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In second language research and pedagogy, motivation has been labeled as a key factor for success (Clément, 1980; Dörnyei, 1998; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 1985); namely, language learners with high levels of motivation will be more successful than those who exhibit more negative attitudes towards learning the TL.

Through classroom observations, student survey responses and personal interviews conducted in a beginner-level university French class, this study attempted to determine broad motivational patterns using Gardner’s (1982) binary integrative and instrumental model, and then determine specific origins for these motivations. Four interviewees were selected: two with high instrumental and integrative orientation, and two with low integrative and instrumental orientation. Research questions aimed to determine initial motivational tendencies of the students and how these changed or remained consistent throughout the semester; additionally, a comparison between what interviewees indicated about their own motivational tendencies and their class performance were analyzed.

The findings of this study indicated that integrative motivational tendencies shifted positively over the course of the semester, whereas instrumental motivational tendencies remained consistent. The change in integrative motivation was mainly due to cultural
francophone insights brought to the classroom through the instructor and textbook materials. The malleable nature of integrative motivation presupposes that students’ investment (Norton-Pierce, 1995) in, or motivation, to learn the TL language culture must grow in order for integrative motivation to do so as well.

Implications include how larger university environments can more successfully hone in on individual achievement through teacher awareness of student motivational behaviors in the classroom. Additionally, pedagogical implications will aid educators in better understanding their pupils’ motivation for learning foreign languages and recognizing how student behavior can be helpful indicators of waning or waxing motivation in class. Results suggest that teaching culture in the FL classroom can help augment integrative motivation.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

In second language acquisition research and pedagogy, the extent to how much learners’ attitudes toward learning a second language affects their overall ability to learn that second language has been a soaring debate for nearly half a century. In particular, motivation has been labeled as a key factor for success in language acquisition (Clément, 1980; Dörnyei, 1998; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 1985); namely, that those with a high level of motivation will be more successful, and those who show more negative attitudes will be less successful. Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1972) devised a two-part analysis of motivation, where instrumental motivation accounts for learners who have immediate or practical reasons for learning a second language (job opportunities, cultural immersion, communicative necessity), and integrative motivation relates to learners who have a personal desire to learn about the language and its speakers and to be enriched by the culture. In further research, Gardner focused on the impact of integrative motivation, asking the question, “Can someone truly learn a language if they do not like the group who spoke the language?” (2001). Considering the pedagogical implications of this probing reflection, it is reasonable to speculate if it is possible to change a learner’s opinion of the target language culture, and if so, will success in acquisition rise. Perhaps a prerequisite to the previous question should be: Is it possible to change a learner’s attitude about the language they are learning simply by changing their opinion of the target language culture? If this were correct, then an emphasis on culture in the foreign or second language classroom would be considered an integral factor in language success.
A key factor in understanding how integrative and instrumental motivation comes into play concerning second language acquisition is Gardner’s socio-education model of learner beliefs (1982), a further expansion upon an earlier model created with Lambert (1959). Essentially, he identified four foundational features that predominately affect language acquisition: social or cultural setting, individual learner differences, educational environment, and context. Further, he dissects individual learner differences into four separate categories: intelligence, language aptitude, motivation, and anxiety. Crooks and Schmidt (1991) were critical in the implementation of this model, emphasizing the importance of positive attitudes towards the target culture and desire to integrate into the target language community on the learner’s overall personal goal. Those who have developed other models of motivation in second language learning include Dörnyei (2001), who developed the process model approach, finding that learners transition through a three-part phase of choice motivation, executive motivation, and motivation retrospection.

Additionally, Hashi (2001) created the transformational motivation hypothesis, where he found that motivation for learning a second language often derives from more than instrumental factors, and instead becomes a venue for changing or empowering the learners’ lives, their society, and/or the host society in some dynamic way. In going beyond integrative and instrumental motivation, this hypothesis makes knowing the target language and integrating into the target culture all the more important. Lastly, the learners’ willingness to communicate (WTC) is recognized by MacIntyre et al. (1998) as an important facet of motivation, especially since integrative motivation concerns positive attitudinal orientations on the part of the learners, where desiring to interact with and acculturate into the target community (both in informal and formal arenas) are of upmost importance. Not only does this support pedagogical approaches, such as
communicative language teaching (CLT) in the classroom, but it has continuing reverberations on researchers who have looked at the correlation between WTC and Gardner’s socio-educational model as well, albeit not always consistent in their findings (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002; Hashimoto, 2002; Peng, 2007). All of these approaches were developed in order to explain the phenomenon for why learners, who are seemingly similar in capabilities, differ greatly when it comes to ultimate success in the rate of acquisition. It is obvious that other factors specific to individuals and their perceptions affect second language acquisition—one of those being how they view the target culture and their language.

Without question, research on any learner characteristic can be difficult to implement because of the impossibility of ensuring that correlations between motivation and success in language acquisition are absolute and without extraneous validity factors leading to misinterpreted data. However, the insightful quality this type of research brings—both quantitative and qualitative—leads us closer to understanding how best to implement culture in the classroom, and to what extent this kind of pedagogical approach is needed (if at all). My hope with this study is to narrow the gap between what we believe is important regarding integrative and instrumental motivation in language learning, and determine if positive cultural enrichment in the language can help to reverse negative attitudes toward a second language and culture—thereby opening the students’ minds to be more motivated to learn the second language.

1.1 Motivation for the study

While working on my Master’s degree in TESOL and Applied Linguistics, I became increasingly interested on the aspects of second language acquisition (SLA) and the motivation students have for learning a second language. There were several opportunities for me to
experience firsthand the differing methods of teaching both a foreign language and a second language. While these terms appear similar, the field of second language acquisition tends to separate the two ideas because of the vastly different social contexts in which they are associated. Kinginger (2004) distinguishes second language learning as “people who are learning the language of the communities where they live, and are assumed to have both stronger motivations and more access to the language than foreign language learners” (p. 221). Foreign language learners, on the other hand, are those who study a language outside of the domain it is spoken; they are assumed “to have little access to the language and to harbor instrumental motivations more closely related to school success than to changes in social identity or lived experience” (Kinginger, 2004, p. 221). As someone who has been subject to both, I desired to come to a fuller understanding of the dynamics surrounding this difference in my second language—French.

As a graduate teaching assistant in the university as well as in an intensive English program affiliated with the university, my awareness of how students viewed English as a second language in the U.S. grew. These students seemed to have a more positive outlook on learning the language, which I found strikingly in contrast with students to whom I taught English in France the year prior. Through informal conversations, I gleaned that most of my students in the United States were excited about living amidst a new culture and wanted to know more about the people, the music, the films, etc. so they could ‘fit in’ with those around them. Additionally, the students whom I taught in the intensive English program would often explain to me their need to quickly improve their English proficiency in order to pass the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and enter the university in the near future. These snapshots of my students’ goals, though not always clear-cut and varied widely from student to student, peaked my interest in studying where motivation for students truly lies.
Being a second language learner myself, I have personal experience in learning French in both a foreign and second language context. Much like Dörnyei’s (2001) ever-changing process model of motivation, my desire to learn French has waxed and waned throughout the years. As an adult, I have achieved a high level of proficiency in French, though not as fluent as what one may call ‘native-like.’ Because I had gone through both the foreign and second language system of learning in the United States and overseas, I wanted to glean perspectives from other students in the U.S. who are learning in the university foreign language setting. I found this study a welcome opportunity to blend my interest in where my students’ motivation comes from with my interest in where foreign language French learners’ motivation originates.

1.2 Outline of the study

The outline of this study is as follows: Chapter 1 has provided a comprehensive vision of what the study entails and where its motivation originated. Chapter 2 provides a detailed literature review of motivation in language learning, theoretical framework for the study, purpose of the study, and research questions. Chapter 3 explains the methodology employed in this research. Chapter 4 is dedicated to analyzing the data illustrating the most pertinent findings of motivational orientations for the French foreign language classroom at a university in the midwestern United States. Lastly, Chapter 5, answers the research questions, includes theoretical implications of this study and adds suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The following literature review is organized into three sections. The first section, 2.1, presents foundational theories that have shaped research on second language learner motivation over the past fifty years. Section 2.2 describes a more distinct view of second language motivation in the foreign language setting as differing from an immersion environment. Section 2.3 provides a narrower view of learner motivation by discussing how introducing culture in the classroom builds up integrative motivation. The next section, 2.4, narrows in on second language motivation in a FL context and discusses studies that have explored the French language in particular. Section 2.5 will discuss the theoretical framework employed in this study, Section 2.6 will discuss the purpose of the study, and finally, the research questions will be addressed in Section 2.7.

2.1 Foundational Theories on Motivation

One of the first theories regarding motivation in second language learners stemmed from Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert’s socio-educational model (1972), where they coined the terms integrative and instrumental motivation. This model was expanded (Gardner, 1982) to include a four-part description of learner beliefs, with integrative motivation radiating from the center as influencing all other learner characteristics the most. Ever since Gardner published his dissertation entitled “Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition” (1960), he has dedicated his life’s work to research in second language motivation and has continually revised his model even until recently (2002). The most current product shows that, inherent inside each learner, there is a correlation between attitudes toward the native language and integrativeness as
directly influencing motivation. Outside the learner, other factors, such as a solid support system and language aptitude, directly affect his/her language achievement. Putting the two together, then, motivation is one of the most important out of many facets that affect the success of acquisition in reaching competency in the target language (i.e. language achievement). More specifically, second language learner motivation is “operationally defined in terms of a composite of variables including measures of integrativeness, attitudes towards the learning situation, and motivation” (Gardner et al., 1992, p. 198). Gardner came to this conclusion based upon his own research over the years and in response to critiques of his original two-part analysis.

Crooks and Schmidt (1991) took Gardner’s original model of learner motivation and applied it to their research, emphasizing that attitudes toward not only the learning situation, but also the target language culture, largely affects attitudes towards learning a second language. Furthermore, Au (cited in Crookes, & Schmidt, 1991, p. 473) split Gardner’s theory of integrative motivation into five distinctive categories (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1:
5-part analysis of integrative motivation (Au, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Integrative motive</td>
<td>Integrative motive will be positively associated with second language achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cultural belief</td>
<td>Cultural beliefs influence the development of the integrative motive and the degree to which integrativeness and achievement are related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Active learner</td>
<td>Integratively motivated learners are successful because they are active learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Causality</td>
<td>Integrative motivation is a cause; second language achievement, the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Two-process</td>
<td>Aptitude and integrative motivation are independent factors in second language learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these hypotheses, integrative motivation is at the center of motivation for language learning.
With integrative motivation being one of the most influential factors in second language acquisition in the last half of the 20th century, critiques undoubtedly arose to its effectiveness in explaining real-life cases of motivation in language learning. One appraisal of Gardner’s analysis of motivation by Oller (cited in Crooks & Schmidt, 1991, p. 48) noted that individual learner beliefs and motivational factors in learning a second language is most likely an “unstable non-linear function of high variability.” In this case, learner differences may be too widespread and based on too many variables to adequately design a model to where research can be absolute and trusted. If this is true, then why is research into learner motivation conducted at all? Succinctly put, simply because something is difficult does not mean that it should not be done. While research in this area may be delicate, hope is not lost. Learners have tendencies (often referred to as orientations) that, while not always exact, can be used to gain knowledge on the likelihood of differing attitudes and motivational patterns found in second language learner classrooms. This, in retrospect, can assist language instructors by gaining background knowledge on their pupils and discovering how to foster better attitudes and instigate positive motivation in the classroom.

Another response to Gardner’s model of integrative motivation is that it is too broad (Dörnyei, 2003; Mills, Pjares & Herron, 2007). Its ambiguous nature even led Gardner (2001) himself to agree that, because it is difficult to define, individuals have interpreted it differently over the years. Dörnyei (2003) defines it as “a positive interpersonal/affective disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community.” Therefore, a positive attitude toward the foreign language group and a desire to interact with them is a necessary component of integrative motivation, though it is arguable if all learners must desire to become similar to them in order to be successful.
Gardner’s model was revisited again by Dörnyei (1990), who realized that the different contexts of learning environments yielded different results. After devising a motivation questionnaire for his participants, he found that instrumental motivation was actually stronger than integrative motivation. This does not mean that integrative motivation is not an important factor in foreign language learning, but perhaps leads us to determine that identity with the target language culture is only one out of many factors involved.

In addition to the integrative/instrumental dichotomy, other theories of motivation in second language learning have been salient in the past ten years, attempting to reevaluate Gardner’s original model in an effort to research learner motivation more comprehensively. Clément introduced the Social Psychological theory (1980), determining that pressure and anxiety are major factors in order for learners to acquire a language quickly. A few years later, Deci and Ryan (1985, 2002) created the Self-Determination theory, an approach in motivational psychology that discusses intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. This theory rests heavily on student autonomy and the language instructor’s communicative style of classroom management.

Bandura (1986, 1987) took student autonomy to the next level in his Social Cognitive theory, indicating that self-regulatory behavior (how well students can regulate their learning, set goals, and keep them) and self-efficacy (how efficient they are in attaining these goals that they set for themselves) are the most important behaviors language learners should have in order to succeed. Along these same lines, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) coined “goal salience” as a component of motivation, where the specificity of learner goals and the frequency of goal-setting strategies used indicate high acquisition rates.
Common in the 1980’s was the idea of causal attributions, later coined by Weiner (1992) as the Attribution Theory. This hypothesis defines past failures and successes as a major component in shaping learning processes and motivational dispositions. If one attributes the failure of a previous language learning experience as due to personal inability or weakness, than the learner is less likely to hold a positive attitude which may even deter them from continuing to learn that language in the future. However, if a past failure is determined by the learner as being unsuccessful due to outside factors or factors that have since changed, then they would be more likely to maintain a more positive outlook throughout their further attempts at language learning.

Dörnyei’s process model approach took flight in the late 90’s and early 2000’s when a more second language acquisition (SLA) approach to learner motivation began to be favored. Dörnyei (1998) points out that motivation started to take a more pragmatic and classroom-centered approach, taking it out of the exclusive scope of research so that theories regarding motivation could be implemented in the classroom. He claims that these reformed approaches answered “an explicit call for a more pragmatic, education-centered approach to motivation research which would be more relevant for classroom application. The main focus shifted from social attitudes to looking at classroom reality, and identifying and analyzing classroom-specific motive.” In response to this, Dörnyei initiated the Process-Model Approach, where time was viewed as a prominent factor in language learning. While Clément’s (1980) social psychological theory emphasized pressure and anxiety as a way to learn quickly, Dörnyei, instead, looks at a slower version of time. He stated that “temporal variation” is an issue for learners, and that their motivation pattern expresses itself in a 3-part model.

Dörnyei’s model explains how choice motivation in the preactional stage originally influences an individual to initiate the desire for language learning, leading them to intentionally
set goals and form intentions to learn. In the *actional stage*, executive motivation comes into play by the individual actually carrying out the necessary tasks to learn a language, engaging in self-regulatory behavior and continually assessing their achievement. In the *postactional stage*, learners form their causal attribution (why it was a positive or negative experience) and either design new strategies to continue learning the language, or dismiss their intentions of planning for further knowledge.

The last foundational model to discuss is a more general theory attempting to allow enough room for all affective learning elements to successfully fit into its constructs. The benefits of a more open model in second language acquisition allows the researcher to construct the reality of their research environment more accurately and assess their participants in a way that is not forced into a fixed model (which can sometimes be rather complex), but is placed where an ethnographer believes is the most exact according to their research schema. A simpler model of motivation can be suitably fit into Bernard Spolsky’s (1989) conditions for second language learning. He describes the social context as providing learning opportunities, but also leading to attitudes of different kinds, which appears in the L2 learner as motivation. Additionally, this motivation conjoins with other personal traits, such as age, aptitude, previous knowledge, and personality, to determine how the learner effectively does or does not use the learning situation afforded them. Whether the learning opportunity is formal or informal, whatever interplay occurs between the learner and their learning situation directly affects their linguistic or non-linguistic outcome (i.e. success of acquisition).

In this way, a classroom foreign language environment could be plugged into this model in order to determine how each element affects language learning as a whole. In the current study, the *social context* would be the foreign language university classroom setting, while the rest of the
constructs are dependent upon each learner individually. Spolsky also gives seven specific conditions for attitudes and motivations defined by the social context of a learner (Table 2.2).

Table 2.2: Conditions of learning for motivation (Spolsky, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aptitude</td>
<td>The greater the learner’s aptitude, the greater he or she will learn all parts of the second language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Exposure</td>
<td>The more time spent learning any aspect of a second language, the more will be learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Motivation</td>
<td>The more motivation a learner has, the more time he or she will spend learning any aspect of a second language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Attitude</td>
<td>A learner’s attitude affects the development of motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>Integrative orientation, a cluster of favorable attitudes to the speakers of the target language, has a positive affect on the learning of a target language, and in particular on the development of a native-like pronunciation and semantic system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Instrumental language learning</td>
<td>If you need to speak to someone who does not know your language, you can learn that person’s language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Language values</td>
<td>The social and individual values which underlie language choice also determine the value and individual assigns to the learning of a specific language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research on motivation for second language learners has been debated as a topic important to language learning, but very difficult to assess and define. All of the previous theories, while differing in their mannerisms, largely relate to integrative motivation as being a salient factor in successful language learning. Since Gardner’s term *integrativeness* seems to elicit ambiguity, integrative motivation can be seen as holding some kind of identity with the target language culture—either identifying with the people, enjoying their culture and language, or being able or willing to communicate with them. Table 2.3 offers a collapsible timeline of the foundational theories on second language acquisition that have been discussed in Chapter 2, beginning with Gardner’s original dissertation work entitled “Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition” (1960).
Table 2.3: Timeline of Foundational Theories on Motivation for L2 Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Focus on integrative motivation</th>
<th>Focus on other motivational influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Instrumental and Integrative Motivation (Gardner &amp; Lambert)</td>
<td>Social Psychological Theory (Clément)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Socio-educational Model of Learner Beliefs (Gardner)</td>
<td>Self-Determination Theory (Deci &amp; Ryan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Conditions for 2nd Language Learning Model (Spolsky)</td>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5-Part Analysis of Integrative Motivation (Au)</td>
<td>Attribution Theory (Wiener)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Salience Theory (Tremblay &amp; Gardner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>Process-Model Approach (Dörnyei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a timeline of the foundational theories on motivation are listed above in Table 2.3, these same researchers have continued to revise their original models. At the same time, other researchers have attempted to implement these theories in real-life second language learning environments. The results of these latter studies will be discussed in the remainder of this literature review.

### 2.2 Motivation in a Foreign Language Context

The previous theories have mainly focused on L2 motivation in general, and have not necessarily focused on learner motivation as it pertains to a foreign language setting. Foreign language learning and second language learning differ in that the former assumes students are acquiring a language that is not readily spoken in their immediate culture, whereas the latter indicates learning a language in an immersion setting and communication with the target language culture is more available.
A major question concerning foreign language learning (FLL) is, how can integrative motivation be a factor if identity with the target language (TL) group is near impossible, since it is significantly removed from the TL culture? Gardner’s socio-educational model seemed to fit into the second language environment of the bilingual Quebecois, but foreign language learning has recently been acknowledged to affect context (and therefore, motivation) in a different way for language learners. When discussing identification with the target language culture, Gardner (2001) refers to the second language community and individuals’ willingness and availability to communicate with the TL culture. In response to this, Schmidt, Boraie, and Kassabgy (1996) conducted a study on Egyptian learners of English indicating that integrative motivation cannot be applied to an FL context where no interaction is possible with native speakers. However, Dornyei mentions that this does not mean FL learners are not tuned into integrative motivation, but simply accept integrative motivation in a different manner:

In the absence of a salient L2 group in the learners’ environment (as is often the case in foreign language contexts in which the L2 is primarily learned as a school subject), the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language as well as the L2 itself. (2003)

In this way, shaping positive values of the TL culture in school would positively affect students’ identification with that culture, and in turn, instigate integrative motivation.

2.3 Motivation and Culture

In second language acquisition research, much focus has been on learner motivations for learning language; more specifically, how pervasive integrative and instrumental motivation affects students’ ability to learn. In regards to learner attitudes towards the target language culture, it has been suggested by previous research that a more positive attitude will elicit better language learning results than more negative attitudes. Therefore, introducing cultural aspects of the TL in
a classroom environment might enhance learner attitudes, resulting in a stronger investment on their part in wanting to learn the language, and ultimately improving their rate of acquisition. In this section, diverse studies that have been focused on the way culture interplays with motivation in the FL classroom will be outlined. First, various definitions of culture will be discussed, showing that some ambiguity concerning this term is evident between students, teachers, and institutions that might hold different ideas of what it entails. Second, the focus will rest on research intent on determining if teaching the culture of a TL affects integrative motivation in FL learners.

2.3.1 Definition of ‘culture’ for students and U.S. National Standards

When highlighting the importance of culture and its necessity in language learning, what do we truly mean by the word *culture*? In fact, culture is not as simple to define as one may assume. Culture can include traditional elements, like food, dance, music, style, etc. But it can also relate to the economic situation, politics, demeanor of the people, etc. These are often all overshadowed by stereotypes language learners carry to the classroom. Chavez (2002, p. 129) discusses the main definitions of culture defined by FL professionals—that of little-c (practices) and big-C culture (products) (Herron et al. 1999), deep and surface culture (Jernigan & Moore, 1997), cultural aspects that include anthropological, sociological and historical perspectives, as well as a more humanities and social sciences-based approaches (Kramsh, 1996).

Chavez also brings to light possible discrepancies between what students think culture entails, what instructors think culture entails, and what the National Standards in U.S. education believe culture entails for classroom language use. He conducted a study of American college students learning German and how they define culture, as well as how they desire to see culture
integrated in their language classrooms. Through a two-part questionnaire (qualitative and quantitative) given to freshman, sophomore, and seniors, results indicated that history was the highest definition of culture, but that cultural definitions largely reflected the age, gender, major, travel experience, and grade of students. In particular, students were found to carry their ideas of culture from their high school experience into college.

The National Standards takes culture and breaks it down to three essential elements: practices, products, and perspectives (Chavez, 2002, p. 129). For example, by the end of high school, students should be able to “analyze, interpret, and evaluate such intangible products of the German culture as social (the education system, economic…political (the federalist political structure) and religious institutions […], exploring historical and contemporary relationships among them” (as cited in Chavez, 2002, p. 136). Additionally, “expressive products” like music, dance, literature, festivals, philosophy and ideas related to German national identity should be introduced. While students in Chavez’s study related to history as something integral to cultural tradition and practice in the language learning classroom, many of the core issues like science, literature, music, and business were ignored by students as being important for cultural enrichment. Interestingly enough, his study revealed negative correlations about differing definitions of culture, meaning that “a preference for certain definitions implie[d] a dislike of others” (p. 136). Overall, Chavez’s research indicated that students did not share similar comprehensive views of culture as the National Standards. In effect, culture is not an easily defined concept and does not hold similar meaning for all individuals. In this case, introducing a vast array of cultural elements of the TL society into the classroom would be a way to ignite students’ curiosity and encourage the growth of integrative motivation for those with individualized preferences.
2.3.2 Affect of culture on integrative motivation

Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) researched the effects of integrative motivation and cultural perceptions as it pertains to attitudes towards Russia in the foreign language setting of a Malaysian university. They discovered that while students’ level of integrative motivation were initially low, it gradually increased in momentum during the course of classroom instruction. Additionally, they came to the conclusion that “the presence of integrative motivation presupposes that learners are familiar with the country and culture of the language they learn or have had some encounters with the native speakers of that language” (p. 4). In a sense, this is where classroom instruction and pedagogy become important in foreign language learning. Just as Wright’s study (1999) found that those who had a desire as well as the possibility of traveling to the target culture had a higher integrative motivation, the knowledge of this culture must be present in order for students to determine if a desire to learn is personally legitimate or attractive to them. In Nikitina and Furuoka’s study, only twenty-one students chose to answer survey questions about the Russian people and culture out of a total number of 193 responses, and only two of these statements proved to be integrative in nature—a probable affect of the geographical distance and unfeasibility of meeting people of Russian decent in the near future or in their daily lives.

Comparing those that exhibit instrumental and integrative motivation may help us reach a better conclusion for which mode of motivation may affect L2 language acquisition more directly. However, research has identified that instrumental motivation and integrative motivation are hard to define because individual learners are unique in their motivational patterns and reasons for studying a second language. Even so, collecting data on student perspectives concerning their motivation and categorizing them respectively would perhaps add more insight into either
defining integrative and instrumental tendencies, or at least discover a clearer way to understand learner motivation in general and how culture affects their attitudes toward learning the TL language.

### 2.4 Motivation and French

Wright (1999) conducted a study on grammar and secondary school students in Ireland based on learner motivation and perceptions of the French language in order to determine three factors affecting student motivation: attitudes towards foreign language, attitudes toward foreign culture, and perceived influences on those attitudes. Using student-centered surveys, the results implied that cultural generalizations and stereotypes gleaned from media, family, friends and personal experiences are, in fact, less of a factor in foreign language motivation than in-class exposure to the language. The highest factor influencing motivation was the possibility of visiting France, with teachers being the second source of influence, and textbooks and course materials appearing as the third most influential factor in student motivation to learn French.

Wright also found that girls tended to exhibit more positive attitudes toward the language and culture while the grammar school students (who came from higher socio-economic positions) indicated visiting France as a more significant factor than the secondary school students (who came from lower socio-economic positions). This has implications on not only who has more opportunities to engage in cultural immersion and enrichment, but also that student perceptions of other cultures are not limited to outside the classroom and are largely influenced by teachers themselves. Murphy (1998), mentions that since teachers have been pinpointed as integral in how students form attitudes toward the target culture, “it would seem important that teachers’ efforts in the cultural domain be well-informed, well thought-out, structured and deliberate, rather than
being loosely based on the assumption that by teaching the language they are also teaching the culture” (as cited in Wright, 1999, p. 207). What happens inside the classroom regarding the target culture might be more influential than outside stimuli. While this study was conducted on high school students with five years of formal French instruction, the present study attempts to discover if college students would have similar attitudes and influences affecting their motivation for foreign language learning as well.

Another study on motivation using the French language as impetus was conducted by Mills, Pjares and Herron (2007) who did use intermediate-level college students in testing their level of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to “judgments [learners] hold about their capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to master academic tasks” (p. 417). They found that students’ own perceptions of their abilities were a large predictor of their actual outcome on selected tasks—those who could self-regulate and willingly assume challenging tasks tended to perform better than those who avoided difficult tasks altogether and opted for ones requiring minimal effort.

Mills et al’s study was based on the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986, 1987) where students can ‘regulate’ their own behavior. This was seen as a more influential motivational factor than Gardner’s socio-educational model based on integrative motivation, doubting its effectiveness because of its “ambiguous terminology” as other theorists mentioned earlier agreed to as well (p. 425). Mills et al’s study indirectly set out to disprove Gardner’s emphasis on integrative motivation and so included in their survey a means for determining the significance of the perception of foreign language and culture in opposition to self-efficacy. The results showed that, when all other motivational variables were controlled, perceptions of foreign language and culture were not as strong a factor in student’s final grade as was their self-efficacy in predicting
what grade they were intent on achieving. Again, as in the previous study, women were found to have a more positive attitude towards the foreign language and culture than men. On a pedagogical level, Mills and associates suggest that teachers should teach learning strategies in the classroom in order for the students to raise their awareness of their own self-regulatory behavior.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

2.5.1 Integrative and Instrumental Motivation

As Chapters 1 and 2 have outlined, Gardner’s binary theory of integrative and instrumental motivation will be a strong basis for this study. Instrumental motivation is determined as an L2 learner possessing a need to learn the language, whether because an immersion environment deems it necessary to communicate with the target language people, because of a need to speak the language for career or professional purposes, or because it is a requirement for their job or school. In this study, the last two reasons will be most relevant for the FL university setting at Midwest American University—the site where this study takes place. Integrative motivation, on the other hand, is determined as a desire to integrate with and know more about the TL culture and people, hence having a strong desire to converse with them. This last facet of motivation is compellingly tied to the importance of teaching culture in the classroom, and may be one of the easiest ways to encourage a positive change in motivational behavior in students for educators. If more culture is taught, sparking a higher increase in integrative motivation, then a stronger investment in learning the language is the hopeful outcome for students. A stronger investment, then, may lead to a better rate of acquisition and discourage the stagnation (or ‘fossilization’) of learning in the foreign language.
2.6 Purpose of the Study

Research on motivation in both foreign and second language learning has been a highly popular subject in the past fifty years, both for research purposes in the fields of psychology, sociology, and philosophy, as well as for pedagogical purposes in language teaching. Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) binary theory of integrative and instrumental motivation signaled a definitive interest in learner motivation, which consequently materialized into an influx of responses to their model. Although later studies on motivation have influenced Gardner to revise his original approach and admit it may not cover all possible aspects of each individual learner’s situation (as large theoretical models usually are not capable of since they favor the general rather than the specific), it is apparent that motivation is still a subject worth attention in the field. The blatant truth remains: language learners will not successfully learn unless they have something motivating them to do so. In this sense, research on motivation will never be exhausted until we can account for the individual learning environments of all language learners. While this is not truly possible, this research narrows down more broad assumptions found in motivation literature and provides pedagogical insights from which language educators can derive their own approach conducive to their teaching environment.

Because of Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) influence on second language acquisition research, much focus has been on how pervasive integrative and instrumental motivation affects students’ ability to learn. In regards to learner attitudes towards the target language culture, it has been suggested by previous research that a more positive attitude will elicit better language learning results than more negative attitudes. Therefore, introducing cultural aspects of the target language in a classroom environment might enhance learner attitudes, resulting in a stronger investment on their part in wanting to learn the language, and ultimately improving their rate of
acquisition. Additionally, comparing those that exhibit instrumental and integrative motivation, as well as examining how levels of motivation change throughout the learning process, may help us reach a better conclusion for which mode of motivation may affect L2 language acquisition more directly.

This current research will focus explicitly on describing students’ motivational patterns in the foreign language classroom, both statistically and ethnographically. Whereas some of the previously mentioned studies have focused on disproving or proving theories related to motivation, the current study zeroes in on following student motivational patterns and describing the degree of progress French FL students make in areas where the TL is not widely spoken (like the midwestern United States) and cultural immersion is not a relevant factor. This research also challenges if placing these learners in distinctive categories is truly sufficient and describes why they do or do not fit into larger generalizations given by previous researchers. In fact, a variety of motivational differences between students were expected to be seen during the course of this study, which should offer helpful insight for instructors whose students do not mold naturally into the traditional models.

Implications of this study include assessing the behavior of different types of motivation in individuals so that teachers can not only react more appropriately to students in the classroom, but also notice the gaps in knowledge some students might have in their integrative motivation that might hinder progress.

2.7 Research Questions

The main questions employed to guide the data in this research are:
1. What are the initial integrative and instrumental motivational patterns for foreign language university-level beginners of French?

1.1 Do these patterns change or remain consistent throughout the semester, and if so, how?

1.2 What reasons (if any) make these motivational patterns in learning French change over the course of the semester?

2. What factors, including new cultural insights of the French/francophone language and culture, affect student motivational patterns throughout the semester?
Chapter 3 describes the methodology utilized to investigate student motivation in the French foreign language classroom. This chapter is organized as follows: Section 3.1 describes the participants, Section 3.2 explains the procedures for data collection, and Section 3.3 presents the materials and methods.

3.1 Participants

The main participants of this study were twenty-two students from the ages of 18-29 solicited from a general education requirement French course at Midwestern American University (MAU). Although this course fits into the core curriculum requirement for the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) at the university, not all students were enrolled in the class for this reason. The French course was taught by an instructor who speaks native French and proficient English as a second language.

The participants in this study took two questionnaires, an entrance questionnaire and an exit questionnaire. Based on specific background information solicited on these surveys, the researcher found that most students were born and raised as U.S. citizens with various ethnic backgrounds; however, two students were from Korea (S7 and S8) and one from Africa (S2). Subjects who participated in these questionnaires were not given a pseudonym but were coded with an S (meaning ‘student’) and a classification number in order to protect their identities. Each students’ age, gender, nationality/race, hometown, year in school, major/minor, and languages spoken and/or studied are listed in Table 3.1 for accessibility.
Table 3.1:
Survey Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality/Race</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Languages Taken/Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>English/Communication Disorders</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>English, Yoruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Economics/Political Science Disorders</td>
<td>English, Spanish, Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Aviation Technology</td>
<td>English, Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>English, Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Art History/Museum Studies</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Political Science/International Studies</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Paralegal Studies</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Radio Television</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Finance Economics</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Business Marketing</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entrance and exit questionnaires were distributed to all students; however, only those students who were present to complete both the entrance and exit questionnaires were used to analyze change in motivation over time. Two students (S21 and S22) who took only the exit questionnaire gave comments that were relevant for this research, and so they will be identified and discussed.
individually in Chapter 4. All participants will still be included in the participant information located in Table 3.1.

The next sections offer detailed descriptions of four students who were selected to participate in individual interviews based on their entrance questionnaire responses—one with high instrumental motivational tendencies, one with low instrumental motivational tendencies, one with high integrative motivational tendencies and one with low integrative motivational tendencies. These students agreed to have their behavior observed during classroom observations and were given pseudonyms to protect their identity.

3.1.1 Kim, S17

Kim is located on Table 3.1 as S17. She is a 26-year-old female of Korean descent, although she is a monolingual English speaker and considers herself American. She grew up in a small town in the Midwest within an hour’s vicinity of the university. She is a sophomore at MAU and is majoring in Paralegal studies. Upon entering MAU, she originally envisioned herself as studying in the music conservatory as a pianist. After only one semester, however, she changed her major in order to increase her chances of obtaining employment after graduation, which seems to be of great importance to her. Kim is only taking French to fill her COLA foreign language requirement and does not believe that knowing this language will be a valuable asset for her future career. The sole benefit she perceives in learning a second language is that it cultivates an aptitude for learning something new. Although she took Spanish in high school, a friend informed her that Spanish was more challenging at this university, which aided her decision to enroll for the first time in this beginner French course instead. Kim was chosen to participate in
the interview portion of this study because her entrance survey responses indicated a low integrative motivation to learn French.

### 3.1.2 Peter, S16

Peter is located on Table 3.1 as S16. He is a 26-year-old male who is a senior majoring in Political Science with a focus on International Studies at MAU. Though indicating his racial origins as Hispanic on the entrance survey, he made no reference to his cultural background in the interview and his comments insinuated that he was mostly Caucasian and of American nationality; additionally, he shares the same hometown as the university he now attends. Peter initially started learning French as a freshman in high school for one year as a shared interest with his sister, but spent the rest of his high school career learning German. Peter finds learning French an asset to his future career in the Air Force since it will offer him more power to choose specific regions for deployment. His goal is to ensure an opportunity to work in North Africa or the Middle East in the future. Originally, he had intended to enroll in Arabic courses at the university in lieu of French, but had been informed that the French program at MAU is more developed and consistent. He enjoys learning French and does not find the course challenging, owing this to a high affinity in learning languages as determined on an Active Battery test given by the United States Marine Corps he had taken a few years prior. Another motivation for taking this class was based upon a decision that his girlfriend would also enroll in the same course. Peter was selected as an interviewee because his entrance survey responses indicated a high instrumental motivation for learning French.
3.1.3 Sarah, S9

Sarah is located on table 3.1 as S9. She is a 20-year-old Caucasian female who grew up in the Midwest, a few hours north of the university. She is a junior transfer student majoring in Communication Disorders. This is her first semester at MAU. She was previously attending a community college in her hometown, but transferred in order to be near her partner. Sarah initially began taking French courses her sophomore year of high school and exudes a clear passion for learning the language and traveling to France in order to be apart of the culture firsthand. She speaks of francophone culture in a positive light and often listens to French music, watches French movies, and studies the era of Marie Antoinette as a hobby. Though taking this course willingly as an elective, she often becomes frustrated in class because of her more independent learning style and rarely participates in activities out of boredom. Her desire to learn French stems from a need to rid herself of ethnocentric tendencies in being a monolingual American and a desire to be different from the average American who often chooses Spanish for a second language requirement. Sarah was selected to participate in the interview portion of this study because she demonstrated a high integrative motivation to learn French on the entrance survey.

3.1.4 Alyssa, S13

Alyssa is located on Table 3.1 as S13. She is a 19-year-old Hispanic female who grew up bilingual in the upper Midwest. While Spanish was her first language, she began to learn English at a bilingual elementary school at the age of seven. Alyssa began learning French as a freshman in high school and has continued learning ever since. Because teachers at her high school were more energetic and helpful in class, she finds learning French at the university overwhelming at
times owing to its fast pace and lack of interest in student-centered teaching techniques.

Nonetheless, her desire to learn French stems from wanting to travel and communicate in the language without feeling incompetent. She considers wanting to learn French similar to her desire to learn English as a young child—by wanting to understand TV shows and other social media. Alyssa plans to major in Socialization and Aviation Management where she would be around people from other cultures and could use French regularly in airline terminals. Although she likes this French class, she is often frustrated by language transfer issues between English, Spanish and French, especially when learning grammar rules or memorizing cognates. She participates passively in class and often follows the behavior of the students around her. Alyssa was chosen to participate in the interview portion of this study because she exhibited a low instrumental motivation to learn French on the entrance questionnaire.

Table 3.2 below offers a comprehensive list of information concerning each interview participant with their motivation type, as well as years of classroom instruction in the French language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Motivation Type</th>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Years of Classroom French Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>High Integrative</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Low Integrative</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>High Instrumental</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Low Instrumental</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Data collection

The current study is a mixed research study where both qualitative and quantitative data were employed in order to offer a more comprehensive understanding of student motivation and
what factors influence motivation over time. In the following two sections, explanations of the benefits and shortcomings of these two research methods are given, as well as how they were used in the present study.

3.2.1 Qualitative research

The qualitative portion of this study was based on student interviews and classroom observations. A small portion of the questionnaires were qualitative as well in that they offered open-ended questions about students’ desire to learn French in addition to the more rigid 5-point Likert scale employed in this study. The benefits of qualitative research have been exposed in recent research because of its successfulness in offering a more thorough understanding of research subjects; however, there are some concerns about its effectiveness in terms of generalizability. Penelope Eckert (1989), in her well-known ethnographic study of variation that took place at Belton High School, expresses that surveys can give an existing overall view of where participants fall in the grand “social matrix,” but they do not successfully reach an understanding of “the behavior, or practices, that produces the structure” (p. 136). Additionally, she expresses that “if we want to get an explanation for the patterns we see, we need to get closer to the social practices in which the patterns are created” (p. 137). While her study focuses on ethnography in relation to sociolinguistic interactions and language choice, this same idea can be applied to the study at hand. Acquiring survey data with previously established questions aims to provide a sample representation of a larger population and attempts to place subjects into pre-ordained categories, but this does not fully suffice when motivation in foreign language learning is such a varied and complex matter. Instead, blending the two approaches is more efficient—quantitative survey research offers an insightful and telling starting point for the researcher to
then carry out a more comprehensive and in-depth qualitative research. As Eckert (1989) says, “the survey researcher seeks out the typical, the ethnographer seeks out the particular” (p. 137). My goal is to show that these two concepts are interrelated and that there is an increased effectiveness in doing both.

Broadening the scope of data collection to include three different areas (interviews, observations, and surveys) brings this research into the scientific approach of triangulation. Martella, Nelson, and Martand-Martella (1999) use this concept to emphasize the importance of using various sources of data in order to come to a more thorough understanding of the question at hand. Specifically, as it pertains to research in second language learning motivations, Spolsky (1999) insists Lambert himself (as the director of Gardner’s MA thesis (1958), the publication of that thesis (1959) and Gardner’s dissertation (1960)) has shown favor of instituting more types of data collection than simply questionnaires or surveys for motivation research. In particular, the more discursive methods used in this study “calls for the triangulation of methodology, using also hard sociolinguistic data and personal statements of second language learners” (p. 157). Because of the challenging nature of pinpointing motivational tendencies and mapping where students stand in their desire to learn French in any moment of time, triangulation is near essential in order to get a more precise understanding of the origins of motivation. Often, students themselves are not exactly sure why they harbor low or high motivation or where their motivation (or lack thereof) comes from. Surveys provide us with a general idea, interviews broaden our understanding in specific contexts, and classroom observations impart to us a view of the social context in real-time.
3.1.2 Quantitative research

The quantitative research employed in this study included two questionnaires (an exit and entrance survey) given to students in their classroom environment, which required about ten to fifteen minutes to complete in full. While two questions on the questionnaires were open-ended, most were in the form of a 5-point Likert scale with a ‘not applicable’ option. All quantitative data were analyzed through SPSS version 18.0 through which descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the patterns of similarities and differences between the two independent variables. More information on how the questionnaire was formed and the value of SPSS in this study will be discussed in a later section entitled ‘Methods and Materials.’

3.1.3 Validity concerns

The researcher decided to use both quantitative and qualitative data in this study to increase its validity. No research can account for all variable factors that may affect validity, but being aware of elements that can become a threat to validity is essential. Martella et al. (1999) divides validity into three major segments: descriptive validity, interpretive validity and theoretical validity. They determine descriptive validity as deciphering information correctly (p. 271), interpretive validity as processing a participant’s meaning through previous experiences, the people around them, body language and other non-verbal cues as accurately as possible (p. 271), and theoretical validity as enmeshing both descriptive and interpretive functions in order to come to a more comprehensive theory to explain a problem or find an answer(s) to a research question (p. 271). The interviews and classroom observations in this study attempted to follow this methodological framework. Body language, tone of voice and hesitations in speech were perceived as telling signs of accurate meaning and attitudes concerning past and present
experiences of learning French during interviews. Words alone do not suffice unless the implications behind them are determined as best as possible. Additionally, carrying out classroom observations where the researcher had the opportunity to watch interview participants in their own learning environment and how they interacted with the students around them also added to positive interpretive validity.

In order to lower researcher bias, the researcher attempted to be as cognizant as possible about decreasing both the conscious and subtle messages that may have been sent in the questions proposed to the interviewees. Following Dörnyei’s (2007) concept of the ‘semi-structured’ interview, guided questions were previously drawn up in order to keep the conversation focused, yet still allow for flexibility. Questions where the researcher might put forth bias were written beforehand as neutral as possible (see Appendix B 1-4), and spontaneous questions were allowed with caution on the researcher’s part in order to expand the effectiveness of feedback.

Although attempts can be made to lower bias, it is in fact relatively impossible for a researcher to be completely unbiased in any given situation regarding their research constructs. However, steps can be made to increase validity as much as possible. Research on qualitative methods concerning the role of the researcher is a concept that has seen much dispute in the past few years. Recently, the positivist theory of making discoveries within an external reality, making assumptions about truth, and becoming a neutral, unbiased observer has made researchers uncomfortable. Therefore, grounded theory on social constructivism acts as a mediator between objectionist and postmodernist standpoints, according to Charmaz (2000). In other words, since objectivism focuses on the general in order to simplify statements, universalize data in abstract terms, and erase the researcher’s voice as much as possible (Glaser, 2002), while postmodernism attempts to limit academic, opaque writing so that it is more accessible to the public (Denzin,
1991), then Charmaz’s view of constructionism aims to keep both these methods in consideration using a bottom-up approach, leaving participants’ voice as central as possible to the research. To her, the observer’s paradox should not be added in as an extra variable, where accuracy is what Glaser labels as “worrisome” and somewhat pointless, but

…it is away of seeing, and [the researcher should] constantly have to be self-reflective about where [he/she] come[s] from to have any conception of [his/her] own values, because the things that are most important to us are what we tend to take for granted. (as cited in Puddephatt, 2006)

It seems that all three methods, to some extent, come to an understanding that the researcher indeed cannot be a ‘fly on the wall,’ but that consideration for bias must be taken into account when analyzing data.

Another point that Charmaz posits concerning qualitative research is that by no means does utilizing a method correctly lower researcher impact upon the data, but rather

…it what you try to do is to understand as best you can, knowing that it always comes out of your own perspective, but you try to understand how the people that you are talking with or studying, construct the situation. (as cited in Puddephatt, 2006)

In this sense, the researcher’s bias in the current study of looking at motivation in foreign language learning is undoubtedly biased with previous assumptions according to experiences the researcher has undergone which have instigated this study. However, being aware of one’s bias and selectively attempting to construct reality from surroundings and shift viewpoints as much as possible can perhaps not reduce researcher impact, but can be helpful in both analyzing and encouraging the reanalysis of data.

3.1.3 Data collection procedures

Data was collected over a period of two months from October 2011 to December 2011. Collection of the data began with an entrance and exit questionnaire given to students in their own
classroom environment on October 26, 2011 and December 9, 2011 in order to receive a perspective of student motivation over the course of the majority of the semester. One interview each was then conducted with four participants with either low or high integrative and instrumental motivation based upon their questionnaire responses. These interviews offered a more thorough understanding of the roots of their motivational tendencies and gave insight into what other factors such as personality or previous language learning experiences contributed to their current desire to learn French. Lastly, six classroom observations were conducted during this two-month period in order to watch the behavior of interviewees in their exclusive learning environment. All data were collected, transcribed and analyzed by the researcher herself.

Table 3.3: Summary of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Questionnaire</td>
<td>20 students in beginner-level French class at MAU</td>
<td>To gage types of motivational tendencies towards beginning of semester</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>French classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Questionnaire</td>
<td>15 students in beginner-level French class at MAU</td>
<td>To gage types of motivation tendencies toward the end of semester and determine change in motivation over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
<td>4 students from MAU French class chosen based on results from entrance questionnaire</td>
<td>To receive deeper insight on the origins of their motivational tendencies indicated on entrance questionnaire</td>
<td>30-60 min.</td>
<td>Conference room and/or researcher’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>Students in beginner level French class at MAU</td>
<td>Observe behavior of interviewees with instructor/classmates and watch their reaction to teaching material</td>
<td>50 min.</td>
<td>French classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table (Table 3.3) offers a clear view of the types of data collected, the participants involved, the purpose of each type of data, the length of time for each type and the environment in which it was collected. Section 3.3 will describe more detailed information surrounding each data collection process.

3.3 Materials and Methods

3.3.1 Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were employed in this study—an entrance questionnaire and an exit questionnaire. The entrance questionnaire (see Appendix A-1) was aimed to determine motivational tendencies for students in the French class towards the beginning of the semester, while the exit questionnaire’s purpose (see Appendix A-2) was to determine students motivation at the semester’s close.

The entrance questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section one was to collect demographic information, section two asked about general perspectives about learning French, and section three asked about their reasons for learning French. Likewise, the exit questionnaire was separated into three parts with a section for demographic information and students’ reasons for learning French; however, in lieu of inquiring about general perspectives about learning French, a section about their overall opinions about the class was introduced. In both surveys, sections one and three were identical so as to lower validity threats based on student responses. The only identifiable difference between the two surveys were section two, where an overall opinion of the class was needed from the students on the exit questionnaire in order to gage if the class itself had altered their type or strength of motivation.
A statistical correlation using SPSS version 8.0 was then conducted between each survey in order to determine in what way (if at all) motivation had changed from the beginning to the end of the semester for each individual student. Statement formation was based upon Gardner’s socioeducational model of instrumental/integrative motivation; however, additional statements were added that were not included in the statistical analysis, but were taken as relevant information for the quantitative portions of this study. Two types of questions were given on the surveys—open-ended ones, which were analyzed qualitatively, and questions based upon a 5-point Likert scale with an option for ‘not applicable,’ which were analyzed quantitatively. A descriptive example of types of survey questions can be seen in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Question</th>
<th>Motivational Tendency</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to go to a French/Francophone country for travel or study abroad.</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>Lykert</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Lykert</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am learning French for fun.</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Lykert</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any additional reasons for learning French?</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the survey results and their significance on theories of foreign language motivation will be located in Chapter 4.

3.3.2 Personal Interviews

The interviews carried out in this study were personal one-on-one interviews with four students (Peter, Alyssa, Kim and Sarah) who were determined to have a wide range of motivational influences to learn French based upon their entrance survey responses. The rationale
behind conducting surveys with these students was to glean a more thorough understanding of their motivational tendencies as qualitative research allows. The methodology employed for the interviews stems from Dornyei’s (2007) idea of a semi-structured interview. This approach allows the researcher to maintain focus during the interview with previously conceived questions intended for the participants and yet also permits a liberal amount of room for spontaneity. In addition, each participant’s entrance questionnaire was reviewed before the interview. In this way, the researcher was able to take notes and determine the most salient issues the students alluded to in their survey and question responses where clarification was necessary. Interview guideline questions were then drafted for each participant (see Appendices B1-4).

In particular, all interview guidelines were separated into six major focuses: previous language learning experience, career objectives, influences from classroom setting, views of francophone culture, French and communicative ability, and perception of attitudes/motivation over time. Although conversation inevitably deviated throughout the interviews depending upon extemporaneous factors of communicative behavior between the researcher and participant, the researcher attempted to focus on these six major umbrella topics.

All interviews were audio-recorded with a duration of 30-25 minutes each so that the information could be more easily elicited at a later date. Because facial expressions and body movements are telling communicative behavior in conversations, in-person interviews are a benefit to qualitative research based on attitudes and perceptions. Using Martella et al.’s (1999) idea of interpretive and descriptive validity mentioned previously, these facial expressions, body signals, voice intonation, and other conscious or unconscious communicative actions were purposefully detected and determined as useful analytical information.
Personal interviews were conducted in a university conference room, excluding one interview with Alyssa where the majority took place in the researcher’s office. Although these conversations took place in an academic environment, the researcher attempted to the best of her ability to create a casual and friendly atmosphere so that the relationship between interviewer and interviewee was as comfortable and accommodating as possible.

3.3.3 Classroom observations

Classroom observations have been of tantamount importance in the field of education research (Van Maanen, 1988; Sanjek, 1990; Emerson et al. 1995, 2001; Mulhall, 2003). Indeed, in order to successfully create materials and thoroughly understand what types of resources function properly in a classroom environment, one must watch what is happening in real-time and attempt to accurately perceive the events unfolding before them. Fasse and Kolodner (2000) have determined that differing methods of observations have been created over the years in order to understand the dynamics of learning and the learner. Additionally, “prolonged engagement and extensive observation are central for gaining an in-depth understanding of a classroom” (p. 193). Not only is the classroom environment laid bare during these observations, but individual student behavior can be noted as well within their classroom social context, which is essential since the foreign language condition of SLA relies heavily on the learner’s surroundings and classroom environment. In a way, classroom observations are a type of ethnography that, as Fasse and Kolodner state, “can be used to help us understand the social interactions in the environment” (p. 193). This social aspect of ethnography is what inspired the use of classroom observations in this current research.
If we are to link classroom observations in tandem with ethnographic research, than the following quote from demographer Ernestina Coast (2001) is revealing in terms of how we should view the participants engaged in an ethnographic event:

An ethnography can take a variety of forms, based upon a wide range of research methods that will include some kind of participant observation. “Reality” or “the field” is represented by the ethnographer to the reader (or viewer) of the ethnography. Underlying this representation is the premise that there is not one reality; there are only multiple interpretations of “reality”. There is therefore what Atkinson terms “a tension between the complexity of social life and the modes of representation - both for the writer and reader” (1992:2). (p. 4)

Because these tensions exist between reality, the ethnographer, and the participants engaged in social interaction, ethnographic research should be scrutinized as being largely interpretive data. While the present research is not focused on a cultural anthropological approach to ethnography as Coast’s research was expressing, being aware of social interactions between the teacher and students and the students amongst themselves is a way to visually determine how motivational attitudes can be portrayed based on student behavior.

Observations in this study were documented by taking field notes during a total of six classroom visits to the beginner-level French class at MAU. The decision to take field notes excluding the addition of audio-recorded material was to lower the affective filter of the participants interacting in the classroom social environment and to be as unobtrusive as possible during the class periods. Methods for taking field notes are adapted from McKay and Patton (as cited in McKay, 2006). They determine that notes based on observations should be descriptive in nature, incorporate quotes from interactions that take palace in the surrounding environment, include both the researcher’s reaction to the situations at hand as well as the reactions of the participants, and finally, to analyze and interpret the data through the researcher’s definitive perception (p. 81-82). Table 3.6 offers an example of the fields notes taken during this research
and also points to indicators of how the researcher coded the data that supported each motivation type.

Table 3.5:
Excerpt from coded field notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended participant(s)</th>
<th>Data excerpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General classroom notes | Class listens to the quiz exercises. Instructor writes phrase on the board and repeats it.  
**10:06 a.m.**  
*Female student 1:* [disrupts class after listening to a phrase] “I understand when you write it but I don’t understand when I listen to the tape.”  
Instructor does not answer, but smiles and continues lesson.  
**10:07 a.m.**  
2 students arrive.  
Instructor continues to listen to phrases, repeat them, and write them on board.  
[Students whisper among themselves]  
**10:10 a.m.**  
1 student arrives.  
End of quiz feedback. Instructor asks for quizzes back. |
| Alyssa |  
10:00 a.m.  
Kim sits in the middle left-hand corner of the room.  
Sarah sits in the back left-hand corner of the room (staggered adjacently next to Kim) |
| Peter |  
Alyssa sits in front right-hand corner of the room sitting next to *Female student 2* (seem to be friends).  
Peter is absent.  
Kim is eating blueberry muffin in class. |
| Kim |  
Instructor asks class to post a question to Blackboard over the weekend, then goes around the class and checks homework for the day, which is in a workbook. All participants present had their completed homework.  
Kim and Sarah talk to each other…friends? |
| Sarah |  
In-class presentation commences. The presenters are *Female student 6 and 9* who talk about ‘La Journée Typique Française.’  
Sarah looks at books/notes while the presentation continues—most likely working on other homework in French workbook. |

The methodology used for the above field notes is the *audit trail* (Sendelowski, 1986). In this method, one concedes that field notes are rather messy and at times only fully comprehensible by the researcher him/herself. However, the *audit trail* attests that readers should still be able to
somewhat follow the ideas portrayed by the field notes, and that the “actions and decisions” made by the researcher should allow outsider to assess auditability (as cited in Mulhall, 2003). My own personal method of field notes is as follows:

1. *How students and the instructor behave, move, speak, and interact.*

2. *Dialogue indicating the way in which language is used (e.g. voice intonation, French and English usage, and pronunciation.)*

3. *A record of time in order to log the chronology of activity*


The goal of the first two classroom observations (as seen in the general classroom notes in Table 3.6) was to glean an overall perception of the learning environment (e.g. the instructor, teaching methods, student comportment, student demographic, classroom arrangement, etc.). For these field notes, the researcher heeded the passing of time and attempted to keep track of the most prominent students in the class in order to assess their behavior (whether they were disruptive, cooperative, etc.). Additionally, particular attitudes and assumptions as it pertains to voice intonation and subject matter were all aspects that were deemed important to understand the student-teacher relationship and the students’ overall investment in the language and participation in classroom activities.

After all four interview participants spoke with the researcher, the following four classroom observations were expressly focused on these student’s behavior (if and to what extent they participated in class, and how they reacted to classroom material, teaching practices, other students, and the professor). These last observations were the most descriptive owing to their specificity in nature and were particularly revealing concerning the correlation between what these student’s expressed in the interviews and how they performed in class. If their behavior in
class mirrors their candid explanation of motivational tendencies during the interviews, then perhaps educators would be able to more thoroughly understand which kinds of classroom behavior are indicative of what type(s) of motivation. Being cognizant of this information could be helpful for teacher training purposes and have lasting effects on teacher education and awareness of student needs.

Table 3.6 below offers the time frame of all data collection procedures that were conducted in this study, including questionnaires, personal interviews, and classroom observations.

Table 3.6: Timetable of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/12/11</td>
<td>Entrance Questionnaire</td>
<td>20 French students</td>
<td>MAU classroom</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/11</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>French students</td>
<td>MAU classroom</td>
<td>50 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/11</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Conference room</td>
<td>27 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/11</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Conference room</td>
<td>33 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/11</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>French students</td>
<td>MAU classroom</td>
<td>50 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/11</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Conference room</td>
<td>44 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/11</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Conference room/researcher’s office</td>
<td>27 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/11</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>French students</td>
<td>MAU classroom</td>
<td>50 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/11</td>
<td>Exit questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3 reviewed the data collection procedures and purpose of each method of data collection, as well as offering specific details of the time frames these data were conducted and descriptions of participants in the foreign language classroom. The next chapter will offer the analysis and findings that were discovered from the questionnaires, personal interviews, and classroom observations.
CHAPTER 4

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Chapter four reports the analysis of data extracted from both quantitative and qualitative methods found in the surveys, interviews, and classroom observations carried out in this research aiming to discover attitudes and motivations toward learning French in a beginner level foreign language classroom at a mid-western university. This chapter is divided into three major sections that independently outline the quantitative and qualitative entrance survey data (section 4.1), the qualitative interview/observation data (section 4.2) and the quantitative and qualitative exit survey data (section 4.3), following the chronological order in which the data was extracted.

4.1 Entrance Survey Responses

The entrance survey responses will be reported in three separate sections. Section 4.1.1 will discuss the quantifiable entrance questionnaire results, section 4.1.2 will discuss the open-ended questions on the survey, and section 4.1.3 will focus expressly on the interview participants and expound upon why they were chosen based on their responses and how they fit into their specific motivational category. It is important to keep in mind that although each participant is labeled with a certain motivation type, these are simply tendencies and do not suggest that students can easily be tailored into a predetermined package with one distinct kind of motivation. Instead, degrees of integrative and instrumental motivation are used as a reference point to explore where motivations lie and how they are uniquely expressed in the individuals selected for the interviews and close observations.
4.1.1 Quantifiable entrance questionnaire results

Twenty French students took part in the entrance questionnaire, which was given at the beginning of class period to allow ample time for students to complete it in the twenty minutes allotted. The Statistical Packet for the Social Sciences (SPSS 19.0) was used in order to analyze the data. The entrance survey methodology was comprised of 14 statements, each measured on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. The questions on the survey aimed to determine two separate constructs in regards to motivation: integrative tendencies and instrumental tendencies. Three questions on the survey (see Appendix A1) were removed from the statistical evaluation because they not seem to fall within either category (instrumental or integrative). These may be investigated as relevant in later sections of the qualitative data analysis and discussion, providing evidence that motivation cannot be so easily categorized but often stems from a myriad of external and internal sources depending upon the individual learner. However, some factors such as integrative motivation and implementing the teaching of culture in the classroom have been noted as possibly having a higher level of significance on motivation than others, which is why this specific category is given more emphasis in this research.

In addition to calculating reliability statistics for each statement and construct, frequency statistics were also calculated for all survey statements, as well as for the total Mean scores for all three constructs.

4.1.1.1 Entrance questionnaire reliability statistics

The entrance questionnaire was tested before use in order to determine how reliable the questions were in determining the three separate constructs. This makes for a more efficient judgment of a research instrument, and therefore a more effective study. To this end, all 17 items
on the entrance survey were subjected to a reliability analysis where the internal consistency was evaluated for each construct using Cronbach's alpha. As reported in Table 4.1, the alpha values range from .602 to .764. The resulting alpha value for the whole scale is .711, which indicates sufficient internal consistency reliability since $\alpha > .7$ is considered acceptable (George & Mallery, 2009).

Table 4.1:
Internal consistency estimates for entrance survey subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative tendencies</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental tendencies</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral tendencies</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, Cronbach's alpha was determined for all survey questions individually, outside of the grouped constructs. No particular item would have significantly changed the alpha value if deleted; therefore, all 17 items were retained for the analysis of the data.

4.1.1.2 Integrative tendency frequency statistics

The first research question concerned construct one, integrative motivation tendencies. It aimed to discover whether motivation driven by a desire to feel closer to the French language and its speakers is a powerful influential factor for beginner-level French foreign language learners at MAU, and more specifically, to identify which integrative reasons are the most salient for these learners. Table 4.2 summarizes the frequency results for the 8 statements and the total Mean score for integrative motivational tendency.
As seen in Table 4.2, in response to Statement 1, *I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French*, 60% of the participants disagreed with the statement and only 15% agreed. This high disagreement is shown by a low mean score of 1.94. The next statement, *I want to go to a French speaking country for study or travel abroad*, contrasted in that it disclosed very high levels of agreement. Specifically, 70% of individuals agreed with this statement while only 10% disagreed. The Mean score for this statement rested relatively high at 4.1. The third statement, *French/francophone culture interests me*, yielded results that revealed hesitation on the part of the participants since a high 40% selected *somewhat agree* while only

---

**Table 4.2:**
Frequency of entrance survey responses for integrative motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Statements</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/francophone culture interests me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French is an important language to know in our current society.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend/family member really wants me to learn French.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10% disagreed. However, the results for this question are still considered in a high category since 45% were also in agreement and the Mean was 3.53.

For the fourth statement, *Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person*, results indicated a lower Mean score, 2.63, than the previous two statements, slightly slanting more toward disagreement. 35% of participants showed hesitation with selecting *somewhat agree* and 40% disagreed, while a mere 20% agreed. The following statement, *French is an important language to know in our society*, shadows a slightly lower Mean score at 2.79. A large 45% disagreed, 35% moderately agreed, and 30% agreed. The sixth statement, *I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers*, jumps much higher in agreement as well as the seventh statement, *I like being able to communicate in a foreign language*. In fact, not one participant strongly disagreed with either of these statements. 60% agreed with statement six, but the highest percentage of agreement for integrative motivation was statement seven with 80% agreeing, creating a Mean score of 4.26. Lastly, statement eight, *A friend/family member really wants me to learn French*, scored the least in terms of agreement: all but 5% intimated that they disagreed.

Collecting the results of all 8 statements yielded a total Mean score of 3.09, which indicated that integrative reasons for motivation are somewhat important factors for learning French by the majority of the participants. This fact is well illustrated by Figure 4.1, which shows that the bigger part of the sample lies within the middle around 2.88. Additionally, we can see that the responses were spread quite evenly across the pie chart (not many choosing very low or very high responses, but more centralized numbers between 2-4), which gives credit to the notion that root motives in second language learning are uniquely individualized.
Two types of responses in particular may explain the nature of the results lying in the middle and not exceedingly intimating that integrative motivation is a particularly important or non-important factor in these participants' current language learning experience. Two questions that yielded high scores and two questions that yielded very low scores ended up leveling the total percentages toward the middle. Among the eight motives, *I want to be able to communicate in a foreign language* and *I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad* were the most prominent, whereas *A friend/family member really wants me to learn French* and *I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French* were the least prominent.

It stands to reason, then, that communicative ability and the opportunity to speak with native speakers in their own country lie at the heart of integrative motivation for the participants, while an imminent need to speak with family members or friends who speak French are not a significant factor. Referring back to Chapter 2 concerning what Dörnyei (2003) discussed about
integrative motivation in a FL context, this identification process with the target language culture is not one of immediate contact, but is more so “generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language as well as the L2 itself.” The reality of the foreign language environment for these learners is that, since French is not spoken within a close proximity to the mid-western states and the demographic of this area is mainly void of French influence, having a relative that speaks French is quite rare. Additionally, most participants have not yet been afforded the opportunity of traveling to a francophone country for study abroad or other reasons and the university does not have a large percentage of French-speaking international students who do not already speak a high proficiency level of English, and so needing to learn in order to communicate with a friend is not a relatively high motivation either. As Sarah mentioned in her interview:

We’re in America. It’s not like the culture is easy to come by unless you’re actually watching a lot of French movies, listening to a lot of French music, going to plays, you know. It’s kind of difficult to come by.

(Sarah, personal communication, Nov. 16, 2011)

Alternatively, some of these learners imagine a community of their own where living in a francophone country, meeting francophone people and conversing with them is plausible in their future if their French proficiency increases over time. This can be compared with the earlier the study conducted by Nikitina and Fururoka (2006), where Malaysian students’ view of Russia and its language grew a stronger positive integrative motivation over time as the students learned more about the culture. In the current study, these French students’ view or France and its culture and the possibility of witnessing it for themselves is a convincing source of integrative motivation.
4.1.1.3 Instrumental tendency frequency statistics

The second research question concerned construct two, instrumental motivation. It focused on finding information as to whether need-based learning for career, graduation or personal/professional development purposes is a major factor influencing motivation for the participants, and to determine which aspects of instrumental motivation encourage learning the most. Table 4.3 summarizes the frequency of responses in percentages and also reveals the Mean scores for each of the 6 individual questions concerning instrumental motivation.

As seen in Table 4.3, the first statement, *It fulfills my university foreign language requirement*, had the strongest percentage of agreement at 70% with a Mean of 4.29. It is also important to note that not one participant *strongly* disagreed, but 15% did disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statements</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It fulfills my university language requirement.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard it was easy to get an A.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It filled up an open spot in my schedule.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes me a more well-rounded person.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to take French for my major/job.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second statement, *I heard it was easy to get an A*, we see the lowest Mean score in the instrumental group at 1.79 and a large 75% who disagreed. Next, the statement *It filled up an*
open spot in my schedule also received responses in the lower percentage range, with 50% disagreeing, 10% somewhat agreeing, and 25% agreeing. The following two statements received responses quite high in accordance. *It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career* prompted 60% of participants to agree, and only 20% to disagree, which the higher Mean score of 3.65 indicates. Additionally, the fifth statement, *It makes me a more well-rounded person*, had 65% of participants who agreed and only 10% who disagreed. It is also valuable to mention that no participants selected *strongly disagree* for this statement. The last statement, *I need to take French for my job/major*, showed varied results. 50% disagreed, 45% agreed, placing the Mean score at 2.77.

Combining all results for the construct of instrumental motivation, the total Mean score is 3.12—only slightly higher than the integrative Mean of 3.09. This indicates that instrumental motivation is neither a really strong nor weak factor for these language learners concerning their motivational tendencies. This fact is shown in Figure 4.2, where the percentages are uniquely varied with a slight increase of results resting within the 3.25 Mean area.

Among the six motives, the response that had the highest number of agreement was *It fulfills my university foreign language requirement*, and the response with the highest number of disagreement was *I heard it was easy to get an A*. It is interesting to note that, aside from fulfilling the immediate need of satisfying the College of Liberal Arts language requirement in order to graduate, students agreed more on the statements that indicated a future possibility for a job (like helping to get a job in the future and making them a well-rounded individual) than the statements that insinuated a concern with current situations (like *needing* to take it for their career or *needing* to get a high score). A possible reason for this is that, as college students, the immediate pressure for career opportunities is not as high as they will be at a later date. Motives
based on current career opportunities and jobs are instead replaced with collegiate classes and student activities, so their purpose for taking French is based on future plans and not on current situations. In fact, the only considerably large instrumental motivational factor directly related to their lives as students was needing to fill a requirement to graduate. Other instrumental factors that seemed important to the lives of these college students rested on future needs and possibilities, which show how they imagine their life to be in the future and the role the French language will play in it.

![Total Instrumental](Figure 4.2: Entrance survey Likert responses within total instrumental)

This ties into Norton's (2001) theory of *imagined communities*, where "individual L2 learners have images of the communities in which they want to participate in the future, and that makes these 'imagined communities' have a large impact on their current learning" (as cited in Kanno, 2008, p. 21). While Norton also emphasizes that this idea incorporates individuals
influencing the learners (for example, child L2 learner's and their parents or guardians), this
theory can be applied to the current context. Outside individuals did not seem to affect
motivation in these participants as discovered in both the integrative and instrumental
motivational survey results, and so this vision of their future plans in using French stem mostly
from within themselves.

4.1.2 Open-ended entrance questionnaire results

The benefits in allowing open-ended questions like the ones utilized in this research’s
surveys have long been discussed. Greene et al. (1987) have identified five specific rationales for
using a mixed research study: complementarity (“clarifying and further illustrating results from
one method to another”), initiation (“stimulating the development of new research questions
and/or challenging the results gained through the study’s other methodological processes”),
expansion (“adds richness to study data and should also add detail to specific aspects of the other
data collected”), triangulation (discussed earlier in the methodology section), and development
(“designed to potentially affect future steps in an existing outline research pathway”) (as cited in
Harley & Holey, 2011). Harland and Holey discovered in their research on including open-ended
questions in quantitative questionnaires, using a survey on back pain as the vehicle, found that
open-ended questions were successful at securing the first three goals of Greene et al.’s three
rationales mentioned above. They claim:

…the addition of open-ended questions to a standard self-report tool can lead to an
increased level of depth and understanding and the opportunity for a greater level of
sophistication during interpretation and analysis. (Greene et al., p. 485)

Likewise, Greer (1988, 1991), a public opinion analyst, has determined that although open-ended
questions may be more difficult to code, they measure the most salient concerns of the
participants and they accurately measure public opinion and the participant’s underlying attitude(s). This should strengthen our confidence in open-ended questions and provide a convincing rationale for their use in this study.

In the current research, the purpose for using open-ended questions were, because of the simple nature of the closed-ended questions provided, the researcher did not want to limit participant responses to these questions alone and therefore risk failing to glean true feelings toward the intended topic. Additionally, the open-ended questions allowed the researcher to determine if students understood the questions correctly and/or give space for them to indicate that they did not understand a particular question. In this research, three open-ended questions were left to the disposal of the participants on the entrance survey. Several chose to leave these spaces vacant, but this section aims to discuss the results of those who supplemented their Lykert responses with additional information. These responses were not analyzed statistically but will be discussed qualitatively. Table 4.4 offers a list of these questions along with their research goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are there other reasons for why you are taking this class?</td>
<td>To find additional motives for taking the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there any additional reasons for why you want to learn French?</td>
<td>To find additional motives for learning French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there any reasons for why you are not motivated to learn French?</td>
<td>To find motives for not enjoying French.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.4, these three questions were utilized as general statements to encourage participants to include information that the entrance survey was not able to suggest.
4.1.2.1 Additional reasons for taking French

The following table (Table 4.5) provides information about the participants who chose to respond to question one, *Are there any other reasons for why you are taking this class*, and the common trends within their results.

Table 4.5:
Results for question one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Motivation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thought it would be easy.</td>
<td>S2; S7; S8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously studied French in high school.</td>
<td>S2; S7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought it would be fun.</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered French as a minor.</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to be fluent.</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to go to France one day.</td>
<td>S13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get out of college.</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a romantic language</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name is French.</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing more than one language helpful for future.</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlates to region of study interest.</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4.5, the highest frequency of responses rested upon participants assuming the class would be easy, either because they had gleaned this information from previous students or because they had taken this class beforehand in high school. S2 mentioned, “I’ve already studied French in high school, so the class was an eas[ier] option then start[ing] over.”

Additionally, two other students responded with “I took French in high school, so I thought it [would] be an easy class” and “I heard it is [a] kind of fun and easy class, but it wasn’t” (S7 and S8, consecutively). Since the class had been meeting at least a month before the entrance survey was executed, S8 is seen offering his opinion about how the class had resulted in being quite complicated, unlike he had originally expected.
Combining all results for question one, we see that motivations for taking this class are varied in terms of integrative, instrumental, and other more individualized types of orientations (which are labeled in Table 4.5 as ‘unspecified,’ as they are not of principal focus in this study). However, the factor showing the most repetition for taking this class was because they thought it would be easy.

### 4.1.2.2 Additional reasons for wanting to learn French

Table 4.6 offers the results for question two, *Are there any additional reasons for why you want to learn French*, including the participant information, motivation type, and frequency of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Motivation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wants to work in French-speaking Africa.</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys French literature.</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous interest in French from past experiences.</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French is apart of heritage.</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of results in the above table reveals four specific reasons that participants pinpointed as additional reasons they wanted to learn French outside of the eleven possible Lykert statements offered on the survey. Results were varied, but most stemmed from integrative reasons, such as S8’s comment, “I like French literature and I thought it would be nice to read one of my favorite books in its original text.” Additionally, S7 seems to reinforce the idea that previous experience and taking “three years of French in high school” is high motivation for him to continue learning French. This does not necessarily indicate that this participant expected the
class to be easier, however, but shows that previous voluntary experience provides an obvious interest in learning the French language. Another motivator for learning French is that students desire to know more about their origins, especially in the United States where diverse cultural backgrounds are often coupled with a physical distance from these other cultures. S8 discusses that “French is also apart of my heritage,” which reinforces S12’s statement in the previous section that “my name is French.”

Overall, results for question two indicate more integrative reasons than instrumental reasons for learning French, and touches upon previous learning experience and personally motivated reasons.

4.1.2.3 Reasons for not wanting to learn French

The entrance survey focused on major motivational factors that come into play when learning a foreign language; however, this particular open-ended question allowed participants to discuss reasons that negatively affected their attitude toward learning French. Table 4.7 offers a summary of the data collected on questions three, Are there any reasons for why you are not motivated to learn French?

Table 4.7:
Results for question three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French is hard to learn and speak.</td>
<td>S4; S8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding time to study is hard.</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching method and materials are not good.</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have required textbook.</td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French is not an important language to learn</td>
<td>S15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we can see in Table 4.7, the most important factor causing lower motivation to learn French is that it is difficult to learn and speak. S4 particularly mentions, “Learning a language is so difficult, especially balancing this class with everything else going on! Finding time to learn [French] is the most difficult part,” while S8 states simply, “[French] is so hard to learn and speak.” Additionally, S5 offered a rather terse response that clearly shows his degree of frustration with learning French:

I am taking this course because I want to; however, the format [this university] has for ‘foreign language learning,’ so to speak, is lousy. The books suck, the audio files, cd’s, etc. are garbage. Without a Rosetta Stone, I will most likely lose everything I’ve learned within two years, tops. This goes the same for Spanish and Mandarin (almost completely forgot). The...department at [this university] is horrible. It is proven that interactive media is necessary. Buy some 'Rosetta Stones'!

(Questionnaire, October 12, 2011)

This student’s frustration clearly stems from both the university’s requirements and instructor’s method of teaching, as well as the materials utilized in the classroom. It is interesting to note that foreign language learning in a classroom setting does not appease the expectations of this student, but he would rather a technological approach to learning a foreign language. This perhaps shows evidence of the necessity of technology in the classroom. The French classroom at MAU was, indeed, not a “SmartRoom,” meaning that the instructor did not have easy access to the internet or other interactive media that has been established as successful mediums to support foreign language acquisition (Gerard & Widener, 1999). Although the instructor often transported a projector to and from the classroom, the inconvenience of this and the outdated material may not have been as effective a teaching tool as more interactive and stimulating activities can be.

Not possessing the required textbooks is also identified as a reason for lower motivation. S12 says, “I am usually very motivated to learn but I do not have the required texts, and the books are not on reserve in the library. Therefore, it is difficult for me to want to study.” The reason for
why this student has not decided to purchase a textbook is unknown, but may be due to the fact that college textbooks are expensive in nature. The last reason indicated for lower motivation was from S15, stating that French is not one of the most beneficial languages to know in our current society. Instead, they list other more relevant languages to learn above French: “[French] is just not all that important. It feels like, if you’re going to learn a language, Mandarin, Arabic, or Farsi is the way to go.” Peter also agrees with this statement during his interview, mentioning that if MAU’s Arabic program had a better reputation, he would have chosen it instead as it correlates to his desire to study in North Africa slightly more than learning French and would have given him broader options in his Air Force career.

In sum, the results for not wanting to learn French are varied, but the most prominent response stemmed from the umbrella idea that French is difficult to learn. This evidence is considerably ironic seeing as the main additional motivational factor for taking the class was because it was expected to be easy. Perhaps, then, it is not the class that is exceptionally difficult in relation to other classes at MAU, but that the initial expectations of being an easy class were not met and has skewed their vision of how much effort they had originally intended to invest in their language-learning process.

4.1.3 Interview participant entrance survey results

The interview participants were chosen based upon their entrance survey results. This section aims to discuss why they were chosen and how they fit into their general motivational category. Originally, the researcher intended to select eight participants to interview: one with low integrative, one with high integrative, one with low instrumental, one with high instrumental, one with both high integrative and high instrumental, one with both low integrative and low
instrumental, one with high integrative and low instrumental, and one with low integrative and high instrumental. This would allow for every possible combination of motivational orientation concerning Gardner’s (2001) binary theory of instrumental and integrative motivation. However, because of low participant responses in their desire to meet for interviews despite the extra credit offered, only the first four orientations were selected. Below in Table 4.8 is a summary of the interview participant responses, validating the researcher’s decisions for the interview selection process.

Table 4.8: Summary of interview participant results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Integrative Mean</th>
<th>Instrumental Mean</th>
<th>Overall motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Low integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter, S16</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>High instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>High integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Low instrumental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4.8, the Means for each orientation were the lowest or highest out of the twenty students who participated in the survey. The overall Mean score most relevant for this research is in bold. In the qualitative part of this research (section 4.2), the implications of both Mean scores will be discussed, as they are not independent of one another. For example, it may provide more understanding to analyze a participant’s low integrative score by discussing the lack or wealth of his/her instrumental score. The next section will delve more deeply into the sources of orientations and attitudes for these four participants by analyzing data from their personal interviews with the researcher and classroom observations the researcher conducted.
4.2 Interviews and Observations

The purpose of this section is to discuss the origins of motivations to learn French for the four interview participants examined in this study: Sarah, Kim, Peter and Alyssa. Section 4.2.1 will discuss the participants’ previous attitudes and experiences learning French and how this has shaped their current perspective towards French language acquisition at this time in their lives. Following in section 4.2.2 will be an examination of how the classroom setting and foreign language (as opposed to immersion) environment has shaped their view of learning French. Section 4.2.3 will portray participants’ personal assumptions about their decline, increase or stabilization in terms of motivation to learn French over the course of the current semester only, and lastly, section 4.2.4 will discuss how the teaching of culture over the semester may have affected their integrative motivation. In all sections, data from both the information gleaned from interviews as well as the behaviors of participants observed in the classroom will be considered important and is intertwined throughout the discussion.

4.2.1 Previous language learning experience(s)

Dörnyei (1998) has outlined in his process model approach to motivation in language learning that it is often previous learning experiences that shape one’s journey in acquiring a second language and that many factors (such as teachers, encounters with a speakers of the TL, test scores, etc.) affect the desire to learn a target language. The following sections explain in detail each participant’s perception of their uniquely tailored language learning experience in light of their ‘type’ of language motivation.
4.2.1.1 “It’s more difficult than I thought it would be, but that doesn't really make it negative” –Kim

Kim exhibited a low integrative motivation to learn French; that is, her survey responses indicated that the impetus for her language learning experience in French is not overpoweringly spurred on by a love of the language/culture or a desire to integrate herself with the target population. Congruently, this corresponds to her lack of exposure to French, as this was her first semester attempting to learn the language. Since her previous French language learning experience was minimal at the time of the interview, it can be said that the current French class she was enrolled in offered the one and only experience she had yet received, making her responses in the exit survey an extremely important factor for this variable. Her attitude at the end of class would indicate precisely how the current French class has shaped her desire to learn or not to learn French.

Indeed, her attitude about the French language on the exit survey was a negative one, though she indicated adversely in the interview, "Um, it’s been mostly positive. Um, it’s more difficult than I thought it would be, but that doesn’t really make it negative" (Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011). The hesitation one remarks here is that the difficulty of the class and the unimportance of learning this language on her major make it unnecessary for her to continue learning French. When asked about what jobs were available to her if she had the ability to learn French, she mentioned:

I think it just depends on what area of job that you are going into that would require that. For now, my profession probably wouldn’t require that I would be able to speak French to anybody. Maybe if I were going into an international sort of area that I would have to speak to people of other languages, than that would help me, but not for what I’m going into I guess.

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011).
Indeed, the exit survey indicated that she would not continue to take French the next semester or anytime in the near future.

At the time of the interview, Kim had barely 1.5 months of university French training. She mentioned that it had been a positive experience for her and she was excited to learn something new, but that it was harder and more difficult than expected. In the end, the challenging nature of the class, the impracticality of taking it for her future career, and the foreign language College of Liberal Arts requirement being completed overruled her desire to learn French and her imagined future of traveling to France someday. The immediate reality of school trumped her desired, but quite vague, vision of speaking French with francophone speakers, which therefore affected greatly her investment in learning French as a second language.

4.2.1.2 “I’ve had good teachers and bad teachers, but for the most part, I’ve really enjoyed language.” – Peter

Peter showed a high tendency for instrumental motivation, where his impending career in the Air Force fuels his desire to learn the language of where he may be stationed in the future. His previous language learning experience stems from taking two years in high school (his freshman and senior year). It can be said that Peter has formally learned French sporadically over the years and has never taken it consecutively in order to progress to high levels of proficiency. Though he has not pursued French in an ordered fashion, he has enjoyed most of his language learning experiences, while admitting to having both what he labels “good” teachers and “bad” teachers. Despite what may have been some bad experiences, he continues to learn French because it aids in communication with international students that he finds every now and then on campus or in his everyday life. In fact, his fascination with languages stems from a desire to
interact with different cultures; therefore, he has had alternative past experiences learning German
and plans to learn others, as seen by the following conversation:

        Researcher: Did you know that you were going to be a Poli[tical] Sci[ence] major or
        need it for any reason?
        Peter: No, no, that was more kind of on a whim. I had a couple of electives open
        so I just decided to take an extra P.E. class and a foreign language. My
        sister and I always talked about learning French, so that’s what I did. So
        far, I’ve studied French and German with the intention of learning Spanish,
        Arabic and Japanese.
        Researcher: Ok, so you’re really into learning a lot of languages.
        Peter: Yea. I feel like it makes communication entirely more successful if you
        understand more languages because you can open yourself up to a wider
        variety of people that you can communicate with.
        (Peter, personal communication, November 15, 2011).

        Within his past experiences, none especially stand out as being a large influence on his
        investment in learning the French language. Instead, because he has had such varied experience
        with learning French and also German, he realizes that learning environments are interchangeable
        from one class to another. His motivations lie elsewhere—in having the ability to communicate
        with people outside of his American lifestyle. This fascination with other cultures is largely a
        factor that is sourced from his personality, but also in imagining communities with others that are
different from his own.

4.2.1.3 “School French? I got more discouraged about it. It’s just so much in a short period
of time.” –Sarah

        Sarah, the interview participant with a high level of initial integrative motivation, began to
learn French her sophomore year of high school and feels as “a bit ahead of the game” in this
French 1 class. Currently a junior in her undergraduate education, she acknowledges that the two-
year pause has made it more difficult to delve into the material the instructor presents, but she
simultaneously feels as if the class is not providing her much with the information and tools for
language learning success she had originally expected. She becomes discouraged often because of the fast-paced material, and would much rather learn French on her own. While the school environment provides her with the basic underlying structures needed to learn the second language, her independent nature renders ‘school French’ incompatible with her learning style. In this excerpt from the interview, she discusses her independent study and learning orientation:

Sarah: I think I’d rather learn on my own than in a class environment. I’m more independent that way rather than having to learn what they want to teach.

Researcher: Have you taught other things by yourself that way too?

Sarah: Yeah.

Researcher: And you think you’re more successful that way?

Sarah: Yeah. Different hobbies and stuff like that.

(Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

This negativity towards French in the classroom environment is contrastingly coupled with a true desire to be fluent in the language because of an inherent love she has for French books, movies, and a desire to travel to France one day. Because of this desire, she has also had previous experience in the bilingual immersion setting of Montreal when she visited with extended family a few years prior. This positive experience outside the classroom has significantly shaped her view of speaking the French language and has promulgated a desire within her to fulfill her dream of visiting France. She says about her experience:

Sarah: I’ve been to Quebec so I actually spoke French there, like ordering my food and listening to people speak and everything.

Researcher: Did you have a good experience there? Did people accept the fact that you were trying?

Sarah: Definitely. Yes. I’ve heard a lot of bad things about France, like they don’t like us and everything. I mean, for my opinion on that, I just think that Americans want everybody to speak English. They don’t even try learning another language. So if you actually try speaking French, they’ll be nicer to you. But the people who say that don’t try. So, me actually speaking French—it was actually in Montreal—they were so nice. They treated you like you weren’t ‘the tourist.’

(Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)
Not only does this reveal her obvious distaste for adopting a typical stereotype towards this particular culture, but it also shows how positive interactions with the target language culture can strengthen integrative motivation within a learner. Alternatively, when the researcher probed Sarah about the obvious cultural and geographical differences between French-speaking Canada and France, she continues to assert a positive orientation toward the target speakers and clearly defines her vision for a future ‘community’ in France:

[France i]s probably different actually because Canada is really used to Americans. I really want to go to France someday. I really want to study abroad, but I’m a junior and it really won’t fit into my schedule for the next two years until I’m in grad school. So then I’ll have a chance to go to France on my own and experience that some day.

(Sarah, personal communication, Nov. 15, 2011)

To her, stereotypes or negative classroom experiences does not change her desire to learn French and travel to France in the future. Even though she concedes that France is different than Canada (and therefore a possibility of a negative experience still exists), she immediately asserts that she wants to go to France someday nonetheless.

Despite her current negative classroom experience, however, she considers her previous two-year experience of learning French in high school an enjoyable one because of the teachers whom she could relate to on a level far deeper than language learning alone. This investment on their students’ behalf indicates that a teacher’s investment toward student progress and well-being can be contended as another salient factor that affects the success of language learning. One teacher, whom she describes as “very goofy and a super nice lady,” particular affected the ease with which she perceived her language learning experience in high school:

Sarah: When she retired, I actually went to the library to return some French books back to her and they asked me if I wanted to say anything nice about her for this collage. So I did. She was just so grateful. She sent me a ‘thank-you’ card and everything, so that’s really nice. And then my other French teacher—I still talk to her. I saw her at my community college.
We’re friends on Facebook and we talk sometimes. It’s funny how you can be friends with your teachers.

Researcher: So do you think that was major motivation to like French or learn French, having teachers that you enjoy?
Sarah: Yeah, actually. I mean, if you can’t have a teacher that you can talk to easily, it’s kind of difficult to actually learn in the class. But yeah, I had a really good experience those three years in high school French.

(Sarah, personal communication, Nov. 16, 2011)

Sarah’s previous experience with French, then, can be determined as threefold: in the college classroom environment, in the short period of time spent in a bilingual immersion setting, and in her high school classroom environment. The two latter venues have been sources of positivity for her integrative motivation orientation, whereas the college classroom environment continues to be a place where frustration occurs regularly. Nevertheless, this had not changed her integrative motivation or her desire to become fluent in the language and imagine a community in France in the future.

4.2.1.4 “It’s like, ‘If you don’t get it, we’re still moving on’” – Alyssa

From her survey responses, Alyssa revealed a low amount of integrative motivation; that is, she did not have a strong desire to acculturate with or learn about the target population in relationship to her other interests. Like Sarah and Peter, she also had a very positive experience in high school concerning the method activities were presented in class and her teachers, calling them “fun” and “energetic.” She draws a very stark comparison between her high school experience and her college experience. When first asked if her experience learning French was a positive or negative one, she responds:

Alyssa: It was positive. Well, when I first started learning?
Researcher: Yeah. When you first started learning and ever since then.
Alyssa: Yeah, it was pretty fun I guess. I had fun.

(Alyssa, personal communication, November 16, 2011)
The goal of the clarification question directed towards the researcher insinuates a desire to make it clear that her affirmative response was not referring to her current learning experience. Alyssa sees a clear dichotomy between why she was more motivated to learn previously then she is now, mainly because of how much the teachers invested in the students back in high school and the ineffectiveness of the learning activities as successful acquisition practices in her current French class. Comparing the two experiences, she says:

**Alyssa:** Well I guess in high school, all my teachers were really happy and like, ‘Oh, I love French! You should love it too—it’s so great!’ And here, it’s just like, ‘Oh, here. You have to learn it.’ They’re not really good at explaining. They’re good, but they just move on to everything and not really make sure they explain it correctly so that you get it all.

**Researcher:** Tell me a little bit more about your teachers both in high school and now in college.

**Alyssa:** In high school, it seemed like they really had more knowledge on how to actually help the students learn. They would do other activities and more things to actually help us grasp the subject more. And here there [are] not that many teaching techniques to actually help us learn than in high school.

(Alyssa, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

It is interesting to note that Alyssa also partakes in saving face as she refers to her instructor as ‘they’ instead of ‘him.’ In this way she can give negative information in a way that seems less face threatening. Like Peter, perhaps she is conceding that the way her current French instructor teaches is a result of the university institutional policies themselves and how they ask for impossible retention of concepts at such a fast speed, as well as how they may not adequately train teaching assistants to effectively administer the material.

Overall, Alyssa’s experience is much like Peter and Sarah’s in that their high school French classes are seen in a much more positive light than their French class at the university. The reasons for this is because, in high school, the teachers were perceived as being more equipped to teach using tried-and-true methodology. They had more energy in showing clear investment in not only the students, but also exhibited a love for the French language and for
instilling this desire in their students, as both Alyssa and Sarah mention. Now in college, all of them witness the instructor not being motivated to teach the class and/or not employing sufficient language learning activities in the classroom, which they perceive as being important for their language learning success.

### 4.2.2 The foreign language classroom environment

This study is focused on learning French in a foreign language environment (outside the culture and interaction with the TL speakers) as opposed to second language environment (immersion in the TL culture). The dynamics of the foreign language classroom environment has been viewed as focusing more thoroughly on instrumental motivation, since most students enroll in the class because of an outside requirement. However, even those students who take this course out of their own volition are still driven by the desire to attain an A—another instrumental motivational factor. The interview participants discuss in detail how their classroom environment affected the way they learned French over the course of the semester.

#### 4.2.3.1 “I feel like I’m not learning enough.” —Sarah

Gardner (2001) has determined that motivation and attitudes perceived in language learners will account for differences within their activity in the classroom. He states that, after assessing the orientations and attitudes of learners before observing their classroom behavior, those who show signs of the integrative orientation would “volunteer answers more frequently in class, get more answers correct, and express more satisfaction with the class than those with lower levels of attitudes and motivation” (p. 17). Several other studies have indicated that higher motivation results in more active participation as well (Gliksman & Gardner, 1982; Naima,
Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978). However, the French class in the current study has shown that Sarah, the student with the highest integrative motivation in class, was one of the students who rarely participated. When asked about her participation, she notes:

I try to. A lot of the times the material we’re covering, the verbs and everything. He gives us a verb and then we have to write the different forms of it on the board. And I just don’t do that because I already know it. A lot of the things I already know… I mean, I participate. I actually try to. I try harder than a lot of other people in the class. I think they just kind of feel it as a joke. One person next to me, I was trying to help him out and he wasn’t even paying attention. He was just lost, playing with his iPad. Not even taking the class seriously. You know, not even trying.

(Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

Even though she insists her participation is somewhat high, classroom observations noted that she was often engaged in other material and not working on activities assigned for the class. Here, her integrative motivation has not stimulated more of an interest in the class activities, but rather a disappointment with the class and lowered motivation to learn. This study only observed one high integrative student’s orientations and actions in class, however, and may not be generalizable to all high integrative learners.

4.2.3 Perception about change in motivation

A large facet of this study is to expose how motivations to learn French are subject to change over the course of language instruction depending upon the perception of the students in the class. Interview participants were asked to state their own opinion on how their motivation has waxed or waned throughout the semester. Their perceptions and attitudes towards their motivation and how this class has affected their motivational behavior and overall investment in learning the language will be discussed in this section.
4.2.3.1 “I was more optimistic before” –Sarah

Sarah’s previous enthusiasm for language learning had come from inspiring high school teachers and an intense love for the things relating to the French culture. Initially, she exhibits a very high integrative motivation and was searching for more insight into the French culture throughout the class, as well as becoming more grammatically and conversationally knowledgeable in the French language. When asked towards the end of the semester if her motivation had changed, she responded:

I was more optimistic about [French before]. I was looking forward to it where I just really wanted to learn the language and now I just feel like I haven’t really been learning as much as I wish I had. I’m learning more grammar and just trying to write it even though…we’re learning more grammar, but not really more words. So he expects us to write sentences because we know the grammar, but we don’t know actually what words to put in it.

(Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

Although her motivation to learn the language in terms of integrative orientations seems to not have changed (i.e., she still loves French culture and wants to be fluent in the language someday), her immediate desire to learn the language in this French class has lowered because her individual expectations were not met. Consequently, her rate of acquisition based upon her current learning environment is assumed to be lower than if the expectations of this class she originally had were met and cultivated.

4.2.3.2 “If only slightly” –Peter

Peter, who originally held high instrumental motivations for learning French, noticed a small decrease in his motivational behavior. Much like Sarah, his original reasons for learning French because of his future career in the Air Force has not seemed to alter; however, his immediate desire to learn the language has decreased in his opinion:
[My motivation has changed], if only slightly. Just because I realized that not every professor is ‘fantabulous’. I understand that it may not be as fun as it was in high school, but it is definitely still entertaining.

(Peter, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

For him, the reason lies within the classroom environment—specifically, how the teacher approaches language learning in the classroom. While we can determine that the instructor of this French class may have had some responsibility in sustaining the higher level of motivation in these students, it is also important to note that their deep-seated reasons to learn French has not been altered by the classroom experience. For example, Peter says about his career:

Peter: I don’t intend to pursue a career maybe specifically in France or Canada or Niger or any of these solely French-speaking cultures, but because my career is going to send me in that region where some people speak French, some people speak Arabic and a lot of different dialects, that somewhat interests me to learn about the culture.

Researcher: But only from a career perspective.

Peter: Yeah. That’s what I was thinking at the time, strictly a career perspective. It is interesting. It’s good to know. I don’t think I’ll go out of my way to learn all the nuances of every single individual culture though.

(Peter, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

His dedication to learning about the North African culture specifically for professional reasons, and his intense affirmation of continuing to learn French the following semester at the same university, is a strong indication that his instrumental motives are still high. His personal goal of achieving a communicable knowledge of French is a much stronger indication of his language learning success than the slightly negative classroom experience he has outlined over the course of the current semester.

4.2.3.3 “I still really like it” –Kim

Kim, originally placed at having low integrative motivation, did not seem to change her motivational behaviors over the course of the semester. She states:
My attitude was pretty positive [at the beginning]. I was kind of excited to learn something new. I thought it would be difficult—and it is—but I still really like it. [I think my attitude] is about the same [now].

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Because she did not have strong motivations initially to learn the language, aside from fulfilling the College of Liberal Arts language requirement, she does not pinpoint any particular reason for why her motivations would have shifted over the semester. Additionally, since this is her first attempt at learning the French language, any change in motivation would have been introduced sometime over the four months of instruction. In the end, however, the low integrative motivational orientation in this individual rests relatively the same, as does her attitude toward learning about the French culture (e.g. that French would be difficult but interesting).

4.2.3.4 “I’m in college and have other things to worry about” – Alyssa

Alyssa, initially categorized as exhibiting low integrative motivation for learning French, has indicated a decrease in motivation over the course of the semester. She attributes this to the added stress of being a college student and having less time to dedicate to her classes—even those she enjoys:

[My motivation has changed] maybe just because I’m in college and I have other things to worry about and other classes to focus on then just French. Whereas in high school, I had other classes too, but I had more time so I could focus more on the language. And right here it’s like, ‘Oh my God, this is so hard.’ Now I have to worry about Anthropology class and other classes too.

(Alyssa, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

The difficulty of the class and the decreased amount of time to dedicate to her French studies, as compared with her previous experiences in learning French, has contributed to an overall decrease in motivation in her opinion.
Overall, Sarah, Peter and Alyssa have all indicated that their motivation to learn French over the course of the semester has waned, whereas Kim indicates her motivations have remained consistent. It is interesting to note that not one interview participant intimates an increase in overall motivation to learn French after 4 months of instruction during this beginner level class at MAU.

4.2.4 Perspectives on culture

4.2.4.1 The effects of teaching culture in the classroom

Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) have determined in their earlier study that “the presence of integrative motivation presupposes that learners are familiar with the country and culture of the language they learn or have had some encounters with the native speakers of that language” (p. 4). In order for integrative motivation to take place, then, an understanding of its culture is important. Out of the four interview participants, it was Sarah and Peter who truly had a deep understanding of the French and francophone culture. Peter spoke extensively about the lifestyle in North Africa where he would like to be stationed in the Air Force, and Sarah’s extensive time spent on watching French movies, reading French novels, and even her brief trip to Quebec all give them a sense of understanding of the culture of the language they are attempting to learn. Kim and Alyssa, however, were lacking in knowledge about French culture and were not able to provide much information on where the language was spoken or anything specific about France or francophone countries apart from what they have regarded through television, movies or other media outlets. Kim says about traveling to France in the future:

[F]or the future…I mean, for right now, I don’t really plan very far into the future anyway. Maybe one day if I decide when I’m working and I have money to take a vacation, maybe I would pick…I think Paris, from what I’ve seen on TV, is a pretty city. Maybe I would go there. But, there’s no reason why not I guess. I just don’t really plan vacation that
much or think about it…. I only think of a few of the French stereotypes, but I don’t really
know a lot of the French stereotypes. From the class, he said that so many countries speak
French, but they have their own culture probably, so you can’t really stereotype all those
countries.

(Kim, personal communication, Nov. 15, 2011)

It seems evident that both Kim and Alyssa are aware that particular stereotypes are not necessarily
true about the target language culture, but they do not actually know the truth with which to
replace them. Instead, they look to the media for answers and show a tentative accordance with
the information they have gleaned from these sources.

Because most of the students in the class were at a beginner level proficiency level, one
can assume that an extensive knowledge of France and francophone countries is not deeply rooted
in their ideologies. Kim believes that the cultural parts of the classroom teaching were one of the
most interesting aspects of class and wishes that the instructor had focused more on teaching
culture, though she admits that learning the language skills is more important:

Kim: I like the cultural parts of [the book]. But, I mean, they’re very brief
section in the books. It’s not as extended as the vocabulary parts.
Researcher: Would you rather it be longer with more culture, or do you like having the
strict vocabulary and sentence structure?
Kim: I guess, I think it’s an appropriate amount for the cultural part because
we’re supposed to be learning how to speak French, but it’s nice to know
cultural facts while we’re studying the speech part.

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Once culture was taught in the classroom, however, both through the medium of the textbook and
from the instructor himself, integrative motivation was seen as having a slight, steady rise over
the course of the semester. This indicates that the more a student has a better comprehensive
understanding about the target language and its culture, such as their beliefs and traditions, the
better a student can judge whether the L2’s culture is attractive to them or not (often an
unconscious decision on their part). Additionally, if students are interested in francophone culture,
as indicated on the surveys and interviews, then perhaps more focus on teaching culture in the
classroom would help rectify the disconnect between student and teacher values that was apparent in this class and boost integrative motivation even more.

4.2.4.2 Comparison between American and TL culture

“In the United States, foreign language learning is normally construed as an academic pursuit which is optional at best, and is not seen as a matter of survival” (Kinginger, 2004, p. 221). While this may be true, some students in this study also find French more attractive because of their attitudes toward their own culture. Sarah, in particular, shows quite negative attitudes towards American culture. Living in the same rural town in the Midwest all her life has shaped her desire to travel and be apart of something bigger than herself. She expresses distaste that, ethnically, she is a combination of several different cultures, because to her, that is one definition of an American that disappoints her.

I love classic cultures. America, I love it because it’s our home country or whatever. But it’s only 200 years old. There isn’t much to it. I love England’s culture because it’s very classic going from so many centuries until now and it’s pretty much the same with France. (Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

One major foundation of Sarah’s integrative motivation ultimately stems from her desire to be different than everyone else around her and separate herself from the monolingual geographical area she currently resides in.

In terms of globalization and the ‘privilege’ of speaking English that Sarah finds such a distaste for, Kinginger (2004) says, “Despite the dominant ideology of monolingualism, foreign language learning in the US is, nevertheless, often an attempt to claim a more complex and more satisfying identity—an attempt that conflicts with implicit monolingual ideologies as well as societal power relations of race, class, and gender” (p. 222.). Monolingualism is not something that any of the interview participants wish for their future, but Sarah and Peter have a tendency to
form stronger identities with their bilingual future French/English self than Alyssa and Kim do.

Peter prides himself on having a strong aptitude for learning languages and boasts about the active battery test he took that describes his ‘gift’:

Peter: I pick up on pronunciation really easily and sentence structure really easily. And this was proved when I took an Active Battery for the United States Marine Corps back in the day so that I could. It was probably the hardest test I’ve ever taken. It made up a gibberish language and it determined how rapidly you could catch on to the sentence structure and pronunciation of the language. And only a 5th of a percent of the American population can pass this test, and I did [laughs].

Researcher: A fifth you said?

Peter: Yeah. 5th percent. I guess I do have a natural aptitude and I base that just on that test. I know foreign languages don’t come naturally to everybody. Pronunciation is really difficult and so is sentence structure.

(Peter, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

On the other hand, while Kim recognizes the importance of communicative ability in a second language and thinks it would be ‘cool’ to speak another language, she does not find it as necessary in her life.

I think it’s impressive to be able to like…to be fluent in more than one language. I don’t really know if it’s necessary for me, you know, but, I don’t know, I think it’s impressive when people can speak two or three different languages.

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Therefore, all participants’ idea of culture is varied and plays into their strength of integrative and/or instrumental motivation. Having an imagined community in the future living amongst the target language culture plays a large factor in having strong investment in the language for them; on the other hand, not sharing a future vision of living or communicating with the TL culture is a factor that contributes to lower integrative motivation—and in fact, lower investment in the language in general.
4.3 Exit survey responses

This last section discusses the exit questionnaire in light of what was revealed in the interviews and observations of the four interview participants (section 4.2). In this way, the effectiveness of quantitative and qualitative data working together can be explored. This comparison can aid in determining the effectiveness of the survey in finding the true motivations of the interview participants. Additionally, the exit survey responses are particularly telling when juxtaposed with the entrance survey responses in order to reveal how motivation has changed in the participants’ attitudes as determined by the surveys over time. Therefore, section 4.3.1 will discuss the quantifiable survey data, examining the exit survey data in light of the entrance survey responses in order to determine if and how motivational orientations have shifted within the same group of students over the course of the semester, especially in the interview participants. Lastly, section 4.3.2 will reveal the open-ended question survey data unique to the exit questionnaire.

4.3.1 Quantifiable exit questionnaire results

Fifteen French students took part in the exit questionnaire. Similar to the entrance questionnaire, the survey was given towards the beginning of class period to preclude time restraint issues and was analyzed statistically using the Statistical Packet for the Social Sciences (SPSS 19.0). The only modification executed between the entrance and exit questionnaire was that the first six questions on the latter concerned participants' opinions about the class now that it was near completion in lieu of statements related to their impetus for initially enrolling in the French class. The second portion of the survey concerning general perspectives about learning the French language was not altered. The next sections discuss the results of the reliability statistics, and frequency analyses for both entrance and exit survey data through paired sample
statistics to determine change in Mean for all survey statements within their established constructs of integrative and instrumental motivation.

### 4.3.1.1 Exit questionnaire reliability statistics

The exit survey was examined through SPSS before given to the actual participants in order to find out how reliable the questions were in determining the two separate constructs. All 17 questions were subjected to a reliability analysis where the internal consistency was evaluated for each survey statement individually. The resulting value for the entire scale was .887, which indicates sufficient internal consistency reliability since $\alpha > .7$ is an acceptable number (George & Mallery, 2005; 2009). No particular item would have significantly changed the alpha value if deleted; therefore all 17 items were retained for the analysis of the data.

### 4.3.1.2 Integrative tendency paired samples $t$-test statistics

The first research question was based upon construct one, integrative motivational tendencies, which determined the extent of how much students were driven to learn French by an interest in 'integrating' with the target language culture. Table 4.9 summarizes the paired sample tests for the frequency results of the eight statements. The differences found in total Mean score for integrative motivational tendency are shown, as well as the significant differences (shown as the $p$ value) for each statement. Table 4.9 specifically offers comparative data between the exit and entrance questionnaire concerning the eight questions with integrative motivation tendency. It offers the number of participants who attempted to answer each question, the Mean and standard deviation for both the exit and entrance questionnaire, the difference in Mean between each questionnaire, and the $t$ value. Most importantly, Table 4.9 shows that the only statistically
significant positive difference is the response to the statement *French/francophone culture interests me.* This is evidence that throughout the semester, the rise in integrative motivation was largely due to the increase in interest in the TL culture. Correspondingly, the teaching of culture either through the instructor or through the textbook must have contributed to this rise in integrative motivation.

Table 4.9:
Paired samples $t$-test statistics for integrative tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Entrance Survey M</th>
<th>Exit Survey M</th>
<th>Diff. M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/francophone culture interests me.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French is an important language to know in our current society.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A French/family member really wants me to learn French.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p < .05$
In order to determine if the rise of integrative motivation was, in fact, due to either the cultural facts present in the textbook or taught through the teacher, two additional statements were included in the exit questionnaire that were not able to be included in the paired sample t-test. The first statement, *The textbook contained interesting cultural material I wanted to read*, garnered 93.4% of accordance and *The teacher told us interesting things about France/francophone culture* brought in 80% of accordance. Additionally, none disagreed with either statement. Therefore, there is a high correlation that the rise in interest in the TL culture stemmed from both the textbook material and the teacher’s cultural input throughout the semester.

Totaling the results for the construct of integrative orientation for the exit survey by itself, the Mean score is relatively high at 3.34, which has risen from the entrance survey’s total Mean score of 3.09. From this, we can deduce that at the time the exit survey was distributed, integrative motivation was indeed an important factor for second language learning in this French classroom. Additionally, it can be deduced that integrative motivation has risen throughout the course of the semester, mainly because of the increase interest in culture. This interest in culture seems to have stemmed from both the textbook and teacher’s involvement of culture intertwined with the teaching of the French language.

As in the entrance questionnaire, the two statements that garnered the most agreement was *I like being able to communicate in a foreign language* and *French/francophone culture interests me*. The agreement with these two questions again solidifies the importance of imagining a future stage in life where communication with the target language culture and its speakers is possible. The strongest percentage of disagreement on the exit questionnaire was with the questions *I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French* and *A friend family member really wants me to speak French*. This reinforces the idea that an immediate need to speak the
language is not a considerable concern for these French learners, but the importance lies amidst future plans for their lives.

Figure 4.3: Exit survey Likert responses within total integrative

Figure 4.3 above offers the results for integrative motivation statements on the exit questionnaire, where the wide distribution of responses (similar to the entrance questionnaire) gives evidence that motivation is a highly subjective issue in language learning and depends upon the individual learner. However, Figure 4.3 also offers proof that while students continued to avoid statements of complete discordance, the higher distribution of answers between 3 and 3.5 on the Likert scale indicate that their responses were more favorable towards integrative motivation than on the entrance survey.
4.3.1.3 Individual comparison between integrative exit and entrance survey data

This section will explore the similarities and differences between the exit and entrance survey data within construct one, integrative motivation, in order to determine how integrative motivation has increased over the semester on an individual basis. Because the entrance and exit questionnaires were given to whatever students were present in class at that time, a discrepancy inevitably occurred when additional students took the exit questionnaire or students who had taken the entrance questionnaire were not present to take the exit questionnaire. In order to rectify this, the researcher only compared those students who took both the entrance and exit questionnaire for examining the change in motivation over time. Following is a chart (Figure 4.4) that explains which of the thirteen student responses were chosen to be analyzed out of the twenty-two students in class and juxtaposes their exit and entrance questionnaire results only on those integrative questions that were identical on both surveys.

![Figure 4.4: Comparison of integrative results](image)

*Figure 4.4: Comparison of integrative results*
As displayed in the figure above, ten out of thirteen participants realized an increase in integrative motivation over the course of the semester, while three participants’ integrative motivation decreased. This concludes that the overall trend for the French class was to increase in integrative motivation.

Table 4.10:
Statements showing change in integrative motivation in interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrative Statements</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/francophone culture interests me.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French is an important language to know in our current society.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend/family member really wants me to learn French.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHANGE IN MEAN</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>+ .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>+ .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>+ .13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Above (Table 4.10) documents the questions that were most prominent in affecting integrative motivation for the interview participants in particular. The change in motivation over time excludes Peter, the interview participant with a high instrumental orientation, because he was not present at the time the exit survey was distributed. As detailed in the table below, all interview participants who completed the exit survey noticed a slight increase in integrative motivation over time during the course of the semester. Alyssa, the interviewee who was originally placed as low instrumental, witnessed the highest increase in integrative motivation with a positive Mean growth of +.38.

Statements concerning wanting or needing to speak French to a friend or family member (Statements 1 and 8) shows no change in responses; however, statements indicating an interest in the cultural factors of the language and its speakers did show an increase in scores. Both Alyssa and Kim selected a higher response for statement two, *French/francophone culture interest me*, and Kim also selected a much higher response for *I want to go to a French/francophone country for travel or study abroad*. Additionally, statements speaking particularly to the acoustic elements of the French language also received a higher selection of responses on the Lykert scale. Statement 4, *Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person* suddenly seemed of high interest to Sarah, who had originally indicated on the entrance questionnaire that the statement did not apply to her (N/A). This may be due to the fact that, as one becomes more fluent in a language, the qualities of pronunciation and intonation become more a factor of interest. Indeed, her interview explicitly detailed her positive opinion on the attractiveness of the French language and how impressive it sounds.

*I like to impress people. I know a few phrases that I say when people, when they say, ‘Oh, you know French?’ It’s just nice to have something different. I mean Spanish, everybody knows Spanish, but French is kind of cool. Me and my boyfriend were hanging out and he*
said, ‘what do you want to do?’ and I say ‘je ne sais pas.’ And he knows by now what that means.

(Sarah, personal communication, November 16, 2011)

The last noticeable different between the entrance and exit questionnaire for the three interview participants concerned statement 7, *I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.* Alyssa showed a large jump in agreement, however Kim’s selection actually decreased. This shows that Alyssa seems to enjoy attempting to speak French after a semester’s worth of instruction; however, Kim has decreased in her desire to do so.

4.3.1.4 Instrumental tendency paired samples *t*-test statistics

The second research question was contingent upon the construct of instrumental motivational tendency. The table below (Table 4.11) reveals the paired sample *t*-test statistics between the exit and entrance survey for this construct, as well as the number of responding participants, the Mean, Standard Deviation, *t*-value and *p*-value for each statement within it. Additionally, the difference between Means is given.

Table 4.11:
Paired sample *t*-test for instrumental tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Entrance Survey</th>
<th>Exit Survey</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It make me a more well-rounded person.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>-.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to take French for my major/job.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at p < .05
The above table reveals that none of the differences in responses between exit and entrance survey were statistically significant. In fact, for statement number one, *It makes me a more well-rounded person*, no difference at all was recorded over the course of the semester. The Mean score for the entire construct of instrumental motivation totaled 3.66 on the exit survey, which is relatively equal to the Mean of 3.69 for these three instrumental statements indicated on the entrance survey. From these results, it is clear that instrumental motivation for taking French did not change for these students over the course of the semester, though the higher Mean shows it is still a salient factor for these second language learners in general. Figure 4.5 reveals the total percentages of the frequency of responses for instrumental motivation on the exit survey. As the figure below discloses, the most frequent results for instrumental motivation rest around 3.35 to 4.00, which is relatively high. However, these results mirror what was found in the entrance survey and has not changed over the course of the semester.

*Figure 4.5: Exit survey Likert responses within total instrumental*
4.3.1.5 Individual comparison between instrumental exit and entrance survey data

This section will explore the similarities and differences between the exit and entrance survey data within construct two, instrumental motivation, in order to determine how and why instrumental motivation has remained consistent over the semester.

Below is a figure (Figure 4.6) that explains which of the thirteen student responses were chosen to be analyzed out of the twenty-two students in class and juxtaposes their exit and entrance questionnaire results only on those instrumental questions that were identical on both surveys. Results in change over time in instrumental motivation were much more varied than integrative orientation. Four students remained the same, five students decreased in instrumental motivation and four students increased in instrumental motivation.

Figure 4.6: Comparison of instrumental results
Following is an in depth description of the three interview participants who partook in both the exit and entrance survey, Sarah, Alyssa and Kim.

Table 4.12:
Change in instrumental motivation in interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Statements</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 It makes me a more well-rounded person.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I need to take French for my major/job.</td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL CHANGE IN MEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah, S9</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa, S13</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, S17</td>
<td>+.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the data above, we can glean that Sarah has significantly reduced her instrumental motivation by -.66, Alyssa has relatively remained the same considering her instrumental orientation, and there has been an increase of instrumental orientation for Kim by +.34. Since the time she completed the entrance questionnaire, Sarah has come to the conclusion that French is not necessary for her major of Communication Disorders or her minor in Rehabilitation. While her integrative motivation has increased, any practical need or job-related obligation in college is clearly not important to her. Kim, on the other hand, showed a stronger agreement to the statement *I need to take French for my major/job.* According to her interview, it would seem that the higher response stems from her awareness of the College of Liberal Arts language
requirement, where she must take two semesters of any language in order to graduate. When asked if French would be helpful for her future career, she explicitly states:

I don’t think it would be helpful at all [laughing]. It’s just a requirement that I have to have. Maybe Spanish would be more practical, maybe. But, I don’t know. I just kinda wanted to learn French. I think French just sounds prettier, I guess, than Spanish […] I don’t think I’ll ever speak French while I’m in my career. I think it’s more ‘can you learn something new?’ and apply it that way.

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Therefore, although Kim does not believe she will ever use French outside of school out of necessity or within the dynamics of her future career, she concedes that the principle of language learning in general could aid her as a paralegal.

Overall, the change in instrumental motivation for all 13 students who took both the entrance and exit questionnaires was extremely varied. This differed from integrative orientation, which had a gradual incline across the board. Even though results for integrative motivation for the class were seen as slightly higher by the end of the semester, the comments from the interview participants as well as some of the survey participants indicated that their overall motivation was lower by the end of the class period. Gardner mentions that this may be an indication that instructors are not motivating their students enough: “If motivation and attitudes continually decline over the course of the year, it throws into question the motivating capabilities of the teachers concerned.” While some burden may be placed on language instructors’ pedagogy, there are other factors that come into play which affect integrative motivation—including the predisposition for students to be interested in culture or how high and low the instrumental motivation may be in the individual, which could override the affects of the teaching of culture. Teachers, then, are most effective when acting as a bridge to information about the TL culture, people, and language. However, it is ultimately the students’ responsibility to cross it.
4.3.2 Open-ended exit questionnaire results

In this research, two open-ended questions were solicited on the exit survey. While several chose not to respond to these questions, this section will quantitatively discuss the results of those participants who did. Table 4.13 offers a list of these two questions along with their research goal.

Table 4.13:
Open-ended exit survey questions and goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are there any additional reasons for why you want to continue learning French?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are there any additional reasons for why you do not want to continue learning French?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table 4.13, these questions gave participants a medium to explicate why they do or do not want to continue to learn French, even if they are obliged to do so for some reason or another (e.g. did not pass the course, graduation requirements, other outside pressure). It also intimates if the current course had any affect on the participants’ attitude on whether or not they want to continue learning French. The next two sections will provide the results for these two open-ended questions on the exit survey.

4.3.2.1 Reasons for wanting to continue learning French

Table 4.14 offers the results for question two, *Are there any additional reasons for why you want to continue learn French*, including the participant information, motivation type, and frequency of responses. The summary of the results in Table 4.14 show five distinct reasons that participants indicated were important for them in why they want to continue learning French. One of the most common responses was integrative in nature—wanting to communicate in their
second language to speakers of that language. S11 specifically pinpointed her French heritage as a reason for learning French, and wanting to understand more about her past relatives. Other reasons for wanting to take French were instrumental in nature; for example, needing to take a foreign language requirement but not interested in other languages the university has to offer, and societal pressure to be communicable in a foreign language in order to be considered educated and professionally equipped for life.

Overall, the following list of reasons repeats some of the previous responses discussed for our interview participants, indicating that some motives have remained the same throughout the entire semester. Not wanting to take Spanish, wanting to communicate in a foreign language, and wanting to feel closer to their heritage are motivations that have not changed throughout the semester over time.

Table 4.14:
Results for question one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Motivation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wants to communicate with speakers in Africa or France</td>
<td>S4; S8;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite country is France.</td>
<td>S4; S8;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the most interesting languages at MAU that isn’t</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apart of heritage/to learn about past relatives.</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to be bilingual in today’s diverse society.</td>
<td>S14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 Reasons for not wanting to continue learning French

Table 4.16 offers the results for participants responding to the second open-ended question, *Are there any additional reasons for why you do not want to continue learning French?* In order to fully understand why French is an important and desirable language to learn for these students,
it is also important to discover why some students may think the opposite. Here in Table 4.16, we see that S2 may have become frustrated after learning French all her academic life and has reached a fossilized level where she cannot break through in order to reach higher levels of competency. Other responses indicated that learning a language is time-consuming and requires more investment than some people are willing to give. S11 again shows frustration that the fast-pace movement of the class is not conducive to her learning style, while S6 is struggling because French is actually his third language, and he often confuses English and French with influence from his L1, Mandarin.

Table 4.15: Results for question two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Motivation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already studied it, so hard to move up to a different level.</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-consuming.</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard because still studying English.</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to learn as quickly as they want me to.</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, reasons for not wanting to learn French have mirrored responses from the previous entrance survey that indicate the class and the French language is too challenging to master.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

While the previous chapter defined key themes that were relevant from the interview, survey and observation data in this study, this next chapter offers answers to the original research questions and discusses theoretical implications and limitations of the current research. Finally, the last section provides a comprehensive conclusion to the study as a whole.

5.1 Discussion

This section provides answers to the research questions proposed in Chapter 2. Two definitive categories of research questions were introduced. The initial research question correlated to discovering the motivational orientations of the students in a university beginner level French foreign language classroom in the Midwest, adopting the idea of integrative and instrumental motivation (Gardner, 2001). Additionally, the sub-questions aimed to find if the perceived orientations at the beginning of the semester changed by the end of the semester due to the classroom language-learning environment (such as the amount of culture introduced) and/or personal reasons. The second branch of research questions attempted to seek the kinds of factors that had the most significant affect on the students’ motivational orientation over the semester.

5.1.1 Answer to research question 1

1.1 What are the initial integrative and instrumental motivational patterns for foreign language university-level beginners of French?

1.3 Do these patterns change or remain consistent throughout the semester, and if so, how?
1.4 What reasons (if any) make these motivational patterns in learning French change over the course of the semester?

French Foreign language learning at Midwestern American University assumes the typical aspects of the foreign language environment that those in the field of SLA determine as having “little access to the language” or to speakers of the language outside of the university setting (Kinginger, 2004, p. 221). Aside from their professors and the foreign language departmental events (such as “French hour” at the campus Starbucks), students at MAU do not have easily accessible opportunities to communicate with speakers of the target language like those in immersion environments. Therefore, they imagine a future time in their life when and where interaction with francophone people will take place in order to motivate them to acquire French.

Adding on to Gardner’s (2001) idea of integrative motivation, Dörnyei (2003) states that it consists of “a positive interpersonal/affective disposition toward the L2 group and the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of that community.” While it was originally posited that language learners have the ability to cherish their own identity and may not necessarily need to assimilate full heartedly into the target community in order to speak the language communicably, a trend in this research shows that, for French foreign language learners at MAU, a stronger connection to and interest in francophone culture correlates to negative attitudes toward American culture. This can be witnessed through the case of Sarah and Peter especially (those with high integrative and high instrumental motivation, respectively). For Sarah, a desire to leave the country and reside in a place that has a richer cultural heritage defies the ethnocentric nature of her friends and family in the Midwest. Globalization of the English language and the attitudes her friends have towards other cultures are a source of distaste for her. In Peter’s case, a desire to progress in his career and become stationed in the Air Force in an area...
where he wants to live is very important to him. Learning French is a solid way to ensure he most likely will not be given an assignment in other parts of the world, such as in Asia. While this is a highly instrumental reason, Peter’s aptitude for learning languages and interest in learning other languages such as German and Arabic, and even his reasons for joining the Air Force in the first place, truly show underlying interest in cultures that are different from the American lifestyle.

The initial motivational orientations for the students at MAU concerning the two constructs of integrative and instrumental motivation show that orientations are extremely individualized. Both constructs indicate a central Mean, where several students had both high and low tendencies, though integrative motivation was initially slightly higher than instrumental. In the foreign language environment, this is surprising as needing to take French for the College of Liberal Arts requirements and other educational endeavors would seem to trump a desire to integrate with the target culture in a geographical location where French is rarely spoken in the community. Nevertheless, the centralized Mean placement of their integrative and instrumental attitudes may be a common theme in lower proficiency level classes in foreign language learning. In a place like Midwestern American University, the vast array of initial integrative and instrumental motivation can offer insight for instructors. It is important to be aware that not all learners are the same and many people begin and want to learn a language for various reasons.

By the end of the class period, this study witnessed a steady incline in students’ overall integrative motivational orientation, yet results were varied with the rise and fall of instrumental motivation. As culture was introduced into the classroom since the textbook had detailed cultural sections that the instructor expounded upon according to his own knowledge and association with francophone culture (although perhaps not to the extent the learners would have liked), this may have been a strong reason for why integrative motivation increased.
5.1.2 Answer to research question 2

2. What factors, including new cultural insights of the French/francophone language and culture, affect student motivational patterns throughout the semester?

The students’ “attitudes towards the learning situation” (Gardner, 1985) directly play into both integrative and instrumental motivations that are inherent within these learners. The students in this study did not necessarily show attitudes that played into stereotypes of the French language, such as being romantic, making one a more well-rounded person, or thinking that French is an important language to know in our society. Yet, all students showed an increased interest in francophone cultures by the end of the semester. Although many students did not believe French was a necessary element for their career (with the exception of Peter), the increase in integrative motivation indicates that their interest in the language was peaked. This may affect their overall investment in the target language.

Aside from culture, another major factor that affected motivation for these college students was the challenging nature of the course. Many students indicated that they enrolled in the class because they thought it would be easy and fun. Instead, they were met with various difficulties, such as the fast-paced nature of the classroom, challenges with pronunciation, and low test scores. Kim especially felt that it did not matter how often or how long she studied, she would not do well. Interestingly, she even recalled two assessment occasions where the difference in study habits played a strange role on the outcome of her tests:

| Researcher: | What grade do you expect to receive in this course? |
| Kim: | [laughs] I’ll probably get a C in this class, yeah. |
| Researcher: | Are you happy with that? |
| Kim: | Um, yeah. At this point, I would be happy to get a C. At the beginning of the class, I kind of would have like to get a B, but I’d be happy with a C. |
| Researcher: | Do you think it’s a fair representation of your efforts? |
| Kim: | Maybe.…maybe/maybe not. |
| Researcher: | Like, do you think your grade reflects how hard you worked? |
Kim: Possibly it could… I’ll just say possibly.
Me: Because I know you said you study several hours for an exam...
Kim: Yeah. It just depends. My exam scores aren’t the best even though I studied a lot more for the second test than I did for the first test, but my grade was the same. So I don’t really know.
Me: Did that maybe discourage you a little bit?
Kim: I mean, I was a little disappointed but I wasn’t gonna just give up for the rest of the class or anything.

(Kim, personal communication, Nov. 15, 2011)

Although Kim is disappointed that she will most likely not obtain the grade she expected at the beginning of the semester, she realizes that it is not for lack of trying. Receiving a low score or missing points on a test only motivates her to “try to do better on the next test,” but only because she still needs to pass the class in order to fill her College of Liberal Arts language requirement.

After these four months of learning French in the foreign language classroom at Midwestern American University, these undergraduate students have undergone a change in motivation over time. The most salient factors that contribute to lowering motivation are because of a discrepancy between student and teacher goals in regards to the fast-paced nature of the classroom and the in-class activities. On the other hand, the most important factor that contributes to a rise in motivation for most students were the cultural factors integrated into the classroom content. This may have spurred on visions of a future of speaking the target language with francophone speakers and helped create an imagined community in the students’ minds that may someday be realized.

5.2 Theoretical implications

In second language acquisition, success often derives from imagining a future reality of communicating in the target language. For learners, this is tantamount to creating an imagined community (Norton, 2000). Additionally, Kinginger (2004) says that a “learner’s dispositions
toward language learning are indeed highly variable and closely related to both real and imagined belongings within communities of practice” (p. 221). She also says that these issues rarely have large implications in the field of foreign language education; however, perhaps it is important that these ‘real and imagined belongings’ are cultivated more efficiently in the foreign language learner through an emphasis on integrative motivation. As Nikitina and Furuoka’s (1996) study showed on Russian learner’s in Malaysia, FL learners were more integratively inclined to learn the language when they were given explicit teaching of the TL culture throughout the course of language instruction. It makes sense, then, that motivation to learn a second language, if strongly tied to integrative motivation, must be taught if we are expected to see a rise in this construct. If students are not aware of or knowledgeable about the culture of the language they are learning, than integrative motivation cannot be assumed to increase. Additionally, this study showed that integrative motivation in the classroom is relatively malleable at a beginner proficiency level, whereas instrumental motivation seems not to be as easily manipulated in students. Within only three months of instruction, integrative motivation concerning the knowledge of the TL culture in this French classroom at MAU was the only motivational factor that showed a consistent increase. Judging from the open-ended survey responses, this seemed to be strongly related to interesting cultural insights that were brought to the classroom by both the instructor and the textbook materials.

Foreign language instruction in a university setting is another factor at MAU which creates a difference in how integrative and instrumental motivation is cultivated, as opposed to second language instruction in an immersion environment. The foreign language environment at MAU is one where social interaction is limited to the classroom and students must interact with one another in order for language output to take place. However, conversation and sentence-like
utterances for a beginner-level classroom seems cause anxiety and raise the students’ affective filter. As Kim mentioned, though she has formed a tentative rapport with the students around her in the classroom, she tends to remain quiet and dislike the group or pair-work the instructor requires of them even though she understands its necessary function for language learning:

Yeah. I mean, we have to participate in group-work. I mean, I think it’s important to do it. It helps you learn. Even if you don’t want to do it, you should do it anyway. And also, he’ll call on you to write your answer on the board so you have to have something there. It’s kind of required. He’s been calling people out for not participating. And it is part of our grade: participation.

(Kim, personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Not only does Kim dislike practicing French out loud with her neighbors (though she concedes hesitatively), it seems as if everything Kim is motivated to do stems from a necessity to pass the class. Therefore, the foreign language environment at MAU is only a temporary place for these students that is contrasted greatly with the imagined community they hope for in their future. For those who fail at imagining a community outside the classroom walls, motivation will stem from instrumental or other personal reasons like Kim’s, and perhaps may not be strong enough to truly reach a point of successful language learning.

In order to discuss the importance of teaching culture in second language pedagogy, Chavez (2002) highlights the necessity for language learners and instructors to come to a collective idea of what culture means to them. Often, discrepancies between student and teacher expectations hinder the effectiveness of a language-learning environment. The instructor of the university French class in this study willingly and often imputed interesting cultural aspects of his own francophone culture to the students, as well as expounded upon the textbook material excerpts on French and francophone culture. This seemed to positively and directly affect the students’ integrative motivation, as witnessed on the altered change concerning this type of orientation on the exit survey as compared to the entrance survey. Students in the class
recognizably enjoyed the interesting cultural material in the textbook and the culturally specific information the instructor promulgated during classroom discussions. Nevertheless, while no student indicated they were against learning culture in their language-learning classroom, there were indications that the type of cultural factors they learned or the low frequency of them may have not been what the students desired. In the end, however, it was shown that through Gardner’s dichotomy of integrative and instrumental motivation, the French students at MAU showed an increase in the former because of the teaching of culture throughout the semester, whereas instrumental motivation remained consistent over time. Despite unearthing this data, however, it is important to note that the four interview participants did not show a higher positive attitude to learn French by the end of the semester, according to their interviews, even though their overall integrative motivation had increased.

5.3 Limitations of this study and implications for future research

This study investigated motivational factors that influence the success of beginner French foreign language students at Midwestern American University. In this regard, there were some limitations that were beyond the researcher’s control, such as her presence in the classroom during observations. While the researcher remained in the back corner and attempted to be as nondescript as possible, the instructor’s teaching or the students’ behavior may have been affected, which in turn may have affected the quality of the data on those six occasions. For the interview participants, even though the researcher attempted to create a comfortable relationship with them by engaging in informal conversational dialogue before the interviews, anxiety over the recording device may have caused some to feel as if they were ‘on stage’ and may have affected their responses. Additionally, Alyssa’s interview was interrupted after the first ten minutes which
resulted in the necessity to relocate from a conference room into the researcher’s own office. This may have affected the ease and fluidity of her responses.

The current research was a short-term intensive study that investigated change in motivation over time during the course of a four-month semester. While participants showed change in the strengths of their instrumental and integrative motivation just over these four months, a longitudinal study on those students who advanced to Intermediate French for the next semester would offer more comparable data in understanding why their motivations shifted and what caused this shift.

Additionally, restrictions on time would be a limitation in this study. Interviewees only met with the researcher once for under an hour, and these students had already been attending classes for one month. Observations also were limited to only six occasions during the semester, which began in early October. A more spread-out approach to data collection would have offered more strength to the veracity of the entrance questionnaire as depicting an ‘initial’ orientation of motivation.

In regards to the surveys, more statements were given assessing integrative motivation over instrumental motivation, and so presented less ways to judge instrumental motivation. This was due to the fact that during data analysis, particular questions were expunged due to their inability to accurately depict the two motivation constructs of integrative and instrumental. These questions were dealt with in the qualitative portion of the study and were more adequately labeled as indicating ‘unspecified’ motives, since they were not the focus of this research. Ideally, more statements could have been inserted that procured an equal number of each type of motivation orientation being examined.
In addition, the location of this study was based in a mid-sized midwestern town in the United States at a public university, and may not be generalizable to other geographical areas with a different demographic or to other private school learning environments. In this way, the tendencies in this study are only suggestive. Future research could explore a larger number of participants to engage in surveys and interviews across several classes at different levels of French competency. Additionally, including interviews with the instructors of these classes concerning their opinions about students and personal interpretations of their teaching style could be useful information to assess where the discrepancy lies between expectations for their classroom and the students expectations of their learning environment.

5.4 Conclusion

Through delineating Sarah, Alyssa, Peter, and Kim’s journey as a French language learner for one semester and outlining the motivational orientations of their classmates, this research suggests that the cultural aspects inherent in language learning affect the imagined communities they have for their future, and directly relates more towards their integrative rather than instrumental motivation. The French students at Midwestern American University have planned a future for themselves outside of the classroom environment that include traveling to France or francophone countries and using the French language in successful communication with francophone speakers. For each student, this vision is unique and not vague. Sarah, Alyssa, Peter and Kim—who come from various positions on the integrative and instrumental motivational spectrum—all have detailed foresights of where they want the French language to take them in the future, though the degree to how strongly they believe this can be realized is variable.
For Americans such as Sarah, this imagined community is often shaped by a desire to distance themselves from the cultural norms of their own society and ethnocentric attitudes of national pride. Negative attitudes toward their home culture are often coupled with more positive attitudes about the target language culture. Interestingly, these college students did not appear to be affected by the typical stereotypes of the French language or its culture; rather, globalization of the English language and frustration with the youth and hybridity of America and its people caused a higher integrative motivation and desire to connect with French as something different and culturally rich.

This study also emphasizes that the unique identities of foreign language learners is important to characterize in a classroom university setting, often because students can all too easily ‘fall through the cracks’ and carry out the minimal effort required in order to pass a class without successfully learning much at all by the end of their experience(s). While attitudes and various personality traits are a factor in lowering student success from the start (i.e. if they do not want to learn, then they essentially will not learn), some students truly are initially motivated to learn the language; however, because of frustration with the class and complications within their language learning experience, their positive attitudes toward the language learning environment can decrease. Two of the strongest factors that have caused MAU students to want to discontinue learning French is because they consider it too challenging to learn and because of the fast-paced nature of the university classroom as opposed to their previous high school French class. Although the above two reasons were the most salient across the board, students had varied opinions on the effectiveness of the teaching methods, strategies, and content the instructor introduced in the course, indicating that individual learning styles are unique. Not only are independent learning styles unique, but they are also changeable. This study shows that even
slight motivational orientation shifts throughout one semester can affect the outcome of a student’s learning experience—whether they will actually continue learning French or not.

Although integrative and instrumental motivation have a strong correlation with the investment that language learners have in the classroom material, some of this responsibility falls onto the instructor and onto the institution itself to create an environment that is conducive to successful language learning. In fact, though foreign language learning in the United States in institutionalized settings have set National Standards, especially regarding the teaching of culture, students often show a disconnect between how this culture manifests in the classroom, as Chavez (2002) has indicated in an earlier study. Differing definitions of culture and various expectations students have of a class may not be the same as the instructor’s own assumptions. Therefore, teacher awareness of students expectations as well as investigation into the institutional standards for foreign language teaching in the United States are areas that this study on the French classroom has highlighted as important.

For educators, linking institutional or program policy with their students expectations and coming to an awareness of their own expectations of the class are essential elements in constructing a successful language-learning environment for the French classroom. A more comprehensive understanding of student expectations, their future vision and complex motivational orientations will aid educators in more successfully molding the quality of their students’ accomplishment.
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APPENDIX A-1

Entrance Questionnaire

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to those investing their valuable time in completing this survey. Your support and cooperation is greatly appreciated as a useful resource for my thesis research.

*Note: your teacher will not see the results of this survey and your responses will be kept fully confidential.*

I. Personal Information

Name:________________________  Age:______

Gender:   MALE   FEMALE   OTHER

Race and/or Nationality:_______________________

Hometown:_________________________________

Year in School:_________________________________

Major and/or Minor Department at SIUC:_____________________________

Languages spoken other than French:________________________________

II. General Perspectives about Learning French

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

1. I am taking this class because… (rate all that apply):

   a. It fulfills my foreign language requirement at my university..............1  2  3  4  5  N/A

   b. I wanted to learn French..........................................................1  2  3  4  5  N/A

   c. I heard it was easy to get an A..............................................1  2  3  4  5  N/A

   d. It filled up an open spot in my schedule.................................1  2  3  4  5  N/A

   e. I heard the teacher was good..............................................1  2  3  4  5  N/A

   f. For fun.................................................................1  2  3  4  5  N/A
Other reasons:_______________________________________________________________

2. I want to study French because…(rate all that apply):

a. I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

b. French/francophone culture interests me.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

c. I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

d. Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

e. French is an important language to know in our current society.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

f. It makes me a more well-rounded person.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

g. I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

h. I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

i. It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

j. I need to take French for my major/job.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

k. A friend/family member really wants me to learn French.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

If there are any additional reasons for why you want to learn French, write it here in your own words:
_________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________  

If there are any reasons for why you are not motivated to learn French, write it here in your own words:

_________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________  

Thank you for taking your time in completing this survey.
APPENDIX A-2

Exit Questionnaire

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to those investing their valuable time in completing this survey. Your support and cooperation is greatly appreciated as a useful resource for my thesis research.

*Note: your teacher will not see the results of this survey and your responses will be kept fully confidential.

Name:_____________________________

I. Opinions About the Class

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

a. The textbook contained interesting cultural material that I wanted to read.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
b. The teacher told us interesting things about France/francophone culture.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
c. I enjoyed the activities in our French class more than those in other classes.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
d. I looked forward to class because the instructor is such a good teacher.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
e. It embarrassed me to volunteer answers in class.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
f. I kept up to date with French by working on it almost every day.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A

II. General Perspectives about Learning French Language

1. Do you want to continue learning French in the future?   YES   NO
   Why? (rate all that apply)

a. I need to communicate with a friend/family member who speaks French.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
b. French/francophone culture interests me.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
c. I want to go to a French-speaking country for travel or study abroad.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
d. Speaking French is romantic and would make me a more attractive person.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
e. French is an important language to know in our current society.  
   1  2  3  4  5  N/A
f. It makes me a more well-rounded person.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

g. I want to be able to make friends and converse with French speakers.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

h. I like being able to communicate in a foreign language.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

i. It will help me get a job and be better equipped for my future career.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

j. I need to take French for my major/job.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

k. A friend/family member really wants me to learn French.
   1 2 3 4 5 N/A

If there are any additional reasons for why you want to continue learning French, write it here in your own words:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

If there are any additional reasons for why you do not want to continue learning French, write it here in your own words:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking your time in completing this survey.
APPENDIX B-1

Guiding Questions for Interviewee 1: Kim

**Basic**
- How long ago did you start learning French? Was it a positive or negative experience? Do you know other people who are learning (or already speak French)?
- Describe why you do or do not want to learn French.

**Career**
- How does paralegal studies play into you taking this French class?
- Do you need French, in particular, for this major?
- Why was French your choice as opposed to other language choices in fulfilling your language requirement?
- Do you think that French will better equip you for your future career in the legal realm? If another language is more prominent in this career setting, why didn’t you switch languages?

**Classroom Setting**
- Do you think foreign languages are easy to learn?
- Do you think French is especially difficult, or one of the easier languages to catch on to quickly?
- Do you think foreign language classes at SIU are hard?
- Did this influence your decision on taking the class?
- Do you enjoy your French class?
- Do you like the teacher’s teaching style? Do you think it is effective? Why or why not?
- Do you think you participate frequently in class? Why or why not?
- How often do you go to class?
- How often do you finish all the required homework?
- How many hours do you spend studying or doing French homework per week?
- Do you have any friends in this class?
- How does the comportment of other classmates affect your classroom behavior or attitude toward French or this class?

**Culture**
- If given the opportunity, would you go to a French/francophone country? Why is it not in the plans for your near future?
- Why doesn’t the French/francophone culture interest you?
- When thinking of the work “francophone,” which countries come to mind?
- What do these cultures make you think of?
- When you think of the French language, what comes to mind?
- When you think of the French culture, what comes to mind?
- Why don’t you think French is an important language in our society?
- What society do you think of when answering this question?
- Why did you choose to take French, then?
French and Communicative Ability

- Do you think French can help you in your personal life?
- What do you think of people who can speak more than one language?
- If you were to stay in the U.S. all your life, would you still feel a need to learn French?
- In what way would you make friends and converse with French speakers if you do not plan to go abroad?
- When you communicate in French and are understood, how does it make you feel?
- When you communicate in French and are not understood, how does it make you feel?
- Do you have any friends or family members who speak French? How badly do you want to communicate with them?
- What kinds of jobs do you think are available to you if you can communicate in French?

Perception over Time

- What was your attitude toward learning French before you started taking this class?
- Has your attitude toward learning French changed?
- What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
- Do you think it is a fair representation of your efforts?
- When you get something wrong, does it discourage or motivate you?
Guiding Questions for Interviewee 2: Peter

Basic
- How long ago did you start learning French? Was it a positive or negative experience? Do you know other people who are learning (or already speak French)?
- Describe why you do or do not want to learn French.

Career
- How does political science/international studies play into you taking this French class?
- Do you need French, in particular, for this major?
- If not, why was French your choice as opposed to other language choices?
- Why do you want to travel to Africa/the Middle East?
- How do you think French will help you in these regions?
- Why did you choose French instead of Arabic or an African language?

Classroom Setting
- Do you think foreign languages are easy to learn?
- Do you think French is especially difficult, or one of the easier languages to catch on too quickly?
- Do you think foreign language classes at SIU are hard?
- Did this influence your decision on taking the class?
- Do you enjoy your French class?
- Do you like the teacher’s teaching style? Do you think it is effective? Why or why not?
- Do you think you participate frequently in class? Why or why not?
- How often do you go to class?
- How often do you finish all the required homework?
- How many hours do you spend studying or doing French homework per week?

Culture
- Why doesn’t the French/francophone culture interest you?
- When thinking of the work “francophone,” which countries come to mind?
- What do these cultures make you think of?
- When you think of the French language, what comes to mind?
- When you think of the French culture, what comes to mind?
- Why don’t you think French is an important language in our society?
- What society do you think of when answering this question?
- Why did you choose to take French, then?

French and Communicative Ability
- Do you think French can help you in your personal life?
- What do you think of people who can speak more than one language?
- If you were to stay in the U.S. all your life, would you still feel a need to learn French?
• When you communicate in French *and are understood*, how does it make you feel?
• When you communicate in French *and are not understood*, how does it make you feel?
• Do you have any friends or family members who speak French? How badly do you want to communicate with them?
• What kinds of jobs do you think are available to you if you can communicate in French?

**Perception over Time**
• What was your attitude toward learning French before you started taking this class?
• Has your attitude toward learning French changed?
• What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
• Do you think it is a fair representation of your efforts?
• When you get something wrong, does it discourage or motivate you?
• Do you have any friends in this class?
• How does the comportment of other classmates affect your classroom behavior or attitude toward French or this class?
Guiding Questions for Interviewee 3: Sarah

Introduction
• How long ago did you start learning French? Did you have exposure to French before high school? Was it a positive or negative experience? Did you know other people who were learning (or already spoke) French at the time? Do you know other people who are learning (or already speak) French now?
• Describe why you do or do not want to learn French.

Career
• How does the communication disorders major play into you taking this French class?
• Do you need French, in particular, for this major?
• Why was French your choice as opposed to other language choices in fulfilling your language requirement?
• Do you think that French will better equip you for your future career? If another language is more prominent in this career setting, why didn’t you switch languages?
• Why did you consider having French as your minor? Do you have a different minor now?

Classroom Setting
• Do you think foreign languages are easy to learn?
• Do you think French is especially difficult, or one of the easier languages to catch on to quickly?
• Do you think foreign language classes at SIU are hard?
• Did this influence your decision on taking the class?
• Do you enjoy your French class?
• Do you like the teacher’s teaching style? Do you think it is effective? Why or why not?
• Do you think you participate frequently in class? Why or why not?
• How often do you go to class?
• How often do you finish all the required homework?
• How many hours do you spend studying or doing French homework per week?

Culture
• Are you going to a French/francophone country for travel or study abroad? Do you want to? Why or why not? What do you think this experience will afford you?
• Why does French/francophone culture interest you?
• When thinking of the work ‘francophone,’ which countries come to mind?
• What do these cultures make you think of?
• When you think of the French language, what comes to mind?
• When you think of the French culture, what comes to mind?
• Why do you think French is an important language in our society? What society do you think of when answering this question?
• If you didn’t take French, which language would you have taken instead?
French and Communicative Ability

- Do you think French can help you in your personal life?
- What do you think of people who can speak more than one language?
- If you were to stay in the U.S. all your life, would you still feel a need to learn French?
- How would French make you a more well-rounded person?
- When you communicate in French and are understood, how does it make you feel?
- When you communicate in French and are not understood, how does it make you feel?
- Do you have any friends or family members who speak French? How badly do you want to communicate with them?
- What kinds of jobs do you think are available to you if you can communicate in French? Do you think you would be less equipped for these positions if you didn’t speak French? Why or why not?

Perception over Time

- What was your attitude toward learning French before you started taking this class?
- Has your attitude toward learning French changed?
- What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
- Do you think it is a fair representation of your efforts?
- When you get something wrong, does it discourage or motivate you?
- Do you have any friends in this class?
- How does the comportment of other classmates affect your classroom behavior or attitude toward French or this class?
Guiding Questions for Interviewee 4: Kelsey

Introduction
• How long ago did you start learning French? Did you have exposure to French before high school? Was it a positive or negative experience? Did you know other people who were learning (or already spoke) French at the time? Do you know other people who are learning (or already speak) French now?
• Describe why you do or do not want to learn French.
• If you’re already bilingual, why did you want to learn another language?
• Explain some of the positive and negative experiences of growing up bilingual.
• How is learning a 3rd language, like French, different from how you learned Spanish? Is one harder than the other? Which way do you prefer?
• Did you decide to learn French because, as a romance language, it is similar to Spanish and you might catch on quicker?

Career
• Although you have an undecided major, what majors are you leaning towards?
• How do these possible majors play into you taking this French class?
• Why did you decide to take French even though it isn’t needed as a language requirement?
• Do you think that French will better equip you for your future career?

Classroom Setting
• Do you think foreign languages are easy to learn?
• Do you think French is especially difficult, or one of the easier languages to catch on to quickly?
• Do you think learning French is fun?
• Do you think foreign language classes at SIU are hard?
• Did this influence your decision on taking the class?
• Do you enjoy your French class?
• Do you like the teacher’s teaching style? Do you think it is effective? Why or why not?
• Do you think you participate frequently in class? Why or why not?
• How often do you go to class?
• How often do you finish all the required homework?
• How many hours do you spend studying or doing French homework per week?

Culture
• Are you going to a French/francophone country for travel or study abroad? What do you think this experience will afford you?
• Why does French/francophone culture somewhat interest you? What about it do you not like?
• When thinking of the work ‘francophone,’ which countries come to mind?
• What do these cultures make you think of?
• When you think of the French language, what comes to mind?
• When you think of the French culture, what comes to mind?
• Why do you think French is not particularly an important language in our society? What society do you think of when answering this question?
• If you didn’t take French, which language would you have taken a different language instead? Which one?

French and Communicative Ability
• Do you think French can help you in your personal life?
• What do you think of people who can speak more than one language?
• If you were to stay in the U.S. all your life, would you still feel a need to learn French?
• How would French make you a more well-rounded person?
• Although you want to go to a French-speaking country, you do not necessarily want to converse with and make friends with French speakers. Can you explain this?
• When you communicate in French and are understood, how does it make you feel?
• When you communicate in French and are not understood, how does it make you feel?
• Do you have any friends or family members who speak French? How badly do you want to communicate with them?
• What kinds of jobs do you think are available to you if you can communicate in French? Do you think you would be less equipped for these positions if you didn’t speak French? Why or why not?

Perception over Time
• What was your attitude toward learning French before you started taking this class?
• Has your attitude toward learning French changed?
• What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
• Do you think it is a fair representation of your efforts?
• When you get something wrong, does it discourage or motivate you?
• Do you have any friends in this class?
• How does the comportment of other classmates affect your classroom behavior or attitude toward French or this class?
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