what educators can do to increase enrollment and/or reduce student attrition in Korean language classes. These include advertising the course in a manner that appeals to students’ initial motivations, teaching the course at hours where students are less likely to have schedule conflicts, and creating a language lab that offers tutoring.

First, 91% of students responding to the survey said they were motivated ("high" or "mid" answer) to take Korean because it looked interesting and because “it’s an important language.” Eighty-five percent were similarly motivated for future career benefits (mean: 69%, standard deviation: 17%). Considering these motivators, it seems that promotional activities (i.e. fliers, booths in the student union, cultural activities, etc.) around campus catered to these motivating factors may increase enrollments. In addition, creating classroom activities that cater to these motivations (i.e. Role playing business interactions, practicing buying and selling, working with money, etc.) may decrease attrition.

Next, 70% of students responding to the survey chose ‘schedule conflicts’ as an important factor (“high” or “mid” answer) in deciding to stop taking Korean (mean: 40%, standard deviation: 17%). Therefore, offering more class times or teaching the course at a less popular hour (early morning or late afternoon, perhaps) may be the best way to decrease student attrition. In addition, for students who are serious about continuing Korean but have major required courses that conflict with the daily schedule, it may be appropriate to allow students to attend the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday sessions or the Tuesday and Thursday sessions and have them work with the TA during office hours or in the language lab to keep up with the class work.

Seventy-seven percent of students responding to the survey noted that the addition of a language lab that offered tutoring would have been an important factor in influencing them to continue (mean: 48%, standard deviation: 17%). If resources allow, this could be another option to prevent high attrition rates. However, at the university where this study was conducted there are teaching
assistants, who have mandatory office hours, available to all students for approximately twenty hours each week. Their services are rarely utilized.

Conclusion

This study set out to measure attrition rates in Korean language classes at a large university in the United States, to determine reasons for Korean language class enrollment and reasons for attrition, and to consider what educators can do to address high rates of attrition in language courses.

It was determined that students took Korean primarily because they heard it was interesting, thought it was an important language, saw future career benefits, and/or because they had Korean heritage. Interestingly enough, student expectations were reasonable; most began in Korean 101 with a desire for proficiency in basic words and phrases or somewhat conversational fluency. Most (90.5%) students were satisfied with their grades in the class. However, this study observed an average attrition rate from the 101 class to the 202 class of 85%. As stated before, timing was the biggest issue: students indicated that the most important factor in deciding to quit Korean was that it didn’t fit their schedules. Anxiety did not appear to be a major factor in attrition; most students felt that they were either good or average at learning languages. However, one high-stress activity for almost half of those who responded to this question was being evaluated on their Korean ability. When asked what would have motivated them to continue taking Korean, it became apparent that by offering more times to take a class (possibly with smaller class sizes), and by creating a tutoring/ language lab, many students would continue to take it.

This study has several implications for further research. The first of these involves a new analysis of the data presented here, comparing heritage versus non-heritage student responses. This analysis was beyond the intended scope of the present paper. Other comparisons may be made, including if/how one’s gender, etc. affects their motivations. Next, if the administration of a Korean program decides to apply some of the suggestions outlined here to decrease attrition, a significant study would compare attrition rates and student survey responses before and after any change(s).
Additionally, it may prove insightful to study categories of motivating factors (i.e., instrumental motivation) and determine whether or not, for example, various instrumental factors about which students responded are statistically correlated, and if so, how they compare to other categorical groups (i.e., integrational motivation, etc.).

Additionally, there were several limitations. First, religious motivations may have been addressed specifically in the survey to determine if these had any impact on student enrollment and/or attrition. Next, this sample was a response/convenience sample. While as far as the authors know, this study is the first to present student attrition rates in university-level Korean language classes, it calls for a more methodical approach in the future, with either all students or a random sample of students completing the survey.
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### Appendix A

**Survey**

1. When did you take Korean 101?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What was the last Korean Class you took?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>101</th>
<th>102</th>
<th>201</th>
<th>202</th>
<th>301</th>
<th>still</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Please indicate on the scale how important each factor was in deciding to take Korean 101.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have Korean Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It fulfills an academic requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard it was interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like Korean pop culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a Korean friend/significant other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's an important language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future career benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looked interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Comments:______________________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate how important each factor was in deciding to stop taking Korean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I lost interest in Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fulfilled my academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned all the Korean I wanted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was too difficult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t learning as much as I wanted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t comfortable moving up to the next</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I no longer had a Korean friend/significant other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was too time consuming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It didn’t fit my schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It wasn’t challenging enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Korean was</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Comments:______________________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please indicate how much each of the following would have influenced you to continue taking Korean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less time consuming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered at a different time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught by a different teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different classroom environment/activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less rigorous coursework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More rigorous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition of a language lab offering tutoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stressful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Comments:______________________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How proficient did you want to become when you first started Korean 101?
   a. Like a native  
   b. Fluently  
   c. Somewhat  
   d. Only basic words and phrases  
   e. No expectations about  

7. Did you receive satisfactory grades in your Korean classes?
   a. Yes, I did as well as I had hoped  
   b. No, I did not get the grades I had hoped for  

8. Are you Male/Female? (please circle one)  

9. What is your Major?  

10. Do you have?
    a. One Korean parent  
    b. Two Korean parents  
    c. I'm adopted from Korea  
    d. No Korean parents  

11. How good do you consider yourself at learning languages?  
    Very Poor  
    Very Skilled  
    1 2 3 4 5  

12. Please indicate how stressful each activity was in learning Korean.  
    Less Stressful  
    More  
    Speaking Korean in class  
    Taking  
    Being evaluated on your oral Korean  
    1 2 3 4 5
Appendix B

Figure 1. Initial Desired Level of Korean Proficiency

6. How proficient did you want to become when you first started Korean 101?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. like a native</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. fluent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. somewhat conversational</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. only basic words and phrases</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. no expectations about proficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Stress Levels for Class Activities
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