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Editor’s Introduction

Danko Šipka
Arizona State University

The present volume includes five papers devoted to various aspects of learning and teaching less commonly taught languages (LCTLS). The first paper explores the types of bilingualism among heritage speakers. The second paper looks into the patterns of motivation to study LCTLS among high school students. The next two papers are devoted to teaching approaches – the third paper discusses deep blended language learning, while the fourth contribution to this volume addresses the language socialization approach. Finally, the fifth paper explores a concrete behavioral pattern in a LCTL classroom.
Variation among heritage speakers: Sequential vs. simultaneous bilinguals

Teresa Lee
University of Virginia

Abstract
This study examines the differences in the grammatical knowledge of two types of heritage speakers of Korean. Early simultaneous bilinguals are exposed to both English and the heritage language from birth, whereas early sequential bilinguals are exposed to the heritage language first and then to English upon schooling. A listening comprehension task involving relative clauses was conducted with 51 beginning-level Korean heritage speakers. The results showed that the early sequential bilinguals exhibited much more accurate knowledge than the early simultaneous bilinguals, who lacked rudimentary knowledge of Korean relative clauses. Drawing on the findings of adult and child Korean L1 data on the acquisition of relative clauses, the performance of each group is discussed with respect to attrition and incomplete acquisition of the heritage language.

Introduction
A heritage speaker refers to a bilingual who grew up listening to and/or speaking a minority language in the US (Valdés, 2000; Montrul, 2011). The use of the heritage (or home) language is normally limited to home settings, as opposed to the use of English, a socially dominant (majority) language in the US. Even with a child who was dominant in the heritage language in early childhood, his/her language use gradually shifts from the heritage language to the majority language of the wider society once schooling begins (Montrul, 2008). As the child begins to use the majority language more than the heritage language, the majority language takes dominance over the heritage language in proficiency and use. As a result, some features of the heritage language may not be fully acquired or be lost by the time adolescence is reached.

One of the characteristics of heritage speakers is that a considerable amount of individual variation is found in their linguistic competence (Polinsky & Kagan, 2007; Kondo-Brown, 2005; to just
name a few), which might be attributed to the fact that the amount of input, opportunities to use the heritage language, and the manner/setting in which heritage speakers received input during childhood vary considerably (Montrul, 2008; Rothman, 2007). Despite this variation, common characteristics and patterns of linguistic knowledge within the subgroups of heritage speakers have been identified (Kondo-Brown, 2005; Lee, 2011; Montrul, 2005; Polinsky, 2008), which provides useful insight into the nature of their heritage grammars.

Several studies have reported that late bilinguals (exposed to English after age six or seven) have an advantage over early bilinguals (Kim, Montrul, & Yoon, 2010; Montrul, 2002, 2004; Yeni-Komshian, Flege, & Liu, 2000). For example, those who were born in their home country (e.g. Korea) and came to the United States after preschool would exhibit more competent knowledge of the heritage language than those who were born in the US and learned it mainly in the home. A similar trend is found with early (simultaneous vs. sequential) bilinguals. Early sequential bilinguals are likely to have an advantage over early simultaneous bilinguals, exhibiting more competent linguistic knowledge (Montrul, 2008). The latter group is exposed to two languages (e.g. English and Korean) from birth or before age three, while the former is predominantly exposed to the heritage language (e.g. Korean) until schooling begins. In other words, it is likely that early simultaneous bilinguals receive reduced input in their heritage language, compared to early sequential bilinguals (Montrul, 2008; Polinsky, 2011).

The distinction between these two types of early bilinguals is useful in discussing incomplete acquisition and attrition in heritage grammars, as Montrul (2008) points out. These two groups mainly differ from each other with respect to the amount of input received during childhood, which would likely have a lingering effect on their linguistic knowledge of the heritage grammar later in life. Incomplete acquisition occurs if features of a given grammatical system were not fully acquired and fossilized in a simplified or reduced form (Montrul, 2008). On the other hand, attrition occurs if a given grammatical system was acquired at an age-appropriate developmental stage and then was lost. A general tendency is that early simultaneous bilinguals are likely to exhibit a more severe degree of deviation from the heritage
language than early sequential bilinguals, whether both groups manifest incomplete acquisition or attrition (Montrul, 2005; Silva-Corvalán, 2003; Tsimpi, Sorace, Heycock, & Filiaci, 2004).

The present study aims to contribute to a better understanding of the differences in the grammatical knowledge of these two types of early Korean-English bilinguals. In doing so, their comprehension of Korean relative clauses is examined and their knowledge is discussed with respect to incomplete acquisition and attrition of the heritage language.

**Previous studies**

**Accuracy rates**

In the literature on the acquisition of relative clauses, much of the discussion revolves around the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977). The hierarchy was formulated, based on a crosslinguistic observation that subjects are the easiest to be relativized, compared to direct objects, indirect objects, obliques, genetives, and objects of comparison. This typological finding has implications for the acquisition of relative clauses in that it captures the difference in the processing load of different syntactic positions when relativized. As noted by Keenan and Comrie (1977) and reiterated by Polinsky (2011), processing ease is closely tied with saliency, and subjects are more salient than other syntactic positions. Hence, it would be easier to associate the subject with a modifying relative clause, and therefore it follows that subject relatives should be easier to comprehend than other types of relative clauses.¹

This prediction has been supported by many studies on several different languages, including East Asian languages (Diessel & Tomasello, 2005; Doughty, 1991; Gass, 1979; Jeon & Kim, 2007; Kanno, 2007; O’Grady, Lee, & Choo, 2001, 2003, Polinsky, 2011; Slobin, 1986; among others).² Several studies on first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition of Korean also found similar results, using different methodologies (Cho, 1999; Jeon & Kim, 2007; Kim, 1987; Kwon, Lee, Gordon, Kluender, & Polinsky, 2010; Lee, 1991; O’Grady et al., 2003). In their oral production study on L2 Korean, Jeon and Kim (2007) reported that subject relative clauses were correctly produced more often than direct object relative clauses. Comprehension studies by Cho (1999) and by O’Grady et al. (2003)
also found that subject relatives were correctly understood more often than their direct object counterparts. Also, Kwon et al.’s (2010) processing (reading-time measures) study with adult native speakers of Korean showed that subject relatives were read faster than direct object relatives.

In heritage language acquisition, many studies have used adult L1 data as the baseline for their studies (Lee, 2011; Montrul, 2002, 2004; Polinsky, 2008). In the acquisition of relative clauses, an L2 Korean study by O’Grady et al. (2003) reported that adult native speakers of Korean correctly understood both subject and direct object relative clauses almost 100% of the time. Similar results were also reported by Kanno’s (2007) L2 Japanese study. Child L1 data can also be useful in discussing incomplete acquisition and attrition of the heritage language (Polinsky, 2011). Unlike adult L1 data, which obscure the asymmetry between subject and direct object relatives, child L1 data provide insight into accuracy and error rates of each type of relative clauses, which helps understand the linguistic development of heritage speakers.

In this regard, the findings of Cho’s (1999) comprehension study with four- to seven-year-old Korean monolinguals provide clues about the knowledge of child monolingual speakers. In Cho’s study, the four-year olds correctly understood both subject (73%) and direct object relatives (56%) more than half of the time. It should be pointed out that the children’s comprehension of subject relatives was at ceiling (98%) by age seven, which suggests that adult-like competence in comprehension of subject relatives is likely acquired by that age. On the other hand, the mean scores for direct object relatives suggest that more time is required to obtain a similar rate (ceiling) of accuracy. Six- and seven-year olds correctly understood direct object relatives approximately 82% of the time. Yet, it might be reasonable to hypothesize that children would reach accuracy at ceiling by age eight or nine, considering the increase rate in accuracy each year.

**Error types and rates**

Before discussing error types and rates, a remark on the differences between relative clauses in Korean and English is in order. Korean relative clauses are different from their English counterparts in two
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major aspects. First, the branching direction is opposite. In English, the relative clause follows the head noun, but the relative clause precedes the head noun in Korean. Second, case markers are crucial to correct interpretation of relative clauses in Korean, unlike in English. As shown in (1), subject relatives are identical with direct object relatives in Korean, except case marking on the noun (an argument of the verb) that appears inside the relative clause.

(1)  
a. Subject relative

\[
[\text{nameca-}lul\ \text{salangha-nun}] \quad \text{yeca} \\
\text{Man-ACC} \quad \text{love-PRES} \quad \text{woman}
\]
‘the woman who loves the man’

b. Direct object relative

\[
[\text{nameca-}ka\ \text{salangha-nun}] \quad \text{yeca} \\
\text{Man-NOM} \quad \text{love-PRES} \quad \text{woman}
\]
‘the woman whom the man loves’

(ACC: accusative, NOM: nominative, PRES: present tense)

Turning now to error types, both case marking and the branching direction seem to have bearing on the particular types of errors that are found in the acquisition of relative clauses in Korean (and Japanese). Several L2 studies have identified two types of common errors: reversal and head errors (Kanno, 2007; Lee-Ellis, 2011; O’Grady et al., 2003). Reversal errors occur when subject relatives are misinterpreted as direct object relatives or vice versa. On the other hand, a head error occurs when the first noun in a relative clause is selected as the head noun. The difference between these two types of errors is illustrated by the examples in (2).

(2)  
\[
[\text{RC yeca-}ka\ \text{po-nun}] \quad \text{nameca} \\
\text{Woman-NOM} \quad \text{see-PRES} \quad \text{man}
\]
a. Correct interpretation: ‘the man whom the woman sees’ (object relative)
b. Reversal error interpretation: ‘the man who sees the woman’ (subject relative)
c. Head error interpretation: ‘the woman who sees the man’ (erroneous)

These two types of errors have different implications for the linguistic knowledge of the learner. As noted earlier, the head noun comes after the relative clause in Korean. If the learner erroneously selected the first noun that s/he heard in the relative clause as the
head noun, it would indicate that s/he had trouble correctly locating the head noun. However, reversal errors would be indicative of the fact that the learner had trouble figuring out the grammatical relation of the gap (i.e. the element that is relativized) to a relative clause, misinterpreting case marking information on the noun that appears inside the relative clause. Also, instances of reversal errors would presuppose that the learner already knows which element serves as the head noun.

An L2 Korean comprehension study by O’Grady et al. (2001) reported interesting results regarding the rates of these two types of errors. Focusing on error rates on direct object relatives, the beginning learners made more head errors (52%) than reversal errors (38%). However, the intermediate learners made more reversal errors (31%) than head errors (23%). In other words, the learners who received less input produced more head errors, assuming that beginning (second-semester) L2 learners would normally have less exposure to the target language than intermediate (fourth-semester) L2 learners.

A similar trend can be observed even with groups, all of whom made more head errors than reversal errors. In Kim’s (2008) comprehension study of Korean relative clauses with heritage speakers, the Korean dominant group received the most input in the heritage language, followed by the Korean-English group and the English dominant group in that order. The English dominant group made head errors three times as often as they made reversal errors, and the Korean-English group produced head errors one-sixth time (16%) more than reversal errors. The Korean dominant group produced a similar rate of errors. These results suggest that those with less input in the heritage language would likely produce more head errors than reversal errors, exhibiting a more severe lack of rudimentary knowledge of Korean relative clauses.

In the next section, I will formulate predictions about two groups of adult early Korean-English bilinguals and describe the methodology of an experimental study.
The present study Predictions about the nature of linguistic knowledge of the two heritage groups

The goal of the present study is to examine the differences in the grammatical knowledge of early simultaneous and sequential bilinguals. Early simultaneous bilinguals are exposed to English and Korean from birth, whereas early sequential bilinguals are predominantly exposed to Korean before schooling begins. Given this difference, early simultaneous bilinguals would likely have received reduced input, compared to early sequential bilinguals, and the former group tends to exhibit a more severe degree of deviation from the heritage language than the latter group (Kim, Montrul, & Yoon, 2010; Montrul, 2002, 2004). Based on this observational tendency, the following two predictions are formulated with respect to their knowledge of relative clauses in Korean. If the amount of input received in the heritage language early in childhood plays a role, (1) early sequential bilinguals will understand Korean relative clauses more accurately than early simultaneous bilinguals, and (2) early simultaneous bilinguals are likely to produce errors (i.e. head errors) that exhibit their lack of rudimentary knowledge of Korean relative clauses more often than early sequential bilinguals do.

Participants

Two types of English-dominant heritage speakers of Korean participated in the experiment: 13 early simultaneous and 38 early sequential bilinguals. All of them were enrolled in a beginning (second-semester) Korean language class at a four-year university in the US. The heritage speakers were in their late teens or early twenties. The study also included five native speakers of Korean (control; in their late twenties or early thirties), who were graduate students at the same institution. All of the controls had completed college education in Korea and most of them had resided in the US for about two to three years at the time of testing.

All early simultaneous bilinguals in the present study were born in the US, except three of them who were born in Korea and came to the US before or at age one. According to the biographical survey, all of them had one parent speaking Korean and the other speaking English, being exposed to both Korean and English. The
majority of the early sequential bilinguals were also born in the US, except five of the thirty-eight participants came to the US before age two and one who came at the age of two and a half years. Unlike the early simultaneous bilinguals, all early sequential bilinguals had both Korean-speaking parents, and they were predominantly exposed to Korean during early childhood. Despite this difference, it should be noted that all participants in both heritage groups started schooling at a similar age (four or five years old), which means that the noticeable difference between these two heritage groups was mainly in the amount of parental linguistic input they had received early in childhood.

Regarding heritage language use since the start of formal schooling, the majority of the heritage speakers in both groups reported that they had conversed with their parents in English more often than in Korean. In many cases, parents would speak in Korean more often than in English, but more than half of the heritage speakers would speak back mostly in English. It should also be noted that the majority of the early sequential bilinguals’ parents had increased their use of English after formal schooling began, further limiting their heritage language use. Most heritage speakers in both groups would converse with their siblings and friends mostly in English. Some of the heritage speakers in both groups showed more interest in and had more exposure to Korean culture including Korean drama and popular music than others, but nobody indicated that s/he watched Korean drama or TV on a regular basis. Based on this, heritage language exposure through media did not appear to be a factor that had an impact on their overall proficiency in Korean.

In addition, some of the participants (both simultaneous and sequential) indicated that they had previously visited Korea, but mostly for a couple of weeks during the summer, which suggests that heritage language exposure through these visits was sporadic and not consistent. Some participants from both groups also attended Saturday Korean schools from a week to several months when they were young (mostly during their elementary school years), but instruction at those schools was limited to the alphabet, basic reading skills, numbers, and some basic writing skills in some cases. Also, many of the participants who had attended these Saturday Korean schools reported that they forgot most or all of what they had learned. In
other words, the main input the participants in the present study received in the heritage language was from their parents in the home.

**Experimental method and test materials**
The experiment employed a picture-selection comprehension task, a similar type used by earlier studies such as O’Grady et al. (2001, 2003) and Kanno (2007). There were a total of 14 test items included in the analysis: seven tokens of subject and direct object relatives, respectively. Test items included both reversible and non-reversible relatives to see whether animacy plays a role in comprehension of relative clauses (Gennari & MacDonald, 2009). Non-reversible relatives are different from reversible relatives in terms of the number of animate nouns (referents) involved in the relative clause. The former type involves one animate and one inanimate noun whereas the latter involves two animate nouns. Examples of these two types are given in (3) and (4).

(3) Reversible relative  
a. Subject relative  
[ _____ yeca-lul po-nun] namca eti iss-e-yo?  
woman-ACC see-PRES man where is  
‘Where is the man who sees the woman?’

b. Direct object relative  
[yeca-ka _____ po-nun] namca eti iss-e-yo?  
woman-NOM see-PRES man where is  
‘Where is the man whom the woman sees?’

(4) Non-reversible relative  
a. Subject relative  
[ _____ chayk-ul ilk-nun] namca eti iss-e-yo?  
book-ACC read-PRES man where is  
‘Where is the man who reads the book?’

b. Direct object relative  
[yeca-ka _____ ilk-nun] chayk eti iss-e-yo?  
woman-NOM read-PRES book where is  
‘Where is the book that the woman reads?’

b. Direct object relative  
[yeca-ka _____ ilk-nun] chayk eti iss-e-yo?  
woman-NOM read-PRES book where is  
‘Where is the book that the woman reads?’
All test sentences were embedded in a full sentence that denotes ‘Where is…?’ as seen in (3) and (4). The vocabulary items used in the task were familiar to the participants. Test sentences were tape-recorded and read once with an eight second interval between each test item. Test items were presented in randomized order, along with instructions written in English. Instructions read as follows:

Each page of this booklet contains a series of three pictures. As you go to each page, you will hear a recorded voice describing a person, or an item in one of the three pictures. Your job is simply to put a circle around the person or item described in the sentences (Do NOT put the circle around the entire box).

A set of three pictures were given for each relative clause. In each set, one picture would correctly depict an action denoted by the verb in a relative clause, one would depict a reversible interpretation, and one would be a distractor. For example, the third picture frame in Figure 1 would be the correct one to choose for the test item ‘the man whom the woman thinks of’, and the participant would circle the right-hand figure if s/he understood the sentence correctly. On the other hand, the participant would circle the left-hand figure in the second frame if s/he understood the given relative clause with a reversible interpretation ‘the man who thinks of the woman.’

Figure 1. Sample test item used in the experiment.
Lastly, it should be mentioned that participants were introduced to relative clauses in class at the outset of their second-semester beginning-level class. The experiment was conducted within several days after this instruction. During classroom instruction, an effort was made to provide the equal number of subject and direct object relatives.

Results

Group results
All of the controls (ages ranged from 25 to 39 years old) correctly understood all types of relative clauses, except one participant who circled both items (e.g. the man and the book) in the correct picture frame of a relative clause on two occasions.

Turning now to the experimental groups, recall that there were seven tokens of subject relatives and seven tokens of direct object relatives included in the analysis. A two-way repeated-measures ANOVA was performed to see if there was a significant effect for gap position (subject vs. direct object) and animacy (reversible vs. non-reversible). The results showed that there was a significant main effect for animacy, which suggests that both heritage groups found non-reversible relatives easier to comprehend than their reversible counterparts ($F(1, 12)=16.54, p=0.0016$ for the early simultaneous bilinguals; $F(1, 37)=30.48, p=0.0001$ for the early sequential bilinguals).

However, mixed results were obtained regarding gap position. A main effect was found for the early simultaneous bilinguals, but not for the early sequential bilinguals. The difference in the mean scores of the latter group was not statistically significant ($F(1, 37)=0.74, p=0.395$), although their overall mean scores suggested a subject advantage. However, the difference in the mean scores of the early simultaneous bilinguals was significant ($F(1, 12) =10.42, p=0.0072$), exhibiting a subject advantage. Also, there was an interaction effect between the two variables for the early sequential bilinguals ($F(1, 37) =5.02, p=0.0312$), but not for the early simultaneous bilinguals ($F(1, 12) =0.81, p=0.2305$).

Let us now take a look at the overall mean scores of each group. Due to the unequal number of tokens in reversible and non-reversible relatives, both overall mean scores and comprehension
percentages are presented here. Table 1 summarizes the mean scores for reversible relatives.

**Table 1.** Mean scores for reversible relative clauses (four tokens each).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject RC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Object RC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total mean average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. simultaneous (N=13)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.91)</td>
<td>1.27 (1.25)</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. sequential (N=38)</td>
<td>2.89 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.42 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.26 (0.83)</td>
<td>-66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC type mean average</td>
<td>2.54 (1.43)</td>
<td>2.06 (1.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores show that both heritage groups gave correct responses to subject relatives more often than to direct object relatives. The early simultaneous bilinguals correctly responded to subject relatives 38% of the time and direct object relatives 25% of the time. The accuracy rates of the early sequential bilinguals were 72% for subject relatives and 61% for direct object relatives.

In terms of a comparison between the two groups, the early sequential bilinguals were twice as accurate as often as the early simultaneous bilinguals. The early sequential bilinguals correctly understood reversible relatives two-thirds (66%) of the time whereas the early simultaneous bilinguals did so just one-third (32%) of the time. *T*-tests showed that the early sequential bilinguals differed from the early simultaneous bilinguals, performing better on both subject and direct object relatives (*t*=-3.21, *p*=0.0024 for reversible subject; *t*=-3.77, *p*=0.004 for reversible direct object). The overall mean scores of non-reversible relatives also show that the early sequential bilinguals gave correct responses more often than the early simultaneous bilinguals, as seen in Table 2.
Table 2. Mean scores for non-reversible relative clauses (three tokens each).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject RC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Object RC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total mean average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. simultaneous (N=13)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>1.96 (1.22)-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. sequential (N=38)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>2.66 (0.58)-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC type mean average</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early sequential bilinguals correctly understood non-reversible relative clauses almost 90% of the time while the early simultaneous bilinguals did so only 65% of the time. *T*-tests revealed that the early sequential bilinguals differed from the early simultaneous bilinguals in terms of non-reversible direct object relatives (*t*=−3.92, *p*=0.0018). However, the two groups did not differ from each other when non-reversible subject relatives were considered. Although the early simultaneous bilinguals performed better than the early sequential bilinguals, the difference in their mean scores was not statistically significant (*t*=0.29, *p*=0.7743).

In addition to accuracy rates, error rates also help reveal the linguistic knowledge of learners. Two types of errors are discussed here. As mentioned earlier, reversal errors occur when subject relatives are misinterpreted as direct object relatives or vice versa. On the other hand, head errors occur when the learner selects the first noun in a relative clause as the head noun. For example, correct interpretation of a direct object relative *yeça-ka* (NOM) *po-nun namca* ‘the man whom the woman sees’ would enable the learner to select the man in the picture frame where the woman’s head is turned toward the man. However, a head error would force the learner to circle the woman in the same picture frame, and the (erroneous) interpretation would be ‘the woman who sees the man’, in which the woman is the head noun of the relative clause. If the phrase was interpreted as a subject relative *yeça-lul* (ACC) *po-nun namca* ‘the man who sees the woman’, it would be an example of reversal error and this interpretation would
go with the selection of the man whose head is turned toward the woman in another picture frame.

Before discussing the error rates of the two bilingual groups, it should be noted that neither group made reversal errors on non-reversible relative clauses. This might have to do with the fact that reversible relative clauses allow two possible interpretations (correct and reversal) whereas non-reversible relative clauses allow only one sensible interpretation. The percentages of each type of error are presented in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Percentages of each error type by (a) simultaneous bilinguals (n=13) and (b) sequential bilinguals (n=38).](image)

Noticeable from Figure 2 is that the difference in the percentages of head errors made by each group is striking. The head error rate of the early sequential bilinguals is minimal (5%) whereas the early simultaneous bilinguals made head errors one-third (31%) of the time. This suggests that unlike the early sequential bilinguals, the early simultaneous bilinguals had difficulty correctly identifying the relative position of the head noun and the relative clause.

**Individual Results**
An examination of individual scores would also provide insight into the linguistic knowledge of the participants. The discussion of this subsection will be on reversible relatives (eight tokens total) mainly because both types of errors were found with them. A first point has to do with the proportion of participants who were accurate on at least seven of the eight tokens. Approximately one-fourth (n=9) of the early sequential bilinguals did so, and four (H15, H22, H30, H33)
of those nine gave correct responses to all eight tokens. However, none of the early simultaneous bilinguals exhibited this type of accurate performance, although it is possible that inclusion of more participants might yield different results.

Another point has to do with the ratio of error types found in each group. Recall that nine of the thirty-eight early sequential bilinguals correctly responded to at least seven of the eight tokens, which kept their error rates minimal. Among those \((n=29)\) who failed to do so, eleven participants made at least two reversal errors on subject relatives, respectively, and fourteen of the remaining participants did the opposite at least twice, respectively. The two (H9, H26) remaining early sequential bilinguals made at least two reversal errors on both types. However, of a total of nineteen head errors, there were only four instances that happened more than twice individually. In other words, the early sequential bilinguals predominantly produced reversal errors (a total of 80 errors).

However, of the thirteen early simultaneous bilinguals, three participants made reversal errors on subject relatives at least twice individually, and another three did the opposite at least twice, respectively. Yet, eight of the thirteen early simultaneous bilinguals made head errors on one or the other type at least on two occasions, respectively, and four (HL1, HL4, HL9, HL12) of those eight did so on both types at least twice, respectively. Table 3 lists individual error rates of the early simultaneous group in each category (reversal vs. head errors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SR Rev. head</th>
<th>OR Rev. head</th>
<th>SR Rev. head</th>
<th>OR Rev. head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the early simultaneous bilinguals produced more head errors than reversal errors, which suggests that the majority of
the early simultaneous bilinguals had trouble correctly locating the head noun and the relative clause, compared to the early sequential bilinguals, who had a good understanding of that aspect of Korean relative clauses.

Discussion
The present study set out to examine the differences in the grammatical knowledge of early simultaneous and sequential bilinguals, who mainly differed from one another with respect to the amount of input they had received in the heritage language during early childhood. Two predictions were tested. Regarding the first prediction (early sequential bilinguals will understand Korean relative clauses more accurately than early simultaneous bilinguals), both group and individual data showed that the comprehension of the early sequential bilinguals was more accurate than that of the early simultaneous bilinguals. The accuracy rates of reversible relatives were 32% for the early simultaneous bilinguals and 66% for the early sequential bilinguals. A similar contrast was also found with non-reversible relatives (65% for the early simultaneous bilinguals and 89% for the early sequential bilinguals).

Turning to the second prediction (early simultaneous bilinguals will produce errors (i.e. head errors) more often than early sequential bilinguals), the early simultaneous bilinguals produced more head errors than reversal errors whereas the opposite was true for the early sequential bilinguals. Unlike the early sequential bilinguals (5%), the early simultaneous bilinguals produced head errors approximately one-third (31%) of the time. Head errors would occur if the learner failed to attend to the fact that the head noun follows the relative clause in Korean. Given this, the error rates suggest that the early simultaneous bilinguals had trouble identifying the head noun and its relative position to the relative clause in Korean, compared to the early sequential bilinguals.

As noted earlier, head errors are made when the first noun in the relative clause is erroneously selected as the head noun. Recall that the early simultaneous bilinguals produced head errors 31% of the time. This head error rate is interesting in that the head noun precedes the relative clause in English, unlike Korean, which leads us to speculation that the early simultaneous bilinguals in the present study
might have relied on the English word order, as similar observations were made by Kim (2008) and by Lee-Ellis (2011). In other words, the sizable proportion of head errors produced by the early simultaneous bilinguals seems to suggest that they were more prone to utilizing the head-initial order of English relative clauses, compared to the early sequential bilinguals. Both bilingual groups in this study were English-dominant, but the percentage of head errors made by each group suggests that the early simultaneous bilinguals were more susceptible to dominant language influence than the early sequential bilinguals.

Before discussing the nature of the linguistic knowledge of the heritage speakers in this study, a remark on their performance on different types of relative clauses (subject vs. direct object and reversible vs. non-reversible) is in order. As for the animacy effect (reversible vs. non-reversible), both heritage groups performed better on non-reversible relative clauses (those with one animate argument) than on reversible relative clauses (those with two animate arguments), which adds support to the observation that the number of animate arguments in the relative clause has an effect on the comprehension of relative clauses (Gennari & MacDonald, 2009). Yet, the two heritage groups differed when the gap effect (subject vs. direct object relative) was concerned. The early simultaneous bilinguals performed significantly better on subject relatives than on direct object relatives while the early sequential bilinguals did not show a statistically significant subject advantage.

At first glance, the results of the early sequential group do not seem to be consistent with the implications of the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie, 1977) whereas those of the early simultaneous bilinguals are. However, it should be noted that the early sequential bilinguals overall did score higher on subject relatives (72%) than on direct object relatives (61%). Another point might have to do with the fact that twenty-five percent (n=9) of the early sequential bilinguals were accurate on at least seven of the eight reversible relative clauses, performing well on both subject and direct object relatives, which might have obscured the difference in the mean scores.

Let us turn now to the nature of the linguistic knowledge of the two heritage groups. Without the longitudinal data of the partici-
pants in the present study, any conclusive remarks must be cautiously made. Yet, it should be noted that there was not much difference between the two heritage groups in terms of their use of the heritage language since the start of formal schooling, according to the biographical survey. All participants indicated that English was their dominant language and they would normally converse with their parents, siblings, and friends mostly in English. Also, the majority of the early sequential bilinguals’ parents had increased their use of English after formal schooling began, further limiting their heritage language exposure. In other words, the main difference between the two heritage groups would be in the amount of input they received during early childhood.

Given this, it might be useful to compare the performance of the two heritage groups in the present study with that of four-year monolingual Korean children as well as that of adult Korean L1 speakers, which would provide meaningful insights into the nature of each bilingual group’s knowledge of the heritage language. According to Cho’s (1999) L1 study, four-year old monolingual children correctly understood (reversible) relatives about 66% of the time and then improved to 71% by age five. The accuracy rate of the early simultaneous bilinguals in the present study was about 32% and that of the sequential bilinguals was 66%. In other words, the early sequential bilinguals’ accuracy rate matches that of four-year old L1 children whereas the early simultaneous bilinguals’ rate is far below. As Cho’s study showed, the accuracy rate would improve as children grow older. In addition, five adult L1 controls in this study correctly understood all test items, which indicated their accuracy rate at ceiling. Based on this, both the early simultaneous and the early sequential bilinguals appear to exhibit incomplete acquisition of Korean relative clauses rather than attrition of them.

However, each group seems to exhibit a different degree of incomplete acquisition. First, the early sequential bilinguals’ head error rate (5%) showed that they had a firm understanding of the relative position of the head noun and the relative clause in Korean, unlike the early simultaneous bilinguals. Second, their accuracy rate (66%) was the same as that of L1 four-year olds in Cho’s study whereas the early simultaneous bilinguals’ accuracy rate was half that (32%). Based on this, it might be possible to speculate that the early
sequential bilinguals’ knowledge of Korean relative clauses was already in place by the time they started to be exposed to English. This speculation seems to be supported by the fact that four of the thirty-eight early sequential bilinguals gave correct responses to all eight reversible relatives.

Compared to the early sequential bilinguals, the early simultaneous bilinguals might not have acquired age-matched knowledge of relative clauses by age four, which might have persisted into their adolescent years. Recall that the early simultaneous bilinguals were accurate about one-third (32%) of the time and made more head errors (41%) than reversal errors (23%). In other words, it appears that the early simultaneous bilinguals did not have a chance to obtain age-appropriate knowledge of Korean relative clauses.

The findings of the present study help better understand the differences of the two heritage groups and the effect of input received in early childhood. Yet, it should be noted that caution must be exercised in interpreting the findings of the present study due to its limitations. In particular, a larger sample size and more tokens of test stimuli would help verify the tentative conclusions drawn in this paper.

Lastly, the findings of the present study also have pedagogical implications for foreign language instruction. In recent years, there has been an increasing trend in many foreign language classrooms including those involving less commonly taught languages that heritage speakers are placed alongside L2 learners (Brinton, Kagan, & Bauckus, 2008). This aspect presents challenges to the instructor in that these two groups of learners bring to class different language backgrounds and experiences, and different sets of language skills, among other things. In turn, the differences in these aspects affect the instructor’s decision-making process in terms of course objectives, designing class activities, and the way in which classroom activities are executed to benefit both learner groups. Along with a mixture of L2 learners and heritage speakers in the same class, the heterogeneous nature of heritage speakers also presents challenges to the instructor in the sense that it adds more variables to consider in his or her instructional decision-making process. As Montrul and Ionin (2012) pointed out, figuring out which linguistic areas the various types of learners (e.g., L2 learners vs. heritage speakers and simulta-
neous vs. sequential heritage speakers) may or may not differ would be a prerequisite to achieving more effective instruction. In this sense, the findings of the present study provide a useful reference point.

**Conclusion**
The present study examined the differences in the grammatical knowledge of early simultaneous and sequential bilinguals. Its findings have revealed that many of the early simultaneous bilinguals had trouble correctly identifying the head noun and the relative clause, unlike the early sequential bilinguals. In addition, the latter group performed at a level similar to four-year old L1 children whereas the early simultaneous bilinguals performed far below. This finding, along with the fact that adult-like comprehension was observed with some of the early sequential bilinguals, seems to indicate that the early simultaneous bilinguals exhibited a lesser degree of grammatical competence, compared to the early sequential bilinguals. In other words, a more severe degree of incomplete acquisition was observed with the early simultaneous bilinguals, although both heritage groups appear to have experienced incomplete acquisition of the heritage language.
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**Notes**
1. Other explanations were also proposed. Some accounts (O’Grady, 1997) are based on the structural distance between the head noun and the gap (the number of nodes or maximal projections such as CP (complementizer phrase), IP (inflectional phrase), and VP (verb phrase)). Others rely on the linear distance (e.g. the number of intervening words) between the gap and the head noun (Tarallo & Myhill, 1983). According to structural distance accounts, subject relatives should be easier to comprehend, regardless of branching directions (pre-nominal vs. post-nominal), in that less syntactic embedding is
involved in a subject relative (\textit{the man [CP who [IP __ looks at the woman]]})
than in a direct object relative (\textit{the man [CP whom [IP the woman [VP looks at __ ]]]}). However, linear distance accounts predict that subject relatives should be easier to comprehend in languages with post-nominal relative clauses (e.g., English) whereas direct object relatives should be easier in languages with pre-nominal relative clauses (e.g., Korean). There are also accounts that invoke the semantic prominence associated with the subject of the relative clause in explaining the relative ease of subject relatives over direct object relatives (O’Grady, 2011).

2. Many studies in first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition of Korean and Japanese relative clauses found an advantage for subject relatives, but studies on Chinese relative clauses have yielded conflicting results. For example, Hsiao and Gibson (2003) found that L1 Chinese speakers read direct object relatives faster than subject relatives while a reading time measures study by Lin and Bever (2006) reported opposite results. See O’Grady (2011) for further discussion of processing effects on relative clauses in these three East Asian languages.

3. This is not to say that subject advantage or the implications of the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie, 1977) do not hold for adult L1 Korean speakers. Rather, adult L1 Korean speakers’ comprehension of relative clauses is so competent that their comprehension scores would obscure the subject-object asymmetry. Hence, different methodologies such as those involving reading-time measures and eye-tracking movement might be more appropriate in probing into the knowledge of adult L1 speakers. In fact, processing studies by Kwon, Polinsky and Kluender (2006) and by Kwon, Lee, Gordon, Kluender and Polinsky (2010) reported that adult L1 Korean speakers read subject relatives faster than direct object relatives, consistent with the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy.

4. Some variation is found in the test materials used in comprehension studies. Cho’s (1999) study only included a set of two pictures whereas studies by O’Grady et al. (2003) and by Kim (2008) employed a set of three pictures including a distractor, which did not depict a relative clause. Yet, Cho’s (1999) study found support for subject advantage, as O’Grady et al. (2003) and Kim (2008) did. Based on these results, it is unlikely that the variation found in test materials would affect the experimental results. Thus, inferences may still be
drawn from the findings of these studies, although direct comparisons might not be desirable.

5. The majority of the participants in the present study were placed into a first-semester beginning-level course through a placement test, which consisted of a written test and an oral interview.

6. Originally there were a total of sixteen tokens in the experiment, but two of them were excluded from the analysis due to an error in those two test items. It would be desirable to have more tokens in general, but the number (four or five tokens for each type) gets small if the comparison between subject and direct object relatives is focused, as seen in some of the previous L1 and L2 studies (Cho, 1999; Diessel & Tomasello, 2005; O’Grady et al., 2001, 2003; to just name a few).

7. In O’Grady et al.’s (2001) study with both heritage and L2 learners of Korean, the difference in the mean scores of subject and direct object relatives was much smaller for the four-semester (intermediate) L2 learners (36%) than for the second-semester (beginning) L2 learners (58.4%). Interestingly, the mean difference of the second-semester heritage speakers (23.7%) was much smaller than that of both L2 groups. The matching four-semester heritage group was not included in their study, but it might be speculated that the mean difference of the four-semester heritage speakers would have likely been much smaller, possibly obscuring the difference in the mean scores of subject and direct object relatives, unlike that of the three groups included in O’Grady et al.’s (2001) study.
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Abstract
Learning less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) such as Japanese can be challenging for American students. Due to the difficulty of learning LCTLs, more effort is required of the learners to become proficient as compared to European languages. Motivation contributes to the learners’ academic success. In the socio-cultural perspective, the learners’ cultural background mediates their cognitive process. This study examines the motivational differences and similarities among two culturally diverse groups of high school learners of Japanese: Asians excluding Japanese-Americans and non-Asians. One hundred forty two students completed a survey. Factor analysis yielded six factors: integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation (doing activities for enjoyment), self-efficacy (a belief in one’s ability to succeed), goal specificity, and goal strategy. The motivational differences were confirmed in intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy. Implications of these findings for LCTL teachers suggest practical steps that can be taken on motivational factors that influence students from different cultural backgrounds.

Introduction
Learning less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) such as Japanese can be challenging for American students. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) reports the length of time to achieve speaking level 3 for English speakers. Spanish and French take 575-600 class hours. German takes longer 750 class hours. East Asian languages (Japanese, Korean and Chinese) and Arabic are significantly more difficult for English speakers. Amazingly, they take 2,200 class hours, nearly 3.5 times more than Spanish and French. It is in large part because of difficulty in learning the writing system. Due to the difficulty of learning LCTLs such as Japanese, East Asian language researchers (e.g., Saito & Samimy, 1996) emphasize the importance of motivation for learners’ academic success.
Unlike other East Asian languages, the recent trend of Japanese language learners is culturally diversified. Recent studies have shown that in the United States, 80% of Japanese language learners had non-Japanese language backgrounds (Schmidt, 2005) whereas only 12% of the Korean language learners had non-Korean language backgrounds (Nunn & Hong, 2007). The concept of considering cultural and ethnic background in the pedagogy contributes to a deep understanding of acquisition of second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) (Iyengar & DeVoe, 2003). Socio-cultural researchers (e.g., Iyengar and DeVoe, 2003) claim that cultural and ethnic differences mediate children’s motivational beliefs since the diverse backgrounds of immigrants and their varied degree of acculturation impacts their perspective as well as the motivation for learning FL and SL. Analyzing the learners of LCTLs such as those of the Japanese language with culturally diverse backgrounds is essential in providing a comprehensive understanding in student motivation. It is worthwhile for instructors to investigate what motivates Japanese language learners to create learning models and to explore what influences acquisition (Nunn & Hong, 2007). The purpose of this study is to identify the differences and similarities in two culturally and ethnically diverse groups of high school Japanese language learners in the United States.

**Literature Review**

Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed the classical theory of language learning motivation which entails two constructs: (a) instrumental orientation and (b) integrative orientation. Instrumental orientation involves learning the target language for a practical purpose in order to gain a benefit from acquiring the target language, such as attaining a better job. The student usually has little interest in the target language’s culture (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977). Integrative orientation reflects the “individual’s willingness and interest in social interaction with members of other groups” (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993, p. 159); therefore, it stems from a desire to be integrated into the community of the target language.

Debate surrounding motivation theory intensified in the 1990s due in large part to two primary components: First, the incentive to learn a language is too complex to explain with a dichotomous
approach; rather, motivational variables must attend to the multifaceted nature of learning a second language (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Secondly, cultural, psychological, and social aspects of language learning need to be considered (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995). In a study of East Asian language learners, Sung and Padilla (1998) found that the integrative and instrumental items belonged to one factor even though they used Gardner’s (1985) orientation items. These studies indicate that the integrative-instrumental motivation approach appeared to be inconsistent; therefore, this dichotomous approach was found to be insufficient by some researchers (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Sung & Padilla, 1998).

In line with the above dichotomous motivational model, Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) created the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation theory. According to them, intrinsic motivation “refers to the motivation to engage in an activity because that activity is enjoyable and satisfying to do, whereas extrinsically motivated behaviors are those actions carried to achieve some instrumental end such as earning a reward or avoiding a punishment” (Nakanishi, 2002, p. 2). They hypothesized that when people are free to choose to perform an activity, they are able to rise to the challenge of the situation and by striving to meet these challenges, develop a sense of competence in their ability. As a result, they enjoy and persist at activities that they have chosen. Katz and Assor (2006) reviewed the value of offering choices in the numerous researches (e.g., Iyengar & Lapper, 2000), when they claim that choice can be either motivating or de-motivating depending upon various settings: “Choice is motivation when the options are relevant to the students’ interests and goals (autonomy support), are not too numerous or complex (competence support), and are congruent with the values of the students’ culture (relatedness support)” (Katz & Assor, 2006, p.1). Iyengar and Devoe (2003) pointed out that the pursuit of personal choice is invariably mediated by culture. Specifically, Iyengar and Lepper (1999) examined Asian and European-American children (ages 7-9) who were asked to either choose an activity for themselves or be told that someone else would choose for them. The results have shown that European-American students demonstrated less intrinsic motivation when choices were made for them by others than when they made their own choices. Conversely, Asian Americans were mainly motivated and performed
best when a member of in-group (e.g., a parent or the class) chose for them and they did significantly worse when they made the choice for themselves. The above literature suggests that self-choice does not cultivate intrinsic motivation for Asian Americans indicating social and cultural factors should be taken into account when analyzing intrinsic motivation.

Wigfield & Eccles (1992) emphasized the importance of self-efficacy stating that “children’s expectancies and values are assumed to have the most direct effect on their performance, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks” (p. 279). Self-efficacy is referred to as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required in attaining designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). Judgments mean rather explicit judgments, such as having specific skills instead of merely a self-recognition of being good in the subject (Schunk, 1991). Self-efficacy also refers to some type of goal (designated tasks) (Bandura, 1986; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). In the academic domain, “students master school-related tasks, but also have outcome expectations about what grades they might receive on the tasks” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 89). Based on the above literature, students with high self-efficacy are more likely to choose challenging but attainable tasks, use higher order cognitive strategies on tasks, demonstrate more self-regulation, and achieve higher levels of comprehension so that they set higher goals, expend greater effort and persist longer than those with low self-efficacy (Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Schunk, 1991).

In the previous motivational study with a population of Euro-American students (Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Locke & Latham, 1990; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002), self-efficacy was correlated with academic performance. However, Eaton and Dembo (1997) claimed that the theory of self-efficacy might not be applicable to Asian American students and their achievement. Eaton and Dembo (1997) investigated differences in the motivational beliefs of Asian American ($n = 154$) and non-Asian ($n = 372$) ninth graders. Their research has shown that Asian-American students who tend to have lower self-perception than Euro-American students, set even higher goals for themselves and evaluate their performance against more stringent criteria motivating them to expend additional effort to reach their
goals. Unlike past research supporting lower levels of self-efficacy that produce motivational, affective, and cognitive deficits (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1991), low self-efficacy appears to be a driving force assisting Asian American students to develop their academic performance. Again, as shown in the above literature, a cultural difference mediates self-efficacy between Asian and non-Asian students.

In the context of language learning, the belief that their goal can be achieved influences student effort and persistence in learning (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). A learner’s belief about his or her own ability to reach the target level of proficiency directly influences the learner’s motivational behavior. Students with high self-efficacy set more challenging and higher goals. From a social cognitive perspective, Locke and Latham (1990) defined goals as “something the individual is consciously trying to attain, but the thing being sought is outside the individual” (p. 7). In other words, students with a goal “tend to experience a higher sense of self-efficacy for attaining it and engage in activities they believe will lead to attainment: attend to instruction, rehearse information to be remembered, expend effort, and persist” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 176).

Goal setting is closely related to self-efficacy and one of the most important positive influences on personal goal setting (Locke & Latham, 1990; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). As learners observe goal progress, self-efficacy is substantiated, which in turn conveys improving skills (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Locke and Latham (1990) reviewed a number of studies and meta-analyses of over 100 studies with over 7,000 cases showing that proximal goals and specific goals lead to better performance (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). The goal-setting theory suggests that individuals who have challenging, proximal, and specific goals will out-perform those with easy, distant, and non-specific (“do my best”) goals (Locke & Latham, 1990; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). However, several studies (e.g., Isogai et al., 2003; Gano-Overway & Dua, 2001; Brandt, 2003; Lee et al., 2003) addressed cultural differences in goal orientation. Roebken (2007) examined student goal orientation in relationship with achievement with the sample of 2,309 college students in Northern California. His study indicated that Asian students rated higher in specific academic goals (e.g., grade and test) than Caucasians.
What causes the inconsistency of the above findings? From a socio-cultural perspective, learners’ cognitive processes are significantly influenced by the social interaction and cultural milieu (e.g., Rueda & Dembo, 1995). Students’ self-efficacy reflects the influence of psychological processes and social-cultural mediation in learning (Oldfather et al., 1999). According to the above literature, in order to investigate the population of various ethnic backgrounds, the socio-cultural component of language learners must be taken into account in motivational studies. Few studies have investigated the differences of culturally different groups in LCTCs. In this study two culturally different groups are investigated to seek out the differences and similarities in motivation: Asian students, excluding Japanese-Americans, and non-Asian students. Japanese-Americans were excluded in the Asian group, since the Japanese language, as a heritage language for Japanese-Americans, is the target language spoken at home to some degree and could mediate Japanese-Americans’ motivation (Fishman, 2001; Sung & Padilla, 1998; Valdes, 2001; Wen, 2011). The research question was then posed to seek out the differences and similarities in motivation between Asian students and non-Asian students in two aspects of learning the Japanese language: 1) how are the six measured motivational variables (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) different or similar between Asian students and non-Asian students? 2) how are these two groups different or similar in intercorrelations among the six measured variables?

Methodology

Participants, Instruments, Data Collection, and Data Analysis

There were 142 high school students enrolled in Japanese language classes in the United States (Hawaii, New York, Texas, and California) who participated in this study in 2006. In this study, subjects were divided into the two major ethnic categories in the Japanese program; Asians ($n = 69$), and non-Asians ($n = 73$). Asians consist of Chinese ($n = 31$), Koreans ($n = 27$), Vietnamese ($n = 7$) and Cambodians ($n = 3$). Non-Asians consisted of the following: Caucasians ($n$
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= 46); Hispanic \((n = 17)\), African Americans \((n = 7)\) and American Indians \((n = 3)\).

The self-reported survey consisted of two parts (see Appendix). Part 1 of the survey consisted of questions about students’ demographics and language-related backgrounds: gender, ethnicity, school year, course level, length of time studying Japanese, and a language-related question as to whether or not Japanese is spoken at home.

Part 2 of the survey consisted of 40 items regarding motivational information including; integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy. The motivational information questionnaire used a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), except for intrinsic motivation which used a 5-point Likert scale. Since the National Foreign Language Resource Center/Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center conducted a similar survey using a 5-point Likert scale with a high reliability of internal consistency \((\alpha = .84)\), the same scale was adopted for this study. The questions of integrative motivation (items 1 to 6), and instrumental motivation (items 7 to 11) were adapted from motivational research at the University of Kansas (e.g., Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994). The University of Kansas validated these motivational orientations in East Asian languages through face-to-face discussions, telephone conversations, and e-mail correspondences. The questions measuring intrinsic motivation (items 12 to 17) were adapted from the National Foreign Language Resource Center/Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa (Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996). These items were created after a series of large-scale studies in undergraduate level foreign language classrooms between spring 1996 and fall 1997. The questions of self-efficacy consisted of 8 items, 18 through 25. Items 18 to 21 were adapted from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and McKeachie (1991). Items 22 through 25 were selected from Malpass’ dissertation (1994). Items 26 through 40 were adapted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995). This section consisted of two parts in goal salience: goal specificity (7 items from 26 to 32) and goal strategy (8 items from 33 to 40). The
polarity of reversed-question items (16, 26, 29, 34, 38, and 40) were adjusted appropriately.

The reliability tests indicated an internal consistency between items for each scale. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of six factors (integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) were: .82, .80, .82, .95, .70, and .74, respectively.

**Results**

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the six motivational factors of each ethnic group. As in Table 1, self-efficacy revealed the highest mean with goal specificity as the second highest. Integrative motivation is the third highest mean for non-Asians and goal strategy is the third strongest mean for Asians. Both groups show that integrative motivation is higher than instrumental motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Asian (n = 69)</th>
<th>Non-Asian (n = 73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>38.93</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal specificity</td>
<td>33.47</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal strategy</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 1: Motivational Differences between Asian and non-Asian Groups**

In order to investigate how the two ethnic groups differ on six motivational factors, *t*-test was administered. The result showed that two factors revealed significant differences demonstrating that non-Asians scored higher than Asians: intrinsic motivation, *t* = 1.92, *p* < .05, and self-efficacy *t* = 4.98, *p* < .05.
Research Question 2: Comparison among the Intercorrelations of Measured Motivations between Asian and non-Asian Groups

Pearson product-moment correlations were also used to compare significant inter-correlations between factors of the two ethnic groups in order to answer the second research question: how each measured variable correlates differently in two ethnic groups. Intercorrelations of six measured variables (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) for the two ethnic groups are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Intercorrelations of Measured Variables for Asian Students (n = 69)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goal specificity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Goal strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .001.

Table 3. Intercorrelations of Measured Variables for Non-Asian Students (n = 73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goal specificity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Goal strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .001.
Differing correlations were revealed among the two ethnic groups only in association with goal strategy as in Tables 2 & 3. The Asian group showed distinctive differences from the non-Asian groups in regard to goal strategy associated with other measured motivational variables. The non-Asian group showed significant correlations associated with three motivational variables; integrative, instrumental and goal specificity. On the other hand, the Asian students linked with only one motivational variable, i.e., goal specificity (see Table 2) indicating that goal strategy correlates with the measured variables more in non-Asians than Asians. The differences of correlations revealed in instrumental and intrinsic motivations related with goal strategy. As in Tables 2 and 3, non-Asians showed significant correlations in goal strategy related with instrumental and intrinsic motivations, whereas Asians showed no significant correlations with these motivational variables. This indicates that goal strategy has a significantly positive influence on instrumental and intrinsic motivations. Goal specificity associates significantly with goal strategy in both groups. Unexpectedly, goal strategy did not reveal significant correlation with self-efficacy in both groups, which does not accord with the previous study (e.g., Seijts & Latham, 2005).

Overall, the measured motivational variables (integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, self-efficacy and goal specificity) with the exception of goal strategy, revealed positively significant correlations with other measured motivational variables indicating that they are significant contributors for the Japanese language learning for both ethnic groups.

In summary of the findings, it was remarkable that many of the measured variables did not reveal statistically significant differences in the correlations among the two ethnic groups as the sociocultural researchers had claimed (e.g., Rueda & Dembo, 1995). This could be because the Asian group consisted of American born participants who were in all probability assimilated into the American culture (e.g., Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner & Cain, 2001). The subgroups of the Asian group (1st, 2nd, 3rd generations, etc.) need to be considered since some studies discovered the significant differences of the motivations among the subgroups of Asians (e.g., Rueda & Chen, 2005). However, differences in motivational beliefs were discovered in this study, specifically in intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy.
Goal strategy shows the different correlations with the measured motivational variables in the two ethnic groups. The findings of this investigation still confirm those of other researchers who examined motivational beliefs and cultural differences (e.g., Bernat, 2004).

**Discussion**

Results of this study show that both Asian and non-Asian students have great confidence in their ability in learning Japanese (e.g., “I am certain I can master the skills being taught in the Japanese class.”), which can be observed in self-efficacy shown from the highest mean (Table 1) among the measured variables in each group. Non-Asians show higher self-confidence than Asians, even though Japanese is categorized as the most difficult language for English speakers and takes longer class hours compared to European languages. This result implies that both groups, especially non-Asians, have confidence in their ability to do well not only in the Japanese class but also in understanding the complex materials presented by the instructor in the course. This is shown in some question items of the survey, such as in items 18-25 (e.g., “I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the reading for this course; I have no doubts about my ability to do well on exams in this class”).

The students of both ethnic groups have specific goals on what they would like to accomplish in the Japanese course displayed in Table 1 where goal specificity revealed the second highest mean for both groups. Both groups also have clear goals and purposes in learning the Japanese language as indicated in the survey items, e.g., “I have specific plans when it comes to learning Japanese; I know what my purpose of studying Japanese is.” Several researchers (e.g., Eaton & Dembo, 1997; Rueda & Chen, 2005) assumed that Asian-Americans set higher goals for their academic achievement due to family pressure, since in general, Asian parents place a greater importance on their children’s education. However, this study did not reveal the significant difference between Asians and non-Asians. The reason might be the fact that Asians are assimilated to the American culture, since Asian students in this study are all American born. However, further research is needed.

As for integrative and instrumental motivations, as some second language acquisition researchers (Cookes & Schmidt, 1991)
claim: “Integrative motivation has often been held to be a superior support for language learning” (p. 472), the students of both ethnic groups indicated that they learn Japanese with more integrative motivation. Instead of intention beneficial to their future careers, the students learn Japanese to be able to better understand and appreciate the art and literature of Japanese culture and to participate in the culture activities of a Japanese group such as the Obon dance (traditional Japanese dance usually held in summer).

In regards to the differences of motivation between two ethnic groups, there are significant differences in self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation between two ethnic groups. First, as for self-efficacy, non-Asian students show much greater confidence in their capability to do well than that of the Asian students, even though the Japanese writing system is far different for non-Asians than Asians. Non-Asian students tend to expect more and do well on the exams and quizzes in the Japanese class. Studies addressing culturally and ethnically mixed samples (e.g., Oettingen et al., 1994) claimed that Asians underestimate their ability while non-Asians overestimate theirs. Similarly, in this study Asians showed much lower self-confidence in learning Japanese than non-Asians in spite of similarities in writing systems, especially for Chinese speakers.

Secondly, non-Asian students tend to enjoy learning Japanese more than Asian students. Even though learning Japanese is more challenging for non-Asians than Asians due to the distinctive difference in its writing system and grammar, non-Asians indicate that the Japanese class is a challenge that they enjoy. Also, they like using Japanese language outside of class whenever they have a chance, more so than Asians. Also, non-Asian students expressed that they would take a Japanese class even if it is not required. The reason for this difference is out of scope in this study and could be researched in the future.

As for the differences of two ethnic groups among the intercorrelations, unexpectedly, the unique difference was observed only in goal strategy with other measured variables. Goal strategy in this study refers to a study plan or schedule for the Japanese course and to make an effort to follow the plan. For non-Asians, goal strategy relates positively with intrinsic, instrumental motivations and goal specificity. This implies that making a study plan for learning Japa-
nese enables non-Asians to enjoy learning Japanese more, to be more career oriented, and to have a specific goal for accomplishing tasks, tests, and assignments. As for Asians, making a study plan does not correlate with other measured variables as much as for non-Asians. This indicates even though Asians make a study plan in learning Japanese, it does not always lead to enhancement of their instrumental, integrative motivations, enjoyment of learning Japanese, and self-confidence. Goal strategy, such as making a list of the things the students have to do and making a time schedule of their study, correlates with goal specificity in both ethnic groups. The implication is that with specific study plans, tasks, and assignments, the students would be enhanced with their goals or expectations of the course in Japanese.

In sum, not many differences between two groups were observed in intercorrelations among the measured variables except for goal strategy. Goal strategy did not correlate with integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, and self-efficacy in the Asian group indicating that this variable might not be universal across ethnic groups. Since the study of goal setting was administered for American and European students of learning European languages, the theory of goal setting might be applied dominantly for the population of Americans and Europeans. Surprisingly, goal strategy did not significantly correlate with self-efficacy in both groups, which does not accord with the previous research claiming that self-efficacy has a direct influence on the level of the goal set (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Seijts & Latham, 2005). Further research is needed to investigate the reason(s) for this discrepancy.

Implications and Conclusions
First, the results demonstrate that different ethnic groups differ in types of motivational beliefs which explains their behavior regarding Japanese language acquisition. The differences in motivational belief could result from family cultural background values (Uba, 1994), or socio-economic status and perceptions of and responses to schooling (Ogbu, 1995). The genesis of these motivational orientations was beyond the scope of this study but would be an important focus for future research.
Secondly, the following pedagogical implications can be addressed based upon the findings. As the study by Iyengar and Lepper (1999) has shown, self-made choice enhances the non-Asian intrinsic motivation; therefore, the projects (e.g., cultural topic and cultural comparison) where the students can decide on topics and create dialogues, facilitate the learner’s freedom within the curriculum framework in the non-Asian dominant class. However, as socio-cultural researchers (e.g., Katz & Assor, 2006) pointed out, self-made choice may not foster intrinsic motivation for Asian students. Asians performed best when a member of the in-group (e.g., the class), did significantly worse when they made the choice for themselves (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999); therefore, the instructors can assign their tasks or choices, or the Asian students can select from the list in the Asian dominant-class, or the instructor needs to balance the self-choice tasks and the instructor-assigned tasks depending upon the ethnically dominant group in the class.

Even though both groups show high self-efficacy, non-Asians have significantly more confidence in their learning Japanese as in the finding of this study and previous researches (e.g. Pintrinch & Schunk, 2002). It is important to give positive feedback often to Asian students in order to enhance their confidence. In order for Asians to develop confidence, especially in speaking skill, the instructors might want to have them demonstrate dialogues with their partners or give a speech in front of the class. Working in pairs, Asians and non-Asians can couple up for oral activities.

As shown in the result of this study, the students respond positively to the specific tasks and activities of learning Japanese so that they are more engaged in the classroom activities. It’s also important that the tasks are challenging but achievable in order to enhance the students’ self-efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1986). The goal setting theory also suggests the specific goals or tasks (Locke & Latham, 1990; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). In order to enhance the purpose of the students’ study, the instructors might be very specific on the challenging but achievable tasks on the assignments, upcoming quizzes, tests, and class activities (vocabulary, new sentence patterns, Chinese characters, etc.). The instructor constantly informs the students about upcoming quizzes or tests, etc., via the campus internet (e.g., Moodle and BlackBoard) so that the students are aware of the
specific plan, goal, and task of the course in the on-going pace. In addition, using the backward design developed by Wiggins and McTighe (1998), the instructors can inform specific items to study for the quizzes and tests. The backward design is the instructional approach to design lesson plans to identify desired outcomes and results. The specific and detailed grammar items, idioms, tasks, classroom activities, etc. are designed in each lesson. In addition, the instructors might benefit students by expressing specific goals for classroom activities, explaining the goal of each lesson before class starts; for example, writing the schedule of each lesson on the board (e.g., grammar items) and upcoming quizzes and tests. In this way, the students clearly see the specific goals, assignments, and accomplishments of each lesson. Providing a detailed course schedule with the syllabus is also recommended. A detailed course schedule means not just the dates and the pages of the lessons, but the dates of the quizzes, tests, and assignments that explain the items they need to study or submit so that the students can make a plan in advance.

The report by Modern Language Association (MLA, 2010) shows that the enrollment of the LCTLs grew between 2006 and 2009: Arabic language (up 46.3%), Korean (up 19.1%), Chinese (up 18.2%), and Japanese (up 10.3%). Additionally, more LCTLs were offered for study in 2009, 35 LCTLs more than in 2006. MLA Executive Director Rosemary G. Feal (2010) said that many American students recognize the importance of LCTLs for the future of the United States. In this sense, the motivational research regarding the socio-cultural perspective in learning LCTLs becomes more important than ever in the American melting pot of cultures. However, since research regarding the socio-cultural perspective in second language acquisition is still predominantly for the populations of Europeans or Americans with commonly taught languages (English as second language, Spanish, French and German), LCTLs are a forerunner in this field. More research is needed in learning the LCTLs in motivational research from a socio-cultural perspective.

Lastly, in light of the socio-cultural perspective, it is quite possible that these differences may apply, not only to the Japanese language learners, but also to other LCTL students within varying motivational paradigms. Instructors of the rapidly increasing numbers of students of LCTLs need to consider these differences in their ped-
agogy when applying motivational constructs to enhance students’ impetus in learning.
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Appendix

**Part 1:** Student Background Information
Please mark X on the appropriate answer.
1. Gender: Male _______ Female ________
2. What is your ethnic membership?
   Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ African-American _____
   American Indian _____ Japanese-American______
   Other (specify) ________________________
3. Year at high school: Freshman ___ Sophomore ____
   Junior ___ Senior ____
4. Is Japanese a spoken language among your family members such as parent(s), relatives, siblings or grandparents?
   Yes____ No _____
5. What level are you currently enrolled in Japanese?
   1_______ 2_______ 3_______ 4_______ 5_______
6. How long have you been studying the Japanese language?
   ________

**Part 2:** Motivation to Learn Japanese
Please circle the number that indicates how well you agree with each of the statements below.
Questions from 1 to 11 and from 18 to 40 have a 1 to 7 scale as follows:
1: strongly disagree 2: moderately disagree 3: slightly disagree
4: neutral (no opinion) 5: slightly agree 6: moderately agree
7: strongly agree

Questions from 12 to 17 have a 1 to 5 scale as follows:
1= strongly disagree
2= disagree  3 = neutral or no opinion
4 = agree 5= strongly agree

I am taking a Japanese language class because…

1. I will be able to participate in the cultural activities of a Japanese group.
2. I will be able to meet and converse with more people.
3. I will be able to better understand and appreciate the art and literature of the culture.
4. I will be more at ease with native speakers of Japanese.
5. I want to converse with my friends in Japanese.
6. I want to travel to countries where this language is spoken.
7. I think foreign language study is part of a well-rounded education.
8. I will be a more knowledgeable person.
9. I will need the language for my future career.
10. It will be useful someday to get a job.
11. I will get respect from others if I know a foreign language.
12. I really enjoy learning Japanese very much.
13. My Japanese class is a challenge that I enjoy.
14. When Japanese class ends, I often wish that we could continue.
15. I enjoy using Japanese outside of class whenever I have a chance.
16. I don’t like language learning.
17. I would take the Japanese class even if it were not required.
18. I am certain I can master the skills being taught in this class.
19. I am confident I can understand the basic concepts taught in this course.
20. I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the reading for this course.
21. I am confident I can understand the most complex material presented by the instructor in this course.
22. Considering the difficulty of this course, the teacher, and my skill, I am confident I can do well.
23. I expect to do very well on most exams in this class.
24. I have no doubts about my capability to do well on exams in this class.
25. Even when the questions are difficult, I know I can succeed in this class.
26. I don’t have any specific plans when it comes to learning Japanese.
27. I have a clear idea of how much Japanese I want to learn.
28. I have a specific goal of how much Japanese I want to learn.
29. I do not know what my purpose of studying Japanese is.
30. I often think of what I want to accomplish in my Japanese course.
31. When it comes to learning Japanese, my goals change all the time.
32. I have planned out well what I want to achieve in my Japanese course.
33. When I study Japanese, I often refer to a goal.
34. I rarely take time to think about my Japanese learning plans.
35. I sometimes ask someone for advice on the best way to learn Japanese.
36. To me it is a great advantage when I have a schedule or a plan for this course in a Japanese class.
37. When I study Japanese, I rarely follow a plan.
38. I don’t spend much time thinking about my goals to learn Japanese.
39. I often make a list of the things I have to do in my Japanese course.
40. I rarely follow a time schedule when I study Japanese.
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Abstract
This article explores the effectiveness of a newly-launched, technology-rich approach in the classes of a less commonly taught language, Turkish; it is one of the rare studies on the proficiency level of students of Turkish as a foreign language, and it provides valuable feedback on new ways of teaching and learning a second language that might help the development of future strategies in the field. Both proficiency and course evaluation significantly improved with the new, deeper approach compared to control groups. The study is a unique contribution and a real opening to approaches in which students are placed as curriculum builders and the language instructor plays a role of facilitator in the management of rich online resources, blending face-to-face interactions and learning support with online activities.

Introduction
This article describes the effects of the integration of online instructional material that takes a “Deep Approach” to Turkish language acquisition. This immersive, learner-centered, technology-rich, and project-based approach was designed for institutions of higher education that offer programs in Turkish language and culture, and Middle East studies (Tochon, Ökten, Karaman, & Druc, 2012). It creates opportunities for blended learning, defined as an education that combines classroom interactions with computer-mediated activities. One advantage is the connection with differentiated instruction: blended learning can be based on personal learning environments that are self-regulated (Tochon, Ökten, Karaman, & Druc, in press). Among the technologies used for blended learning in this research are a new hypertextbook, streaming videos, multimedia, and PowerPoints (Tochon, 2013), and the integration of current technologies into instructional modules, such as blogs, Skype, Livemocha, forums to create educative projects, etc. Larmer, Ross, and Mergendoller
(2009) define project-based learning as a teaching method in which the learners are in large part independent from the teacher—they demonstrate in-depth understanding and critical thinking, and engage in an inquiry process on authentic and complex issues that lead to quality public productions. In addition to these aspects, one key principle of the Deep Approach is that students choose their own projects (rather than having them imposed by the teacher) and create their own curriculum for the projects with their peers and guided by the teacher. This article explores the difference this integrated learning and Deep Approach makes in terms of proficiency growth, as demonstrated through the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages’ Oral Proficiency Interview, or OPI, and course evaluations.

**Self-determined Projects, Deeper Learning, and Enhanced Motivation**

Blended learning is particularly helpful to scaffold projects, as it supports autonomous problem solving (Delialioğlu, 2012). It places students in self-regulated environments in which they are able to evaluate their own progress (Lee & Lim, 2012). The ever-changing nature of communication in educational spaces and the existence of various literacies with social, cultural, and regional variation require new ways of conceptualizing language instruction. Computers and Internet connections can help access multiliteracies, yet they often lead to shallow learning. Carr (2011) suggests that a counterweight to fast and shallow learning is needed: educators need to study in what ways technologies can enhance rather than prevent deep learning.

Deep language learning is the target of the approach studied in this research project. It involves both cultural understanding and proficiency. A specific teaching methodology is required for deep learning. In Figure 1, Entwistle (2008, p. 7) indicates how knowledge can and should evolve away from authoritative knowledge and dualism toward reasoned commitment, intercultural respect and recognition, which implies parallel conceptions of learning evolving from acquisition to epistemic transformation. Understanding education as an identity-seeking project may transform our vision of what curricula should be and of the need for personalized and self-motivated pathways towards deep understanding. This is the intent of the Deep
Effectiveness of deep, blended language Approach, which is relevant and applicable to both education and language learning.

Deep learning is defined by behaviors related to remembering what is learned for a long time, applying knowledge to new situations, inferring new meanings and generating new ideas, associating concepts to daily experiences, establishing relationships between incidents and results, and examining principles of thought in discussions, while surface learning is defined as quickly forgetting what is taught, not holding discussions using correct principles of thought, understanding a limited amount of knowledge, memorizing only the required information to pass tests, and seeing learning as an extrinsic load. (Göçmençelebi, Özkan, & Bayram, 2012, p. 554)

While the conceptualization and operationalization of deep and surface processing may differ across studies depending on the theoretical frame utilized, the results from studies that meet stringent criteria for deep learning demonstrate that the levels of processing and performance are related, and confirm the assumption that deep processing promotes stronger learning outcomes, while surface processing promotes weaker learning outcomes (Dinsmore & Alexander,
Deep learning concerns the whole person, implying a sense of purpose, empowerment and transformation (Tochon, 2010a). Environment providing increased learner autonomy may be an excellent ground for a deepening of knowledge. Such are blended learning environments, which integrate e-learning and virtual education with face-to-face interaction (Thorne, 2003). Among the many conceptions of learning, blended environments can be used for project-based learning and peer work, which is conducive to deep learning (Mahoney & Schamber, 2011). They create a sense of community. Jaffee (2007) summarized the advantages of “interdisciplinary connections,” promoting “deeper understanding of content,” and facilitating active learning through application (p. 65). Deep learning emphasizes action, quality, relevance and purposefulness rather than rote learning. Learning a new language is understood as a process of intercultural accommodation, which connects to a variety of subtle meanings and situational elements that need to be related to catch the whole.

Blended with the use of new technologies, project-based learning can stimulate autonomous discovery of new content and direct contact with native speakers (Tochon, 2010b). While conceiving of computer-assisted environments may be extremely complex if the goal is to create virtual learning worlds, such as making a Second Life environment useful for learners (Wold, 2011), the task is easier when it comes to scaffold thematic resources in an environment that permits students to create personal and team projects. Studies on learning effectiveness indicate that students perform significantly better in blended learning environments than in environments that are exclusively online (Chen, 2012). Asynchronous environments are most frequently used for convenience: learners explore topics through emails, forums, blogs, and make their own team schedule without interaction with the instructor (Kruse, 2004). However, synchronous interaction is crucial for second language acquisition (Lee, 2002). Synchronous learning usually integrates the familiar classroom model, learners can receive feedback from their peers as well as the instructor, and can retrieve or create content quickly that otherwise would not be available in the normal classroom (Keegan et al., 2005), which helps students access complex subject matters (Pfister, 2005). Addi-
tionally, Ge (2012) showed that a blended approach in which language learners can interact with contents through streaming video and can contact native speakers through networks such as Livemocha brings significantly better learning results than the asynchronous approach.

Blended environments can offer authentic, collaborative challenges over which learners have control and stimulate meaningful second language use. Real-world themes, issues, problems and actions create reflective situations to solve problems in their context, in a way that respects the autonomy of the student and is conducive to proficiency. Students then have choice, decision-making authority, and voice. They become engaged learners. The next section examines how a deeper approach to language learning could reach these goals. Then we will examine how in-depth projects can stimulate a form of apprenticeship. Such projects can lead to creation, action, and experience. Enjoying the journey is part of the goal.

**How the Deep Approach Differs from Previous Methodological Trends**

What is new in the approach studied here is the emphasis on the transformational dynamics of life learning—in which learners become social activists through the practice of values and practical wisdom pertaining to the studied cultures (Ikeda, 2010; Obelleiro, 2012). Thematic organizers are used to scaffold projects. They are flexible ways of guiding students’ choices, more like personalized standards, without reifying the concepts enacted in the projects. Tochon (2013) summarizes what makes this approach distinct:

- The students are placed in charge of building their own curriculum and projects to achieve their desired expertise, using accountability measures through instructional agreements.
- The basis of the students’ curriculum building is the teacher’s provision of blended resources (literary, visual, aural, and online) organized adaptively. The teacher becomes expert in scaffolding and facilitating feedback.
- Knowledge is not a “thing” that can be taught as an object: it is understood as deep, subjective and intersubjective, inseparable from the identity process. Depth is defined in a way
that transcends the commodification and commoditization of knowledge. Educative projects are open and become ways of preventing knowledge crystallization and sedimentation. Rather, it is about situated knowledge in action.

- The focus is on deep, personalized processing, not the same standardized outcomes for all. There is room for diversity and flexibility, non-native speaker comfort, code switching, and unique perspectives.

- The approach targets transdisciplinary values for a more sensible and wiser world—this way language learning becomes the means toward conflict resolution, ending war and poverty, re-greening the planet, and turning to more humane politics through socially and even globally-situated projects and problem exploration. Yet, rather than a dualistic view, the principle of the included middle (or third space) is applied, through which two apparently opposed elements can be integrated at a higher (still relative) level.

The Deep Approach is a convergence of what worked best in earlier approaches. Its holistic scope allows for more student autonomy and works for the planet and society while working on the language. The instructional principles for teachers are to:

- go by the results of motivation research, and provide incentives for self-directed learning and self-determination;

- merely scaffold possibilities, thus making the landscape as flexible as possible for students to choose, select, and frame—on their own—the curriculum; in this they use their own literacy-based thematic units, indexing all language modalities to each other, and use online modules (rather than a textbook) or supplement with a large variety of multimedia resources for blended learning;

- emphasize process rather than outcomes; refer to “instructional organizers in forward planning” (Tochon, 2010c) rather than goals or outcomes in backward planning;

- encourage individualized, peer-oriented, and small group project-based learning, focusing on cultural content and social action;
• give primacy to text; consider grammar as storytelling about language; target extensive reading/viewing and intensive writing/recording;

• use deep formative feedback and empowerment evaluation; integrate self-evaluations and peer-evaluations; and,

• focus on value creation by highlighting critical issues related to the respect of other languages and cultures, language status and invisible or open discrimination, the colonial mindset versus principles of social justice, and linguistic human rights for peace building.

In summary, understanding the Deep Approach is seeing education and schooling in an “avant-garde” way, as learning languages and cultures constitutes a threshold towards global and transdisciplinary goals supported by intrinsic motivation and identity investment.

Projects Stimulate Apprenticeship and Learning by Doing
Three motivation theories legitimate project-based approaches: self-efficacy theory, attribution theory, and self-determination theory (Beckett & Miller, 2006; Larmer, Ross, & Mergendoller, 2009). This literature indicates that in-depth projects benefit from the students’ intrinsic motivational impulse, which increases classroom dynamics. Students like to know that they are in control of the factors of their success. Their source of accomplishment is inside, not outside. They develop a sense of ownership over their projects. Self-determination, effort-enhancing attributions, as well as a sense of self-efficacy and what Norton (2000) defines as identity investment, form the groundwork of the Deep Approach to language learning. Blended learning in self-determined projects meets students’ needs for instructional relationships, autonomy, and competence (Deci et al. 1991).

As mentioned by Beckett and Miller (2006), project methodology was initiated by David Snedden in science education and then developed and disseminated by a student of Dewey named William Heard Kilpatrick (1918). Project-based apprenticeship enhances the quality of student learning compared to other approaches; it affects positively problem-solving and decision-making capacities (Thomas, 2000). Projects tend to reduce learners’ anxiety and emulate positive attitudes toward the discipline (Boaler, 2002). When educative pro-
jects target interpersonal and social situations in the other language, situated modeling, scaffolding, collaboration, and coaching stimulate various forms of socialization that enhance knowledge, skills, and experiences within contexts genuinely and informally created by the learners through their collaborations (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Ding, 2008). Project-based learning promotes expression, interpersonal exchange, individual thought, and personal apprenticeship.

However, mainstream project-based learning often implies that the instructor is the curriculum builder, which prevents students from choosing their own projects and determining on their own how they will accomplish them. When they are given such self-directed opportunity, deep learners engage in problem solving from the phases of conception, design, decision making, investigation, realization, and report. Exposing students to new habits of self-directed learning may help them take charge of their own learning and develop proficiency. They can choose to work by themselves or in groups, however there must be a negotiation on the type of process involved, the life situation explored and the ways it will be explored and accounted for. Heilman and Stout (2005) indicate possible stages that can help language instructors stimulate the creation of educative projects among their students:

(a) generate ideas together and outline the project by determining what groups will be formed and what will be the role of each (teachers should not accept duplicate projects);

(b) visualize anticipated projects and prepare possible scenarios;

(c) conduct an Internet search, multimedia exploration and strategic skimming of data; engage in inquiry and summary writing; and practice the interviews among peers—initial contact, warmup, interview and close—before the actual experience;

(d) refine projects for the report phase and prepare and rehearse presentations;

(e) present the individual, peer or group projects, which can be done using various media, and conduct self- and peer-assessment as preps for instructional assessment; and,

(f) engage in post-active reflection on the work done, whereby students reflect on what they learned, the amount they use the tar-
get language, and the strategies that could have improved their action.

To sum up, self-directed projects can blend with the use of online resources and new technologies. Motivation research suggests that it would increase opportunities for deep learning, which might have an impact on proficiency growth, the hypothesis underlying the present study. Increased student satisfaction may result from that deep process, which can also be measured through course evaluations.

**Proficiency Growth**

Language teacher effectiveness and student learning or achievement are in large part measured on the basis of the growing ability by the language learner to speak and interact with the language, as measured on a scale that the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has taken years to perfect. The movement towards proficiency in language studies is often known through its instrument: The Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) is a structured conversation between one student and one rater lasting 20 to 30 minutes (ACTFL, 1999). The ACTFL OPI is used worldwide by universities and public and private agencies for purposes such as placement, assessment, program evaluation, professional certification, hiring and promotion. Research in second language acquisition indicates that the quantity and variety of target language input affects student learning, which is a sound rationale to make sure language instructors have reached a reasonably high proficiency level (Chambless, 2012; Weyers, 2010), which was the case in the present study.

The OPI is recognized by the American Council on Education for college credits, and more than 10,000 evaluations in 37 languages have been conducted through this testing program. The ACTFL guidelines for the evaluation of oral proficiency are associated to robust criteria. Its raters are submitted to thorough practical training that, in many cases, may last almost 1 year after the initial OPI training workshop (Swender, 2003). After an initial familiarization workshop, tester training for the OPI is organized in intensive 4-day sessions focusing on the techniques of administering and rating the proficiency interview. The rating scale and techniques for eliciting a ratable sample are highlighted in daily sessions and reinforced in language-specific sessions. Participants can observe demonstration
interviews and then conduct practice interviews with volunteer candidates under trainer supervision. Following this initial training, they will practice at all levels of the rating scales and send recordings for feedback and evaluation, until certified.

During their OPI training, OPI raters must submit recordings at the various levels of proficiency, which often require double the amount of interviews before selection of these levels and thresholds. Then an experienced rater evaluates the ratings, some feedback is provided and more often than not a second series of recordings is required before the final rater certification. The rater certification is temporary and its renewal depends upon additional supervised training and practice. The OPI scale is considered robust because—after much training—there is satisfactory reliability across testers and across tests by the same evaluator, and the criteria are robust enough to be applied and replicated without major bias. Yet the ACTFL OPI has been criticized for various reasons, some of which are its lack of sensitivity over the span of one semester (Young, 2001) and even over an 8-week intensive summer course associated with immersion abroad (Davidson, 2010a). Other criticisms relate to the artificial conversation in the interview, which simplifies interpersonal communication; moreover, when OPIs are done by phone, the lack of face-to-face interaction may lead one to question its external validity, since interviewees interact without the semiotic and behavioral clues typical of face-to-face conversations.

Therefore, there was some initial hesitancy at the time of defining the evaluation scheme of the present study as to whether the OPI scale should be used and would be sensitive enough to measure the results of Deep Approach program. Nonetheless the OPI is the most commonly used measure of proficiency in U.S. universities, and therefore there was not much choice in terms of the availability of raters. Most major Turkish programs have certified OPI raters, and a majority of language programs integrate the OPI in the normal student evaluations at the beginning and end of each semester, or at the beginning and end of the academic year. Thus the ACTFL OPI was integrated in the assessment model. Turkish OPIs are based on the Provisional Proficiency Guidelines for Turkish prepared in 1993 by the American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages Proficiency Guidelines Working Committee; they are informed by the ge-
neric ACTFL proficiency guidelines. “The Guidelines afford the lan-

guage teaching communities a means to describe proficiency levels

that are language specific while at the same time providing linkage to

the corresponding proficiency levels in other languages” (AATT,

1993, p. 1).

OPI Research Methodology

What is the effectiveness of the Deep Approach and of the use of

this instructional material in terms of oral proficiency growth and

course evaluations? To respond to this research question, ACTFL

OPI and course evaluations were used to measure the effectiveness

of the Deep Approach with its online resources. The OPI research

protocol is presented first. The research protocol for course evalua-

tions is presented after the OPI results. The ACTFL website men-

tions the characteristics of the OPI1: it is “a valid and reliable means

of assessing how well a person speaks a language. It is a 20–30 mi-

nute face-to-face or telephonic interview between a certified ACTFL

tester and an examinee. The interview is interactive and continuously

adapts to the interests and abilities of the speaker. The speaker’s per-

formance is compared to the criteria outlined in the ACTFL Profi-

ciency Guidelines.”2

OPI Data Collection

Testing sites: The tests were organized in the Turkish programs of

five Big Ten and Ivy League universities.

Participants: The experimental group consisted of volunteer

students from the Deep Approach programs in these universities. 

Following appropriate research procedures, students could decide

that their ratings would be used for research or not. Twenty-four in-

termediate students and 21 advanced students for a total of 45 stu-

dents OPI-tested at least twice. The control group consisted of 20

intermediate students and 11 advanced students for a total of 31 stu-

dents OPI-tested at least twice.

1 http://www.actfl.org/professional-development/certified-proficiency-testing-

program#opi

2 See the ACTFL website:

http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012-

Speaking.pdf
OPI Testers: Each of the programs had an ACTFL certified OPI tester. All the raters were native speakers of Turkish, ACTFL certified and experienced OPI raters. Experience in Turkish teaching ranged from 7 to 10 years, and experience in OPI testing ranged from 5 to 11 years. The testers were among the most experienced of the Turkish instructor community in the United States.

Quasi Experimental treatment: The treatment was the integration of online instructional material specially created for Deep Turkish Learning, as described in the guidelines for the Deep Approach to languages and cultures (Tochon, 2013). In most language programs, an ACTFL trained lecturer is in charge of the OPI assessment, which is an integral part of the curriculum. Since the OPI is often the basis of some percentage of the students’ grades, there is often a double check of oral recordings. One-rater OPIs are named “unofficial OPIs.” Audio recordings were systematic in two universities, not in the others. Some programs include OPIs at the beginning and end of each semester, some only provide ratings at the beginning of the Fall semester and at the end of the Spring semester. It was not always possible to evaluate oral proficiency at the beginning and end of the same semester.

**OPI Data Analysis**

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the rating scale used numerical equivalents for each OPI level, as shown in Table 1. These numerical equivalents differ from Kenyon and Tschirner (2000); however, what is important is the order of these ordinal data rather than the value because non-parametric statistics are used, based on the median.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Rating</th>
<th>Numerical Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Low (NL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice Mid (NM)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice High (NH)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Low (IL)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Mid (IM)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate High (IH)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Low (AL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mid (AM)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced High (AH)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following sections, we explore the OPI data and then course evalua-
Effectiveness of deep, blended language
tions are compared.

OPI Results
The following two tables present the results of the OPIs for the experimental group and the control group in the Intermediate Course (Table 2) and the Advanced Course (Table 3).

Table 2. Pre-Fall Pre-Spring Post-Spring Intermediate Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY A</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL</td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY A</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Pre-Fall Pre-Spring Post-Spring Advanced Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY A</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
<td>POST-SPRING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL GROUP</td>
<td>POST-SPRING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-SPRING</td>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY B</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY C</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>SUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>AH-SUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSEY A</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSEY C</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress across OPI levels and across OPI thresholds was noted in Table 4 (Intermediate Course, 2nd year) and Table 5 (Advanced Course, 3rd year). The results presented below differentiate proficiency growth and when a proficiency threshold had been passed. Thresholds represent progress from Novice (1) to Intermediate (2), from Intermediate to Advanced (3), or from Advanced to Superior (4). For example, if Laura progressed from IM (2.35) to AL (3), she gained two levels (IH and AL) and passed one threshold (the Advanced threshold): both are mentioned in each Table.
### Table 4. Levels of Oral Proficiency Progress in Two Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTFL Unofficial OPI</th>
<th>EXPERIMENT INTERMEDIATE One semester N = 7</th>
<th>EXPERIMENT INTERMEDIATE Two semesters N = 17</th>
<th>CONTROL INTERMEDIATE One semester N = 4</th>
<th>CONTROL INTERMEDIATE Two semesters N = 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Progress</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level of Progress</td>
<td>5 students</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>3 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels of Progress</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>7 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levels of Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Levels of Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Levels of Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OPI Threshold</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td>10 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OPI Thresholds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Levels of Oral Proficiency Progress in Two Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTFL Unofficial OPI</th>
<th>EXPERIMENT ADVANCED One semester N = 5</th>
<th>EXPERIMENT ADVANCED Two semesters N = 16</th>
<th>CONTROL ADVANCED Two semesters N = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Progress</td>
<td>2 students AH+S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level of Progress</td>
<td>3 students</td>
<td>4 students</td>
<td>8 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels of Progress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 students</td>
<td>3 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levels of Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 students</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OPI Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 students</td>
<td>5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

What the results in Table 4 and 5 tell us is that the most engaged students using a Deep Approach, who were given a greater autonomy and the power to be curriculum builders, had the opportunity to progress faster towards higher levels of proficiency. Qualitative data helped understand how such results had been made possible (Tochon, Ökten, Karaman, & Druc, 2012). Here is an example. In one university, an intermediate group of students decided to organize their own extensive Reading Club. They found a series of short novels and decided to read a different one each week, which was far beyond what their instructor would have normally advised, but this was their decision as a group. Self-directed team decisions and extensive reading are aligned with the Deep Approach model (Tochon, 2010c, in press), so the instructor did not object. Each student would read a novel that would be different from the ones read by their peers, and would prepare vocabulary and pre-reading scaffolds for the future readers, and they would discuss their readings in their weekly Reading Club meetings. During the first few weeks, the students who chose to create an extensive Reading Club faced a situation similar to that of students who are suddenly immersed in a foreign language abroad. During the first weeks they were lost but kept up with the task because this activity was their own decision. After 4 to 6 weeks they were able to cope with their extensive readings and its fast pacing, moreover they could enjoy the pre-reading materials of their peers, as well as team discussions as scaffolds for forthcoming readings. Some leaped three to five OPI levels and transcended one threshold in one semester.

This is not to say that extensive reading alone made them move up so many OPI levels and one threshold: autonomous language learning with the Deep Approach was more likely the real motivator. It forced students to face their choice for the amount of reading, as well as book choices and collaborative work over the readings. They persevered because these had been autonomous choices. They would have resisted against such choices had they been imposed, taught, and evaluated by the instructor. Extensive reading might not provide the same results with another group that had not chosen on its own initiative to enact this recommended aspect of the Deep Approach.
The interpretation of the results has to be mitigated. Firstly the instructors did not report their detailed monthly activities, which had been initially requested. We learned afterwards that some of them had maintained 2 hours of direct instruction in grammar per week while dedicating the rest to the Deep Approach. To free instructors from grammar instruction, the instructional materials proposed grammar storytelling on video that students could consult when needed. It may be anticipated that within environments in which autonomous learning becomes more acceptable and instructors agree to attend intensive training on the new approach, the results would be even stronger. This aspect was emphasized in Tochon, Ökten, Karaman, and Druc (2012). Secondly, the control groups were particularly strong, as would be attested by comparisons with OPIs in other languages of similar difficulty such as German. It was very difficult to find control group data for the OPI, which led this author to include data from University D, whose instructor is knowledgeable of the Deep Approach and admitted she was using similar strategies in part of her courses.

In the following sections, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics are used to determine the significance of the OPI results and verify their generalizability and consistency, first in University A, where the results have reasons to be more consistent because of the presence of a single evaluator across years and across experimental and control groups, and then for all university sites.

**OPI Statistical Analyses for University A**

The first descriptive and inferential analyses focus on the results obtained in University A. It is the university in which the largest number of data was obtained, which allows comparisons across experimental and control groups. The way of assessing proficiency was most probably highly consistent because it operated on the same site by the same experienced evaluator over many years, with and without the Deep Approach and its instructional hyper textbook (Tochon, 2013). Table 6 indicates a progression in proficiency among students in both control and experimental groups, with an advantage in groups using the Deep Approach (Intermediate: compare 2.58 for the control group to 2.74 for the experimental group; Advanced: compare 3.24 for the control group against 3.60 for the experimental group in the
Table 6. Descriptive Statistic of OPI Results in University A Means and Standard Deviations in the Intermediate Course and the Advance Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPI GROUP</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>CONTROL Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
<td>PRE-SPRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td>2.00 (.25)</td>
<td>2.42 (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>3.00 (.29)</td>
<td>3.55 (.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OPI test is on an ordinal scale, therefore non-parametric statistics were used first to explore the differences across groups and second to analyze the pre-post differences within each group. For University A, the U-Test of Mann-Whitney for independent groups indicated a significant difference between the experimental and control posttests in the Advanced Course (U=18; U’=70; p=.026).

The pre-Fall vs. post-Spring comparison with the Wilcoxon Sign Rank test in each group indicated that both the experimental group and the control group in both the Intermediate Course and Advanced Course were demonstrating significant progress in proficiency, with a minimal probability of error of p=0.002. The Friedman ANOVA for related groups confirms this progress across the three testing periods of pre-Fall, pre-Spring and post-Spring (Table 7). Note: Missing data had to be replaced by column means to operate the Friedman ANOVA.

Table 7. OPI Progress in University A Measured with the Friedman ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPI</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PROGRESS Chi-Square (Prob)</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP PROGRESS Chi-Square (Prob)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td>23.04 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
<td>22.17 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>18.17 (p=.0001)</td>
<td>15.88 (p=.0004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For an ultimate verification, an ANCOVA was used to confirm the differences for each testing time and group, comparing pre-Falls, pre-Springs, and post-Springs for both experimental and control groups. The rationale for using an ANCOVA is that no equivalent measure exists in the non-parametric arena. The results indicate $F=12.11$ for the Intermediate Courses ($p=.0002$) and $F=3.71$ for the Advanced Courses ($p=.037$). These results can be considered food for thought, confirming the prior results of significant pre-post differences and differences across groups.

The Alpha post hoc reliability of the University A measures was verified with Hoyt’s analysis, which indicated an F-ratio of 58.94 between items ($p<.0001$) and an F-ratio of 2.33 between cases ($p=.01$), which were highly significant.

**OPI Statistical Analyses for All Sites**
The second set of analyses focuses on the results obtained in all university settings, including University A. Various evaluators were involved in this measure, described in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Descriptive Statistic of OPI Results in All Sites Means and Standard Deviations in the Intermediate Course and the Advance Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPI GROUP</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>CONTROL Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE-FALL</td>
<td>PRE-SPRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td>1.73 (.35)</td>
<td>2.42 (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>2.64 (.40)</td>
<td>3.55 (.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all university sites, the pre-Fall vs. post-Spring comparison with the Wilcoxon Sign Rank test in each group indicates that both experimental and control groups in both the Intermediate Course and Advanced Course were demonstrating significant progress in proficiency, with probabilities of error ranging between $p=.003$ and 0.0002. Note: The reason why the Advanced experi-
mental group has better results in pre-Spring comes from the small number of ratings obtained at that time from University A. See Table 2. The Friedman ANOVA for related groups confirms progress across the testing period with a probability of error inferior to .0001 (Table 8).

Table 8. OPI Progress in All University Sites Measured with the Friedman ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPI</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PROGRESS</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square (Prob)</td>
<td>Chi-Square (Prob)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td>41.17 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
<td>47.57 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>43.56 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
<td>45.39 (p&lt;.0001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an ultimate verification, ANCOVAs confirm the differences for each testing time and group, comparing pre-Falls, pre-Springs, and post-Springs for both experimental and control groups, which non-parametric statistics do not offer. F=16.03 for the Intermediate Course (p <0.0001) and F=9.59 for the Advanced Course (p=.0003). Thus there are significant differences across groups and across time. The Alpha post hoc reliability measures were verified with Hoyt’s analysis, which indicated an F-ratio of 128.06 between items (p<.0001) and an F-ratio of 2.58 between cases (p<.0001), which were highly significant.

**Discussion**

Comparisons with other corpora are possible (see Table 9). As a test, the ACTFL OPI is well documented in undergraduate language courses and comparisons abound—while we must admit that they are very rare for the Turkish language, a language that presents special difficulties to students because of its morphological cases, and its reversed and agglutinative structure. Tscheriner and Heilenman (1998, p.156) compared 20 students at the end of their fourth semester and found results ranging from Novice High to Intermediate Mid, which was consistent with seven prior university studies in French, German, and Russian: “It was previously assumed that the median OPI rating
of the fourth semester students of German is IM. The results … seem to indicate that OPI level expectations need to be lowered by one sublevel”. This issue relates to program expectation. The median results in the present study were higher (Table 9).

Table 9. Oral Proficiency Range and Median in the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Pre-Fall</th>
<th>Post-Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>IH</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the oral proficiency results indicate that both experimental and control groups were successful in significantly improving the students’ proficiency across the semesters of both the Intermediate and the Advanced courses (2nd and 3rd year of study). Furthermore, there are significant differences between the experimental and the control groups at both levels, which means that students developed their skills differently. The results are reliable, consistent, and have been confirmed by inferential statistics over time and across groups. What then is the difference for the Deep Approach group? The differences in progress pacing indicate that the best students improved more swiftly and in more important ways with the Deep Approach, to the point of reporting results superior to study abroad programs (Davidson, 2010ab). While average results are better at the Intermediate level, the Deep Approach makes a stronger difference in terms of proficiency growth at the Advanced level. These results were obtained in conditions in which not all instructors had been fully trained to the new approach, and in which the control groups were particularly strong. Project-based learning is an environment of blended interactions in which learners are curriculum builders, using online resources for their project, and provides valid, successful and reliable proficiency growth.

**Course Evaluations Methodology**

All universities use standardized forms to assess the success of instruction on the basis of the evaluation made by the students. It is not easy to enter into the logics of the tests used by various institutions, some focusing on content effectiveness and planning, others
on pedagogy, rapport, and fairness. Not only were the scales different from university to university, they might vary from year to year in the same university. They may focus on the students’ own perception of various dimensions of the instruction, such as the articulation of course goals, the emphasis on language skills and culture, the value of homework and assignment, course quality and rapport with the class, appropriateness of activities and course pacing, and usefulness of the approach and challenges in terms of language abilities. Many of the items permit an evaluation of the program’s approach and thus can illuminate some aspects of the study. The control groups’ comparisons focus on courses given by the same experienced instructors between 2007 and 2012 with various classes. Descriptive and inferential statistics are used to study the responses to similar items. Thus the methodology used here was to find items that would (1) correspond across scales, and (2) would be relevant to aspects of the present study.

Course Evaluations by Students
In this section, the course evaluations of different classes with or without the Deep Approach are compared. The methodology to compare course evaluations and allow statistical analysis was complicated by the presence of competing scales across universities (0 to 4 or 1 to 5), and of questionnaires that were different across institutions and even across years at the same institutions. The statistical differences are examined from a descriptive and then from probabilistic perspective: (1) across scales presenting high levels of similarities, such as similar questions, see Tables 10 and 11; and, (2) across three universities having different scales for which semantically similar questions could be found; a selection of ten questions presenting a high level of similarity across universities has been done, and the 0–4 scales were adjusted to 1–5 to ease comparison (Table 12).

Intermediate Level. The first comparison was made at the intermediate level (Table 10).
Table 10. Descriptive comparison of course evaluation means in Intermediate courses of one University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Course Evaluations in one University across years</th>
<th>Non-Deep Approach 12 students</th>
<th>Deep Approach 10 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Course goals clearly articulated</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate emphasis on language skills</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Useful readings &amp; culture materials for language acquisition</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Valuable homework as reinforcement of classroom work</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exams consistent with assignments, method &amp; materials</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Challenged linguistic abilities in reading, writing, speaking and listening</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Course pacing</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Weekly hours spent outside class</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall course quality</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Instructor was able to stimulate interest in material</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Appropriate activities to encourage oral skills</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Care for students learning</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rapport with the class</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instructor attitude towards the course</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Instructor effectiveness in presenting &amp; explaining course materials</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Instructor availability outside of class</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fairness in grading process</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Overall quality of instructor</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Survival immersive skills learned in the course</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
The comparison of the means presented in Table 10 is in favor of the experimental group in these Intermediate level courses. The students perceived the goals were clearly articulated with the Deep Approach, which was possibly related to the online modules presenting the re-
lated 5C standard goals. The template used for projects emphasized the language skills appropriately. The readings and culture materials were perceived as more useful for second language acquisition, and the homework was more valued. Evaluations were perceived as more consistent and the abilities of the students were challenged in a higher fashion. However pacing (question 7 in Table 10) was perceived as somewhat quieter (from 2.17 down to 1.92) and these intermediate students had the perception of spending less time working outside class (which is contradicted by the results of question 8 in advanced courses as shown in Table 11). Overall intermediate courses with the Deep Approach were perceived as having higher quality, yet the terms “course quality” in the questionnaires may suggest a reference to directed courses, which was not the case here. Teacher rapport, attitude, effectiveness and availability outside of class were perceived as higher than in usual courses. The Deep Approach provided the survival skills for immersion abroad.

The statistical differences in Table 10 were subjected to statistical analysis to verify whether they were significant. For that purpose, the U-Test of Mann-Whitney was used, which is the appropriate non-parametric measure for two independent groups. The U-Test indicates that the differences between control groups and experimental groups are significant in favor of the Deep Approach, with an error probability threshold of $p=0.0068$ (z-value=-2.71) allowing generalization.

**Advanced Level.** The second comparison was made at the advanced level (Table 11).
Table 11. Descriptive comparison of course evaluation means in advanced courses of one university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Course Evaluations in one University across years</th>
<th>Non-Deep Approach 9 students</th>
<th>Deep Approach 15 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall quality of instructor</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall course quality</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor ability to communicate the subject matter</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructor ability to stimulate student interest</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructor accessibility and willingness to discuss course content &amp; any problems</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Value of assigned readings</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Course difficulty</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amount of work required for the course</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

In the advanced courses of one university, the quality of the instructor was highly noted in both groups. However, its grading was higher in the Deep Approach, with a higher note for the instructor’s accessibility and willingness to discuss course contacts and any problems that might pop up, which is typical of a Deep Approach. The factors of communication about the subject matter and course quality were perceived as lower than in other courses, possibly due to the nature of self-directed projects. Therefore, course difficulties and effects were perceived as more important at the advanced level. Advanced students used to systematic teaching might have some difficulty adapting to a regimen in which they are in charge of their own learning and projects. The results shown in Table 11 were obtained in one university only, and the U-Test statistic indicates that they are not significant ($p=.52; z$-value $=-.64$). The next table, Table 12, presents the overall results of intermediate and advanced students in three classes for 10 factors that are common to all settings.

Table 12. Descriptive comparison of course evaluation means on ten questions presenting a high level of similarity in three universities
### Analysis

Table 12 shows the comparison of similar questions in three universities with a larger number of students with and without the Deep Approach. The item means indicate a superior appreciation for all items for the Deep Approach, with very high values (between 4.62 and 4.85 contrasting with much lower appreciations in the control groups). The only exception is question 9, as the contribution to subject matter knowledge was somewhat lower than 4.86; yet 4.74 remains an excellent course evaluation. Some students might perceive that they get less content when they explore the subject matter on their own, rather than getting the “master’s voice” from the instructor. Yet here the difference was minimal. The U-Test of Mann-Whitney indicates that the difference is significant with a probability of error of $p=.031$ ($z$-value=$-2.16$). Thus, compared to control groups with the same

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Non-Deep Approach</th>
<th>Deep Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear &amp; effective presentation of subject matter</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor’s ability to help clarify course readings &amp; materials</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor’s responsiveness to students’ questions, opinions &amp; criticisms</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructor’s ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructor’s feedback outside class</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriateness and fairness of grading</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall value of readings for second language acquisition</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall value of assignments &amp; homework</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contribution to knowledge of the subject matter</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contribution to interest in the discipline or subject matter</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instructors using a different approach, the Deep Approach program had significantly better course evaluations.

**Discussion**

Course evaluations based on student responses introduce a series of biases that are well studied in that literature. Variables other than the program approach might account for the discrepancies between the two sets of data, such as the amount of experience held by the teacher at the time of evaluation or the proficiency level of the students. These possibly parasite variables could be controlled in a future study. Moreover, we kept here some items that might at first sight seem superfluous, such as grading satisfaction or instructor’s ability to answer questions. However, these items actually are dependent upon aspects of the program chosen: grading satisfaction may be higher when self-assessment and peer-assessment are accounted for, and the ability to free time for personal questions at least partly depends upon the teaching approach in the program. The results of course evaluation are an indication that the orientation is positive and successful; they provide food for thought and they confirm and triangulate the subjective perceptions of the language instructors, analyzed in other studies (Tochon, Ökten, Karaman, & Druc, 2012 and in press).

To sum up, the strongest results of this section indicate that students perceive that Deep Approach-oriented courses with blended resources and self-determined projects offered clear and effective presentations of subject matter; the instructor was able to clarify course readings and materials; the instructor was responsive to questions, opinions, and criticisms; and the instructor stimulated the students’ intellectual curiosity. The instructor provided enough feedback outside class. The students valued the assignments and homework highly, which contributed greatly to their interest in the discipline and subject matter. Grading was perceived as highly appropriate and fair (compare 4.77 to 3.67 for the control group).

These results are significant and can be generalized. In addition, Hoyt’s analysis provides a high coefficient of reliability of these data (.84) for the course evaluations and indicates internal consistency and a high level of generalizability, with high reliability between items ($p<.0001$) and between cases ($p<.0001$). Course evaluations are signif-
icantly better with a Deep Approach program.

**Conclusion**

Studies on Turkish learners in the United States are rare. The approach used to deep language learning is “new.” Therefore, this study is unique in the data it provides and the results it demonstrates, which support a deep, blended approach to language learning. The data showed a link between learning with online resources used in self-determined thematic projects and high student language performance in Turkish in unofficial OPI measures. Course evaluations were also significantly higher. Measures of reliability indicate that the results are consistent. Furthermore, they were triangulated by qualitative data (Tochon, 2013): the connection with higher levels of proficiency was noticeable for the Turkish instructors who used various forms of assessment current in their programs, such as conversations, formative and summative evaluations, individual and group comparisons across years, drills, and examinations, which helped them ground their professional judgment. Self-directed projects blend with the use of online resources and increase opportunities for deep language learning and proficiency growth. Increased student satisfaction resulted from that deep process, which was measured through course evaluations.

Blended learning is gaining primacy in language learning as instructors and students try to integrate new technological environments into classroom activities, which places instructors as facilitators of learning, providing the learners with opportunities to work through both face-to-face and online interactions (Duhaney, 2012). Yet, as recently mentioned in two online journals, “blended learning begins with, and relies upon, skilled teachers” (Merrow, 2012), and “teachers must give up some control” (Fortson, 2012). These issues are crucial and require professional development. Another issue that appears so important when designing blended learning environments is to scaffold deep learning designs: a conceptual basis is needed for sound design, applicable across personal technological environments. Deep learning design shapes the possibilities for “technology to most effectively enhance learning” (Boyle & Ravenscroft, p. 1224). The Deep Approach website created conditions for such deep linguistic and cultural exploration. As was noted at the beginning of this article,
Effectiveness of deep, blended language conceptual clarification is essential if we are to establish a stable and deep discipline of technology-enhanced learning. The technology is alluring; this can distract from deep design in a surface rush to exploit what the new technology affords.

One limitation of the study is the use of a speaking test (the ACTFL OPI) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Deep Approach as a methodology, which targets the improvement of all basic skills. There is no single, reliable, well-established, easy-to-implement proficiency test for Turkish language assessing all language skills. European-based comprehensive proficiency tests assume different proficiency guidelines. The Reading and Listening tests of the National Middle East Language Resource Center could be incorporated into future research for more complete measures. Life in a less than ideal world does not always allow researchers to obtain exactly the neat set of data that experimentalists might wish for. Instructors are not subservient to researchers and may refuse or have difficulty providing the needed comparison groups, which attests to a participant’s freedom that is explicitly encouraged by Institutional Review Boards.

Regarding the OPI, the literature provides comparative measures (Malone, Rifkin, Christian, & Johnson, 2003; Tschirner & Heilenman, 1998). Reliability coefficients provide only one perspective and should be viewed within the larger system of reliability analysis of the OPI literature. The idea that the numerical values of OPI levels could be compared in an experimental design with a control group emerges from the conviction that such tests are comparable. It should be remembered that the concept of comparability rests upon a probability that settings were comparable, testers had comparable grading strategies, and that variability can be accounted for by the probability thresholds of the statistics. In this research of an exploratory nature, we adopt a more modest stand and perceive the comparison as food for thought. The statistics must be understood as a reflective tool.

Another aspect that might be questioned in the present study is whether using the course evaluations of different years with the same instructors might neglect the growth of experience that may increase student course ratings; however, these instructors already had more than 7 years of experience teaching in the initial courses used in the comparison and the effort, for them, to learn how to
handle the new approach in an institutional context in which self-determined learning is not welcome could have produced opposite evaluations, and could have led to a decrease in student course ratings.

The type of online resources that provide for a blended, Deep Approach to language learning represents a new orientation and an important contribution to less commonly taught language teaching and learning, as this is a field in which textbooks are rare and sometimes obsolete. We need more research on the challenges that face teachers to help their students initiate self-determined projects for a deeper learning of world languages and cultures. Indeed, teachers face a certain number of challenges when they help their students implement projects, namely adapting students’ pacing and work to class periods and the administrative pressure for them to cover the master study plan of their foreign language department.

Inquiry-based projects take time in a class schedule compared to so-called teacher-centered efficiency, but depth is a sounder choice than breadth with surface learning. The ability to stimulate various groups at the same time in the same class is to be developed in higher education. Another challenge is that, as many resources are online, teachers must continually update their technology practices (Boss, Krauss, & Conery, 2008; Nissen & Tea, 2012). Students might want to build up their projects online in electronic portfolios and linguafolios that must be pre-structured by the teacher (Gulbahar & Tinmaz, 2006). In this context, teachers continue to play a crucial role in providing resources, enhancing motivation, and empowering the students to become curriculum builders. Teachers then stimulate, not stifle; they support learners’ accomplishments by encouraging their efforts. The creation of free online resources for less commonly taught languages can motivate an increasing number of learners to start learning critical languages, and actually, the Deep Approach would work for any language.

Acknowledgements
The project, titled “A Deep Approach to Turkish Teaching and Learning”, was funded by a 2009–2012 Title VI grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board. We are grateful to the instructors who
shared their experiences with us, to Isabelle Druc, Project Director, and to the project assistants on this project, in particular Esra Alagoz, Yasin Tunç, and Mukaddes Şahin.
References
American Association of Teachers of Turkish (1993). *Provisional Proficiency Guidelines for Turkish.*
Davidson, D. (2010b, October). *L2 gain, time-on-task, and language use in Arabic and Russian overseas Flagship programs.* Lecture given at the Language Institute, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison on October 26, 2010 for the American Councils for International Education.


A Language Socialization Approach to Uzbek Language Learning

Baburhan Uzum
Sam Houston State University

Abstract
Using an ethnographic case study design, this study investigates language learners' socialization into the cultural values of Uzbek language. Informed by a language socialization theoretical framework, the study focuses on the classroom routines and interactions that socialize students into certain social values through mini-lectures that are beyond the linguistic objectives of the curriculum. The research questions addressed are: What social values are being taught implicitly or explicitly? What cultural values are students being socialized into? What constitutes valuable cultural knowledge as claimed by the teacher? In the audio and video recorded observation data, a selected excerpt of typical classroom interactions is analyzed adopting discourse analysis methods. The findings of the study could be implemented in teacher education programs and in designing textbooks and curriculum for less commonly taught languages.

Introduction
Parallel to the increasing rate of globalization, less commonly taught languages such as Uzbek are becoming more popular at American higher education institutions. A member of the Ural-Altaic languages family and a genetic neighbor of Turkish, the Uzbek language is spoken by around 20 million people in Uzbekistan and several neighboring countries. Historically, the Uzbek language has been influenced by various conquerors of the region, such as Persian, Arabic, and most recently Russian (Sjoberg, 1963). In North American universities, the Uzbek language classes are generally offered by Fulbright Language Teaching Assistants (FLTA). The FLTA program was first established in 1968 in order to improve foreign language instruction in the U.S. and to create opportunities for both native-speaking teaching assistants and American students to learn about each other’s cultures and traditions by encouraging mutual understanding. The program now employs teachers from 45 countries and offers 32 lan-
languages in nearly all 50 U.S. states and Washington, DC (Fulbright FLTA program, 2011).

Through the FLTA program, learners in Uzbek classes have the opportunity to interact with an Uzbek speaker and gain access to the authentic cultural content. Therefore, students not only learn language as a system, but also as a social and cultural construction (Uzum, 2012). The present study follows an ethnographic case study design and uses discourse analysis methods, adopting language socialization as the theoretical framework.

**Language socialization**

In the present study, language socialization is defined as the process through which novices become competent members of a community through participation in routine interactions with more experienced members of that community (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Language socialization theory draws from sociocultural approaches to language learning and teaching (Johnson, 2009; Lantolf, 2000) and situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), sharing the notions that learning takes place within a context and through a novice’s interactions with the context. It was started by two linguistic anthropologists—Bambi Schieffelin and Elenor Ochs, in the 1980s “to consider aspects of the sociocultural environment of children’s communicative practices that were left out of linguistic, psychological, and anthropological studies” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 2).

Language socialization literature examines two kinds of socialization: (a) socialization to use language; and (b) socialization through language. Earlier socialization research focused on the former, and more contemporary research studies the latter. Socialization to use language includes the process in which a novice acquires forms and the social meanings of these forms. For example, a novice learns to say “please,” not only with its orthography and phonology, but with its social function as well: when, where, and to whom to say “please”. Socialization through language is a more implicit process, in which language is utilized as a medium to transmit sociocultural knowledge such as the local beliefs and values of a particular community. Some of the contemporary examples of socialization through language focus on academic discourse socialization. In these studies,
international students’ socialization into oral and written discourse communities is examined with a focus on language.

**Academic Discourse Socialization**

Foreign language classrooms have a widely accepted role in socializing students into certain linguistic and cultural behaviors. These language classrooms are not isolated from the realities of life, but are strategically embedded within an institutional context and a broader social political context. Therefore, institutional, social, historical, and political settings create multiple layers around these classrooms.

The social, cultural, political, and historical macrostructures also influence the language ideology taught in classes. Byon (2006) studied the ways Korean-as-a-foreign-language (KFL) students are socialized implicitly and explicitly into the social values and cultural norms of Korean language such as the use of honorifics to index hierarchy and authority. For example, the teacher, in this study, used assertive directives to signal a position of authority. This hierarchy came up several times in the teacher’s speech through assertive directives, personal pronouns/occupational terms (sensayngnim [teacher honorific title]), and error corrections (to use the humble personal pronoun while speaking to someone of higher status). Byon’s findings contrast with those of Poole (1992), in which the researcher found that teachers aligned with the students in an effort to minimize the appearance of power differences. In Byon’s data set, the hierarchical differences were highlighted through implicit and explicit socialization, and students were socialized into these cultural norms. Whereas, in Poole’s data set, the teachers used inclusive *we* (e.g., Where should we put the things in the room?) to avoid an overt display of asymmetry, employing indirect strategies to run the classroom practices and avoiding directly telling students what to do. Students in these two studies were sometimes successful in responding to these signals, and sometimes not. In the latter, the teacher corrected them or provided them a model, lending further support to the consideration of corrective feedback as an implicit socialization practice (Friedman, 2010).

In her review article, Duff (2010) addressed the question: “How do newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse and related practices of
that discourse community?” (p. 169). She reviewed early and recent studies that explored novices’ socialization to oral and written discourse communities, academic publication and textual identities, and electronic modes of discourse such as Computer Mediated Communication. Early work on discourse socialization, drawing on sociology, rhetoric, and the history and sociology of science, tended to focus on written discourse socialization, while neglecting oral discourse practices such as classroom discussions or conference presentations. Emphasizing the importance of oral discourse socialization, parallel to the expansion of multicultural communities, Duff argued for “joint responsibility” between instructors and students, “appropriate mediation”, and “scaffolding” (p. 186) for the successful socialization of novices.

An important example of oral discourse socialization is the study of Morita (2004) at a Canadian university. In her ethnographic multiple case study, Morita investigated the discourse socialization experiences of six female graduate students from Japan. The theoretical framework was guided by communities of practice, activity theory, and critical discourse research. The author argued that learners’ discourse socialization to oral classroom activities was diverse and contextually situated, and therefore cannot be explained with the folk view of cultural and gender roles ascribed to Japanese female students. The learners in this study participated in a variety of ways in different classes. For example, their silence was not to be interpreted by being uninterested or the assumed cultural value, but it reflected personal preference, resistance, struggle to gain membership, and position-taking. In addition to their internal conflicts, their access to classroom discussions and opportunities given for them to speak were also limited. Therefore, their struggle was situated on the cognitive plane and in social interactions. Learners continuously negotiated their modes of participation, and in many cases sought out for help from the instructors. Morita’s argument of giving legitimacy to learners as “valuable intellectual and cultural resources” (p. 598) also resonates with Duff’s (2010) suggestions of “scaffolding” and “joint-responsibility” of the instructors in this shared endeavor.

In the present study, Uzbek classes taught by an FLTA are placed within an American higher education institution; therefore, the academic discourse produced in this institutional setting may reflect
the beliefs and values of the larger community. Furthermore, academic and disciplinary discourses may be different across institutions and cultures. The Uzbek FLTA, previously socialized into the Uzbek ESL teacher community, brings her initial beliefs and practices to the new educational context, which will inevitably interact with the routines in the classroom and the expectations of students. The analysis in this paper focuses on the teacher’s practices that are socializing students into certain social values through mini-lectures that go beyond language practice and textbook objectives. The mini-lectures the teacher frequently delivers in this class are rather explicit forms of socialization, in which the teacher tells students about Uzbek culture and history. These episodes can be argued to socialize students explicitly into Uzbek social values rendering language teaching as a space to reproduce culture. The questions the analysis addresses are: What social values are being taught implicitly or explicitly? What cultural values are students being socialized into? What constitutes valuable cultural knowledge as claimed by the teacher?

**Method**

**Research Context**

The audio and video recorded classroom observation data for the study were collected in a beginner level Uzbek class at a Midwestern American University throughout Spring 2012. One classroom hour was selected on the basis of its representation of typical classroom activities in this classroom and was transcribed in detail. The participants in this selected excerpt are: the teacher (native of Uzbekistan, female, 29 years old, visiting FLTA for a year), and two undergraduate students: Calvin and Thomas (pseudonyms). The students are in their second semester of Uzbek, and both are interested in being advanced Uzbek speakers and possibly working there. The institutional objectives in the less-commonly-taught-languages (LCTL) program at this university emphasize student-centered instruction and communicative methods of language teaching. The teacher’s specific objectives, perpetuated by the assumed role of “cultural ambassador” through Fulbright, focus on meaningful learning through the presentation of cultural and historical exemplars. For this teacher, learning about the culture and history of a language community is just as important as learning the structure of a language.
In the selected segment, Calvin’s one-page writing assignment about Uzbekistan is reflected on the projector with the teacher’s markings. These markings do not indicate the nature of an error, but identifies its location by underlining or circling. In this error correction practice, the students read this text sentence by sentence with the teacher, and Thomas is expected to correct the marked words or sentences. The text starts with the geographical information about Uzbekistan, continues with its famous people, and finishes with the statement “I love my country” or “I am proud of my country”; a structure that students have learnt in this chapter. For this writing assignment, the students gathered facts about Uzbekistan (e.g., its location, neighbors, climate, major cities, and major people).

**Analysis**

In this excerpt, the students are portrayed to be the novices being socialized into the Uzbek discourse community. In order to be a member of this community, the novices are expected to speak like Uzbek people and know their cultural values. The teacher’s mini-lecture practices are centered on enabling students’ membership into Uzbek linguistic and cultural ideologies (e.g., what constitutes valuable knowledge). The analysis focused on initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) sequences, and addressed the questions: What exactly is the teacher trying to teach in this practice? What is the purpose of this lesson? The students are not only learning to speak Uzbek, they are also learning the national legacy of Uzbek culture. This national legacy is presented through the teacher’s advice about what they “should” know about Uzbekistan, thereby socializing them into valued knowledge and practices.

**The Classroom Materials**

The socializing agents in this excerpt are not only the teacher, but also the textbooks and the curriculum attached to it; “some [language ideologies] are under metapragmatic (re)construction via every socializing interaction, and some have been fixed and codified in institutional law and handed down through careful pedagogy” (Riley, 2012, p. 509). It is a widely accepted phenomenon that textbooks have a significant role in socializing students into particular language ideologies and social values (e.g., Curdt-Christiensen, 2008; Gulliver, 2010).
The beginner Uzbek textbook aims to “provide learners and their instructors with a wide selection of materials and task-oriented, communicative activities to facilitate the development of language learning” (Azimova, 2010, p. 13). It has sixteen chapters, and each chapter has a theme (e.g., work, study, family, shopping, and travel), language use (e.g., being a host and being a guest), language tools (e.g., verbal nouns, adverbs), and language and culture (e.g., Uzbek families) sections. Through its focus on daily life in Uzbekistan, the textbook has an authoritative voice and is an influential discourse type. Students not only learn subject matter, but acquire identities, values, interests, and habits via this powerful medium of socialization.

The Classroom Interaction Data
The following excerpt is taken from a one hour long class in Spring 2012. Each turn by the teacher and the students is marked with the participants’ initials. The Uzbek speech is written in Italics and is matched by English translations below each sentence. Interrupting and accompanying speech is marked with brackets and located where the accompanying speech starts (see Appendix for complete transcription conventions).

T: Teacher, C: Calvin, Th: Thomas, Ss: Students
1  T  And do you have enough information about Uzbekistan? If I ask you next time for example, O’zbekiston qayerde joylashgan? O’zbekistanim abalisi qancha? O’zbekistonin hududu qancha? O’zbekiston qande shaharlar bor? O’zbekistonin nemasi bilan mashhur? Can you answer at least two five questions? Hum? Next time if I ask you now? Where is Uzbekistan located? What is its population? How large is the country? What cities are there? What is it known for?
2  Ss  (Students laugh) (2 secs)
3  Ss  Ha
   Yes
4  T  Bashlarig. Calvin. O’zbekiston qayerde joylashgan? Let’s start. Calvin. Where is Uzbekistan located?
5  C  Himm. (4 secs) otacha
6  T  [Orta?]
Middle?

7 C  *Orta Asyada* (3secs) *oyish* - *oyisha*
In the Middle East

8 T  *Orta Asyada*

9 C  [Orta Asyada

10 T  *Joylashgan yaxshi*
Located, very good!

11 T  Umm, Thomas (2 sec) *O’zbekiston poytaxti* (2 secs) *nema?*
What is the capital of Uzbekistan?

12 Th  Tashkent?

13 T  Tashke:nt! *Yaxshi!*
Very good!

14 T  Calvin, *O’zbekistonin bududi qanchе?*
What is the size of Uzbekistan?

15 C  Umm (4 secs) it’s *erк? besbiнchi*
It’s fifty fifth

16 T  I am. not asking. What place it is. but *budud* what is the
territory of O’zbekiston?

17 C  What is the territory of Uzbekistan?

18 T  Uzbek Republic?

19 C  Exact number? I don’t know

20 T  [*dort yuz kirk yedi ming’*]
Four hundred forty thousand-

21 Ss  (students laugh) (2 secs)

22 C  I don’t know what the exact number is.

23 T  Okay, *dort yuz kirk yedi ming—*
Four hundred forty thousand-

24 C  [*ko’p?*
A lot?

25 T  (laughs) *ko’p. you cannot say ko’p

26 Ss  (laugh)

27 T  Approximately. *o’rtacha, taxminan* If you are suspicious
that it’s not the right number you can say (1sec) *taxminan’
dort yuz kirk yedi ming dort yuz kilometer quadrat or quadrat
kilometer
Approximately, four hundred forty thousand four hun-
dred kilometer square
28 T Yaxshi, abalisi qancha, Thomas?
Very good, what is its population, Thomas?
29 Th Umm (5 secs)
30 T Was it mentioned here? (2 secs) I think it wasn’t men-
tioned. abalisi It was twenty-six million people. It was
mentioned that it was at the: (1 sec) this place because of
its population, but it’s not mentioned how many popula-
tion it had. In Uzbekistan, there are more than twenty six
million people (2 secs) yaxshi:
31 T Calvin. O’zbekistan nemasi bilan meseb?r?
What is Uzbekistan known for?
32 C Umm (3 secs) mevalar’, sabza’ or-
Fruits, veggie-
33 T [sabzavotlarì? vegetables?
34 C taxi- umm (1 sec) joylar?
histo- cities?
35 T topla dogri!
very correct.
36 T asosiyisi? The most important one is?:
major one?
37 C umm poytaxta?
capital?
38 T poytaxtasì: bilan meseb?r.
its capital is well known
39 C poytaxtasi
its capital
40 T umm (2 secs) Thomas? Asosiy shabarlarì qaysi?
O’zbekistanda?
What are the major cities in Uzbekistan?
41 Th Which are-
42 T [asosiy shabarlar?
major cities?
43 Th like, which are the major cities?
44 T uhhum.
45 Th Bukhara’
46 T Bukhara.
47 Th Khorez- Khorez’m’
Uzbekistan has twelve regions and one autonomy republic. It’s Qoraqalpog‘iston. Have you heard about it? What is the problem of the Aral sea (?) Have you heard? It’s Qoraqalpog‘iston autonomi respublikasi, (2 secs) yaxshi,

Who lived there? Which scholars have lived there? Or born there?

Did you ask how many people lived there? Or?

No. What kind of scien-scientists?

Who are they?

Their names? (laughs)

Their names. Do you remember that?

Uhh Merto Ulug?

Merzo Ulug‘bek. Merzo Ulug‘bek

umm (3secs)

(laugh)

And? He is the founder of medicine? (3 secs) Ibin-?

You should-. You should know these names. Ibin Sina’ at least. He is the founder of medicine. Some people said it is (1 sec) medicine means as an asset (product) of Sina. He firstly treated the diseases he wrote books about different type diseases and how to treat them. It’s Ibin Sina. Next is Beruniy. Abraham Beruniy, he was a great geographer that he-at that time, he…. as-as I read from historical books, he just-he was able to say that, (acted speech)
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“there is a place or there is a country beyond the ocean”, he predicted that there was America!

71 Th uhhum
72 T look-US-umm. Central Asia (1 sec) is in the East part of the world yes? But in history, there-they don’t have any equipment to see where is what? What is what? But at that time he said that. Umm. The earth is round’ (1 sec) and there is one land’ it was America!. And after him, that America Vespucci discovered America. In history, but before them umm (2 secs) three or four centuries ago. It was he who said that. There is a place. And Al-Khorezmi is-em (2 secs) the founder of mathematics and algebra (2 secs) the rules of mathematics and algorithms’ something like this stuff. And Merzo Ulug’bek? You know about him, yes? Who was he?

73 Th The guy who got murdered?
74 T (1 sec) (smiling) haaaa: you just know that-
75 Ss (laugh)
76 C by son?
77 T yeah by son
78 Th but he was for-
79 T [but what was his profession?
80 Th He created the-umm (2 secs)
81 C [translator?
82 Th the-um-plan-planetarium?
83 T Yes. U' yildizlarni gozetken. He just.umm analyzed umm stars and he found more than one thousand and one stars on the sky. (2secs) Morze’Ulug'bek. You shouldn’t say, (acting speech) “oooohh U oglı tamamge oldirilgen”. He observed stars. He was killed by his son.

84 Ss [(students laugh)
85 T but you should know what he did. what they did in general, just a few things, okay? (1 sec) names and few things? What they-what was their field’ (2 secs)
86 Ss (students keep laughing)
87 T (laughs stop) for what they were familiar-famous till these days? Why Uzbek people proud of them? They are –their ancestors. Because of what? Because they have did a lot
of things’ (2 secs)

88  Ss  uhhum

89  T  That’s why we are. When you say I am from Uzbekistan, some people will say, (acting speech) “oohh! You are from the country of Karezmì the country of Sina’ ” but I cannot say at that time in history it was exact place, which Uzbek people are living now. (1 sec) but the origin of theirs from Uzbekistan, this territory.

90  Ss  uhhum

91  T  Have you understood? (2 secs) sualler bor mi? (Do you have any questions?) so on Wednesday we’ll have quiz in quiz I am going to include some questions about Uzbekistan, okay? It means you have to reread again. Yaxshi. Umm (1 sec) bugunku dersimiz (today’s lesson) Today I am going to explain how you can express ability. (2 secs) So what does it mean? (2 secs) for example, Calvin can say. I can swim. I can cook. I can speak Uzbek, yes? This expressing ability.

The lesson continues with a new grammar topic: “expressing abilities”.

Discussion

The socializing role of the teacher along with the textbook is visible in such areas of “what constitutes socially valuable knowledge”. In line 17, the teacher raises the question “what is the size of Uzbekistan?” which reflects the ideologies of valuable knowledge reflected in the textbook, since she is quizzing them about a fact in the book. After reviewing this information on the practiced text, she expects the learners to remember this factual information and be able to produce it when asked. Calvin responds to this question, “I don’t know what the exact number is” (line 19), and the teacher repeats this information, “four hundred forty thousand-” (line 20). As she repeats the size of Uzbekistan again, Calvin attempts to simplify this information into an adverb “ko’p” (a lot?) in line 24. The teacher is first entertained by this attempt and laughs at it briefly, but immediately rejects such simplification, and negotiates a middle way by abandoning her initial insistence on the precise measurement of the geographical area: “If you are suspicious that it’s not the right number you can
say *taxminan* (approximately). Although the size of Uzbekistan is mentioned in the textbook, the students do not necessarily attend to it as “important information,” however the teacher pulls it out and quizzes students on this fact. When the teacher observes that the students do not recall the exact numbers, she teaches them a marker of epistemic stance and a context in which it could be used. Ochs (1993) identifies marking certainty as a cross-cultural phenomenon that can be performed through factive predicates, determiners, cleft constructions, and other presupposing structures; whereas, uncertainty can be marked with modals and rising intonations. By teaching the word *taxminan* as an epistemic marker, the teacher socializes students into using the language to act, out uncertainty. The teacher ends this IRE episode with her evaluation “*yaxshi*” in line 28, and continues with the next question addressing, the next person. The next question is about the population of Uzbekistan, which was mentioned in the text, but not as a number. The teacher realizes this after asking the question and during Thomas’ long pause (line 29), and provides this information herself: “In Uzbekistan, there are more than twenty-six million people”. The teacher’s inquiries about the size of Uzbekistan and the population of Uzbekistan prompts Calvin to interpret the question in line 56 as another number question: “Did you ask how many people lived there?” (line 57). The teacher’s emphasis on exact numbers prompts students to look for numbers as important information. By quizzing students on these facts, the teacher displays her epistemological preferences (e.g., knowing quantities and sizes in exact numbers is valuable information), and socializes students into looking out for this information.

In addition to the teacher’s expectations that the students should remember the size and population of Uzbekistan in numbers, she displays similar epistemic preference for names in lines 56 and 60, reflecting her stance leaning toward certainty, when she asks students the names of well-known scholars that have lived in Uzbekistan’s territories. Calvin is surprised by the question and the fact that he was supposed to remember the names of these people (line 61). Calvin and Thomas together produce parts of the name “Merzo Ulug’bek”, and the teacher asks for other names by providing some clues; facts about these people and parts of their names. “And? He is the founder of medicine? Ibin-?” (line 68). Students, unable to put these clues to-
together, pause and laugh briefly, in response to which, the teacher

gives a mini lecture about the importance of these people and their

contributions to modern science (lines 70 and 72). Thomas shows

understanding of the significance of these people, and produces an

audible confirmation sound “uhhum” in line 71 and again in lines 88

and 90, following the mini-lectures.

In these mini lectures, the teacher does not necessarily teach a

linguistic point, but socializes students into the social values of Uz-

bekistan: “Why Uzbek people [are] proud of them” (line 87), and

claims legitimacy for Uzbekistan due to its less-known contributions
to modern science and geography (line 70 and 72). The teacher’s

knowledge is based not solely on personal experience but the facts in

history books: “as I read from historical books” (line 70). The stu-

dents respond to these mini lectures with confirming nods, and often

audible acknowledgements (lines 71, 88, and 90). In line 92, when the

teacher asks if they remember Ulug’bek, the students respond: “the
guy who got murdered” (line 73). This stands to be accurate infor-

mation, but not necessarily relevant, appropriate, or prioritized, as

shown in the teacher’s rejection and acted imitation of their response:

“oohh he was killed by his son” (line 83). The teacher is initially en-
tertained by how they came up with this side note about Ulug’bek,

but she diverts their attention into more relevant and valuable areas
of facts, in her perspective: “but what was his profession” (line 79).

Thomas was able to respond to this question by the right area of
work “Planetarium” (line 82), and the teacher continued to give fur-
ther information about his profession and contributions to modern
science (line 83), which ended with a slight reprimand about what
they should not say: “you shouldn’t say ‘oooohh U ogli tamamga
oldirilgen’ but you should know what he did.” with an emphasis on
“did”. This rule also applies to other scholars of Uzbekistan: “what
they did in general, just a few things, okay? names and a few things?
what they—what was their field” (line 85).

Second language classrooms exhibit and teach a set of cultur-
al and epistemological assumptions with varying degrees of explicit-
ness (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). These language classrooms
are not isolated from the realities of life, but are strategically
embedded within an institutional context and a broader sociopolitical
context. Therefore, institutional (e.g., Fulbright and LCTL programs),
social, historical, and political settings create multiple layers around the classroom and inform the language teaching practices to a certain extent (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). In this study, through the teacher’s mini lectures on the geographical facts about Uzbekistan and historical figures and scholars, students are socialized into what constitutes valuable knowledge in addition to speaking the language. Therefore, competence in the Uzbek language is not limited to producing the language, but expands to the awareness of the culture and values of its speakers. The cultural information is often initiated by the textbook, but it is the teacher who elaborates on it and expands its focus to other relevant topics in her perspective. For example, the information about Beruniy and his discovery of America (line 70) was not in the textbook, but was the teacher’s contribution. Through these mini lectures, learners become aware that people might be offended, if learners do not show enough respect to the values and national and cultural legacy of Uzbeks. It is also noteworthy that her mini lecture is assessment-worthy, and that the students are going to be evaluated on their knowledge of Uzbekistan on their next quiz (line 91).

**Conclusion and Implications**

The findings of this study could be implemented in assisting students to operate in study abroad contexts, in teacher training programs for less commonly taught languages, and designing textbooks and materials. Teaching culture in LCTL classrooms has significant impact on learners' language learning experience. When students know about the values and traditions of the target culture, they can use their local knowledge to establish solidarity with the speakers of this language and use it as leverage to enable their membership to the community. Teachers can use mini lectures of cultural practices to stimulate conversation, which not only leads to meaningful practice opportunities, but also introduces learners to the beliefs and values of the target community. However, given the fact that teachers and textbooks are such powerful mediums in socializing students into certain ideologies and values, teachers and textbook writers should be careful about which cultural values are represented in the curriculum. In order to avoid a simplistic view of culture and essentialized beliefs about the whole community (e.g., everybody in Uzbekistan does it this way), the classroom content should be shaped with an emphasis on the flu-
id and diverse nature of culture. If culture is constructed as homogeneous in classroom discourse, the regional, social, racial, socioecon-
omic, and religious variations are ignored. In everyday classroom conversations, teachers may tend to draw from their own cultural
background, but should at least show awareness of regional variations
and acknowledge their own subjectivity in their representations of the
target cultural practices (Uzum, 2013). The present study shows that
teachers and textbooks are strong socialization mediums and operate
like gateways into the cultural practices of a community. In most
LCTL classes, learners' only exposure to the target language and cul-
ture are these two resources; therefore, administrators, curriculum
designers, textbook writers, and teachers should be attentive to the
importance of cultural representations on the LCTL classroom con-
tent.
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Italicized: Foreign language

: lengthened vowels

Underline: erroneous utterances

Bold: emphasized

?: rising intonation

.: brief pauses, shorter than 1 second

‘: slightly rising intonation

Italic: original utterance in foreign language

(): accompanying actions, transcriber comments

(2 secs): length of pause longer than 1 second

(?) guessed transcription uncertain word

Word- :false starts, incomplete utterances
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Abstract
While several studies have investigated the role of risk-taking in language learning, the findings of these studies may not be generalizable to language learning where the performed culture approach (PCA) is used. This study describes the relationship between language learning and risk-taking in PCA, and the relationship between risk-taking and personal study habits, teaching style, daily grading, and classroom dynamics. Data were collected by means of a questionnaire.

This study finds that risk-taking behavior has a moderate positive relationship with student performance in PCA. While questionnaire items related to teaching style and classroom dynamics are not found to significantly correlate with students’ risk-taking behavior, some items related to daily grading and personal study habits are found to have a moderate positive relationship with risk-taking behavior. Based on these findings, it is recommended that further research investigate the relationship between assessment and risk-taking in language learning.

As second language acquisition researchers have investigated the role of affective variables in language learning, risk-taking has frequently been identified as a variable linked with success (Beebe, 1983; Ely, 1986; Naiman, Frolich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; Rubin, 1975; Samimy & Pardin, 1994; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992). However, it is difficult to apply these findings to language classrooms that use the performed culture approach (PCA), an approach to the teaching of East Asian languages, for two reasons: (a) PCA’s focus on the learning of a foreign culture could mean that greater risk is involved in...
language learning than in a typical language classroom; (b) PCA creates a language learning experience for which the risks involved are different than those in language classrooms where other approaches are used.

**Literature Review**

**The performed culture approach**

PCA was developed because, according to Christensen and Warnick, the Western European and ESL pedagogies that are prevalent in North American foreign language education do not adequately address the “specific linguistic and cultural challenges for native English speakers in approaching foreign languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean from a holistic, culturally centered approach” (2006, p. 2). The kind of culture that PCA seeks to address is not the achievements of a particular culture (e.g., food, literature, music, etc.), but rather the conventions that members of the culture use to interact with each other (Jorden, 2003). PCA is concerned with imparting, through performance, the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in East Asian societies (Christensen & Warnick, 2006; Walker, 2010; Walker & Noda, 2010), a feat that anecdotal evidence suggests can be difficult even for those who achieve considerable linguistic ability in an East Asian language (Christensen & Warnick, 2006, pp. 1-16; Jorden, 2003; Shepherd, 2005, pp. 131-140).

PCA seeks to provide learners with useful memories of target culture interactions. The process by which these memories lead to increased ability to participate successfully in a foreign culture is described in detail by Walker and Noda (2010). They consider the story, or a memory of a personal experience, to be the basic unit of analysis in this process. Learners come away from class with stories that are compiled with learners’ other memories. The compilation process involves multiple levels. At lower levels are cases, or stories about doing something; and sagas, or stories about a set of people or a specific location. At higher levels of compilation themes begin to emerge. These compiled memories form the learner’s second culture worldview. The second culture worldview shapes how learners perceive new linguistic and cultural information. It also informs learners’ future performances.
In PCA, learners develop memories of personal experiences in the target culture primarily in ACT classes. ACT classes are conducted entirely in the target language. In ACT class, the teacher uses contexts to elicit performances from students. The teacher establishes the time and place of the performance, the roles of the participants, and the nature of the audience. The teacher then calls on students to perform. It is common for 2 or 3 students to perform at a time while the rest of the class observes, although some PCA instructors include pair and group activities (M. Noda, 2012, personal communication).

The rehearsal of dialogues that students have practiced outside of class is often a part of ACT class. These dialogues are always culturally authentic. Variations in context are used to elicit variations in dialogues. Such variations are also used to elicit performances that go beyond the material contained in the dialogues. In this way students spend the majority of class responding to contexts with performances that are improvised. The teacher guides students’ performances by providing feedback to each performance. As part of this feedback the teacher occasionally models acceptable performances for students. At the end of class the teacher assigns each student a grade, referred to as a daily grade, which is a reflection of how a typical native speaker who is unused to interactions with foreigners would have reacted to the student’s performance.

ACT classes are supported by FACT classes. In FACT classes students and teachers discuss topics such as grammar and culture in the students’ base language. Students have the opportunity to ask questions about the language, and teachers can use the base language to explain complex concepts. Christensen and Warnick (2006) recommend 4 ACT classes for every 1 FACT class.

**Risk-taking and foreign culture learning in PCA**

While a number of previous studies have reported on the relationship between risk-taking and language learning (Beebe, 1983; Ely, 1986; Naiman, Frolich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; Rubin, 1975; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992; Samimy & Pardin, 1994), it is difficult to apply these findings to language learning in PCA, in part because of PCA’s focus on learning a foreign culture. Beebe, in discussing how language
learning involves risk, suggests that looking ridiculous, feeling frustrated, not being able to care for oneself, alienation, and loss of identity are all risks involved in trying to learn a foreign language (1983, p. 40). When the foreign language and culture to be learned are in sharp contrast—Jorden and Walton’s (1987) “truly foreign” languages—these risks are compounded, particularly the risk of “alienation” and “loss of identity”. As Turner has noted:

Some of us are afraid of changing the language we speak, which is to say, of learning a foreign language….There is a sense that language is a scary thing, and that we were lucky to have gotten through learning it the first time. This fear leads to that prevalent style of trying to learn a foreign language without changing or disturbing anything that is already in place….

At the deepest level, we feel that we will lose ourselves if we change our default concepts. (1991, p. 27)

If, as Turner suggests, there exists a fear of changing one’s default concepts, then it stands to reason that the more foreign the culture (i.e. the farther one must depart from one’s default concepts) the greater the risk of losing oneself. For one learning a truly foreign language in the classroom, if the language program requires learners to act in ways that challenge their default concepts, learners may perceive greater risk in learning the foreign language Iv.

In learning a foreign language in the classroom, the risk involved is not limited to learners losing themselves. Learners’ may feel that their relationships with others could also suffer. In learning to communicate in a foreign culture one must learn not only a new way of speaking, but a new worldview (Shepherd, 2005; Walker & Noda, 2010). In a classroom setting learners are together with peers, the majority of whom can be expected to hold the base culture’s worldview. Learners may feel that by developing a second culture’s worldview and acting upon it they risk disassociation from their peers. The greater the difference between the first culture’s worldview and the second culture’s worldview, the greater the risk that may be perceived in adopting foreign culture behaviors.

Since learning a truly foreign language may involve more risk than learning a language with more cultural similarity, it is difficult to know how applicable previous research on risk-taking behavior is to
language learning in PCA. In studies where learners were primarily native speakers of one Indo-European language learning another Indo-European language (i.e., Beebe, 1983; Ely, 1986), less risk may be involved then when a truly foreign language is learned. In studies where a truly foreign language was learned (i.e., Samimi & Pardin, 1994; Samimi & Tabuse, 1992), less risk may be involved if students did not perform actions that may have been challenging to their default concepts. In community language learning, the approach used in Samimi and Pardin’s (1994) study of learners of Japanese, learners are unlikely to experience the language in a context other than that of one language learner speaking to another (Omaggio Hadley, 2003). It seems unlikely that such a classroom would provide much opportunity for learners to practice culturally important behaviors, such as acknowledging hierarchy, that Americans can be resistant towards engaging in (Walker & Noda, 2010, pp. 29-30), but which are essential for successful communication. The language program described by Samimi and Tabuse (1992) in their study of affective variables and Japanese language learners actually has many features in common with PCA, such as daily grading and ACT and FACT classes. Indeed, this program may have been a precursor to PCA, which became firmly established as an approach in the early 2000s. Despite these similarities, however, it is unclear if culture was taught and performed in this program to the extent that it is taught and performed in PCA. It is therefore difficult to apply the findings of previous studies on risk-taking to programs that use PCA.

**Risk-taking and PCA: Other potential factors**

**Potential positive effects**
In addition to PCA’s practice of having students perform the target culture, many other procedures employed in PCA seem likely to affect students’ risk-taking behavior. One way in which risk-taking behavior is encouraged in PCA is through the practice of inviting individual students to perform rather than asking for volunteers. In this way, passive students and enthusiastic students both receive equal opportunities to perform in class (Christensen & Noda, 2002, pp. 19-20; Christensen & Warnick, 2006, pp. 60-61). Furthermore, in PCA choosing not to perform is detrimental to one’s grade. Consequently,
more students speak in class than would be expected if only those willing to volunteer performed and such participation did not affect their grades. Since speaking in class involves a certain degree of risk (e.g., looking ridiculous, reproach from a teacher, etc. [Beebe, 1983]), PCA’s practice of inviting students to perform seems to encourage risk-taking behavior.

Another way in which PCA may encourage risk-taking behavior in students is through students’ personal study habits. In PCA, students are encouraged to prepare for class carefully and seriously. Daily grading encourages this behavior. This emphasis on good preparation may encourage risk-taking behavior in PCA. Bang lists “sufficient preparation for class” as a major facilitating factor and “insufficient preparation for class” as a minor debilitating factor in Korean EFL students’ risk-taking behavior (1999, pp. 134, 156). Thus, by requiring students to prepare well, students may be more likely to take language risks in class.

Another characteristic of PCA relevant to risk-taking behavior is feedback. It is possible that the large amount of feedback students receive in PCA may have a positive effect on students’ language ability in relation to risk-taking (Beebe, 1980, p. 180). With a large amount of feedback, it is likely that when a language risk leads to an error, students will be made aware of the error. Without that feedback it is possible that students will not recognize their errors and fossilization may occur. Thus, because of the large amount of teacher feedback typical of PCA, risk-taking may lead to greater gains in performance in PCA than in other programs. However, the way in which this feedback is administered, an element of a teacher’s teaching style, may influence the extent to which this feedback positively affects a student’s language ability.

**Potential negative effects**

While there are several aspects of PCA that may encourage risk-taking, there are also aspects of PCA that may discourage this behavior. One of these aspects is daily grading. While there are many benefits to a daily grading system (Choi & Samimy, 2002; Christensen & Warnick, 2006, pp. 66-69), it may have a negative impact on students’ willingness to take language risks in class. Since students are graded each day on their performance, the possibility that an utterance could
lead to a bad grade is always present. Beebe suggests that in a testing situation, to avoid taking risks is the best strategy for being successful on the test (1983, p. 60). Since students are tested each day on their ability to perform, some students may adopt a strategy of not taking risks in an attempt to acquire a good performance score.

Feedback has been mentioned as an aspect of PCA which may increase the benefit students gain from taking language risks. However, this feedback may also discourage students from taking language risks. “Reproach from a teacher” is one of the risks Beebe lists as those related to language learning in a classroom setting (1983, p. 40), and “instructor’s error correction” is listed by Bang as an aspect of instructor’s attitude and teaching style that can discourage students from taking risks (1999, p. 143). It is possible that teachers who provide feedback in an unfriendly or critical manner may discourage students from taking risks, and due to the large amount of feedback typically provided to students in PCA, a teacher’s teaching style may influence students’ risk-taking behavior more in a PCA classroom than in other programs.

The student-oriented nature of PCA (Christensen & Noda, 2002, p. 19; Christensen & Warnick, 2006, p. 60) may also have a negative effect on students’ risk-taking behavior. When students perform, typically two or three students perform at a time and the rest of the class observes. Students that feel uncomfortable speaking in front of the whole class may be disinclined to take risks in such a situation (Bang, 1999, p. 134). However, it is also possible that students may become accustomed to this practice. Thus, classroom dynamics may also affect students’ risk-taking behavior in PCA.

Conceptual Framework
Based on the literature reviewed above, the conceptual framework that appears in Figure 1 was developed to guide the present study.

Research questions
This study was designed to investigate the following research questions, which are based on the conceptual framework that appears in figure 1:
1. What is the relationship between language classroom risk-taking behavior (LCRTB) and student performance (SP) in PCA?
2. What is the relationship between LCRTB and daily grading in PCA?
3. What is the relationship between LCRTB and teaching style in PCA?
4. What is the relationship between LCRTB and classroom dynamics in PCA?
5. What is the relationship between LCRTB and personal study habits in PCA?

Methods
These research questions were investigated through means of a questionnaire. All participants in the study were students enrolled in undergraduate Japanese language classes at a large mid-western university. Data were gathered during the 2006-07 academic year. The Japanese language classes in question were all taught in a classroom setting using PCA. Since first-, second-, and third-year classes were taught by several teachers, all participants had experienced the teaching styles of multiple teachers in PCA. All participants were of at least 18 years of age. The questionnaire was distributed in autumn and spring quarters. A total of 46 usable questionnaires were returned in autumn quarter, and 34 in spring quarter.

Instruments
The construct language classroom risk-taking behavior (LCRTB) was developed for this study to assess students’ risk-taking behavior in PCA. In previous studies researchers have often operationalized risk-taking behavior in terms of voluntary participation (e.g., Bang, 1999; Ely, 1986). However, since asking for volunteers is not commonly practiced in PCA, LCRTB was given the following constitutive definition, which guided the present study: Behavior in which one acts despite the possibility of exposing weak points in one's language ability. This constitutive definition was felt to represent the idea of risk as it would pertain to a language classroom. It was also felt to encompass behaviors related to risk-taking identified in previous studies (e.g., Rubin, 1975; Naiman, et al., 1978; Beebe, 1983; Ely, 1986). For
example, being willing to appear foolish in order to communicate and get the message across, using the language when not required to do so, being willing to try out guesses, and being willing to make mistakes in order to learn and communicate (Rubin, 1975) are all behaviors in which one acts despite the possibility of exposing weak points in one’s language ability.

Video recordings of Japanese language classes taught with PCA were reviewed in order to identify potential manifestations of LCRTB\textsuperscript{vii}. Based on these observations, the following 7 behaviors were posited as manifestations of LCRTB in PCA: (a) (-)\textsuperscript{viii} favoring linguistic elements which are more familiar over those that are less familiar; (b) using linguistic elements in ways that have not yet been tried by others; (c) using negotiation strategies (e.g., “please say that again”, “what does ___ mean?”, etc.); (d) (-) giving up on communication in Japanese (e.g., resorting to English, refusing to participate, “I don’t understand [so call on someone else]”); (e) tolerance of possible incorrectness in using the language; (f) (-) hesitancy in using a certain linguistic element; and (g) (-) engaging in behavior which seeks confirmation that an utterance was correct (e.g., raising of shoulder/hands, raised eyebrows, rising intonation). LCRTB in PCA was then operationalized with 14 questionnaire items pertaining to the 7 behaviors (see Appendix A for individual questionnaire items). Items concerning participants’ daily grades, classroom dynamics, teaching style, and study habits were also included on the questionnaire. Both negatively and positively worded items were used in order to minimize the effects of “self-flattery” and “approval motive” (Oller and Perkins, 1978). Each of these questionnaire items (with the exception of item #23\textsuperscript{ix}) was followed by a 5-point Likert-style response scale: 5=agree strongly; 4=somewhat agree; 3=neutral; 2=somewhat disagree; 1=disagree strongly. Items pertaining to participants’ demographic information also appeared on the questionnaire.

Item total correlations were performed with Pearson product-moment correlations for LCRTB questionnaire items (#1 through #14; see Appendix A) using data from the Autumn quarter questionnaire. Items #7 and #14, for which item-total correlations were found to be low, were removed from the final data analysis. Follow-
ing this adjustment, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated at 0.85 for LCRTB in PCA.

Student performance (SP) in PCA was operationalized as the average daily grade students had received at the end of the quarter in which the questionnaire was administered, excluding scores of 0. The rubric given below was used in assigning daily grades to students. This rubric was developed by faculty at Ohio State University. It is identical to the rubric that appears in Christensen and Warnick’s description of PCA.

4.0 Solid preparation is evident and performance is fully coherent culturally; that is, students speak, write and respond in ways in which natives of Japanese culture expect people to speak, write, and respond. The performance presents no difficulty, discomfort, or misunderstanding for a native. Repair (restating, or correcting oneself) is self-managed. The performance reflects a sense of language as communication - an interpersonal exchange (not just parroting memorized material).

3.5 Good preparation with solid performance, such that there would be little to create difficulties, discomfort, or misunderstanding in interaction with a native speaker. However, some noticeable errors could hinder smooth interaction. Most repairs are self-managed.

3.0 Good preparation with good performance. A few aspects of the performance would create difficulties, discomfort, or misunderstanding in communication with a native speaker. Weakness or patterned error that would require occasional correction from another (instructor, classmate) is evident.

2.5 Some preparation is evident and performance enables communication, but there are also several clear sources of difficulty, discomfort, or misunderstanding in communicating with a native speaker. Repair is largely a matter of correcting problems, and comes mostly from others.

2.0 Minimal preparation. The performance presents definite obstacles to communication and would cause more than simple discomfort. Utterances would cause puzzlement that
the native would be at a loss to resolve. Repair requires multiple, often repeated, corrections and guidance from another (mostly the teacher).

1.5 Barely any preparation. The performance would create considerable difficulties, discomfort, or misunderstanding in communicating with a native. Communication is achieved only with repeated correction and guidance from the teacher. The student is clearly not in control of the assigned material.

1.0 Attended class, but did not participate or failed to perform with any viable degree of competence.

0 Absent (2006, pp. 68-69)

Data analysis
Pearson product-moment correlations were performed between LCRTB and SP. Correlations were also performed between LCRTB and each questionnaire item related to daily grades, classroom dynamics, teaching style, and study habits.

Findings and discussion
The results of correlations performed between LCRTB and SP appear in Table 1. The results of correlations performed between LCRTB and questionnaire items related to daily grades, teaching style, classroom dynamics, and study habits also appear in Table 1.

Significant correlations between LCRTB and SP were found in both autumn quarter (r=0.339, p=0.033) and spring quarter (r=0.507, p=0.002). These findings suggest that there is a moderate positive relationship between LCRTB and SP, with LCRTB accounting for 25% of the variance in SP in spring quarter. Although risk-taking has been operationalized differently in other studies (e.g., Ely, 1986; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992), this study’s finding that risk-taking is moderately correlated with successful language learning is consistent with the findings of other studies, suggesting that behaviors related to risk-taking in language learning are not limited to those related to voluntary participation. It is also noteworthy that the participants in the current study were learning not only a foreign language but also the behaviors of a foreign culture. Given that learning the behaviors of a foreign culture may involve more risk when the base culture and the target culture are in contrast than when they are similar, it is not
surprising that this study finds that risk-taking is correlated with language learning success. It may be beneficial to inform students that learning the behaviors of a markedly different culture will involve some risk, such as looking ridiculous and loss of identity (Beebe, 1983, p. 40), and that students unwilling to take the necessary risks may have difficulty being successful.

In interpreting the finding that LCRTB and SP are moderately correlated, it should be noted that correlation is not the same as causation (Aron & Aron, 2002, p. 270). While it seems likely that taking risks in using the target language leads to better language ability, it is also probable that having better language ability would lead one to take risks. Thus, as Ely (1986) has noted, simply encouraging students to take risks as they learn the language may not produce better results.

The only item found to be significantly correlated with LCRTB in both autumn and spring quarters was item #22 “I usually feel prepared to perform when I come to class”, for which a moderate positive relationship was found (autumn: r=0.307, p=0.038; spring: r=0.346, p=0.045). This finding is consistent with the findings of Bang (1999). It suggests that those students who consistently prepare well for class tend to engage in LCRTB. If language learning in a foreign culture involves greater risk, then preparing well may be even more important than when learning a language in a culture similar to learners’ base culture. Thus, it seems that preparing well for class has both direct and indirect benefits in language learning. Furthermore, while simply encouraging students to take risks in language learning may not be effective, it is possible that encouraging more thorough preparation for class could help students improve their risk-taking behavior.

While item #22 was found to be significantly correlated with LCRTB in autumn and spring quarters, item #21 “I find myself less worried about making mistakes in class when I feel well prepared” was not (autumn: r=0.001, p=0.995; spring: r=0.298, p=0.092). It may be that preparing well does not necessarily mean that one is not worried about making mistakes in class. Consequently, it may be that students who engage in LCRTB in class do so regardless of whether or not they are worried about making mistakes.
Item #16 “when I perform in class, I don’t worry about how my performance will affect my grade” was found to have a moderate positive relationship with LCRTB in autumn quarter (r=0.418, p=0.004), but in spring quarter the relationship was negligible (r=0.006, p=0.972). This difference between autumn and spring quarters suggests that students may eventually grow used to daily grading. Thus, it may be that worry about how one’s performance affects one’s grade is a significant factor in predicting students’ LCRTB early in the academic year, but later in the year, when students have become more accustomed to being graded daily on their performance, it is less of a factor. This finding also suggests that daily grading may discourage LCRTB until students become accustomed to the practice. However, daily grading may also simultaneously encourage risk-taking behavior by encouraging students to thoroughly prepare for class. Further research regarding the relationship between daily grading and LCRTB is recommended.

Item #16 was significantly correlated with LCRTB in autumn quarter, while other similar items (e.g., item #17 “performing in front of a large group of students makes me more worried about making mistakes than performing in front of a smaller group” and item #19 “I worry more about making mistakes when speaking Japanese in front of some teachers than others”) were not. It may be that students are generally more concerned about how their performance affects their grade than how it affects their standing with their peers or with the teacher.

A number of limitations should be considered in regard to these findings. First, some of the questionnaire items were worded negatively. While this negative wording was intended to minimize the effects of “self-flattery” and “approval motive” (Oller & Perkins, 1978), it may have created confusing items, and some variance in participant responses may be related to not understanding what the item said (Oller & Perkins, 1978).

Second, despite the negative wording of questions, subjects still may have been affected by “approval motive”, “self-flattery”, and “response set” (Oller & Perkins, 1978, pp. 86-88) as they responded to the questionnaire.

Third, students may not have been able to give precise responses to item #17 “performing in front of a large group of stu-
dents makes me more worried about making mistakes than performing in front of a smaller group”, since classroom size stays fairly consistent throughout the quarter. Thus, students may not be fully aware of how class size affects their ability to perform.

Fourth, items related to teaching style (#19 and #20) were worded in terms of how teachers in the program are individually different from other teachers. However, such items fail to address how teachers in the program are collectively different from teachers in other programs. Thus, it remains unclear whether or not students’ willingness to take risks would change in a program where the role of the teacher is defined differently than in PCA.

Lastly, data regarding those who did not complete the questionnaire were not collected. It is possible that students who did not complete the questionnaire possess significantly different characteristics than those who did. Thus, it is possible that the participants who completed the questionnaire are not representative of the general population of PCA students in this respect.

Conclusion
This study finds that risk-taking behavior is associated with successful language learning in PCA, an approach to the teaching of East Asian languages. It finds that preparing well for class is associated with more risk-taking. However, it also finds that students who are concerned about their grades may engage in less risk-taking. It is recommended that further research explore the relationship between assessment and risk-taking, and in particular the relationship between assigning daily grades and risk-taking.
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Appendix A

(-) Favoring linguistic elements which are more familiar over those that are less familiar
1. I try to say complicated sentences in class when I have the chance.
2. (-) When possible, I avoid using linguistic elements I have difficulty with while performing in class.

Using linguistic elements in ways that have not yet been tried by others
3. I try to incorporate previously learned words and structural patterns in new situations in class, even when the focus of the activity is on more recently learned items.
4. (-) When performing in class, I try to imitate what other students have said in a similar context.

Using negotiation strategies (“please say that again”, “what does ___ mean?”, etc.)
5. When I don’t understand, I try to seek clarification in Japanese.
6. (-) When I don’t understand what was said to me in Japanese, I try to respond without seeking for clarification in order to hide the fact that I don’t understand.

(-) Giving up on communication in Japanese (resorting to English, refusing to participate, “I don’t understand [so call on someone else]”)
7. (-) I sometimes use English in class to seek clarification on something I don’t understand.
8. (-) When I don’t understand, I try to get the teacher to call on someone else.

Tolerance of possible incorrectness in using the language
9. I try to use linguistic elements which I find difficult in class, even when I may be using them incorrectly.
10. (-) As much as possible, I avoid using linguistic elements when I don't feel confident that I can use them correctly.
11. (-) I sometimes wonder what the teacher wants me to say.
(-) Hesitancy in using a certain linguistic element
12. I usually speak without hesitation, even when I am not sure if what I am going to say is correct.
13. (-) When performing in class I am hesitant about using structural patterns that I am not sure I can use correctly.

(-) Engaging in behavior which seeks for confirmation that an utterance was correct (e.g., raising of shoulders/hands, raised eyebrows, rising intonation)
14. (-) If I am unsure if what I am saying is correct, I try to get the teacher to confirm whether or not what I said was correct.

Daily grades
15. I would do anything (in terms of effort) to get an A in Japanese. xi
16. When I perform in class, I don’t worry about how my performance will affect my grade.

Classroom dynamics
17. Performing in front of a large group of students makes me more worried about making mistakes than performing in front of a smaller group.
18. I usually study with a group.

Teaching style
19. I worry more about making mistakes when speaking Japanese in front of some teachers than others.
20. I avoid asking certain teachers for help.

Study habits
21. I find myself less worried about making mistakes in class when I feel well prepared.
22. I usually feel prepared to perform when I come to class.
23. I study an average of ___ before each ACT class.
   a. less than 15 minutes
   b. 15-30 minutes
   c. 30 minutes – 1 hour
   d. 1-2 hours
e. 2-3 hours
f. more than 3 hours

**Demographic information**
24. Age:______
25. Gender: Male / Female
26. I am currently enrolled in the following Japanese language course  
   (example: Japanese 102):_______________
27. Expected grade in the Japanese language course I am currently  
   taking:________
28. I am a:
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate/Professional student
   f. Other
29. My current GPA is:
   a. 3.7-4.0
   b. 3.3-3.69
   c. 3.0-3.29
   d. 2.7-3.0
   e. 2.3-2.69
   f. 2.0-2.29
   g. Below 2.0
30. I am taking Japanese:
   a. To Fulfill a requirement for my major
   b. To Fulfill a GE requirement
   c. As a free elective choice
   d. Even though it does not help me progress toward gradua-
Table 1

Summary of Correlational Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>LCRTB</th>
<th>LCRTB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn (n=46)</td>
<td>Spring (n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would do anything (in terms of effort) to get an A in Japanese.</td>
<td>0.339*</td>
<td>0.507*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When I perform in class, I don’t worry about how my performance will affect my grade.</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Performing in front of a large group of students makes me more worried about making mistakes than performing in front of a smaller group.</td>
<td>0.418*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I usually study with a group.</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I worry more about making mistakes when speaking Japanese in front of some teachers than others.</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I avoid asking certain teachers for help.</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I find myself less worried about making mistakes in class when I feel well prepared.</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I usually feel prepared to perform when I come to class</td>
<td>0.307*</td>
<td>0.346*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Average amount of time spent studying before each ACT class.</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Daily Grading
Teaching Style  Risk taking behavior  Language ability
Classroom Dynamics
Personal Study habits

**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework of risk-taking behavior and antecedent factors in PCA

**Footnotes**

i For further discussion of why PCA was developed and the theory behind the approach, see Walker (1989), Walker (2010), and Walker and Noda (2010).

ii For a more complete discussion of the design and procedures characteristic of PCA, see Christensen and Warnick (2006) and Christensen and Noda (2002).

iii PCA teaching demonstration videos of ACT classes in Chinese can be found on this website: https://chineseclassresources.osu.edu/CCC_unit_1_stage_9.

iv See Shepherd (2005, pp. 133-139) for a relevant discussion of how the acculturation of immigrants in America influences Americans’ beliefs regarding the consequences of learning the behaviors of a foreign culture.

v According to the daily grading rubric given by Christensen and Warnick (2006, p. 66-69), students who attend class but do not participate receive 1 point out of 4 points possible.

vi The university in question offered Japanese instruction in both an individualized instruction setting and a classroom setting, both of which used PCA. Investigation into risk-taking behavior in PCA in an individualized instruction setting was beyond the scope of this study.

vii These video recordings were available as part of the curricular improvement effort. All students who appeared in the video recordings had given written consent to be videotaped for this purpose.

viii A minus sign (-) indicates an item associated with a lack of LCRTB.
Item #23, which pertained to study habits, was not followed by a Likert-style response scale, and appeared in the demographic section of the questionnaire.

Beebe (1983, p. 58) has made a similar argument regarding research on successful businessmen and risk-taking.

Item #15, which was taken as a measure of students’ desire for a grade, was deliberately worded strongly in order to create some measurable variation in student responses.

In responding to item #23 students indicated the range of time in which the amount of time they spent studying fell. In order to perform correlations using responses to this multiple choice item, the middle value of the selected range, in minutes, was substituted for the selected range. The following substitutions were made: less than 15 minutes: 7.5 minutes; 15-30 minutes: 22.5 minutes; 30 minutes-1 hour: 45 minutes; 1-2 hours: 90 minutes. No participant marked “2-3 hours” or “more than 3 hours”.