Abstract

The general research questions for this research study are concerned with learning styles and whether differences in student and teacher learning styles negatively impact students’ perceived grades in second and foreign language classrooms. Participants were asked to take a 30-minute online questionnaire on Qualtrics to determine their perceptual learning styles, group orientation, extraversion, and tolerance for ambiguity. They come from 11 different ESL or foreign language classes, two English language classes and nine language classes offered at the University of Utah. Participants were split up into two groups, students and teachers. A t-test determined that there was no statistical difference between students’ and teachers’ learning styles in any subset measured. Thus, the negative perception that students have of their grade cannot be attributed to differences in learning styles alone. For students who participated on a study abroad experience or an LDS mission, the responses were overwhelmingly positive, suggesting that immersion in the foreign language may be important in developing a positive orientation for language learning and may also prepare students to adapt to change.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the 21st century our world has become metaphorically smaller. With the increased access to digital and online technologies worldwide, more and more people who speak different mother tongues and come from different cultures and countries are communicating on an almost daily basis; consequently, the importance of learning a second or foreign language cannot be denied in today’s world. For a variety of reasons, both personal and professional, university students in the United States are increasingly choosing to study second and foreign languages. Beginning foreign language study for the first time in a university setting is considered a late stage in life to learn a second or foreign language. Some researchers (Birdsong, 1999; Johnson & Newport, 1989) believe that there is a critical age for learning a language like a native speaker (particularly where pronunciation is concerned) and that by the time one has passed puberty and reached university education, the time has passed. In addition, at the university level, students are more likely to approach foreign language learning as they might approach learning a general topic like math, science, or history. In other words, as mature learners, they have already determined how they learn best and are learning with their preferred learning style; however, not all learners have the same preferred learning style.

The question of individual differences has been at the forefront of both research and pedagogy in second language acquisition and learning for several decades. Most language teacher education programs (Christison 2003, Ellis 1994) tend to have at least one course dedicated to teaching methods in the classrooms. One of the fundamental parts of such a course is how to address individual differences in foreign and second
language teaching, namely the incorporation of all learning styles into lesson planning and syllabus and curriculum design. However, teaching is a skill that one learns through both formal instruction and experience, and, thus, teachers are likely to approach teaching with their own learning styles in mind. This approach can potentially lead to difficulties for learners who learn differently from their teachers. A lack of instructional activities that target different learning styles for different students is likely to leave them struggling with learning rather than thriving from it.

This study will address several research questions regarding foreign language classroom learning at the university level and learners’ preferences for learning. The following research questions will be the focus of this study.

1. Are there different learning style preferences among students who have selected to study foreign languages at the university level?
2. What are the preferred learning styles of students who have selected to study a foreign language at the university level?
3. Is there a significant difference in the learning style preferences between the students who have selected to study a foreign language at the university level and their instructors?
4. Is there a relationship between students’ perceptions of their grades in their foreign language class and their learning styles?
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Individual differences, such as age, aptitude, motivation, and beliefs about learning, can affect how individuals learn a foreign language. Ellis (1994) introduces seven individual differences, discussion relationships among them, and explores how each might affect an individual’s ability to acquire a second language. One of these differences is learning styles or the preferred ways we each have of perceiving and processing information. As early as 1976, learning styles and the role they play in second language acquisition has been studied. Early studies tested a concept known as field independence/dependence, and while results were mixed, gains were made in our understanding of how this concept pushed an individual to learn one way or the other. The four perceptual learning styles (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile) are currently quite popular with language teachers and often considered by teachers when planning lessons. Reid also identified that fact that learning styles vary from culture to culture, and that other factors, such as length of time in a country and educational background, can impact a learning style. This variation makes it difficult for a foreign language teacher, especially one teaching at a English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom, to satisfactorily teach all learners using the same material and instructional tasks every year.

The bulk of the literature that currently exists on learning styles in the second language-teaching focuses predominantly on English Language Learners (ELLs). Reid (1987) stated that when non-native speakers (NNS) of English study English as their second language, their teachers “have little knowledge of learning styles… [and] often use methods and materials that have been developed with the learning needs of native
Much of the current literature investigates the learning styles of non-native speakers of English and their teachers and considers the importance of perceptual learning styles in the ESL classroom. It also addresses the types of learning styles that ESL students display in class and the results that are likely to have “implications for materials development and for teacher training in intensive English language programs” (Reid 1987).

Christison (2003) explains the difference between learning strategies and learning styles, and says that learning styles are “individually and culturally motivated.” Culture has an impact on an individual’s development, including which learning styles are used. These language and cultural variables can “lead to conflicts in a second language classroom that is made up of students from many different language backgrounds, especially when a teacher does not understand the relationship between the students’ learning styles and his/her own” (Christison 2003). This study was conducted in ESL classrooms and the impact of the incorporation of learning styles into the classroom is only discussed in an abstract sense.

Halasa and Al-Manaseer (2012), Jang and Jimenez (2011), and Murray and Christison (2011) all note the importance of a student’s cultural backgrounds on their attitudes towards language learning. Jang and Jimenez find that “broader social factors such as race and ethnicity can influence students’ choice and use of certain strategies” (as referenced in Murray & Christison, 2011). A classroom full of students from various cultural backgrounds requires students to navigate the real or imagined differences between teacher and student or student to student. These differences can even occur in a classroom that comes from the same country, as individual values will then be the real or
imagined differences in the classroom relationships. As students navigate their new environment, they may be even less receptive to change, such as being completely immersed in the second language (L2). Halasa and Al-Manaseer suggest methods to incorporate the first language (L1) into a homogenous classroom, like in the Alternating Language Methods approach. This approach has both languages involved in a non-classroom situation, and when tested at the University of Jordan, it was considered successful based on the “students’ satisfaction and improvement in their oral skills” (74). For second language learners with a dominant auditory learning style, hearing instructions or information in their native language and the second language combined may be more useful than hearing it in just the second language.

The research of learning styles is diverse and discusses everything from learning strategies to methods of targeting learning styles and to the number of learning styles. In no research study can the impact of differences in learning styles be found on second language learners of all languages.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

In this chapter I will introduce the methodology for carrying out a study on the determining learning styles of foreign language students and their teachers.

Participants

The participants in this study consist of two different groups (1) teachers (of ESL or teachers of foreign languages at the University of Utah) and (2) the students (in the academic ESL or foreign language classes). The teachers are part of the English Language Institute (ELI), the English for Academic Success (EAS) program in the Department of Linguistics, and a number of different foreign language classes in the Department of Languages and Literature. There is a combination of native speakers of English and second language speakers of English in the language classes taught. The teachers are either graduate students working towards their graduate degrees or adjunct faculty who have finished their degrees and have been hired part-time by the university to teach the courses.

The total number of participants consists of seven teachers and 37 students from EAS 540 (Dramatically Speaking), RUSS 1010 (Beginning Russian I), EAS 1100 (Integrated Language Skills), KOREA 3060 (3rd Year Korean I), RUSS 3060 (3rd Year Russian I), JAPAN 1010 (Beginning Japanese I), JAPAN 2010 (Intermediate Japanese I), GERM 1010 (Beginning German I), ARABIC 3010 (Third Year Arabic), JAPAN 3040 (Third Year Japanese), and SPAN 1010 (Beginning Spanish I).

Out of the 37 students, three are ESL students (one in ELI and two in EAS), ten are RUSS 1010 students, one is a KOREA 3060 student, five are RUSS 3060 students, one is a JAPAN 1010 student, six are JAPAN 2010 students, one is a GERM 1010
student, one is an ARABIC 3010 student, five are JAPAN 3040 students, and four are SPAN 1010 students. Nineteen are male and eighteen are female. All but three are native speakers of English. One of the non-native speakers is a native Arabic speaker, while the other two did not have their languages listed in the questionnaire. The median age range of the students is 21-25. Twenty-five of the students perceived their grade to be “good,” nine described their grade as “not what I want, but it will be okay,” and three perceived their grade to be “bad.” Five students each went on a study or an LDS mission to a country that their language is spoken in. Among the seven teachers, only one taught two classes, both in Japanese. Three teachers are male and three teachers are female.

**Materials**

The subjects were given a link to a questionnaire that was created within Qualtrics. Qualtrics is an online survey platform used for various kinds of research, customer satisfaction questionnaires, concept testing, and employee feedback, among other uses. It is used across all industries and used by every major university in the United States. The interface allows members to create multiple surveys, distribute them with a link, and view the results, all from an easy-to-understand dashboard. Prior to answering any questions about their learning styles, participants were asked background questions so that I could craft profiles for both the teacher and student participants. The questionnaire appears in Appendix A.

Due to a time constraints and issues related to reliability and validity, I decided to collect data using three commercially available questionnaires. These questionnaires targeted different learning styles, and permission was granted to use them. The first questionnaire was the perceptual learning styles questionnaire and the group/individual
learning preference (Reid & Christison, 1987). This questionnaire tests for four different learning styles—visual, auditory, kinesthetic and tactile (otherwise known as haptic) and group/individual learning preferences, which will be analyzed separately. Each question was formatted to be a multiple choice question, with the answers formatted on a numerical five-point Likert scale. Subjects were told that “1” corresponded to “strongly disagree,” “3” to “undecided,” and “5” to “strongly agree.”

There were also questions for identifying introversion/extraversion and tolerance for ambiguity (Brown, 1991). Extraversion, in this context, is defined as “the extent to which you need to interact with other people in order to feel sustained, whole, fulfilled and happy,” while introversion is “the extent to which your emotional and mental needs are met on your own, without other people to interact with” (Brown 1991). Tolerance for ambiguity is split into two subsets: tolerance for ambiguity in general and tolerance for ambiguity in language learning. The extraversion questionnaire remained unchanged; however, the ambiguity questionnaire was turned into a numerical five-point Likert scale. Test 2B, which tested tolerance for ambiguity in language learning, was put first. The presentation of information looked exactly like the perceptual learning style questionnaires. The questions in Test 2A were put into a matrix table due the fact that it was of less importance in answering the research questions than Test 2B. Five answer choices were provided in the form of a numerical five-point Likert scale.

**Data Collection**

Subjects took the questionnaire on devices that had Internet access. These could be their laptops, desktop computers, tablets, or their phones, as the questionnaire was also formatted to accommodate smaller screen devices.
Emails were sent out to 44 instructors who teach at the University of Utah’s English Language Institute (ELI), the English for Academic Success (EAS), and nine languages in the Department of Languages and Literature: Japanese, German, French, Korean, Spanish, Arabic, Hindi, Chinese, and Russian. In this email, the researcher asked professors to take the survey and to post the link to the questionnaire on the class Canvas page so that students could take it. It was stressed that both teachers and students needed to take the survey, as the results of the research depended on teacher and student learning styles, not just student learning styles. The researcher also requested that she be allowed to go to different classes to explain the research project to the students. The decision to allow this presentation was left up to the professors, as language classes, have a limited amount of time to teach students the foundations of the language or to converse in the language. Ultimately, six teachers allowed the researcher to give a brief presentation in class, with an additional one allowing the researcher to create a video presentation that the teacher then posted on the class’ Canvas page. Approximately half of the teachers responded back saying that they posted the link to the questionnaire or would let their students know. The other half did not respond back.

In all, seventy-one responses were collected, with seven being from instructors and the rest from students of various classes. The conditions under which the subjects took the questionnaire could not be known and were likely not uniform, as the ability to take the questionnaire from any place with an internet access allowed subjects to take the survey anywhere they wished. It would be time-consuming to account for every single potential place where a subject may have taken this test. As a result, environmental problems that might affect internal validity could not accounted for. The time participants
spent completing the questionnaire could also not be uniform, as subjects took the questionnaire when they had the time to take it. The researcher explained to the participants beforehand that the questionnaire would take anywhere from 15-30 minutes, depending on how much time they took to think about their responses. Most respondents took less than the estimated time.

No teachers were eliminated from the study. One student was eliminated due to being a minor (i.e., under the age of 18 years). Three were excluded because they did not complete the entire questionnaire. Eleven were excluded because they failed to answer at least one question. This left a total seven teachers and 37 students from eight different ELI, EAS, and foreign language courses.

**Data Analysis**

The researcher utilized a one-tailed $t$-test with an alpha decision level of .05. Hypotheses

The hypotheses are as follows:

$H_0: \bar{X_S} = \bar{X_T}$

$H_1: \bar{X_S} > \bar{X_T}$

The null hypothesis states that there will be no statistically significant difference between the means of the students and the teachers, while the one-tailed hypothesis ($H_1$) states that the means of the students will be significantly greater than the means of the teachers. The alternative hypothesis can only be accepted if the null hypothesis is rejected. In order for this to occur, the value of $t_{obs}$ must be greater than the value of $t_{crit}$ when the alpha decision level is set to .05. If the observed value of $t$ is greater than the
critical value, then it is logical to conclude that the results occurred because of something other than chance.

**Descriptive Statistics**

All responses to the Qualtrics survey were transferred onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The responses that were excluded were moved to a separate Excel page, and the responses that remained were then placed into two groups: students and teachers. The three commercially available questionnaires came with their own scoring guides, and these scoring guides were used to identify the makeup of the sample. Totals from the questionnaires were found using Excel’s built-in formulas.

The learning style questionnaire scoring guide came with three different levels: major learning style, minor learning style, and negligible. The researcher chose to look only at the major learning styles, here defined as “any learning style in which the respondent had a total between 38 and 50 points.” The group/individual preference was scored the same way. The key for ambiguity tolerance in language learning describes a score of 16 or less as “quite intolerant,” 17-20 as “moderately intolerant,” 21-24 as “moderately tolerant,” and 25 and over as “quite tolerant.” For the general ambiguity tolerance, these numbers are 42 or less, 43-49, 50-59, and 60 and over. The extraversion questionnaire defines “quite introverted” as any score that is 6 or less, “moderately introverted” as a score of 7 or 8, “moderately extroverted” as a score from 9-12, and “quite extroverted” as a score that is 13 or over.

**Inferential Statistics**

Calculations for inferential statistics were also performed using the formulas that I learned in my research methods course, LING 5170. I used the charts found in my
textbook (Brown 1988). The alpha decision level was set to .05 and the degrees of freedom set to 40 (rounded down from 42), which resulted in a $t_{crit}$ of 1.684. Then using a one-tailed t-test, $t_{obs}$ was found for each of the perceptual learning styles (group and individual preference), the extraversion scale, and the ambiguity for tolerance scale.
CHAPTER 4

Results

In this chapter, I report on the results for perceptual learning styles, group preferences, and tolerance for ambiguity. I then report on perceptions of grades, and the amount of homework that was assigned, which could have affected grade perception.

Perceptual Learning Styles

The major perceptual learning styles for both groups were identified first. Major learning styles are the learning styles that students learn best while using, determined by a score of at least 38. This number is provided by the scoring chart in Reid and Christison (1995). Twelve students had two major perceptual learning styles. These individuals have bi-modal profiles. One of these 12 students had all three types of major learning styles fairly evenly distributed. Seventeen had auditory as primary learning style, 12 had haptic, 11 had visual, and 10 had no major learning styles. That is, they scored less than 38 for all learning styles. When calculating the means for the groups, the students had no major learning style preference, although the closest was the auditory learning style with a mean of 37.459 points, just 0.541 points short of being considered a major learning style. Five teachers had at least two major perceptual learning styles: one preferred haptic/visual, one preferred auditory/haptic/visual, one preferred auditory/haptic, one preferred haptic/visual, and one preferred auditory/visual. One teacher was a visual learner and the last teacher had no major learning style, meaning that they scored less than 38 on every single learning style.

There was one individual in each group who had no preference for group or individual learning. In the student group, 12 had a strong preference for individual
learning, 10 for group, and fourteen had neither. Two teachers expressed a major preference for individual learning, two for group learning, and three had no strong preference. As a whole, however, neither group had a major preference for group or individual learning, although the individual learning preference was higher for students and teachers with a mean of 34.108 and 33.714.

**Tolerance for Ambiguity**

The individual breakdown for students shows that 13 are quite tolerant of ambiguity in language ambiguity, 17 are moderately tolerant, and 7 are moderately intolerant. With general ambiguity, 22 were quite tolerant, 13 were moderately tolerant, and 2 were moderately intolerant. The teachers had 2 among them be quite tolerant of ambiguity in language learning, 2 were moderately tolerant, and 3 were moderately intolerant. Only one teacher was quite tolerant for ambiguity in general situations, while the other six were moderately tolerant. There were no individual in either group who were quite intolerant. In both groups, not one person was quite intolerant in either situation. As a group, both students and teachers were moderately tolerant of ambiguity in language learning, with a mean 23.838 and 22, respectively. They differed in general ambiguity tolerance, with students being quite tolerant at 61.784 points and teachers being moderately tolerant at 57.429 points.

The two groups are also quite introverted, with a mean of 4.73 for students and 5.0 for the teachers. None of the teachers was extraverted. Two were moderately introverted and five were quite introverted. The students were more spread out, but still leaned more towards being introverted. Only one student was quite extroverted and six
were moderately extroverted. Four students identified as moderately introverted and 26 were quite introverted.

Table 4.1 lists the Standard Deviation (SD) and \(t_{obs}\) for each of the subsets. The hypotheses were previously stated as:

\[ H_0: \bar{X}_S = \bar{X}_T \]

\[ H_1: \bar{X}_S > \bar{X}_T \]

The null hypothesis states that there will be no statistically significant difference between the means of the students and the teachers. The alternative hypothesis states that the means of the students will be significantly greater than the means of the teachers. With a \(t_{crit}\) of 1.684, and the \(t_{obs}\) for each category under 1, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This means that there is no significant difference between students and teachers in any of the subsets tested and that any differences calculated between the groups are due to chance.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Deviation and (t_{obs}) for Each Group and Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student SD</strong> (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade Perception

Although there was no significant difference between the two groups, there were still students who reported that their perceived grades would either not be as good as they hoped it would be or that they would fail the class. In total, 25 students perceived their grade in their foreign language class would be “good,” nine believed that their grade would be “not what they want, but it’ll be okay,” and three believed that their grade would be “bad.” The students who fell into second group believed that their grades would not be what they wanted, but they would still pass the class. Their major learning styles may not have matched up with their teacher’s learning style preferences for classroom activities and instructional tasks, thereby requiring the students to adapt and utilize a lesser-developed learning style to understand class content. The third group of students believed that they would fail the class. These students struggled with the class. There are a number of reasons for their beliefs about failure; however, we cannot rule out as one possible cause may be related to learning styles and to the difficulty they may have in adapting another learning style to meet the teacher’s.

Students’ perceptions of their grades might also be influenced by the amount of homework they were given, the frequency of the homework, and the degree to which the students completed homework assignments. Type of learning style most prevalent in the homework assignment and whether that learning style was consistent with the students’ might influence the degree to which they completed the homework tasks and their overall perceptions of the course. With the exception of the teacher from EAS 540, who assigned 1-2 hours a week of homework, all teachers assigned 3-5 hours a week of homework. However, the frequency of homework assignments varied. Five assigned homework 2-3
times a week, one assigned homework 4-5 times a week, and one assigned homework once a week.

The types of homework assignments varied for each class, but every single teacher assigned some sort of writing assignment. Four teachers assigned vocabulary-based assignments, five assigned speaking assignments, three assigned memorization assignments, five assigned listening assignments, four assigned reading assignments, one assigned copying word lists, and two assigned homework that was not listed. With one exception, the teachers who assigned listening assignments taught 1000 level (i.e., introductory) courses. The two Japanese classes were the only ones to be assigned “copying word/word lists.”

Relative to classroom activities, participants reported the following information. Every single foreign language course presented grammar at the beginning of class. The ELI 540 teacher focused on pronunciation, which none of the other teachers mentioned doing. All of the teachers but the ELI 540 teacher preferred presenting new information in a lecture format. All but the EAS 1100 teacher, who did not elaborate on the types of activities, had students practicing in a group or in pairs. The kinds of activities varied, from “skills with language” (GERM 1010), improvisation (JAPAN 1010, JAPAN 2010), translation (RUSS 3060), student-generated conversations prompted by questions cards guided activities (KOREA 3060), or creating scripts (ELI 540).
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the students and teachers in terms of their learning style preferences, which means that the question about students’ perceptions of the grades they’ll receive in class cannot be answered definitively. Learning styles alone cannot explain the students who believed their grades to be not what they wanted, but their belief that they would be okay. Individual differences, excluding learning styles, were not taken into account, but these could explain why students did not perceive their grades to be “good.” The students’ motivations for taking the classes or whether they had an aptitude for learning foreign languages are also potential factors affecting their beliefs about grades. Some participants differed from their teachers in terms of learning style preferences. For example, one student had no major learning style, while their teacher was clearly an auditory/visual learner. It is also interesting to note that there was also a difference in group/individual preferences, with the student having a strong preference for group learning and the teacher having a strong preference for individual learning.

When looked at on a case-by-case basis, students who believed that their grades would be less than “good” had differences with their teacher in regards to learning style, tolerance of ambiguity, and extraversion. However, even those who thought their grade would be “good” had learning style preference differences with their teachers, so learning styles cannot be considered the sole factor in influencing perceived grades.

The majority of the students who studied abroad or who went on an LDS mission were positive about their foreign language experiences. It seems that these students found
ways to accommodate for differences in learning styles due to prior exposure. Having a variety of teachers is one way for students to develop exposure and strengthen different learning styles, as it is very unlikely that all of the teachers teach the same way. In addition, having teachers who consciously teach to different learning styles can also have the same result. For those who go on a study abroad or an LDS mission, emersion in the culture, society, and language can also cause a learning style change, whether that is strengthening a learning style or changing it completely.

The reason students have for taking a foreign language class can also affect how motivated students are to do homework assignments, which, in turn, can lead to a change in a student’s perception in the class. An internally motivated student- in other words, one who studies the language because it is interesting, wants to talk to family and friends, or visit the country for the purpose of studying abroad or traveling- is more likely to put more effort into learning a language. They will do their best on homework assignments and try harder in class when their own learning styles differ from their teacher’s learning styles. While this may not the most desirable outcome in terms of teacher development because it can result in teachers who continue to teach the way in which they are most comfortable and forget about the students who are struggling, it is beneficial for a student’s understanding.

There are different ways that future research can build upon this one. Some future ideas can include seeing if there is a difference between teachers and students in their own classrooms (as opposed to two large groups with no classroom breakdown). In addition, it might also be valuable to see if there is a difference between students who have gone on a study abroad or an LDS mission and those who have not. Another area of
investigation with learning styles is to see if there are any differences between age
groups. This same study design might also be replicated using a larger population to
sample from.
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APPENDIX A

Default Question Block

Perceptual Learning Styles Questionnaire

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the learning styles of teachers and students in a foreign language setting and whether similarities or differences have an impact on students’ grades. We are doing this study because individuals who pursue a second language in higher education are more likely to approach language learning using skills from past learning experiences than to naturally acquire it the way babies do. When learning a new subject or skill, an individual learns better if they are able to utilize their perceptual learning style.

I would like to ask you to complete the following questionnaire. This questionnaire consists of three smaller questionnaires to find your ambiguity tolerance, extraversion, and perceptual learning styles. Please do not take the questionnaire more than once. While answering this questionnaire, you may find yourself feeling stressed about picking an answer that seems to accurately reflect you. However, it is possible that by the end you may feel more aware of yourself and be able to use this awareness in the classroom, regardless of if it is a foreign language classroom or a core classroom.

In order to maintain the confidentiality of your results, names will not be asked. Measures will be taken in order to prevent anyone from identifying you by the data that is asked for. The only people to view the collected data will be the primary investigator and the adviser. Then, only the amount of people from the language classes in general will be mentioned. So, for example, if three (3) people from one English class and five (5) from another English class take the questionnaire, then
the sentence will be phrased as “a total of eight (8) students from ESL classes took the questionnaire.” If the teachers are different, then the sentence will be phrased as “three students from one English class and five students from another class took the questionnaire.” Grades will be averaged to prevent any specific grades from being attributed to any student. For teachers, class sections will not be designated and names will not be asked for.

If you have any questions complaints or if you feel you have been harmed by this research please email Jessica Loveland, Department of Linguistics, University of Utah, at u0790890@utah.edu.

Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions, complaints or concerns which you do not feel you can discuss with the investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

It may take anywhere from 15-30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. You may stop taking this survey at any time, exit the survey, and come back to it, providing you use the same computer with the same IP address. You have a two week period to come back to the survey, or it will be deleted. Participation in this study is voluntary. You can choose not to take part. You can choose not to finish the questionnaire or omit any question you prefer not to answer without penalty or loss of benefits.

By completing this questionnaire, you are giving your consent to participate.

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this study!

What is your gender?

Male
Female
Other

Are you a teacher or a student?

Teacher
Student

What language class(es) are you taking?

ARAB 101- Beginner Arabic I (non-credit)
ARAB 1010- Beginner Arabic I
ARAB 201- Intermediate Arabic I (non-credit)
ARAB 2010- Intermediate Arabic I
ARAB 301- Third Year Arabic (non-credit)
ARAB 3010- Third Year Arabic
CHIN 101- Beg Mandarin Chin I (non-credit)
CHIN 1010- Beg Mandarin Chin I
CHIN 201- Intm Mandarin Chin I (non-credit)
CHIN 2010- Intm Mandarin Chin I
CHIN 301- Third Yr Mandarin (non-credit)
CHIN 3010- Third Yr Mandarin
EAS 105- Composition for Nns
EAS 1050- Composition for Nns
EAS 6050- Intro to Grad. Writing 1
EAS 110- Integret Land Skills ESL (non-credit)
EAS 1100- Integret Lang Skills EAS
EAS 430- Advanced Pronunciation (non-credit)
EAS 4300- Advanced Pronunciation
EAS 6300- Advanced Pronunciation
EAS 6040- Spoken English Skills
ELI 50- Introduction to Skill Building
ELI 100- Integrated ESL Skills Course I
ELI 410- Introduction to Grammar
ELI 540- Dramatically Speaking
ELI 610- Intermediate Grammar 2
ELI 710- Advanced Grammar 1
FRNCH 101- Beg French I (non-credit)
FRNCH 1010- Beg French I
FRNCH 201- Intrm French I (non-credit)
FRNCH 2010- Intrm French I
FRNCH 3600- French Conversation
GERM 101- Beg German I (hybrid course; non-credit)
GERM 1010- Beg German I (non-credit)
GERM 1010- Beg German I (hybrid course)
GERM 1010- Beg German I
GERM 201- Intrm German I (non-credit)
GERM 2010- Intrm German I
GERM 304- Grammar and Culture (non-credit)
GERM 3040- Grammar and Culture
HINDI 101- Beg. Hindi-Urdu I (non-credit)
HINDI 1010- Beg. Hindi-Urdu I
HINDI 201- Int. Hindi-Urdu I (non-credit)
HINDI 2010- Int. Hindi-Urdu I
JAPAN 101- Beg Japanese I (non-credit)
JAPAN 1010- Beg Japanese I
JAPAN 201- Intrm Japanese I (non-credit)
JAPAN 2010- Intrm Japanese I
JAPAN 304- Third Year Japanese (non-credit)
JAPAN 3040- Third Year Japanese
KOREA 101- Beg Korean I (non-credit)
KOREA 1010- Beg Korean I
KOREA 201- Intrm Korean I (non-credit)
KOREA 2010- Intrm Korean I
KOREA 3060- 3rd Year Korean I (non-credit)
KOREA 3060- 3rd Year Korean I
RUSS 101- Beg Russian I (non-credit)
RUSS 1010- Beg Russian I
RUSS 201- Inter Russian I (non-credit)
RUSS 2010- Inter Russian I
RUSS 306- Third-Year Russian I (non-credit)
RUSS 3060- Third-Year Russian I
SPAN 1010- Beg Span I (hybrid course; non-credit)
SPAN 101- Beg Span I (non-credit)
SPAN 1010- Beg Span I (hybrid course)
SPAN 1010- Beg Span I
SPAN 201- Intrm Span I (hybrid course; non-credit)
SPAN 201- Intrm Span I (non-credit)
SPAN 2010- Intrm Span I (hybrid course)
SPAN 2010- Intrm Span I
SPAN 304- Inter Grammar and Comp (non-credit)
SPAN 3040- Inter Grammar and Comp

Are you a native speaker of English?

Yes
No, my native language is Spanish
No, my native language is Arabic
No, my native language is Korean
No, my native language is Chinese
No, my native language is Japanese
No, my native language is German
No, my native language is French
No, my native language is Russian
No, my native language is Hindi
No, my native language is not listed here.

Please rate your proficiency in the language(s) you are learning.
If you are a native speaker of any of the languages or are not a student of the language, please skip that language and continue.

- English
- Spanish
- Arabic
- Korean
- Chinese
- Japanese
- German
- French
- Russian
- Hindi

What is your age?
- 17 or younger
- 18-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31 or older

What is your perception of the grade you will receive in class?
- My grade in this class will be good
- My grade in this class will not be what I want, but it will be okay.
- My grade in this class will be bad.

With 1 being "very easy" and 100 being "very difficult," what is your perception of the difficulty level of your language?
If you are not taking a class in that language, please skip that language and continue onto the next question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Languages**
- English
- Spanish
- Arabic
- Korean
- Chinese
- Japanese
- German
- French
- Russian
- Hindi

Have you studied abroad to a country in which the language you are learning is spoken?
- Yes
- No

Have you gone on a mission to a country where the language you are learning is spoken?
- Yes
- No

Have you studied the language before taking a university class for it?
- Yes
- No
How long have you been studying this language for?

Less than 1 year
1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years or more

Outside of your language class, how do you improve your language skills?

What is the main reason you are studying the language you are learning?

What language class(es) are you teaching?

ARAB 1010- Beginner Arabic I
ARAB 2010- Intermediate Arabic I
ARAB 3010- Third Year Arabic
CHIN 1010- Beg Mandarin Chin I
CHIN 2010- Intm Mandarin Chin I
CHIN 3010- Third Yr Mandarin
EAS 1050- Composition for Nns
EAS 1100- Integret Lang Skills EAS
EAS 4300- Advanced Pronunciation
EAS 6040- Spoken English Skills
ELI 50- Introduction to Skill Building
ELI 100- Integrated ESL Skills Course I
ELI 410- Introduction to Grammar
ELI 540- Dramatically Speaking
ELI 610- Intermediate Grammar 2
ELI 710- Advanced Grammar 1
FRNCH 1010- Beg French I
FRNCH 2010- Intm French I
FRNCH 3600- French Conversation
GERM 1010- Beg German I
GERM 2010- Intm German I
GERM 3040- Grammar and Culture
HINDI 1010- Beg. Hindi-Urdu I
HINDI 2010- Int. Hindi-Urdu I
JAPAN 1010- Beg Japanese I
JAPAN 2010- Intm Japanese I
JAPAN 3040- Third Year Japanese
KOREA 1010- Beg Korean I
KOREA 2010- Intm Korean I
KOREA 3060- 3rd Year Korean I
RUSS 1010- Beg Russian I
RUSS 2010- Inter Russian I
RUSS 3060- Third-Year Russian I
SPAN 1010- Beg Span I
SPAN 2010- Intm Span I
SPAN 3040- Inter Grammar and Comp

What does a typical lesson look like? List any activities, worksheets, etc. you use.
What kind of homework assignments do you give?

- Vocabulary-based assignments
- Listening assignments
- Writing assignments
- Reading assignments
- Speaking assignments
- Memorization assignments
- Copying words/word lists
- Other

How often do you assign homework?

- Never
- Once a week
- 2-3 times a week
- 4-5 times a week
- 6+ times a week

How much homework do you assign a week?

- <1 hour a week
- 1-2 hours a week
- 3-5 hours a week
- 6-8 hours a week
- 9+ hours a week

Please use your first impression when you read the questions and move quickly through the questions.

1 = "Strongly Disagree"
3 = "Undecided"
5 = "Strongly Agree"
When the teacher tells me the instructions, I understand better.

1 2 3 4 5

I prefer to learn by doing something in class.

1 2 3 4 5

I get more work done when I work with others.

1 2 3 4 5

I learn more when I study with a group.

1 2 3 4 5

In class, I learn best when I work with others.

1 2 3 4 5

I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.

1 2 3 4 5

When someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn it better.

1 2 3 4 5

When I do things in class, I learn better.

1 2 3 4 5

I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have read.

1 2 3 4 5
When I read instructions, I remember them better.

1  2  3  4  5

Please use your first impression when you read the questions and move quickly through the questions.
1 = "Strongly Disagree"
3= "Undecided"
5= "Strongly Agree"

I learn more when I can make a model of something.

1  2  3  4  5

I understand better when I read instructions.

1  2  3  4  5

When I study alone, I remember things better.

1  2  3  4  5

I learn more when I make something for a class project.

1  2  3  4  5

I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.

1  2  3  4  5

I learn better when I make drawings as I study.

1  2  3  4  5
I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.
1 2 3 4 5

When I work alone, I learn better.
1 2 3 4 5

I understand things better when I participate in role-playing.
1 2 3 4 5

I learn better in class when I listen to someone.
1 2 3 4 5

Please use your first impression when you read the questions and move quickly through the questions.
1 = "Strongly Disagree"
3 = "Undecided"
5 = "Strongly Agree"

I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.
1 2 3 4 5

When I build something, I remember what I have learned better.
1 2 3 4 5

I prefer to study with others.
1 2 3 4 5
I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.

1  2  3  4  5

I enjoy making something for a class project.

1  2  3  4  5

I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.

1  2  3  4  5

In class, I work better when I work alone.

1  2  3  4  5

I prefer working on projects by myself.

1  2  3  4  5

I learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures.

1  2  3  4  5

I prefer to work by myself.

1  2  3  4  5

Please think of the language you are currently studying.

1= Strongly Disagree
3= Undecided
5= Strongly Agree
I am bothered when I don't understand everything in the foreign language.

1  2  3  4  5

I like to know specific rules for all aspects of grammar.

1  2  3  4  5

I am satisfied with only a vague understanding of conversations in which I am a participant.

1  2  3  4  5

Multiple or hidden meanings in the foreign language confuse me.

1  2  3  4  5

I avoid reading material in the foreign language that I don't understand.

1  2  3  4  5

I like my foreign language class to be structured so that I know just what is going to happen next.

1  2  3  4  5

Starting to learn a new foreign language is scary.

1  2  3  4  5

Please answer with your first impression and move quickly through.

1= Strongly Disagree
3= Undecided
### 5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost every problem has a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to fool around with new ideas, even if they are a total waste of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing gets accomplished in this world unless you stick to some basic rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in the final analysis there is not a distinct difference between right and wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually, the more clearly defined rules a society has, the better off it is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I tend to think that there is a right way and a wrong way to do almost everything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the certainty of always being in control of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I start a task, I don't like to start another task until I finish the first one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before any important job, I must know how long it will take.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a problem-solving group, it is always best to systematically attack the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A problem has little attraction for me if I don’t think it has a solution.

I do not like getting started in group projects unless I feel assured that the project will be successful.

In a decision-making situation in which there is not enough information to process the problem, I feel very uncomfortable.

I don’t like to work on a problem unless there is a possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.

Complex problems appeal to me only if I have a clear idea of the total scope of the problem.

A group meeting functions best with a definite agenda.

I am tolerant of ambiguous situations.

The BEST part about working a jigsaw puzzle is putting in that last piece.

Please answer with your first impression and move quickly through. Please do not skip any items, even if you have a hard time placing yourself into one of the categories.
I usually like...

Mixing with people.
Working alone.

I'm more inclined to be

Fairly reserved.
Pretty easy to approach.

I'm happiest when I'm...

Alone.
With other people.

At a party, I...

Interact with many, including strangers.
Interact with a few people that I know

In my social contacts and groups, I usually...

Get behind on the news.
Keep abreast of what's happening with others.

I can usually do things better by...

Figuring them out on my own.
Talking with others about it.

My usual pattern when I'm with other people is...
To be open, frank, and take risks.
To keep "myself to myself" and not be very open.

Please answer with your first impression and move quickly through. Please do not skip any items, even if you have a hard time placing yourself into one of the categories.

When I make friends, usually...

Someone else makes the first move.
I make the first move.

I would rather...

Be at home on my own.
Go to a boring party.

Interaction with people I don't know...

Stimulates and energizes me.
Taxes my reserves.

In a group of people I usually...

Wait to be approached.
Initiate conversation.

When I'm by myself I feel a sense of...

Solitude.
Loneliness.
In a classroom situation, I prefer...

Group work, interaction with others.
Individual work on my own.

When I get into a quarrel or argument, I prefer...

Being silent, hoping the issue will resolve itself or blow over.
To "have it out" and settle the issue right then and there.
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