This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

An Investigation Learner Beliefs at Two Stages of Study Abroad

presented by

Eun Hye Lee

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

M.A. degree in Linguistics, Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages

Paula Winke
Major Professor's Signature

May 10, 2007
Date

AN INVESTIGATION OF LEARNER BELIEFS AT TWO STAGES OF STUDY ABROAD

By

Eun Hye Lee

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ART

Department of Linguistics, Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages

2007

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF LEARNER BLIEFS AT TWO STAGES OF STUDY ABROAD

By

Eun Hye Lee

Learner beliefs have traditionally been considered to be stable and static. However, recent research in learner beliefs has highlighted their dynamic and variable nature. Adopting the new research approach to learner beliefs as a dynamic construct, the current study explores effects of study abroad (SA) on learner beliefs. Participants of early stage (N=38) and late stage (N=32 of study abroad were asked to respond to beliefs items on a questionnaire. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted in order to investigate sources of learners' beliefs. The results reveal that learners who are at the later stage of SA hold significantly stronger beliefs regarding learner independence and perceived improvement in listening compared to the learners at the early stage. In the examination of belief changes, learners in both groups reported that their beliefs in learner autonomy and the importance of feedback has significantly strengthened during SA when compared to the strength of their beliefs when they were studying English in their home country. While learners at the early stage of SA showed significant changes in beliefs in the importance of grammar and in the difficulty of learning, beliefs of learners at the later stage significantly changed in the areas of teacher's role and the importance of knowing the culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank Dr. Paula Winke and Dr. Debra A Friedeman who provided guidance throughout the process of thesis writing. This study would not have been possible without English Language Center at Michigan University and English Language and Culture Center at Lansing Community College that gave me a permission to collect data. A number of people helped me with the data collection including Sherrie Davis, Seng Sook Han and Mendel Ruth. Finally, I must tank Dozie Amuzie, my best friend, whose support has been indispensable during the entire process of the research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

Teachers and learners share the belief that the best way of acquiring a foreign language is to learn in a country where the language is spoken (Kuntz & Belnap, 2001). As for language learners, moving to a study abroad (SA) setting means a drastic change of the learning context, which entails having different language input, interaction, and instruction. SLA scholars have investigated how these changes learners experience in the SA context might affect the language learning process. However little has been known about how study abroad affects what learners believe about language learning and what they believe about themselves as learners.

The present study aims to investigate changes in learners' beliefs in a context of study abroad. Learners at two different stages of study abroad were asked to self-report what they believed about language learning when they studied English in their home country and what they believe now in the U.S. The study follows the recent research approach to beliefs as a dynamic and variable construct (Barcelos, 2006). The study aims to increase the understanding of nature of learner beliefs in relation to the learning context and learning stage.

Study abroad

As interest in the role played by the context of learning in second language acquisition (SLA) has increased, the effects of study abroad (SA) contexts in language learning have attracted the attention of SLA researchers in recent years (Freed, 1995; Lafford, 2004). A considerable amount of empirical research has been conducted to investigate SLA process and outcomes in study abroad contexts. Topics explored include language gains in study abroad settings (Collentine, 2004; Diaz-Dampos, 2004; Huebner,

1995), the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in study abroad environments (Marriot, 1995; Ragan, 1998), and student perspectives on language learning (Wilkinson, 1998; Pellegrino, 2004).

A rich body of research has focused on the role of SA and language gains. These studies lend support for positive impacts of study abroad in diverse language skill areas. For example, Milton and Meara (1995) found that 53 European exchange students who spent at least six months in the U.K. showed significant increase in acquiring vocabulary. Siegal (1995) provided evidence that SA students of Japanese acquired improved sociolinguistic skills as they encountered pragmatic conflicts while abroad. Barron's study (2003) investigated the pragmatic development of learners of German and found that learners' pragmatic competence improved while living in Germany. Benefits of language learning abroad are reported even in studies looking at short durations. Woodman (1998) investigated effects of a study abroad program for 384 Japanese speakers in Australia and observed increased language comprehension and production, as well as reduced anxiety in language use.

However, researchers have not reached consensus about linguistic gains while studying abroad. The literature also shows counterevidence that questions the value of study abroad experience in language learning. Simoes (1996) examined fluency in a group of five adult-learners of Spanish in a SA program. The findings revealed that only two students out of five showed significant changes in their fluency. A study conducted by DeKeyser (1991) on lexical and grammatical development also failed to show any advantage for gains in syntactic control in the SA context. The evidence found in these

studies demonstrates that the mere change in learning contexts per se does not guarantee an automatic improvement in language skills.

In attempts to address the controversial issues relating to the benefits of language learning while abroad, more recent studies compare SA learners to at-home (AH) or immersion (IM) learners. In a study on speaking gains, Segalowitz and Freed (2004) looked at various indices of oral performance gains. Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) and three oral fluency measures--speech rate, mean length of speech run not containing filled pauses, and longest fluent run not containing silent hesitations or filled pauses--were used to measure oral performance gains. The results indicated that, compared to the AH context, learning in the SA context led to significantly greater oral performance gains. However, superiority of the SA context to an AH setting was not conclusive in other areas of proficiency. Dewey (2004) examined the effects of learning context on reading behaviors. The study investigated the development of reading comprehension by L2 learners in SA and IM settings. Although SA learners showed more confidence in reading, their comprehension abilities did not significantly improve more than IM learners. Diaz-Campos (2004) also suggests that a study abroad context may not have significant influence on certain phonological abilities. Neither the SA nor AH groups in the study made a significant improvement on the most difficult consonantal phenomena of Spanish. Whether the SA context is superior to the IM setting in terms of greater learning gains still remains a question. However the SA literature provides enough evidence to support the notion that L2 learning is influenced by learning contexts (e.g. Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1995; Huebner, 1995; Lafford, 1995; Lapkin, Hart & Swain, 1995; Marriott,

1995; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004) and study abroad is a context that worth investigation for better understanding of the relationship between the learning context and SLA.

While there is a plethora of research focusing on language-related outcomes (e.g. Allen & Herron, 2003; Dewey, 2004; Diaz-Campos, 2004; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004), scant research has been conducted on motivation and perception of the SA learner despite their importance as potential factors for success or failure in learning (Pellegrino, 2004). Although few in number, some studies have investigated learners' perception in the SA context (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; Miller & Ginsberg, 1995; Polanyi, 1995; Wilkinson, 1997). Lennon's (1989) study investigated factors that affect language acquisition process in the SA contexts. As learners advanced, the participants more freely engaged in communication in the L2 and reported that they perceived themselves as improving in fluency more than grammar. They also held strong attitudes about and beliefs in the role of the classroom in the SA context. The participants suggested that speaking English in the classroom is not as effective as real interaction with native speakers.

Miller and Ginsberg (1995) investigated the language use and perception of Russian learners through analysis of diaries. Learners' writing in dairies showed they had certain ideas about language learning, which the researchers called *folklinguistics*. More importantly, their experience was influenced by these ideas about language learning. For example, the students believed there was only one correct way to say things. This idea subsequently consciously limited their language production. Students expressed beliefs that their speaking improved or deteriorated in various situations. They avoided speaking in situations where they tend to get more nervous but became more participatory in communication in other circumstances. Such tendency that has developed over a period

of time led them to become selective of language use opportunities. The results of the study strongly implied that learners enter an SA context with certain ideas and beliefs that they have previously developed and these sometimes influence learning behaviors in the SA context. However, little is known about how the SA context affects beliefs. The aim of the study is to fill this gap by investigating the SA effects on learners' language learning beliefs.

Learner Beliefs

When approaching and engaging in language learning tasks, learners have their unique sets of beliefs, attitudes and preconceived notions that influence their actions (Kern 1995; Horwitz 1988). SLA has recognized the important role of beliefs in individuals' learning as a potential to influence, or even determine their attitude, motivation or behaviors (Riley 1996). This has provided a strong motivation for investigation of beliefs. However, due to the complex nature and multiple dimensions of belief system, how beliefs are viewed and examined varies according to the theoretical orientations. (Sakui & Gaies, 1999).

Traditionally, beliefs have been understood from the perspective of cognitive psychology where a rich body of theories on beliefs were framed and developed. According to Wenden (1998), metacognitive knowledge is the relatively stable human information thinkers have about their own cognitive process. It consists of what learners know about learning. Learners can become conscious of the knowledge and articulate what they know. In cognitive psychology, beliefs about learning have been viewed as a component of metacognitive knowledge (Sakui & Gaies, 1999; Wenden, 1998). Though beliefs are distinct from metacognitive knowledge in that they are value related and tend

to be held more tenaciously (Alexander & Dochy, 1995; Wenden, 1999), as a subset of metacognitive knowledge, beliefs are also considered to be stable. In SLA, *metacognitive knowledge* is interchangeably used with the term *learner beliefs* (Wenden, 1999; Dörneyi, 2005).

It is within the framework of metacognitive knowledge that mainstream research on learner beliefs has been produced. Numerous studies have been conducted across different cultures, target languages, academic settings, age groups and different learning stages in seeking to answer the primary question "what do learners and teachers believe?" What provided an impetus to beliefs research within the metacognitive framework was the development of the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) by Horwitz (1987). BALLI contains items in five major areas of language learning: 1) difficulty of language learning, 2) foreign language aptitude, 3) the nature of language learning, 4) learning and communication strategies and 5) motivations and expectations. In an attempt to identify beliefs of ESL students, Horwitz (1987) administered the BALLI to 32 ESL students at the Intensive English Program. According to her report, most students believed in language aptitude and acknowledged the importance of grammar and vocabulary learning. They also agreed with the importance of repetition and practice in learning. Studies also compare beliefs held by teachers and learners (e.g. Kern, 1995; Kuntz & Belnap, 2001). In Kutnz and Belnap's study the greatest difference in beliefs between teachers and learners were found in the areas of motivation and expectation, followed by attitudes about the nature of language learning. These studies identified and classified beliefs held by learners and teachers with different characteristics, indicating that multiple dimensions exist in beliefs.

Knowing what a learner believes generates a set of subsequent questions about the impacts of beliefs on learning. How do beliefs affect motivation, learners' behaviors, or learning outcomes? Moving beyond the descriptive level of explanation, research on learner beliefs expanded the notion of how beliefs might affect learners' motivation and learning behavior. Explanations for how beliefs may be directly related to learner motivation are offered by self-efficacy theories. In cognitive psychology, self-efficacy is defined as the "personal judgments of performance capabilities in a given domain of activities" (Schunk, 1985, p. 208). According to self-efficacy theories, people have confidence about performing activities they judge themselves capable of doing, while they avoid those they believe are beyond their abilities. Their perceptions about their capabilities may also determine how much effort they will make in the face of challenges or obstacles (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). What learners believe about themselves may cause different emotional reactions, triggering different learner motivations and behavior in turn (Yang, 1999; Dőrnyei, 1994). Thus, many researchers have recognized self-efficacy as the major component of the motivational dimension in learners' belief systems. For example, Cotterall (1999) recognized self-efficacy as one of six key factors of learner beliefs and included a number of items aimed at measuring learners' self-efficacy in her study. When proposing a theoretical construct of language learning beliefs, which is composed of two primary dimensions, metacognitive and motivational, Yang (1999) also acknowledged learners' beliefs about their ability as one of three motivational components along with their goals for L2 learning and learners' emotional reaction to L2 learning. In addition, she calls for researchers to give more attention to motivational beliefs, arguing that motivational beliefs play an important role in L2 learning.

The importance of investigating the relationship between learner beliefs and learner behaviors is well acknowledged in learner autonomy research. Autonomy is defined the capacity to take over one's own learning (Benson, 2001). According to Bound (1988, p.23), "the main characteristic of autonomy as an approach to learning is that students take some significant responsibility for their own learning over and above responding to instruction." Promoting learner autonomy is considered as an important teacher behavior (Yang, 1998). The reason why beliefs are so important in fostering autonomy is because autonomous language learning behavior may be supported by a particular set of beliefs. Cotterall (1995) argues that beliefs learners hold may either contribute to or impede the development of their potential for autonomy. She identified underlying dimensions of beliefs through factor analysis of data that was obtained by the means of questionnaires from adult 139 ESL learners in an intensive English for Academic Purposes course. She discussed each factor, examining the claims that have been made in literature about the relationship of each factor to autonomous language learning. Her conclusion was that understanding learner beliefs is a prerequisite to understanding learner autonomy because beliefs are likely to reflect learners' readiness for autonomy. Though using a different term, *self-regulation*, Wenden (1999) also maintains that learners' acquired knowledge about learning influences the learning process. According to her explanation, learning beliefs affect task analysis and monitoring, which are two key phases in self-regulation. Since learning is engaging in cognitive knowledge, learners may deliberately call upon their metacognitive knowledge (Flavell, 1979; Wenden, 1999). When faced with problems, learners make decisions about how to deal with problems based on their metacognitive knowledge.

SLA scholars who seek evidence for the relationship between beliefs and autonomous, self-regulated language learning turned their attention to learning strategy research in the late 1980s. It is suggested that learners' preconceived beliefs about language learning would likely influence the way learners use their learning strategies and learn a second language (e.g. Horwitz, 1988). Learners' beliefs about their abilities affect their goals and motivational patterns, which in turn influences their learning behaviors (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Others suggest the importance of strategy use research in this dynamic. Pintrich and De Groot (1990) found that self-efficacy beliefs are positively related to the use of cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies, both of which are important learning strategies widely used among foreign and second language learners (Oxford, 1990). Yang's study (1999) also established a strong connection between learner beliefs and strategy use. Yang administered both the BALLI (Horwitz, 1985) and Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) to more than 500 students in Taiwan and examined the relationship between this belief and strategy factors. The results of correlation analysis suggested a significant relationship between beliefs and strategy use. The first correlation was found between self-efficacy and all six groups of learning strategies (formal oral-practice strategies, compensation strategies, social strategies, metacognitive strategies, functional strategies, and cognitive-memory strategies) with the strongest connection being to functional practice strategies (e.g. watching TV shows or movies in English, encouraging themselves to speak, starting conversations in English). The second significant correlation was between language learners' beliefs about the value and nature of language learning and a more frequent use of formal oral practice strategies (e.g. practicing the sounds of English, saying or writing

new English words several times, trying to talk like native English speakers). These findings indicate that learner beliefs do influence learner behaviors. They are also consistent with Wenden's claim (2001) that metacognitive knowledge is related to the ability to self-regulate one's learning.

The common approach to beliefs taken in the studies reviewed above is that beliefs are relatively stable. Learners act upon these beliefs with tasks they perform during the second language process. The contribution of studies from within the framework of cognitive psychology is undeniable in that it identifies common beliefs held by learners. This has helped us to understand the impacts theses beliefs have on learning behaviors such as strategy use. However, the assumption that beliefs are stable mental representations overlooks the fact that beliefs are connected to learners' experience and to learning contexts that are external to learners (Barcelos, 2006). Little is known about how learners' beliefs are formed and developed. However, it is reasonable to assume that the learning experience involves interaction. Indeed, the learning context may be an important (conscious or unconscious) source of learner beliefs.

The influence of the learning contexts on one's beliefs about L2 learning has been acknowledged by some researchers. In an effort to identify cultural differences in learner beliefs, Horwitz (1999) examined eight studies that investigated learner beliefs: Horwtiz (1988), which catalogued the beliefs of American learners of French, German, and Spanish who were in their first semester; Kern (1995), which compared the beliefs of French learners at an American university with their instructors; Oh (1996), which investigated the beliefs of American university students of Japanese; Kunt (1997), which compared the beliefs of two groups of Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot pre-university

learners; Park (1995) and Truitt (1995), which used a sample of Korean university students learning English; and Yang (1995), which examined the beliefs of Taiwanese university students studying English. These particular studies were chosen because they used similar research methodologies and allowed comparisons between similar and different cultural groups. The data for each group was compared both between groups of different cultures and between groups of the same culture. There were several differences identified between the American learners and Asian and Turkish EFL learners. For example, The Asian and Turkish learners more strongly believed that vocabulary is key to foreign language learning. Their motivations and expectations also differed, with the Asian and Turkish groups tending toward instrumental motivations and American groups tending toward more integrative motivations. However, although there were some variations in responses of the different culture groups, the results did not point to any distinctive differences between them. Rather, beliefs differences within American groups and same-culture EFL groups were observed. Horowitz's conclusion was that differences in beliefs should not be attributed to cultural influence but to contextual differences in the language learning situations. Different instructional approaches, she hypothesized, would have an impact on learner beliefs.

As demonstrated in Horwitz's study (1999), most of the literature on learner beliefs does not provide systematic explanations about how learner beliefs are developed in relation to learning contexts. However, the contextual influence on beliefs is strongly implied. Interestingly enough, the concept of changes in beliefs as a result of learners' experience in different learning contexts has not drawn much attention from SLA scholars in recent years. This could be because when beliefs are viewed as knowledge,

which is static and resistant to change, there is not room for consideration of the notion that interaction with the environment might change beliefs.

In response to criticism concerning the metacognitive approach, researchers have recently begun to depart from the traditional framework of cognitive psychology and to approach learner beliefs from various perspectives (McGroarty, 1998). According to the social constructionist perspective, "beliefs are not stable entities within the individual, but situated in social contexts and formed through specific instances of social interaction and, as a result, are constantly, evolving" (Woods, 2006, p202). A social psychological perspective on beliefs also highlights the interactive nature of beliefs. From a social psychological perspective, beliefs are greatly influenced by individuals' experience (Corsini 1994). Thus, a learner's beliefs may change over time as the learner adapts to and interacts with new learning experiences. In this sense a learners' belief system is an interactive and evolving structure, one that is constantly changing as the learner's L2 proficiency and/or learning environment changes. Both social constructionist and social psychological perspectives acknowledge the dynamic nature of beliefs, which has been ignored by those taking a more metacognitive approach to understanding beliefs.

An important empirical question is whether or not beliefs do change over time or from one learning context to another (Woods, 2006). Wenden (1999), in his overview in the special issue on learner beliefs in the journal *System*, also listed this question among areas that are yet to be explored. One of the few studies that have examined this area is Kern (1995). Kern collected data from students in first-year French in order to determine whether they changed their beliefs over the course of the 15-week semester. The BALLI was given twice, at the beginning and end of the semester. The comparison of the scores

showed 35% to 59% of the responses changed over the 15-week period. However, 29% of the French students showed no change in correlation with their instructor's responses over the course of the semester, suggesting that their beliefs were stable from the beginning to the end of the semester.

In a more recent study, Tanka and Ellis (2003) also used the BALLI to examine changes in students' beliefs as a result of a 15-week study abroad program. The results revealed statistically significant changes in the students' beliefs relating to analytic language learning, experiential language learning, self-efficacy and confidence, the greatest being in self-efficacy and confidence. However, no statistically significant relationships were found between changes in beliefs and in proficiency.

With conflicting findings on changes in learner beliefs, the picture is still unclear. Moreover, because they rely on questionnaires only, the studies reviewed above do not provide answers to the questions of what affects the changes in beliefs, or what process learners go through in developing beliefs. Many scholars have acknowledged the methodological limitations of questionnaire-based studies in belief research. For example, Sakui and Gaies (1999) state that learners might have different interpretations of the questionnaire items. In addition, there are limits to what can be learned about language learners' beliefs from questionnaire items. Questionnaire items aim to look at learners' perspectives, yet they filter learners' experience because the questions are "necessarily and dangerously based on the researcher's perspectives of what participants my find important in their experience" (Pellegrino, 2004. p. 115). These problems inherent to the questionnaire-based studies raise the possibility that a different

methodological approach is needed in order to gain a deeper understanding into the dynamic, context-dependent nature of beliefs (Alanen, 2006).

With the recognition of the limitations in using questionnaires only for investigation of the dynamic nature of beliefs and the importance of contexts in beliefs development, researchers are turning to new methodological approaches in conducting belief studies. The new approaches incorporate qualitative methods in exploring the dynamic nature of beliefs and their development in context. For example, White (1999), who studied self-instructed language learners, employed multiple instruments including interviews, ranking exercises, questionnaires, scenarios, and open-ended questionnaires through the five phases of data collection to investigate shifts in expectations and to find emergent beliefs. The analysis indicated that as learners accrued experiences in the new learning context, evident shifts in learner expectations and beliefs occurred. In particular, there were significant differences between the second and fifth phase in the mean ranking of conditions for success. While mean rankings of "persistence" and "knowing how you learn best" significantly dropped, rankings of "confidence in self" and "amount of interaction with a tutor" significantly increased. Hosenfeld (2006) also found evidence for emerging beliefs through the analysis of journals kept by learners during a two-month period of self-directed language learning. The four emerging beliefs were 1) using multiple voices, 2) learning dialogues in context, 3) using phonetic symbols and 4) assessing improvement.

The findings of these studies have value in that they provide insight into the nature of beliefs. They suggest that learners' belief dynamics are affected by varying learning contexts and stages of learning. This supports the claim that beliefs should be

viewed not as stable and static, but as dynamic and variable. In addition, these studies exemplify how qualitative information in the investigation of beliefs is beneficial. The qualitative data collected through interviews and journals gave a greater understanding about what underlies learner belief systems.

Past research on learner beliefs has provided a direction for the present study in terms of both topical and methodological areas. First, little research has considered learner beliefs as varying at different stages of study abroad. Also, though there is evidence to support the idea that beliefs may change as a result of a study abroad experience, the reasons behind the apparent changes in beliefs has not been satisfactorily addressed. Second, in terms of a research methodology, research in learner beliefs has a history of relying heavily on questionnaires only. A shift to using qualitative methods has been observed in recent studies (e.g., Kalaja, 2006; Dufva, 2006). Acknowledging the relative strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative measures, the present study will employ both in an effort to triangulate data and to paint a broader picture of the effects of study abroad on learner beliefs. The following hypotheses (H) and research questions (RQ) guided this study.

H1: Learners who study abroad undergo a change in their L2 learning beliefs.

H2: These changes are due to their study abroad experience.

RQ1: What beliefs become stronger or weaker due to study abroad?

RQ2: What aspects of the SA experience might account for these changes in beliefs?

H3: Learners at the early and later stages of study abroad have differences in their L2 learning beliefs.

RQ2: How do learners' beliefs differ between learners at the early and later stages of study abroad?

Method

Participants

Table 1 shows the demographic information about the participants. A total of 70 international students (male: 30, female: 40) took part in the present study. The students were enrolled either in an ESL program (N=28) or an undergraduate or graduate program (N=41) in the United States. The target population of the study was limited to those who had been in the U.S. no more than 2 years at the time of the study. The ESL students were recruited from the English Language Center (ELC) at Michigan State University (MSU) and the English Language and Culture Center at Lansing Community College (LCC). According to the placement tests administered by these institutions, the proficiency level of the ESL students ranged from the intermediate to the advanced level. Twenty ESL students were in the English for Academic Purposes Program (EAP), which is designed to help international students with their English language in order to prepare them for the regular undergraduate programs. Their proficiency level is considered to be higher than that of other ESL students but lower than that of regular international students who are carrying out degree requirements. Undergraduate and graduate students were recruited from activities for international students held at the International Center, MSU.

The study included participants with diverse language backgrounds. The majority were Korean (N=30) and Chinese (N=22). The large proportion of Korean and Chinese represents the international population at the two institutions. In ESL classes, Koreans

Table 1

Demographic Information

Sex		Program		Language	
	N		N		N
Male	30	ESL	28	Korean	30
Female	40	Undergrad	19	Chinese	22
		Master's	17	Arabic	5
		Ph.D	5	Japanese	2
		Other	1	French	2
				Other	9
Total	70	Total	70	Total	70

outnumbered other nationalities, while in degree programs there were as many Chinese speakers as Korean speakers.

The students were classified into two groups: early and later stages of study abroad. The early group (Group E) consisted of students who had been in the U.S. less than or equal to six months at the time of the study, and the later group (Group L) consisted of students who had been in the U.S. more than six months and less than two years. A six-month cut-off point was used for dividing the early and later stages because students whose length of residency was under 6 months had had one semester or less of classes in the U.S., while those who had been in the country longer than 6 months were on average in their second or third semester of study abroad. A similar cut-off point was used by Milton and Meara (1995). The average number of months of stay was 4.11 for

the early group and 14.19 for the later group. The detailed composition of each group is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Age, Years of Instruction and Length of Residence

	Mean	St.	Minimum	Maximum
Group E				
Age	23. 39	5.55	17	39
Years of instruction in the home country	8.66	4.66	2	23
Length of Residence in the U.S. (in months)	4.11	1.83	1	6
Group L				
Age	26.63	6.50	19	44
Years of instruction in the home country	10.61	6.60	2	30
Length of Residence in the U.S. (in months)	14.19	5.87	7	24

Instruments

The current study used both questionnaires and interviews to collect quantitative and qualitative data from participants. The questionnaire had two sections. The first was a background questionnaire. The second was a questionnaire on learners' beliefs. The belief questionnaire was constructed by adopting existing questionnaires (Cotterall, 1999; Horwitz, 1985) and writing new items. The new items were written in order to examine

learners' beliefs in study abroad learning (e.g., perceived improvement during study abroad) that is not included in the existing questionnaires. The questionnaire included 54 items to which participants responded on a 10-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (10). Though traditional questionnaires on learner beliefs such as the BALLI (Horwitz, 1985) use a 5-point Likert scale, the current study employed Cotterall's 10-point scale in an attempt to obtain a wider distribution of responses.

The beliefs questionnaire was tested through a pilot study with 45 participants. The data from the pilot study was first submitted to a factor analysis in order to reduce the number of variables in the beliefs questionnaire by identifying broader underlying dimensions. The factor analysis yielded a six-factor solution. The top three factors, learner autonomy, self-efficacy, and difficulty of learning, accounted for 54.94 % of the total variance. Items pertaining to these factors were included in the pilot study and future analyses because items related to the other three factors had a weak contribution to the overall variance and questionnaire construct. That is, the other items did not contribute much to the total variance and had low eigenvalues and so were dropped from the survey. The reliability of the remaining three factors was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients were .89 for learner autonomy, .88 for self-efficacy, and .66 for difficulty of learning.

Based on the results of factor analysis and reliability tests, the questionnaire was revised. New items were also added for the revision of the questionnaire. The final version of the questionnaire (Appendix 1) consisted of a total of 54 items. These items aimed to measure the following areas:

Table 3

Factor Analysis of Learner Beliefs (Initial version)

Item #	Questionnaire Items	F1	F2	F3
	Factor 1: Self-efficacy			
1	I am above average at language learning.			
2	I am confident about my ability to learn English successfully.	.816		
4	I am afraid of making mistakes when speaking with others in English.	.826		
7	I will ultimately learn to speak English very well.	.898		
	Factor 2: Learner autonomy			
26	My language success depends on what I do outside the classroom.		.708	
39	I should find my own opportunities to use the language		.747	
	Factor 3: The difficulty of language learning			
9	I believe English is a difficult language.			.777
16	It is possible to learn English in a short time.			.642
	Eigenvalue	3.98	2.09	1.61
	Percentage of Variance	28.47	14.95	11.51
	Cumulative Percentage	28.47	43.42	54.94

1. Self-efficacy (Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 12)
2. Learner autonomy (Items 26, 39,,44 and 45)
3. The difficulty of language learning (Items 9, 18, 16, and 37)
4. The nature of language learning (Items 17, 19, 20 and 23)
5. The role of teachers (Items 11, 14, 38, 43, 47 and 50)
6. Perceived competence in listening, speaking, reading, writing and grammar (Items 22, 27, 28, 35, 39, 44, 48, 51 and 54)
7. Perceived importance of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Items 8, 15, 30, 31, 32 and 41)

The questionnaire was designed to capture learners' beliefs before and after beginning study abroad in order to examine the changes in the learners' beliefs about language learning. Each statement about a specific belief appears two times, once asking about the belief in the home country, and once in the United States. For example, learners were asked to respond to the statement "When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it was important to repeat and practice." Later another statement asks "Here in the U.S., I believe it is important to repeat and practice." The two statements relate to the same belief in different learning contexts. All items were randomized and then checked to make sure no pair of statements occurred one after the other. This was done to avoid item dependence as much as possible.

Data collection

The questionnaires were distributed to the ESL students during their classes. They were allowed to bring it home, complete it on their own and return it to their teacher. Twenty three ESL students received extra credit for their participation. Non-ESL students

were approached outside of class and asked to fill out the questionnaire to return it directly to the researcher. [

After a questionnaire was returned to the researcher, the respondents were asked whether he or she would agree to participate in a follow-up interview. Interviews were semi-structured. A basic set of questions for the interview was asked of everyone, and additional questions were asked of individual participants depending on their responses and individuals' changes in beliefs that were identified in the questionnaire responses. The interview questions were formulated based on the questionnaire responses. They focused on learners' perception on the value of SA, language improvement, and comparison between the AH context and SA context. The basic set of interview questions can be found in Appendix 2. Fourteen respondents, six from the early (Group E) and eight from the late group (Group L) participated. They were from seven different countries: Korea (5), Chinese (1), Taiwanese (3), Indonesian (1), Arabic (2), Japan (1), Egyptian (1).

The interviews lasted for 20 minutes on average. The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. The interviews were conducted in English, except for some Korean participants (N=5), who showed the tendency to start speaking English but to soon change to speaking in Korean (the researcher's L1). The ramifications of this will be discussed in the limitations section. Interview data were transcribed verbatim; Korean language data of four Korean interviewee were also translated into English by the researcher.

Quantitative data Analysis

The questionnaire items were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha to estimate the reliability of the questionnaire. The data were also submitted to a factorial analysis to test the underlying construct validity of the measurement. The three variables relating to *the teacher's role*, *self-efficacy* and *learner autonomy* were confirmed as major dimensions of the belief questionnaire. The three variables accounted for 53.76 % of the variance of the data. Unlike the results of the pilot-study, the reliability of the items for the *difficulty of learning* ($\alpha = .37$) and *nature of learning* ($\alpha = .16$) did not reach an acceptable level. Thus, the items for these factors with a low reliability were examined separately. The Cronbach's alpha value of the major three variables and the items that belong to these variables are presented below.

Variable 1 is associated with learners' perceived importance of instruction and the teachers' role in their language learning and will therefore be labeled as the *teacher's role*. The result of reliability analysis of three the items (11, 47 & 50) is .70. The three items are listed below.

- Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what the teacher does in the classroom.
- Here in the U.S. I believe that opportunities to use the language should be provided by the teacher.
- Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what I do inside the classroom.

Variable 2 concerns learners' beliefs about themselves. Four items (4, 5, 7 & 12) are all associated with beliefs in their ability to learn English and their confidence.

Accordingly, this variable will be referred as *self-efficacy*. The Cronbach's reliability of coefficient of the four items is .67.

- Here in the U.S. I am afraid of making mistakes when speaking with others in English.
- Here in the U.S. I think I am above average at language learning.
- Here in the U.S I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak English very well.
- Here in the U.S. I believe I am confident about my ability to learn English successfully.

Variable 3 is related to learners' view on their own responsibility for language learning. Two items (26 & 45) were used to measure the degree to which learners accept their responsibility for learning. They will be labeled as *learner autonomy*. The reliability coefficient (α= .59) showed a marginally acceptable level of reliability for the two items.

- Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what I do outside the classroom.
- Here in the U.S. I believe that I should find my own opportunities to use the language.

Besides the three variables above, there are items that were separately analyzed as subcategory of *improvement in learning*. The items concerned following areas: the value of one's study abroad experience; importance of grammar; importance of pronunciation; and importance of vocabulary learning. Learners' self-reported scores on perceived improvement in speaking, listening, reading and writing and vocabulary were also

included in the analysis. The self-reported improvements in the five areas of learning will be labeled as *perceived competence*.

Independent T tests were used to examine the between-group differences of Group E and Group L for *perceived improvement* and *perceived importance of grammar, pronunciation* and *vocabulary*. A paired-sample T test examined whether significant changes were found between what they believed in their home country and what they believe now in the U.S. The results of these statistical analyses will be discussed in the next section.

Results

Teachers' role, self-efficacy, and learner autonomy

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of scores for beliefs in *the teacher's role, self-efficacy* and *learner autonomy*. The mean score (M=15.84; M=15.22) for *teacher's role* is below the median point, suggesting that most learners disagree with the idea that their language success depends on the role of teachers. On the other hand, the mean score for *learners' autonomy* (M=15.16; M=17.03) suggests that learners hold a relatively strong belief in learner autonomy. According to the independent t-test results, learners who are in the late stage held significantly stronger beliefs in learner autonomy than learners at the early stage, $t(70) = -2.39$, $p < .05$.

Paired sample T tests were used to compare means scores of the at-home (AH) context to the SA context. The tests were separately conducted for each group in order to examine whether or not significant changes were found in the learners' self-report. According to the results, the late-stage learners had significant changes in their beliefs in the teachers' role. The beliefs in the role of the teacher did not change significantly for

Table 4

Between Group Difference in Teacher's Role, Self-Efficacy, Learner Autonomy

	Group	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	M Diff.	t	P
Teacher's role	E	15.84	5.47	3	30	.61	.44	.66
	L	15.22	5.91	3	30			
Self-efficacy	E	24.87	7.69	4	40	.16	-.10	.92
	L	25.03	5.78	4	40			
Learner Autonomy	E	15.16	3.35	2	20	1.87	-2.39	.02
	L	17.03	3.09	2	20			

Table 5

Beliefs in the AH Context and the SA Context

Dependent Variables	Group	Mean		SD		T	P
		AH	SA	AH	SA		
Teacher's role	E	17.64	15.96	5.69	5.49	1.84	.074
	L	18.06	15.23	6.40	5.91	2.89	.007*
Learner Autonomy	E	12.11	15.16	3.80	3.35	-4.08	.000*
	L	15.42	17.03	2.75	3.09	-2.54	.017*
Self-efficacy	E	21.55	24.87	8.78	7.69	-1.98	.056
	L	24.77	25.33	7.23	5.63	-.48	.635

**Significant at the .05 level.*

the early-stage group. Both early and late stage learners reported that their beliefs in leaner autonomy became stronger in the SA context compared to the AH context, $t(38) = -4.08$, $p < .001$, and $t(32) = -2.54$, $p = .02$. These differences were significant. The mean scores for self-efficacy also show changes in a positive direction; however, the changes were not statistically significant.

Perceptions on, grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation

Paired sample T tests were conducted for items that measured four areas of learners' perceived importance; grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. In perceived importance of grammar, the results showed that learners' belief in importance of grammar is not as strong in the SA context as their beliefs were in the AH context. The learners in the early stage of study abroad reported a significant decrease in beliefs in the importance of grammar; learners in the later stage of study abroad showed no significant change. Grammar was the only area where beliefs became weaker rather than stronger. Belief scores in all other areas increased in the SA context, although changes in views on vocabulary and pronunciation were not significantly different.

Nature of learning

Table 7 shows the results of paired-sample T tests conducted for the two items that are associated with the *nature of learning*. The two items that are included in the analysis are related to the *difficulty of English learning* and the *importance of knowing the culture*. The mean scores of the SA context were compared with the mean score of AH contexts for each item. According to the results, early-stage learners showed a significant change in their beliefs that it is possible to learn English in a short time, $t(38) = 3.44$, $p = .001$. On the other hand, late-stage learners' beliefs focusing on the

Table 6

Perceptions on Grammar, Vocabulary and Pronunciation

Dependent Variables	Group	Mean		SD		T	P
		AH	SA	AH	SA		
Grammar	E	6.46	5.57	2.30	2.26	-2.76	.009
	L	6.28	6.00	2.71	2.81	.07	.665
Vocabulary	E	7.29	7.05	2.03	2.16	-.85	.400
	L	6.71	6.75	2.07	1.97	.06	.946
Pronunciation	E	6.02	6.60	2.10	2.21	1.11	.271
	L	6.75	7.50	2.37	1.98	1.47	.153

Table 7

Nature of Learning

Dependent Variables	Group	Mean		SD		t	P
		AH	SA	AH	SA		
It is possible to learn English in a short time.	E	3.53	5.32	2.26	2.89	3.44	.001
	L	4.09	4.66	2.86	2.66	.93	.358
It is necessary to learn to know foreign culture.	E	6.73	7.14	2.39	2.23	-1.02	.311
	L	7.09	8.18	2.57	1.79	-2.67	.012

importance of *knowing a foreign culture* were significantly strengthened when compared to their beliefs in the home country , t(32) = -2. 67, p = .01. Although the mean score of the early-stage learners' beliefs on the importance of culture also increased from 6.73 (SD = 2.39) to 7.14 (SD = 2.23), it did not reach a significant level of difference.

Improvement in learning

Table 8 shows how much learners think they are making improvements in writing, reading, listening, speaking and grammar. Overall, learners in the later stage are

Table 8

Improvement in Learning

Dependent variables	No	Group	Mean	SD	M Diff.	T	P
Writing	48	E	6.79	2.28	.96	-1.70	.092
		L	7.75	2.40			
Reading	44	E	6.26	2.32	1.39	-2.80	.007
		L	7.66	1.84			
Listening	22	E	7.45	2.36	.99	-2.09	.041
		L	8.44	1.58			
Speaking	27	E	6.82	2.22	.97	-1.98	.052
		L	7.78	1.86			
Grammar	54	E	6.26	2.39	.30	-.50	.616
		L	6.56	2.58			
I know how to find an effective way to learn English.	54	E	5.87	2.15	1.54	3.23	.002
		L	7.40	1.78			

consistently higher in mean scores for all areas. The perception of improvement by learners who were in the later stage of study abroad was significantly higher in reading (M=7.66, SD=1.84; M=6.26, SD=2.32) and listening (M=8.44, SD=1.58; M=7.45, SD=2.36) than by learners who were in the early stages of study abroad, t(70)= -2,80, p= .007; t(70)= -2.09, p= .041. The early and late learners reported that they were making the greatest improvement in listening and the least improvement in grammar. The mean scores for the item concerning whether they know how to find an effective way to learn English were also compared. The late learners (M = 7.40, SD = 1.78) agreed that they did find an effective way to learn English to a much larger extent than the learners of Group E did (M = 5.87, SD = 2.15), possibly suggesting that learners in a later stage of study abroad are more confident about their ability to use effective learning strategies.

Discussion

The study set out to investigate the impact of study abroad on learner beliefs by examining beliefs at two different stages of study abroad. The results can be summarized as follows. The first and second hypothesis concerned changes between AH beliefs and SA beliefs. The first set of research questions formulated from these hypotheses addressed the question of what beliefs become stronger or weaker due to study abroad. The learners in both early and later stages reported that their SA beliefs in learner autonomy and the importance of feedback were significantly strengthened when compared to their AH beliefs. This confirms the Hypothesis One: Students who study abroad do undergo a change in their L2 learning beliefs. .

The second set of research questions addressed the effects of the learning stage on learner beliefs in the SA context. According to the results, a significant difference in

beliefs between the early- and late-stage study abroad students was found in learner independence and the perceived improvement in listening and reading. In those cases, the mean scores of later-stage learners were significantly higher than early-stage learners, suggesting that learner beliefs at the early stage changed toward the later stage of study abroad. This confirms the third hypothesis: Learners at the early and later stages of study abroad have differences in their beliefs about language learning.

The results also revealed different patterns in belief changes between the groups of early-stage learners and late-stage learners. While learners at the early stage (those with less than six months of study abroad) of study abroad showed significant changes in beliefs in the importance of grammar and in the difficulty of learning, beliefs of learners at the later stage of study abroad (those who have been studying abroad more than six months) significantly changed their beliefs in the areas of the perceived important of the teacher's role and the importance of knowing the culture.

Overall, these findings provide substantial evidence for the claim that beliefs should be viewed not as static and stable but as dynamic and variable. In this section, interpretations and implications of the major findings will be discussed in the light of literature. Moving beyond the descriptive level of beliefs patterns, this section will present interview data that will provide insights into what might be the source of these changes in beliefs.

Belief changes in learner autonomy

The most notable positive impact of study abroad on learner beliefs was shown to be in the area of learner independence. The learners of both groups reported that while abroad they more strongly believe that they themselves should find opportunities to use

their L2 and that success in L2 learning depends on what they do outside of the classroom. The significantly increased score in learner independence in the SA context suggests that study abroad helps learners better recognize the importance of their own role in their learning. Furthermore, the significant difference between the early and late stages suggests that the learning stage might be a factor that influences changes in learner independence: learner independence may increases as time spent on study abroad increases. The mean score of learner independence of those at the later stage of study abroad (M = 17.03, SD = 3.09) was significantly higher than those at the beginning stage of abroad (M = 15.16, SD = 2.75). The between-group difference in learner independence is noteworthy in that no effect of learning stage was found in beliefs in the teacher's role, self-efficacy, or the nature of learning.

Hypothesis 2 stated that study abroad directly influences the L2 learning beliefs students have. The question is, "What factors related to study abroad influence the increase of learner independence?" Participants' responses to interview questions provided some clues about the answers. Interestingly, the positive change in learner independence seemed to be related to learners' negative perceptions about study abroad as a learning context. Many learners expressed frustrations and disappointments when asked about how their experience matched up to their expectations that they had about study abroad prior to leaving their home country.

> Question: How is your study abroad experience similar to or different from your expectations?
>
> Example 1: Tom[1], Taiwanese student, male, Group L
>
> It is so different from what I expected. I realized it is the same here... difficult to talk to a native speaker. I don't have many chance to meet native speakers and

[1] Names are pseudonyms.

talk to them. In class I talk to classmates, other Taiwanese and Chinese, speaking Chinese. When I come home, I talk to my roommate, also Chinese. I don't speak English much here.

Example 2: Young, Korean student, female, Group L

One of disappointing thing is that it is very hard to talk to Americans. Except classes, other than project, all relationships with Americans are very official, not like very comfortable or... not like friendship. It is through class, or meeting for project. Maybe it is related to my personality, but I don't know.

Example 3: Emily, Korean student, female, Group E

I was so surprised that there are so many Koreans here. Everywhere there are many Koreans. I was very disappointed about that. I came here all the way from Korea to be in a different learning environment. If I knew there would be so many Koreans like this, I would have not come here. I know I need to try to speak English here but usually I talk to other Koreans in Korean. I hang out with Koreans, my classmates. We all speak Korean all the time because it is easier for us. It is funny to speak English to them. Students from other counties also hang out with their friends and speak to each other in their own language. I wish I could make many American friends. But I don't know where I can find the opportunities.

The frustrations that learners express are derived primarily from the discrepancy between what they believe what study abroad should be and what it really is. Participants' responses clearly show that learners came abroad with expectations that study abroad would guarantee sufficient opportunities to be immersed into a different culture and that authentic interactions with native speakers of English would be readily available. However, as they expressed during the interviews, the number of opportunities to actually engage in communication with native speakers seems to be far below their expectations. According to learners' reports, both in and outside the classroom, learners tend to cluster with friends from the same country, speaking their native language to each other. Participants' responses to items on the background questionnaire also revealed how little learners use English outside the classroom. The mean time they spend using English

outside the class for reading and speaking was less than one hour per day. Even the time they spent on listening to English did not go beyond 2 hours per day. This means that the primary mode of communication outside the classroom is often in the learners' first language, not the target language.

The similar trend of using more L1 over L2 while SA learning has been reported in several studies (e.g. Barron, 2003; Schumann, 1980; Wilkinson, 1997). Barron (2003), who studied pragmatic developments of SA learners, concluded that even spending a full year abroad, learners may not have enough access to meaningful interactions with native speakers that could help them acquire pragmatic norms "because SA learners often hang out with other L1 peers" (p.70). The fact that learners do not take advantage of superior strengths and advantages the SA context offers should be surprising (Collentine & Freed, 2004). The discouraging picture is contradictory to expectations of most of learners and teachers.

Consequentially, the mismatch between the expectations they had and the reality they are facing seems to be leading these learners to the realization that the study abroad environment alone does not promise success in L2 learning in the absence of their own efforts to increase their opportunities to engage in L2 communication. For example, learners who disagreed with the idea that SA is the most effective way to improve English often cited the need to make extra effort to gain benefits from their SA experience.

> Example 4: Ray, Japanese student, male, Group E
>
> I also knew it is how I use my time. If I don't try, try really hard, then they will not develop. But if you try to meet many people and talk to people, then it is good.

> I like the environment. But I am no satisfied with myself. I have to put more time. I don't have to hurry, but I need to make some effort, really, really is my effort.

Example 5: Young, Korean student, female, Group L

> I don't think learning English in the U.S. is the best way to improve English anymore. What is important is to be proactive about creating learning opportunities myself. I realized that there is no such thing as automatic improvement in language learning. Study abroad can be a good opportunity if one makes a lot of efforts to take advantage of the context. Without my own efforts, the environment makes little impact.

Example 6: Laura, Egyptian student, female, Group E

> The most important thing is exposure. Some people, although they are here to improve English skills, they always hang out with their friends from the same country. If they don't expose themselves to American culture, American people, their English is not going to improve. It does not matter how long they are here. If I don't make effort to have a lot of exposure, I will not have gains and benefits.

These learners seem to agree with DeKeyser (1991) who said that "the sheer number of hours spent in the native-speaking environment provides a huge amount of comprehensible input for all students and a sizable amount of speaking practice *for those who are willing to make an effort*" (p. 116, my italics). Obviously, opportunities for target language use are much more abundant in the SA context compared to the learning environments in the AH context. However, the opportunities might not be so meaningful if learners do not make use of them. Though unfortunate, the paucity of meaningful communication in the face of an abundance of potential opportunities seemed to play a role in helping learners to realize what their own role and responsibility for learning should be, resulting in a significant increase in beliefs in learner independence.

From the perspective of educational psychology, increased learner independence should be viewed as a positive change. Researchers who have attempted to discover the

"secret" of strategic learners have recognized that a critical element of 'good' learners is autonomy. According to Macaro (2001, p. 264), "one thing seems to be increasingly clear and that is that, across learning contexts those who are proactive in their pursuit of language learning appear to learn best." It is not types or directions of strategies per se but a proactive approach to learning that characterizes successful learners (Dörneyi, 2005). While it is beyond the scope of the paper to discus whether these learners with strong beliefs in learner independence will actually demonstrate self-regulated, autonomous learning behaviors, the learners in the current study clearly showed the cognitive and affective components of self-regulation, which are said to "provide individuals with the capacity to adjust their actions and goals in order to achieve desired results in light of changing environmental conditions" (Zeidner et al., 2000, p.751). The significantly increased beliefs in learner independence certainly reflect learners' readiness for autonomy (Cotterall, 1995).

Belief changes in the teacher's role

Another finding that should be discussed in relation to learner autonomy is changes in the beliefs about what the teacher's role should be. The mean scores of both early-stage learners (M=15.96, SD=5.49) and late-stage learners (M=15.23, SD=5.91) for SA beliefs in the teacher's role are significantly lower than the mean scores for AH beliefs in teacher' role (M=17.64, SD=5.69; M=18.06, SD=5.91). The within-group difference for the learners at the later stage of study abroad is significant, $t(32)= 2.89$, $p= .007$. Note that the mean scores of both groups for the AH context is above the median of the scale, while the mean scores for the SA context is below the median, which suggests learners studying abroad no longer believe that their language success depends

on what their teachers do. The beliefs that were changed in the SA context again seemed to grow stronger at the later stage of study abroad, again suggesting a longitudinal impact of study abroad on learner beliefs. The decrease in learners' dependence on teachers can be explained by the increase in learner independence. It is logical that the more they recognize their own responsibility for learning, the less dependent on teachers they become.

One of the factors that might have influenced the learners' dependence on teachers may be SA instruction practices that are different from what the learners had been exposed to in their home country. Table 9 shows a comparison of the learners' English classes in the AH contexts and the SA contexts. According to the learners' responses, the instructional approach in English classes in the U.S. is significantly

Table 9

Comparison of Instruction Practices Between the AH and SA Contexts

	Mean		SD			
Dependent variables	AH	SA	AH	SA	T	P
Teachers have us review vocabulary and grammar a lot.	8.12	5.00	1.95	2.30	8.16	.000*
Teachers get us to talk a lot in class.	4.43	7.26	2.07	2.45	-6.60	.000*
In my English class we do a lot of repetitions.	6.87	5.62	2.14	2.45	-3.17	.002*

* Significance is at the .05 level.

different from that in English classes in their home countries. The learners reported that English teachers in their home countries used more drills, had learners review grammar and vocabulary more, and had them talk less in class.

The differences in instructional practices revealed in the questionnaire items were consistent with the comparison that learners made between the AH classes and SA classes in the interviews. Below are some of individual students' descriptions about English classes.

> Question: What is the biggest difference between your English classes here in the U.S. and your classes in your home country?
>
> Example 7: Eric, Arabic student, male, Group E
>
> In my home country, teachers are like you know teachers. They know everything. So, and we learn from them... it is not easy to talk to them and question is hard. I mean asking question. But here teachers ask my ideas, opinions.
>
> Example 8: Sara, Indonesian student, female, Group E
>
> Here we make a lot speakings and writings. In Indonesia, we focused on grammar a lot and teachers explain. We don't have to talk. We listen and write down on the note book. It is not a talking to me. It is explaining.

The instructional techniques that emphasize drills and repetition for learning grammar and vocabulary are characteristics of traditional EFL classes where grammar-translation and audiolingual methodologies are dominantly used (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Most of the learners in this study are from countries where English is taught as a school subject in a teacher-fronted English class. Teachers are often viewed as authority figures as opposed to facilitators of learning, which may be due to cultural influences on teacher-student relationships (Wright, 1987). The participants' own comparisons highlight the differences in their beliefs concerning their teachers' role in their own L2 learning, beliefs that differ

depending on if they are in the AH or SA context. SA English classes provide learners a different learning environment, one that they have not experienced in their home country. While a learner's participation may be minimal in AH English classes, learners in SA classes are encouraged to express their ideas, ask questions and interact with peers. The different nature of teacher-student interactions and peer interactions in class was pointed out as the biggest difference between English classes in the U.S. and English classes in their home country.

Example 10: Eric, Arabic student, male, Group E

> The way they teach you, the way they talk to you is very different. In classes, I can share a lot with people... Everything I do here, they give a lot of feedback. They say what is good and what is not good. What to change, how to change. I think it is good, very helpful.

Example 11: Mina, Korean student, female, Group L

> We do a lot of activities including group activities. When we are doing activities, teachers always ask how we are doing or if we have questions. In Korea, teachers usually don't ask that kind of questions. They don't have to because teacher does everything. And whether I am doing ok or not will be judged after exams. The scores will tell them.

In their home countries, learners stated that they did not engage in group work with others in the classroom. According to learners' descriptions, the structures of English classes were not different from the lecture classes they had where students are not required to play an active role apart from attentively listening. Also, the nature of feedback and student-teacher interaction during class is different in that SA teachers' feedback more international, participatory, and explanatory. All of these create more opportunities for learners' participation during the class. This might help learners depart from viewing learning as teacher-directed process and teachers as authorative figures

(Cotteral, 1995), resulting in decreased in dependence in the teacher' role in learning. It is possible that the totally different ways of teaching and interaction that learners are exposed to may foster the view of learning not as a teacher-led process but as learner-centered and self-regulated process in which their proactive participation and initiates are important.

In this study it was found that learners believed teachers had less to do with their L2 learning than they themselves did. That is, SA students came to believe that they were responsible for their L2 learning, and that leaner autonomy was very important, even if this was not something they had believed strongly when they studied the language in their home country. In addition, these beliefs in the diminished role of the teacher and an increased role for leaner autonomy were more firmly solidified with more time spent in a study abroad context. The negative correlation between beliefs in the teacher's role and learner autonomy has been discussed in literature. Galloway and Labarca (1990) recommended that teachers provide "scaffolding" for their learners, gradually withdrawing support as learners gain greater task autonomy. Tudor (1993) claims that the teachers need to prepare learners for their new role by helping them develop learners' self-awareness as language learners. Other studies (e.g. Kumaravadivelu, 1991) examining learners' perception on the roles of teachers and learners point to the mismatch of differing perceptions of the roles among teachers and learners, illustrating that learners often expect the teacher to function as an authority figure in the classroom. Cotterall argues (1995, p.197) that "learners who subscribe to such a view do not correspond to the profile of the autonomous learner... and learners' expectation of teacher authority can present an obstacle to teachers to transfer responsibility to their

learners". From these perspectives, the significantly deceased dependence in the teacher' role that was found in this study can indeed be considered to be a positive change.

Perceived importance of and competence in grammar

When comparing their beliefs about L2 learning before and during study abroad, many learners commented on their views of grammar instruction. The results of the survey reveal that learners' perception of the importance of grammar decreased in the SA context (Group E: M=6.46, SD=2.30; M=5.57, SD=2.26, p(38)= .009), though the difference for the late-stage learners was not significant, M=6.28, SD=2.71; M=6.00, SD=2.81; t(32)= .665. Among the areas of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and feedback, the lowest mean score for the learners both in early and later study abroad stages was found in *perceived importance of grammar*, meaning learners believe grammar is the least important area in their L2 learning during SA. Grammar was not perceived as being as important as it was when participants were learning English in their home country. Also, the learners' self-assessment of their perceived improvement in the different skill areas (listening, reading, writing, speaking, and grammar) revealed that they believed they were making the most improvement in listening, but least improvement in grammar. During the interviews, the learners explained what had changed their perception on grammar. The learners seemed to attribute the decrease in perceived importance of grammar to the different focus of learning between the AH context and the SA context.

Example 12: Tom, Taiwanese student, male, Group L

> In Taiwan, I studied English only for TOFEL and school exams. So I focused on grammar and memorizing vocabulary. I thought my English is good because my scores was good. But now I know that grammar is like not nothing but not that important, if you cannot speak. It is not you don't know grammar. I know the

> grammar but it is hard to think of that when communicating. I thought grammar is really important because that is only thing I studied before.
>
> Example 13: Sue, Korean student, female, Group E
>
> I knew my listening was not very good. But I was so surprised I could not understand what they were saying. Even when I know the word and grammar, I could not still understand them. You cannot think of grammar when you have to speak and listen. It is a different process. When I try to think of grammar before speaking, the chance to speak is already gone.
>
> Example 14: Maureen, Chinese student, female, Group E
>
> I studied grammar a lot. Grammar is very important in the school. So I thought grammar is very important. Teachers come from China. They are very good at grammar. But maybe they cannot teach speaking, I don't know... The test, we have many test and questions are grammar questions.

The learners described their learning experiences in their EFL classes as often having a focus of instruction on grammar. Students were primarily evaluated by measuring how much they mastered in terms of linguistic rules. Also, a grammar test was a major component of many standardized English tests these learners prepared to take, such as the TOEFL and TOEIC. As a response to the demands, the primary needs and goals of EFL learners are related to academic achievements for which grammar learning is very important. However, with SA, learners enter a different context where linguistic demands placed on learners are different from EFL. The SA context is an English speaking environment. SA learners have far greater need to communicate in English than EFL learners.

Language learning goals reflect learners' linguistic needs. The language needs of SA learners that are different from EFL learners are revealed in their expressed study abroad goals. According to these interview data, learners' study abroad goals were often related to their overall improvement in communication skills and speaking, in particular.

When asked what goal they had in mind when they decided to go abroad for language learning, few expressed goals pertaining to the improvement of grammar. Rather, they stressed their intent to improve their speaking ability. Two examples below show that learners' primary goal for L2 improvement is focused on the communication skills, and speaking skills in particular.

> Example 14: Mary, Taiwanese student, female, Group L
>
> I wanted to learn vocabulary, especially idiomatic expression is important. Not academic words, but more conversation words. I wanted to express well and really use English.

> Example 15: Mina, Korean student, female, Group E
>
> I wanted to improve everything, but mostly communication skills, especially speaking and listening. I thought most important goal was to acquire basic skills to communicative with speakers.

> Example 16: July, Chinese student, female, Group L
>
> My goal was improving speaking and listening. In China, we teach grammar and writing a lot... reading too. But we don't get to speak... I tried to watch movies and news from China but it was difficult to understand. I wanted to improve listening, then I can watch movies and TV.

The goals of language learning expressed by the learners above were related to abilities to express themselves and communicate with others. SA learners tend to think that the opportunity to engaging in real communication in L2 is the biggest advantage of learning English in the SA context (Pellegrino, 2004). For this reason, the learners might have shifted their attention from grammar learning to speaking and listening as essential for interactive communication in L2. The less attention on grammar might have resulted in

less perceived improvement in grammar, which account for the change of learning contexts account for the low score for the perceived improvement.

The greater focus on fluency over accuracy among SA learners is not an uncommon phenomenon in SA learning. In Lennon's study (1989), German learners of English who were spending a six-month period in England were afraid of making mistakes at the beginning stage but they later overcame that fear and more freely engaged in L2 communication. As a result, they perceived themselves as improving in fluency more than in grammar. Robinson (1995) also found in her study of American students in Russia that participants were more focused on communication than on accuracy when interacting with native speakers of Russians. Tanaka & Ellis (2003), in their study using the BALLI, investigated changes in beliefs by measuring learner belief before and after a 15-week study abroad program. They reported that learners' beliefs in analytic learning had slightly strengthened as a result of study abroad. However, compared to the changes that had occurred in beliefs in experiential learning, self-efficacy and confidence, the belief change in analytic learning was relatively modest. Overall, findings in this study are consistent with those reported in the literature: learners' perceived improvement in grammar does not increase as much as in other areas of learning.

Contrary to the positive reports on perceived improvement, learners' perceptions of their overall progress were very negative. According to learners' responses to the questionnaire items, they agreed that that they were making improvements in listening, speaking, reading, writing and grammar, though variations in terms of the degrees of improvement were found. However, learners' dissatisfactions that was not captured in the questionnaire was revealed through interviews. The participants' responses to interview

questions about how they think they are improving were far from positive. Learners' common response was that although they perceive their English improving, they are not satisfied with their progress that is far below their expectations they had. Below the examples reveal how the learners felt frustrated and disappointed about the little improvement they were making.

Example 17: Rachel, Taiwanese Student, female, Group L

> No, it is almost the same. After I came to U.S., I don't think I actually improved. I actually feel stressed in language study. I think my academic program is helpful for my professional development but not for language learning, not necessarily. I think my English is almost the same and I will go back home pretty soon.

Example 2: Japanese, Group, female, L

> I think I improved some, but not as much as expected. I don't know why. Maybe my expectation is too much. Learning English is not that easy.

Example 3: Emily, Korean, female, Group E

> I don't think my English is improving as fast as I thought it would be. But I want to think positively. I hope I will eventually make a lot of progress. Though it is not happening yet, I hope it will be the case. To be honest, when I see other people who have been here for a longer time, I feel like I don't have much hope. I am not sure how I can be so different.

The interview data indicate that learners think that their English improvement is not what they expected it should be. Simply, the level of progress is far below what they had expected. Especially, learners felt frustrated from little or slow progress in speaking. Their responses again revealed that they held certain expectations and beliefs about how their SA learning would be or should be like. In her ethnographic examination of two learners studying French during a summer abroad in France, Wilkinson (1998) called such learners' expectation the "language myth". Wilkinson highlights that a common

erroneous belief held by learners in her study was that study abroad would ultimately and inevitably lead to language improvement due to the sheer number of the hours students spend simply exposed to the language. It was evident that the participants in the current study held similar false beliefs about study abroad effects. Apparently the discouragement and frustrations may have resulted from the unrealistic beliefs about language improvement.

Little discussion is found in literature about the relationship between beliefs and motivation. However, it is very possible that not being able to handle the gap between their expectations and the reality of the learning situation might be a source of demotivation in learning. Dörneyi (2001) said that "unrealistic beliefs about how much progress to expect and how fast, can function like 'time bombs' at the beginning of a language course because of inevitable disappointment that is to follow" (p. 67). Further, when talking about motivational strategies teachers could use to improve learner motivation, he recommended that helping learners create realistic beliefs is important to maintain their motivational level.

The findings of the study have a pedagogical implication for SA program developers and administrators, regarding the length of SA programs in particular. The learners' responses on the questionnaire items revealed a general pattern of more positive beliefs about language learning being more stronger among late-stage. For example, they were more confident about their ability and they perceive their skills more improving in all areas of learning. The differences were significant especially in the areas of learner autonomy. This suggests that learners can gain more benefits of being in the SA contexts from longer period of exposure. This is not to say that the longer it is, the better should be

for learners or that short-term programs has no value.. However, as far as learner beliefs are concerned, learners need a longer period than six months during which their beliefs system respond to the new learning contexts, cope with expected/unexpected challenges, go through the process of reconsruction or reaffirmation and play a role in learning as a driving power of learner motivations and learning behaviors.

Limitations of the Study

The present study explored changes in learner beliefs between the two different contexts: AH vs. SA and between two different stages of SA. By using both quantitative and qualitative methods, the study provides rich data that allows insights into the beliefs of SA learners and considers what influences changes in beliefs. However, the findings of the study should be interpreted with caution due to some limitations of the study.

First, the effect of the learning stage was operationalized through the inclusion of two different groups, one at the early- and one at the late-stage of study abroad. The participants were divided by the timeline of 6-months. Although it is not unreasonable to assume that the different stages of study abroad might be what distinguishes the groups from each other, it is still possible that there might have been other differences that might have accounted for the belief differences found between early-stage learners and late-stage learners. A longitudinal study investigating the belief changes of a single group over a long period of time might be able to better capture a dynamic change of beliefs at different stages of study abroad.

Second, the current study included both ESL students and students in an academic degree program; however, they were not equally distributed across the early-stage group and late-stage group. That is, second language (English) proficiency was not controlled in

this study. In this case, there were more ESL students (N=19) in early-stage group while, undergraduates and graduates (N=23) predominated in the late-stage group. In addition, their purposes for studying abroad is very different. While ESL students are staying in the U.S primarily for the purpose of improving their language skills, international students who are in an undergraduate or graduate program might not necessarily be focused on language learning, though a good command of English is important for their academic performance. It is likely that those who are in degree programs spend more time on reading and writing than ESL students, who might focus more on basic skills and grammar. The students who are working on their degree usually take more classes, and the nature of their classes is different from ESL classes. In addition, the proficiency level of students in the degree programs is higher. It is prerequisite that international students demonstrate a high level of English proficiency with a minimum 213 on a computer-based test in order to apply for a degree program, while students at any level can enroll in the ESL classes. Therefore, it is possible that the study-abroad learning stage might not be the only variable contributing to the differences found between the two groups. The differences might be partially attributed to the students' different goals related to their academic programs and to their own stages of development in English as a second language.

Third, the study used a sample of convenience. The participants of the study might not be the representative of the SA populations as a whole. By the same token, the group of 14 interviewees might not represent the whole group of 70 who were included in this study since we could only hear the voice of those who were willing to talk.

Fourth, language barriers should be recognized as a limitation. The questionnaires were written in English which is L2. The participants' responding to the questionnaire items requires a certain level of reading comprehension. If learners' reading comprehension is not good enough, it is be possible that they might misunderstand what is being asked. More comprehension difficulties might have emerged during the interviews. Learners had to respond to open-ended questions using their L2 except for Koreans. Learners, especially ESL students whose proficiency level is low, might have not been able to fully express themselves. In addition, the issue of comparability might arise due to the fact that Koreans used their L1 and others spoke in their L1. More accurate and comparable data might have been obtained if all the interviews were conducted in learners' first language. However, this problem might not be significant, since there were only a few participants who used Korean in the interview.

The present study attempted to investigate belief changes by comparing two things, the beliefs held by AH and SA students and the beliefs held by students at two different stages of abroad. The study depended on participants' retrospective reports for measuring their beliefs in the AH context. The participants were asked to recall what they believed when they were studying English in their home country. One might question the reliability of self-reported data due to concerns about the accuracy of reporting, memory loss or situational and relational variables that might influence learner response (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Others even characterize such data as unscientific due to their idiosyncratic nature and lack of objectivity (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990). It is true that the way that we represent ourselves to others (not only to researchers, but to everyone) is always in flux, depending on our relationship with that other person, the situation, our

moods, etc. In this sense, the data obtained from self-report of research cannot be seen as objective "facts" but as subjective perceptions.

Yet Barcelos (2006), quoting the discussion of Bailey and Ochsner (1983) on diary studies, point out that "it does not matter if someone actually received a bad grade on a test: what interests us is how the author perceives that bad grade---as an embarrassment or as an irrelevance not even worth mentioning in the report" (p.192). In any type of self report, what we are getting is representation. In the case of the present study, the participant represented both a past and present self to the researcher. The purpose of the study was "not to find 'the' truth, but students' subjective reality, 'their truth' because it is their beliefs more than anybody else's that will influence their learning" (Riley, 1997, p.127). The study cannot claim to present what the participants "really" thought before they came to the U.S. or what they "really" think now, but what it *does* present is their current representations of their past and present experiences as language learners. This variable and dynamic nature that is evoked by experience is the very core of what this study aimed to reveal about learner beliefs as social constructions rather than static entities.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the study abroad effects on learner beliefs. The impetus of the current study was provided by the contextual approach to beliefs, which assumes that they are part of a learner's construction of his or her experiences (Kalaja, 1995). Therefore, "beliefs change along with the experiences in which they are embedded" (Hosenfeld, 2006, p. 39). The significant changes found

between AH and SA beliefs and differences between the groups at the two stages confirmed that the learning context and the stage of study abroad influence belief formation or development. The evidence provided in the study renders strong support to the view that beliefs should be seen as dynamic, socially constructed, and "relational and responsive to context" (Benson & Lor, 1999, p.464). The within-group differences and between-group differences strongly suggest that learning context and learning stages influence changes in beliefs. The findings contribute to the literature by providing deeper insight into the nature of beliefs as a dynamic construct. Beliefs may emerge or fade away, become stronger or weaker in a new learning context. According to Hosenfeld (2006), emerging beliefs that arise during learning can become an integral part of a learner's belief system after the beliefs are acted upon repeatedly. Whether learners are acting upon their changed beliefs or whether they will continue to hold these changed beliefs after they return to their home country is a matter for future investigations.

Appendix A

Learner Beliefs Questionnaire

1. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that I was above average at language learning.
2. When I was in my home country, I was confident about my ability to learn English successfully.
3. Here in the U.S. I believe having my work evaluated by others is helpful.
4. Here in the U.S. I am afraid of making mistakes when speaking with others in English.
5. Here in the U.S. I think I am above average at language learning.
6. When I studied English in my home country, I was afraid of making mistakes when speaking with others in English.
7. Here in the U.S. I think I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak English very well.
8. Here in the U.S. I believe that the most important part of learning English is learning vocabulary.
9. Here in the U.S I believe that it is possible to learn English in a short time.
10. When I studied English in my home country, I believed I would ultimately learn to speak English very well.
11. Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what the teacher does in the classroom.
12. Here in the U.S. I am confident about my ability to learn English successfully.
13. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that having my work evaluated by others was helpful.
14. When I studied in my home country, I believed that my language success depended on what I do inside the classroom.
15. Here in the U.S. I can communicate in English without knowing the rules.
16. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that English is a difficult language.
17. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it was necessary to know the foreign culture in order to speak the foreign language.
18. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it was possible to learn English in a short time.
19. Here in the U.S. I believe that it was necessary to know the foreign culture in order to speak the foreign language.
20. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it is better to learn English in an English-speaking country.
21. Here in the U.S. I believe that it is important to speak English with an excellent accent.
22. I think my listening is improving.
23. Here in the U.S. I believe that it is better to learn English in an English-speaking country.
24. Here in the U.S. in my English class we do a lot of repetitions.

25. When I studied English in my home country, teachers had us review vocabulary and grammar a lot.
26. Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what I do outside the classroom.
27. I think my speaking is improving.
28. I have the ability to learn a language successfully.
29. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it was important to speak English with an excellent accent.
30. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that I could communicate in English without knowing the rules
31. When I studied English in my home country, I believed that it is important to repeat and practice a lot.
32. When I studied English in my home country. I believed that the most important part of learning English is learning vocabulary.
33. When I studied English in my home country, my English teacher got us to talk a lot in class.
34. When I studied in my home country, I believed that the most important part of learning English was learning the grammar.
35. I think my vocabulary is improving.
36. Here in the U.S. I think English is a difficult language.
37. When I studied in my home country, I believed that my language success depended on what the teacher did in the classroom
38. I have the ability to express myself in English
39. When I studied in my home country, I believed that I should find my own opportunities to use the language
40. Here in the U.S. I believe that it is important to repeat and practice a lot.
41. In my home country, in my English class, we did a lot of repetitions.
42. When I studied in my home country, I believed that opportunities to use the language should be provided by the teacher.
43. I think my reading is improving.
44. Here in the U.S., I believe that I should find my own opportunities to use the language.
45. When I studied in my home country, I believed that my language success depended on what I did outside the classroom.
46. Here in the U.S., I believe that opportunities to use the language should be provided by the teacher.
47. I think my writing is improving.
48. Here in the U.S., my English teachers get us to talk a lot in class.
49. Here in the U.S. I believe that my language success depends on what I do inside the classroom
50. I have the ability to write accurately in English
51. Here in the U.S. my English teacher have us review vocabulary and grammar a lot.
52. I know how to find an effective way to learn
53. I think my grammar is improving.
54. ...plays an important role in successful learning

1. Feedback, 2. practice, 3. opportunities to use the language, 4. own efforts, 5. classes

Appendix B

General Interview Questions

1. What was your goal that you wanted to achieve during study abroad in terms of language learning?
2. What expectations did you have about study aboard?
3. How's your study abroad experience similar to or different from your expectations?
4. Do you believe that study abroad is the best way to improve English? Why or why not? What aspect of study abroad do you think is helpful? What aspect of study abroad is disappointing?
5. What is the biggest difference in your English classes in the U.S. and English classes in your home country?
6. How did you study English when you were in your home country? Do you still use the same methods?

References

Alanen, R. (2006). A sociocultural approach to young language learners' beliefs about language learning. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 55-85). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Allen, H. W., & Herron, C. (2003). A mixed methodology investigation of the linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*(3) 370-385.

Alexander, P.A., Dochy, F., (1995). Conceptions of knowledge an beliefs: a comparision across varying cultural and educational communities. American Educational Research Journal, 32, 413-442.

Bailey, K. M., & Ochsner, R. (1983). A methodogocial review of the diary studies: Windmill tilting or social science? In K. M. Bailey, M. H. Long, & S. Peck (Ed.), Second Language Acquisition Studies. Rowely, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 586-598.

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2006). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Research approaches* (pp. 7-33). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baudura, A., & Schunk, D. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 586-598.

Benson, P., & Lor, W. (1999). Conceptions of language and language learning. *System, 27*(4), 459-472

Brecht, R. D., & Roninson, J. L. (1995). On the value of formal instruction in study abroad: Student reactions in context. Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 317-333). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Celce-Murcia. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 3-11). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Collentine, J. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 227-248.

Collentin, J., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 153-171.

Corsini, R. (1994). *Encyclopedia of psychology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Cotterall, S.M. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System, 23* (2), 195-205.

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

Dewey , D. P. (2004). A comparison of reading development by learners of Japanese in intensive domestic immersion and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 201-327.

Diaz-Compos, M. (2004). Context of learning in the acquisition of Spanish second language phonology. *Studies in Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 249-273.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, D. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language. 78*(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Deweck, C.S., Leggett, E. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273.

Dufva, H. (2006). Beliefs in dialogue: A Bakhtinian view. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Research approaches* (pp. 131-151). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing data. New York: Teachers College Press.

Flavell, J. H., (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: a new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906-911.

Galloway, V., Labarca, A. (1990). From student to learner: style, process and strategy. In D. W. Birchbichler. *New Perspectives and New Directions in Foreign Language Education* (Ed.). (pp. 111-158). Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Hesenfeld, C. (2006). Evidence of emergent beliefs of a second language learner: A diary study. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Researchapproaches* (pp. 37-53). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Horwitz, K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-129). Prentice-Hall, London.

Horwitz, K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*(3), 283-294.

Horwitz, K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies. *System, 27*, 557-576.

Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas language program: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese course. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a stud abroad context* (pp. 171-193). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ife, A. (2000). Language learning and residence abroad: How self-directed are students? *Language Learning Journal, 22*, 30-37

Kalaja, P. (1995). Student beliefs (or metacognitive knowledge) about SLA reconsidered. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 191-204.

Kern, R. G. (1995). Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*, 71-91.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1991). Language-learning tasks: teacher intention and learner interpretation. *ELT Journal, 45*, 98-107.

Kuntz, P., & Belnap, R. K. (2001). Beliefs about language learning held by teachers and their students at two Arabic programs abroad. *Al-Arabiyya, 34*, 91-113.

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

Lafford, B. A. (2004). The effect of the context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 201-225.

Lennon, P. (1989). Introspection and intentionality in advanced second-language acquisition. *Language Learning 3(3)*, 375-396.

Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classroom.* London: Continuum.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). Second language research: Methodology and design. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marriot, H. (1995). Acquisition of politeness patters by exchange students in Japan. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), Second language acquisition in a study abroad context (pp. 197-224). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

McGroarty, M. (1998). Constructive and constructivist challenges for applied linguistics. *Language Learning*, *48*(4), 591-622.

Miller, L. & Ginsgerb, R.B. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), Second language acquisition in a study abroad context (pp. 293-316). Amsterdam: Benjamins

.

Milton, J. & Meara, P. (1995). How periods abroad affect vocabulary growth in a foreign language. *Review of Applied Linguistics*, *107*, 17-34.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House.

Pellegrino, V. A. (2004). Student perspective on language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers, 10*, 91-120.

Pintrinch, P. R., & DeGroot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*,33-40.

Ragan, V. (1998). Sociolinguistics and language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers*, *4*, 61-120.

Riley, P. (1996). *BATs and BALLs: Beliefs about talk and beliefs about language learning.* Proceeding of the International Conference AUTONOMY 2000: The development of learning independence in language learning, Bangkok, November, pp.151-168.

Riley, P. (1997). The guru and the conjurer: aspects of counseling for self-access. In R.

Pemberton, E.S.L. Li, W.W.F. Or & H.D. Pierson (Eds.). Autonomy and independence in language learning (pp. 114-131). New York: Longman.

Robinson, L. (1995). *Second language learning in social context: An ethnographic account of an academic semester abroad in Russia.* Dissertation. U. Maryland.

Sakui, K., & Gaies, S.J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System, 27*, 473-492.

Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad: Women learning Japanese in Japan. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp.225-244). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schunk, D. L. (1985). Self-efficacy and classroom learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 22*, 208-223.

Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 173-199.

Tanka. K., & Ellis. R. (2003). Study-abroad, language proficiency, and learner beliefs about language learning. *JALT Journal, 25*, 63- 85.

Tudor, I. (1993). Teacher roles in the learner-centered classroom. *ELT Journal*, 47.22-31.

Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 515-537.

Wenden, A. L. (1999). An introduction to metagonitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning beyond the basics. *System, 27*, 435-441.

Wenden, A. L. (2001). Megacognitive knowledge in SLA: The neglected variable. In M.P. Breen (Ed.), Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research (pp. 44-64). Harlow, England: Longman. '

Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies in Language Learning. NJ: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

White, C. (1999). Expectations and emergent beliefs of self-instructed language learners. *System, 27*, 443-457.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers, 4*, 121-138.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*(1), 23-39.

Woods, D. (2006). The social construction of beliefs in the language classroom. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Research approaches* (pp. 201-230). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Woodman, K. (1998). A study of linguistic, perceptual, pedagogical change in a short-term intensive language learning program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Victoria, British Colombia, Canada.

Wright, T. (1987). *Roles of Teachers and Learners.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yang, N. D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*, 515-535.

Yang, N. D. (1998). Exploring a new role or teachers: promoting learner autonomy. *System, 26*, 127-135.

Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 749-768). San Diego: Academid Press.