1-1-2011

The Relationship Between Study Abroad And Motivation, Attitude And Anxiety In University Students Learning A Foreign Language

Stefania Gabriella Morreale
Wayne State University

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDY ABROAD AND MOTIVATION, ATTITUDE AND ANXIETY IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

by

STEFANIA GABRIELLA SILVESTRI MORREALE

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2011

MAJOR: CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION: FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Advisor Date

DEDICATION

To my late father, Marco Silvestri, who always encouraged me to follow my dreams and pursue a Ph.D. in Education. In 1980, he took me on my first stay abroad to Pacentro, Italy during where I truly acquired my heritage language and developed a passion for Italian culture.

To my mother, Pierina Fabiilli Silvestri, my biggest supporter and inspiration, without whose encouragement and help with my children I would never have had the strength to reach the finish line. She was my first foreign language teacher from birth and sparked my interest in learning foreign languages. Grazie mamma!

To my husband, Antonio Morreale, for his forever-lasting love and support along this journey.

To my children, Anthony, Marco and Alessia, i gioielli della mia vita, whose love keeps me going and provides the inspiration for all that I do. I will never forget the heartwarming valentine written from my son Anthony: "I love you - I hopp (hope) you will be a pefaser (professor) one day - Love, Anthony".

To my brother, PierMarco Silvestri, for his constant reminder to "get to it".

Finally, to my sister, Anna Silvestri Giuliani, who literally hand-delivered a MacBook to me and said: "please write your dissertation!" For her gift of motivation, her support, and her belief in me, I am eternally grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the long creation phase of this dissertation, I have been fortunate to receive the support of many. I am especially grateful to my dissertation committee, and first and foremost to my advisor, Dr. Marc Rosa, whose unfailing encouragement and thoughtful feedback along the way gave me the strength and motivation to do the "impossible." For over a decade, his teaching, mentorship, and friendship have fueled my confidence, my intellectual interests, and my passion for second language acquisition research. I could not have done this without his unwavering generosity and commitment to my success.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Sharon Elliott, co-chair of my committee, for providing invaluable input and thoughtful feedback on my work; and to Dr. Jo-Ann Snyder and Dr. Frances LaPlante-Sosnowsky, for the generous assistance and outstanding insight they contributed towards the success of this project. A special thank you also goes to Dr. Raffaele DeBenedictis for his ongoing support as professor, colleague, and friend through my entire career at WSU – not least of all, for inspiring my many study abroad experiences, and helping me see the beauty of medieval literature and the importance of semiotics.

I would also like to thank other scholars and friends who supported this project: Dr. Navaz P. Bhavnagri, for her excellent methodology course, which provided a wealth of training in the rigors of academic research; Veronica Bielat, for her talent and patience in teaching effective library research strategies to graduate students; Dr. David J. Strauss, who offered advice regarding data collection and great enthusiasm; Thomas Wilhelm and Andrew Ura, who strategized and guided me in organizing my survey responses; Dr. Bulent Ozkan, who guided my statistical work with great expertise and encouragement; and Dr. Margarita Machado-Casas for

valuable assistance in the last stages of the project. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Margaret Winters, who kindly allowed me to conduct survey research in the Classical and Modern Languages Department, and without whose support and enthusiasm for second language acquisition research the success of this project would not have been possible. I would also like to acknowledge the generous collegiality of the foreign language instructors of Arabic, French, German, Italian Spanish and Russian, who donated their class time to this project and distributed the research survey to their students. I also acknowledge and thank the students of the Classical and Modern Languages Department for participating in this research project.

I am grateful to Dr. Andrea DiTommaso and Dr. Louis Kibler for teaching me a great deal about Italian literature, theater, and cinema; for allowing me to teach Italian in their department; and for encouraging my many study abroad experiences.

Many thanks also go to Dr. Caryn Wells for introducing me to brain-based teaching within secondary education and supporting the Grosse Pointe North study abroad exchange program to Italy during my tenure there. I am also thankful to Teresa Taranta and Maureen McHugh for helping me turn theory into practice during my student teaching experience. Their experience and guidance helped me evolve into a classroom teacher.

I am grateful to Dr. Linda Nurra, my best supporter and academic companion of a lifetime, without whose constant support, encouragement and inspiration, I might not have completed this journey. Finally, I am thankful for Elaine Johnson for being another *nonna* to my children and for her superior proof reading of the manuscript – all when I most needed it and down to the eleventh hour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

A major challenge that foreign language educators face is determining how to promote second language (L2) proficiency in their students (Omaggio, 2001). Study abroad programs are one option that has increased in popularity over time. Each year, thousands of students from across the globe leave their homes with the intention of participating in a study abroad experience. According to the Institute of International Education, during the last ten years, students from the U.S. studying abroad has increased by 150 percent. In 2005-2006, 223,534 U.S. students studied abroad, representing an increase of 8.5% from the preceding year (Open Doors, 2009).

Carroll (1967) discovered that time spent abroad is a chief predictor of student foreign language proficiency. According to Freed (1995), reaching ultimate language functionality and competence in a foreign language requires traveling to the country where the language is spoken. She further elaborates that classroom exercises can never be a substitute for authentic communication exchanges with native speakers in real-life situations. Study abroad is, therefore, a vital context for second language acquisition and merits a deep and rich investigation.

Despite the perceived value of study abroad programs for developing language proficiency, according to Ferguson (1995), minimal attention has been given to second language learning that occurs when students study and live in countries where that language is the national language spoken by most residents. Yet, as Freed (1995) explains, it is a significant dynamic worth exploring because many students end up learning the language spoken at the site where they study. The aspects of their language acquisition—accuracy, style, dialect—depend on several variables. In the present study, the researcher will investigate the following variables:

short-term study abroad (SA) participation, long-term SA participation, non-participation in SA and affective variables as an outcome of length of time spent studying abroad.

Short- and long-term study abroad programs provide an authentic experience to help accomplish the goal of language acquisition. Studying abroad is now considered a very important component of the foreign language curriculum in universities across the United States, and offers the most effective language and cultural instruction. In fact, study abroad is a pedagogical pathway to both language acquisition and global education. Yet research in this area has followed relatively narrow parameters.

First, researchers in the field of second language acquisition have primarily studied the effects of study abroad programs on linguistic gains (Brecht, Davidson & Ginsburg, 1990; DeKeyser, 1991; Freed, 1990, 1993, 1995; Ginsburg, 1992; Huebner, 1991; Lapkin, Hart & Swain, 1995) and sociolinguistic gains (Marriott, 1995; Regan, 1995; Siegal, 1995). Specifically, in Spanish L2 research, linguistic proficiency has been examined in SA groups over at home (AH) groups (Collentine, 2004; DeKeyser, 1986; Lafford, 1995, 2004; Rodriguez, 2001; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Stevens, 2001; Torres, 2003). However, study abroad contexts and their effects on affective variables, such as motivation, attitude and anxiety across languages have scarcely been studied.

Second, researchers in second language acquisition have primarily studied the effects of study abroad on language learning programs of medium to long duration, while short-term study abroad programs have received scant investigation. Presently, however, the largest area of increase in foreign study is in short-term study abroad, tripling in the last decade (Badstubner & Ecke, 2009). Consequently, the authors report that with short-term programs tripling in the last decade, programs being less than eight weeks in duration, the shift from traditional semester or

junior-year to short-term study abroad programs is not only a trend; but a new reality. According to the Open Doors Report (2009), the yearly statistical survey published by the Institute of International Education, the number of students from the United States studying in short-term abroad programs has increased by over 75% in the past ten years. Of the total number of students going abroad in 2003-2004 and in 2004-2005, 56% participated in short-term programs. The report concluded that, because the shorter programs are more affordable, their popularity has inspired a growing interest in students who might not otherwise have considered them (Institute of International Education, 2005).

Even so, one must not discount the benefits of long-term study abroad programs. The Junior Year in Munich (JYM) (a long-term study abroad program in Germany) has thrived for more than 75 years, and students who participate in this program seem to sense their place in the world as they live and study in the heart of the European community (Ferguson, 2007). The traditional junior year abroad still remains in existence in many universities throughout the U.S. Teachers, students, parents and administrators may therefore wonder whether the length of the program influences the amount of second language acquired. Yet, there is little research on the effects of program length (Dufon & Churchill, 2006).

Given the large increase in the number of U.S. students studying abroad over the past decade and the boom in short-term SA program attendance, it is useful to further examine the effects of the duration of study abroad programs and their affective outcomes. To set the stage for this study, the remainder of this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section addresses the background of the study while the second addresses the study itself.

Background

Current issues in the field of study abroad. Research in the field of study abroad is currently focused on four major issues: 1) the internationalization or globalization of higher education through the creation of research centers around the world; 2) the promotion of cross-cultural experiences in teacher education; 3) the development of professionals with a global perspective; and 4) the significant increase in the number of short-term study abroad programs in the United States. These four major issues emerged from the investigator's thematic research in Eric Digest and two current handbooks on study abroad (e.g. Stuart, 2007; Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009; Currier, Lucas & Arnault, 2009; Cushner, 2009; Ference, 2006; Labi, 2009; Wainwright, Ram, Teodorescu & Tottenham, 2009).

First, the movement to internationalize higher education is being led by Columbia University by building a network of six to eight research institutions in capitals around the world (Labi, 2009). These institutions have been designed to include faculty and students focusing on international projects across various disciplines. Labi claims that, as the world is becoming increasingly interconnected, it would be beneficial to resolve world issues within a diverse framework.

Second, promoting and using cross-cultural experiences in teacher education as part of the multicultural education curriculum is a leading issue in the field of study abroad. (Ference, 2006). Ference adds that the inclusion of a study abroad component within teacher education programs has been found to lead to their personal development, cultural understanding and openness to cultural diversity. Cushner (2009) likewise calls for the incorporation of study abroad in teacher education curricula in order to prepare globally responsible teachers. He claims that teachers play an indispensible role in preparing the next generation of youth to better

comprehend the world around them and work collaboratively to resolve global issues. Cushner argues that the extent to which teachers can do this depends on their own firsthand knowledge and experience, which affect their ability to train future teachers in their teacher education classrooms.

Third, producing professionals with a global perspective is a current issue in the United States (Stuart, 2007). Some institutions of higher education, – like Goucher College, a small liberal arts school in Baltimore, for example – are including international experience among their graduation requirements. Starting with the class of 2006, this college required its prospective graduates to attend at least one study abroad and provided a voucher of $1,200 to every student. Research currently supports the benefit of international training across the professions. Currier, Lucas and Arnault (2009) argue that an internationally trained nurse, for example, will have a more holistic perspective on health and is therefore more prepared to provide culturally appropriate care in diverse settings. In the education context, Smith (2002) reports that a serious problem facing the internationalization of education is teachers' insufficient knowledge about the world. In the sciences, producing students who possess solid cross-cultural knowledge and can collaborate with scientists from various countries across the globe is also a major priority (Wainwright, Ram, Teodorescu & Tottenham, 2009).

Fourth, the rise and fame of short-term study abroad programs in the United States is receiving much attention (Chieffo & Griffiths, 2009). According to the *Open Doors Report*, published by the Institute of International Education, since the 2003-2004 academic year, more than 50% of students participating in SA do so as part of a short-term program (Institute for International Education, 2006). The traditional year-long SA program, on the other hand, now represents only 5.5% of all SA students. The authors report that short-term programs appeal to

students who work, students with fixed curricula, students with double majors, students who have difficulty being away from home and students who have already studied abroad. In addition, many students would not study abroad at all if they were not given the short-term option. Chieffo and Griffiths further elaborate that short-term programs are clearly perceived as offering students great benefits, while the exact value of longer programs remains the object of intense debate and research. This study investigated the effects of both long- and short-term SA programs on motivation, attitude and anxiety in relation to learning a foreign language.

Affective outcomes of study abroad: motivation, attitude and anxiety. According to Gardner (1985b), affective variables have an effect on language achievement. Therefore, it is of great importance to take a closer look at these variables and the research that exists. The specific affective variables that will be examined in the proposed study and their relationship to achievement in foreign language learning are: 1) motivation; 2) attitude; and 3) anxiety.

First, according to social psychologist Gardner (1985b), motivation for second language learning is comprised of four elements: attitudes towards language learning, desire, motivational intensity, and goal. He further distinguishes the concept of motivation into two orientations: instrumental and integrative. While instrumental motivation towards language learning focuses on the practicality and usefulness of learning a foreign language, integrative motivation contains a sincere interest in the people and culture of the L2.

Empirical investigations that explore motivation in language learning (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstubner & Ecke, 2009; Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008; Ingram, 2005; Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009; Mills, Pajares & Herron, 2007; Shedivy, 2004) demonstrate how, indeed, motivation has an effect on language learning proficiency. A detailed discussion of these investigations will follow in Chapter II of this study. Few of the above-

mentioned studies, however, examine the role of study abroad and its effects on motivation towards language learning (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstubner & Ecke, 2009; Shedivy, 2004). Thus, there is a need for further empirical investigation into the value of study abroad for second language acquisition.

Second, Gardner (1985b) states that attitude plays a role in achievement in a second language. He focuses his attention on two types of attitude variables that exist: attitudes toward learning the language and attitudes toward the other language community. While the first attitude is pertinent to education, the second type of attitude is a social one. He further delineates that although it might seem logical that there exists an instrument for measuring attitudes toward learning a second language in relation to actual achievement in the L2, the available measures vary greatly from study to study in spite of all the evidence to support the construct. He additionally expands this by claiming that attitude variables are not related to achievement in other school subjects but weigh more heavily on language acquisition. Therefore, these two types of attitudes variables merit considerable investigation in the field of foreign language learning.

Several empirical studies that investigate attitude change in students as a result of study abroad (Amuzie & Winke, 2009; Hensley & Sell, 1979; Marion, 1980; Stitsworth, 1988; Yager, 1998; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide & Shimizu, 2004) similarly report changes in attitude after a study abroad experience. These investigations will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter II of this study. In sum, it appears that study abroad programs affect students' attitudes towards learning a foreign language. Since attitude affects language gain, this field of study merits a more profound investigation and further empirical research.

Third, according to Krashen's *Affective Filter Hypothesis* (1985), the "affective filter" prohibits students from fully taking in the comprehensible input they receive in language learning. Beyond this, affective factors such as anxiety prevent learners from using the input when the filter is up. When the filter is lowered, the language learner becomes so engrossed in the language task, that he "forgets" that he is communicating in another language. Nevertheless, even though study abroad programs are an essential part of foreign language students' curriculum, little is known about their affective outcomes, i.e., whether factors such as anxiety are influenced by the study abroad experience (Allen, 2003).

Empirical studies attempting to shed light on the role of anxiety on foreign language learning (Allen & Herron, 2003; Casado & Dereshiwsky, 2004; Hurd, 2007; Lim, 2009; Picchette, 2009; Tallon, 2009) agree that anxiety does have an effect on second language acquisition, and research moves towards a rationale for lowering language anxiety. Interestingly, among all of these studies, only one study (Allen & Herron, 2003) examines the effects of study abroad on language anxiety levels. Hence, more empirical research is required to determine the relevant role that study abroad programs play in relation to language anxiety.

This investigation is unique not only in examining study abroad programs, but also in narrowing the focus on the length of study abroad programs and their effects on affective variables such as motivation, attitude and anxiety in university students across several languages. As an additional point of comparison, this study includes a group of students who did not study abroad as a control group. This investigation adds to the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research for there is no known published empirical study examining both long- and short-term study abroad programs and non-participation in SA programs, as well as their effects on motivation (Allen & Herron, 2003; Shedivy, 2004), attitude (Marion, 1980; Amuzie & Winke,

2009; Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009) and anxiety (Hurd, 2007; Picchette, 2009) towards language learning in Chinese, French (Ingram, 2005; Mills, Pajares & Herron, 2007), German (Badstubner & Ecke, 2009), Italian, Japanese, Polish, Russian and Spanish (Casado & Dereshiwsky, 2004; Shedivy, 2004; Marcos-Llinas & Garau, 2009; Tallon, 2009).

The Research Study

This section includes: (1) a problem statement, (2) the significance and need for the proposed study, (3) the purpose of the study, (4) research questions, (5) research hypotheses, (6) null hypotheses, and (7) definitions of terms.

Problem statement. Study abroad programs in the U.S. are promoted on the premise that they benefit students' language learning, but little evidence has been gathered to support the programs' effectiveness in carrying out this purpose, especially with regard to the short-term study abroad programs that have recently grown in popularity. Due to the increase of study abroad programs in colleges and universities in the United States during the last decade, it may be useful to explore the effects of participation in short- and long-term study abroad programs on motivation, attitude, and anxiety among students enrolled in foreign language classes in the foreign language department of a large, urban, midwestern public university. The students included in this study will have either participated in short- or long-term study abroad programs or were eligible to attend but did not participate.

Significance and Need for the Proposed Study. Several circumstances give rise to the need for this study. There is little dispute that the world is becoming increasingly interconnected, and that globalization is having widespread effects on education. Globalization affects not only business, but also cultural dynamics and educational institutions. As a result, there has been a dramatic rise in the numbers of students who are seeking educational experience

through study abroad programs (Jackson, 2008). Therefore, an evaluation of the outcomes of short- and long-term study abroad will be extremely beneficial.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of this proposed study was to examine differences among university-level foreign language students who participated in long-term study abroad, short-term study abroad, or did not participate, and their motivation, attitudes and anxiety towards learning foreign languages.

Research questions.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivation in learning a foreign language, as measured by the Attitude Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) survey?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude toward learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their anxiety in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey?

Research hypotheses.

H_{1a}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivational intensity in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{1b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their desire to learn a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{1c}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude toward learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2a}. There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their integrative motivation in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their instrumental motivation in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2c}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and

those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in foreign language-speaking people, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2d}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in learning a foreign languages, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{3a}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their classroom anxiety in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{3b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad, and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their anxiety in using a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

Null hypotheses. The specific null hypotheses to be examined are:

H_{1a}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivational intensity in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{1b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their desire to learn a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{1c}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude toward learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2a}. There is no statistically significant difference among university-level foreign language students who participated in long-term study abroad, short-term study abroad and those who were eligible but did not participate in study abroad with respect to their perceptions of integrative motivation in learning the foreign language, as measured by the AMTB.

H_{2b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their instrumental motivation in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{2c}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in foreign language-speaking people, as measured by the AMTB survey..

H_{2d}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in learning a foreign languages, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{3a}:. There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their classroom anxiety in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

H_{3b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad, and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their anxiety in using a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey.

Definition of Terms.

Study abroad – An umbrella term describing any of the following experiences: student or faculty exchange, study abroad, internship, or service learning (Jackson, 2008).

Short-term study abroad – A study abroad program of less than eight weeks (Institute for International Education, 2010).

Long-term study abroad – A study abroad program of more than eight weeks (Institute for International Education, 2010).

Motivation – In language learning, this refers to the summation of student effort, desire to attain the goal of learning the foreign language and positive attitudes toward learning the foreign language (Gardner, 1985b). In sum, motivation involves four components: a goal, behavior without effort, a wish to achieve the goal and positive attitudes towards the activity in discussion (Gardner, 1985b).

Attitude – A state of being that is not only mental but also neural in nature that gives influence to a person's response to all situations to which he/she is exposed (Gardner, 1985b).

Anxiety – According to Scovel (1978) there are two types of anxiety: facilitating anxiety, which motivates the learner to "fight" the new learning task and take on the new learning challenge, and debilitating anxiety, which urges the learner to escape the new educational scenario.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section provides a theoretical framework of language learning theories and focuses in on motivation, attitude and anxiety as they relate to foreign language learning. The second section provides an empirical framework of research findings on study abroad (long- and short-term) affective outcomes such as motivation, attitude and anxiety as they relate to foreign language learning.

Theoretical Perspective on Language Learning

The question of how language is acquired leads educators to analyze theories of language learning and not only interpret, but also adopt and filter them to recreate their own personal language learning theory as a basis for everyday planning and teaching. Omaggio (2001) addresses this very question in her work by claiming that most teachers have formed a methodology based on a particular theoretical framework of second language acquisition, and it would be beneficial for teachers to understand the premises embedded in those approaches in order to properly asses them. Foreign language teachers must have a subconscious, mental theory of how they believe language is acquired. Whether they are leaning towards empiricism or rationalism, they subscribe to a theory that informs how they create lessons and activities, and even how they plan study abroad programs.

Theories of language learning range from the behaviorist early stimulus-response psychology of B.F. Skinner to the cognitive theory of McLaughlin (Omaggio, 2001). On this language acquisition continuum, in which the pendulum sways from empiricism to rationalism, it is possible to explore, interpret and redefine one's personal theory of foreign language

acquisition. What follows is a brief outline of theories that are most pertinent and valuable to this study and play a significant role in L2 language learning via a study abroad experience.

Stephen Krashen's seminal work, *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition* (1982), introduced the "Monitor-Model Theory" aimed at finding an effective method for incorporating active language instruction that would activate Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device (LAD) and enable students to retain the newly acquired language. This model encompasses five subhypotheses interconnected with the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis functioning as its anchor (Krashen, 1985). A closer analysis of these five subhypotheses will provide theoretical support for including study abroad programs in second language acquisition curriculum.

First, *The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis* states that formal lessons with grammar presented in isolation of context or meaning result in learning a language; while active lessons in a natural context produce meaningful and lasting language, thus result in acquiring a language. In language acquisition, as opposed to language learning, students subconsciously internalize the language and ultimately assume ownership of it. According to Krashen (1985) this acquisition process is what leads to spontaneous use of language in real situations.

Second, *The Natural Order Hypothesis* explains how humans all have an innate, biological language device that allows for students to acquire different grammatical forms and vocabulary in a natural order independently of what is presented in class at different points in the curriculum. This hypothesis stresses the importance of teaching L2 naturally, with a methodology similar to how L1 was acquired.

Third, *The Monitor Hypothesis* refers to the self-made "monitor" through which language learners filter their speech or writing before producing an utterance. This "monitor" is most

common in adult second language students who have learned a language through grammar translation or the audio-lingual method. Students may use the "monitor" consciously or unconsciously in an attempt to self-correct their speech production. According to Krashen, when language is acquired instead of learned, the use of the "monitor" is less apparent and confidence in the target language is established.

Fourth, *The Input Hypothesis* states that the most important factor that affects students' abilities to become proficient in a second language is the need for teachers to provide comprehensible input, or what Krashen has termed the "here and now." Students must receive meaningful, visual, interactive, authentic instruction that allows them to actively process the material for long-term storage and assume ownership of that material for later retrieval. The Comprehensible Input Hypothesis has two corollaries: 1) speaking and writing are not taught; they are acquired as a result of comprehensible input, and 2) grammar will be automatically acquired due to the deep structures with which one is born.

Finally, *The Affective Filter Hypothesis* refers to a "mental block" that affects a student's ability to "open up" or "shut down" to comprehensible input. In order to have maximum, effective language acquisition take place, the affective filter must be very low. According to Krashen (1982), the filter is reduced when a student is so engrossed in the communication that s/he forgets s/he is communicating in another language. According to Stevick (1976), when a language acquirer is not motivated, lacks self-confidence and has anxiety, the affective filter is turned up and the input will not reach the brain's language acquisition device (LAD). While all of Krashen's hypotheses apply to language acquisition, the *Input Hypothesis* and the *Affective Filter Hypothesis* are of critical theoretical importance to this study because they directly address the independent (long- and short- term study abroad) and the dependent (motivation, attitude and

anxiety) variables. In sum, Krashen (1985) synthesizes his five hypotheses by claiming that people acquire second languages when they receive comprehensible input and their affective filers are low, enabling the input "entrance".

Vygotsky's theory on the *Zone of Proximal Development* also develops the notion of *input*. The zone of proximal development outlines the functions that are not yet ready but are in the course of complete development (Vygotsky, 1978). These functions are in their fetal state and will be ripe at a future date. Vygotsky (1978) metaphorically terms the functions "buds" or "flowers" of development as opposed to the "fruit" of development. In foreign language acquisition, the comprehensible input (C+1) should be a little above the students' level, with the goal of continually pushing them to acquire more and more language (C+1+1). Study abroad programs provide this ultimate context for this Vygotskyian scaffolding in which students are constantly exposed to more and more authentic language input, internalizing it and thus acquiring language.

Similarly, Lee and VanPatten (2003) add to the *input* theory, offering a *Principles of Input Processing Model* for second language acquisition. They define input processing as the process through which students first perceive and process linguistic data in the foreign language they hear (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). They further clarify *input processing* as an activity that uses strategies and mechanisms by which students extract intake from input. This model incorporates two basic principles: *The Primacy of Meaning Principle (P1)* in which language learners process input for meaning prior to processing it for form and the *The First Noun Principle (P2)* in which language learners usually process the first noun or pronoun they hear in a sentence as the subject (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Central to this study, is the notion of how students extrapolate intake

from the linguistic input they receive in a study abroad program. VanPatten's Input theory thus functions as an indispensable theoretical model for this study.

In addition to Krashen's model and Lee and VanPatten's theory, examining the cognitive approach, where both external and internal factors play a role in language acquisition, cognitive theororists focus on the role of internal, mental processes (Ausubel, 1968; Ausubel, Novak & Hanesian, 1978; Ellis, 1985; and McLaughlin, 1987, 1990). Cognitive theory, a derivative of cognitive psychology, bases its theory on the role of cognitive processes that are involved in the act of learning a language such as transfer, simplification, generalization and restructuring. Therefore, for a language learner to become fluent, s/he must not only acquire these subskills, but also automatize and integrate them (McLaughlin, 1987). In automatization, a routine skill is repeated through practice until it becomes a learned response. Although cognitive theory applies in general to foreign language acquisition, it is specifically related to the independent variable of this study because of the constant repetition of daily language skills that occurs in a full-immersion context like a study abroad program.

Finally, within the social learning viewpoint, which has been referred to as a bridge between behaviorist and cognitive learning, Albert Bandura's (1977) theory states that the way people learn is by observing and modeling other human behavior. According to Bandura, this is a safer and less laborious way to learn than through exclusive reliance on personal action and experience. The components of the processes embedded in social learning are 1) attention, 2) retention, 3) motor reproduction, and 4) motivation (Bandura, 1977). This theory is most applicable and crucial to this study in which study abroad programs offer an ideal context where students are continually observing and modeling the foreign language.

To summarize, the five above-mentioned theoretical perspectives on language learning (Krashen, 1982, 1985; Vygotsky, 1978; Lee & VanPatten, 2003; McLaughlin, 1987; Bandura, 1977) support the idea that study abroad experiences provide a meaningful, natural context for second language learners to receive authentic *input* and *acquire* rather than *learn* the foreign language. Their relevance to this study is indispensible as they function as a foundation for the researcher's investigation. This study aims to show the SLA community the importance of study abroad programs (whether they are long- or short-term) and their effects on affective variables which, in turn, play a role in second language acquisition. Foreign language acquisition is accelerated by many variables such as motivation, attitudes, anxiety, intelligence, age and personality (Shams, 2008). In the following section, theoretical perspectives on motivation, attitude and anxiety with regard to L2 will be discussed.

Motivation in L2 language learning. During the last two decades, there has been a revival in research on motivation in foreign language learners (e.g., Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1994; Dornyei, 1990, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2005; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; Oxford, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). According to Gardner (1985b), L2 motivation involves effort, desire and positive attitudes toward L2 learning. Gardner and Lambert (1972) claim that, although an individual may have great language aptitude, motivation may supersede that aptitude effect in language learning achievement. Gardner and Smythe's (1975) socio-educational model provided the framework for Gardner's seminal work on L2 motivation theory.

Hence, the examination of certain motivational orientations and their role in foreign language learning is outlined by Gardner's (1985b) theory of motivation in which he describes two types of orientations toward learning a language. Integrative motivation refers to the yearning to learn a language with the scope of fully interacting with members of the L2

community. Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, refers to the yearning to learn a language with the practical scope of fulfilling a requirement or getting a job (Gardner, 1985b). Jakobovitz (1970) discussed integrative and instrumental motivation as intrinsic interest and extrinsic interest. Gardner (1985b) and Stevick (1976), however, argue that both integrative and instrumental orientations are extrinsic because a foreign language is being acquired with the intent to achieve a goal, and not because of an internal interest in the language per se.

Subsequently, Dornyei (2005) contributed to this discourse on motivation with a cognitive-based paradigm he calls the "process-oriented" approach. This paradigm looks at changes in motivation to learn what students experience in their lifetime. He explains that motivation is dynamic and thus may increase or decrease. Dornyei and Otto (1998) created a model of L2 motivation with three stages: the preactional stage (when motivation is first activated), the actional stage (when motivation is actively maintained) and the postactional stage (when the learner retrospectively evaluates events and sparks future motivation). In this investigation, all of the above-mentioned theories come into play for students of foreign languages who are motivated to study abroad.

Attitude in L2 language learning. Beyond the discussion of motivation is the research on the role of attitude in learning a second language. Many studies suggest that attitude plays an influential role in achievement in second language acquisition (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Bartley, 1970; Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1978; Lalonde & Gardner, 1985b; Kraemer, 1990). Gardner (1985b) elaborates on this hypothesis by stating that attitudes navigate learners to seek out language learning opportunities. Gardner also establishes that there are two types of attitudes that are important in determining proficiency in SLA: attitudes toward learning a second language and attitudes towards the second language community. Gardner (1985b) further adds

that these attitudes are independent of age, sex or intelligence. He concludes that attitudes toward learning a second language are a better indicator of achievement in a foreign language than attitudes towards the second language population.

Anxiety in L2 language learning. Some studies have concluded that high language anxiety usually has a negative result on the process of language learning (Campell & Ortiz, 1991; Gregersen, 2003; Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002; Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; Horwitz & Young, 1991; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Oxford, 1999). According to Dornyei (2005), anxiety is an affective factor that may be defined by two distinctions: 1) between beneficial/facilitating and inhibitory/debilitating anxiety, which outlines how anxiety does not always hinder performance but may indeed promote it. Worry, on the other hand, is the cognitive component that has a negative result on language performance; 2) between trait and state anxi*ety*. Trait anxiety outlines how one may become anxious due to certain situations, while state anxiety refers to the momentary occurrence of anxiety as an emotional response to a scenario. Thus, different anxiety constructs produce different outcomes. MacIntyre (2002) claims that effort is sometimes a response to anxiety and, in that case, being anxious is a positive state. According to Gardner and MacIntyre (1993), language anxiety is experienced as tension and apprehension felt in speaking, listening and learning situations in L2 contexts.

In conclusion, the above theories of motivation, attitude and anxiety and the supporting empirical research studies support the notion that affective variables do play a role in achievement in foreign language learning. Hence, motivation, attitude and anxiety are key variables that affect proficiency in the field of second language acquisition. Further investigation of how these variables are affected by participation or non-participation in a study abroad

program is necessary for developing more effective pedagogical avenues to second language acquisition.

Empirical Perspective on Study Abroad and L2 Learning

Study abroad and motivational outcomes. Only few published studies have focused primarily on motivational outcomes of long- and short-term study abroad programs (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstubner & Ecke, 2009; Shedivy, 2004). While several studies have focused on *motivation* as an independent or dependent variable within the foreign language teaching context (Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009; Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008; Mills, Pajares & Herron 2007; Ingram, 2005).

Allen and Herron (2003) investigated the use of a short-term (40-day) study abroad program on both affective (integrative motivation and language anxiety) and linguistic outcomes (oral and listening skills). A convenience sample of 25 college students of French was examined with the use of the Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the State Anxiety Scale, the AMTB, the French Oral Proficiency Test and the French Listening Test. Their results showed a change in integrative motivation, a decrease in language anxiety and significant improvement in both oral and listening French skills after the SA.

In the same vein, Badstubner and Ecke (2009) investigated the effects of a short-term study abroad on student expectations, motivations and target language use in foreign language learning. They used a convenience sample of 30 students who participated in a one-month summer study program in Leipzig, Germany, offered by the University of Arizona in 2006. All of the participants were undergraduate students. Data were collected with the administration of two sets of questionnaires based on the Language Contact Profile (Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz & Halter, 2004). The first questionnaire was given at the inception of the study abroad program,

while the second was distributed at the end of the study abroad. The results of the study reported that motives to study abroad were integrative in nature; students' expected proficiency gains were high and perceived target language use in listening correlated to frequency of listening.

In yet another examination of study abroad programs, Shedivy (2004) investigated the effects of study abroad on motivation to persist in a foreign language via a phenomenology and a qualitative interview. The participants were five college students between the ages of 19 and 28 who had studied Spanish throughout high school and college. The sample was chosen by criterion sampling and thus all the students had lived in Spanish-speaking countries during their stay abroad. Data collection was conducted with taped interviews with the participants that lasted between two and four hours in length. The researcher states that her investigation did not reach a definitive conclusion on motivational orientations that may lead to continued study in a foreign language, even though integrative and instrumental motivation were apparent in each of her subject's descriptive results.

Kouritzin, Piquemal and Renaud (2009), on the other hand, investigated differences in language learning beliefs, attitudes and motivations in university students in Canada, Japan and France. They surveyed more than 6,000 university students with a survey they constructed entitled "Social Norms in Foreign Language Learning" (SNIFL). The results concluded that the Japanese students gained significantly higher social value compared to those in Canada and France. While the French students showed a number of motivations for foreign language learning that indicate a personal authentic interest in the culture and related aspects of foreign languages. In contrast to the Japanese students, the weakest motivator for the French students was the perceived social value of foreign language learning. In Canada, the motivator that had the highest value was the perceived opportunities for learning a foreign language. The results of

the study indicated that Canadian students perceived a relationship between educational and economic opportunity and the value of learning a foreign language. Thus, using Gardner's perspective (1985b), Japanese and French students seemed to have stronger integrative motivation; while, the Canadian students seemed to display greater instrumental motivation.

In contrast, Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman and Playford (2008) studied the effects of motivation to study abroad on the adaptation of international students in Canada. In this investigation, the independent variable was the motivation to study abroad and the dependent variable was the students' adjustment in the host country. The sample consisted of 228 international students from three Canadian universities. The students were given an online survey within the first month of class and then another online survey during the final months of class. The Self-Regulation Questionnaire–Study Abroad (SRQ-SA) (Chirkov, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2007) was the tool that measured four types of motivation: intrinsic, identified, introjected and external. The results of this investigation supported the researchers' main assumptions that the autonomous motivation for studying abroad to receive an education is a predictor of adjustment.

In yet another study investigating motivation, Mills, Pajares and Herron (2007) examined the effects of self-efficacy and motivation on achievement in intermediate French students. The subjects were 303 college students enrolled in intermediate French I or intermediate French II courses at three different institutions of higher education in the northeastern, southeastern and midwestern United States. The researchers implemented a survey with multiple components in order to investigate students' French grade self-efficacy, learning anxiety, learning self-concept, self-efficacy for self-regulation, and perceived value of language and culture. Achievement was measured by the final grade in the course. The results reported that intermediate French

students' self-efficacy for self-regulation was the most statistically significant predictor of intermediate French language achievement.

Adding to the study of motivational outcomes, Ingram (2005) investigated a pilot program in which study abroad in France was an integral component of a third-semester French class. The class was twofold: it included a seven-week component on campus in which students attended class four times weekly for the traditional 50-minute sessions and then studied abroad for three weeks during which students attended class six times weekly for two-hour sessions. In addition, the study abroad component included lectures and excursions. The subjects were 17 students enrolled in the third-semester French class. The measurement tool was the student evaluation at the termination of the class completed in France. The evaluation for the course was favorably higher than the other third-semester French classes' evaluations. In addition, eight of the 17 pilot students continued with French courses after the program. In contrast, only 10 (12%) of the 82 students taking the traditional course continued on with more French courses. The investigator stated that the Avignon program has been successful in motivating students in continuing their studies at the 200 level.

The above investigations suggest that study abroad programs play a role in affecting motivation to learn a foreign language (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstuber & Ecke, 2009; Shedivy, 2004). In addition, motivation has also been investigated as the independent variable or dependent variable in language learning research (Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009; Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008; Mills, Pajares and Herron 2007; Ingram, 2005). However, the cited investigations have a number of limitations.

First, small sample sizes (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstuber & Ecke, 2009; Shedivy, 2004; Ingram, 2005) may not allow the findings to be generalized. The generalizability of the results of a study determines the external validity of the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005). Second, short interventions (short-term study abroad programs) (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstuber & Ecke, 2099; Ingram, 2005) may not provide as effective a treatment and therefore affect outcomes. Third, focus on one group of college students only (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstuber & Ecke, 2009) may not allow for generalizing the findings. Fourth, limited measurement tools (Shedivy, 2004; Ingram, 2005) such as lengthy interviews as the sole instrument for collecting data (Shedivy, 2004) make it difficult to qualify qualitative data for results, while student evaluations as the sole data collection tool do not allow for a multi-measure methodology, which in turn makes the result more robust.

Despite the noted limitations, the aforementioned studies also had a number of strengths that are worth mentioning. Large sample sizes (Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009; Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008; Mills, Pajares & Herron 2007) allow for the findings to be generalized. Investigating different types of motivation (Chirkove, Safdar, de Guzman & Playford, 2008) offer a more in-depth investigation of affective attributes in language learning and surveying different regions of the United States allows for greater generalizing of the results. Surveying university students in three different continents (Kouritzin, Piquemal & Renaud, 2009) offer global and comparative interpretations of the findings.

Taking into consideration both the limitations and strengths of the cited investigations, this study replicated three of the strengths of the previous studies: 1) investigating more than one kind of motivation (both integrative and instrumental); 2) using a large sample size of 140+ subjects; 3) using a reliable tool, Gardner's AMTB. In addition, this study addressed three of the

cited studies' limitations by 1) examining both long- and short-term interventions (study abroad programs; 2) examining an absence of intervention or control group (students who did not study abroad); and 3) surveying a variety of foreign language university sections from a Department of Classical and Modern Languages (two-three sections of each of the following languages: Arabic, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish).

Study abroad and attitudinal outcomes. Several studies have investigated study abroad programs and changes in student attitudes (Yager, 1998; Amuzie & Winke, 2009; Hensley & Sell, 1979; Stitsworth, 1988; Marion, 1980). While, one study (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004) focused on the effects of attitudes on willingness to communicate (WTC) in a foreign language.

Yager (1998) examined students' gain in Spanish skills in 30 students who had studied in Mexico over a seven-week period. As part of his study, he examined student attitude and informal contact with the foreign language as the independent variable. He found that both informal contact with native speakers and student attitudes play a part in language acquisition. Students took a pre- and post-study abroad oral sample and completed background questionnaires, language and culture attitude questionnaires, and a language contact profile (LCP). Four control subjects underwent the same process but remained in the United States. The results reported statistical significance in language gain as a result of informal contact with the foreign language. The controls' scores did not improve. Interestingly, Yager (1998) found that language attitude measure and motivation measure did not correlate significantly with gains in Spanish skill.

In a study of foreign students traveling to the United States, Amuzie and Winke (2009) investigated the effects of study abroad on the students' beliefs about their language learning

experience. Belief questionnaires were distributed to 70 English language students studying abroad in the United States. The subjects were asked to think about their beliefs at the moment of their arrival and then at the moment the questionnaire was given. The subjects were then assigned to two groups, depending on the length of time they had been abroad to examine if this had an effect on their beliefs. The researchers' dependent variables were the teacher's role, learner autonomy and self-efficacy. The results indicated that learners underwent changes in their beliefs in only two areas: learner autonomy and the role of the teacher. In addition, learners who had spent more duration abroad registered increased changes in their belief system.

In yet another study, Hensley and Sell (1979) examined the effects of a political science study abroad program on student attitudes. The subjects were 52 students enrolled in the Kent State Geneva Semester Program in Geneva, Switzerland. A questionnaire was distributed to the students during their orientation in the U.S. and then again at the end of the program. The questionnaire was developed with items from a number of different scales (Measures of Political Attitudes by Sampson and Smith, 1957; Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes by Shaver, 1973; an internationalism scale by Lutzker, 1960; a 1970 Gallup poll; a 1963 Roper poll). The control group comprised of 17 students enrolled at Kent State University that did not have a study abroad experience. The results reported that a substantial change occurred only on the self-esteem variable and not on world-mindedness, support for the U.N. and tolerance of ambiguity.

Similarly, Leonard (1964) compared the attitudes of students before and after a foreign exchange program and reported no significant change in attitudes. In like manner, Hanna and Smith (1979) investigated the attitude change of 132 students from 12 to 17 years of age who

participated in a four-week exchange program and found no significant difference between the pre- and post-SA groups.

Still yet, examining attitude change after an SA program, several studies (Hofman & Zak, 1969; Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1977; Desrochers & Gardner, 1981) focused on student's level of contact with native speakers as a determining variable in attitude change. Hofman and Zak (1969) studied subjects' attitudes after a five-week study abroad to Israel. They discovered that high contact with the members of the target community had an effect on positive changes in student attitude toward Jewishness and Israel. Clement, Gardner and Smythe (1977) investigated the change in attitude in a group of eight Anglophones after an excursion to Quebec City. Results concluded that students with high contact with natives yielded desirable attitudinal changes. Equally important, Desrochers and Gardner (1981) investigated attitude changes in foreign language students learning French before and after an SA experience. They focused on the degree of contact with natives and examined low-contact students, high-contact students and a control group with regards to their attitude change. The investigation concluded that the high-contact group had more significant favorable attitudes toward learning French than the other two groups.

With a different focus, Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide and Shimizu (2004) investigated attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. The subjects for this investigation were two cohorts of high school students in Japan. Two separate investigations with varying groups of Japanese teenagers were conducted. The first investigation focused on students in a high school where native English speakers teach English as a foreign language (EFL). The second investigation was conducted on students who attended a study abroad program in the United States.

In the first investigation, the two groups analyzed had a total of 166 subjects. Participants were either 15 or 16 years of age. The measurement tool was a set of questionnaires with attitudinal/motivational measures and willingness to communicate (WTC) scales. The first set of questionnaires was given to Group 1 in July 1999, while the second was given to Group 2 in July 2000. Both groups were given the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in April of that academic year. The results of this first investigation indicate that WTC correlates negatively with communication anxiety, correlates with perceived communication competence and relates to many motivational/attitudinal variables.

In the second investigation, the subjects were Japanese high school students who took part in a year-long Japanese student exchange in the U. S. in 1999 and 2000. Students stayed with host families for three weeks and attended an intensive language course before departing for various parts of the U.S. to attend a year of high school. The study focused on the three-week period in which 57 Japanese students took a pre- and post- questionnaire. The average age of the subjects was 16.1. The results of this investigation indicate that WTC measured prior to departure significantly relates to frequency of communication. WTC also correlates significantly with the length of time the student spends conversing with the host family. In addition, desire to learn the L2 significantly correlates with frequency of communication. In sum, the results of investigation II confirm those obtained in investigation I.

Examining a quite different outcome, Stitsworth (1988) examined the relationship between previous foreign language study and personality change in youth exchange participants. The subjects were 154 adolescents 4-H club members from 21 states who traveled to Japan for one-month homestays during the summer of 1986 as part of an exchange. The sample was comprised of 154 exchangees and 112 control group members who did not journey abroad. The

measurement was the California Psychological Inventory and was given to both groups prior to the exchange, at the end of the exchange and four months after the conclusion of the exchange. The results indicated that the overseas group increased in flexibility and autonomy and became less conservative than the control group. Students who had studied a foreign language one or two semesters showed no measurable change; while students who had studied a foreign language for three or four semesters registered significant change. Students who were the first ones in their family to study abroad or who had self-funded a large portion of their trip expenses also changed significantly. Thus, this study supports the idea that affective changes, aside from linguistic skill changes, do result from study abroad programs.

Examining a much longer SA program, Marion (1980) analyzed the relationship of student characteristics and experiences in a study abroad program to student attitude changes. The sample was composed of 90 undergraduate students from an American university who had studied abroad in England, France, Germany and Italy. The programs in England Germany and France were a full academic year in duration, while the program in Italy lasted one semester. The measurement tool consisted of an antecedents questionnaire, an attitude scale, and a transactions questionnaire. In addition, the students also completed pre- and post- scales on dogmatism, internationalism, radicalism-conservatism, perception of the host country and perception of the U.S. The results indicated that students who were more radical and visited fewer countries during their stay abroad became more dogmatic; students who visited fewer countries, lived with a host family and had fewer host friends and more American friends became more conservative; younger students who had a fair or poor foreign language ability, experienced more than one kind of living situation while abroad, had fewer host friends and more American friends, and lived in a living unit with a sizeable percentage of host people and a

minor percentage of either Americans or other foreign people became more nationalistic; foreign language majors became more nationalistic; and undecided majors were more nationalistic than those planning on going into law or medicine. The perception of the host country became more favorable for students who listed socially oriented activities in the pre-test, for students who visited a greater number of countries, had only one kind of living situation abroad, and had more host friends than American friends. The perception of the U.S. became more favorable for students who had fewer semester hours; were female; were more nationalistic and conservative on the pre-tests; had only fair or poor foreign language ability; lived with a host family; had more than one living situation abroad; had fewer host friends; had more American friends; and engaged in activities of a non-social nature during the stay abroad.

The above-mentioned investigations provide evidence that study abroad programs play a role in affecting student attitudes or attitude changes (Yager, 1998; Amuzie & Winke, 2009; Hensley & Sell, 1979; Stitsworth, 1988; Marion, 1980; Leonard, 1964; Hanna & Smith, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1977; Desrochers & Gardner, 1981) and, in turn, how this is related to language learning. However, the cited investigations have some limitations. Small sample sizes (Yager, 1998; Hensley & Sell, 1979) and examining one language area only (Yager, 1998; Hofman & Zak, 1969; Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1977; Desrochers & Gardner, 1981) do not allow for the results to be generalized.

On the other hand, the aforementioned studies also had numerous strengths that are worth mentioning. Using a multi-measure methodology (Amuzie & Winke, 2009), multiple questionnaires (Marion, 1980), and a questionnaire developed from a number of different scales (Hensley & Sell, 1979) also add to the reliability of the findings. Reliability is also increased through the use of both an experimental group (treatment was the study abroad program) and a

control group (student who did not study abroad) (Stitsworth, 1988; Yashima, 2004; Desrochers & Gardner, 1981). Examinations of both year-long and semester-long study abroad programs (Marion, 1980) and their effect on attitude also add validity to the results. Some researcher (Hensley & Sell, 1979; Leonard, 1964; Hanna & Smith, 1979; Hofman & Zak, 1969) gave the students questionnaires at the beginning and end of the study abroad in order to record changes in student attitude. This implementation of the measurement provided for a comparison of pre- and post-treatment results.

Taking into consideration both the limitations and strengths of the cited investigations, this study replicated three of the strengths of the previous studies. First, both an experimental (study abroad participants) and a control group (non-participants in a study abroad) were examined. Second, the researcher examined study abroad programs of different lengths (short- and long-term) and third, the researcher will used a number of scales from the AMTB (Gardner, 1985a) as its measurement tool. In addition, this investigation addressed the two limitations of the aforementioned studies. The sample size was large (140+) and the study surveyed students studying a variety of languages (Arabic, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish).

Study abroad and anxiety outcomes. Although researchers have examined the effects of study abroad programs on language achievement, only one published study has been found specifically on the examination of a study abroad program and its effects on language anxiety (Allen & Herron, 2003). Several studies (Casado & Dereshiwsky, 2004; Hurd, 2007; Lim, 2009; Picchette, 2009; Tallon, 2009), on the other hand, have examined different variables that have an effect on foreign language anxiety. Inversely, one study examined the effects of language anxiety on achievement in foreign language learning (Marcos-Llinas & Garau, 2009).

Allen and Herron (2003) investigated the use of a short-term study abroad program (40 days) on both affective (integrative motivation and language anxiety) and linguistic outcomes (oral and listening skills). A convenience sample of 25 college students of French was examined with the use of the FLCAS, the State Anxiety Scale, the AMTB, the French Oral Proficiency Test and the French Listening Test. Their results reported a change in integrative motivation, a decrease in language anxiety and significant improvement in both oral and listening French skills after the SA.

Instead, Casado and Dereshiwsky (2004) investigated the effects of educational strategies on anxiety in the foreign language classroom. These researchers compared the levels of anxiety of first-semester university language students in the U.S. and Spain, as measured by the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). There were 114 subjects in Group I (Northern Arizona University) and 154 subjects in Group II (Universidad de Murcia). The students were given surveys within the first three weeks of class. The independent variables in this study were an "early start" in language learning and a "well-articulated framework" for foreign language learning within the school district. The researchers hypothesized that students with an early start in foreign language education and with a well-defined framework should exhibit decreased levels of anxiety than students in a system that does not present them. The results of the study indicated that these strategies may not have an outcome of decreased levels of anxiety at the moment students take their first semester of foreign language at the university.

Tallon (2009) expands on the "early start" by examining heritage students of Spanish who were exposed to Spanish in the home and, in fact, had had an earlier start in the foreign language, and anxiety scores. He examined a total of 413 students (209 heritage students and

204 non-heritage students) and also administered the FLCAS to determine anxiety scores. The subjects were students in a total of 27 sections of Spanish at a large university in the southwestern United States in the fall semester. Quantitative data were collected using a demographic questionnaire and the FLCAS (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Qualitative data were collected through an open-ended question after the FLCAS, four open-ended questions that asked the students to expound on how they felt about using the Spanish language included in the last section of the questionnaire, and a telephone interview from 37 subjects (all heritage students). The results of this study reported that there was a significant difference in anxiety scores between the heritage and non-heritage students. Thus, heritage students of Spanish had diminished anxiety scores than non-heritage students of Spanish. In addition, these heritage students had diminished anxiety scores than any other studies reported in the literature review.

In yet a different context, Hurd (2007) examined distance learning programs and their effect on language anxiety in a longitudinal study. The sample contained 500 university students enrolled in a lower intermediate French course. The study used a multi-measure methodology that included questionnaires, audio-recorded think-aloud protocols and telephone interviews. Students were surveyed at the inception and the midpoint of the class. Triangulation was therefore implemented to complete the findings. The results indicated that distance learners and non distance learners shared similar aspects of anxiety and that some distance learners were found to have an absence of anxiety. The researcher suggests future studies with distance learners examining anxiety and achievement, suggesting they would be useful in foreign language education.

Still yet, Pichette (2009) compared anxiety profiles of classroom and distance language learners and also compared anxiety levels between first-semester and more experienced students

in both learning settings. The subjects were 186 French-speaking subjects studying English or Spanish as a foreign language, either in a classroom or distance learning setting, tested via a web questionnaire in Canada in 2006. While the FLCAS (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986) measured general foreign language anxiety, the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS) (Saito, Horwitz, Garza, 1999) measured L2 reading anxiety and the Writing Anxiety Test (WAT) (Daly & Miller, 1975) measured L2 writing anxiety. The results indicated that there is no statistical difference in anxiety profiles between classroom and distance learners. Likewise, there is no statistical difference in anxiety levels between first-semester students and students in the second semester or beyond. The researcher suggests that more research is warranted in the field of anxiety-reducing methods in foreign language acquisition.

Finally, Lim (2009) investigated the relationship of collectivism versus individualism on foreign language use anxiety, country of origin on foreign language use anxiety, and variation of country of origin on perceptions of factors that lead to successful language learning. The subjects were 224 attendees at a workshop for International Teaching Assistants at a U.S. university. The participants were between the ages of 21-38 representing 32 different countries. The subjects completed three questionnaires: a cultural orientation scale (Triandis, Chen, Chan, 1998), an attribution scale (designed by the researcher), and an English Use Anxiety scale (Gardner, 1985a). The results indicated that anxiety scores were not directly related to individualism or collectivism; learners from Asia had higher scores on the English Language Use Anxiety Scale than learners from other countries; North and South Americans made significantly fewer external attributions and Asians made the most effort attributions with regard to success in language learning. The researcher offers a more holistic view, claiming that his investigation

goes beyond the traditional focus on single characteristics to examine multiple factors in language learning.

Inversely, Marcos-Llinas and Garau (2009) studied the *effects* of language anxiety on achievement on three proficiency-level courses of Spanish as a foreign language. The three Spanish courses investigated were beginner, intermediate and advanced. The purpose of this investigation was not only to examine differences in language anxiety across the three Spanish courses but also to examine the relationship between language anxiety and course achievement. The independent variables were language level and language anxiety as measured by the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). The dependent variable was achievement, as measured by the final grade in the course. The participants were 134 college students from various degree programs enrolled in eleven courses of Spanish during the winter and spring terms at a midwestern, American university. The instruments used in this investigation were the FLCAS, the background questionnaire and the final grade in the course. The FLCAS and the background questionnaire were administered twice: once during the first week of class and again during the fifth week of class.

The results of this study reported, first of all, significant differences in language anxiety (scores on FLCAS) across the language levels. The higher the level of the course, the higher the level of anxiety. Secondly, the study reported that low-anxious students showed lower grades; and lastly, a significant correlation was found between language anxiety and course achievement. Thus, the higher the anxiety, the greater the achievement in the class.

The above-mentioned investigations provided evidence that language anxiety is a result of many different variables in the field of foreign language education. Indeed, a lack of empirical research specifically on how study abroad programs impact foreign language anxiety

called for more research and investigation in this field. However, the cited studies have some limitations. First, solely looking at the effects of educational strategies on language anxiety (Casado & Dereshiwsky, 2004) limited the treatment to pre-existing attributes and did not provide for experimental treatment. Marcos-Llinas and Garau (2009) also examined pre-existing attributes and did not include study abroad as treatment. One investigator (Lim, 2009) examined how the country of origin affected language anxiety. This did not offer any pedagogical insight but provided more of a social rationale for levels of anxiety.

On the other hand, the aforementioned studies also had numerous strengths that merit mentioning. Good sample sizes (Casado & Dereshiwsky, 2004; Hurd, 2007; Lim, 2009; Marcos-Llinas & Garau, 2009; Picchette, 2009; Tallon, 2009) result in good generalizability. The use of a control group (Tallon, 2009) also increased generalizability and reliability. While the use of a multi-measure methodology (Hurd, 2007; Tallon, 2009) promoted validity, the use of more than one questionnaire (Lim, 2009; Pichette, 2009) increased the reliability of the findings.

Taking into consideration both the limitations and strengths of the cited investigations, this study replicated three of their strengths. First, a large sample size (140+) was used. Second, the study included a control group (students who are non-participants in a study abroad). Third, the use of multiple scales from Gardner's AMTB were used to assess outcome variables. In addition, two of the limitations were addressed. The investigator looked at more than one outcome variable, specifically, motivation, attitude and anxiety. Second, the investigator focused on pedagogical issues, not cultural/social issues in language education.

To summarize, the review of literature provided a substantial theoretical and empirical framework of support for the effects of study abroad programs on motivation, attitude and anxiety in foreign language education. Taking into consideration this critique of the research

studies reported, the investigator addressed some of these critiqued issues in this study. In the following chapter, the investigator presents a detailed discussion of the methodology that was employed in conducting the study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The methods that were used to collect and analyze the data needed to describe the sample and address the research questions are presented in this chapter. The topics included in this discussion are a restatement of the purpose of the study, the research design, the setting for the study, the participants, the instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the relationship between university-level foreign language students who participated in long and short-term study abroad language programs and their motivation, attitudes and anxiety toward learning a foreign language.

Research Design

This study used a non-experimental, causal-comparative research design to determine if students' motivation, attitudes, and anxiety toward learning foreign languages differed among students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad language programs and students who did not participate. A causal-comparative research design investigates causes of differences that are already in existence among groups of human beings (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005). This type of research is often thought of as associational research and is frequently referred to with the Latin phrase "*ex post facto,"* meaning "after the fact" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005). This type of research design was appropriate as the independent variables were not manipulated and no treatment or intervention was provided to the participants. A causal-comparative research design differs greatly from an experimental research design because the researcher does not give a treatment to one group and then compare them.

This type of research design was not subject to the same types of threats as experimental and quasi-experimental research designs (e.g., maturation, instrumentation, etc.). However, the

researcher must be aware of any extraneous variables that could affect the outcomes of the study. However, at the beginning of the study, there did not appear to be any extraneous variables that could have influenced the data collection or outcomes of the study.

Setting for the Study

The study was conducted at a large urban university located in the Midwest. This university was a comprehensive university offering 126 Bachelor's degree programs, 139 Master's degree programs, 60 doctoral degree programs, and 30 certificate, specialist and professional programs. This urban university was rated as a doctoral/research university assigned both the "Very High Research" and "Community Engagement" designations by the Carnegie Institute. This comprehensive university was comprised of thirteen colleges and schools, which offered more than 350 academic programs. The university was accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Forty specific programs and curricula have been accredited by specialized or professional accrediting agencies.

The total enrollment for this university for Fall 2008 was 31,668 students. Out of this number, 20,123 were undergraduate students; 8,733 were graduate students; and 2,812 were graduate and professional students. 35.1% of the students were minorities and 2,609 were undergraduate transfer students. Eight percent of the students were from foreign countries, with the largest group from Canada, followed by India and China. A total of 5,411 degrees and certificates were awarded for the 2005-2006 academic year. Study abroad programs were offered in several disciplines, including African Studies, Art, Business Administration, Chinese, Classics, Computer Science, Education, Engineering, Environmental Studies, German, Honors, Health Care, Interdisciplinary Studies, Italian, Japanese, Labor and Employment Relations, Political Science, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Theatre and Urban Planning.

Participants

Participants in this study were university students who were enrolled in foreign language courses at a large, public, midwestern university. These students were at least sophomore level and had completed sufficient coursework to participate in short- or long- term study abroad language programs.

To determine the sample size needed, the software program G-Power 3.1 was used. Given the effect size of .25, alpha level of .05, with three groups and three dependent variables, a sample size of 48 will yield a power of .96.

The sample was comprised of students enrolled in the Classical and Modern Languages and Literature program. These languages included Arabic, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish. The enrollment in each of these classes was from six to thirty students. Two to three sections of each of the above mentioned foreign languages were asked to participate in the study. The total number of sections that were asked to participate in the study was 20. Of the 20 sections, 10 instructors agreed to participate in the study and gave the survey to their students. A total of 142 students participated in the study. This number was adequate to provide students who have participated in long- (n=1) and short-term (n=13) study abroad language programs, as well as a comparison group (n=128) of students eligible to participate in these SA programs, but who have not gone abroad yet.

Instrumentation

AMTB survey. The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery was designed by Gardner and Smythe (1981) to test attitudes, motivation, and anxiety in learning foreign languages. The scale is used to assess the affective reactions associated with second language acquisition. The instrument has 101 items that measure 12 independent subscales. Each of these items is rated using a six-point Likert scale ranging from one for "strongly disagree" to seven for "strongly agree." The instrument has been used in many studies and for many different language groups, including Croatian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, and Romanian. The items are reworded to reflect the language group that is being studied. For the purpose of the present study, the generic term "foreign language" will be used instead of a specific language. Table 1 presents the items on each subscale.

Student demographic survey. A student demographic survey was used to collect demographic data such as country of study abroad, length of stay and frequency of study abroad. In addition, this demographic survey will serve as the consent form.

Table 1

Attitude/Motivation Test Battery Items on Each Subscale

Subscale	Items on Subscale*
Interest in foreign languages	1, 9*, 16, 24*, 32, 41*, 48, 56*, 63, 70*
Motivational intensity	2*, 10, 17*, 25, 33*, 42, 49*, 57, 64*, 71
Foreign language class anxiety	3*, 12, 18*, 27, 34*, 44, 50*, 59, 65*, 72
Attitudes toward foreign language learning	4, 14*, 19, 29*, 35, 46*, 51, 61*, 66, 74*
Attitudes toward foreign language speaking people	5, 20, 31, 36, 39, 52, 67, 76
Integrative orientation	6, 21, 37, 53
Desire to learn a foreign language	7, 13*, 22, 28*, 38, 45*, 54, 60*, 68, 73*
Foreign language use anxiety	8, 15*, 23, 30*, 40, 47*, 55, 62*, 69, 75*

Instrumental orientation	11, 26, 43, 58

*Reverse coded

Scoring. The numeric responses for each subscale was summed to obtain a total score. The total score was divided by the number of items in order to obtain a mean score for each subscale. The use of a mean score provided a result that is in the original scale and allows direct comparisons across the subscales.

Reliability. The original survey measured 12 independent subscales. As these subscales are independent, they can be used separately without affecting the validity and reliability of the scale. Cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained to examine the internal consistency of each of the subscales. The alpha coefficients ranged for .13 to .97, with 89% exceeding .70. The median reliability was .85 for all the subscales, indicating the instrument has adequate internal consistency as a measure of reliability. The median six-week test-retest reliability was reported to be .79, which indicates the instrument has good stability (Gardner, 1985a).

Validity. Gardner (1985a) tested the instrument for several types of validity. He indicated that the instrument had content validity based on the judgment of people who constructed the items and those who selected the items that would be included on the survey. Predictive validity has been determined by a number of research studies (e.g., Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1977; Gardner & Smythe, 1975, 1981; Gliksman, 1981; Lalonde, 1982). Convergent and discriminate validity were assessed to provide evidence of construct validity.

Procedure

After receiving permission from the Dean of the Classical and Modern Language Department, from the Dean of Student Affairs and the Human Investigation Committee (HIC) at the urban university, the researcher emailed the professors who were teaching foreign languages to determine their willingness to collect data from their students. The researcher provided them

with copies of the survey and answered any questions they had regarding their students' participation in the study.

The researcher developed survey packets that included a copy of the research information sheet and the survey. The research information sheet was used in lieu of an informed consent form. The research information sheet included all the information that is on the informed consent form, but did not require the participant to sign and return a copy. The return of their completed survey provided evidence that they were willing to participate in the study. The use of a research information sheet provided additional assurance that participants will remain anonymous.

The researcher first e-mailed the instructors of 20 sections of foreign languages in the Modern and Classical Languages Department, announcing that she would be putting the survey packets in their mailboxes. The packets had complete instructions and asked the instructors to give the survey to their students within a two -week period. The researcher then explained the purpose of the study and asked the instructors to return the completed surveys to a collection bin in the departmental office. The researcher offered to come into the classroom and give the surveys to the students to all the language instructors. No instructor accepted the researcher's offer and each instructor that participated, distributed the surveys to his/her students and collected the completed surveys. All the data were collected in the classroom by the instructors. Students were not allowed to remove the surveys for completion at a later date. The instructors then placed the completed surveys into the designated collection bin. The researcher collected the completed surveys at the end of every week for two weeks. The survey packets were not coded in any way. The researcher did not have a class roster and no student was identified in the

class. By not coding the surveys, the researcher was able to assure that the students' identities were kept confidential.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the surveys was entered into a computer file for analysis using SPSS – Windows, v. 17.0. The data analysis was divided into three sections.

Descriptive statistics. The first section used frequency distributions, crosstabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion to describe the sample. The second section used descriptive statistics including measures of central tendency and dispersion to summarize the subscales on the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery.

Inferential statistics. The findings of the statistical analyses, including a single-tailed, bootstrapped *t*-test, was used to address the research questions and test the associated hypotheses presented in the third section. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05. Table 2 presents the statistical analyses that were used to test the research questions and associated hypotheses.

Table 2

Statistical Analysis

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
1. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivation in studying a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey?		
H_{1a}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivational intensity in	<u>Dependent Variable</u> • Motivational intensity to continue studying foreign language (Interval) • Desire to learn a foreign language (Interval) • Attitudes toward learning a foreign language (Interval)	A single-tailed *t*-test was used to determine if there is a difference in their motivation toward learning a foreign language based on their study abroad participation.

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
studying a foreign language. H_{01a}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long-term and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivational intensity in studying a foreign language. H_{1b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their desire to learn a foreign language. H_{01b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad programs on their desire to learn a foreign language. H_{1c}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude in learning a foreign language. H_{1c}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long-	<u>Independent Variable</u> Group membership (Nominal) • Short- & Long-term study abroad • No study abroad	

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude in learning a foreign language.		
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitudes in learning a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey?		
H_{2a}. There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their integrative orientation in learning a foreign language. H_{02a}. There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their integrative orientation in learning a foreign language. H_{2b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their instrumental orientation in learning a foreign language. H_{02b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long-	<u>Dependent Variable</u> • Integrative orientation (Interval) • Instrumental orientation (Interval) • Interest toward people of other countries where their programs were held (Interval) • Interest in learning foreign languages (Interval) <u>Independent Variable</u> Group membership (Nominal) • Short- & Long-term study abroad • No study abroad	A single-tailed *t*-test was used to determine if there is a difference in their motivation toward learning a foreign language based on their study abroad participation.

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their instrumental orientation in learning a foreign language. ~~H_{02c}~~: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in foreign language speaking people. H_{02c}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest tin foreign language speaking people. H_{2d}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest in learning foreign languages. H_{02d}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their interest		

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
in learning a foreign language.		
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their anxiety in studying a foreign language, as measured by the AMTB survey?		
H_{3a}:. There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their class anxiety associated with learning a foreign language. H_{03a}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to their class anxiety associated with learning a foreign language. H_{3b}: There is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to anxiety associated with using a foreign language. H_{3b}: There is no statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who did not participate in study abroad with respect to anxiety	<u>Dependent Variable</u> • Anxiety associated with learning a foreign language (Interval) • Anxiety associated with using a foreign language (Interval) <u>Independent Variable</u> Group membership (Nominal) • Short- & Long-term study abroad • No study abroad	A single-tailed *t*-test was used to determine if there is a difference in their motivation toward learning a foreign language based on their study abroad participation.

Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
associated with using a foreign language.		

Chapter 4: Results

This research was conducted to investigate the effects of university student participation in study abroad on student motivation, attitude, and anxiety in relation to foreign language learning. This chapter reports the analysis and results for the investigation and was divided into two sections: descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. The descriptive analysis originated from the data received from the students' AMTB surveys and the student demographic surveys. The inferential analysis originated from data collected from the AMTB survey.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistical procedures were utilized to organize, report, and clarify the data collected from the surveys. These statistical procedures included frequency distribution, means, median, standard deviation, and percentages. The data received from both the student demographic survey and the AMTB survey was analyzed and represented in tables for explanation. The data provided a demographic portrait of the participants followed by a descriptive analysis of students' responses to the AMTB survey.

Student demographic survey.

Students' gender, age, and grade. As shown in Table 3, 47 (33.6 %) of the student participants were male and 93 (66.4 %) were female. The age of the student participants was mostly concentrated in the 18-22 range with 94 (75.8 %) students, followed by 16 (12.9 %) students in the 23-36 range, 7 (5.6%) in the 27-30 range, 3 (2.4%) in the 31-35 range, 2 (1.6%) in the 41-45 range, and 1 (.8 %) each in the 46-50 and 51-61 ranges (see Table 4). Regarding participation by grade level (see Table 5), the largest group was seniors, with 50 (37.9%) participants, followed by 46 (34.8%) juniors, 22 (16.7%) sophomores, and freshman and graduate students tied at 7 (5.3%) each.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution for Gender of Students

	Frequency	Valid %
Male	47	33.6
Female	93	66.4

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Age of Students

	Ranges	Frequency	Valid %
Students	18-22	94	75.8
	23-36	16	12.9
	27-30	7	5.6
	31-35	3	2.4
	41-45	2	1.6
	46-50	1	.8
	51-61	1	.8

Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Grade Level of Students

	Frequency	Valid %
Freshman	7	5.3
Sophomore	22	16.7
Junior	46	34.8
Senior	50	37.9
Graduate	7	5.3

Students' university major and foreign language studied. As shown in Table 6, the majority of students reported a major in Liberal Arts (35 or 28.7%), 24 (19.7%) in Science; 20 (16.4%) in Fine, Performing & Communication Arts; 15 (12.3%) in Foreign Language; 11 (9.0%) in "Other;" 7 (5.7%) in Education; 4 (3.3 %) in Business; 3 (2.5%) in Nursing; 2 (1.6%) in Pharmacy & Allied Health; and 1 (.8%) in Engineering. Of the surveyed students, 33 (27.0%)

were studying Italian, 32 (26.2%) Spanish, 21 (17.2%) German, 16 (13.1%) Arabic, 13 (10.7%) French, and 7 (5.7%) Russian (see Table 7).

Table 6

Frequency Distribution for University Major of Students

	Frequency	Valid %
Foreign Language	15	12.3
Business	4	3.3
Education	7	5.7
Engineering	1	.8
Fine, Performing & Communication Arts	20	16.4
Liberal Arts	35	28.7
Nursing	3	2.5
Pharmacy & Allied Health	2	1.6
Science	24	19.7
Other	11	9.0

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Students for Foreign Language Being Studied

	Frequency	Valid %
Arabic	16	13.1
French	13	10.7
German	21	17.2
Italian	33	27.0
Russian	7	5.7
Spanish	32	26.2

Native speakers and fluency in languages other than English. The vast majority of students were not native speakers of the language being studied. As shown in Table 8, 107 (89.2%) were non-native while 13 (10.3%) were native speakers of that language. Interestingly, when the students were asked about their fluency in languages other than English, Chinese was the most popular with 19 (36.5%) responses, followed by Arabic with 12 (23.1%), Spanish with

11 (21.2%), German with 6 (11.5%), French with 2 (3.8%), and Italian and Russian both with 1 (1.8%) (see Table 9).

Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Native Speakers in the Foreign Language Being Studied

	Frequency	Valid %
Native	13	10.3
Non-native	107	89.2

Table 9

Frequency Distribution for Student Fluency in Languages Other Than English

	Frequency	Valid %
Arabic	12	23.1
Chinese	19	36.5
French	2	3.8
German	6	11.5
Italian	1	1.9
Russian	1	1.9
Spanish	11	21.2

Students' participation in study abroad, type and characteristics of study abroad, and number of times abroad. As shown in Table 10, only 14 (9.9%) of the 144 students surveyed participated in a study abroad program and 128 (90.1%) did not. More specifically, 11 (10.3%) participated in a study abroad program for the foreign language program in which they were enrolled and 96 (89.7%) did not (see Table 11). In addition, the most frequent duration of a study abroad program was 5-6 weeks with (6) 42.9% of the students participating for this length of time. (5) 35.7% of students experienced a duration of 1-2 weeks, while (1) 7.1% experienced 2-4 weeks, (1) 7.1% experienced 7-8 weeks and (1) 7.1% experienced 37+ weeks (see Table 12). As shown in Table 13, the most popular type of program was Language and Culture 9 (64.3%) students, followed by Language 2 (14.3%) students, Music 2 (14.3%) students, and Culture 1

(7.1%). In reference to hours of instruction per week, 9 (56.3%) students reported 10-16 hours, 3 (18.8%) reported 25+ hours, 2 (12.5 %) reported 17-20 hours, and 2 (12.5%) reported 21-24 hours (see Table 14). In reference to the number of times the student studied abroad, 92 (84.4%) students reported 0, 12 (11.0%) reported 1, and 5 (4.6%) reported 2 (see Table 15).

Table 10

Frequency Distribution for Students' Participation in Study Abroad

	Frequency	Valid %
No study abroad	128	90.1
Short-term study abroad	13	9.2
Long-term study abroad	1	.7

Table 11

Frequency Distribution for Study Abroad in the Foreign Language Program in which Student is Enrolled

	Frequency	Valid %
Yes	11	10.3
No	96	89.7

Table 12

Frequency Distribution for Duration of the Study Abroad Program

	Frequency	Valid %
1-2 weeks	5	35.7
2-4 weeks	1	7.1
5-6 weeks	6	42.9
7-8 weeks	1	7.1
37+ weeks	1	7.1

Table 13

Frequency Distribution for Type of Program

	Frequency	Valid %
Language	2	14.3
Language & culture	9	64.3
Culture	1	7.1
Music	2	14.3

Table 14

Frequency Distribution for Hours of Language Instruction per Week

	Frequency	Valid %
10-16 hours	9	56.3
17-20 hours	2	12.5
21-24 hours	2	12.5
25+ hours	3	18.8

Table 15

Frequency Distribution for Number of Times Studied Abroad

	Frequency	Valid %
0	92	84.4
1	12	11.0
2	5	4.6

Students' birth country, school attendance in birth country, and language fluency in country where student lived. The vast majority of students, (102) 87.9%, were born in the United States, while only 14 (12.1%) were not (see Table 16). Among birth countries of students born outside the United States, Asia and Europe tied with 7 (30.4%) students each, followed by 5 (21.7%) in North America, 2 (8.7%) in the Middle East and North Africa, 1 (4.3%) in South America, and 1 (4.3%) in Sub-Saharan Africa (see Table 17). As shown in Table 18, when students were asked if they attended school in their country of birth, 78 (89.7%) responded "yes" and 9 (10.3%) responded "no." The majority of students, (87) 87.9%, did not live outside the

United States for an extended period of time, while 12 (12.1%) indicated that they did, as shown in Table 19. Although a large number, (41) 80.4%, of students surveyed became fluent in the language of the country where they lived, 10 (19.6%) did not (see Table 20).

Table 16

Frequency Distribution for "Born in the United States?"

	Frequency	Valid %
Yes	102	87.9
No	14	12.1

Note. Missing 28 responses

Table 17

Frequency Distribution for Birth Country if Born Outside the United States

	Frequency	Valid %
Asia	7	30.4
Middle East & North Africa	2	8.7
Europe	7	30.4
North America	5	21.7
South America	1	4.3
Sub-Saharan Africa	1	4.3

Table 18

Frequency Distribution of "Did you attend school in your country of birth?"

	Frequency	Valid %
Yes	78	89.7
No	9	10.3

Table 19

Frequency Distribution for Living Outside the U.S. for an Extended Period If Born in the U.S.

	Frequency	Valid %
Yes	12	12.1
No	87	87.9

Table 20

Frequency Distribution of Fluency in the Language of the Country Where Student Lived

	Frequency	Valid %
Yes	41	80.4
No	10	19.6

Students' AMTB Survey.

Students' AMTB data related to all nine subscales and three main scales. Students responded to nine subscales of the AMTB survey developed by Gardner (1981). As displayed in Table 21, the mean and standard deviation for each of the subscales were reported. Table 22 displays the mean and standard deviation to each of the subscales by groups (No SA and SA).

Table 21

Bootstrapped Estimates of Descriptive Statistics for the Listed Subscale Scores by Group

TOTAL GROUP

Subscales	N	M	SD
1. Interest in Foreign Language	142	47.75	10.11
2. Motivational Intensity	142	41.96	8.91
3. Foreign Language Class Anxiety	142	33.85	11.39
4. Attitude Toward Foreign Language Learning	142	46.29	11.98
5. Attitude Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People	142	32.28	8.54
6. Integrative Orientation	142	19.06	4.67
7. Desire to Learn a Foreign Language	142	45.49	12.47
8. Foreign Language Use Anxiety	142	30.07	10.06
9. Instrumental Orientation	142	16.18	4.89

Table 22

Bootstrapped Estimates of Descriptive Statistics for the Listed Subscale Scores by No Study Abroad and Study Abroad

GROUPS

	No study abroad			Study Abroad		
Subscales	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
1. Interest in Foreign Language	128	47.48	10.17	14	50.21	9.49
2. Motivational Intensity	128	41.67	9.10	14	44.57	6.59
3. Foreign Language Class Anxiety	128	34.43	11.46	14	28.50	9.53
4. Attitude Toward Foreign Language Learning	128	45.67	12.14	14	51.93	8.96
5. Attitude Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People	128	32.11	8.66	14	33.79	7.46
6. Integrative Orientation	128	18.96	4.76	14	20.00	3.68
7. Desire to Learn a Foreign Language	128	45.03	12.69	14	49.71	9.64
8. Foreign Language Use Anxiety	128	30.60	10.11	14	25.21	8.43
9. Instrumental Orientation	128	15.96	5.03	14	18.14	2.88

Students' AMTB data related to Interest in Foreign Languages. Table 23 lists the mean response and standard deviations for each question pertaining to the students' interests in foreign languages. Students used a six-point Likert scale response system with answers ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" to complete the survey. The highest mean was reported by the study abroad group in agreement with question 16: "I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages" (*M*=5.50). The lowest mean was reported by the study abroad group in agreement with the negative statement in question 24: "I really have no interest in foreign languages" (*M*=1.29).

Table 23

Mean Responses to Underlying Interest in Foreign Language

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q1 I wish I could speak many foreign languages perfectly	1 No study abroad	128	5.30	1.16
	2 Study abroad	14	5.29	1.49
Q9 Studying foreign languages is not enjoyable	1 No study abroad	128	2.1	1.31
	2 Study abroad	14	1.93	1.38
Q16 I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages	1 No study abroad	128	4.80	1.32
	2 Study abroad	14	5.50	.76
Q24 I really have no interest in foreign languages	1 No study abroad	127	1.70	1.24
	2 Study abroad	14	1.29	.83
Q32 I would really like to learn many foreign languages	1 No study abroad	125	4.88	1.34
	2 Study abroad	13	5.31	1.11
Q41 It is not important for us to learn foreign languages	1 No study abroad	121	1.86	1.34
	2 Study abroad	14	2.36	1.78
Q48 If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language	1 No study abroad	119	5.42	.82
	2 Study abroad	14	4.57	1.60
Q56 Most foreign languages sound crude and harsh	1 No study abroad	116	2.10	1.17
	2 Study abroad	13	1.54	.88
Q63 I enjoy meeting people who speak foreign languages	1 No study abroad	110	4.96	1.12
	2 Study abroad	13	5.15	1.28
Q70 I would rather see a TV program dubbed into our language than in its own with subtitles	1 No study abroad	112	2.48	1.58
	2 Study abroad	13	2.00	1.47

Students' AMTB data related to Motivational Intensity. Table 24 lists the mean response and standard deviations for each question pertaining to the students' motivational intensities. The highest mean response was reported by the study abroad group in reference to question 10: "I make a point of trying to understand all the foreign language I see and hear" (*M*=4.62). In addition, the lowest mean response was also reported by the study abroad group to the negative statement in question 2: "I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my foreign language class" (*M*=1.79).

Table 24

Mean Responses for Underlying Motivational Intensity

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q2 I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my foreign language class	1 No study abroad	127	1.96	1.16
	2 Study abroad	14	1.79	.70
Q10 I make a point of trying to understand all the foreign language I see and hear	1 No study abroad	128	4.29	1.43
	2 Study abroad	13	4.62	1.45
Q17 I don't bother checking my assignments for me to learn the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	2.05	1.04
	2 Study abroad	14	2.14	1.03
Q25 I keep up to date with the foreign language by working on it almost every day	1 No study abroad	127	3.78	1.37
	2 Study abroad	14	3.93	1.38
Q33 I put off my foreign language homework as much as possible	1 No study abroad	126	2.48	1.21
	2 Study abroad	14	2.50	1.16
Q42 When I have a problem understanding something in my foreign language class, I always ask my teacher	1 No study abroad	121	4.08	1.38
	2 Study abroad	14	4.50	.94

Q49 I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don't understand my foreign language teacher's explanation of something	1 No study abroad	119	2.45	1.33
	2 Study abroad	14	2.36	1.01
Q57 I really work hard to learn the foreign language	1 No study abroad	115	4.36	1.26
	2 Study abroad	13	4.54	1.05
Q64 I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of the foreign language	1 No study abroad	111	2.45	1.40
	2 Study abroad	13	1.92	.86
Q71 When I am studying a foreign language, I ignore distractions and pay attention to my task	1 No study abroad	110	3.87	1.36
	2 Study abroad	13	4.00	1.00

Students' AMTB data related to Foreign Language Class Anxiety. Table 25 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement pertaining to the students' foreign language class anxiety. The highest mean response (*M*=4.57) was reported by the study abroad group in relation to question 18: "I feel confident when asked to speak in my foreign language," while the no study abroad group had a mean of 3.64. The lowest mean response (*M*=2.07) was also reported by the study abroad group in relation to the negatively posed statement in question 27: "It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our foreign language," implying disagreement with this statement.

Table 25

Mean Responses for Underlying Class Anxiety

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q3 I don't get anxious when I have to answer a question in my foreign language class	1 No study abroad	128	3.02	1.48
	2 Study abroad	14	4.14	1.17

Q12 I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in our foreign language class	1 No study abroad	127	3.76	1.46
	2 Study abroad	14	3.57	1.55
Q18 I feel confident when asked to speak in my foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	3.64	1.34
	2 Study abroad	14	4.57	1.16
Q27 It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	2.75	1.29
	2 Study abroad	14	2.07	1.14
Q34 I am calm whenever I have to speak in my foreign language class	1 No study abroad	126	3.79	1.37
	2 Study abroad	13	4.46	1.20
Q44 It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak the foreign language better than I do	1 No study abroad	120	3.73	1.65
	2 Study abroad	14	3.00	1.47
Q50 I don't understand why other students feel nervous about speaking the foreign language in class	1 No study abroad	119	2.73	1.45
	2 Study abroad	14	3.36	1.60
Q59 I get nervous when I am speaking in my foreign language class	1 No study abroad	114	3.54	1.42
	2 Study abroad	13	2.46	1.13
Q65 Students who claim they got nervous in foreign language classes are just making excuses	1 No study abroad	111	2.11	1.30

	2 Study abroad	13	2.77	1.17
Q72 I am sometimes anxious that the other students in class will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language	1 No study abroad	110	3.08	1.46
	2 Study abroad	13	2.54	1.45

Students' AMTB data related to Attitudes Toward Foreign Language Learning. Table 26 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement pertaining to student attitudes toward foreign language learning. The highest mean (*M*=5.64) was reported by the study abroad group in reference to agreement to question 4: "Learning foreign language is really great." The lowest mean (*M*=1.29) was also reported by the study abroad group in relation to question 46: "Learning a foreign language is a waste of time," thus implying great disagreement with this statement.

Table 26

Mean Responses for Underlying Attitudes Toward Foreign Language Learning

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q4 Learning foreign language is really great	1 No study abroad	128	5.09	1.25
	2 Study abroad	14	5.64	.84
Q14 I hate this foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	1.43	.88
	2 Study abroad	14	1.50	1.09

Q19 I really enjoy learning the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	4.97	1.15
	2 Study abroad	14	5.29	1.14
Q29 I would rather spend my time on subjects other than foreign language	1 No study abroad	126	2.79	1.49
	2 Study abroad	14	1.71	.47
Q35 Foreign language is a very important part of the school program	1 No study abroad	125	4.59	1.43
	2 Study abroad	14	5.29	.83
Q46 Learning a foreign language is a waste of time	1 No study abroad	117	1.68	1.09
	2 Study abroad	14	1.29	.61
Q51 I plan to learn as much foreign language as possible	1 No study abroad	118	4.53	1.62
	2 Study abroad	13	5.00	.91
Q61 I think that learning the foreign language is dull	1 No study abroad	112	2.05	1.37
	2 Study abroad	13	1.77	.83
Q66 I love learning the foreign language	1 No study abroad	111	4.63	1.50
	2 Study abroad	13	5.46	1.39
Q74 When I leave school, I will give up the study of the foreign language because I am not interested in it	1 No study abroad	108	2.13	1.35

	2 Study abroad	13	2.00	1.22

Students' AMTB data related to Attitudes Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People. Table 27 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement regarding the students' attitudes toward foreign language-speaking people. The highest mean (*M*=5.29) was reported by the study abroad group in reference to question 31: "I wish I could have many native foreign language-speaking friends." The lowest mean (*M*=2.90) was reported by the no study abroad group in reference to question 76: "You can always trust native foreign language speakers."

Table 27

Mean Responses for Underlying Attitudes Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q5 If the foreign language country had no contact with English-speaking countries, it would be a great loss	1 No study abroad	127	4.41	1.54
	2 Study abroad	14	3.93	1.59
Q20 Most native foreign language speakers are so friendly and easy to get along with, we are fortunate to have them as friends	1 No study abroad	126	4.37	1.28
	2 Study abroad	14	4.71	.91
Q31 I wish I could have many native foreign language speaking friends	1 No study abroad	125	4.67	1.22
	2 Study abroad	14	5.29	.91
Q36 Native foreign language speakers are very sociable and kind	1 No study abroad	124	4.44	.99
	2 Study abroad	14	4.43	1.22
Q39 Native foreign language speakers have much to be proud about because they have given the world much of value	1 No study abroad	124	4.38	1.33
	2 Study abroad	14	4.29	1.38

Q52 I would like to know more native foreign language speakers	1 No study abroad	115	4.68	1.31
	2 Study abroad	13	4.85	1.07
Q67 The more I get to know native foreign language speakers, the more I like them	1 No study abroad	109	4.39	1.25
	2 Study abroad	13	4.46	1.33
Q76 You can always trust native foreign language speakers	1 No study abroad	106	2.90	1.51
	2 Study abroad	12	2.92	1.00

Students' AMTB data related to Integrative Orientation. Table 28 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement regarding the students' integrative orientation toward foreign language learning. The highest mean (*M*=5.50) was reported by the study abroad group in reference to question 6: "Studying a foreign language is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak the foreign language." The lowest mean response (*M*=4.69) was reported by the no study abroad group to question 53: "Studying the foreign language is important because I will be able to interact more easily with speakers of the foreign language."

Table 28

Mean Responses to Underlying Integrative Orientation

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q6 Studying a foreign language is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	5.02	1.351
	2 Study abroad	14	5.50	.650
Q21 Studying the foreign language is important because it will enable me to meet and converse with more and varied people	1 No study abroad	127	5.03	1.181
	2 Study abroad	14	5.14	1.099
Q37 Studying foreign language is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate the foreign language way of life	1 No study abroad	125	4.82	1.187

	2 Study abroad	14	5.00	.679
Q53 Studying the foreign language is important because I will be able to interact more easily with speakers of the foreign language	1 No study abroad	117	4.69	1.392
	2 Study abroad	12	5.08	.900

Students' AMTB data related to Desire to Learn a Foreign Language. Table 29 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement regarding the students' desire to learn a foreign language. The highest mean response (*M*=5.46) was reported by the study abroad group in reference to question 68: "I wish I were fluent in the foreign language." The lowest mean (*M*=1.38) was reported by the study abroad group in response to a reverse coded statement: "To be honest, I really have no desire to learn the foreign language," thus implying strong disagreement with this statement.

Table 29

Mean Responses to Underlying Desire to Learn a Foreign Language

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q7 I have a strong desire to know all aspects of the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	4.97	1.28
	2 Study abroad	13	5.15	.90
Q13 Knowing the foreign language isn't really an important goal in my life	1 No study abroad	126	2.15	1.42
	2 Study abroad	14	1.64	.74
Q22 If it were up to me, I would spend all of my time learning the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	3.55	1.68
	2 Study abroad	14	4.36	1.69

Q28 I sometimes daydream about dropping the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	2.26	1.43
	2 Study abroad	14	1.71	1.07
Q38 I want to learn the foreign language so well that is will become natural to me	1 No study abroad	125	5.21	1.25
	2 Study abroad	14	5.29	.99
Q45 I'm losing any desire I ever had to know the foreign language	1 No study abroad	120	2.19	1.39
	2 Study abroad	14	1.79	1.37
Q 54 I would like to learn as much foreign language as possible	1 No study abroad	115	4.70	1.45
	2 Study abroad	13	4.77	1.01
Q60 To be honest, I really have no desire to learn the foreign language	1 No study abroad	114	1.81	1.28
	2 Study abroad	13	1.38	.87
Q68 I wish I were fluent in the foreign language	1 No study abroad	111	5.32	1.22
	2 Study abroad	13	5.46	1.39
Q73 I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of the foreign language	1 No study abroad	109	2.25	1.42
	2 Study abroad	13	1.92	1.26

Students' AMTB data related to Foreign Language Use Anxiety. Table 30 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement regarding the students' foreign

language use anxiety. The highest mean response (*M*=4.86) was reported by the study abroad group in response to question 30: "It doesn't bother me at all to speak the foreign language." The lowest mean response (*M*=1.86) was also reported by the SA group to the reverse coded statement in question 23: "Speaking the foreign language anywhere makes me feel worried." This response implied strong disagreement with the above statement by the study abroad group.

Table 30

Mean Responses for Underlying Foreign Language Use Anxiety

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q8 I would get nervous if I had to speak the foreign language to a tourist	1 No study abroad	128	3.80	1.45
	2 Study abroad	14	2.64	1.15
Q15 I feel very much at ease when I have to speak the foreign language	1 No study abroad	127	3.28	1.34
	2 Study abroad	14	3.79	1.19
Q23 Speaking the foreign language anywhere makes me feel worried	1 No study abroad	127	2.58	1.24
	2 Study abroad	14	1.86	.53
Q30 It doesn't bother me at all to speak the foreign language	1 No study abroad	125	3.77	1.43
	2 Study abroad	14	4.86	1.03
Q40 It would bother me if I had to speak the foreign language on the telephone	1 No study abroad	126	3.01	1.32
	2 Study abroad	14	2.79	1.58

Q47 I would feel quite relaxed if I had to give street directions in the foreign language	1 No study abroad	118	3.24	1.41
	2 Study abroad	14	3.86	1.35
Q55 I would feel uncomfortable speaking the foreign language anywhere outside the classroom	1 No study abroad	116	2.92	1.38
	2 Study abroad	13	2.15	.99
Q62 I would feel comfortable speaking the foreign language where both foreign language and English speakers were present	1 No study abroad	111	3.86	1.39
	2 Study abroad	13	4.62	1.19
Q69 I feel anxious if someone asks me something in the foreign language	1 No study abroad	111	3.52	1.37
	2 Study abroad	13	3.00	1.41
Q75 I would feel calm and sure of myself if I had to order a meal I the foreign language	1 No study abroad	107	3.97	1.37
	2 Study abroad	13	4.38	1.12

Students' AMTB data related to Instrumental Orientation. Table 31 reports the mean response and standard deviations for each statement regarding the students' instrumental orientation toward foreign language learning. The highest mean response (*M*=5.21) was reported by the study abroad group in reference to question 26: "Studying the foreign language is important because it will make me more educated." Conversely, the lowest mean response (*M*=3.58) was reported by the no study abroad group in response to question 11: "Studying foreign language is important because I will need it for my career."

Table 31

Mean Responses to Underlying Instrumental Orientation

	Student groups	N	M	SD
Q11 Studying foreign language is important because I will need it for my career	1 No study abroad	126	3.58	1.71
	2 Study abroad	14	4.43	1.22
Q26 Studying the foreign language is important because it will make me more educated	1 No study abroad	127	4.82	1.31
	2 Study abroad	14	5.21	.89
Q Studying a foreign language is important because it will be useful in getting a good job	1 No study abroad	121	4.39	1.47
	2 Study abroad	14	4.57	1.16
Q58 Studying the foreign language is important because other people will respect me more if I know the foreign language	1 No study abroad	115	3.91	1.45
	2 Study abroad	13	4.23	1.17

Inferential Analysis

The inferential statistical procedure used to investigate the research hypotheses was an independent samples *t*-test (bootstrapped). This test was chosen due to an unbalanced sample size in the two groups compared in the study. This test was used to examine the effect of study abroad or lack of study abroad on foreign language students' motivation, attitude, and anxiety in foreign language learning. Nine individual hypotheses were tested and then regrouped to produce three main hypotheses: Motivation, Attitude, and Anxiety with regard to foreign language learning.

Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university students who participated in short- and long-term study abroad and those who were eligible but did not participate in study abroad with respect to their motivation toward foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB survey. An independent, bootstrapped t-test was calculated comparing the mean AMTB scores of study abroad participants (n=14) to the mean AMTB scores of non-study abroad participants (n=128). The three AMTB scales that measure motivation (Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn a Foreign Language, and Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning) were tested individually and then combined to produce a result. A statistically significant difference was found (t(.043)=.021, p<.05) (see Tables 32 and 33). The mean of the study abroad participants (m=146.21, sd=23.79) was significantly different from the mean of the non-study abroad participants (m=132.38, sd=32.05). Therefore, this hypothesis was statistically significant.

Hypothesis 2. The second hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who were eligible but did not participate in study abroad with respect to their attitude

toward foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB survey. An independent, bootstrapped t-test was calculated comparing the mean AMTB scores of study abroad participants (n=14) to the mean AMTB scores of non-study abroad participants (n=128). The four AMTB scales that measure attitude (Integrative Orientation, Instrumental Orientation, Attitudes Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People, and Interest in Foreign Languages) were tested individually and then combined to produce a result. No significant difference was found (t(.223)=.11, p>.05). The mean of the study abroad participants (m=122.14, sd=20.99) was not significantly different from the mean of the non-study abroad participants (m=114.52, sd =25.70) (see Tables 31 and 32). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. Interestingly, when tested individually, the sub-scale "Instrumental Orientation", resulted in statistical significance (t(.012)=.006, p<.05); while the subscale, "Integrative Orientation" did not result in statistical significance (p=.163).

Hypothesis 3. The third hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university students who participated in long- and short-term study abroad and those who were eligible but did not participate in study abroad with respect to their anxiety in foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB. An independent, bootstrapped t-test was calculated comparing the mean AMTB scores of study abroad participants (n=14) to the mean AMTB scores of non-study abroad participants (n=128). The two AMTB scales that measure anxiety (Foreign Language Class Anxiety and Foreign Language Use Anxiety) were tested individually and then combined to produce a result. A statistically significant difference was found (t(.014)=.007, p<.05) (see Tables 32 and 33). The mean of the study abroad participants (m=53.71, sd=17.36) was significantly different from the mean of the non-study abroad participants (m=65.03, sd=20.74). Therefore, this hypothesis was statistically significant.

Table 32

Bootstrapped (N=1000) Independent Samples t-Test for all 9 Scales

Subscales	Mean Difference	Bias	S.E.	p
1. Interest in Foreign Language	-2.73	-.02	2.59	.149
2. Motivational Intensity	-2.89	.02	1.83	.054
3. Foreign Language Class Anxiety	5.92	.04	2.76	.012*
4. Attitude Toward Foreign Language Learning	-6.24	-.01	2.55	.007**
5. Attitude Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People	-1.66	-.01	2.08	
6. Integrative Orientation	-1.03	.00	1.03	.163
7. Desire To Learn a Foreign Language	-4.68	-.02	2.73	.044*
8. Foreign Language Use Anxiety	5.38	.00	2.41	.013*
9. Instrumental Orientation	-2.17	.00	.88	.006**

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Table 33

Bootstrapped (N=1000) Independent Samples t-Test for Combined Scales

Subscales	Mean Difference	Bias	S.E.	p
Motivation: Motivational Intensity, Attitude Toward Foreign Language Learning, Desire to Learn a Foreign Language	-13.83	.17	7.24	.021*
Attitude: Interest in Foreign Languages, Attitudes Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People, Integrative Orientation, Instrumental Orientation	-7.62	.14	6.36	.11
Anxiety: Foreign Language Class Anxiety, Foreign Language Use Anxiety	11.32	-.34	4.79	.007**

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Conclusion

Quantitative data from both the student demographic survey and the AMTB survey offered empirical findings that reported that 1) motivation for foreign language learning was statistically significantly higher in the university-level SA students than non-SA university-level foreign language students, 2) foreign language anxiety was statistically significantly lower in the university-level SA students than non-SA university-level foreign language students, and 3) attitude toward the foreign language remained statistically unchanged between the university-level SA foreign language students and the non-SA university-level study abroad students. The independent variable, study abroad, was examined in relation to short- or long-term stays and this investigation concluded that the majority of foreign language university students are embarking on a short-term study abroad experience with language and culture as its primary focus.

Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was to research the relationship between study abroad programs and their effects on university-level foreign language students' motivation, attitude, and anxiety in relation to foreign language learning. The investigation was designed as a causal-comparative study that compared the responses of two university student groups (study abroad participants and non-study abroad participants) to the AMTB survey. The results presented in the previous chapter highlighted the extent to which a study abroad experience impacts affective components such as motivation, attitude, and anxiety. The motivation for language learning of the 14 SA participants in this investigation was significantly higher than that of their 128 non-SA counterparts. Additionally, while the SA participants did not show a significantly more positive attitude towards foreign language learning over the non-SA participants, their anxiety in relation to the foreign language was significantly lower than that of their non-SA counterparts.

A summary discussion of how SA participation shapes affective outcomes in foreign language learning was presented in this chapter. The present findings in light of previous research were examined and educational implications on how SA programs may benefit from this investigation were addressed. Finally, in this chapter, recommendations for continued research in the field of foreign language education were suggested.

Affective Outcomes after SA Participation

Discussion of Hypothesis 1: Motivation. The first research hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term SA and those who did not participate in SA with respect to their motivation for foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB survey. The AMTB survey was used in accordance with the work of Gardner and Smythe (1981), which proposed a

motivation index derived from measuring student responses to the following three scales: Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn a Foreign Language, and Attitudes Toward Foreign Language Learning. The present study showed that there was a statistically significant difference (t (.043)=.021, p<.05) between SA participant (n=14) mean responses and non-SA participant (n=128) mean responses in relation to motivation. This finding was comparable to previously published research (Allen & Herron, 2003; Badstuber & Ecke, 2009) in which an SA experience increased motivation towards foreign language learning. In yet another study, Ingram (2005) discovered that students who attended an SA in France continued on to take more classes beyond the 200 level in French than the non-SA students. Thus, the result of this hypothesis was consistent with recent research findings regarding motivation in foreign language learning.

The result for this hypothesis may be linked to Gardner's socio-educational model (1979) in which he outlined four types of learners' individual differences that affect achievement in foreign language learning. Gardner claimed that intelligence, language aptitude, motivation, and situational anxiety have a direct influence on language achievement. According to Gardner, motivation refers to a student's effort, desire, and affect connected to learning a second language. As shown by this investigation, study abroad programs provided an optimal learning environment to increase student motivation and consequently increase achievement in language learning.

Discussion of Hypothesis 2: Attitude. The second research hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term SA and those who did not participate in SA with respect to their attitude toward foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB survey. The scales of the AMTB survey used to measure attitude were Interest in Foreign Languages, Attitudes

Toward Foreign Language-Speaking People, Integrative Orientation, and Instrumental Orientation. When the mean scores of the SA group and the non-SA group were compared, no statistically significant difference emerged ($t(.223)=.11$, $p>.05$). This finding is consistent with previous published studies (Yager, 1998; Amuzie & Winke, 2009; Hensley & Sell, 1979). Yager found that his SA students did not make significant gains in attitude measure. While Amuzie and Winke reported changes in learner autonomy and the role of the teacher, they did not find significant changes in student self-efficacy. Hensley and Sell reported no change in world-mindedness, support for the United Nations, and tolerance of ambiguity in his 52 students after a semester in Switzerland. Similarly, Leonard (1964) compared the attitudes of students before and after a foreign exchange and found no significant change in attitudes. Hanna and Smith (1979) investigated the attitude change of 132 students from 12-17 years of age who participated in a four-week exchange and found no significant difference between the pre- and post- SA groups. It is likely that simply attending an SA program or exchange will not produce positive attitudes (Gardner, 1985b). A discussion of attitude, how it is formed, and why it is difficult to change in a short period of time will be valuable in explaining the findings of this investigation.

Numerous factors may affect attitude development. Oskamp (1977) suggested that attitude development is genetic in its formation – specifically, that aggressiveness or persuasibility is inherited and may affect attitude. Social scientists Stein and Bailey (1973) alluded to the notion that environment plays a role in attitude formation. Oskamp (1977) similarly argued that environmental factors – in particular, parental influence, group determinants, and the media – play a role in attitude development. Whereas parents are the primary influence on attitude in children, in subsequent stages of development, direct experience, the mass media, school, peers, and community become the dominant influences. Gardner (1968)

distinguished between two parental roles in attitude formation. He labeled one the "active" role, in which parents are actively involved in their student's foreign language learning. In this role, for example, parents reinforce the homework and teach additional mini-lessons at home. Gardner labeled the other a "passive" role, in which parents unconsciously enact negative or positive roles toward the second language community. If their role is positive, their children will develop a positive attitude toward the second language community, leading to the development of integrative motivation. If their role is negative, their children will develop more negative attitudes. These studies ultimately suggested that attitude formation is a multi-faceted process that is developed over time.

Most of the SA experiences investigated in this study were short-term (n=13), while only one was long-term. One might reasonably inquire whether a complex factor like attitude can be changed in a short amount of time, as well as what specific variables contribute to attitude change. Hofman and Zak (1969) studied subjects' attitudes after a five-week SA to Israel and found that contact with the members of the target community had an effect on changes in attitude. High-contact subjects had more favorable attitudes than low-contact subjects. In a similar study, Clément, Gardner, and Smythe (1977) investigated the change in attitude in a group of eighth grade Anglophones after an excursion to Quebec City. Their results concluded that students with high contact who actively sought out opportunities to use their French yielded desirable attitudinal changes. In a similar study, Desrochers and Gardner (1981) investigated attitudinal changes in foreign language learning in low-contact students, high-contact students, and a control group. The investigation concluded that the high-contact group had more significantly favorable attitudes than the other two groups. These research findings may offer an

explanation for why attitudes are difficult to change, suggesting that the quality of contact with the second language community is a significant variable.

Discussion of Hypothesis 3: Anxiety. The third research hypothesis stated that there is a statistically significant difference between university-level foreign language students who participated in long- and short-term SA and those who were eligible but did not participate in SA with respect to their anxiety in foreign language learning, as measured by the AMTB survey. A comparison of the mean scores of the SA group and the non-SA group on the two combined scales (Foreign Language Class Anxiety and Foreign Language Use Anxiety) that measure anxiety from the AMTB yielded a statistically significant difference ($t(.014)=.007$, $p<.05$). In other words, the SA group had lower levels of foreign language class anxiety and foreign language use anxiety in comparison to the non-SA group. This outcome remained consistent with previously published studies (Allen & Herron, 2003; Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986), which showed that language anxiety is reduced after a study abroad experience.

The ways in which anxiety impacts foreign language learning have been the object of ongoing discourse in the field of second language acquisition. According to Price (1991), foreign language classrooms seemed to be prone to anxiety arousal. In addition, multiple studies have shown a negative correlation between language anxiety and course grades (Aida, 1994; Horwitz, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). SA programs, therefore, provide an opportunity for intervention by promoting a decrease in anxiety for the foreign language student. Along similar lines, Horwitz and Young (1991) argued that changing the context of foreign language learning reduces student stress. Lowering student anxiety can, in turn, allow students to acquire and perform in the target language at a higher level. The theoretical basis for this research finding is embedded in Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Affective Filter Hypothesis (1982). The Input

Hypothesis established that students must receive comprehensible input in order to process material and assume ownership of that input. An SA context provides a meaningful, authentic experience for students to acquire language in this way. Similarly, it provides meaningful comprehensible input in order to lower the "affective filter" and not only allow effective language acquisition, but also reduce language anxiety.

Limitations of the Study

While it provided statistical significance for two of the three hypotheses explored, this investigation also showed some limitations. The disproportionate size of the two groups (non-SA group, n=128; SA group, n=14) may have affected the outcome, even though a bootstrapped t-test was adopted. Only 10% of the total student group surveyed (N=142) attended an SA which is consistent with recent statistics that only 5% of U.S. college students attend an SA (Cushner, 2009). Additionally, because only one subject reported having experienced a long-term SA, the three original groups were reclassified into two: SA participants and non-SA participants. Another limitation of the study is that of the 20 sections of language classes targeted for this study, only ten instructors agreed to participate in this investigation. Also, this study focused only on college students enrolled in a foreign language class at one large, public university in the Midwest. Surveying students at two or three universities and possibly a university where SA is mandatory, may affect the outcome. Finally, using a multi-measure design with both quantitative and qualitative data may increase the robustness of the data and thus affect the results.

Educational Implications

The present investigation answered some theoretical questions and provided an explanation for some of the current inconsistencies and inconclusive results in SA research (Wang, 2010). First

of all, this investigation answered the question, "Is SA necessary?" and established that, indeed, study abroad is necessary and important for foreign language learning. Although many researchers have provided empirical research (Allen & Herron, 2003; Balaz & Williams, 2004; Huebner, 1995; Freed, 1995; Carroll, 1967; Davidson, 2007) supporting the benefits of SA programs, this still remains a theoretical question in the field of foreign language learning. In this study, students who engaged in study abroad benefited over students who did not. SA therefore plays an important role in the university foreign language curriculum.

Second, based on the results from this investigation, SA makes a significant difference in affective gains. Previous researchers (Allen & Herron, 2003; Spenader, 2008; Yu, 2010) have alluded to affective outcome gains as a result of SA. Unlike most studies that research linguistic gains after an SA, this investigation provided statistically significant data proving that motivation is higher and foreign language anxiety is lower after an SA experience. Although the findings reported no significant change in attitude after an SA experience, the raw score of the SA students was higher than that of the non-SA group. Research in the area of attitude change still remains inconclusive and further investigation is recommended.

Third, high contact with natives during an SA is necessary for any positive attitudinal changes toward the foreign language and foreign language-speaking people. Byram & Feng (2006) focus on student isolation and inadequate non-classroom interaction with native speakers during an SA. This investigation did not report a significant attitude change in SA students. Increased contact with native speakers may foster more positive attitudes toward the target language and the native citizens.

Next, a short-term SA program is adequate in producing student gains (Allen & Herron, 2003; Davidson, 2007; Cubillos, Chieffo & Fan, 2008). There has been a recent shift in the

length of SA programs to a short 2-8 weeks as opposed to the historically popular junior year or semester abroad. While more dated research studies have suggested that short-term stays provide minimum gains (Freed, 1990; Wilkinson, 1998), this investigation provides empirical findings that supported and reinforced the notion that short-term SA programs are effective in producing student gains.

Next, the proficiency level of foreign language students (level of course they are registered in) and their gains found that advanced learners (Isabelli, 2007; Regan, 1995) also made gains during SA as opposed to only beginning students (first and second semester students) making advances (Krashen & Seliger, 1976; Freed, 1990). In this investigation, surveys were completed by third-semester and above students. Also, in this investigation, the majority of students who participated in SA were juniors and seniors; hence, upper- level students are making important affective gains that are directly related to second language learning.

Finally, SA programs provide a valuable context for foreign language learning. This investigation provided empirical evidence that SA experience reduces students' language use anxiety and foreign language class anxiety, as well as increases student motivation towards foreign language learning. Overall, these findings highlighted the success of SA programs in dominant affective areas that positively impact achievement in language learning. In addition, the demographic statistical findings also offered insight into what types of SA programs students are keen to engage in (for example, short-term language and culture curricula) and allow for the creation of programs that tailor to those preferences. SA program directors will also benefit from data that is not limited to the linguistic benefits of SA. By presenting significant affective gains, this research study showed a more compelling, holistic picture of the value of SA.

Directions for Future Research

This study provided a preliminary response to the research question "Does SA make a difference with regard to affective outcomes in university-level foreign language students regarding their motivation, attitude, and anxiety toward foreign language learning?" – a question that, to the researcher's knowledge, has not yet been investigated in the United States. Additionally, this investigation surveyed a sample of university foreign language students studying Arabic, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. No known investigation researching three affective variables across several languages has yet been published in the United States, to the researcher's knowledge. The results concluded that SA students benefited by experiencing higher motivation and less anxiety toward foreign language learning. The SA students' attitudes did not show statistical significance when compared to those of the non-SA students. Still yet, surveying students with the same measurement tool, the AMTB, before and after an SA program, may provide more data for the investigation of attitudinal changes. In addition, surveying students in different countries with the AMTB survey in their native language may increase the generalizability of this research. Although the overall findings provided pedagogical insight regarding SA, additional research studies may continue to add to the literature.

In the future, researchers may want to continue to explore the findings of this investigation by addressing the following questions:

1) Does SA affect affective components that, in turn, affect achievement in cases where students enroll in upper-level foreign language courses immediately upon return to the home institution?

2) Does SA affect university students' motivation to continue the study of the foreign language as indicated by the choice of a foreign language major or minor?

3) Does SA affect students' instrumental motivation to interact with speakers of the target language in the United States?

4) Does the degree of contact with the target community during an SA program affect attitudinal changes in university-level foreign language students?

5) Is there a difference between male and female attitudinal changes toward foreign language learning after an SA experience?

6) Does SA that produces an increase in motivation also increase linguistic achievement in a foreign language?

7) Does the SA process have an effect on student motivation and achievement toward foreign language learning?

Conclusion

This investigation examined affective outcome variables of university-level foreign language SA students versus university-level foreign language non-SA students. The SA experience provided for a rich, authentic learning environment in which students' language anxiety was lowered and motivation toward the foreign language was increased. These findings suggested that study abroad plays an important role in facilitating increased motivation and decreased anxiety, two of the most significant and determinant variables related to second language achievement and proficiency (Gardner, 1985b). Attitude change has demonstrated to be a variable that remains inconclusive and merits additional research. In addition, the findings reported that the majority of foreign language university students are embarking on a short-term SA experience with language and culture as its primary focus. This finding was consistent with the recent trend of SA programs in the United States (IIE, 2010). Most importantly, this investigation is noteworthy to students, educators, and administrators in the field of foreign

language learning due to its reporting of multiple positive and advantageous SA outcomes and resonates with Carroll's (1967) pioneer research finding in L2 development that time spent abroad was the major factor in predicting high levels of language proficiency in U.S. university-level foreign language students. In closing, the findings of this investigation contributed to the field of foreign language education by offering empirical evidence that a short-term SA experience does make a difference in regards to university-level foreign language student motivation and anxiety in foreign language learning.

APPENDIX A: Research Information Sheet

Research Information Sheet

Title of Study: *The Relationship Between Study Abroad and Motivation, Attitude and Anxiety in University Students learning a Foreign Language*

Principal Investigator (PI): Stefania Morreale
Education Department

Purpose:
You are being asked to be in a research study of study abroad programs and university foreign language learning because you are a university foreign language learner. This study is being conducted at Wayne State University.

Study Procedures:
If you take part in the study, you will be asked to fill out a survey and complete a demographic questionnaire. The survey will focus on study abroad and foreign language learning. Your active participation should take 15-20 minutes.

Benefits

There may be no direct benefits for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future.

Risks

There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

Costs

There will be no costs to you for participation in this research study.

Compensation

You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality:

All information collected about you during the course of this study will be kept without any identifiers.

Voluntary Participation /Withdrawal:
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You are free to not answer any questions or withdraw at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships with Wayne State University or its affiliates.

Questions:

If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Stefania Morreale or one of *her* research team members at the following phone number xxx.xxx.xxxx. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

Participation:
By completing the questionnaire, you are agreeing to participate in this study.

APPENDIX B: Survey Answer Sheet Questions

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please mark the following answers in the first section of the answer sheet.

1. Omit name in NAME section.

2. Mark M or F in SEX section.

3. Mark answer in GRADE or EDUCATION section:

    1. Freshman
    2. Sophomore
    3. Junior
    4. Senior
    5. Graduate
    6. Guest Student

4. Omit birth date in BIRTH DATE section.

5. In IDENTIFICATION section, answer in column A (vertically) the following question:

Which foreign language are you currently studying in this class?

    0. Arabic
    1. Chinese
    2. French
    3. German
    4. Greek
    5. Italian
    6. Japanese
    7. Polish
    8. Russian
    9. Spanish

6. In SPECIAL CODES section, answer in column K (vertically), the following question:
Have you participated in a study abroad program for the language in which you are currently enrolled?

    1. No.

    2. Yes, a short-term study abroad program (2-8 weeks in duration).

    3. Yes, a long-term study abroad program (greater than 8 weeks in duration).

APPENDIX C: AMTB Survey

Attitude/Motivation Test Battery

R. C. Gardner

Please fill in the bubble on the answer sheet that most closely matches your agreement with each of the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I wish I could speak many foreign languages perfectly.
2. I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my foreign language class.
3. I don't get anxious when I have to answer a question in my foreign language class.
4. Learning foreign language is really great.
5. If the foreign language country had no contact with English-speaking countries, it would be a great loss.
6. Studying a foreign language is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak the foreign language.
7. I have a strong desire to know all aspects of the foreign language.
8. I would get nervous if I had to speak the foreign language to a tourist.
9. Studying foreign languages is not enjoyable.
10. I make a point of trying to understand all the foreign language I see and hear.
11. Studying the foreign language is important because I will need it for my career.
12. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in our foreign language class.
13. Knowing the foreign language isn't really an important goal in my life.
14. I hate this foreign language.
15. I feel very much at ease when I have to speak the foreign language.
16. I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages.
17. I don't bother checking my assignments for me to learn the foreign language.
18. I feel confident when asked to speak in my foreign language class.
19. I really enjoy learning the foreign language.
20. Most native foreign language speakers are so friendly and easy to get along with, we are fortunate to have them as friends.
21. Studying the foreign language is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
22. If it were up to me, I would spend all of my time learning the foreign language.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. Speaking the foreign language anywhere makes me feel worried.
24. I really have no interest in foreign languages.
25. I keep up to date with the foreign language by working on it almost every day.
26. Studying the foreign language is important because it will make me more educated.
27. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our foreign language class.
28. I sometimes daydream about dropping the foreign language.
29. I would rather spend my time on subjects other than foreign language.
30. It doesn't bother me at all to speak the foreign language.
31. I wish I could have many native foreign language-speaking friends.
32. I would really like to learn many foreign languages.
33. I put off my foreign language homework as much as possible.
34. I am calm whenever I have to speak in my foreign language class.
35. Foreign language is a very important part of the school program.
36. Native foreign language speakers are very sociable and kind.
37. Studying foreign language is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate the foreign language way of life.
38. I want to learn the foreign language so well that it will become natural to me.
39. Native foreign language speakers have much to be proud about because they have given the world much of value.
40. It would bother me if I had to speak the foreign language on the telephone.
41. It is not important for us to learn foreign languages.
42. When I have a problem understanding something in my foreign language class, I always ask my teacher for help.
43. Studying a foreign language is important because it will be useful in getting a good job.
44. It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak the foreign language better than I do.
45. I'm losing any desire I ever had to know the foreign language.
46. Learning a foreign language is a waste of time.
47. I would feel quite relaxed if I had to give street directions in the foreign language.
48. If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language.
49. I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don't understand my foreign language teacher's explanation of something.
50. I don't understand why other students feel nervous about speaking the foreign

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
language in class.					
51. I plan to learn as much foreign language as possible.					
52. I would like to know more native foreign language speakers.					
53. Studying the foreign language is important because I will be able to interact more easily with speakers of the foreign language.					
54. I would like to learn as much foreign language as possible.					
55. I would feel uncomfortable speaking the foreign language anywhere outside the classroom.					
56. Most foreign languages sound crude and harsh.					
57. I really work hard to learn the foreign language.					
58. Studying the foreign language is important because other people will respect me more if I know the foreign language.					
59. I get nervous when I am speaking in my foreign language class.					
60. To be honest, I really have no desire to learn the foreign language.					
61. I think that learning the foreign language is dull.					
62. I would feel comfortable speaking the foreign language where both foreign language and English speakers were present.					
63. I enjoy meeting people who speak foreign languages.					
64. I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of the foreign language.					
65. Students who claim they got nervous in foreign language classes are just making excuses.					
66. I love learning the foreign language.					
67. The more I get to know native foreign language speakers, the more I like them.					
68. I wish I were fluent in the foreign language.					
69. I feel anxious if someone asks me something in the foreign language.					
70. I would rather see a TV program dubbed into our language than in its own language with subtitles.					
71. When I am studying a foreign language, I ignore distractions and pay attention to my task.					
72. I am sometimes anxious that the other students in class will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.					
73. I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of the foreign language.					
74. When I leave school, I will give up the study of the foreign language because I am not interested in it.					

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
75. I would feel calm and sure of myself if I had to order a meal in the foreign language.					
76. You can always trust native foreign language speakers.					

APPENDIX D: Student Demographic Survey

77. Age: 1) 18-22 2) 23-26 3) 27-30 4) 31-35 5) 36-40 6) 41-45 7) 46-50 8) 51-61 9) 62+

78. Gender: 1) Male 2) Female

79. Education Level:
1) Freshman
2) Sophomore
3) Junior
4) Senior
5) Graduate
6) Guest

80. University Major: 1) Foreign Languages 2) Business 3) Education 4) Engineering 5) Fine, Performing & Communication Arts 6) Liberal Arts 7)Nursing 8)Pharmacy & Allied Health 9) Science 10) Other

81. Foreign language currently being studied: 1) Arabic 2) Chinese 3) French 4) German 5) Greek 6) Italian 7) Japanese 8)Polish 9) Russian 10) Spanish

82. Are you a native speaker in the foreign language you are studying? 1) Yes 2) No

83. Languages other than English in which you are fluent: 1) Arabic 2) Chinese 3) French 4) German 5) Greek 6) Italian 7) Japanese 8) Polish 9) Russian 10) Spanish

84. Did you study abroad in the language for the Foreign Language Program in which you are enrolled (for example, in high school or college)? Please report on the most recent study abroad experience.
1) Yes 2) No

85. If yes, was the program 1) short-term (2 to 8 weeks) 2) long-term (more than 8 weeks)?

If no, skip to question #89.

86. How long was the program? 1) 1-2 weeks 2) 2-4 weeks 3) 5-6 weeks 4) 7-8 weeks 5) 9-12 weeks 6) 14-16 weeks 7) 17-20 weeks 8) 21- 24 weeks 9) 25-36 weeks 10) 37+ weeks

87. What type of program was it? 1) Language 2) Language & Culture 3) Culture 4) Art History 5) Music

88. How many hours of language instruction did you receive per week? 1) 10-16 hours 2) 17-20 hours 3) 21- 24 hours 4) 25+ hours

89. How many times have you studied abroad? 1) 0 2) 1 3) 2 4) 3 5) 4 6) 5+

90. Were you born in the United States? 1) Yes 2) No

91. If you were born outside of the U. S., where were you born? 1) Asia
2) Middle East & N. Africa 3) Europe 4) North America 5) Central America
6) South America 7) Sub-Saharan Africa 8) Australia & Oceana

92. Did you attend school in your country of birth? 1) Yes 2) No

93. If you were born in the U. S., have you lived outside of the United States for an extended period? 1) Yes 2)No

94. Did you become fluent in the language of the country where you lived? 1) Yes 2)No

REFERENCES

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 155-168.

Allen, H. W., & Herron, C. (2003). A Mixed Methodology Investigation of the Linguistic and Affective Outcomes of Summer. *Foreign Language Annals*, *36*(3), 370-385.

Amuzie, G. L., & Winke, P. (2009). Changes in Language Learning Beliefs as a Result of Study Abroad. *System*, *37*(30), 366-379.

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational Psychology: A cognitive view*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ausubel, D. P., Novak, J. D., & Hanesian, H. (1978). *Educational Psychology: A cognitive view* (2 ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Badstubner, T., & Ecke, P. (2009). Student Expectations, Motivations, Target Language Use, and Perceived Learning Progress in a Summer Study Abroad Program in Germany. *Unterrichtspraxis*, *42*(1), 41-49.

Balaz, V., & Williams, A. M. (2004). Been there, done that: International student migration and human capital transfers from the UK to Slovakia. *Population, Space and Place, 10*, 217-237.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bartley, D. E. (1970). The importance of the attitude factor in language dropout: a preliminary investigation of group and sex differences. *Foreign Language Annals, 3*(3), 383-393.

Brecht, R., Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. (1990). *The empirical study of proficiency gain in study abroad environments of American students of Russian*. In D. Davidson (Ed.),

American contributions to the VII International Congress of MAPRIAL (pp. 123-152). American Council of Teachers of Russian, Washington, DC.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Campbell, C. M., & Ortiz, J. A. (1991). Helping students overcome foreign language anxiety: A foreign language anxiety workshop. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp.153-168). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Carroll, J. B. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals*, *1*, 131-151.

Casado, M.A., & Dereshiwsky, M. I. (2004). Effect of educational strategies on anxiety in the second language classroom: An exploratory comparative study between U.S. and Spanish first-semester university students. *College Student Journal, 38*(1), 23-35.

Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2009). Here to Stay: Increasing Acceptance of Short-Term Study Abroad Programs. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 365-380). New York, NY: Routledge.

Chirkov, V. I., Safdar, S., Guzman, J. de, & Playford, K. (2008). Further examining the role motivation to study abroad plays in the adaptation of international students in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*, 427-440.

Citron, J. L. (1995). Can Cross-Cultural Understanding Aid Second Language Acquisition? Toward a Theory of Ethno-Lingual Relativity. *Hispania*, *78*(1), 105-113.

Clément, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, *44*, 417-448.

Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 9,* 123-133.

Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1978). Persistence in second language study: motivational considerations. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 34*, 688-694.

Collentine, J. G. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*, 227-248.

Cubillos, J., Chieffo, L., & Fan, C. (2008). The impact of short-term study abroad programs on L2 listening comprehension skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, *41*, 157-185.

Currier, C., Lucas, J., & Arnault, D. (2009). Study Abroad and Nursing: From Cultural to Global Competence. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 133-150). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cushner, K. (2009). The Role of Study Abroad in Preparing Globally Responsible Teachers. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 151-169). New York, NY: Routledge.

Daly, J., & Miller, M. (1975). Apprehension of writing as a predictor of message intensity. *The Journal of Psychology*, *85*, 175-177.

Davidson, D. E. (2007). Study abroad and outcomes measurements: The case of Russian. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 276-280.

DeKeyser, R. (1986). *From learning to acquisition? Foreign language development in a U.S. classroom and during a semester abroad*. (Doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

DeKeyser, R. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 104-119). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Desrochers, A., & Gardner, R. C. (1981). *Second language acquisition: an investigation of a bicultural excursion experience*. Quebec City, Canada: International Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Laval University.

Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, *40*, 45-78.

Dornyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding second language motivation: On with the challenge! *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 515-523.

Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, *31*, 117-135.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaub Associates.

Dornyei, Z., & Otto, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* (Thames Valley University, London, England), *4*, 43-69.

Dufon, M., & Churchill, E. (2006). *Language Learners in a Study Abroad Context*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Ference, R. (2006). Building and Sustaining Short-Term Cross-Cultural Immersion Programs in Teacher Education. *AILACTE Journal*, *3,* 11-24.

Ferguson, C. A. (1995). Foreward. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), S*econd Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Contex*t (pp. xi-xv). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Ferguson, M. (2007). 75 Years of the Junior Year in Munich. *Unterrichtspraxis*, *40*(2), 124-132.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2005). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Freed, B. F. (1990). Language learning in a study abroad context: the effects of interactive and non-interactive out-of-class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency. In J. Atlatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: the interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 459-477). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Freed, B. F. (1993). Assessing the linguistic impact of study abroad: what we currently know-what we need to learn. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *4.4*, 151-166.

Freed, B. F. (Ed.). (1995). *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Freed, B. F., Dewey, D., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The Language Contact Profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*, 349-356.

Gardner, R. C. (1968). Attitudes and motivation: their role in second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 2*, 141-150.

Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Gardner, R. C. (1985a). *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery Manual*. Retrieved from The University of Western Ontario: www.publish.uwo.ca.

Gardner, R. C. (1985b). *Social psychology and second language learning*: *The role of attitudes and motivation.* London, England: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, *13*, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second language learning: Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching, 26*(1), 1-11.

Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). *Second language acquisition: a social psychological approach*. (Research Bulletin No. 332). Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1981). On the Development of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 37*, 510-525.

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 359-368.

Ginsberg, R. (1992). *Language gains during study abroad: an analysis of the ACTR data*. National Foreign Language Center, Washington, DC.

Gliksman, L. (1981). *Improving the prediction of behaviours associated with second language acquisition.* (Unpublished master's thesis), The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Golonka, E. M. (2006). Predictors Revised: Linguistic Knowledge and Metalinguistic Awareness in Second Language Gain in Russian. *The Modern Language Journal*, *909*(iv), 496-505.

Gregersen, T. (2003). To err is human: A reminder to teachers of language-anxious students. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*, 25-32.

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 562-570.

Hanna, G., & Smith, A. H. (1979). Evaluating summer bilingual exchanges: a progress report. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19*, 29-58.

Hensley, T. R., & Sell, D. K. (1979). A study abroad program: Impacts on student attitudes. *Teaching Political Science, 6*, 387-412.

Hofman, J. E., & Zak, I. (1969). Interpersonal contact and attitude change in a cross-cultural situation. *Journal of Psychology, 78*, 165-171.

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 559-562.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70*, 125-132.

Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (1991*). Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Huebner, T. (1991). *Effects of overseas study: a preliminary report on an intensive beginning-level course in Japanese*. Paper presented at the annual PACIE conference, Pittsburg, PA.

Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas language programs. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp.171-193). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Hurd, S. (2007). Anxiety and Non-Anxiety in a Distance Language Learning Environment: The Distance Factor as a Modifying Influence. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, *35(*4), 487-508.

Ingram, M. (2005). Recasting the foreign language requirement through study abroad: A cultural immersion program in Avignon. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*, 211-222.

Institute of International Education, IIE Network. (2005). *Open Doors*. Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org.

Institute of International Education, IIE Network. (2006). *Open Doors.* Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org.

Institute of International Education, IIE Network. (2009). *Open Doors.* Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org.

Institute of International Education, IIE Network. (2010). *Study Abroad by U.S. Students Slowed in 2008/09 with More Students Going to Less Traditional Destinations*. Retrieved from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org.

Isabelli, C. A. (2007). Development of the Spanish subjunctive by advanced learners: Study-abroad followed by at-home instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*, 330-341.

Jackson, J. (2008). Globalization, internationalization, and short-term stays abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*, 349-358.

Jakobovitz, L. A. (1970). *Foreign language learning: a psycholinguistic analysis of the issues*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Janes, D. (2008). Beyond the Tourist Gaze? Cultural Learning on an American "Semester Abroad" Programme in London. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *7*(1), 21-35.

Kouritzin, S. G., Piquemal, N. A., & Renaud, R. D. (2009). An International Comparison of Socially Constructed Language Learning Motivation and Beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(2), 287-317.

Kraemer, R. (1990). *Social psychological factors related to the study of Arabic among Israeli Jewish high school student*s. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Isreal.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York, NY: Longman Inc.

Krashen, S., & Seliger, H. (1976). The role of formal and informal environments in second language learning: A pilot study. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics, 3,* 15-20.

Kruse, J., & Brubaker, C. (2007). Successful Study Abroad: Tips for Student Preparation, Immersion, and Postprocessing. *Unterrichtspraxis*, *40*(2), 147-152.

Labi, A. (2009) Columbia University to Open Network of International Collaborative-Research Centers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *55*, 33.

Lafford, B. (1995). Getting into, through and out of a survival situation: a comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying Spanish abroad and 'at home'. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 97-121). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Lafford, B. (2004). The Effect of the Context of Learning on the Use of Communication Strategies by Learners of Spanish as a Second Language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 201-225.

Lalonde, R. N. (1982). *Second language acquisition: a causal analysis*. (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language acquisition: Where does personality fit? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 15*, 224-237.

Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Swain, M. (1995). A Canadian interprovincial exchange: evaluating the linguistic impact of a three-month stay in Quebec. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 97-121). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Leonard, E. (1964). Attitude change in a college program of foreign study and travel. *Educational Record*, 173-181.

Lim, H. -Y. (2009). Culture, Attributions, and Language Anxiety. *Applied Language Learning*, *19*(1), 29-52.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences in second language acquisition* (pp.45-68). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Language anxiety: Its relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second languages. *Language Learning, 41*, 513-534.

Marcos-Llinas, M., & Garau, M. J. (2009). Effects of Language Anxiety on Three Proficiency-Level Courses of Spanish as a foreign Language. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(1), 97-111.

Marion, P. (1980). Relationships of Student Characteristics and Experiences with Attitude Changes in a Program of Study Abroad. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *21*(1), 58-64.

Marriot, H. (1995). The acquisition of polite patterns by exchange students in Japan. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 197-224). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

McLaughlin, B. M. (1987). *Theories of Second Language Learning*. Rockville, Maryland: Edward Arnold.

McLaughlin, B. M. (1990). Restructuring. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 113-128.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of College Intermediate French Students: Relation to Achievement and Motivation. *Language Learning, 57*(3), 417-442.

Omaggio, A. H. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oskamp, S. (1977). *Attitudes and Opinions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Oxford, R. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 512-514.

Oxford, R. (1999). Anxiety and the language learner: new insights. *Affect in language learning* (pp. 58-67). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 12-28.

Pichette, F. (2009). Second Language Anxiety and Distance Language Learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(1), 77-93.

Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with highly anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101-108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Regan, V. (1995). The acquisition of sociolinguistic native speech norms: effects of a year abroad on second language learners of French. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 245-267). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Rodriguez, S. (2001). *The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second and foreign–language contexts: a longitudinal study of acquisition patterns.* (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Saito, Y., Horwitz, E., & Garza, T. (1999). Foreign Language Reading Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *2*, 201-218.

Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: a review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, *28*, 129-142.

Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*, 173-199.

Sell, D. (1983). Research on attitude changes in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *7*(2), 131-147.

Shams, M. (2008). Students' Attitudes, Motivation and Anxiety Towards English Language Learning. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, *2*, 121-144.

Shedivy, S. L. (2004). Factors that lead some students to continue the study of foreign language past the usual 2 years in high school. *System, 32*, 103-119.

Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad: women learning Japanese in Japan. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 225-44). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Smith, A. F. (2002). How global is the curriculum? *Educational Leadership, 60*(2), 39-40.

Spenader, A. J. (2008). Acquiring oral language skills over the course of a high school year abroad: What's in it for absolute beginners? In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 247-263). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stangor, C., Jonas, K., Stroebe, W., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Influence of student exchange on national stereotypes, attitudes and perceived group variability. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*, 663-675.

Stein, A. H., & Bailey, M. M. (1973). The socialization of achievement orientation in females. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*, 345-366.

Stevens, J. J. (2001). *The acquisition of L2 Spanish pronunciation in a study abroad context.* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

Stevick, E. (1976). *Memory, Meaning, and Method: Some Psychological Perspectives on Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Stitsworth, M. H. (1988). Personality changes associated with a sojourn in Japan. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129*(2), 213-224.

Stuart, R. (2007). Stepping Up to Study Abroad. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 24*, 16-19.

Tallon, M. (2009). Foreign Language Anxiety and Heritage Students of Spanish: A Quantitative Study. *Foreign Language Annals*. *42*(1), 112-137.

Torres, J. P. (2003). *A cognitive approach to the acquisition of clitics in L2 Spanish: insights from study abroad and classroom learners*. (Doctoral dissertation). Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K.-s. (1988). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 275-289.

VanPatten, B. (2003). Input processing in SLA. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wainwright, P., Ram, P., Teodorescu, D., & Tottenham, D. (2009). Going global in the Sciences: A Case Study at Emory University. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad* (pp. 381-398). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wang, C. (2010). Toward a Second Language Socialization Perspective: Issues in Study Abroad Research. *Foreign Language Annals*, *43*(2), 50-63.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, *31*, 28-39.

Yager, K. (1998). Learning Spanish in Mexico: The Effect of Informal Contact and Student Attitudes on Language Gain. *Hispania*, *81*(4), 898-913.

Yashim, T., & Zenuk-Nishide, L. (2008). The impact of learning contexts on proficiency, attitudes, and L2 communication: Creating an imagined international community. *System, 36*, 566-585.

Yihong, G., Yuan, Z., & Ying, C. (2007). Relationship Between English Learning Motivation Types and Self-identity Changes Among Chinese Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(1), 133-155.

Yu, B. (2010). Learning Chinese abroad: the role of language attitudes and motivation in the adaptation of international students in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(3), 301-321.

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDY ABROAD AND MOTIVATION, ATTITUDE, AND ANXIETY IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

by

STEFANIA GABRIELLA SILVESTRI MORREALE

May 2011

Advisor: Dr. Marc H. Rosa

Major: Curriculum & Instruction: Foreign Language Education

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

The objective of this dissertation was to discover the program effects of long- and short-term study abroad for university students (N=142) at a midwestern, public university. Affective outcomes, such as motivation, attitude and anxiety, were examined using Gardner's Attitudes and Motivational Test Battery (AMTB) survey and a student demographic questionnaire. Quantitative data from the student demographic survey reported that the typical foreign language student surveyed is female, between the ages of 18-22, a junior, a liberal arts major with non-native fluency in the target language. The typical study abroad program attended by this sample is: short-term (less than eight weeks), most often 5-6 weeks in duration, a language and culture program with 10-16 hours of instruction per week. Quantitative data from the AMTB survey reported that SA students had a higher motivation index than the non-SA participants. The attitude index did not show a statistical difference between the SA group and the non-SA group. Anxiety, however, was found to be statistically significantly lower in the SA students when compared to that of their non-SA counterparts. These findings contribute to the field of foreign language education by offering empirical evidence that a short-term study abroad experience does make a difference in regards to student motivation and anxiety in foreign language learning.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Stefania Silvestri Morreale received a bachelor's degree in Italian Language and Literature and English Literature, as well as a master's degree in Italian, from the Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures department at Wayne State University. She subsequently received a Teaching Certificate in English, ESL, French, and Italian and a master's degree in Teaching with a specialization in secondary education from the Education department at Wayne State University. In winter 2010, she defended her Ph.D. dissertation entitled, *The Relationship Between Study Abroad and Motivation, Attitude and Anxiety in University Students Learning a Foreign Language*. Her doctoral area of research focuses on curriculum and instruction with special attention to second language acquisition theory and practice, foreign language teaching methodologies, and qualitative and quantitative research in SLA. She has led and participated in multiple study abroad programs, including university-level courses at the Università degli Studi di Genova (Genoa, Italy), the Università per Stranieri di Siena (Siena, Italy) and the Università Gabriele d'Annunzio (Pescara, Italy). Stefania Morreale also held positions as secondary teacher in Italian, French, humanities, and English at Grosse Pointe North High School (Grosse Pointe, Michigan); Italian instructor at Oakland University (Royal Oak, Michigan); and adjunct faculty in Italian at Wayne State University for a number of years. Her areas of interest for future research include study abroad and affective gains in second language education, study abroad and linguistic gains in second language education and the study abroad experience as a process and its impact second language education.