

Preliminary Findings of L2 Motivational Changes in a Short-term Study Abroad Program

Hiroshi MORITANI, Craig MANNING, and Stephen HENNEBERRY

Abstract

This paper reports on a pilot study involving 15 university students who participated in a four-week study abroad program in Hawaii. It monitors students' motivation to learn English before and after the program. Motivational changes were depicted within the framework of the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005) and the related affective factors. The result showed the applicability of the L2 Motivational Self System to describe how L2 learning motivation changed. Change occurred to their ideal L2 self, L2 confidence, and integrativeness, while L2 anxiety showed no change. The paper concludes with pedagogical suggestions for how to maintain students' ideal L2 self after short-term study abroad programs.

1. Introduction
2. Literature Review
 - 2.1. Efficacy of SA
 - 2.2. L2 Learning Motivation
3. Research Questions
4. The Study
 - 4.1. Participants
 - 4.2. SA Program
 - 4.3. Procedures
 - 4.4. Instruments
 - 4.5. Analysis
5. Results
6. Discussion
7. Pedagogical Implications
8. Limitations and Future Directions
9. Conclusion

1. Introduction

The number of Japanese students participating in Study Abroad (SA) programs has fluctuated greatly over the last decade. The number of participants peaked at 82,945 in 2004,

then declined to 57,501 by 2011 (MEXT, 2013). However, according to the Japan Student Services Organization, the number of students participating in SA, based on a Memorandum of Understanding between institutions, has been increasing (JASSO, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015). In particular, those who took part in SA programs shorter than one month have more than doubled in five years; from 10,036 in 2009 to 25,526 in 2013. It is reasonable to assume that the Project for Promotion of Global Human Resources Development (MEXT, 2011), a government promotion, played a significant role in these increases. Given these recent increases, empirically documenting the outcomes of these short programs is both desirable and significant. This paper aims to document the outcomes of a short-term SA program held at the University of Shimane. This study specifically focuses on the influences of a four-week SA program on language learning motivation, the self-concept, and L2 anxiety.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Efficacy of SA

SA experience can offer students great benefits such as new perspectives, new friends, life experience, and foreign language ability. In fact, SA tends to be viewed as an ideal form of language learning. While SA may improve students' linguistic abilities, the linguistic benefits tend not to be as satisfactory as students and teachers expect (Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey 2004; Segalowitz et al. 2004). Freed, et al. (2004) sought the cause of these modest linguistic outcomes in the quality of the exposure to the target language in a sojourn, and investigated the qualitative aspect of their SA experience using the Language Contact Profile. The results showed that students who took part in an immersion program in their respective home countries had more contact with the target language and made more linguistic improvement than those who took part in a SA program. This implies that engaging in linguistic tasks arisen in educational settings and real life settings are essential for linguistic improvement. Therefore, teachers and administrative staff preparing SA programs need to make more conscious efforts to enhance the quality of exposure. Nevertheless, how much students want to commit to real life communication largely depends on the students' willingness to do so. Accordingly, individual difference factors result in varied linguistic outcomes of SA as Huebner (1995) points out. The causal relationship between individual difference factors and language improvement is also discussed in Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide and Shimizu (2004). They investigated the role of students' attitudes to target language on the linguistic outcomes of SA. Their data showed that students who were more willing to communicate in L2 made more linguistic progress than those who were less willing to communicate. These previous studies clearly show the important role of affective factors on the linguistic outcomes derived from SA experience.

Likewise, SA experiences can have an impact on affective aspects of language learning. Irie and Ryan (2015) investigated the change in motivation of 19 Japanese university students who took part in various SA programs. They compared the students' motivation before departure and five months later. They described the changes in student motivation

and classified those changes into three types; those whose earlier optimism about language learning had completely gone, those who had difficulty living abroad but did not give up in order to meet the expectations of others, and those who enjoyed their time abroad using English. It shows that SA experience can influence the motivational and attitudinal aspects. Allen and Herron (2003) reported the affective and linguistic outcomes of 25 American learners of French, who took part in six-week study abroad program in France. Their data showed participants' target language use anxiety both in and outside the classroom decreased over the course of SA. Gardner et al. (1992) showed that L2 anxiety correlates negatively with L2 learning motivation and integrativeness, which will be discussed below. If short-term SA experience brings the reduction of L2 anxiety to the participants, it is expected to enhance their L2 learning motivation, influencing their future linguistic outcomes. Thus, it is important to investigate not only actual linguistic outcomes, but also the psychological impact of an SA experience. This study aims to gain insight into this area of inquiry, specifically whether the results of this study support Allen and Herron's (2003) findings and how SA affects L2 learning motivation.

2.2. L2 Learning Motivation

Motivation is one of the most important learner factors, leading to a variety of learning achievements. Research on L2 motivation can be traced back to early studies conducted by Gardner and Lambert (1972). They emphasized that motivation is as important as language aptitude and put forward the psychological construct named "integrative motivation." The key concept of integrative motivation is 'integrativeness' or the "individual's willingness and interest in social interaction with members of other groups" (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993: 159). Gardner and his associates argued that success of L2 learning is related to students' integrativeness. Years later, Dörnyei (2005) reinterpreted integrativeness to include self-concept. This new framework, called the L2 Motivational Self System, reconceptualized L2 learning motivation in terms of self-identity. This study employs this new system, which defines L2 motivational self as consisting of three dimensions: ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience.

The ideal L2 self is an idealized mental image of oneself as an L2 speaker. Trying to fill the gap between one's self image as a better L2 speaker and actual current self image is considered to be a motivated behavior. The ought-to L2 self is an image of self, based on perceived expectations of others. Language learning derived from pressure, expectation, and obligation from others can play a certain role in the actual course of learning. These selves "act as 'future self-guides', reflecting a dynamic, forward-pointing conception that can explain how someone is moved from the present towards the future" (Dörnyei, 2014: 8). The last component of the L2 Motivational Self System is L2 learning experience. Motivation is not an individual's trait, but a state that changes all the time through multifaceted interactions with learning experience and individual difference factors (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Teachers and peers influence each other and motivation constantly changes. Needless to say, a

positive learning experience is likely to fuel additional efforts.

Other affective factors underlying the self-system are hypothesized and various efforts to validate the relationship among them have been made (e.g. Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; Lamb, 2012; Magid, 2009; Papi, 2010; Papi & Teimouri, 2012; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009 among others). Taguchi, Magid and Papi (2009) investigated the relationship between these selves and attitudes toward L2 community, instrumentality, and family influence in Japanese, Chinese, and Iranian context respectively. They obtained data supporting the validity of the system and the two different kinds of instrumentality suggested by Dörnyei (2005). Dörnyei (2005) made a reference to Higgins' Self Discrepancy Theory (1987), and divided instrumentality into two kinds: instrumentality-promotion and instrumentality-prevention. Instrumentality is generally defined as a desire to learn L2 for more pragmatic reasons. Instrumentality-promotion is the instrumental motivation in order to get a better job and to make more money, in other words, to achieve positive goals. Instrumentality-prevention aims to avoid negative outcomes, such as failing exams etc. These two types contribute to different selves. The former relates to ideal L2 self, while the latter relates to ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2005).

Additional affective variables were also discussed in the literature. For example, Ryan (2009), in his self-system framework validation study, showed a correlation between intended learning efforts and factors such as L2 anxiety, L2 confidence, ethnocentrism, and fear of assimilation. Yashima (2009) conducted the study to investigate the relationship among ideal L2 self, and willingness to communicate and international posture, which is defined as “a tendency to relate oneself to the international community rather than any specific L2 group” (Yashima, 2009: 145). She claims the possibility that a high level of international posture, the willingness to communicate and ideal L2 self are interrelated and suggests the creation of a leaning context where students can draw their self-images in the global society in everyday practice. As briefly noted here, the current mainstream theory of L2 motivation studies puts self-concept in its center and posits multifaceted structure with related subcomponents.

SA is an extraordinary opportunity for most students to gain new learning experiences including meeting new teachers, making new friends and using English as a means of real life communication. It is highly probable that students' selves are influenced.

3. Research Questions

The purpose of this pilot study was to document the outcomes of a four week SA experience in terms of the L2 Motivational Self System. The study included the following three research questions.

- 1) Does the L2 Motivational Self System depict the changes of students' motivation before and after SA program?
- 2) Does a four-week SA program contribute to the development of L2 motivational self?
- 3) What components of L2 motivational self are influenced by SA?

4. The Study

4.1. Participants

This study includes 15 university students, who were all sociology majors, attending university in a rural area in Japan. Participants consisted of 2 male freshmen, 4 male sophomores, 2 female freshmen, and 7 female sophomores. They took part in a four week SA program in Hawaii. Their self-assessed proficiency was Twelve A1s, two A2s on the CEFR-J Scale (Tono (ed.), 2013), and one unknown due to absence. None of them lived abroad for more than three months.

4.2. SA Program

The four-week program took place at the University of Hawaii, Manoa. The students had English classes in the morning, activities and extracurricular activities in the afternoon; five days a week. They did homestays and lived with English speaking families. Two students stayed with each host family. There was one group of three students.

4.3. Procedures

A set of questionnaires with motivational measures and willingness to communicate (WTC) scales was administered twice in order to monitor the levels before and after the SA. One of the researchers explained the purpose of the survey at the first orientation session. The pre-program questionnaire was administered on the bus to the airport on the departure day in February, 2015, and the post-program questionnaire was administered four weeks later in March on the return flight. The teacher in charge of the program distributed the questionnaire both times.

4.4. Instruments

The questionnaire included 45 L2 Motivational Self System related items, 7 items about willingness to communicate in Japanese, and 7 items about willingness to communicate in English. The items from previously validated questionnaires were adopted (Papi & Teimouri, 2012; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009). Some items were translated from English to Japanese because there were no Japanese versions available. Directions and items were also written in Japanese. The questionnaire was piloted and revised before this study. The revised questionnaire contained four versions, with the same question items in different orders, were created to reduce fatigue effect. It included a consent form, prompts to indicate self-reported proficiency levels and questions about background information. A 6-point-Likert scale (1: strongly disagree to 6: strongly agree) was used in the questionnaire. An explanation of the items are listed below:

Criterion measure (three items)

This concept assesses the learner's intended effort, which is the amount of effort the student was willing to put into learning the given language (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002: 430)

e.g. I am working hard at learning English.

Attitudes to learning English (three items)

This concept assesses “situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009: 74). We decided to include these items because of the change in learning environment while participating in the SA program.

e.g. I always look forward to English classes.

Ideal L2 self (three items)

This concept refers to “the L2 specific facet of one’s ideal self” (Dörnyei, 2009: 28).

e.g. Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using English.

Ought-to L2 self (three items)

This concept “concerns the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and to avoid possible negative outcomes” (Dörnyei, 2009: 28).

e.g. Learning English is necessary because people surrounding me expect me to do so.

Instrumentality-promotion (three items)

This measures “the regulation of personal goals to become successful such as attaining high proficiency in English in order to make more money or find a better job” (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009: 74).

e.g. Studying English can be important to me because I think it will some day be useful in getting a good job.

Instrumentality-prevention (three items)

This measures “the regulation of duties and obligations such as studying English in order to pass an examination” (Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009: 74).

e.g. I have to learn English because without passing the English course I cannot graduate.

L2 confidence (three items)

This “reflects a confident, anxiety-free belief that the mastery of an L2 is well within the learner’s means” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002: 432).

e.g. I think I will be able to communicate with people from other countries in English without any problems.

L2 anxiety (three items)

This means “[a]nxiety experienced while using the second language” (Clement, Dörnyei & Noels, 1994: 426).

e.g. I would feel uneasy speaking with a native speaker.

Cultural interest (three items)

This “reflects the appreciation of cultural products associated with the particular L2 and conveyed by the media” (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005: 618).

e.g. I like the music of English-speaking countries (e.g. pop music).

Attitudes toward L2 community (three items)

This is “the extent to which students felt positively toward the particular community and its citizens” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002: 430).

e.g. I like the people in English-speaking countries.

Integrativeness (three items)

This “reflects a general positive outlook on the L2 and its culture, to extent that learners scoring high on this factor would like to communicate with and might even want to become similar to the L2 speakers” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002: 432).

e.g. I want to become similar to the people in English-speaking countries.

The L2 Motivational Self system largely replaced the concept of “integrativeness” due to vagueness of target L2 communities that accompanied the global expansion of English. Studies showing high correlation between integrativeness and ideal L2 self demonstrate they are closely related. Moreover, our participants are believed to have a distinct target language community because they have a specific destination. Hence, integrativeness items were included.

Fear of assimilation (three items)

This is “the extent to which students believed that learning and using the foreign language might lead to the loss of native language and culture” (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002: 430).

e.g. Because of the influence of the English-speaking countries, I think the morale of Japanese people is becoming worse.

Ethnocentrism (three items)

Ethnocentrism generally means belief in the superiority of one’s own ethnic group.

e.g. It would be a better world if everybody lived like the Japanese.

International posture (three items)

International posture is “a tendency to relate oneself to the international community rather than any specific L2 group” (Yashima, 2009: 145).

e.g. I want to make friends with international students studying in Japan.

Willingness to communicate (seven items)

Willingness to Communicate (WTC) is defined as “the probability of speaking when free to do so” (MacIntyre, 2007: 564).

Items monitor situations, such as public speaking (1), speaking in a small group of friends (2), acquaintances (3), or strangers (4), as well as speaking in a dyad with a friend (5), an acquaintance (6), or a stranger (7).

4.5. Analysis

In order to make the results easier to understand, obtained data were rewritten so 0 is the new minimum and 5 the new maximum. For example, if 1 was obtained in the questionnaire, the value will be reported as 0 in the analysis. If 6 was obtained in the questionnaire, the value will be reported as 5. Therefore, the median is 2.5. Participants' mean scores for each category were calculated and a Wilcoxon signed-rank test using SPSS was administered to monitor the changes of each component of motivational variables before and after the program. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used because of the small number of the participants.

5. Results

Table 1 shows a comparison of median scores of each motivational scale for the two administrations. It also demonstrates Z -value obtained by the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and effect size to see the strength SA had on the category when there is a significant difference between pre- and post-score.

Statistically significant differences can be found in ideal L2 self, L2 confidence, and integrativeness. The median of pre-program survey of ideal L2 self was 2.00 and that of post-program survey score was 3.00. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test result in Table 2 indicates that the post-program score was statistically higher than that of the pre-program ($Z = -2.810, p = .005$, effect size: $r = .73$). This means participants did not have a clear future self-image as a L2 speaker before the program, but they became capable of imagining themselves as a L2 speaker after the program. Likewise, the median of pre-program survey score of L2 confidence was 2.5 and that of post-program was 3.75. The difference was also statistically significant ($Z = -3.153, p = .002$, effect size: $r = .81$) (Table 3). This suggests participants were not sure if they could master English but they became more optimistic about improving. It should be noted that the effect sizes of both cases are large.

Changes to integrativeness were also observed. The pre-program score for integrativeness was 3.00 (*Mdn*). Post-program was 3.33 (*Mdn*). Table 4 shows that the increase was statistically significant ($Z = -2.444, p = 0.15$, effect size: $r = .63$). Participants became more willing to be part of the target language community or to become similar to them. Since integrativeness and ideal L2 self are closely related constructs, this result is a compatible data to the previously mentioned theoretical studies.

No significant differences between pre and post-program surveys were found in any other

variables. Both pre-program and post-program score of criterion measures were 3.00 (*Mdn.*). This means the short-term SA did not lead the participants to actual learning behavior. L2 anxiety also showed no change between pre-program and post-program scores (*Mdn.* = .375). No significant changes were also found in other variables including Willingness to Communicate (WTC in Japanese pre: 2.29 (*Mdn.*) post: 2.29 (*Mdn.*); WTC in English pre: 2.71

Table 1. Results: mean and median score differences of pre and post-program surveys

	Pre-program		Post-program		<i>Z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Effect size (r)</i>
	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Median</i>			
Criterion measure	2.96 (.21)	3.00	3.22 (.15)	3.00	-.877	.371	.23
Attitudes to learning English	3.13 (.23)	3.33	3.33 (.14)	3.33	-.861	.390	.22
Ideal L2 self	2.33 (.27)	2.00	3.16 (.34)	3.00	-2.810	.005**	.73
Ought-to L2 self	2.18 (.23)	2.00	2.27 (.40)	2.00	-.032	.974	.01
Instrumentality-promotion	3.53 (.22)	3.67	3.49 (.21)	3.33	-.197	.844	.05
Instrumentality-prevention	2.84 (.43)	2.67	2.87 (.37)	2.67	-.040	.968	.01
L2 confidence	2.83 (.25)	2.5	3.65 (.26)	3.75	-3.153	.002**	.82
L2 anxiety	3.60 (.19)	3.75	3.53 (.16)	3.75	-.360	.719	.09
Cultural interest	2.87 (.25)	3.00	3.17 (.18)	3.00	-1.568	.117	.41
Attitudes toward L2 community	3.65 (.18)	3.75	3.98 (.19)	4.00	-1.474	.140	.38
Integrativeness	3.24 (.36)	3.00	2.49 (.20)	3.33	-2.444	.015*	.63
Fear of assimilation	1.23 (.30)	1.00	.900 (.17)	1.00	-.557	.577	.14
Ethnocentrism	2.37 (.36)	2.00	2.37 (.33)	2.50	-.157	.875	.04
International posture	2.33 (.33)	2.50	2.67 (.35)	2.50	-1.393	.164	.36
WTC in Japanese	2.71 (.22)	2.29	2.76 (.26)	2.29	-.346	.730	.09
WTC in English	2.39 (.26)	2.71	2.72 (.30)	2.71	-1.426	.154	.37

Note: N=15; **p*<.05 ***p*<.01

Table 2: Wilcoxon signed rank test result concerning ideal L2 self

Post – Pre	N	Rank mean	Rank total	Z	p	r
Negative rank	1 ^a	1.50	1.50	-2.810	.005**	.73
Positive rank	10 ^b	6.45	64.50			
Equal	4 ^c					
Total	15					

Note: Two-tailed test, ** $p < .01$, ^aPost- < Pre-, ^bPost- > Pre-, ^cPost- = Pre-

Table 3: Wilcoxon signed rank test result concerning L2 confidence

Post – Pre	N	Rank mean	Rank total	Z	p	r
Negative rank	1 ^a	2.50	2.50	-3.153	.002**	.81
Positive rank	13 ^b	7.88	102.50			
Equal	1 ^c					
Total	15					

Note: Two-tailed test, ** $p < .01$, ^aPost- < Pre-, ^bPost- > Pre-, ^cPost- = Pre-

Table 4: Wilcoxon signed rank test result concerning integrativeness

Post – Pre	N	Rank mean	Rank total	Z	p	r
Negative rank	2 ^a	5.50	11.00	-2.444	.015*	.63
Positive rank	11 ^b	7.27	80.00			
Equal	2 ^c					
Total	15					

Note: Two-tailed test, * $p < .05$ ^aPost- < Pre-, ^bPost- > Pre-, ^cPost- = Pre-

(*Mdn.*) post: 2.71 (*Mdn.*)).

6. Discussion

Applicability of the L2 Motivational Self System

The first aim of this pilot study was to see if the L2 Motivational Self System can be applied to investigate the change of SA participants' motivation. The results show that the framework successfully depicted the changes and a lack of change in various components of the L2 Motivational Self System before and after the short-term SA.

What motivational factors can be influenced by SA

The second and third aims of this study were to determine if a four-week SA contributes to the development of L2 motivational self and what motivational dimensions are affected by a four-week SA program. The results show positive changes in ideal L2 self, L2 confidence and integrativeness, and no negative changes in any categories occurred. The four-week SA experience did impact participants' motivational selves. How they changed is discussed below.

The results indicate L2 use in a real L2 society helped the participants gain a clearer

and more vivid self-image as an English speaker (ideal L2 self). They also reported feeling that they would be able to do so in the future (L2 confidence). After experiencing life as part of society, all using the target language, they wanted to become more like people in the target language society (integrativeness). The firsthand experience to use English in a native English speaking environment seems to have enhanced their ideal L2 self. Previously, English might have been experienced only as a language used in a classroom, a subject necessary to get into university, or a language spoken on TV. Perhaps they could not imagine speaking English before the program, which could lead to viewing speaking English as an unattainable goal. After being able to imagine speaking English, it has become part of their attainable selves, which could be the reason for the improvement of L2 confidence.

Interestingly, their criterion measures did not improve (pre: 3.00; post: 3.00). This is an interesting contradiction because the central idea of the Motivational L2 Self System is that ideal L2 self acts as a strong motivator to learn the L2 (Dörnyei, 2005). However, the results showed that the participants in this study had more vivid ideal L2 selves than before and were confident to become so, but they did not want to make more efforts to achieve their ideal self. One possible explanation for this result is that they might not have imagined being a fluent speaker of English, so they might have felt confident and thought not much effort would be required. Another interpretation is that they imagined being a fluent English speaker and thought it would be attainable, but did not yet know how much effort would be needed. If this explanation is accurate, there might be a time lag between the strengthening of the vision and the actual learning behavior. Alternatively, students may have found that the immersive nature of SA was more linguistically beneficial than making an effort to actively study. As mentioned earlier, English had previously been a classroom language and a requirement to get into university. Their ideal L2 self was someone who gets good grades in a class and has good-enough knowledge of English to get into university. On the other hand, their new ideal L2 self is a fluent English user who can communicate with other English speakers. They have a clearer image, but do not know how to achieve it, yet. It could be an undesirable situation if their confidence to master English is just naïve optimism. If this is the case, they do not know what to do to become their ideal selves. In Irie and Ryan's longitudinal study (2015), they observed that students, who were initially optimistic about learning English, were struck harshly by the reality of language learning during their time abroad. These students expressed hopelessness about learning English in the end. It might be that the participants of our study simply did not stay long enough to have a similar experience.

Another interesting contradiction can be found in the relation between the increase of integrativeness and no reduction of L2 anxiety. The participants in this study did increase integrativeness, but their L2 anxiety did not decrease (pre: 3.75; post: 3.75). According to Gardner et al. (1992), L2 anxiety correlates negatively with L2 learning motivation and integrativeness, so their L2 anxiety was expected to decrease as integrativeness increased. However, this was not evident in the data. This result does not support the findings of

Allen and Herron (2003), either. In their study, L2 anxiety level of 25 American learners of French statistically reduced after a six week SA program. The length of time spent abroad may account for these contradictions. A four-week SA may not be long enough to reduce L2 anxiety. Other explanations for these contradictions are also possible. For example, shyness and reticent dispositions could overpower their intentions to take risks, or SA might not have a strong impact on L2 anxiety, etc. Further qualitative research is necessary to identify what kind of L2 anxiety participants experience and what kinds of factors hamper the reduction of L2 anxiety during SA. Even if four weeks is not long enough to reduce L2 anxiety, the increase of integrativeness is perceived as beneficial. Gardner et al. (1992) did not mention any causality between integrativeness and L2 anxiety, but it is possible that high levels of integrativeness come first, and the reduction of L2 anxiety comes later. If this is accurate, the reduction would appear after the program is over. To fully understand the efficacy of four-week SA programs, follow-up studies should be carried out.

7. Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study have practical and pedagogical applications when examined using the necessary conditions to exert motivation as suggested by Dörnyei (2009). These conditions are as follows,

- (1) the learner has a desired future self-image,
- (2) which is elaborate and vivid,
- (3) which is perceived as plausible and is in harmony – or at least does not clash – with the expectations of the learner's family, peers and other elements of the social environment,
- (4) which is regularly activated in the learner's working self-concept,
- (5) which is accompanied by relevant and effective procedural strategies that act as a roadmap towards the goal,
- (6) which also contains elaborate information about the negative consequences of not achieving the desired end-state. (Dörnyei, 2009: 32)

The increase of ideal L2 self found in this study suggests that students can successfully enhance their ideal L2 self during a four-week SA and that their image becomes more elaborate and vivid, meeting condition number (2) above. The fact that their L2 confidence increased during SA indicates that they have met condition number (3). After returning from SA, participants occasionally need to reflect on their experiences to meet condition number (4). Providing new tasks, such as essays and strategic planning for continued learning, at the end of SA would also help students stay motivated to achieve their goals, thus meeting conditions (4) and (5).

The fact that the level of L2 anxiety did not decrease in this study suggest that instructional sessions should be held for students before SA. Students should set stronger aims for their trip. They need to understand the importance of not being hesitant to use

English, even to avoid possible negative or embarrassing experiences, in order to meet their aims. The reduction of L2 anxiety would help them avoid negative consequences, as seen in condition number (6). The results of this study show that four weeks is not long enough to reduce their anxiety. Therefore, efforts to reduce students' L2 anxiety should be made before SA begins.

8. Limitations and Future Directions

Although this study achieved the initial aims, several limitations should be mentioned. First, this pilot study employs only fifteen students. This group size is much too small to generalize the results. In the future, larger numbers of participants should be employed. In order to do so, several cohorts should be employed to solve this problem. Second, more longitudinal design needs to be employed. This study showed the motivational changes before and immediately after SA. Investigating how students maintain, strengthen or lose their self-images will result in a better understanding of what they actually experience during the course of SA. This is important, as the learning experience is an important component of L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005). Returning to regular courses at the home institution should also have an impact on learners just as SA had an impact on them.

Lastly, some of the explanations used to understand the results relied on the researchers' interpretations. Therefore, follow-up qualitative studies should be carried out to better understand the results. Qualitative studies would also help reveal what kind of L2 anxiety students had during SA. If the type of anxiety could be identified, it would be possible to better support students.

9. Conclusion

This pilot study described the effects of a four-week SA on learner motivation. It showed the L2 Motivational Self System successfully depicts students' change of motivation before and after SA, and it revealed changes and what remained unchanged by SA. The findings indicate students' motivational conditions and offer insightful information on what can be done to better support students. This study is just a small part of an ongoing effort to better understand and improve the SA learning experience.

References

- 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.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 417-448.
- Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, 55(4), 613-659.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language*

- acquisition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. (pp. 9-42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Future self-guides and vision. In K. Csizér & M. Magid (Eds.), *The impact of self-concept on language learning*. (pp. 7-18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(4), 421-462.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.)*. Harlow: Longman.
- Freed, B., Dewey, P., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 349-356.
- Freed, B., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D.P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classroom, study abroad, and intensive domestic immersion programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 303-327.
- Gardner, R.C., Day, J., & MacIntyre, P.D. (1992). Induced anxiety and language learning in a controlled environment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13, 197-215.
- Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1972). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. In R. C. Gardner & W. E. Lambert (eds.) *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. (pp. 119-216). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R.C., & MacIntyre, P.D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43(2), 157-194.
- Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319-340.
- Huebner, T. (1995). The effect of overseas language programs: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese course. In B. Freed (ed), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. (pp. 171-193). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Irie, K., & Ryan, S. (2015). Study abroad and the dynamics of change in learner L2 self-concept, motivational dynamics in language learning. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre & A. Henry (eds), *Motivational dynamics in language learning*. (pp. 343-366). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- JASSO (Japan Student Service Organization) (2011). *Heisei 21 nendo Kyouteitou nimotozuku Nihonjingakusei ryuugakujoukyou chousa* [The Summary of Results on Status Survey of Japanese Students Studying Abroad 2009]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/short_term09.pdf>
- JASSO (Japan Student Service Organization) (2012). *Heisei 22 nendo Kyouteitou nimotozuku Nihonjingakusei ryuugakujoukyou chousa* [The Summary of Results on Status Survey of Japanese Students Studying Abroad 2010]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/short_term10.pdf>
- JASSO (Japan Student Service Organization) (2013). *Heisei 23 nendo Kyouteitou nimotozuku Nihonjingakusei ryuugakujoukyou chousa* [The Summary of Results on Status Survey of Japanese

- Students Studying Abroad 2011]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/short_term11.pdf>
- JASSO (Japan Student Service Organization) (2014). *Heisei 24 nendo Kyouteitou nimotozuku Nihonjingakusei ryuugakujoukyou chousa* [The Summary of Results on Status Survey of Japanese Students Studying Abroad 2012]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/short_term12.pdf>
- JASSO (Japan Student Service Organization) (2015). *Heisei 25 nendo Kyouteitou nimotozuku Nihonjingakusei ryuugakujoukyou chousa* [The Summary of Results on Status Survey of Japanese Students Studying Abroad 2013]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/short_term13.pdf>
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self-system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 997-1023.
- MacIntyre, P.D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 564-576.
- Magid, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system from a Chinese perspective: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 69-90.
- MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) (2011). *Guroobaru jinzai ikuseisuishinkaigi chuukanmatome* [Interim Report on Commission on the Global Human Resources Development]. Retrieved February 17, 2015 from <http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/koutou/46/siryu/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/08/09/1309212_02_1.pdf>
- MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) (2013). *Nihonjin no kaigairyuugakujoukyou* [The current state of Japanese citizens studying abroad] Retrieved March 3, 2015 from <http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/25/02/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2013/02/08/1330698_01.pdf>
- Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, 38, 467-479.
- Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2012). Dynamics of selves and motivation: A cross-sectional study in the EFL context of Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 287-309.
- Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learner of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. (pp. 98-119). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Segalowitz, N., Freed, B.F., Collentine, J.G., Lafford, B.A., Lazar, N. & Diaz-Campos, M.A. (2004). A comparison of Spanish second language acquisition in two different learning contexts: Study abroad and the domestic classroom. *Frontiers*, 10, 21-38.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system amongst Chinese, Japanese, and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. (pp. 66-97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Tono, Y. (ed). (2013). *The CEFR-J handbook: A resource book for using CAN-DO descriptors for English language teaching*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self system in the Japanese EFL context. In

Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. (pp. 120–143). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 119–152.

KEYWORDS: Short-term study abroad, Motivation, The L2 Motivational Self System

(Hiroshi MORITANI, Craig MANNING, Stephen HENNEBERRY)