

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

---

Mahurin Honors College Capstone Experience/  
Thesis Projects

Mahurin Honors College

---

Spring 2019

## Motivated to Learn: Motivational Differences in High School and University-Level Foreign Language Classroom Experiences

Roy Williams IV

Western Kentucky University, r.e.williamsiv@pm.me

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu\\_hon\\_theses](https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses)



Part of the [Education Commons](#), [Linguistics Commons](#), [Modern Languages Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Williams, Roy IV, "Motivated to Learn: Motivational Differences in High School and University-Level Foreign Language Classroom Experiences" (2019). *Mahurin Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects*. Paper 818.

[https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu\\_hon\\_theses/818](https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/818)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mahurin Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact [topscholar@wku.edu](mailto:topscholar@wku.edu).

MOTIVATED TO LEARN: MOTIVATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL  
AND UNIVERSITY-LEVEL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM EXPERIENCES

A Capstone Experience/ Thesis Project

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Bachelor of Science with

Honors College Graduate Distinction at Western Kentucky University

By

Roy E. Williams IV

\*\*\*\*\*

Western Kentucky University  
2019

CE/T Committee:

Doctor Elizabeth Winkler, Advisor

Doctor Ashley Stinnett

Approved by

---

Advisor  
Department of English

Copyright by  
Roy E. Williams IV  
2019

## **ABSTRACT**

Student motivation in the context of foreign language learning is a complex topic that influences many areas of language study. Dornyei's L2 Motivational Self Model and the concept of future self guides give some insight into the underlying motivational orientations when used to analyze self-reported survey data regarding language learning and its perceived benefits (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 456). This analysis brings to light some of the major differences between these two contexts, challenges the idea that they are identical or equivalent in learning outcomes, and suggests some practical application to the foreign language classroom at Western Kentucky University.

Dedicated to my lovely wife, Anna.

I don't know that I could have graduated without your support.

VITA

December 12, 1995..... Born – Louisville, Kentucky  
2014.....Homeschool - Elizabethtown, Kentucky

FIELD OF STUDY

Major Field: Honors Self-Designed Studies – Linguistics

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Vita.....	iv
Chapters:	
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Literature Review .....	3
3. Methodology .....	7
4. Observations .....	9
5. Foreign Language at Western Kentucky University .....	19
Bibliography.....	25
Appendix.....	27

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Language influences every aspect of our lives. From day-to-day interactions with friends, family, and peers to academic research, religion, and work, complex language is what makes the human experience unique. Because individual relationships with native language are nuanced and varied, strong emotions are often associated with language education. Each individual's idiolect, or individual expression of dialect, is uniquely shaped by the people they grow up around, their region, and their experiences. From a native English speaker's perspective on studying their own language, students often feel frustration with English classes because in their own minds, they already know all that they need to communicate. In a way, they are correct. Students grow up speaking English in an immersion environment, with the world as their classroom and have learned how to communicate *in ways that are important to them*. Academic English and its usage do not seem as interesting or important to many students, so much of early education is spent convincing them that it is important or useful.

That being said, the conversation surrounding language becomes even more complex when foreign or second languages are introduced. To clarify terms, foreign



language refers to any language not used commonly for everyday communication in the region which the learner is studying, such as English speakers learning German in the United States. Second language acquisition refers to languages that are being learned in a context where they are commonly spoken, such as English speakers learning Spanish in Mexico.

During my time at WKU, there has been an ongoing conversation surrounding foreign language classrooms. From my experience, it tends to be a polarizing topic. Students either love their language classes and are frustrated when others do not see value in them, or hate language classes and feel they have to persevere through them. Students make many claims about foreign language learning based on their experiences, both positive and negative. An effective way to conduct research is to start with these real-world observations and pull them apart. If we start with the claims being made about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of language classes by students, we have some anecdotal evidence for what is and what is not effective in foreign language classrooms from the learner's perspective.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Gardner's (2006) work thoroughly outlines the study of motivation in the context of language learning research. Gardner and Lambert's (1972) research was in many ways the beginning of the modern study of motivation in the context of language learning. This study introduced the usage of social psychology as a framework for understanding language learning (as cited in Dornyei, 1994, p. 273).

When studying motivation, it is important to define exactly what motivation is in this context, and what can be expected from its analysis. Gardner does not settle upon an all-encompassing definition of motivation, but instead cites several that are useful for considering the topic from different perspectives (Gardner, 2006 p. 349). He quotes work by Dornyei, who defines motivation as “[concerning] the direction and magnitude of behavior, and that it is ‘responsible for why people decide to do something, how long they are willing to sustain the activity, and how hard they are going to pursue it’” (as cited from Dornyei, 2001: 8, p. 349). Additionally, Gardner also quotes his own, earlier

research which defines motivation in second language learning as “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language” (as cited from Gardner, 1985, p. 340).

Another important point that Gardner makes is that researchers of student motivation must be careful in the claims that they make. Motivation is already complex and difficult to measure. It also does not have a direct causal relationship with student outcomes. Gardner states, “With characteristics that individuals bring with them to any situation, random assignment is not possible; hence, unequivocal conclusions about causation are not possible” (2006, p. 352). There are too many variables in the equation of language classrooms to make “unequivocal conclusions,” but research into student motivation can at the very least inform classroom practice and indicate areas of effective and ineffective practices.

**Future Self Guides.** A model that this research will primarily focus on is Dornyei and Ushioda’s (2009) model of language learning, called the L2 Motivational Self Model (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 456). Two of the primary components of this model that will be utilized are the “Ideal L2 Self” and the “Ought-to L2 Self.” The Ideal L2 Self is the learner’s personal, mental model of who they want to be in the context of the target language, and the Ought-to L2 Self is the learner’s personal model of what types of obligations, responsibilities, or milestones that an individual feels a learner should achieve.

The main difference between the Ideal and Ought-to selves is the type of motivation they produce. The Ideal self “[has] a promotion focus, concerned with hopes, aspirations, advancements, growth and accomplishments,” while the Ought-to self “[has] a prevention focus, regulating the absence or presence of negative outcomes associated with failing to live up to various responsibilities and obligations” (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009).

As Dornyei and Ushioda directly state in *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, “[a] basic hypothesis is that if proficiency in the target language is part and parcel of one’s ideal or ought-to self, this will serve as a powerful motivator to learn the language because of our psychological desire to reduce the discrepancy between our current and possible future selves” (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 268).

This idea is adapted directly from mainstream psychology and Higgins’ (1987, 1996) Self-Discrepancy Theory, which states that this search for equilibrium between a person’s present self-image and these kinds of “future self guides” is what fuels motivation (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 268). While the present self-image is still significantly different from the future self guides, Higgins theorized that individuals will be motivated to change to meet the expectations of the future self guides. Additionally, the researchers credit Gardner and Lambert’s (1974) work on motivation to be foundational in this model as well, since Gardner’s foundational work shifted motivational study toward mainstream psychology (as cited in Dornyei, 1994, p. 273).

Where Higgins’ model is more generally focused on motivation in general, this

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) focused, visualization-focused adaptation of the model still carries much of the same reasoning. In general, the larger the discrepancy between the present self and these two future self guides, the greater the motivation. If the future self guides are significantly different from the present self, students will be more motivated to “close the gap” and this will propel them into language learning.

An important distinction to note is the difference between future self guides and goals. Dornyei emphasizes that the most significant difference between the two is that future self guides are “experiential” and embody a convincing, holistic narrative the learner has about themselves (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 276). This differs greatly from the study of goal theory in psychology because it is complex and “involve[s] images and senses, approximating what people actually experience when they are engaged in motivated or goal-directed behavior” (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 276). Goals can be a component of future self guides, and are generally more complex in their construction than just meeting a requirement or a milestone. This is what makes future self guides more powerful than a subset of goals for motivating students to learn.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

To gather information on student experiences in foreign language courses at Western Kentucky University, a survey was conducted via email. It was distributed through several professors that were willing to help distribute it, as well as being sent directly to students who were contacted in person. The survey consisted of 11 questions, which were developed to create a general picture of their opinions on their courses and their motivations for learning a foreign language. See Appendix A for a complete list of the questions contained in the survey. The collected data were made anonymous, and the responses numbered in the order they were collected, with the only identifying information being the student's grade level and the languages they studied.

#### **Response Demographic**

Of the 15 responses collected, there were a variety of language programs represented, including American Sign Language, Chinese, Spanish, Korean, Thai, Tagalog and Russian. In addition to the traditional Chinese language programs, there

were also several students who had attended the intensive Chinese Flagship Program, which is an accelerated program with a focus on real-world application and overall fluency. At the time of response, six of the respondents were Freshman, seven were Sophomores, and two were Juniors at WKU. The respondents gender was not collected, as the focus of this research was not differences in experience based upon gender.

Roughly half of the respondents only listed high-school language courses. This was a slight change in the original focus of the survey, but provided more complex data, as it offered insight into the difference in experience between high school and university-level language courses. As can be expected, there were three responses which did not fit the focus of this study and were excluded from analysis. Two of these responses only described English classes they had taken at the university level as native English speakers. One response described experience in military foreign language courses. These three responses were excluded from the larger analysis because they did not describe experiences in foreign language courses in high school or at a university, which is the focus of this research.

## CHAPTER 4

### OBSERVATIONS

In this study, the topic that stood out as most prominent in the collected data was motivation. This, in part, was by design. The questions were designed to gain some insight into the respondent's language learning experience as a whole, but reflecting back, many of the questions were expressly focused upon student motivation. Specifically, Question 3 of the survey asks, "What motivated you to choose this particular language?" although other parts of the response also give insight into student motivation. During the creation of the survey, this seemed only to be a small part of the greater focus of the data. Once the data was analyzed, it became clear that the answers respondents gave were all rooted in their response to this question of motivation. This wealth of data regarding motivation redirected the focus of this study from a general analysis of student experiences to an inquiry into how student motivation influences language learning.

#### **Observed Motivations**

In both the high school and university responses, respondents reported three distinct motivations for studying their particular target language: (1) perception of



usefulness, (2) interest in culture, and (3) lack of choice. These categories were created by reading each response and grouping like responses. When analyzed in the context of Dornyei and Ushioda's model, these categories and their underlying motivations for language study give insight into some factors influencing their reported outcomes.

**Perception of Usefulness.** Many of the students who studied Spanish in high school (Respondents 2, 3, 4, and 14) reported that they chose Spanish because they felt it was useful. Respondent 14 specifically states: "Of all the options I had to take, I thought Spanish would be the most useful and a language I would possibly utilize in my everyday life."

In this category, the students' future self guides are somewhat similar, but with important differences. Their reported Ideal L2 Selves envisioned learners of Spanish using it in their day to day lives with native and non-native speakers. In the same way, these students also reveal an expectation they have: communication is a goal and an expectation in language learning. Their Ought-to L2 Selves see the goal as communication.

Based on the L2 Motivational Self Model, these self guides should lead to high motivation in students, since the present self (at the time of starting language study) and the future self guides are considerably different. Going from not being able to speak a language to communicating with other people in a language is a significant change. This increase in motivation is supported by the reported outcomes of these students.

Respondent 2 states "Taking a foreign language has helped me grow mentally."

Respondent 4 reported that it has helped them in their current position in an afterschool program, working with Spanish speaking students, saying “I understand them and have more patience with them on things, so in a way it helped prepare me for my career.” The students entered into language learning with the expectation that they should communicate, and this influenced them to have positive outcomes, since they had a clear image of the way they saw themselves using the language.

**Interest in Culture.** Respondents 5, 6, 7, and 13 reported that interest in a culture represented by the target language motivated them to study it. Respondent 5 states “My parents had the opportunity to travel to China. When I had the same chance the next year, I took it. I fell in love with the culture, and that is what has pushed me to learn the language.”

In this category, the students’ future self guides are also similar to those that saw language as a useful skill. These respondents’ models of their Ideal L2 Selves envisioned learners using language as a way to understand another culture better. This leads to an interesting change in their Ought-to Selves. These respondents’ Ought-to L2 Selves, expect the outcome of their language courses should be *cultural learning* rather than communication.

As with the previous category, the present self at the start of language study and their future self guides are different enough to possibly motivate students. One might expect because these students’ future self guides did not focus specifically on language proficiency for communication, they might not be as highly motivated as the students

from the previous category. However, even without a reported proficiency-focused future self guide, these respondents found opportunities to interact with native speakers and immerse themselves in culture. This desire for cultural knowledge placed them into immersion environments, which helped further their language proficiency since they had more opportunity to practice with native speakers. Native speakers who are not teachers offer a bit of a challenge to students, since they do not usually modify their speech to make comprehension easier. This challenging situation is what makes immersion force students to utilize language more and improve their skills.

Based on the L2 Motivational Self Model, these self guides should also lead to high motivation in students, since the student's self-image and the future self guides are highly different. This model is supported by the reported outcomes of these students. For example, Respondent 6 found that their language learning helped them learn about themselves, stating, "ASL specifically has opened me up to the ways in which language and culture are inextricably linked and made me analyze my own language and how that has shaped my culture and vice versa." Respondent 13 also states they have grown as a person, reporting, "I feel more cultured and well-rounded, I also have higher self-efficacy for learning about other languages and cultures." These students entered into language learning with a collateral interest in culture that propelled them forward. When students are intrinsically motivated in this way, then motivation comes more easily and is sustained over time.

**Lack of Choice.** Respondents 10 and 11, who both studied Spanish in high school, simply stated that they had no choice in the language they studied, since it was the only language offered at their schools.

These respondents' Ideal L2 Selves and Ought-to L2 Selves contained a learner who simply studied to achieve a requirement, with no specific level of proficiency as a goal. The Ideal L2 Self for these respondents envisioned themselves graduating, and their Ought-to Self saw the expected outcome of the language course as getting a passing grade.

Based on the L2 Motivational Self Model, these future self guides should be expected to lead to low levels of motivation. This is because the present self at the beginning of language study and the future self guides are somewhat similar, minus fulfilling the graduation requirement.

The respondents' reported outcomes support this analysis. These two respondents (10 and 11) were the only ones with reported negative outcomes from language learning. Depending on the individual, students with this motivation might still gain some proficiency or cultural knowledge from the courses. However, when a student's motivation is simply to pass a class or "check a box" towards graduation requirements, it can be difficult to stay motivated to do more than the minimum. One respondent from this category, Respondent 10, represented this difficulty in motivation in their response. They had the shortest response at 89 words, and when asked if they felt they benefited in any way from their courses, they responded simply: "Not really."

### **Individual Analysis – Respondent 1**

Respondent 1, who appeared as somewhat of an outlier in many ways, reported that they specifically chose their program of study because they desired high fluency in a foreign language, regardless of the specific language, stating: “I wanted to learn a language to a high degree of skill, and Chinese Flagship was the best option for this at WKU. If the Flagship here had been another language, I would likely have picked that.”

This respondent’s Ideal L2 Self is a fluent speaker who communicated effectively using the target language. In many ways, Respondent 1 and the students who see foreign language as “useful” are very similar in terms of the Ought-to L2 Self. This is seen in a later question, where Respondent 1 states, “I am hoping that when I begin to apply for post college opportunities, knowing Chinese will give me a leg up.” Respondent 1 perceives language learning as useful, not solely because of the ability to communicate, but because of the opportunities that L2 proficiency can provide.

Based on the L2 Motivational Self Model, these future self guides should be expected to lead to high levels of motivation. This analysis is supported by the positive nature of Respondent 1’s reported outcome. They feel that one of the most meaningful things they gained was the cultural knowledge that was given to them by their teacher. Respondent 1 specifically states that “[organized cultural events] felt less meaningful since they were very stereotypical “Chinese culture” activities but don’t actually give much insight into Chinese culture, whereas stories about Chinese society from my teachers do.” Especially in this individual’s case, the present and future self guides are

years apart in study and skill level. If the student maintains this desire for fluency, it can be a powerful guide that keeps them focused upon improving their language skills.

### **Motivation and Length of Response**

In this section, a word count analysis has been performed in order to investigate a discrepancy in response length based on grade level. The university-level responses were overall longer and more detailed than the high school-level responses. For comparison, the university responses were more than twice as long at an average of 541 words per response, compared to an average of 238 words per response from high-school respondents. The overall average length was 390 words. Table 1 shows the length of response per respondent and other general analysis of average, longest, and shortest length.

<b>University Language Study</b>	<b>Language Studied</b>	<b>Length of Response</b>
Response 1	Chinese Flagship	781 Words
Response 2	Spanish	332 Words
Response 5	Chinese Flagship	453 Words
Response 6	American Sign Language	744 Words
Response 7	Korean	392 Words
		<b>Average: 540 Words</b>

<b>High School Language Study</b>	<b>Language Studied</b>	<b>Length of Response</b>
Response 3	Spanish	245 Words
Response 4	Spanish	302 Words
Response 10	Spanish	89 Words

Response 11	Spanish	99 Words
Response 13	Chinese	186 Words
Response 14	Spanish	342 Words
Response 15	Spanish	318 Words
		<b>Average: 238</b>

---

<b>Overall Average Length</b>	<b>Longest Response</b>	<b>Shortest Response</b>
390 Words	R1 – Chinese Flagship 781 Words	R10 – HS Spanish 89 Words

*Table 1.* Length of Response Data. Responses are categorized by grade level.

There are many factors that could have influenced this difference in length. The length could have been influenced by the “freshness” of the experience in the respondent’s memory, based on relative length of time between taking the courses and responding to the survey. However, the length of time between the university and high school-level respondent’s learning experiences and the survey response were too similar for this to have such a great impact on response length. Respondents who only had high school second language courses were overwhelmingly first or second-year students, while those with university language course experience were mostly third or fourth-year students. This outcome may be influenced by Western Kentucky University’s recent change in language course requirements that allowed high school foreign language courses to count towards the foreign language study requirement for graduation. The younger respondents likely did not take foreign language courses at the university because they were no longer required to.

A longer response does not directly indicate a positive response. This being considered, it is reasonable to conclude that the longer (and more detailed) the response is, the more memorable the experience was for the student. Even the shortest of the university-level respondents was longer than all but the longest high school-level response. This large discrepancy indicates some distinct difference in the experiences of university and high school language learners.

### **Differences in Grade-Level Context**

Even upon a cursory analysis of the university-level responses, it is evident that the level of multi-contextualization is higher than those who took language courses in high school. These students had engagement with native speakers through study abroad opportunities, school clubs, and summer programs. All the university-level students reported positive outcomes from their language study, citing better cultural understanding, gained academic perseverance, and job opportunities. Many of these aspects which differ from high school-level respondents are simply due to context. In most cases, universities have more funding than high schools, and are more focused around a flexible schedule for students on a campus that includes a multitude of extracurricular activities.

In addition to these differences, most high schools only offer a few language programs, which led to a perceived lack of choice in two of the high school respondents.



Students are likely to be more motivated when they are able to choose what courses they study and feel they have more control over their schedule. The only two completely negative reported outcomes were from Respondents 10 and 11, who felt they had no choice in their study.

High school-level respondents had vastly different experiences. These ranged everywhere from reporting they did not feel they benefited in any way from their language courses (Response 10), all the way up to feeling they had grown as a person from studying a foreign language (Response 13).

Regardless of grade level, however, there were certain strategies and activities that students reported as being the most engaging for them: competition, interaction with other students in the target language, and presentations or prepared oral assignments.

This difference in outcomes is supported by Krashen's concept of Comprehensible Input (2017). Since university-level students are able to immerse themselves in many different contexts of learning, they are much more likely to receive comprehensible input from native and non-native speakers alike. Extra reinforcement seems to be the main difference between university and high-school level courses. This is expected, since less direct student engagement means that it is less likely that language learning is retained. It is also likely that this greater variety of teaching style makes learning more memorable for university students. This could have led to the greater length, detail, and enthusiasm of the university-level responses.

## CHAPTER 5

### FOREIGN LANGUAGE AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Western Kentucky University's decision in 2018 to allow high-school foreign language courses to count towards the university graduation requirements effectively removed the foreign language requirement for most students. University language courses are a vital part of having a well-rounded curriculum. There are many well-meaning arguments behind this change. The main implication behind this change in policy is that high school and university-level foreign language courses are equivalent experiences. Based upon the collected responses, this is not shown to be true. University-level respondents reported much more communicative and varied teaching practices as compared to high school courses, more positive outcomes, and higher motivation for learning a foreign language overall. If WKU desires to be an internationally-focused university that instills cross-cultural understanding in its students, then reinstating the university-level foreign language class requirement would help further this goal.

In regards to this specific decision, it seems that the significant difference in context and learning outcomes between high school and university-level courses needs to

be considered. In this research alone, the student-reported levels of motivation, enthusiasm, and engagement between these two contexts is dramatic. To count these courses as equivalent overlooks this difference and disregards the benefit of multi-contextualization that university foreign language courses often provide.

### **Why Study Foreign Language?**

The problem with the arguments against foreign or second language education overall, which may have influenced this decision, is the assumption that the only benefit of learning a foreign language is the utilization of the language itself. Even in the data collected for this research, many responses cited cultural learning as important and relevant to them personally.

**Opening Opportunities.** One of the most tangible benefits of foreign language study is the wealth of opportunities that it introduces to students. From leisure vacation in another country where the student now knows how to communicate, to marketing themselves well to enter into a desired career path, multilingualism can open many doors for students who persevere and gain language proficiency.

**Challenging Ethnocentrism.** The cultural experience that students gain from studying a foreign language can help them understand their own ethnocentric tendencies.

Ethnocentrism is the concept that one's own culture is inherently superior or is considered normal (Omohundro, 2008, p. 87). When living under this assumption, it may be difficult to learn about and understand other cultures, since the individual will be mentally critiquing them as "strange" or "wrong" compared to their own. When students

step outside of their own small corner of the world into the shoes of another people group, something amazing happens. In a way, the world becomes larger. They begin to understand that there are ways of living and of experiencing the world that they have never considered before. At the same time, the world seems smaller. Despite the differences in language and culture, students begin to see that regardless of language or culture, humans are humans. This juxtaposition of unique and familiar leaves a lasting effect on language learners regardless of whether they continue to study the language or not and helps to challenge ethnocentric thinking in their day-to-day lives.

**Cognitive Improvement.** Studies also show that studying foreign language increases students' cognitive abilities. In a study by Stocco, Yamasaki, Natalenko, and Prat, (2014), the researchers outline the reason for this biological change. When individuals learn to command multiple languages, they utilize their prefrontal cortex much more than a monolingual speaker (Stocco, et. al., 2014, p. 68). This is due to the amount of switching between linguistic contexts that multilingual individuals learn to do during language study. This increased usage of the prefrontal cortex "trains" the brain to perform better in executive function of all kinds, even non-linguistically (p. 69). This means that language study physically improves the function of a learner's brain, even in contexts not directly linked to the foreign language they studied.

### **Classroom Application**

Even considering these benefits, it can still be difficult to motivate students to

study foreign languages. Listed below are two suggestions for classroom application that could foster motivation in students or help them refocus and consider their personal goals for foreign language usage in the context of future self guides.

**Linguistic Education.** One change to curricula that could enhance foreign language classes at WKU, or language courses in general, would be an explicit description of linguistic concepts. Hudson (2004), in his article defending the importance of linguistics in education, gives an example of how linguistic concepts can inform learning across-disciplines (Hudson, 2004, p. 110). The example he gives is the general concept of “form versus function,” and how teaching this concept can help students look for the underlying goals of individual components in a sentence (p. 110). This idea is the basic distinction between prescriptive grammar, which describes how language “should” be used, based on expected forms and standards, versus descriptive grammar, which simply describes real world usage. Pountain (2017) also urges educators to integrate explicit linguistic education in foreign language classes, stating that this kind of linguistic education, integrated into language courses could give students more insight into how language works, rather than just trying to figure out how things work as they go along (Pountain, 2017, p. 260). Being able to go into language study with an understanding of how languages are learned may help students’ confidence and motivation by giving them a framework of what to expect. With some planning, foreign language courses at WKU could integrate some of these concepts or a preparatory linguistics course could be required before entering into foreign language study.

**Journaling and Self-Reflection.** Another activity that could be implemented in foreign language courses is a type of self-reflection assignment. Seshachari's concept of a "instructor-mediated journal" outlines an effective way of integrating this kind of activity into curriculum (Seshachari, 1994, n.p.). Rather than just assigning a journal assignment and having students turn it in as homework, instructors will instead give time during class to write. This writing could be directly assigned, or it could be free writing. The goal is to get students to think critically about their learning experience (Seshachari, 1994, n.p.). Applied to a foreign language classroom, based on the previously discussed concept of future self guides, this journal could be specifically focused on how the student plans to use language outside the classroom. Encouraging students to visualize a clear path for their language learning could foster a future self guide that might lead to greater motivation. Once the students' proficiency is high enough, this journal could even be written in the target language to practice writing skills.

### **Institutional Impact on Motivation**

Of the three reported categories of motivation, the two that led to positive outcomes overall were perception of usefulness of the language and interest in culture. Institutions cannot directly control students' motivations, and Gardner notes individuals bring much to the table with them, regardless of the institution (Gardner, 2006, p. 352). However, institutions can foster globally-focused attitudes and reinforce the importance university language courses by applying theory to the classroom. This could be further enhanced by teaching linguistic theory and encouraging self-reflection in foreign language classrooms.

For these reasons, this university should reconsider this decision, consider what effect it might have on the greater educational and cultural outcomes of its students, and consider what attitudes towards our global society it wants to foster in its students.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (3)
- Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner, R. C. (2006). Motivation and attitudes in second language learning. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, pp.348-355.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hudson, R. (2004). Why education needs linguistics (and vice versa). *Journal of Linguistics*, 40(1), 105–130.  
<https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1017/S0022226703002342>
- Krashen, S. (2017). The case for comprehensible input. *Language Magazine*.
- Masgoret, A.-M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53, 167–210. <https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1111/1467-9922.00227>



Omohundro, J. T. (2008). *Thinking like an Anthropologist: A practical introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. McGraw Hill.

Pountain, C. J. (2017). The three Ls of modern foreign languages: Language, linguistics, literature. *Hispanic Research Journal*, 18(3), 253–271. <https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1080/14682737.2017.1314096>

Seshachari, N. C. (1994). Instructor-mediated journals. *College Teaching*, 42(1), 7. <https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1080/87567555.1994.9926806>

Stocco, A., Yamasaki, B., Natalenko, R., & Prat, C. S. (2014). Bilingual brain training: A neurobiological framework of how bilingual experience improves executive function. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(1), 67–92. <https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1177/1367006912456617>

## APPENDIX

### SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. Please list the language course(s) have you taken at WKU.
2. Please list any other language courses that you have taken, and where you took them.
3. What motivated you to choose this particular language?
4. In your WKU language classroom(s) did you use more English, or more of the language you were trying to learn? Did this change over time?
5. Did your instructor enforce a “no English” policy in the classroom? Do you feel this was an effective way to help you learn?
6. What opportunities did you have to practice using the language with native speakers? If so, how do you think it benefited you, if at all?
7. What was a specific exercise or activity that you did in the language classroom that you feel helped you learn more effectively or that you enjoyed? What was it, and how did it help you?
8. Think of a time where you felt engaged in the classroom. What were some things that helped you feel this way?
9. If you had to give someone advice about learning the language you studied, what would it be?
10. Do you feel that taking a foreign language has benefited you in any way?
11. Do you feel like you learned anything about foreign culture while learning this language?