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Abstract

At a time when an increasing focus on multilingual and multicultural competencies is recognized globally, educational institutions are faced with the challenge of internationalizing their student bodies. It is no longer sufficient to limit language learning opportunities to the traditional grammar or oral-practice classroom, and shrinking budgets have demanded new ways to expose language-learners to their target language in an economical way. At the same time, the need to build intercultural competencies and personal relationships between domestic and international students has necessitated new and creative solutions. One of these solutions is tandem learning, a language learning model that subverts the traditional teacher-student dynamic by having all participants play the role of both expert and learner.

This study addresses the biographical makeup, motivations, perceptions of self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning strategies of participants in a university tandem language learning program. Participants, who meet weekly to learn each other’s’ languages, completed a pre- and post-survey assessing various aspects of their language learning beliefs and practices. A small number of participants also completed in-person interviews. The data gathered were analyzed through frequency analysis, descriptive statistics, and thematic coding. The theoretical frameworks used in this study were the socio-educational model, perceived self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning.

Results showed that participants are, on average, younger and more international than the rest of the institution’s student body. They are also more likely to be from an East Asian country than the average international student. Results also show that participants commonly join the program in order to improve their oral/aural proficiency as well as develop friendships with
members of the target language community, but that they do not always practice effective goal-setting strategies or expend the effort necessary to realize their goals. At the end of the program, participants reported positive feelings toward tandem learning due to their relationships with their partners, the low-anxiety environment in which the program was held, and their beliefs that their language proficiency was improving.
Preface
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Statement of the problem

Recent years have seen a growing emphasis on the internationalization of student bodies in Canadian universities, as well as on increased enrolment from international students who pay full tuition and can help mitigate the financial challenges of decreasing government funding. Yet, these lofty goals of internationalization and diversification of the student body face serious challenges: how can universities struggling with financial shortfalls fund student development programming to promote traditional forms of internationalization, such as study abroad exchanges? How can an institution foster connections between a South Korean business major and a Canadian liberal arts student? Deep, personal relationships between students of diverse backgrounds do not always come easily, yet there is a need for them if universities are going to achieve their goals of broadening their global reach, fostering worldly graduates, and supporting cohesive, multiethnic student bodies. This study identifies and researches one learning model that seeks to build these cross-cultural bridges and increase the internationalization of its participants through second language education. This learning model is called tandem learning.

This investigation took place at a large research university in Western Canada which hosts a tandem learning program. Tandem connects language-learners from various backgrounds to support them in developing multilingualism through peer-to-peer exchanges. Popularized in Europe in the late 20th century, this model of language learning is not yet as common in North American universities (Telles & Vassallo, 2006). Three questions guide the present study. It seeks to learn what sort of students usually join the tandem program, what their motivations are for participating, and how their participation affects their motivation to continue their language learning upon completion of the program.
The Tandem Language Learning Program began at this Western university with a pilot project in January 2011; by 2014, it received over 900 applications each term from students and community members who wished to develop their second-language skills with members of the target language community. Typically, this takes the form of participants offering conversation practice in a language in which they are proficient in exchange for conversation practice in their target language. Participants are matched with each other based on their language competencies and learning desires and meet weekly to practice speaking their target languages with each other. Pairs meet in either facilitated discussion groups at pre-arranged times or independently with minimal input from program organizers.

This study took place from January 2013 to April 2013, which coincided with the Spring term of the tandem program and allowed me sufficient opportunities to meet with the participants on a number of occasions. During this period, participants met weekly for a total of twelve exchanges.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The tandem program at this university has been successful at attracting participants; however, little is known either about its effects on second language acquisition for individual participants or the motivators that compel participants to join this program. Presently, program administrators do not collect information about participant demographics, their motivations, or how their long-term motivation for language learning is affected by their participation in the program. While tandem learning has been studied in formal academic environments (especially eTandem or CALL (Toyoda & Harrison, 2002; Ushioda, 2000), there is a lack of research on tandem learning in informal environments or in voluntary programs, such as the program studied
in the present study. Additionally, this tandem program is a unique model as it is one of the only university-based, voluntary, and facilitated tandem language learning programs in the world. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to discover who is attracted to tandem learning, how they are motivated to participate, and how their motivation to continue their language learning is affected by their participation. For the purpose of this study, I will be defining motivation in basic terms as being responsible for why one decides to do something, how much effort one will put into the activity, and how long one is willing to pursue the activity (Dörnyei, 2013; Gardner, 2010).

While the simplicity of tandem learning makes it likely that this is a longstanding form of language learning, attention to formalized tandem models has blossomed in recent years. Telles and Vassallo (2006) lay out two of the fundamental qualities of tandem learning: reciprocity and autonomy (see Chapter 2.1.1). The present study will explicitly address autonomy, its role in tandem, and how its perception affects learner motivation.

In 2011, 36 languages were represented in the tandem program\(^1\), which ranged from Arabic to Samoan, 80% of offerings were English, Japanese, Mandarin, Korean and French (in order of popularity). Other, less-dominant languages like Swahili, Turkish, and Urdu were represented in language pairs. What does this indicate about the varying motivators for participants? Does one see a spectrum of orientations, ranging from instrumental (facilitating pragmatic goals, such as career development) to integrative (bringing one closer to the target language community)? Do all learners of Japanese, for instance, share the same reasons for

\(^1\) A total of 36 languages were either offered or requested. Because some applicants wanted to learn languages that were not being offered, fewer than 36 languages were eventually represented in tandem partnerships.
joining the program? By gathering and analyzing data on participant motivations, this study aims to provide a clearer picture of the nature of tandem language learning by identifying the wealth of motivators that lead participants to study a particular language.

Furthermore, 64% of participants self-identify as originating from outside of Canada. These include exchange students, international students, and recent immigrants to Canada enrolled in an English language course. With this wealth of diversity in participants, what can we learn about instrumental and integrative motivators? Is there a difference in what motivates international students compared to domestic students? By answering these questions, we will have a better understanding of how student status\(^2\) is related to learner motivation in tandem language learning.

### 1.3 Significance of the study

The potential applications for broader language education in tandem learning are significant. The benefits offered to participants, to educational programs, and to society at large are substantial. Initiatives such as the tandem program offer learners greater access to the target language community, as well as more opportunities to practice their oral communication skills (all of this free of cost). For universities, the opportunity to offer a diversity of language input and instruction is both pedagogically exciting and financially attractive. Indeed, it allows for greater amounts and sources of language input without having to hire more teachers or charge students more tuition. The present study will be the first to comprehensively review and analyze

\(^2\) Student status refers to the domestic or international registration status of participants. Domestic students have either Canadian citizenship or have legal Permanent Resident Status. International students may be attending the university on a short-term exchange or be studying for multiple years in the country.
this emerging pedagogical tool in terms of motivation in language learning and as such, this study will have theoretical and pedagogical implications for language education.

The importance of motivation in language learning is supported by Freiermuth and Huang (2012), who note that “it is vital to continue to unravel the complexities of motivation … because the stakes of ignoring it are tantamount to showing indifference towards learners’ welfare” (p. 62). For this reason, this study is valuable because it identifies, for the first time, the roles of motivation in tandem learning as an emerging pedagogical tool. One cannot assume that what holds true for motivation in traditional classrooms, or even online language learning, would be the same in face-to-face tandem learning.

1.4 Research questions

The objective of this study was to develop a comprehensive understanding of the motivating factors that draw participants to join this voluntary program, and the effects of the program on long-term motivation for participants to continue language learning after completing the program. Three specific questions guided this study:

i. In terms of student status (domestic, international, or exchange), age, sex, and language learning background, what is the demographic makeup of Tandem participants?

ii. What motivates students to participate in Tandem? How might these motivations vary depending on students’ demographic makeup?

iii. From the perspective of participants, what are the effects of the program on their motivation to develop their second language?
1.5 Organization of the thesis

Following the Introduction, this thesis includes four chapters: Literature Review, Methods, Results, and Discussion. Relevant documents are included in the appendices.

Chapter 2 is a comprehensive literature review that is developed through five sections addressing tandem learning, motivation in language learning, the socio-educational model, self-efficacy theory, self-regulated learning, and the theoretical framework used in this study.

Section 2.1 includes a detailed discussion of the history of tandem learning globally, the various delivery models that have developed in recent years, and research into the pedagogical value of tandem learning. Research on tandem learning focused on its potential in specific contexts, such as online exchanges of students in language classes between universities. This section reviews the applicable literature of tandem learning and intends to provide the reader with an understanding of the origin of tandem learning, its developments, and its current state within the literature.

Section 2.2 reviews the development of motivation theory over the past 50 years. It traces the evolution of behaviourism into the cognitive revolution, and the rise of the social-psychological turn heralded by the work of Vygotsky (1978). This section takes an in-depth look at the socio-educational model (Gardner, 2010) and the L2 motivational self-system (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011), explaining the socio-educational model is the main theoretical framework for this study. This section outlines the relationships between critical variables in the socio-educational model, such as integrativeness, attitude toward the learning situation, instrumentality, and language anxiety.

Section 2.3 discusses the development of social cognition theory and the self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy theory is concerned with how a learner’s conception of her
own capabilities will lead her to pursue or avoid challenges. It discusses how a learner’s conception of ability as an acquirable skill can reinforce motivation, which makes this theory an effective bridge to the socio-educational model’s concept of motivational intensity. This section also includes discussions of the pedagogical benefits of cooperative learning environments as well as the connection between effective goal setting and motivation (Bandura, 1993; Locke & Latham, 1990; Mento, Steel, & Karren, 1987).

Section 2.4 addresses Zimmerman’s work in social cognition theory and his identification of important self-regulated learning strategies (Zimmerman, 1990). This section focuses on the practice of metacognitive skills, environmental structuring, and the role of autonomy in self-regulated learning.

Section 2.5 brings together the socio-educational model, self-efficacy theory, and self-regulated learning to explain the theoretical model used in this study. Because the context of study is quite different from educational contexts usually involved in the socio-educational model, I decided to supplement the model with these two additional frameworks, thus enhancing the study’s ability to effectively answer the research questions.

Chapter 3: Methods, reviews the setting of the study, the sampling plans for the participants, the measurement instruments, and the questions asked via the interviews and surveys. It describes the participants and explains how the questions asked in the interviews and surveys are connected to the research questions and the theoretical model used in this study. The chapter also discusses the procedures for the collection of data and analysis. Survey data were analyzed quantitatively through SPSS (v. 22), while interview data were analyzed through thematic analysis (Roulston, 2010).
Chapter 4: the results of the interviews and the surveys for each research question. Section 4.1 describes the demographic makeup of participants as determined through the surveys. These details focus on the representation of males and females, undergraduates and graduates, and domestic and international students. It also discusses the national backgrounds of international participants and lists the most-represented countries.

Chapter 5 discusses the results of this study. It addresses in-depth the results of each research question and offers summary conclusions to the questions posed. It also describes some of the limitations of this study and makes recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Tandem learning

2.1.1 What is tandem learning?

Tandem learning has taken many forms since it rose to popularity in the 1970s in Western Europe. Originally a learning style done exclusively in face-to-face settings, with the advent of technology it can also take place in synchronous video-chat or text-based chat sessions via the Internet. It also takes place through asynchronous e-mail or regular mail exchanges. And it is still practiced through face-to-face meetings, either facilitated as part of a larger group, or independently. “In Tandem sessions,” Telles and Vassallo (2006) note, “ordinary teacher-student and peer relationships are subverted, giving way to alternative and peculiar partners’ relationships that shape (and are shaped by) the Tandem learning context” (p. 15). The style of tandem learning discussed in this study is characterized by two key principles: autonomy and reciprocity (Little & Brammerts, 1996).

Tandem exchanges typically involve two speakers of different languages who come together to learn their target languages from each other. Each participant is a proficient speaker of the target language of their partner, allowing them to scaffold their language knowledge and abilities through regular, bilingual conversation sessions. As Telles and Vassallo (2006) describe, each partner “becomes both a learner of the foreign language and a tutor of his/her mother tongue (or language in which he/she feels proficient)” (p. 1). Partners work together through discussions to learn their target languages through oral/aural practice and linguistic scaffolding. These discussions may have a specific pedagogical goal (such as to practice a certain grammar point or to expand vocabulary knowledge of a particular topic), or they may be less goal-
oriented, with an overall focus on developing oral/aural fluency through practice, or even increasing intelligibility.

In terms of reciprocity, both partners are considered equal contributors as they alternate between the roles of learner and expert. This principle of reciprocity supports the self-esteem of the partners and “puts both participants on equal terms. Tandem is, thus, a free and mutual exchange of knowledge about language and culture” (Telles & Vassallo, 2006, p. 6-7). Partners jointly decide how, when, and even where they hold their meetings (Brammerts, 2002). Many choose to meet at a weekly, facilitated group session with a number of other partnerships; others meet independently in various locations, as best fits their schedules. Furthermore, partners can decide whether to follow a suggested theme or whether they would like to choose their own.

The rise of tandem learning has paralleled the advent of internationalism in the post-wars years in Europe, as well as with the development on online technology, which I will discuss below.

2.1.2 The development of tandem learning

The modern genesis of tandem learning can be found in the French-German youth exchanges, which began in 1963 (Krotz, 2002). These mass student exchanges were designed to relieve post-war tensions and develop bonds between the two countries, as it was believed by de Gaulle and Adenauer that “intercultural acquaintance [could] quell prejudice and provide the basis for common identity” (Friend, 1991, p. 41). One aspect of these exchanges was the delivery of bilingual courses to French and German students. In these courses, French and German students worked together on a range of activities, including shared exercises and conversations on pre-determined topics (Telles & Vassallo, 2006). While this early form of tandem learning
included the principle of reciprocity, it lacked the learner autonomy characteristic of tandem learning today.

It was not until the 1970s that learner autonomy was seen as a principle of tandem learning (Telles & Vassallo, 2006). Tandem partnerships, primarily in Spain, began to be seen as collaborative, bilateral exchanges of knowledge that could be supported by a teacher or facilitator, or run independently (Brammerts, 2002). The 1980s saw tandem learning expand throughout universities across Europe, and evidence of this early expansion can be seen today in the popularity of tandem programs in Europe, while remaining obscure in the rest of the world (Telles & Vassallo, 2006).

The 1990s saw the principles of tandem learning systematized. In 1994, twelve universities from across Europe founded the International Tandem Network, an international collaboration designed to offer and research tandem partnerships (Brammerts & Little, 1996; Delille & Chichorro, 2002; Rosanelli, 1992; Stickler, 2003). The rising popularity of tandem learning in this period led to the expansion of tandem into new models and media, such as chat- and email-based tandem, as well as video-chat tandem via the Internet.

Globalization and the rapid expansion of technology has pushed tandem learning into new frontiers. Expanding from the original face-to-face model, we now see tandem learning become popular across the media spectrum. The following section reviews the variety of models of tandem learning found today.
2.1.3 The various delivery models of tandem learning

2.1.3.1 Face-to-face tandem learning

The earliest model of tandem learning is the one focused on in this study: face-to-face. This model involves two or more participants meeting in-person to learn each other’s languages, alternating between their target language and their first language. There is a great deal of flexibility in the delivery of this model, as partnerships can be independent or as organized as part of an academic course, with or without a teacher’s guidance, and can take place for short or long spans of time (Telles & Vassallo, 2006). The oldest version of this model is known as binational Tandem and involves intensive group activities where partners are changed regularly (Macaire, 2004). The model discussed in this study, which evolved out of the French-German youth exchanges of the 1960s and binational Tandem, predates Internet-based communication and is seen as the original model of tandem learning (Herfurth, 1992, 1996)

2.1.3.2 E-mail tandem learning

One of the challenges of tandem learning is the need for a supply of speakers of various languages. Considering the multilingual composition of Europe, it makes sense that Europe would be the birthplace of tandem learning; however, a lack of multilingual participants can limit the potential of face-to-face tandem learning in many parts of the world. As noted by the Brazilian researchers Telles and Vassallo (2006):

Tandem has been scarcely practiced in Brasil due to the fact that … it can only be carried out in places where proficient speakers of foreign languages are present, such as in tourist cities, at national border regions or at universities where foreign students can be found (p. 32) This limitation stymied the growth of tandem learning in much of the world until electronic technology made feasible near-instant international communication at minimal cost. Many
educators and researchers were interested in the potential for tandem learning to develop alongside the rise of free and universal e-mail access (Little & Brammerts, 1996). Conducting tandem learning through e-mail allowed educators and researchers to overcome the challenges of geography and time zones, but it also fundamentally altered the nature of tandem learning. Instead of focusing on oral/aural competency and synchronous communication, as is common in face-to-face tandem learning, e-mail tandem focuses on writing/reading competency and asynchronous communication, due to the nature of e-mail as a written medium (Appel & Mullen, 2000). The advent and facility of e-mail tandem captured the interests of educators internationally and many significant research efforts were made from the late 1990s that continue to today (Edasawa & Kabata, 2007; Greenfield, 2003; Torii-Williams, 2004; Ushioda, 2000).

2.1.3.3 Internet chat-based tandem learning

The development of e-mail tandem learning in the mid-1990s was mirrored by an interest among educators and researchers in the potential of internet chat-based tandem learning (often referred to as CALL, or Computer Assisted Language Learning, in the early literature) (Toyoda & Harrison, 2002). This model of tandem learning has been delivered through both proprietary web software (Kötter, 2001; Morley & Truscott, 2006; Toyoda & Harrison, 2002) and ubiquitous chat programs, such as MSN Messenger (Kawaguchi & Di Biase, 2010). The advantages to internet chat-based tandem learning include the easy access to speakers of other languages, as well as the synchronous nature of the communication, which has been shown to have pedagogical benefits (Toyoda & Harrison, 2002).
2.1.3.4 Video-chat tandem

The development of models of video-based tandem learning, sometimes called Teletandem, expanded with increased access to video-chat technology in the early 2000s. In this model, participants connect directly with a tandem partner via an online program, such as Skype or Windows Live Messenger. The benefits of a tandem learning model that connects partners over the internet via video-chat are clear: minimal cost to the users, access to partners from around the world, the introduction of oral/aural practice opportunities that had been missing in text-based tandem, and the benefit of being able to see and respond to visual clues in a synchronous environment (Telles & Vassallo, 2006b). The rise of the video-based model of tandem learning has proliferated in areas of the world marked by monolingualism; in Brazil, educators and researchers have established Teletandem Brasil, a pairing service designed to match Brazilian students with speakers of other languages. Once paired, partners use free video-chat services, such as Skype or Windows Live Messenger, to hold their video-chat tandem sessions. These sessions can be casual conversations, or the partners may work together to complete a project provided by their instructor. This service has supported a thriving academic research community focused on language acquisition and tandem learning (Benedetti, Consolo, & Vieira-Abrahao, 2010; Salomão, 2011; Telles, 2009). It is clear by reviewing trends in the development of models of tandem learning that the potential for this style of learning is expanding alongside technological development. As e-mail and text-based chat technology spurred their accompanying models of tandem, so did access to low-cost webcams foster the development of video-chat tandem. In the coming years, one expects that the proliferation of

3 http://www.teletandembrasil.org/home.asp
high-speed internet access and online video will continue to improve and offer opportunities for tandem-learning that more seamlessly reflect the style of communication found in face-to-face tandem.

2.1.4 The benefits of tandem learning

Tandem learning offers cognitive, metacognitive, social, and affective benefits to participants. It is attractive to learners and educators because of its ability to mimic the immersive environment lacking in contexts where learners are studying a target language as a foreign language (Salomão, 2011). For researchers and educators, it offers an interesting language learning model where the cognitive, metacognitive, and affective aspects of learning intersect.

Still, one of the challenges in discussing research on face-to-face tandem learning is the limited research that exists on this particular model. The explosion of research interest that began in the mid-1990s and has continued to today has focused almost exclusively on internet-based models of tandem learning (Freiermuth & Huang, 2012; Morley & Truscott, 2006; Telles & Vassallo, 2006). This has left the research community with questions about the applicability of research results of tandem learning across the different types of tandem language learning.

2.1.4.1 Access to authentic language

One of the strongest attractions of tandem learning is the opportunity for students to engage in unscripted, scaffolded conversation with a speaker of the target language. Many participants in Ushioda's (2000) multi-week study of an e-mail tandem program between Irish and German students “principally focused on the benefits of using the [target] language and of
observing it in use, rather than receiving corrections and feedback” (p. 124). A major finding of this study was the appreciation participants had for the access they gained to informal register, which they considered valuable and missing from their second language classes. One participant commented that he had “the opportunity to write German in a conversation style and ‘chat’ so my fluency will improve” (Ushioda, 2000, p. 4). Other studies on tandem learning programs, such as Edasawa and Kabata (2007) and Kötter (2001) found that participants placed a strong focus on meaning clarification as opposed to explicit error correction, which can also be seen as more closely aligned with oral communication outside of the classroom.

The value placed on access to authentic target language input, as well as on opportunities to interact at in the target language, may have developed in the years since these cited studies were published; at this time, however, I am not aware of any recent studies comparing access to these issues between tandem learning environments and the language learning classroom.

### 2.1.4.2 Expanded vocabularies in the target language

Another benefit of access to proficient speakers of the target language is the opportunity for expanded vocabularies. Kawaguchi and Di Biase (2010) held a longitudinal study of Japanese and Australian internet-chat tandem participants and noted over the course of a term a significant increase in the range and complexity of vocabulary used. Vinagre (2005) found similar results in a study pairing Spanish and English language learners, noting that 77% of participants “perceived a clear improvement” in their language abilities by the end of the 12 week study (p. 380). These findings were replicated in an e-mail tandem study by Torii-Williams (2004) where analysis of e-mail transcripts showed a marked increase of more complex target grammar.
2.1.5 The challenges of tandem learning

For all the excitement in the potential benefits of tandem learning, there are a number of challenges that face its implementation. Researchers, educational administrators, and participants may struggle with a lack of curriculum, the uncertainty about language acquisition, or the challenge of finding the right partner for everyone.

First, tandem environments that do not include a curriculum can create challenges for participants to direct their learning process. Without this direction, participants may select their topics on an ad hoc basis, as opposed to choosing topics with the intention of developing and refining their target language skills. Participants may learn more efficiently when making deliberate choices about what to focus on, so programs may find a need for informal curricula to provide participants with relevant and challenging goals.

Second, it is difficult to gauge participants’ language acquisition in tandem learning, given that they join the program with varying levels of competency, and also because they may have divergent interests and goals. While one participant may focus on expanding her vocabulary, another may be more interested in developing oral fluency and cultural understanding. Without restricting the autonomy and self-led nature of tandem learning, it may not be feasible to gauge language acquisition with any validity or reliability. While some contexts, such as using tandem learning as a supplement to the language learning classroom, may be better-suited to assessing language learning development, these contexts may diverge from the nature of tandem learning as they may restrict learner autonomy by compelling students to focus on what is prescribed and not that in which they are interested.

Third, plurilingual contexts pose a challenge to equal access to tandem learning. In every context, some languages may be more desired than others. Because tandem learning depends on
having someone who is willing to exchange their language for that of another, there will always be the difficulty of finding equilibrium between the languages offered and desired. In some contexts, there simply may not be a partner for a particular person because nobody who can offer that language is interested in learning the first language. This challenge may be more pronounced in places where a few languages are seen as highly-desirable, while others are not.

These challenges demonstrate that tandem learning does not neatly fit what we expect in academic offerings. Its progress can be unstructured, its impact challenging to measure, and its organization of participants imperfect. But these challenges can also be viewed as qualities. Tandem learning brings together diverse participants who want to learn languages from around the world, talk about whatever they want, and do so for their individual motivations. Discerning these motivations will help educational administrators deliver tandem learning models effectively in their local contexts.

2.2 Motivation in second-language learning

Motivation, on its face, seems a straightforward idea. It’s a word used regularly to explain everything from avoiding the gym to why one succeeds in a particular area of interest. It’s a concept employed reflexively and its meaning is typically understood by interlocutors without need for further explanation. Motivation serves as a crucial concept in explaining everything from the benign realities of our daily lives to matters of extraordinary consequence. Yet, for all its ubiquity in daily life, the concept of motivation has proven staggeringly complex among scholars and researchers who have sought for decades a satisfactory definition of the concept and description of its processes. The definition on which most researchers agree is that motivation is responsible for why one decides to do something, how much effort one will put
into the activity, and how long one is willing to pursue the activity (Dörnyei, 2013; Gardner, 2010).

Research has shown that despite the seeming simplicity of this everyday concept, motivation in language learning is a complex process affected by cognitive, affective, environmental, neurobiological, and temporal aspects (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). The 20th century saw an explosion of scholarly interest in motivation, resulting in decades of debate, the construction of competing theoretical models, and little consensus. As Covington (1998) explains, “motivation … is easier to describe (in terms of its outward, observable effects) than it is to define. Of course, this has not stopped people from trying” (p. 7). The concept had been so extensively addressed in the research that the American Psychological Association at one point considered removing it from its main database, Psychological Abstracts, because the term had too many different meanings (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Researchers in psychology and language learning acknowledge that we may never have an exhaustive concept of motivation that integrates all the various motives that impact one’s actions, but a number of theoretical frameworks have developed to answer specific questions. In the following sections, I will trace the development of motivation theory, its various theoretical frameworks, and conclude with a review of the current dominant models.

2.2.1 The early years: motivation and emotion studies

The psychology and motivation studies which dominated the mid-20th century were influenced by the work of Freud (1966), focusing on what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) call “deep-seated unconscious drives, emotions and instincts shaping human behaviour” (p. 4). Areas of focus in these years included research on implicit achievement and power motivation, intrinsic
motivation and reward-psychology (Ryan, 2007). This period was marked by an interest in the role of emotion, its role in human behaviour, and where these relations could be seen as culturally-specific or universal (Ryan, 2007). These early inquiries into the role of motivation were closely tied to the prevailing force of behaviorism, but led researchers to investigate the role of cognitive processes in motivation.

2.2.2 The modern years: the cognitive revolution

The 1950s and 1960s saw the birth of what is now known as the cognitive revolution (Ryan, 2007), a period where many scholars in psychology revolted against long-standing dominance of behaviorism. The focus now turned to conscious and unconscious cognitive processes, such as goals and expectations, beliefs about self-efficacy, and interpretations of events (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Greater interest was placed on thoughts, how events were interpreted, and the role of self-concept; attention on personal drives, needs, and emotions receded (Ryan, 2007).

An early step in the cognitive revolution was the development of self-actualizing theory (Maslow, 2011). This theory suggested that the central motivating force in our lives, as opposed to those of other animals, is a “desire to achieve personal growth and to develop fully the capacities and talents we have inherited” (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 8). Maslow’s theory is best-known through his formulation of the hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 2011), which argues that once the basic needs of people are satisfied (such as food, sex, and security), we yearn to meet more abstract needs, such as love, social acceptance, and insight.

Within the field of SLA, the cognitive approach developed further to place a specific focus on how mental processes, such as thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes, become action. The
cognitive revolution was crucial for expanding our understanding of the explanatory power of internal processes, as opposed to the focus paid by behaviourism on external actions. Still, the cognitive models suffered from the same shortsightedness as behaviourism; they viewed human agency as an enclosed system unaffected by external factors, such as time, place, people, and culture. This would all change with the work of Vygotsky (1978) and the social-psychological turn.

2.2.3 The social-psychological turn

The early-20th century work of psychologist Vygotsky influenced the field of language learning by arguing that learners can develop their second language skills by interacting with others (Vygotsky, 1978). This concept, termed the zone of proximal development, posited interaction as a major contributor to the internalization of knowledge. Learners need opportunities to interact in a social context in order to learn the target language, he argued. Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory is still held in high regard and his arguments for peer interaction in learning have continued to receive attention and support from scholars (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994; Hadley, 1993). More recent theorists have expanded Vygotsky’s framework to include a focus on how the zone of proximal development can also include L2-L2 interactions (Swain, 2000). The importance of socio-cultural theory is that it expanded the focus to see how cognitive processes interact with and are affected by the context of the learner. This expanded focus was employed by Gardner and Lambert (1959) as they researched language learner motivation.

The early work of Gardner and Lambert (1959) led to the development of a social-psychological theory called the socio-educational model. This theoretical framework of
motivation in language learning still holds much sway (and, indeed, is the main theoretical framework employed in this study). Alongside the enduring popularity of the socio-educational model, which I will discuss later (see Chapter 2), a number of other theories developed in the field of SLA and motivation that should be reviewed.

Speech accommodation theory (Giles & Byrne, 1982) employed much of the social-psychological aspects of the socio-educational model, explaining how aspects such as in-group identification, group boundaries, and in-group vitality can promote or prevent second language acquisition (Beebe, 1988). Speech accommodation theory is connected with other motivational frameworks, Beebe and Giles (1984) explain, because it “was devised to explain some of the motivations underlying certain shifts in people’s speech styles during social encounters” (p. 7). This concern with how the social context dynamically affects speaker motivation can be seen as connected with Gardner's (2010) concept of attitude toward the learning situations, where a learner’s attitude toward the social context will affect his motivation to participate.

Plato (1992) set a phenomenological organization of what Dörnyei (2013) calls the “three areas of mental functioning: cognition, motivation, and affect” (p. 519). What Plato proposed, and centuries of scholars have accepted, is that our mental processes can be categorized as either wanting (motivation), feeling (affect), and thinking (cognition). Krashen's (1981) monitor model saw the role of motivation in language learning reduced to a component of affect, instead of its traditional role as one of the primary mental processes, alongside cognition and affect (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Motivation, Krashen argued, is a component of the affective filter in the monitor model. Krashen (1982) posits this filter as something blocking input from “that part of the brain responsible for language acquisition” (p. 31). While popular for a time, the concept of the affective filter has been roundly criticized by scholars for making the model unfalsifiable, for
not explaining why it applies to adults and not children, and for the lack of evidence of filters in the greater psychological research community (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991).

The importance of linguistic self-confidence, seen as an important motivational process within multi-ethnic settings, was argued for by Clement and his associates (Clement, 1980, 1986; Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977). Linguistic self-confidence, Clement argued, affects L2 learners who are living in the target language community. Clement’s work focuses on how the quality and quantity of contact between language learners and members of the target language community affects the learner’s desire to identify with that group and continue making efforts toward learning the language. Linguistic self-confidence is closely associated with Bandura’s self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986), which I will discuss later in this chapter. I chose to use Bandura’s theory instead of Clement’s because linguistic self-confidence works best in settings where learners are living within the target language community. While this is true for some of the participants in this study, it does not reflect the reality of the majority of participants, who are studying languages other than English.

As we have seen, the development of theories of motivation in SLA in the latter-part of the 20th century consistently put an emphasis on the social aspects of language learning. I will now review two of the dominant theoretical frameworks in motivation studies: Dörnyei and Ushioda’s (2011) L2 motivational self-system, and Gardner’s (2010) socio-educational model.

2.2.3.1 The L2 motivational self-system

One of the most recent developments in the field of motivation studies in language learning has been made by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011; Dörnyei, 2013). After decades of working at the borders of the dominant theoretical framework of the socio-educational model
Dörnyei and Ushioda have spent much of the last decade working on an alternative perspective. The socio-educational model is a reductionist model of motivation aimed at identifying the key variables affecting learner motivation in order to “achieve increased precision in explaining the interrelationship of the constituents” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 8). Their concern with the use of a reductionist model is that it is limited and unable to “take account of evolving dynamic interactions with the social context or of the complexities of interacting cognitive and emotional processes and systems functioning within and between individuals at any point in time” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 11). Indeed, models like the socio-educational model offer researchers a snapshot of a learner’s motivational process in and at a particular time and place. While Gardner (2010) protests that this is exactly the goal of the socio-educational model, it is important to review and evaluate the alternative offered by Dörnyei and Ushioda. For this, I will rely on two recent sources: Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) and Dörnyei (2013).

The development of the L2 motivational self-system came about in response to what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) call “increasing concern about [the] theoretical basis and explanatory power” of Gardner’s socio-educational model (p. 80). The L2 motivational self-system is offered as “a natural progression from Gardner’s theory, addressing many of these concerns” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 80).

To begin with, it is important to establish the definitions being used. As noted earlier, the definition of motivation has always been a slippery one. Motivation is ubiquitous in discussions about education, and its meaning has been spread near to the point of meaninglessness. There seems to be no end to the possible definitions of motivation: Kleinginna and Kleinginna (1981) presented 102 different ways of understanding the term. Dönyei takes a broad approach in his
definition of motivation, accepting the vagueness of this multitude of meanings, preferring to argue that motivation simply refers to “why people decide to do something, how long they are willing to sustain the activity, and how hard they are going to pursue it” (p. 519). Motivation, Dörnyei argues, can be discerned by a sort of phenomenological smell test: “we simply know and feel when we are motivated and when we are not” (Dörnyei, 2013, p. 519). Surely, this cannot be our best definition of such an important concept. Gardner (2010) offers a compelling and clear portrait of a motivated individual:

Motivated individuals express effort in attaining the goal, they show persistence, and they attend to the tasks necessary to achieve the goals. They have a strong desire to attain their goal, and they enjoy the activities necessary to achieve their goal. They are aroused in seeking their goals, they have expectancies about their successes and failures, and when they are achieving some degree of success they demonstrate self-efficacy; they are self-confident about their achievements. Finally, they have reasons for their behavior, and these reasons are often called motives. (p. 8)

Scholars, of course, define motivation in the way that best suits their purpose. Gardner defines motivation to be congruent with the constructs of his socio-educational model, whereas Dörnyei is vague in his definition to support the openness of the L2 motivational self-system, itself developed in response to the reductionist model of Gardner.

2.2.3.2 Integrativeness and the L2 self

In promoting a new model of L2 motivation studies, Dörnyei and Ushioda have had to deal with the basic question of how a person’s reasons for studying a language affect their overall
success in acquiring that language. To address this, Dörnyei (2013) appropriates the term

integrativeness⁴ from the Socio-educational Model:

I have been intrigued by Robert Gardner’s concept of integrativeness throughout my whole research career… I have been trying to find a broader interpretation of the notion that was originally offered by Gardner – the new paradigm I propose builds on the robust body of past research but reinterprets the concept (Dörnyei, 1995, p. 94).

Dörnyei (2013) contends that his L2 Motivation Self-system model has much stronger construct validity than the Socio-educational Model:

In studies that specifically compared R. C. Gardner’s traditional concept of integrativeness with the ideal L2 self, the latter was found to explain the criterion measures better (typically explaining more than 40% of the variance) (p. 521).

This appropriation of the integrativeness construct is problematic for a number of reasons. First, Dörnyei looks to support his new model with research based on the traditional version of integrativeness, but how can this be done if the interpretations of the concept are different?

Eating oranges regularly has been shown to be beneficial to one’s health, but we can’t redefine oranges as fruit in general, and then argue that the original research supports regular consumption of all fruit. As pointed out by Gardner (2010), new constructs need new research to support them, and the L2 motivational self-system is still in its infancy in this regard.

The second major issue with the appropriation of the integrative construct is that it attempts to use an affective construct in a cognitive process model. The construct of integrativeness is based on the belief that emotional factors influence behavior in ways that are often imperceptible by the learner. This construct has no place in a cognitive model like the L2

---

⁴ Integrativeness is a concept coming Gardner’s socio-educational model. It refers to the interest a learner holds in learning a second language in order to communicate with members of the target language community (Gardner, 2010).
motivational self-system because it belongs in a parallel but separate system of mental functioning (Gardner, 2010).

2.2.3.3 Discussion of the L2 motivational self-system

The L2 self-motivational system is a cognitive model for understanding motivation in second language learning. As a model, it is still in development. In my opinion, it cannot be seen as an heir to the socio-educational model because it works with different constructs and is concerned with a discrete area of mental functioning, despite its claims to integrate cognition, affect, and motivation. It relies on appropriating and redefining well-established and researched constructs such as integrativeness and goal setting strategies, but it presents itself as a unique model.

The theoretical support that Dörnyei offers is questionable. It attempts to support itself by making incompatible comparisons: that is, between the L2 motivational self-system and the socio-educational model. The L2 motivational self-system claims to be more valid than other systems, and claims heredity from other models, yet has neglected to develop valid and reliable measures to support its constructs. Maybe the system will develop to a mature model, supported by research to detail the relation of its constructs to measurable achievement in language learning, but it’s not there yet.

For all of this, the L2 motivational self-system has value and potential. By avoiding a reductionist framework, it has potential to become more valid than the socio-educational model because it can take into account innumerable variables; however, the challenge that comes with this is that it becomes increasingly difficult to operationalize the model to help us understand how motivation works in a social context.
To bolster the credibility of this model, research is needed to show the following: how cause and effect function in it; the importance of the various constructs and their relations to each other; how these constructs can be measured; and how achievement can be measured consistently across time and place. The socio-educational model has accomplished this, and for this reason I have chosen to use it as the primary theoretical framework for this study.

### 2.2.4 The socio-educational model

As research on motivation in SLA developed within the social-psychological perspective, a persistent and lasting focus developed on how language learning is socially- and culturally-bound (Dörnyei, 2003). Language learning, scholars argued, was different from other fields of study because it “involves taking on features of another cultural community” (Gardner, 2010, p.2). This assertion, made earliest by Gardner (1968), has continued through most major veins of motivation research in SLA (Dörnyei, 2003). The socio-educational model was established in 1972, accounting for Gardner and Lambert’s research findings since the 1950s. The socio-educational model was most recently updated in 2010, with the release of Gardner’s latest book, “Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model.” In it, he reviews over four decades of research and responds to the numerous criticisms of the model that came about following the extensive debate of the early 1990s (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Various debates have taken place over the past decades, so this work will focus exclusively on the socio-educational model as represented in Gardner (2010). To learn more about these debates, see Au (1988), Crookes & Schmidt (1991), Dörnyei (1994), Oxford and Shearin (1994), and Tremblay and Gardner (1995).
As discussed earlier, the socio-educational model is a reductionist model of motivation, inasmuch as it focuses on a number of key variables, which together can be shown to account for the majority of variance in the actions of learners. Gardner (2010) notes that “other researchers have identified measures and constructs that have been shown to have relevance to second language study,” but he argues that the validity of these “in no way questions the utility of the socio-educational model” (p. 209; 210). The value of this model is that it allows researchers to operationalize its key components for empirical testing, which has taken place extensively since the 1970s. By identifying and measuring these key variables, the socio-educational model has helped researchers better understand how motivation works in second language acquisition. I will now review the various constructs and their relationships within the socio-educational model.

2.2.4.1 The constructs of the socio-educational model

There have been a number of updates to the socio-educational model since its original structural equation representation (Gardner & Smythe, 1974). Figure 2.1 below taken from Gardner’s 2010 book is the latest representation of the model.
Within the socio-educational model, motivation is posited as a construct affected by integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and instrumentality. It is manifested through motivational intensity (MI), desire to learn (DESIRE), and attitude toward learning the foreign language (ALF). I will discuss the various constructs of the model in the following sections.
Integrativeness is the interest a learner holds in learning a second language in order to communicate with members of the target language community (Gardner, 2010). The intensity of integrativeness may range from a learner who is willing to take on behavioural patterns from the target language community, all the way to a learner who wishes to withdraw from their own language community and identify solely with the target language community. Many learners will find themselves somewhere between these two extremes, and their integrativeness will be evidenced by, for example, an interest in art and culture in the target language. The socio-educational model sees integrativeness reflected in three constructs: an integrative orientation\(^5\) (IO), an interest in foreign languages and a corresponding lack of ethnocentrism (IFL), and positive attitudes toward the foreign culture (AFC)\(^6\) (Gardner, 2010). Integrativeness can be seen as the sum of the integrative orientation, the interest in foreign languages, and positive attitudes toward the foreign culture.

Attitude toward the learning situation refers to learner attitudes toward the specific learning context. This may be in the traditional language learning classroom, a foreign exchange setting, or even the tandem environment studied here. The concept encompasses the physical space, teachers or facilitators, colleagues, and learning materials used within and outside of the learning environment. While reactions to all these factors affect language learning, what the socio-educational model is concerned with is the learner’s reactions to the various factors. As

\(^5\) “An orientation refers to a general inclination, not a specific reason for learning another language. If it somehow reflects a desire, willingness, or ability to become psychologically closer to another language community, it would be classified as integrative. If it stressed instead the practical benefits for the individual, it would be classified as instrumental.” (Gardner, 2010, p. 17)

\(^6\) In Gardner (2010), AFC refers to attitudes toward French Canadians. Given that this study takes place in a multicultural context with minimal emphasis on French Canada, I have chosen to restate this concept as attitude toward the foreign culture.
any teacher can attest, one can find a range of learner attitudes even within the same learning environment, despite sharing a teacher, a physical environment, and learning materials. The model shows the relationship between positive attitudes toward the learning situation and overall learner motivation.

Motivation is the driving force behind action. In the socio-educational model, it is composed of three elements: first, a motivated learner makes persistent efforts to learn the language through studying, seeking out opportunities to grow, and going beyond the bare minimum needed to get by; second, a motivated learner wants to learn the language and has little difficulty identifying and expressing this desire; third, a motivated learner will enjoy the learning experience, despite periodic changes in enthusiasm (Gardner, 2010). These three elements are represented in the equation as motivational intensity / effort (MI), desire to learn (DESIRE), and attitude toward learning the foreign language (ALF\(^{7}\)). It is important to note here that these elements are not contributors to motivation, but manifestations of it; a motivated learner will demonstrate effort, desire, and positive affect.

Instrumentality refers to learner motives that have less to do with affinity or attraction to the social aspect of the target language community and more to do with achieving pragmatic goals; these goals could consist of passing a course, pleasing one’s parents, or improving one’s career opportunities. Of all the major constructs within the socio-educational model, instrumentality is the least directly-supportive of motivation; that is, instrumental factors can lead to increased motivation, and this combination of factors and motivation can be seen as

\(^{7}\) In Gardner (2010), ALF refers to attitudes toward learning French. Given that this study takes place in a multi-cultural context with minimal emphasis on French, I have chosen to restate this concept as attitude toward learning the foreign language.
instrumental motivation (Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 2010). The only measure of instrumentality in
the socio-educational model is the instrumental orientation (INS).

Language anxiety refers to a situational form of anxiety associated with “learning and
using a second language” (Gardner, 2010, p. 90). Language anxiety is interesting because it has
no direct connection to general anxiety within learners; one cannot assume that a learner who
experiences anxiety in daily life will suffer from anxiety in language learning, nor that an
anxiety-free learner will find language learning relaxing and enjoyable (MacIntyre & Gardner,
1991). So if there is no direct correlation between general anxiety and language anxiety, where
does it come from? Gardner (2010) argues that it is a result of exposure to language learning and
language learning environments. Language anxiety plays an interesting role in this model as it is
the only endogenous variable; that is, it is the only variable that is affected by, and also affects,
language achievement. Language achievement can create a positive feedback-loop that generates
less language anxiety, resulting in greater language achievement; inversely, negative experiences
in the language learning environment can lead to greater language anxiety, detracting from
language achievement. Within the socio-educational model, language anxiety is measured by
two indices: language class anxiety (CLASS) and language use anxiety (USE).

It is important to note that the structural equation model represented in Figure 2.1
includes aptitude and language achievement, but there are no measures of these variables in the
Attitude Motivation Test Battery (discussed in section 2.2.4.3). In order to include them in such a
model, one would need to produce other measures to test them. For feasibility and
generalizability, I have decided not to include these variables within this study. Given that this
study’s participants come from a wide range of educational backgrounds and current language
learning practices, it was not feasible to develop a single measure of either aptitude or language achievement that might then be compared across the group.

### 2.2.4.2 What the socio-educational model is not

A common critique of the socio-educational model is that it is not a comprehensive model of motivation and language learning. This is absolutely true. The model does not include a host of variables that could be correlated with motivation and success in language learning, such as quality of teacher and curricula, or parental and peer pressures. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) sought to determine if these additional factors “appreciably improve[d] prediction of success in learning the second language” and found that they had no significant effects on the basic structure of the model (Gardner, 2010, p. 92).

In the same way that some variables related to motivation are excluded from the socio-educational model, many potential contributors to language achievement are not included. There are other significant variables, such as language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990) and self-confidence (Clement, 1980) that could be used to explain individual differences in language learning achievement. The purpose of the socio-educational model is not only to link together variables, but to describe a process that posits motivation as being supported by integrativeness and attitude toward the learning situation (Gardner, 2010). All of this is to remind the reader that the socio-educational model was never intended to be a taxonomy of the myriad of variables affecting language achievement; the model is concerned specifically with the role of the most salient variables in language learning.
2.2.4.3 Support for the socio-educational model and the attitude/motivation test battery

The longevity and influence found in the socio-educational model is attributable to its verifiability. To support the claims of the socio-educational model, Gardner (1985) developed the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) in order to “produce a test that would measure the major affective individual difference variables identified by the socio-educational model” (Gardner, 2010, p. 108). In the decades following the 1985 development of the AMTB, it was refined and tested extensively, culminating in the development of two additional tests for particular contexts: the International AMTB (designed for contexts broader than the French focus of the AMTB) and the mini-AMTB.

Masgoret and Gardner (2003) performed a meta-analysis of 75 studies conducted by Gardner and his associates using the AMTB; these studies involved 10,489 students and looked at the major constructs of the AMTB: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, integrative orientation, and instrumental orientation. The results of this meta-analysis are convincing and conclusive: the AMTB is a valid tool for measuring the relationship between measures of achievement and the major variables of the socio-educational model (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). The article states that

On the question of the consistency of the relationships between measures of achievement in a second language and the three components of the integrative motive, integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation, as well as integrative and instrumental orientations, the evidence strongly supports the view that the correlations are consistently positive. (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 153)

I decided to use the socio-educational model as the primary theoretical framework for this study due to its well-established validity, explanatory power in large, multilingual contexts such as the one found in the present study, and its ability to be operationalized for large groups
of participants. Because I was also interested in analyzing how the experience of learning within this tandem environment affected ongoing motivation, I chose to include two additional theories: self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986) and self-regulated learning (Zimmerman, 1990). I will discuss these two theories in the following sections.

2.3 Self-efficacy theory

Beyond the effectiveness of the socio-educational model in explaining the variables of motivation, the context of tandem learning lends itself to examination through self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy theory consists of a robust range of topics, including an interest in: goal-setting, attitudes toward the subject, cooperative versus competitive learning environments, conception of ability as an acquirable skill, social evaluation and feedback, self-monitoring, and outcome expectations. Unlike the traditional language learning classroom experience most learners encounter, the model studied here is different in that it is entirely voluntary, not-for-credit, and cooperative. Participants do not compete with each other on standardized tests, nor are they called upon by facilitators to perform in their target language. I was eager to explore how this cooperative learning environment affected participant motivation to continue studying the target language upon completion of the tandem program. To research this, I employed some of the concepts within self-efficacy theory.

The most applicable elements of self-efficacy theory for this study concern how a learner’s conception of their own capabilities will lead them to pursue or avoid challenges. According to the theory, a person’s conception of their ability, or self-efficacy beliefs, will affect their choice of activities, the challenges they’re willing to face, the amount of effort they are willing to expend, and how long they’ll persist in their efforts (Bandura, 1993). One can see this
as a clear extension of the socio-educational model’s construct of motivational intensity (Gardner, 2010).

Self-efficacy research has shown the pivotal role efficacy beliefs hold in our decisions to pursue or avoid certain endeavors (Bandura, 1993, 2001). Learners with strong self-efficacy beliefs are more willing to approach challenges with confidence, which leads them to focus on the task (instead of spiraling into self-doubt) and sustain their efforts even when facing potential failure (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Bandura (2001) emphasizes the importance of self-efficacy beliefs:

Efficacy beliefs are the foundation of human agency. Unless people believe that they can produce desired results and forestall detrimental ones by their actions, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors may operate as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce effects by one’s actions. (p. 10)

2.3.1 Conception of ability as an acquirable skill

But where do self-efficacy beliefs come from? There are a number of practices that foster strong self-efficacy beliefs in learners. One of the most pertinent to this study is conception of ability as an acquirable skill (Bandura, 1993), which is when learners believe that their desired ability (in our context, being competent in the target language) is not innate, but rather something that they can achieve if they work hard and long enough. How often is heard in the language classroom that too-frequent complaint, I’m just not a language person? When learners view language acquisition as an acquirable skill, they develop a “highly resilient sense of personal efficacy … [and] remain steadfast … despite difficult standards to fulfill” (Bandura, 1993, p. 121). In tandem learning, participants are constantly exposed to learners of varying language
abilities, offering a wealth of examples to reinforce in the participant’s mind her potential to learn the target language.

2.3.2 Social comparison and cooperative learning environments

Tandem learning is, by definition, cooperative. Because participants work in pairs, with only one of them being the learner at any given moment, there is no one to compete with. This contrasts from some classroom language learning environment where students may be encouraged to compete among each other to answer corrections correctly and score better on oral or written assessments. Self-efficacy theory supports the value of cooperative learning environments over competitive environments for a number of reasons. Learners in competitive environments who see themselves “surpassed by others [experience] undermined personal efficacy, increased erratic analytic thinking, and progressively impaired performance” (Bandura, 1993, p. 123). It is not hard to envision a language learner who, upon seeing his classmates outperform him, begins to doubt his own abilities and focus less on his potential and more on his failures. This spiral of self-doubt can distract learners and discourage them from sustaining their efforts in language learning. In contrast, Bandura (1993) found that learners who saw themselves “gain progressive mastery … strengthened personal efficacy, [had more] effective thinking, and enhanced performance” (p. 123). What this suggests is that self-efficacy is better fostered in environments where learners focus on their own development and not on that of others.

2.3.3 Goal setting and self-efficacy beliefs

Goal setting is related to self-efficacy beliefs in that learners perform best when they have a goal in mind. This goal might be the ability to order a meal in the target language, or have a
conversation with a taxi driver, or watch the news. Whatever the goal, research has shown that “explicit, challenging goals enhance and sustain motivation” (Bandura, 1993, p. 130; Locke & Latham, 1990; Mento, Steel, & Karren, 1987). Goal setting gives learners “direction to their behaviour and creates incentives to persist in their efforts” (Bandura, 1993, p. 130). This persistence goes back to the socio-educational model’s construct of motivational intensity, which argues that an important quality of the motivated learner is their ability to persist in their efforts (Gardner, 2010).

The tandem learning environment is particularly well-suited to self-efficacy theory because it is a cooperative environment that encourages participants to view language proficiency as an acquirable skill, while weekly sessions promote increased proficiency. Bandura (1993) concludes that

learning environments that construe ability as an acquirable skill, deemphasize competitive social comparison, and highlight self-comparison of progress and personal accomplishments are well suited for building a sense of efficacy that promotes academic achievement” (p. 125).

For this reason, I think it is valuable to use self-efficacy theory in the theoretical framework of this study.

2.4 Self-directed learning

As mentioned previously, this study focuses on a tandem learning environment that is a unique model within the typical offerings of post-secondary institutions. Participants are students, staff, and faculty; their efforts are entirely self-directed and they are responsible only to themselves and their partner. For these reasons, it is interesting to look at the learning habits of these participants to see what self-directed learning strategies they practice, and how their use of
these strategies affects their overall satisfaction with the program and their motivation to continue language learning once the program has finished.

Bandura’s work in social cognition, as discussed in self-efficacy theory, was extended by Zimmerman (1990), who identified self-regulated learning practices effective learners use within a framework that views self-regulation as operating within three main areas: personal, behavioural, and environmental (Bandura & Cervone, 1983). Zimmerman’s work in self-regulated learning addresses how learners take ownership of their learning process and guide themselves to success. As Zimmerman (1990) explains, it is a look at “how students metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally initiate and direct their learning processes” (p. 185). This approach, based on Bandura’s theory of triadic reciprocal determinism (1983; 1986), takes a holistic view of the learning process and focuses on the personal (metacognitive skills), the behavioural (motivational awareness), and the environmental (environmental structuring) (Zimmerman, 1990, p. 180). These three factors are all separate but interdependent sources of influence on why people do what they do. What makes self-regulated learners special in the learning context is “their awareness of how specific strategies can influence learning outcomes and … their willingness to employ these strategies to achieve their academic goals” (Zimmerman, 1990, p. 180).

Interest in self-regulated learning grew through the 1980s and 1990s because of its clear emphasis on autonomy and the responsibility of students to take control of their own learning (Paris & Winograd, 2003). Its value comes from its inclusion of research into metacognition, cognitive strategies, and motivation. By giving each of these forces their own role within the construct, it has made it easier to see how they influence each other.
Metacognitive skills, such as what Zimmerman (1990) calls the “use of self-regulated learning strategies”, are fundamental to self-regulated learning (p. 185). These skills include: goal-setting, planning, organizing, studying, and self-monitoring and self-assessment. Csikszentmihalyi and Nakamura (1989) address the importance of having realistic but challenging goals for students. Kawaguchi and Di Biase (2010) reinforce studies in motivation and goal-setting theory outlined by Oxford and Shearin (1994) by showing that students in tandem learning situations steadily improve when faced with challenging, but manageable, goals. This study is interested in the role of goal-setting in the learning strategies of participants, insofar as effective goal setting is posited to be a predictor of learner satisfaction. The applicability of goal-setting in self-regulated learning for tandem is clear: it is assumed that participants who set clear and challenging goals will be more likely to value their experience than those who don’t set such goals.

This study will focus on two factors Zimmerman (1990) connects to the behavioural aspects of self-regulated learning: self-efficacy beliefs and autonomy. Self-efficacy beliefs have already been discussed at length in section 2.3, but where does autonomy fit in?

A central characteristic of tandem learning is learner autonomy. While exchanges may be loosely led or facilitated, it is up to the participants to determine the direction of their work. Supporting learner autonomy has been shown to be productive for learner motivation (Rigby, Deci, Patrick, & Ryan, 1992; Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, & Deci, 1978) and is considered intrinsically motivating (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Noels, Clement, and Pelletier (2001) showed that autonomous learning environments are supportive of “more self-determined forms of motivation” and are “predictive of lower feelings of anxiety” (p. 426), both of which are represented in the socio-educational model.
The final element of triadic reciprocal determinism is environmental events, what Zimmerman and Pons (1986) call *environmental structuring*. Zimmerman (1990) describes this as the way in which self-regulated learners “select, structure, and create environments that optimize learning” (p. 185). Tandem learning environments offer substantial opportunities for participants to practice environmental structuring by choosing the location, time, and mobility of their meetings; this may show a connection between participation in tandem learning and greater self-directed learning skills.

The extent to which learners practice self-regulated learning is one of degrees. All students who make an effort to go beyond what is required of them in the classroom have some degree of self-regulation. As Zimmerman (1990) states, it is not “an absolute state of functioning, but rather varies in degree” according to the effort a student is willing to expend and their control over the learning contexts (p. 195).

### 2.5 The theoretical framework used in this study

As I have mentioned, this study relies heavily on the explanatory power of the socio-educational model to consider the various facets affecting participant motivation. Because of the unique nature of the tandem learning model, I believe this framework would benefit from considering two additional theories from social cognitive theory: self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1993) and self-regulated learning (Zimmerman, 1990).

The goal of this study was to learn about the role and nature of motivation within participants of this tandem program. This topic has two sides, represented in research questions #2 and #3: *what motivates students to participate in Tandem?*; and, *from the perspective of participants, what are the effects of the program on their motivation to continue developing their*
second language skills? These questions investigate participant motivation during the program, as well as how participant thoughts, emotions, and actions affected their motivation to continue pursuing their language learning goals.

This framework posits three hypotheses: 1) that the motivational state of participants will be effectively described by the socio-educational model; 2) that participants with strong perceptions of self-efficacy will intend to continue their efforts toward learning the target language; and, 3) that participants practicing self-regulated learning strategies will have a positive attitude toward the learning situation and will intend to continue their efforts toward learning the target language.
Chapter 3: Methods

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

(i) What is the biographic makeup of Tandem participants in terms of student status (domestic, international, or exchange), age, sex, and language learning background?

(ii) What motivates students to participate in Tandem?

(iii) From the perspective of participants, what are the effects of the program on their motivation to continue developing their second language skills?

The goal of these questions was to learn more about who participates in this program, why they decide to join a non-credit, voluntary program, and what effects their participation has on their motivation to continue language learning in the future. A mixed methods approach was used in gathering both qualitative and quantitative data through pre- and post-surveys, as well as through six one-on-one, semi-structured interviews. The collected quantitative data were analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics using descriptive statistics and frequencies, while the qualitative data were transcribed and analyzed through thematic representation according to the research questions (Roulston, 2010). Transcriptions took place one month after the interviews concluded.

3.1 Setting

This study took place at a large, multicultural research university in Western Canada. In the study year, the university had approximately 49,000 full- and part-time students, 20% of whom were enrolled in graduate studies (Farrar, 2013). Of those, approximately 9,300 were international students studying on a short- or long-term basis at the university (Farrar, 2013).
Data were collected both in-person and via an Internet questionnaire. For the survey data, collection sites included communal student areas where the tandem sessions took place. Interview data were collected in a private office where the conversations were audio-recorded and later transcribed. Data for those who completed the survey online were collected via the online polling website Survey Monkey.

3.2 Participants

All of the participants involved in this study were enrolled in studies at the university. While the tandem program included staff and community members, they composed such a small percentage of the tandem body that they were excluded from the sampling plan. The sampling plans in this study varied between the quantitative and qualitative measures.

3.2.1 Survey Participants

No sampling occurred with the quantitative data, as all tandem participants were invited to take part in the study. I visited the on-site program sessions at the beginning and end of the study period to explain the study and its goals, as well as to distribute the pre- and post-surveys to interested participants. Those participants who did not attend the in-person sessions received emails from the program leaders, explaining the study and its goals and encouraging their participation via an online survey website. In total, 196 of 398 participants (49%) completed at least one of the surveys. 52 of 398 participants (13%) completed both surveys.

The sampling plan for the qualitative data, gathered through one-on-one interviews, involved selecting six interview participants amongst the 65 people who had indicated in the pre-survey their willingness to be interviewed. Selection of the candidates was accomplished through
a purposive sampling; volunteers were invited to participate to represent the program population based on sex, student status, and ethnic background.

3.3 Measurement Instruments

This study uses an adapted form of the mini-AMTB (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). I chose to adapt the mini-AMTB, instead of using the full AMTB, for a number of reasons: first, it was unrealistic to expect participants, many of whom would be working in English as their second language, to complete two instances of a 114-item survey; second, the mini-AMTB is particularly well-suited for the use of the descriptive statistics performed in this study, as opposed to the importance placed on convergent validity in the full AMTB; third, using the mini-AMTB would allow me to add additional measures concerned with perceptions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1993) and self-regulated learning strategies (Zimmerman, 1990). I was less concerned with testing the well-established validity of the socio-educational model than with learning about the various reasons why participants join the tandem program and what effect their participation, motivation, and learning strategies have on their desire to continue learning the target language.

The AMTB was developed to provide researchers with a tool to measure “the major affective individual difference variables identified by the socio-educational model” of SLA (Gardner, 2010, p. 108). By measuring these qualitative variables, the AMTB quantifies them and can support the research of large populations, such as second language classrooms in secondary schools. The test was originally developed to study the variables involved in SLA for English-speaking Canadian students studying French as a second language, though its validity and reliability in international contexts have since been supported by extensive research using the adapted International AMTB (Gardner, 2006).
The mini-AMTB, from which the surveys were adapted, is a shorter, 12-item version of the full AMTB developed in 1993 (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). It was originally designed to assess the convergent validity of the scales of the AMTB, and has been shown to have significant correlations with the AMTB. Because the intent of these surveys was to measure a series of variables among participants in a minimally-intrusive manner, and not to produce an aggregate score (as is the purpose of the AMTB and the mini-AMTB), an adapted form of the mini-AMTB was developed for its utility as a brief but effective measure of these variables.

3.3.1 The Adapted mini-AMTB

The first measurement instruments, the pre- and post- surveys, were adapted from Gardner’s (2010) mini-Attitude-Motivation Test Battery (mini-AMTB). Further adaptations reflect the unique plurilingual context of Tandem, as well as a desire to measure issues relevant to self-regulated learning (SRL) and perceptions of self-efficacy (PSE). The pre-survey consisted of 10 demographic questions and 17 questions relevant to the socio-educational model (SEM), self-regulated learning (SRL), and perceived self-efficacy (PSE). The post-survey consisted of 14 questions relevant to the SEM, SRL, and PSE. Nine questions from the pre-survey were repeated for the post-survey to measure changes over time. Two questions asked for open response answers, while the rest used a Likert six-alternative response format.

As this study is concerned with the SEM, SRL, and PSE, the mini-AMTB was adapted to include questions measuring elements of these other theoretical frameworks. Furthermore, an adaptation of the original mini-AMTB was necessary because the setting is different: the mini-AMTB’s questions assume that the user is studying English as their second language, whereas
participants in this study are studying a wide variety of languages. The adaptations used for these surveys are reasonably close to the AMTB and are considered appropriate in this context.

The surveys in the present study primarily used a Likert six-alternative response format. The items associated with the SEM measured participant affect on six scales: attitude toward the learning situation (ALS), interest in foreign languages (IFL), attitude toward the foreign culture (AFC), instrumentality, and motivational intensity. I did not include items for measuring parental encouragement (Gardner, 2010), given that all participants were adults. Items assessing language anxiety were added to the adapted mini-AMTB as language anxiety is an important factor in both SEM and SRL.

### 3.3.2 Instruments and associated measures used to answer research questions

This study used a pre-survey, a post-survey and individual interviews to answer its research questions. Table 3.1 summarizes the instruments and tools used to answer each of the research questions. The surveys used can be found in Appendices B and C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Question 1: In terms of student status (domestic, international, or exchange), age, sex, and language learning background, what is the biographic makeup of Tandem participants?</th>
<th>Question 2a: What motivates students to participate in tandem learning?</th>
<th>Question 2b: How might these motivations vary based on a student’s biographical attributes?</th>
<th>Question 3: From the perspective of participants, what are the effects of the program on the nature of their motivation to develop their second language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Measures</td>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong> Questions #1 – 10</td>
<td><strong>Post-survey</strong> Questions #1 – 9</td>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong> Questions #12 – 19, 23 – 29</td>
<td><strong>Pre-survey</strong> Questions #15, 16, 20 – 22, 24 – 26, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Measure

**Attitude toward the learning situation**
- How do you feel about Tandem as a learning environment?

**Language use anxiety**
- Before participating in Tandem, how did you feel about using your new language? Do you feel any differently now?
- Are there some situations where you feel more comfortable using your new language, and others where you feel less comfortable?

**Environmental structuring**
- Do you change anything in your learning environment to help you learn better?
- How much control do you feel you have over how you learn in Tandem?
- If there is a difference between your control over your learning in Tandem compared to in the traditional classroom environment? How is your ability to control the learning process different?
- How do you feel about the learning environment, in terms of the partnerships and possible facilitator roles in Tandem?
- If you had a goal for Tandem, how did you develop it, and did you create any smaller goals to help you along the way?

**Metacognitive strategies**
- What do you think are the qualities of a good language learner?
- Do you think learning a language is different than learning other subjects in school?
- How do you keep track of your progress? Is this any different than how you act in your language classroom (if applicable) where the teacher gives you grades?
- What do you do to help yourself learn your new language?
- What do you do inside of Tandem and outside of Tandem to learn, remember, and practice your new language?
- Has your approach to these activities changed since joining Tandem?
3.3.3 Participant Interviews

At the beginning of the study, those participants who completed the pre-survey were asked if they would like to take part in a one-on-one interview at the end of the term. I contacted a number of those who indicated their willingness to participate and invited them for a one-on-one interview. These interviews typically lasted 45 minutes and were audio-recorded and later transcribed. Efforts were made to have a demographically representative group of participants, though this was made challenging by low response rates (approximately 30%) to the interview requests, which may be attributed to the busy schedule of the end of term and exams.

The interviews were semi-structured and participants were asked a series of questions related to variables in the SEM and in SRL. Table 3.1 shows what interview questions were used and how they answered the research questions.

3.4 Procedure

Approval for the study was sought and received from the Behavioural Research Ethics Board in November 2012. All participants received a copy of the pre- or post-survey, as well as a copy of the consent form (see Appendix A). After obtaining consent from the participants, data collection took place in both public settings, a private office on campus, and online. As mentioned, I presented the study in-person to participants who attended the on-site sessions. The study’s goals and the pre- and post-surveys were discussed. Participants were then offered the opportunity to complete the survey and submit it to their discussion facilitator, who would return them to me. Approximately 89% of survey responses were completed in this way. The data collection process for the pre-survey took place over one week in January 2013, while the collection process for the post-survey took place over two weeks in April 2013.
The program coordinators sent an email at the beginning and the end of the term to all participants who met independently of the on-site sessions. In this email, they introduced the study and its goals. This email included a link to an online survey website that contained either the pre- or post-survey, which the participants could complete. Approximately 11% of all survey responses came from the online surveys.

The in-person interviews were completed in my on-campus office near the end of the term, once the Tandem sessions had concluded. The data collection process for the interviews took place over three weeks in April 2013.

3.5 Data Analysis

In the following sections I describe the methods used to analyze the quantitative data from the pre- and post-surveys, as well as the qualitative data from the interviews.

3.5.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics and frequencies. To prepare the data for analysis with descriptive statistics, responses on the Likert scales were collapsed from a six-response alternative format (possible responses included Completely disagree, Disagree, Somewhat disagree, Somewhat agree, Agree, Completely agree) to a three-response alternative format (reflecting Disagree, Neutral, Agree). The decision to do this was to draw a clearer distinction in responses and attitudes. Descriptive statistics were then produced and items that occurred in both the pre- and post-survey were represented together to show changes in time, which helped answer research question 3: From the perspective of
participants, what are the effects of the program on their motivation to continue developing their second language skills?

Two items were analyzed through frequencies. These questions were: i) If you have specific goals in your language learning, list your top 3; and, ii) What strategies do you use to help yourself learn? Because these answers allowed participants to respond in free form, it was necessary to code the data to categorize responses and analyze the responses through frequencies. To do this, I interpreted responses into a number of broad, distinct categories. After categorizing all responses, I reviewed the categories to ensure there were no significant overlaps between them. These final categories are represented in Chapter 4.

3.5.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

For the interviews, the collected data were transcribed and categorized for relevancy to the research questions and notable themes. Responses were coded in relation to their relevance to research questions 2 and 3, as research question 1 was answered with the quantitative data. To code the data, I organized it by what appeared to be the most prominent themes corresponding with each research question, but also included what were viewed as important thematic outliers. Quotations were selected from these interviews to illuminate significant themes and concepts, as well as to allow participant voices to be faithfully represented. These qualitative data were compared with the quantitative data to confirm consistency across research methods. A summary of the questions asked and their relevant research questions can be found in Table 3.1.
Chapter 4: Results

An analysis of these data from the surveys, as well as the interviews, yielded important findings within the research questions, and these findings have been categorized in major and minor themes according to the research questions.

4.1 Research question #1

4.1.1 Survey participants

Research question #1 sought to determine the biographical makeup of program participants. Through the use of pre- and post-surveys, the following factors were considered: sex, age, ethnic background, language learning background, and student status were reviewed.

In total, 196 participants completed surveys that included questions on their biographical details. Of those who completed the surveys, 65% were female and 35% were male. On-site meeters (those who met in facilitated discussion groups) made up 44% of the participant population, while those who met independently composed 56% of the group. Given the international setting of the study, and the identity of tandem as a multicultural program, the study also sought to determine what percentage of participants were either Canadian or Permanent Residents, known within the university as domestic students. The survey results are displayed in Figure 4.1, which shows that 36% of participants were domestic students, while 64% were non-Canadian. Of the 64% of participants who were international students, 9% were on short-term academic exchanges from their home universities, while the remaining 91% were studying at this university for an extended period of time.
While this program started 2 years before this study took place, only 14% of participants had previous involvement. The mean age of participants was 22 years old ($SD = 5.7$).

Table 4.1 Most common countries of origin shows that the majority of Tandem participants originate in countries other than Canada, with the greatest representations coming from China, Japan, and South Korea. In total, 24 countries of origin were listed by participants, though Table 4.1 reflects only those countries represented by two or more participants.
Table 4.1 Most common countries of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Interview participants

The pre- and post-surveys were one of the major instruments used in this study. The second was in-person interviews. Six participants took part in these interviews, and their demographic data were as follows:

- 5 were female and 1 was male.
- 5 were enrolled in an undergraduate program and 1 was enrolled in a graduate program.
• 3 were domestic students and 3 were international students. 2 were from South Korea and 1 was from Mexico.

The demographic data of the interview participants is not a perfect representation of the larger group of participants who completed the surveys, but efforts were made to be as representative as possible. I carefully considered the demographics of the overall group of study participants and looked to have its characteristics reflected in the interview participants. The following paragraphs offer a deeper description of the backgrounds of these interview participants, whose names have been exchanged for pseudonyms.

Maria is 22 year-old exchange student doing her undergraduate double-major in Business and the Liberal Arts. She is from South Korea, her first language is Korean, and she is teaching Korean and learning Chinese. She originally intended to learn English in the program, but upon realizing that her partner’s competencies in English were similar to her own, she decided to learn Chinese instead. She joined the program to improve her career opportunities.

David is a 25 year-old international undergraduate Science major teaching Spanish and studying French. He is from Mexico, his first language is Spanish and he is competent in English. At the time of this study, he had already completed one term of the program in Autumn 2012. He wanted to become competent in French so that he can one day live in a French-speaking community, and he is attracted to the French culture.

Joanne is a 27 year-old international graduate Education student teaching Korean and learning English. She is from South Korea and her first language is Korean. Joanne joined the program in order to improve her career prospects and her academic work, with another goal of reducing her anxiety about speaking English.
Erin is a 22 year-old domestic undergraduate double-major in the Liberal Arts and Physics. She is Canadian with Japanese heritage, and English is her first language. She taught English and learned Japanese. Erin joined the program to help prepare herself for an upcoming trip to Japan as well as to create bonds with her family’s heritage.

Sheila is a 20 year-old domestic undergraduate Liberal Arts major. She is from Canada and English is her first language, though she is also competent in French and Italian. In the program, Sheila taught French and learned Portuguese. She is attracted to Brazilian culture and wanted to learn Portuguese for career and travel opportunities.

Kait is a 23 year-old domestic undergraduate Liberal Arts student originally from the United Kingdom. She teaches and learns French with other French learners. Kait is attracted to French culture and hopes to one day teach French in public schools.

4.2 Research Question #2

Research question #2 asked what motivates students to participate in Tandem. The interview prompts and survey questions focused on this question involved the socio-educational model (SEM) and self-regulated learning (SRL), as explained below.

The first set of prompts asked interview participants about their previous experiences in second language learning and why they chose Tandem instead of a different learning environment, such as a language classroom, tutoring, or self-study. Past experiences in language learning can have a strong effect on one’s attitude toward the learning situation, as they have shown students what they value and dislike in their learning environments. Students with strongly positive or negative past experiences in language learning may come to a new learning environment with preconceived ideas about its value and potential. For this reason, a number of
interview prompts can be associated with the concept of attitude toward the learning situation, a primary contributor to the construct of motivation.

The two other major constructs investigated in answering research question 2 were motivational orientation and goal-setting strategies. Motivational orientations are found along a continuum between integrativeness and instrumentalism. While many language learners have motivations that fall somewhere between these two extremes, looking at this construct in depth helped answer research question 2. Similarly, reviewing participant goals for their learning also helped answer research question 2 in greater detail, as participants each listed a number of goals, many of which were instrumental, integrative, or a hybrid of the two.

Thus, the results presented below are related first to attitude toward the learning situation, then motivational orientation, and finally goal setting strategies.

### 4.2.1 Attitude toward the learning situation

All interview participants reported previous language learning experiences, though these varied in context and appreciation. The three participants who had studied in private settings in a foreign language context had negative feelings toward their past experiences. David, for example, complained that during his time learning French in Mexico “nobody really cared about [learning the target language]”. On the other hand, participants who had studied a second language in an immersive setting, such as the Explore Program\(^8\) or foreign exchange studies, had a strong appreciation for this style of language learning. “I think Tandem is great,” Kait

\(^8\) Explore is a Canadian program that sponsors Canadian students to live and study for five weeks in Quebec, a Francophone province of Canada. The minimum age for participation is 16 years old.
remarked, “because it reminds me of Explore and what I liked about it – the communicative aspect”.

Interview and survey participants expressed an appreciation for interactive learning as one of their primary reasons for joining the program. The opportunity to engage with and develop relationships with proficient speakers in their target language was something many participants reported feeling was missing in their language learning experience. But for some, tandem learning offered more than that: one interview participant reported wanting to have someone to talk to, since, as an international graduate student in a department with mostly professional, adult students, she had little opportunity to develop relationships with her peers.

Participants also cited the fact that the program is free as major attraction, as well as the setting, which is generally viewed as comfortable, low-anxiety, and communal.

Table 4.2 displays survey responses to the question “the Tandem program is an effective program to learn a language”. In the pre-survey, 59% agreed, 38% were neutral, and 1% disagreed. In the post-survey, 73% agreed (a 14% increase), 25% were neutral (a 14% decrease), and 1% disagreed. This measure reflects attitude toward the learning situation from the socio-educational model.
Table 4.2 Beliefs at beginning and end of term about the effectiveness of Tandem to learn a language

*Beliefs (expressed in % and no.) at beginning and end of term about the effectiveness of Tandem to learn a language (n=129, n=114)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=129)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that a strong majority (79%) of participants agreed with the statement “I am very interested in foreign languages,” while 19% of participants had a neutral opinion. 2% of participants disagreed with the statement. This measure reflects interest in foreign languages (IFL), a contributing factor to integrativeness in the SEM. By gauging participating interest in foreign languages, we see the contribution of integrativeness to learner motivation.

Table 4.3 Interest in foreign languages

*Interest (expressed in % and no.) in foreign languages (n=136)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Percent pre14 (n=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data displayed in Table 4.4 reflects responses to the statement “my tandem partner is better than most of my language teachers”. These data reflect the participants’ attitude toward the learning situation in regards to the source of L2 input, whether it be their tandem partner or language classroom teacher. In the pre-survey, 26% of participants agreed that their tandem partner was better than most of their language teachers, 62% were neutral, and 11% disagreed. In the post-survey, 24% agreed (a decrease of 2%), 55% were neutral (a decrease of 7%), and 21% disagreed (an increase of 10%). This measure reflects attitude toward the learning situation from the socio-educational model. The goal of this measure was to determine whether participants consider tandem learning to be a substitute for the traditional language classroom.

**Table 4.4 Assessment of tandem partner efficacy compared with language teacher**

Assessment (expressed in % and no.) of tandem partner efficacy compared with language teacher (n=116, n=111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=116)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second set of prompts asked participants about their motives, or reasons, for participating in Tandem. The SEM posits two motivational orientations in language learning: integrativeness and instrumentality. While neither that model nor this study claim that motivational orientation leads to stronger motivation, it is important to determine the various motives for tandem participants. To explore this issue, participants were asked what they wanted
to do with their new language. They were then asked about their feelings toward members of the target language community, a contributing factor for the construct of integrativeness.

4.2.2 Motivational orientations

To answer the first research question, I investigated what sorts of positive and negative past experiences participants had in language learning. Next, it was necessary to determine the range of motives behind their language learning. I began by asking participants what they wanted to do with their new language.

Responses among interviewed participants were evenly divided between those that could be categorized as integrative motivations and those considered instrumental motivations. The integrative motivations included David, a Mexican student who wanted to live in Montreal and Erin, a Canadian student with Japanese heritage who wanted to visit Japan and speak with locals. Instrumentally motivated participants mentioned wanting to learn French to teach in elementary schools, as well as developing a greater command of spoken English to help with academic and social settings. Finally, there were participants who mentioned motives that could be considered a blend of integrative and instrumental reasons for their language learning, such as Sheila, a Canadian student who studied Portuguese in order to travel in Brazil and possibly have a career there; or Maria, a Korean student who originally studied English to “build a competitive advantage in Korean society,” but came to see that “it could be helping me interact with other people from the much bigger world”.

Next, I asked the interview participants how they felt about members of their target language community and their associated culture. This question is an adaptation of the Gardner’s concept of attitudes toward French Canadians (AFC), modified to fit the local, multiethnic
context. In the SEM, AFC directly affects the construct of integrativeness, which affects motivation.

Half of the interview participants (and none of the English L2 users) mentioned strongly positive feelings toward members of their target language community. Reasons for these feelings ranged from a positive sense of the culture to an appreciation for the “Latin lifestyle … living with their family, eating at home.” Other participants had a range of responses. Erin, a Canadian interview participant with family ties to Japan mentioned that “this heritage idea … is important to me,” while Maria mentioned her surprise at realizing that most English users did not fulfill her expectations of “white people who are really good at English.” Joanne, the other Korean participant, expressed a strong sense of intimidation and anxiety when interacting with English users, which she felt embarrassed her interlocutors and made her regretful.

Table 4.5 displays responses to the statement “I learn my new language in order to speak with people from that culture”. This item assesses a key component of integrativeness: attitude toward the foreign culture. 84% of participants agreed with this statement, 13% were neutral, and 2% disagreed. This measure reflects integrativeness from the SEM, which contributes to motivation.
Table 4.5 Desire to learn target language to speak with people from that culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 reflects another measure of integrativeness, attitude toward members of the target language culture. 75% of participants agreed with the statement that “I like people who speak my new language”, 23% were neutral, and 2% disagreed. This measure reflects the attitude toward the foreign culture, which is a component of the construct of integrativeness from the SEM. Strongly positive responses to this measure demonstrate a high degree of integrativeness, which contributes to motivation.
Table 4.6 Positive attitudes toward members of the target language community

Positive attitudes (expressed in % and no.) toward members of the target language community (n=134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 addresses instrumental motives for learning the target language, giving career prospects as an example. The table displays responses to the statement “my main motivation to learn my new language is for practical purposes (i.e., to get a good job)”. 35% of participants agreed, 52% were neutral, and 14% disagreed. This measure reflects instrumentality from the SEM, which is one of the two motivational orientations.

Table 4.7 Desire to learn target language for instrumental purposes

Desire (expressed in % and no.) to learn target language for instrumental purposes (n=136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8 displays a measure related to the importance participants place on language learning. 88% of participants agreed that “language learning is very important”, 11% were neutral, and 1% disagreed. This measure reflects the interest in foreign languages, which is a component of the SEM’s construct of integrativeness, one of the two motivation orientations.

**Table 4.8 Importance placed on learning languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that 92% of participants agreed that they “really want to learn my new language”, 7% were neutral, and 1% disagreed. This measure reflects motivational intensity, which is affected by the construct of motivation from the SEM. This question was paired with the following question, which asks participants if they are willing to “spend lots of time” to learn their second language. These questions were paired to determine if there was a gap between what participants wanted and how hard they were willing to accomplish it.
Table 4.9 Intensity of desire to learn new language

Intensity (expressed in % and no.) of desire to learn new language (n=136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 asked participants if they would be willing to “spend lots of time to learn my new language”. 60% agreed, 38% were neutral, and 3% disagreed. This measure reflects motivational intensity, which is affected by the construct of motivation from the SEM. As described above, the goal of this question was to determine if there was a gap between how much participants wanted to achieve their goals and how hard they were willing to work to do so.

Table 4.10 Willingness to expend effort to learn new language

Willingness (expressed in % and no.) to expend effort to learn new language (n=136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third set of prompts asked participants about their thoughts on and use of goal setting strategies in language learning. Goal setting is an important metacognitive strategy in SRL and
one that is of particular focus in this study. Understanding the role of goal setting can shed light on overall learner satisfaction, as well as explain another aspect of why participants decide to join the program.

4.2.3 Goal setting strategies

The question of why participants join a program like Tandem can be viewed as consisting of two sub-questions: 1) why join Tandem in particular? and, 2) what is the purpose of participating in Tandem? I sought answers to the second question by focusing on the metacognitive strategy of goal setting, an important element of SRL. I began by asking participants what general role goals play in their language learning.

Participants had different perspectives on the importance of goals in their language learning, though most noted that they hold some value. Of the three participants who answered the question, all mentioned the motivating power of goals, though Maria noted that “they can sometimes give you limitations because if your goals are limited, like just to get a good grade, then you don’t have to be that fluent in English.”

When asked about particular goals they held when joining the program, most of the interview participants were unable to identify a specific goal. Most responded that they either had no goal or a general goal of hoping to have more opportunities for conversation practice. One participant noted that she wanted a better understanding of academic discourse, as she was feeling overwhelmed in her university lectures. Participants in the pre-survey were able to list goals, and these are displayed in Table 11.

Table 4.11 displays the different language learning goals that surveyed participants listed at the beginning of the period. The goals, in order of popularity, were: speak with a native
speaker (59%); improve oral proficiency (28%); better career opportunities (19%); deepen cultural understanding (16%); travel opportunities (13%); language skills development (13%); improved reading skills (11%); increased understanding of television shows (10%); improved pronunciation (7%); make friends (7%); improved writing skills (6%); improved academic work (5%); accent reduction (5%); improved grammar skills (5%); survival language skills (5%); opportunities to teach target language (5%); greater understanding of song lyrics (3%); greater appreciation for humour (2%); increased confidence (2%); and greater knowledge of professional jargon (2%). This measure reflects motivational orientation from the SEM and metacognitive skills from SRL. These results show us that the majority of common goals can be considered to be integrative; however, instrumental goals such as better career opportunities and support for academic work were also well-represented.
Table 4.11 Language learning goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with a native speaker*</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral proficiency^</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better career opportunities`</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural understanding*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel^</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills^</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading^</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding television*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation^</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make friends*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve writing^</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve academic work`</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent reduction^</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar skills^</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach target language`</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = integrative goal  ` = instrumental goal  ^ = both integrative and instrumental goal

There are a number of goals which may be considered to be both integrative and instrumental, as they both help the learner develop various skills while becoming closer to the target language community.
4.3 Research Question #3

Research question 3 asked what effect, from the participants’ perspectives, their participation had on their motivation to continue developing their second language skills. Interview prompts focused on this question addressed the socio-educational model and self-regulated learning. The socio-educational model posits three concepts as reflections of a motivated individual: motivational intensity (effort), a desire to learn the language, and positive attitudes toward the foreign language. A number of questions were asked of the interview and survey participants to gauge these concepts and answer research question 3. Because of the short-term duration of this study, I have assumed that the motivation held by participants at the end of the study will be maintained as they conclude with this program and seek out new learning opportunities. A number of the interview participants, for example, listed immediate plans to continue their language learning efforts, such as through travel or an academic exchange. By gauging these facets of the motivation, we are able to answer research question 3. Do participants enjoy the tandem learning environment and process? Do they feel safe in practicing, even if they make mistakes? Do they make the effort to study outside the program or find other opportunities to supplement their experience in tandem learning? Do they have plans to continue learning their L2? Answers to all of these questions paint a clear picture of the motivational state of the learner, from which we can make assumptions about their motivation to continue learning their target language.
4.3.1 Motivational intensity, desire to learn, and attitude toward the foreign language

A number of prompts for the interviewed participants regarded three reflections of motivation: motivational intensity, desire to learn, and positive attitude toward the foreign language. These are called reflections as they do not contribute to motivation, but reflect it. For example, someone who is motivated to improve his language skills in order to travel makes a strong effort because he is motivated. His motivation isn’t a result of his effort, but rather the catalyst for it. In the SEM, a motivated learner will demonstrate effort motivational intensity, desire, and positive affect. Motivational intensity can be seen as the “persistent and consistent attempt to learn” the language (Gardner, 2010, p. 89). Desire is the interest learners have in acquiring their target language, and attitude toward the foreign language is the enjoyment found in the learning process. According to the socio-educational model, truly motivated individuals will demonstrate all three reflections of motivation (Gardner, 2010). Interview questions were framed to determine the prevalence of these reflections for the participants.

To begin addressing motivational intensity, interview participants were asked about the effort they had put into past experiences in language learning. This is important because past successes attributed to significant efforts can encourage learners to continue making strong efforts in future endeavors. Participants noted mixed levels of motivational intensity during their immersive experiences on study exchange or with the Explore program, with Sheila commenting that she “cruised” during the Explore program in Quebec, but “put a lot of effort into” her exchange in Italy because of the positive reactions she received from locals when attempting to speak Italian (as opposed to apathetic reactions received in Montreal while trying to speak French). Interviewed participants who had experienced language learning in a private language
school or a classroom commented that they had put in significant effort, as it was required from the instructors.

Interview participants were asked about their efforts during the program. All interview participants reported feeling a lack of effort on their parts, and many expressed regret over this. Some participants commented that they began the term with strong motivational intensity, but that they became distracted with other responsibilities and did not prioritize studying for the program. Kait commented that she would have committed more effort if she had been partnered with a native speaker of her target language, as opposed to being in an L2-L2-L2 three-person partnership (an uncommon pairing in this program).

To assess desire to learn the language, interview participants were asked what they wanted to do with their target language. All six interview participants reported motives for their learning that can be associated with long-term desires, such as developing career opportunities and wanting to live in a community that speaks the target language.

To assess attitude toward the foreign language – the enjoyment found in the learning process – interview participants were asked their opinion of the Tandem format. There was a variety of responses to this, some negative and others positive. Four of the six interview participants said that they enjoyed working with their Tandem partners, and Joanne mentioned that her partner was “diligent and showed up every week … she was willing to help me out … I felt very comfortable and never intimidated by her”. However, those learners with advanced proficiencies were more likely to report frustration with the learning experience; for example, Maria said that Tandem learning is “no more than just spending your time with people who actually use that language … Tandem was not that effective a way for me … because it was short and also I was not that [much of a] beginner learner".
4.3.2  Attitude toward the learning situation

Attitude toward the learning situation was assessed by asking interview participants about their feelings toward the learning environment, their partnerships, and the roles of the discussion facilitators. All participants reported positive feelings toward the environment; David, for example, commented, “it’s really good, really fun”. Partnerships where the participant was paired with an L1 user were viewed more positively than those where the partner was not a fluent speaker of the target language. Joanne commented that her partner “didn’t judge me by how I spoke English … she was very generous so I could feel much more comfortable using English”. Regarding the discussion facilitators, all participants reported positive attitudes toward them and their roles in Tandem. Sheila commented that “they seemed to be really well-experienced in the language field … she was really friendly and open and got the ball rolling”.

4.3.3  Language Anxiety

The final construct from the SEM explored was that of language anxiety. Language anxiety is viewed within the SEM as “a situational form of anxiety associated with learning and using a second language” and is different from regular anxiety as it likely “develops as a function of exposure to learning and attempting to use” a target language (Gardner, 2010, p. 90; p. 91). Language anxiety is different from other constructs in the SEM as it is an exogenous variable, as opposed to the endogenous variables of attitude toward the learning situation and integrativeness. It is considered an exogenous variable because it has a reciprocal relationship with language achievement: positive experiences in language achievement reduce language anxiety, and reduced language anxiety leads to more positive relationships in language achievement. Within
the SEM, language anxiety is viewed as negatively related to motivation and language achievement.

At the end of the study, interview participants were asked about their pre- and post-program language anxiety. All but one of the participants mentioned high levels of language anxiety before participating in the program. Joanne discussed how, previous to her experience in the program, high levels of language anxiety had led to a negative self-image and conflicted feelings of academic identity.

I couldn’t really speak to my classmates because I felt like an idiot sometimes, so I didn’t feel very comfortable. In Korea, I went to Yonsei University. It’s second or third best in Korea. I don’t feel like an elite, but I wasn’t judged like an idiot or not very knowledgeable. I wasn’t used to that kind of recognition. But here, because of my English, I feel like I’m really under-assessed. I was really afraid to speak to other people because I was afraid to be judged as… oh, she cannot really speak well, I don’t know where she’s from.

When asked how their experience in the program affected their levels of language anxiety, interview participants had generally positive responses, though this was more prevalent with those who had higher levels of language proficiency at the beginning of the study. Joanne recalled how her partner patiently helped her learn to ignore her self-doubt and make more persistent efforts to be understood.

Table 4.12 displays participants’ pre- and post-survey feeling of being “nervous about speaking my new language outside of Tandem”. 23% of participants in the pre-survey agreed that they felt language use anxiety outside of the Tandem program, 52% were neutral, and 25% disagreed. In the post-survey, 24% agreed (an increase of 1%), 42% were neutral (a decrease of
10\%), and 34\% disagreed (an increase of 9\%). This measure reflects language anxiety from the SEM. This measure was included in both the pre- and post-surveys to determine if there were any changes in language anxiety between the start and the end of the term.

**Table 4.12 Perceived anxiety in speaking new languages outside of Tandem environment**

*Perceived anxiety (expressed in \% and no.) in speaking new language outside of Tandem environment (n=135, n=114)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=135)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 displays participants’ pre- and post-survey feelings of being “nervous about speaking in my Tandem class”. 8\% of participants in the pre-survey agreed that they felt language use anxiety in the Tandem program, 39\% were neutral, and 53\% of participants disagreed. In the post-survey, 5\% agreed (a decrease of 3\%), 29\% were neutral (a decrease of 10\%), and 66\% disagreed (an increase of 13\%). This measure reflects language anxiety from the SEM. As mentioned above, this measure was found on the pre- and post-survey in order to determine if there were any changes in language anxiety between the start and the end of the term.
Table 4.13 Perceived anxiety in speaking new languages in the Tandem environment

Perceived anxiety (expressed in % and no.) in speaking new language in the Tandem environment (n=135, n=114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=135)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 compares pre- and post-survey data on levels of anxiety within the Tandem environment compared to outside of the environment. In the pre-survey, 38% of participants felt more comfortable inside Tandem, 50% were neutral, and 12% disagreed. In the post-survey, 46% felt more comfortable inside Tandem (an increase of 8%), 39% were neutral (a decrease of 11%), and 16% disagreed (an increase of 4%). This measure reflects language anxiety from the SEM. As mentioned above, this measure was found on the pre- and post-survey in order to determine if there were any changes in language anxiety between the start and the end of the term.
Table 4.14 Perceived lack of anxiety in speaking new language in the Tandem environment compared to outside it

Perceived lack of anxiety (expressed in % and no.) in speaking new language in the Tandem environment compared to outside it (n=135, n=114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=135)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Metacognitive strategies

Interview prompts addressing constructs associated with the socio-educational model were supplemented with prompts concerning constructs in self-regulated learning. To begin, participants were asked a series of questions about metacognitive strategies in language learning.

Interview participants were first asked about the qualities of a good language learner. The purpose of this question was to assess participant understanding of the metacognitive strategies that support language learning. All participants mentioned that good language learners actively seek out and engage in opportunities to practice their target language in communicative, authentic settings. Heather said, in a comment reflective of the opinions of the other interview participants, said that good language learners “don’t care… they just throw themselves at the language and make mistakes … they seek to do everything in their life in that language”. Most
interview participants mentioned the need for substantial and sustained effort in language learning, and the willingness to “spend a lot of time by yourself” studying the language.

The second question asked interview participants if they believed that language learning was fundamentally different from other courses studied in school. This question addresses concepts in both the SEM and SRL. The SEM regards second language learning as fundamentally different from other types of learning because it involves “taking on features of another cultural community”, which is reflected through the construct of integrativeness (Gardner, 2010, p. 2). This question is relevant to SRL because it asks participants about the learning strategies they believe to be important to learning in general, in addition to those specific to language learning discussed above. Participant responses to this question varied, but most disagreed that there is a fundamental difference between second language learning and other school subjects. The interview participants spoke of language learning in cognitive terms, as opposed to the sociocultural framework of the SEM. Most interview participants commented on the importance of memorization and the mastery of syntax and discourse-specific skills.

Interview participants were then asked to identify the specific learning strategies they use to support their language learning goals, if they had any such goals. They typically supplemented the interactive nature of tandem with activities they could do on their own, such as using flashcards on their smartphones, watching media in the target language, and practicing writing. Still, some interactive practices were mentioned, such as speaking to friends in the target language and attending academic workshops for opportunities to practice English and meet new people.

An important metacognitive strategy in SRL is self-monitoring, or the ability to critically reflect on one’s development. Interview participants were asked how they keep track of their
progress in language learning while in tandem, and whether this differs from how they self-monitor in the language classroom, if applicable. Few of the interview participants reported using self-monitoring, and those who did spoke of self-monitoring through their abilities to hold conversations in their target language. As their abilities to hold more elaborate conversations developed, they noted this improvement. Maria said that they had no tools for self-monitoring or self-assessment, which she found quite challenging:

I have no self-evaluation criteria. That’s why I’m feeling kind of sad these days. When I reflect [on] my first arrival in Vancouver last September, and this. To compare my English in both periods, I really don’t know how much I’ve improved since then. So that’s what makes me really sad these days. I don’t know how I could measure. I really want to convince myself that I’ve improved a lot, but there’s no criteria that I could completely say that I’ve improved a lot.

Table 4.15 addresses research question 3 and reviews how participants view their language learning progress while working with their partner. In response to the statement, “I am making progress when I am speaking to my partner”, 63% of participants agreed, 35% were neutral, and 2% disagreed. This measure reflects self-assessment, a metacognitive strategy from SRL. Self-assessment was measured for two reasons: first, because self-assessment skills are a metacognitive strategy that can contribute to motivation; second, because it is assumed that learners who feel they are seeing the rewards of their efforts will be motivated to continue in those efforts.
Table 4.15 Self-assessment of language learning progress during Tandem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 displays participants’ perception of whether they “met the goals I set out for myself when I began” the program. 24% of participants agreed, 66% were neutral, and 11% disagreed. This measure reflects self-assessment, a metacognitive strategy from SRL. This measure assesses the use of metacognitive skills, but also participant satisfaction with their progress in tandem learning. This question is related to the information displayed in Tables 4.9 – 4.11, as those tables measured participant motivational intensity and goal setting strategies.

Table 4.16 Self-assessment of progress toward meeting initial goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 Self-regulated learning: behavioural aspects and environmental events

The behavioural aspect of SRL includes the constructs of autonomy and self-efficaciousness. To address these constructs, interview participants were asked about their perceptions of autonomy in their language learning classroom experiences. Most noted an overall lack of autonomy in these environments, though one interview participant reflected on the greater autonomy offered in her oral French class compared to her French grammar courses.

Interview participants were then asked how they perceived autonomy and their ability to customize their learning experience in tandem learning. All participants commented on a high degree of flexibility within the program and gave examples of how they would choose their own discussion topics if the weekly topic did not fit their language learning goals. For example, Sheila mentioned that:

even though there were suggested topics, we could talk about whatever. I learned a lot from my partner that I wouldn’t have learned if I’d followed all of the topic suggestions. It’s a more personal approach to learning a language and you can tailor it to your needs … I like the control here.

Another participant commented on how the flexibility of the program allowed her and her partner to spontaneously redirect their topic for the week, in response to ideas and themes that had arisen through their conversations.

The comparisons between tandem learning and the language learning classroom were made to assess research question 3, how participation in a highly-autonomous learning environment may affect the participant’s desire to continue their language learning once completing the program. It was assumed that the tandem environment was able to offer more autonomous selection of language learning topics, goals, target structures, and activities than academic language classrooms usually do.
Table 4.17 addresses participants’ “plans to continue studying my new language” after completing the tandem program. 82% of participants agreed that they had plans to continue studying, 18% were neutral, and 1% disagreed. This measure reflects autonomy from SRL and motivation from the SEM. This question is one of the key factors in answering research question 3, as it directly measures participant interest in continuing their language learning upon completion of the tandem program.

**Table 4.17 Intent to continue studying new language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18 addresses perceptions of learner autonomy in Tandem. In response to the statement “I feel like I have control over how I learn in Tandem”, 52% of participants agreed, 45% were neutral, and 3% did not. This measure reflects autonomy from SRL, which is a contributor to motivation.

Table 4.18 Perception of control over learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.19 reflects participants’ willingness to modify their learning environment to better meet their educational needs. In response to the statement “If there is something I dislike about my learning environment, I change it”, 39% of the pre-survey participants agreed that they would change a suboptimal learning environment, 57% were neutral, and 4% disagreed. In the post-survey, 48% agreed (an increase of 9%), 51% were neutral (a decrease of 6%), and 1% disagreed (a decrease of 3%). This measure reflects environmental structuring from SRL. Learners who practice environmental structuring are considered to be more self-directed, which can help sustain motivation.

Table 4.19 Willingness to modify the learning environment in order to improve one’s experience

_Willingness (expressed in % and no.) to modify the learning environment in order to improve one’s experience (n=126, n=114)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=126)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.20 displays responses to the prompt “my experience in tandem has shown me how to choose ways of learning languages that work best for me”. This scale addresses the impact of tandem on participants’ awareness of diverse forms of language learning. In the post-survey, 37% of participants agreed that tandem had made them more aware, 55% were neutral, and 8% disagreed. This measure reflects environmental structuring from SRL, which is a metacognitive skill found in self-directed learners.

**Table 4.20 Assessment on Tandem contributing to new ways of thinking about optimal language learning environments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.6 Perceived self-efficacy**

Perceived self-efficacy is an important topic in language learning because a strong sense of self-efficacy is correlated with positive learning skills. Bandura (1993) notes that “the stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer is their commitment to them” (p. 118).

Table 4.21 displays a measure related to participants’ perceived self-efficacy. In the pre-survey, 74% of participants agreed with the statement that “I believe I can accomplish my
language learning goals”, 24% were neutral, and 2% disagreed. In the post-survey, 68% agreed (a 6% decrease), 30% were neutral (a 6% increase), and 2% disagreed. Learners who agreed with this statement may be considered to have a strong sense of self-efficacy, which reinforces motivation.

Table 4.21 Belief in the feasibility of reaching language learning goals

*Belief (expressed in percentages) in the feasibility of reaching language learning goals (n=136, n=114)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=136)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 displays information regarding participants’ willingness to continue language learning in the face of strong challenges. In response to the statement, “If I feel that learning this new language is too difficult for me, I will stop trying”, 2% of pre-survey participants agreed. 27% were neutral, and 70% disagreed with the statement. In the post-survey, 7% agreed (a 5% increase), 33% were neutral (a 5% increase), and 60% disagreed (a 11% decrease). This measure reflects self-efficaciousness, a construct within SRL. The measure also reflects language learning philosophy, a concept of perceived self-efficacy. Learners who agree with this statement may be considered to lack motivational intensity, which demonstrates low motivation.
Table 4.22 Willingness to quit language learning efforts if the challenge is viewed as too great

Willingness to quit (expressed in % and no.) language learning efforts if the challenge is viewed as too great (n=132, n=114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=132)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Language learning philosophy

Associated with perceived self-efficacy is the construct of language learning philosophy (Bandura, 1993). Language learning philosophy addresses what learners believe regarding the feasibility of their goals. “Conception of ability as an acquirable skill,” Bandura says, “foster[s] a highly resilient sense of personal efficacy. Under this belief system, [learners] remain steadfast in their perceived efficacy, despite difficult standards to fulfill” (1993; p. 121). To assess language learning philosophy in this study, participants were asked about their conception of language as an acquirable skill or as an innate ability. A change in language learning philosophy from the start to the end of the study would help answer research question 3.

Table 4.23 displays pre- and post-survey data on participants’ perception of language learning as an innate ability. In the pre-survey, 10% of participants agreed that “being good at a language is a talent – you either have it or you don’t”. 54% were neutral on the statement and 36% disagreed. In the post-survey, 12% agreed (a 2% increase), 47% were neutral (an 8%
decrease), and 41% disagreed (a 5% increase). This measure reflects language learning philosophy from perceived self-efficacy. Participants who view language learning ability as something inherent may struggle to maintain their motivation compared to participants who see language as an acquirable skill.

**Table 4.23 Conception of language learning ability as innate**

*Conception (expressed in % and no.) of language learning ability as innate (n=136, n=114)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Levels</th>
<th>Pre-survey (n=129)</th>
<th>Post-survey (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore motivation in the context of tandem language learning. While past research on motivation in language learning has focused primarily on the traditional language classroom, little work has been done on the role of motivation in tandem learning environments. What kinds of students take part in tandem learning? Why do participants join a program that offers no trained language teachers and no academic credit? Does participation in tandem learning motivate participants to keep studying their target language, or does it discourage them and lead them to give up? This study answers these questions and discusses the complex faces of motivation among these learners.

5.2 Discussion

In the following sub-sections, I will discuss my research findings following the organization of my three research questions. When appropriate, I will use the qualitative data gathered through interviews as a means to expand upon the quantitative data.

5.2.1 Research question #1

Research question #1 sought to determine the biographical makeup of program participants. I was interested in learning about the sex, age, ethnic background, language learning background, and student status of study participants to determine if this tandem program appealed strongly to a particular student demographic.
5.2.1.1  Sex

I was first interested in the potential for a sex divide among participants. Survey results showed that 65% of participants were female, while 35% were male. The demographics at this post-secondary institution are in line with these results; 54% of students are female and 46% are male. While the sex divide is greater in this study, the difference is not so great as to support the idea that tandem learning is more popular among a particular sex. What we can see is that tandem learning in this context is not sex-biased and is viewed as equally attractive by both males and females.

5.2.1.2  Age

Next, I wanted to determine if the tandem participants were different from the greater student body in terms of age. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the mean age of tandem participants was 22 years old ($SD = 5.7$). The mean age of the student population at the institution was 25 years old, making tandem participants, on average, younger than the average student. The reason for this age discrepancy isn’t easily attributed to one factor; international students are equally represented in between undergraduates and graduates, and the advertising for the program is distributed to both groups of students.

Still, there is one strong reason why the mean age would be lower than the general student body: the program is predominantly composed of undergraduate students. In fact, 72% of participants were undergraduates, while only 28% were graduate students. The mean age of undergraduate students at this university in 2013 was 21, which explains how a heavily undergraduate-dominated program like tandem learning would skew toward the younger ages.
5.2.1.3 **International student representation**

A program that offers opportunities for learners to practice oral language skills in their target language holds a strong attraction for those studying a second language as a foreign language, as well as for those studying English while living in Canada. Despite being surrounded by English-speakers in their classes and possibly at home, many international students in this study expressed a sense of isolation and a desire to form personal connections with local English speakers. These reasons explain the strong representation of international students within this study: 64% of participants were international students studying in Canada as either part of an academic exchange or for the entirety of their degree. The remaining 36% of participants were either Canadian citizens or permanent residents.

These numbers are even more notable considering that international undergraduate and graduate students only make up 19% of the institution’s student population. What this shows is that there is a significant gap in post-secondary offerings for international students in terms of both social and academic support. Universities compete to attract international students, yet existing programs, such as work opportunities and social clubs, struggle to provide the support necessary for these students to flourish socially and academically in a new country. This study shows that student-led programs like tandem learning can be effective and economical tools for supporting international students.

5.2.1.4 **National backgrounds of participants**

Given that international students compose a majority of the participants in this study, I wanted to determine national representation within this group. As related in Chapter 4, participants from China, Japan, and South Korea make up 66% of the international student
participants in the tandem program. Other countries, such as the United States, Iran, Taiwan, Brazil, India and Peru are represented, but to a much smaller extent. These numbers show that participants from East Asian nations are overrepresented in comparison with the larger student body at the institution, where only 45% of international students (undergraduate and graduate) come from these countries.

What is interesting in these data on the national origins of participants is not who is represented, but who isn’t. European and South Asian countries are underrepresented in this study. These two regions represent 24% of the university’s international student population, but only 11% of participants in this study. Why do students from these regions participate in this program so much less than students from East Asia?

The clearest reason as to why there are so few participants from Europe and South Asia could be that there are simply not enough partners who want to learn those target languages. The participants I have been discussing here do not make up the entire body of applicants to the program, and many of those who apply do not take part in the program because of lack of partners in their desired language. For instance, unpublished data from the program coordinators show that there are a number of applicants who offer to teach Farsi, Polish, Armenian, or other European languages, but for whom partners cannot be found. For example, it is not always easy to find a Korean speaker who would like to learn Portuguese. This is one of the challenges of face-to-face tandem learning: shortages of participants who want to learn less-common languages in the local context. For every English-Mandarin pairing, there are many students from Iran, Indonesia, and Norway who cannot find someone who wants to learn their language.

This challenge seems fundamental to face-to-face tandem learning models because even when the applicant base expands, unless there is an equilibrium of languages distributions, the
discrepancies will only grow. Possible solutions to this challenge will require creative thinking and testing by program facilitators. There are two potential solutions to this challenge: the first is to pair a speaker of a highly-desired language (Spanish, for example) with two or more speakers of her target language (English, for example). This would narrow the gap between the amount of Spanish and English offered. The second possible solution is to create pairings of L2 users who can learn from, and with, each other (for example, pairing two students of French together). To be done effectively, program facilitators would need to educate participants of the potential benefits of L2-L2 learning as well as ensure that partners are at similar levels so that the tandem partnership does not devolve into one-sided peer tutoring.

Still, this is only half an explanation. The reason why European and South Asian languages are so poorly represented in this study could be, in part, because there are too few people offering, or requesting, those languages. But why aren’t there more participants from France, Spain, Mexico, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand? Finding the answer to this question will require further research into the linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) associated with these languages in the minds of tandem applicants.

5.2.1.5 Conclusion for research question #1

Overall, participants of this tandem learning program are partially representative of the university student body. There is a similar sex makeup, and the mean age difference is only two years. However, there are notable differences that have been interesting to explore. Participants are far more likely to be international students compared to the average university student. They are also more likely to be from an East Asian country than the average international student.
I have offered a number of explanations for these differences. First, it is clear that this program offers linguistic and social support desired by international students which is otherwise lacking within the university community. For this reason, post-secondary institutions should consider implementing student-led tandem learning programs as an effective, economical solution to meeting the needs of their international student populations.

Second, there is an unequal distribution of languages being offered versus those desired. European languages like French, Italian, and Portuguese are in high demand by domestic students but in short supply. English is in high demand from participants from East Asian countries, yet there are not always enough participants who want to learn Mandarin or Korean in exchange for English. There are a number of potential solutions to this issue. Organizationally, program coordinators could devise and test new pairing models that may include L1-L2-L2 combinations. Educationally, international student offices could raise awareness of the rich cultural makeup of nations that are not so highly sought-after in tandem pairings, thus raising the perceived linguistic and cultural capital of those languages within the university community.

These conversations all focus on the variety of participants who joined this tandem learning program. The next question seeks to determine why these participants joined. What was their motivation?

5.2.2 Research question #2

Research question #2 investigated the motivations for participants to join and partake in this tandem learning program. The measures for this question were built around the socio-educational model and included measures of self-regulated learning. Measures included attitude
toward the learning situation, motivational orientation, integrativeness, instrumentality, motivation intensity, and goal setting strategies.

Motivated learners do not all look alike. As discussed earlier, motivation is a staggeringly complex construct that is affected by time, emotion, environments, and ways of thinking. Two learners in the same environment may have vastly different senses of motivation depending on an array of affective and cognitive processes, as well as their reaction toward the learning environment. Still, the socio-educational model provides us with a framework for discussing the various agents that affect, and are affected by, language learner motivation. The goal of this research question is not to paint a single picture of a motivated study participant, but rather to review the diverse range of motivations found within these learners at the time this study took place.

5.2.2.1 Attitude toward the learning situation

When meeting with the interview participants, I learned that all had previous experience in language learning environments, though they had different opinions of them. Participants who had studied a language in a foreign context (and not living in a place where that language is commonly spoken) had negative feelings toward their experiences. On the other hand, those who had studied their target language in an immersive environment had positive experiences and were positively-inclined to language learning environments. The interview participants cited a desire for language learning through interaction as one of their motivations for joining the tandem program. These findings are supported by the larger survey results where interaction with members of the target language was one of the most-cited reasons for joining the program.
One unexpected result of the interview and survey responses was learning the extent to which participants joined tandem in order to make personal connections. This wasn’t just learners wanting access to a member of the target language community; these participants wanted friends. As a researcher working within his own social and linguistic community, I had forgotten the feelings of isolation and inferiority that can come with living in a foreign community without the invisible bonds of family, friends, and cultural capital that support us socially, emotionally, and academically (Bourdieu, 1986). These feelings, previously discussed in Chapter 4, were poignantly expressed in an interview with Joanne, who speaks about feeling judged as “an idiot or not very knowledgeable” because of her anxiety in speaking English.

Interview and survey responses show that this tandem learning program is viewed by applicants as a safe, low-anxiety space to develop personal connections, not as a byproduct of developing language competence, but as an end in itself. In a large university in a large city, it is easy to lose focus on the emotional and social support that students need to help them succeed. These results show that tandem learning programs may be one tool for providing this support. Other tools have been investigated internationally and suggest a number of other opportunities for learners to build social networks in unfamiliar communities (Dewey, Ring, Gardner, & Belnap, 2013; Kurata, 2011).

Beyond the interactive experience of speaking with members of their target language, participants had positive attitudes toward the specific learning situation found in this tandem program. They appreciated that in a university of $500/semester language classes, they could learn in tandem for free. Furthermore, interview and survey participants spoke about the comfortable, communal, and low-anxiety environment in which the on-site sessions were held.
But what were the participant expectations of the program? What did they expect to get in exchange for giving up their free time? Because I entered this study with a focus on tandem learning as a vehicle for linguistic (and not social) development, I asked survey participants at the beginning of the study if they believed that the program was an effective way to learn a language. The majority (60%) agreed that it was, 39% were unsure, and 1% disagreed. It is interesting that 40% of participants joined the program without strong feelings that they were going to develop their target language skills, but it makes sense when we consider that many participants join the program for social, as well as linguistic, reasons.

On another measure, I asked participants how they expected their tandem partner to compare to their language teachers in terms of language learning facilitation. Again, participants were realistic about the efficacy of their partners, with only 27% believing that their partners would outperform their teachers (62% were neutral and 11% disagreed).

Together, these measures of attitude toward the learning situation show us the diversity of program participants. Because the program requests that applicants have a base level of competence in their target language, all participants have had some experience in language learning, whether it be positive or negative.

Interaction was a major attraction for participants, and this wasn’t limited to interaction for the purpose of language learning. Many participants joined the program in order to make friends and for some of these language learning was a secondary motivator. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that many participants did not join the program with expectations that their language proficiency would dramatically improve, or that their partners would be necessarily more effective than their language teachers. This aspect of tandem learning is one that is little-discussed in the research (though it is addressed in the literature, such as Dewey, Ring, Gardner,
and Belnap, 2013; Kurata, 2011) but should be taken seriously by researchers and educators, as there is clearly an unmet need in contexts like this for opportunities for social development across cultural and linguistic groups.

5.2.2.2 Motivational orientations

The social benefits of tandem learning discussed above are significant and worthy of discussion and research. But tandem learning is also a language learning tool with a goal of helping learners expand their target language proficiency. So, why do participants want to expand their target language proficiency? Is it to support them in their academic work? Prepare them for a career in the target language community? Help them travel or even find a boyfriend? This questions provided a variety of responses.

As discussed in Chapter 2, researchers often talk of the division between integrative and instrumental motivations. Integrative motivations are those that support personal growth and stronger connections to the target language community. Instrumental motivations are typically associated with improving career opportunities or supporting academic work. And of course, like any alleged binary, there is a lot of gray between these points. For instance, is learning a language as preparation for travel instrumental or integrative? The integrative/instrumental argument is one that has been waged for decades and can be more of a distraction than an explanatory tool. Still, a study on the motivations of language learners would not be complete without an acknowledgement of these issues. Also, as the socio-educational model argues, strong motivational orientations coupled with sustained effort are contributors to motivation.

The survey included a number of measures that are indicative of strong integrativeness, as described by the socio-educational model. For one measure, attitude toward the foreign
culture, a strong majority (84%) of participants agreed that they were learning the target language in order to speak with members of that linguistic community. Another measure, attitude toward members of the target language culture, saw 75% of participants agreeing that they like people who speak their target language (23% were neutral). A final measure of integrativeness, the importance placed on language learning, had 88% of participants agreeing that language learning is very important. Together, these three measures make a compelling argument that participants in this study had a strong degree of integrativeness and an integrative orientation (see Figure 2.1).

Instrumental and integrative orientations are not mutually exclusive. While one may be dominant, there is no reason to believe that one excludes the other. This was attested to in the interviews where half of the interview participants cited instrumental motives for learning their target language, such as career opportunities and “building a competitive advantage”. When asked if their main motivation in language learning was for practical purposes, such as getting a good job, only 14% of survey participants disagreed. 52% of participants were neutral on this question, and 35% agreed. This demonstrates that despite the strong integrativeness of this community, there is a large portion of participants who are learning their language to fulfill instrumental desires.

As previously mentioned, the socio-educational model is clear that motivational orientation alone has no correlation with language achievement. What matters is a strong motivational orientation paired with significant and sustained effort, or motivational intensity.
5.2.2.3 Motivational intensity

Taking part in a tandem program such as the one studied here shows, at least, a minimal devotion to the language learning endeavor. Participants join the program knowing that they will get no academic credit for their participation, yet they intend to make the effort to take part in weekly sessions and regularly review in their spare time what they covered with their partner. I included two measures of motivational intensity on the pre-survey to get an idea of the difference between desire and investment. Desire is the yearning of participants to speak the target language, whereas investment is the amount of effort they are willing to expend in order to learn the language.

Participants overwhelmingly agreed (92%) that they “really want to learn” their target language, with only 7% being neutral. It is clear that the desire among participants is strong, but how willing are they to make the effort necessary to realize this desire? On this, the answer is less clear: only 60% of participants agreed that they were willing to spend “lots of time” to learn their new language, with 38% neutral.

This is one of the fundamental challenges of a voluntary, not-for-credit program like this. I will discuss this further in regards to research question #3, but it is clear from survey and interview data that this gap between desire and investment creates challenges for participants in realizing their goals.

5.2.2.4 Goal-setting strategies

The final aspect to consider in answering what motivates participants to spend their time in this tandem program is learning about their goals. I see this topic as different from that of motivational orientation discussed earlier, as motivational orientations typically are broadly-
focused and long-term. Motivational orientations are represented through things like career interests, or desires to relocate to other linguistic communities. Goals are shorter-term efforts to realize new competencies or have certain experiences. Effective goal setting is considered a hallmark of metacognitive skills, but what is effective goal setting?

Effective goal setting involves the development of realistic, challenging, measurable short-, medium-, and long-term goals (Zimmerman, 1990). A student practicing effective goal setting may enter the tandem program with a short-term goal to learn three new phrases each session, a medium-term goal to be able to understand a particular television show in their target language by the end of the term, and a long-term goal to spend a semester on exchange in their target language community. These goals meet the requirements of effective goal setting: they are possible, they are challenging, and they are measurable. How do the goals reported by this study’s participants compare?

As we recall from Chapter 4, the most common goals (in order of popularity) were: ability to speak with a native speaker (reported by 59% of participants), improve oral proficiency (28%), improve career opportunities (19%), improve cultural understanding (16%), be able to travel in the target language community (13%), and improve language skills (13%). While most of these goals meet at least one requirement of effective goal setting, they are mostly long-term, vague, difficult to measure goals. None are the short-term, incremental and realizable goals that help learners sustain their motivation through the challenging and taxing process of second language acquisition. These findings are also seen in the interview data. While participants were able to identify the importance of goal setting, only one participant was able to recall a clear goal that she had in mind when joining the program.
These findings should not lead one to believe that these participants were neglectful, unfocused, or rudderless in their efforts; rather, they point to the lack of explicit instruction about effective goal setting in the university, and the program, learning environments. For many students, a clear advantage of the structured, traditional language class is that it requires students to complete tasks that are consistently more challenging than the ones before them. Students are expected to memorize new target vocabulary on a regular basis and demonstrate their mastery of increasingly complex grammar structures. None of this is a requirement in a tandem program. The program focused on in this study did not have discussions about how to set goals, how to self-assess, and how to reflect on what has been learned. Because of this, the majority of participants have little direction in how to approach their aspirations and meet their goals.

5.2.2.5 Conclusion for research question #2

The reasons why participants in this study joined the tandem program are two-fold: first, they wanted to have opportunities to speak in their target language with proficient speakers; second, they wanted to develop relationships. Both of these motivations can be considered integrative, although many participants also cited instrumental motivations for their language study, such as improving career opportunities or supporting their academic work. This shows that tandem learning has unique qualities as a quasi-academic program in a post-secondary setting: students participate in it for both academic and social reasons.

Another important finding is that tandem participants do not have unrealistic expectations of what they are getting out of the program; they do not expect to have brilliant teachers as partners, though they expected that the program would be effective in helping them improve their target language. This finding again demonstrates that tandem learning may serve well as a
supplement to the traditional language classroom, as it can provide the oral/aural practice needed for students to acquire their target languages.

Participants in this study entered the program with a strong desire to learn their target language, but were less willing to expend significant effort in order to achieve this. Here we find one of the fundamental challenges of tandem in a not-for-credit setting. Future tandem delivery models will need to think of creative solutions for sustaining motivation among participants; one method noted in the interviews was that being responsible to a partner can help participants sustain their efforts, as they are not disappointing themselves if they do not work hard – they are letting down their partner.

Finally, participants of this tandem program had few effective goal-setting strategies. Many of these goals were overly vague or impossible to measure, which may explain why only 24% of participants felt that they had met their goals by the end of the term. Future versions of this model could consider having discussions at the beginning of the term on how best to create short-, medium-, and long-term goals for language learning.

5.2.3 Research question #3

Research question #3 investigated the possible effects of participation in this tandem program on participants’ motivation to continue learning their target language. Because of the short-term design of this study, these effects were measured through the reported perspectives of participants. These measures included reflections of motivation, language anxiety, and the use of metacognitive strategies.
5.2.3.1 Reflections of motivation

As discussed earlier, reflections of motivations are the signals a motivated individual makes. These are: effort (motivational intensity), desire (to learn the language), and attitude toward the foreign language. A motivated learner demonstrates all of these. In this study, participants reported mixed levels of motivation by the end of the term. All interview participants, for instance, were dissatisfied with their efforts during the term, and most attributed this to competing academic demands. There were mixed feelings about working with tandem partners, especially for highly-proficient speakers who were not partnered with native speakers of their target language. Still, participants maintained their long-term goals and their desire to continue language learning, which shows that while tandem learning may not be a panacea for the challenges of learning a second language, it certainly doesn’t discourage language learners from maintaining their goals. In the end, participants reported very high satisfaction with their experience in the tandem program and strong relationships with their partners.

5.2.3.2 Language anxiety

Another measure of motivation is language anxiety, which was measured in pre- and post-surveys. While all measures suggest minor decreases in language use anxiety both in and out of the tandem environment, these data show us that tandem participants reported about half the amount of anxiety when speaking within the tandem environment compared to outside it. These data suggest tandem participation may have positive effects on language anxiety, and also that the tandem environment is perceived as a safe, low-anxiety environment for language learners to practice and develop their skills.
5.2.3.3 Metacognitive skills

When it comes to approaching learning, study participants expressed a strong belief in the importance of seeking out opportunities to speak, self-study, and manage language anxiety. Interview participants listed a number of resources that help them progress, including everything from flashcards to participating in academic workshops in the target language. These opinions may be expected given the nature of this tandem program, but they also show that, while participants may not study as much as they know they should, they are aware of the practices needed to succeed and they are often creative in their efforts.

In order to sustain motivation, participants need to believe that their efforts and time are not wasted. In this, the tandem program has relatively positive responses: 63% of participants agreed that they made progress in their language acquisition while in the program, while only 2% disagreed. This measure is supported by the 82% of participants who stated that they had plans to continue studying their target language (only 1% disagreed). This suggests that, while there may be opportunities for fine-tuning and improving this language learning model, the fundamental response to tandem learning is very positive.

These findings are counter-balanced by the comments of the interview participants who struggled to self-assess their performance, as described by Maria, who reflected that “I really want to convince myself that I’ve improved a lot, but there’s no criteria that I could completely say I’ve improved”. Again, this suggests an opportunity for tandem programmers to fill a need by fostering discussions on how to self-assess and self-monitor.
5.2.3.4 Conclusion for research question #3

These findings demonstrate that while the tandem model focused on in this study is imperfect, it has a number of positive qualities and merits serious considerations as a fixture in language education settings. Overall, participants appreciated the program and their partners and felt that they were improving their language skills by participating. They felt that the tandem setting was a relaxing, low-anxiety environment to work on their target language, and that their language anxiety decreased with their participation in the program. Participants were both traditional and creative in their search of self-study aids and other environments for target language exposure, though many felt dissatisfied in their inability to self-assess their progress.

Still, there are many areas for improvement. Deep-held beliefs about the inferiority of non-native language users can bias the opinion of participants, leaving them to feel disappointed when paired with someone who isn’t a native speaker of the language. Proficient speakers may need more structure in their sessions so that they are exposed to new target language and grammar. Finally, all participants would benefit from more discussion on self-assessment strategies, so that they can gauge their progress as the term progresses.

5.3 Limitations of the study

While efforts were made to use reliable measurement instruments and involve the greatest number of participants possible in this study, limitations arose. Some of these derived from unforeseen inadequacies in the measurement instruments, others with the population sample.

Because I had not expected so much interest in the tandem program to be focused on developing personal relationships, my survey and interview questions did not focus on this.
Clearly, the opportunity to develop bonds with members of the target language community was an important motivation for many participants, and the study would have benefited from exploring this in greater depth during the data-collection stage. I have made efforts to discuss the data collected fully, but there is clearly much left unrepresented here.

In terms of the participants reflected in this study, there are two fundamental challenges. The first was the difficulty in involving the large number of tandem participants who do not attend the weekly sessions. While these independent meeters were sent e-mails encouraging their participation in the study, the response rates were far lower than for those who attended the on-site sessions. While we cannot know if these independent meeters held similar views to those of their on-site peers, there is the possibility that they may have different motivations and experience in the tandem program, given the different context of their participation. The second challenge was in determining how representative the participants in the post-survey were of the group that began tandem at the beginning of the study. It is likely that some of the participants who completed the pre-survey quit during the term and were not represented in the post-survey. This could skew the data to show a greater degree of satisfaction with the program than should exist, as well as hide the reasons why these participants quit the program.

The final limitation of this study is time. The study was conducted over four months as part of a graduate research project. One of the main research questions focused on how program participation affected participants’ motivation to continue learning their target language. The only measures we have of this are taken at the end of the program, which reflects the intentions of participants, not their actual efforts following completion of the program. Will 82% of participants continue to work on their target language development? This question could have been better-answered with a longitudinal study that followed participants over the coming years.
Unfortunately, the nature of this study does not allow for longitudinal research over multiple years and relies on the expressed intentions of participants to draw its conclusions.

5.4 Implications of this study

As this study focused on a program in-situ, it dealt with the practical organization and delivery of a learning model through specific theoretical lenses. It comes at a time where pedagogical, administrative, and theoretical interests converge in the interest of providing holistic learning opportunities at lower costs.

Pedagogically, this study shows that tandem learning can have significant buy-in from students, even if they aren’t getting academic credits for their participation. Interest and commitment, most educators would agree, are the foundations upon which learning is built. The study shows that students join tandem learning for a multitude of reasons, including the search for friendships and connections to other students. This finding should not be overlooked. There is clearly an unmet need when it comes to building social support for students, particularly those coming from other countries. Furthermore, many local students demonstrate their desire for opportunities to practice their second language skills with members of their target language community. Tandem learning can address these issues and provide educational institutions with a win-win scenario that is attractive to all participants, while building stronger bonds between students, staff, faculty, and community members.

For educational administrators, there is much here to learn about how to run a tandem program. The tandem program focused on in this study is not perfect. It struggles to help students set and pursue realistic goals. It is unable to find partners for a number of its applicants due to a lack of corresponding language requests. And it has not figured out yet how to accommodate
learners with high-proficiency, who often express frustration when being partnered with someone with whom they feel they are not learning. Still, the groundwork has been laid and this program has managed to build a popular, sustainable program with minimal resources or financial support. A strong culture of volunteerism has ensured that this has remained a student-run initiative, and this community has successfully grown and improved over the years, despite the regular change of coordinators and facilitators. These issues have been explored and discussed at length in a program handbook produced about this particular tandem program, and interested readers should consult Zappa, Bournot-Trites, Wang and Ryan (2013).

Theoretically, this study has noted a disparity in regards to age and national background for participants. It is unclear as to whether this disparity is unique to the context or time in which this study took place, but it clear that participants are younger and much more likely to be from an East Asian country compared to the average student of the institution. This study has also demonstrated that the socio-educational model, while a strong tool for researching motivation, struggles to represent the complex social systems in place driving the motivation of many learners for whom relationships are as great a motivator as language proficiency. Use of the socio-educational model can benefit from incorporating other social system theories in order to ensure holistic a understanding of language learning motivation.

5.5 Recommendations for future research

While this study served as an effective introduction to the issues of motivation in a face-to-face tandem learning environment, it is only the beginning. There is a need for further research to expand both the scope and depth of the inquiries presented here. Longer studies are needed to research the longitudinal effects of participation, and new measurement instruments to
better-explain the role of social-development in these programs. New metrics to investigate the effects of participation on language acquisition would also be effective to determine whether tandem learning programs are a feasible supplement to second-language programs. I hope that the research presented in this study will invigorate research interest in face-to-face tandem programming, encouraging researchers and program coordinators to think about the myriad benefits of such a unique program.

5.6 Conclusion

Three major conclusions may be drawn from this study. The first is that tandem learning programs appeal to a broad range of students, but are particularly attractive to international students who want more social interaction. The second conclusion is that tandem participants join the program because they have positive feelings toward the target language community, and they want to develop closer connections to it. The third conclusion is that tandem learning is a positive, low-anxiety experience where many participants feel they are able to improve their language proficiency in an autonomy-fostering setting.

The appeal of tandem learning to international students should be of considerable importance to educational administrators and educators. An educational setting that fulfills the social needs of its students will benefit from greater student cohesion, a wider spread of ideas and culture, and a more globalized student body. Tandem learning is an excellent vehicle for meeting these goals.

This study has also shown that the majority of tandem participants join the program because they want to develop closer bonds to the target language community. Few participants partake simply to improve their grades in their language courses, which shows that while tandem
learning may be an effective supplement to the language classroom, it is more than that. It is a vehicle for exposure to new cultures, and for this reason should be viewed as a tool to expand the global reach of communities and foster strong ties between cultures. Educational administrators should consider the potential for tandem learning programs to enhance a range of academic programs and foster relationships with foreign partner universities.

Finally, tandem learning works. Participants are happy, pleased with their perceived progress, and disposed to continue their language learning journey. While experimentation will widen our understanding of the potential for tandem learning, future programs should avoid deviating from the fundamentals of tandem learning found here. Tandem relationships should be centered on the reciprocal exchange of knowledge in an autonomous, supportive environment. While there may be opportunities to expand tandem learning into new models and for-credit programs, these endeavours should be approached with great care and research in order to avoid turning tandem learning into an elevated form of a classroom language lab.

The tandem learning program focused on in this study is an exciting and innovative language learning model that is attractive to a range of stakeholders. For educational administrators, it offers the change to foster connections between an ethnically- and linguistically-diverse student population. For educators, it holds potential to enhance the efficacy of second language programming by giving learners the much-needed opportunity to develop their language competencies through practice. And for students, it gives the chance to develop the yearned-for bonds to new cultures, new people, and new lives. Tandem learning is no panacea for the difficulties of foreign language learning, but it is a tool with immense potential.
References


Appendices

Appendix A  Consent Form

A Global Campus: Tandem learning at UBC and
Motivation in Tandem learning

Dear prospective participant,

We are writing to ask for your consent to take part in two studies conducted by Dr. Monique Bournot-Trites, Dr. Sandra Zappa, Robin Ryan, and Rachel Wang, Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia. The studies are entitled A Global Campus: Tandem learning at UBC and Motivation in Tandem learning.

Study overview

A Global Campus: Tandem learning

We would like to ask you to take part to help us better understand the program and how we can make it successful. The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the program and the achievement of its objectives, as well as the interactions among students. With these data, we will revise the current Tandem Handbook.

Motivation in Tandem learning

This study seeks to learn about the role of motivation in Tandem participants. We will seek to answer the following questions:

1. What types of students participate in Tandem?
2. What motivates students to participate in Tandem? How might these motivations vary depending on students’ personal attributes?
3. From the perception of participants, what are the effects of the program on the nature of their motivation to develop their second language?
**Study procedures**

If you agree to participate, you will be invited to complete two short surveys. The first survey will be distributed in mid-January, and the second one in mid-March. There will be a series of questions regarding your feelings about the program as well as your own experiences learning in Tandem and your language learning plans. These surveys should each take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

You will also be invited to take part in an interview (either together with a group of other Tandem participants or one-on-one, depending on your choice) with the research team. The interview is expected to take between 30 to 60 minutes, and will focus on your learning experience in Tandem. If you are interviewed, we will audio record the interview. If you are willing to be interviewed, please note this in the consent form.

**Potential Benefits**

With your help, we will collect information that will be used to improve the existing manual for Tandem. The revised manual will be distributed free of charge to any person or institution that would like to start a Tandem program of their own. You will be able to have a copy of this manual once it is produced upon request.

Additionally, you will have access to the publication of the study on *Motivation in Tandem learning* once this study is completed and made available online.

**Confidentiality**

Participants will not be identified in reports of the completed study. You will be assigned a code number and the code numbers will be used in the analysis. No participant will be referred to by
name or identified in any way in the report of the results. All data, including audio or videotapes, will be stored in a locked file cabinet and/or password secure computer.

If you choose to participate in the focus group interview, it is possible that your responses will not be confidential. We encourage all participants to refrain from disclosing the contents of the discussion outside of the focus group; however, we cannot control what other participants do with the information discussed.

**Contact for information about the study**

Participation in the study is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without any consequences even after signing the consent form. Refusing to participate or deciding to withdrawal will not jeopardize your academic achievement. For your records, please keep a copy of this letter. Whether you wish to consent to participate in the study or not, please fill out the attached consent form according to your wishes and sign. You can give this form to Robin Ryan at one of the Tandem sessions, or you can email a PDF of it to him.

Sincerely yours,
Statement of Informed Consent (copy to put back in the envelope and return)

Title of the project: *A Global Campus: Tandem learning.*

Please fill out the information below and give your completed form to Robin Ryan, or email a PDF of it to him. Thank you very much.

I have read and understand the studies entitled “*A Global Campus: Tandem learning at UBC*” and “*Motivation in Tandem learning*” described in the letter above.

I have kept copies of both the letter describing the study and one of the Statements of Informed consent.

‘I consent / I do not consent (circle one) to participate in this study.’

___________________________________________________

Printed name

___________________________________________________

Signature and Date

Would you be willing to be interviewed as part of these studies? (Check the box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you wish to participate in the interview please give your e-mail address so we can contact you:

________________________________________________________
Appendix B  Pre-survey

Tandem learning Survey (pre-survey)

Thank you for participating in our survey of the Tandem learning Program! There will be two surveys, one at the beginning of a term and the other at the end of the same term. The purpose of these surveys is to collect data in order to improve your experience as a Tandem learning (TLL) participant. All of your responses will be kept anonymous. Please send your filled out survey to Robin Ryan or give it to him during one of the sessions. For any question, please contact Robin.

To safeguard your anonymity, Robin will replace your name with an ID code. He will be the only person with access to the coding key and will be responsible for matching responses from the second survey to those of the first survey, for the purpose of longitudinal analysis.

This survey contains 29 items. At the end of the survey, we invite you to add any relevant comments or opinions.

Please respond to these questions in a manner that reflects your opinions. If a question does not apply to you, or you prefer not to answer, please indicate “NA” in the margin.

A) General information. Please circle or highlight the answer that applies to you

Your name:____________________________________

1. Type of participant:
   a. I am an independent meeter
   or
   b. I meet my Tandem partner with the larger group:
      1. on Tuesday morning
      2. on Tuesday afternoon
3. on Friday afternoon
2. Identify your gender: male or female
3. Have you participated in Tandem before?
   a. Yes / No
   b. If yes, when? ______
4. How old are you? ______
5. What is your student status?
   a. Domestic
   b. International
   c. Exchange
      i. Ritsumeikan
      ii. Go Global
      iii. Other (specify)________________________
   d. English Language Institute (ELI)
   e. Other (specify)________________________
   f. Not a student
6. If you are not originally from Canada, which country are you from? ________________
7. What language(s) do you speak? __________________
8. What language(s) are you learning? __________________
9. What is your level of education?
   a. Graduate
   b. Undergraduate
   c. Other (specify) ______________________
10. If you are currently studying, what is your subject area or major?
    ______________________________________
11. How did you hear about Tandem?
    a. Advertising email
    b. On-campus posters or advertisement
    c. Recommended by instructor
    d. Suggested by friends
    e. Other (please specify) ________________
Do you agree with the following statements? *(Please circle the right answer)*

I learn my new language in order to speak with people from that culture

1. I learn my new language in order to speak with people from that culture

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

12. I like people who speak my new language

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

13. I am very interested in foreign languages

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

14. My Tandem partner is better than most of my language teachers

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

15. The Tandem program is an effective program to learn a language

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

16. I really want to learn my new language

   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

17. I am ready to spend lots of time to learn my new language
18. I feel that learning languages is very important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. I am nervous about speaking my new language outside of Tandem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. I am nervous about speaking my new language with my Tandem partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. I feel more comfortable speaking in my new language inside Tandem than outside it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. My main motivation to learn my new language is for practical purposes (i.e., get a good job)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. I believe that being good at a language is a talent - you either have it or you don't

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
25. I believe I can accomplish my language learning goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. If I feel that learning this language is too difficult for me, I will stop trying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. If you have specific goals in your language learning, list your top 3

1) 
2) 
3) 

28. What strategies do you use to help yourself learn?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

29. If there is something I dislike about my learning environment, I change it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please add any other comment you may want to share

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for participating! Please return this survey to Robin either in person or by email!
Appendix C Post-survey

LANGUAGE LEARNING SURVEY (POST-SURVEY)

Thank you for participating in our survey of the Tandem learning Program! This is the second survey (there was a first one at the beginning of the term). The purpose of these surveys is to collect data in order to improve your experience as a Tandem learning (TLL) participant. All of your responses will be kept anonymous. Please send your filled out survey to Robin Ryan at robin.ryan@ubc.ca or give it to him during one of the sessions.

For any question, please contact Robin.

To safeguard your anonymity, Robin will replace your name with an ID code. He will be the only person with access to the coding key and will be responsible for matching responses from the second survey to those of the first survey, for the purpose of longitudinal analysis.

This survey contains 27 items. At the end of the survey, we invite you to add any relevant comments or opinions.

Please respond to these questions in a manner that reflects your opinions. If a question does not apply to you, or you prefer not to answer, please indicate “NA” in the margin.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION. (Please circle or highlight the answer that applies to you)

Your name:__________________________________________

1. Type of participant
   a. I am an independent meeter
   or
   b. I meet my Tandem partner with the larger group:
      1. on Tuesday morning
      2. on Tuesday afternoon
      3. on Friday afternoon

2. Identify your gender: male or female
3. Have you participated in Tandem before?
   i. Yes / No
4. If yes, when? ______
5. How old are you? ______
6. What is your student status?
   i. Domestic
   ii. International
   iii. Exchange
      1. Ritsumeikan
      2. Go Global
      3. Other (specify)________________________
   iv. English Language Institute (ELI)
   v. Other (specify)_______________________________________
   vi. Not a student
6. If you are not originally from Canada, which country are you from? __________
7. What language(s) do you speak? __________________
8. What language(s) are you learning? __________________
9. What is your level of education?
   a. Graduate
   b. Undergraduate
   c. Other (specify)________________________
10. If you are currently studying, what is your subject area or major?
    ______________________________________
11. How did you hear about Tandem?
    a. Advertising email
    b. On-campus posters or advertisement
    c. Recommended by instructor
    d. Suggested by friends
    e. Other (please specify) ____________________________

B. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS? (Please circle your response.)
1. My Tandem partner is better than most of my language teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. The Tandem program is an effective way to learn a language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. I am nervous about speaking my new language outside of Tandem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. I am nervous about speaking in my Tandem class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. I feel more comfortable speaking in my new language inside Tandem than outside it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I believe that being good at a language is a talent-you either have it or you don't

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: Completely disagree</th>
<th>2: Disagree</th>
<th>3: Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>4: Somewhat agree</th>
<th>5: Agree</th>
<th>6: Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. I believe I can accomplish my language learning goals
   
   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

8. If I feel that learning this language is too difficult for me, I will stop trying
   
   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

9. I feel like I have control over how I learn in Tandem
   
   1. Completely disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Somewhat disagree
   4. Somewhat agree
   5. Agree
   6. Completely agree

10. I have plans to continue studying my new language
    
    1. Completely disagree
    2. Disagree
    3. Somewhat disagree
    4. Somewhat agree
    5. Agree
    6. Completely agree

11. If there is something I dislike about my learning environment, I change it
    
    1. Completely disagree
    2. Disagree
    3. Somewhat disagree
    4. Somewhat agree
    5. Agree
    6. Completely agree

12. My experience in Tandem has shown me how to choose ways of learning languages that work best for me
    
    1. Completely disagree
    2. Disagree
    3. Somewhat disagree
    4. Somewhat agree
    5. Agree
    6. Completely agree
13. I am making progress when I am speaking to my partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I met the goals I set out for myself when I began

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What were your original expectations when you joined Tandem?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

16. Tandem has met my original expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Please explain how and/or why.
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

18. What were your favourite discussion topics?
______________________________________________________________________________
19. Did you enjoy all the conversation topics? *Please circle your response.*
   Yes       No

20. If you answered “yes” to the question above, go to question 21.

   **If you answered “no”,** can you tell us what topics did you enjoy most (please list) and what
topics do you enjoy least (please list)

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

21. Can you please suggest at least one topic that you would like to discuss with your Tandem partner, and which is currently not included?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

22. Would you recommend Tandem to a classmate or friend? *Please circle your response.*
   Yes       No

   **Why?**

______________________________________________________________________________
23. Please, share with us at least one suggestion to improve Tandem.

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

24. What do you like most about Tandem?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

25. What do you like least about Tandem?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

26. How often do you check the Tandem website or Facebook page? Please circle your answer.
   a. At least once a week.
   b. At least once a month.
   c. Never.

27. What communication methods do you like the best?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Please add any other comment you may want to share

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for participating! Please return this survey to Robin either in person or by email!