Research on beliefs about second language learning based on a model designed by Elaine Horwitz is reviewed. The model is incorporated in the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) developed for students of English as a Second Language, college students of commonly taught languages (French, German, Spanish), and college teachers of commonly taught languages. Creation of the BALLI is chronicled, with attention to the development of themes (foreign language aptitude, difficulty of language learning, nature of language learning, appropriate language learning strategies), sampling, and limitations. Related studies based on this model are then reviewed. It is concluded that development of the BALLI marked the beginning of systematic research on student beliefs about language learning, and that subsequent research has identified common beliefs that should influence language instruction, curriculum development, textbook writing, and program planning. Research focuses primarily on commonly taught languages, and a wider language sampling is recommended for further research. Appended materials include the BALLI instrument and charts indicating the original research components and expansions and the characteristics of later studies using this model. Contains 22 references. (MSE)
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Abstract

This paper summarizes a ten-year history of research concerning beliefs about language learning. It begins by describing the model of research created by Elaine Horwitz (University of Texas-Austin) to study beliefs held by university students and teachers of the commonly taught languages (English, French, German, and Spanish). The article describes results from studies of beliefs by nine other scholars. The studies are compared in terms of sample type and size, method and instrument, and analysis.
BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE LEARNING: THE HORWITZ MODEL

In the early 1980s, Elaine Horwitz developed an instrument for identifying beliefs about foreign language learning. She studied relationships between goals of students and teachers and learning strategies for foreign or second language acquisition of each group. This article summarizes Horwitz's work as well as significant research that has evolved from her pioneering interest in beliefs.

The Horwitz Model

To understand beliefs about language learning, Horwitz (1983, 1984, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1990) designed her research to comprise an instrument, a set of themes, a sample of first-semester students or teachers, and descriptive analysis of the findings.

Instrumentation

In order to identify adult student beliefs about language learning, Horwitz created an instrument called the Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI). She has used this instrument to gather data concerning the beliefs of students studying commonly taught languages (CTL) in the U.S. (i.e., English as a second language (ESL), French, German, and Spanish) and beliefs of teachers of ESL and CTL. Three distinct BALLIs are in use today: one for ESL students (1984, 1987), another for foreign language teachers (1985), and a third for foreign language students (1988, 1990). The ESL- and teacher-BALLIs
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language students (1988, 1990). The ESL- and teacher-BALLIs comprise 27 statements; the foreign language BALLI comprises 34 statements. The foreign language student BALLI is especially pertinent for this article (Appendix A).

Several groups of people contributed to the creation of the BALLI. The statements for the original BALLI were derived from a free-recall activity developed by 25 language teachers (1985, 1988). Using this teacher-generated list of beliefs, Horwitz then worked with colleagues in psychology and cognition in rephrasing the statements. Subsequently, she pilot-tested the instrument among 150 first-year language students at the University of Texas-Austin.

For over a decade, the BALLI has generated data for numerous studies and researchers consider it to be a valid instrument. However, in each study, Horwitz has made adjustments and modifications to the BALLI. Initially, her focus was on immigrants studying ESL in Texas. Over the years, the numbers, encoding, phraseology, and the order of statements have changed to meet the special needs of each new sample group (Appendix B). The changes that she made were pertinent to the validity of the instrument as it related to the different sampled groups. Unfortunately, these modifications have limited comparisons of results between and among sampled groups.

For example, although each version uses a 5-point Likert scale delineating points of agreement for response encodement. In the case of the teachers' BALLI, Horwitz did not explain the
reversal in the response choices. This inversion on one of the three BALLIs raises the issue of instrument validity. The order of choices can bias respondents or influence answers since English is read from left to right with the strongest agreement (the expected response) frequently is placed closest to the statement or question.

Theme Structure

In order to depict themes (statements related by common topic) of language learning, Horwitz proposed five themes to represent statements in the BALLI. For the initial 27 statements (ESL-BALLI), she created four themes: foreign language aptitude, difficulty of language learning, nature of language learning, and appropriate language learning strategies. Over the years, these four themes have been expanded as have the inclusion of specific statements (Table 1).

Table 1  Theme Order for CTL and ESL BALLIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTL 1988 (FGS)</th>
<th>ESL 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>difficulty of language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>foreign language aptitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nature of language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>learning (and communication) strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>motivation and expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* order of theme changed

These themes present several problems for analyzing and interpreting results. Despite Horwitz's emphasis on themes, she has not discussed the selection of the theme labels, the significance of the order of these themes, or the reasons for changing their composition (Horwitz, 1985, 1987, 1988, 1990).
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Although her studies were designed to identify the structure of student beliefs, Horwitz did not generate statistically themes from student responses. Instead, she sorted statements into logical themes based on suggestions from experienced teachers of CTLs. Consequently, the five present themes represent a belief structure that teachers think students hold and not one that the sample of students actually revealed.

Sample of Students

The timing of samples and selection of languages have been critical for Horwitz's research model. In order to obtain data concerning initial beliefs of students prior to class instruction, Horwitz emphasized the importance of selecting first-semester, first-year students. Collecting data after a week or month of instruction has always been considered too late for a true measure of initial beliefs. For ease of data collection, Horwitz's sample have always comprised university students or instructors at the University of Texas-Austin (repeated studies). Moreover, she has done each study only once and thus has no replication or cohort studies to report.

The sampled languages have always been the CTLs. Although other languages are taught at the University of Texas, the languages having the largest enrollments for multiple classes sampling are English, French, German, and Spanish. Since undergraduates mostly complete language requirements with CTLs, students and teachers of these languages provide the largest sample pool.
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Analyses

Descriptive analysis is Horwitz’s method of analysis. In only one of her studies did she discuss the steps taken in her analysis. Horwitz reported results of her ordinal-scored data in the form of raw score totals and frequency counts expressed in percentages. To show greater distinctions, her analyses often grouped the responses for "strongly agree" and "agree" (choices 1 and 2) as AGREEMENT or "strongly disagree" and "disagree" (choices 4 and 5) as DISAGREEMENT (Table 2).

Table 2 Five Strongest Rated Statements for French, German, and Spanish at Texas in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>French TX 86</th>
<th>German TX 86</th>
<th>Spanish TX 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>N=63</td>
<td>N=80</td>
<td>N=98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Important to repeat &amp; practice</td>
<td>98% 1</td>
<td>98% 1</td>
<td>98% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Some FL easier to learn than others</td>
<td>86% 2</td>
<td>88% 2</td>
<td>86% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Child learn FL better than adults</td>
<td>83% 4</td>
<td>88% 2</td>
<td>77% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-FL differs from other subjects</td>
<td>79% 5</td>
<td>76% 5</td>
<td>86% 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** AGREEMENT

***

| 21-Practice in Lang. Lab necessary | 84% 3 |
| 34-Everyone can learn to speak FL | 83% 3 |
| 11-Better to learn FL in country | 77% 4 |
| 26-Learning FL is translating from English | 75% 5 |

** DISAGREEMENT

| 9-Do not speak in FL until correct | 83% 3 |

N=241, J=3

Student responses disclose prevailing beliefs by strong agreement to BALLI statements. In her studies, Horwitz found that most of the students enrolled in a foreign language did so to meet a university requirement. Generally, both student and student teacher respondents believed the following:
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Learning and Communication Strategies
17. It is important to repeat and practice a lot;
9. You SHOULD say anything in the FL even if you can NOT say it correctly;

Difficulty of Language Learning
3. Some foreign languages are easier to learn than are others;
4. Each language varies in difficulty;
14. A working proficiency is possible after 2-5 years of instruction;

Foreign Language Aptitude
1. It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language;
34. Everyone can learn a foreign language;

Nature of Language Learning
26. Language learning does not consist mostly of translation;
11. Language learning is better studied in a target language country;
25. Learning a foreign language is different from learning other school subjects.

These students did not indicate consensus responses for any statements associated with the theme Motivation & Expectation. Five additional statements received strong ratings (over 75% agreement) from students enrolled in one or two of the languages. Only four statements (1, 3, 17, 25) present a picture of consistent beliefs among these students. No doubt such differences indicate diversity in students’ expectations.

As discussed above, three principal conditions limit the Horwitz studies. (Appendix B - Horwitz Research) First, her analysis created themes from the opinions of teachers rather than from opinions of students. Moreover, she neglected to form themes based upon statistical analyses such as principal components, factor analysis, cluster analysis, communality estimates, or correlations. In addition, her measurements comprised only descriptive statistics. Consequently, she was not
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able to test hypotheses by inferential statistics concerning the significance of selected variables on the beliefs of students. Second, the BALLI did not provide data concerning all current issues of foreign language learning. Finally, Horwitz sampled only students affiliated with CTL programs at the University of Texas-Austin. These students probably included a large bilingual or "false beginner" population, especially for the Spanish sample.

Related Studies Based on the Horwitz Model

Several scholars have repeated the Horwitz study using the BALLI or a variation of it.3 (Appendix D - Web of Researchers)

Smith and Nummikoski

Two colleagues of Horwitz, Smith (1989) and Nummikoski, repeated her study with students of Russian at the University of Texas-Austin.4 Their results showed that students of Russian agree that everyone can learn a foreign language including people who are good at math and science. The results indicated that these students considered themselves good language learners and sought to learn Russian well so that they could speak with Russian nationals. This study was important in that it was the first one designed to sample students of an LCTL and to go beyond Horwitz's work with students of the CTLs.

Bacon and Finnemann

Bacon and Finnemann (1990) conducted a survey consisting of 109 statements of beliefs, in contrast to Horwitz’s BALLI
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comprising 34 statements. They sampled 1000 first-year students of Spanish at two midwestern universities. Using factor analysis, they classified the 109 statements into 11 factors upon the basis of two pilot studies. In contrast to the BALLI, this instrument listed the statement in groups by factors.

Although many students surveyed were in second and third quarter classes, results show that students still held a few beliefs expressed by first-month beginners in the Horwitz study. For example, students showed strong agreement with statements that referred to anxiety about activities involving performance. Both groups of students disagreed that foreign language learning is mostly a matter of memorizing grammar rules and vocabulary. In addition, both groups stated that they would guess at meaning as a communication strategy.

Bacon and Finnemann concluded that student beliefs "shed light into how individual students anticipate their reactions to components of the foreign language curriculum. Beliefs and attitudes may be self-fulfilling" (1990, p. 469). Moreover, they noted that not only must the teacher be familiar with these common student beliefs, but also the curriculum planner, the textbook author, and the students themselves.

Campbell and Ortiz

At the U.S. Air Force Academy, Campbell and Ortiz (1991) incorporated five additional statements into a larger survey in order to identify the beliefs held by 150 military recruits about foreign language learning. This measure was repeated in the
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training of recruits to test changes in beliefs. However, the results of this initial study were inconclusive.

In another study, Campbell (1993) redesigned the study and condensed the Horwitz instrument to seven statements followed by a write-in section. The new instrument, Beliefs about Language Learning (BLL) followed the 5-scale Likert format. Three items dealt with grammar, two with language aptitude, one with fluency, and one with pronunciation. Although no pilot testing took place, a panel of scholars judged this abbreviated instrument as being reliable and valid. Seventy first-month students of French and Spanish from two midwestern universities participated in this survey. Over half wrote additional remarks.

Campbell’s results contrasted with those of Horwitz in two important areas. More than 60% of Campbell’s students disagreed that foreign language is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules. In addition, the two samples foresaw different applications of their foreign language learning—strategic, military applications. Despite this motivational difference, both sets of students rated "strongly" the two following statements, which appear to be contradictory:

. Most people can learn a foreign language; and
. A learner must have a capacity to learn a language.

Overall, Campbell’s results upheld Horwitz’s findings.

Tumposky

Research by Tumposky (1991) utilized Horwitz’s BALLI in order to survey two groups of undergraduate students from
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different cultural settings: U.S. students of French and Spanish were compared with U.S.S.R. students of English. Both groups of students previously had studied another foreign language. Unlike the students in Horwitz’s research, all Tumposky’s students had studied the target language for at least a year. The U.S.S.R. students had studied English for several years as a condition for passing a TOEFL examination.

Tumposky compared the groups simply by frequency of responses. Although the overall pattern of responses was similar to that found by Horwitz, Tumposky’s results supported the impression that monolingualism is favored in the U.S. in contrast to multilingualism in the then U.S.S.R. The Soviet students, representing a culture with linguistic pluralism, indicated high agreement for learning a language to "know" a speaker of English. Furthermore, the students enjoyed practicing English with people proficient in the language or with language tapes. This desire underscored the value of studying a foreign language in a target language country. Soviets also indicated that it was easier to read and write (recursive skills) a foreign language than to speak or understand (spontaneous skills) it (Table 3).
Table 3  Five Strongest Rated Statements for English as a Foreign Language and CTLs in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Tai</td>
<td>Kor</td>
<td>Kor</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95P</td>
<td>95T</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=54</td>
<td>N=498</td>
<td>N=332</td>
<td>N=204</td>
<td>N=241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>USSR</th>
<th>Tai</th>
<th>Kor</th>
<th>Kor</th>
<th>TX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Important to repeat &amp; practice</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Better to learn FL in country</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Speaking well will bring opportunities</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Learn language to know speakers better</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Would speak FL with speakers of FL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-People in my country want to speak FL</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Want to speak FL well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Must know FL culture to speak FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Speak FL with an excellent accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Learning FL differs from other subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Some FL easier to learn than others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Child learn FL better than adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISAGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>USSR</th>
<th>Tai</th>
<th>Kor</th>
<th>Kor</th>
<th>TX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Do not speak in FL until correct</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1329, J = 5

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Tumposky (English as a Foreign Language)
Tai: Taiwan: Yang (English as a Foreign Language)
Ko: Korea: Park (English as a Foreign Language)
Ko: Korea: Truff (English as a Foreign Language)
TX: University of Texas-Austin: Horwitz (French, German, Spanish)
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Tumposky concluded:

Perhaps [the difference] was their [the U.S. students'] awareness that the learning of the target language was not viewed by their compatriots as an important or valued achievement . . . . It seems that culture does contribute to the belief system of foreign language learners in ways which may relate to motivation and strategy selection. . . (1991, p. 62)

Thus, Tumposky's research suggested that cultural differences were related to motivation and specific learning strategies.

Yang

Yang's (1992) research on Taiwanese students studying English as a foreign language (EFL) substantially expanded the results of belief research. On the basis of Horwitz's initial work with students of French, German, and Spanish, Yang designed her research to examine a different culture (Taiwanese), non-beginner students (6 or more years of language study), multiple sites (6 universities), a different language (English), and a different set of measures (inferential statistics). She translated the BALLI into Chinese to enable students to respond easily. Using principal component and factor analysis, Yang divided the 34-statement BALLI into four new groups based upon factor loadings that were coefficient dependent:

1. self-efficacy & expectation;
2. value & nature of learning spoken English;
3. foreign language aptitude (also a Horwitz group); and
4. formal, structured study.

Although four factors best represented the Taiwanese responses, Yang's reliability coefficients were still low (below
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The reliability of these factors varied from $\alpha = 0.71$ to $\alpha = 0.52$ yielding a sample reliability of $\alpha = 0.69$. Upon her student responses analyzed by factor analysis, some of the statements that Horwitz classified as "foreign language aptitude" actually loaded on different factors in Yang's study. This set of descriptors offered another way of conceptualizing beliefs about foreign language learning. Yang's results suggested that each sample may have a unique underlying structure of beliefs.

Yang used a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to investigate effects of background variables on beliefs and strategy use. Her results for statements concerning beliefs about "foreign language aptitude" showed that students' majoring in languages were more positive than students of business, humanities, or science. In addition, students' expectations about learning English was significantly associated with their use of a variety of learning strategies.

The differences in results between Horwitz and Yang may suggest that ethnicity and culture influence student beliefs. The majority responses from Taiwanese students in Yang's sample indicated that foreign language learning is important and should be acquired correctly and thoroughly. These beliefs reflected Taiwanese culture that values English skills and proficiency in its citizens. In contrast to the Horwitz results, the majority response of these students showed a preference to learn English (target language) in an anglophone culture (target language...
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country). Likewise, the majority responses for Taiwanese students indicated speaking the language would result in many opportunities and that the citizens of Taiwan want to learn English (foreign language). Yang’s sample revealed additional strong beliefs:

- It is important to speak with an excellent accent;
- Previous language experience may have no influence on current language learning; and
- Foreign languages are important

Yang’s research design expanded the Horwitz research model by drawing a student sample from many universities, by obtaining a large sample size for one language, and by using inferential statistics of the parametric type for analysis. Her study became a model for Park (1995) and Truitt (1995) in their research of Korean students of English.

Fox

Fox (1993) incorporated parts of the Horwitz BALLI to identify beliefs held by teaching assistants (TA) of first-year students of French in New York. Fox utilized 26 statements from the BALLI. Her study showed that the following beliefs were most commonly held by the TAs:

- Everyone can learn a foreign language;
- Women are NOT better language learners than are men;
- Mistakes are not hard to correct later; and
- Students may learn the language well.

Her result for TAs contrasted with those for students of
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French in Horwitz's study. In contrast, students and instructors reported strong ratings only for one statement "It is important to repeat and practice" (Table 4). The SUNY instructors agreed with students of French on only one other statement "Some foreign languages are easier to learn than others."
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Table 4  Five Strongest Rated Statements for Students and Instructors of French in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>French TX 86</th>
<th>French UW 92</th>
<th>French UCB 93</th>
<th>Fre-Inst UCB 93</th>
<th>Fre-TAs SUNY 92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>N=63</td>
<td>N=48</td>
<td>N=180</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Important to repeat &amp; practice</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-Everyone can learn to speak FL</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-People in the US want to speak FL</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Practice in Lang. Lab necessary</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Easier to learn L3 if one learned FL</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Child learn FL better than adults</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Learning FL differ from other subjects</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Guessing is OK</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-People who speak a FL are intelligent</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Do not speak in FL until correct</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Learning FL is translating from English</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Learning a FL is learning grammar</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-FL easier to speak than understand</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 450, J = 5

TX86 - University of Texas-Austin: Horwitz
UW92 - University of Wisconsin-Madison: Kuntz/Rifkin
UCB93 - University of California-Berkeley: Kern (French Students & Instructors)
SUNY92 - State University of New York-Albany: Fox (French TAs)

Best Copy Available
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Fox, like Horwitz (1985), concluded that instructor's knowledge of both student beliefs and their own beliefs is important for successful foreign language teaching and learning. Comparison of beliefs between students and instructors disclosed goals and possible misunderstandings between teachers and students in learning situations.

Kern

At the University of California, Kern (1994) repeated the 1986 Horwitz model, but sampled students of French and their teachers. Unfortunately, Kern did not match students with their respective instructor; thus, he lost an important variable concerning teacher influence upon students. Like the Fox's study, Kern's project sampled students only at one university and did not classify statements by Horwitz's themes. After analyzing results from first-semester students and teachers, he conducted a follow-up study on the same students during the second semester of their first year. He then determined any changes in their initial beliefs as a result of influences from the teacher, textbooks, course content, and/or peer attitudes.

Kern found a general enthusiasm among students concerning French language learning. First-year students in California and Texas concurred on the following beliefs:

- They will ultimately learn French very well;
- Everyone can learn a foreign language; and
- They will learn French in two years.

However, as the semester progressed, student responses indicated
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that error correction, pronunciation, grammatical rules, and acquisition increasingly deviated from those of the teachers. Furthermore, he found that the first-semester samples of students and instructors concurred only on three statements (Table 5):

- It is important to repeat and practice (agree);
- Everyone can learn to speak FL (agree); and
- Do not speak in FL until correct (disagree).

The second-semester survey showed some changes in student beliefs. Individual students frequently changed their responses following the second semester of study, although not to the degree reported in earlier studies (Morello, 1988; Kosbab, 1989) of either second-semester or first-semester students. Kern found that initial responses for some beliefs (learning overseas, length of time for achieving fluency) did not change over time, while some responses (learning grammar rules, self-consciousness) became even more negative (opposing adult language learning and grammar/vocabulary focus) than reported by the beginning students. Most striking, however, was Kern’s conclusion that the teachers’ beliefs did not influence second-semester students as much as other elements in the learning environment.

Mantle-Bromley

Most recently, Mantle-Bromley (1995) described her results of beliefs about foreign language learning for middle school students of French and Spanish. Using the Horwitz research model to identify of student beliefs, Mantle-Bromley posed a question designed to utilize data from the BALLI:
Do students new to foreign language learning enter their introductory language classes with misconceptions or mistaken beliefs that could cause frustration with the language-learning process? (1995, p. 375)

The BALLI was one of two instruments that were used to gather data. Because of replication of statements in the two instruments, Mantle-Bromley deleted four statements from the BALLI associated with the theme "Motivation and Expectation." Therefore, the total number of BALLI statements were 29. In the case of this study, the BALLI served descriptive purposes.

Mantle-Bromley included the theme structure as an organizing structure for discussion of her results. However, she did not examine the basis for the statement inclusion in each theme. She made her recommendations to teachers from the results for statements but not upon the results by themes.

Her results showed that adolescent students believed that:

The Difficulty of Language Learning
3. Some languages are easier than others;
6. They will ultimately learn to speak a FL well;
14. They will learn this language well within two years;

Foreign Language Aptitude
22. Girls are better than boys at learning FLs;
29. People good at math/science are not good at FLs; and

Learning & Communication Strategies
17. It is important to repeat and practice (but not in front of others or FL speakers).

In a comparison of results (Horwitz, 1988; Tumposky, 1991; Kuntz, 1996), these adolescent students of French and Spanish rated four statements (17, 3, 25, 34) in common with those of the adult learners. These adolescent students and those from St. Lucia highly rated three (3, 17, 34) statements (Table 5).
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#### Table 5  Five Strongest Rated Statements for French/Spanish in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>ADULTS</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX 86</td>
<td>N=161</td>
<td>N=113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 90</td>
<td>N=36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW 92</td>
<td>N=114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS 91</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>17-Important to repeat &amp; practice</th>
<th>23-Speaking well will bring jobs</th>
<th>2-Some people born with FL ability</th>
<th>3-Some FL easier to learn than others</th>
<th>25-FL differs from other subjects</th>
<th>34-Everyone can learn to speak FL</th>
<th>19-Mistakes are hard to get rid of later</th>
<th>14-Can learn language in two years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98% 1</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
<td>99% 1</td>
<td>80% 2</td>
<td>97% 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79% 4</td>
<td>94% 3</td>
<td>80% 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>84% 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-Speaking well will bring jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97% 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89% 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86% 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83% 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-FL differs from other subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-Everyone can learn to speak FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mistakes are hard to get rid of later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Can learn language in two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Do not speak in FL until correct</td>
<td>77% 5</td>
<td>86% 5</td>
<td>82% 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 607, J = 5
KS91 - middle schools near Kansas City: Mantle-Bromley
StL96 - secondary schools in Castries, St. Lucia: Kuntz
UW92 - University of Wisconsin-Madison: Kuntz/Rifkin
TX86 - University of Texas-Austin: Horwitz
USA90 - New England college: Tumposky
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Despite Mantle-Bromley's classification of statements by Horwitz's themes, she did not use these themes in her recommendations for teachers. Rather, she recommended that teachers design and implement lessons concerning language learning processes so as to implement strategies for changing detrimental beliefs and accentuating effective beliefs. Moreover, these lessons should include activities that focus on changing negative attitudes.

These and other scholars who used the BALLI have identified beliefs of students about foreign language learning and have showed that these beliefs continue to influence language instruction, curriculum development, and program planning. A summary of the published research concerning beliefs in which scholars applied the BALLI or a variation of it for data collection showed a focus on students of the CTLs and the use of descriptive analyses (Appendix C - Expansion of Research Model). Only Mantle-Bromley utilized Horwitz's themes to interpret the underlying belief structure. The other researchers did not discuss the strongly marked statements by theme or analyze the student responses by themes for different languages. By not commenting on the theme divisions or statistically analyzing the statements for factors, the researchers appear to indicate their dissatisfaction or perhaps distrust of the themes which Horwitz's teachers had chosen.
Conclusions

Prior to the Horwitz research model, student beliefs about foreign language learning had not been analyzed systematically. These scholars who used the BALLI have identified common beliefs about foreign language learning. Moreover, they have demonstrated that these beliefs should influence language instruction, curriculum development, textbook writing, and program planning. A summary of the published research concerning student beliefs in which scholars applied the BALLI or a variation of it for data collection shows an expansion of the instrument, variation in sampling, and multiple forms of analyses.

The structure of beliefs continues to interest researchers. Although several scholars have utilized Horwitz's theme to discuss results, more recent scholars are using factor analyzes to determine the structure of student beliefs. This approach reveals the important factors unique to each sample and enables researchers to recommend specific instructional changes.

The samples of languages remain for the most part the CTLs. Given that most studies were based upon U.S. students studying French or Spanish (easy languages for adults in the U.S.), the results are similar. However, few of the researchers compared groups to ascertain significant differences among responses by language, by age of student, or by level of language learning experience. In addition, future research might focus on beliefs between beginning and advanced level students and between
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adolescent and adult students and sample a variety of languages. After these data are analyzed, the results should be incorporated into program design, materials and instructional strategies to enhance foreign language learning not only in the U.S. but also around the world.
1. In 1939 for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rensis Likert developed this method of scaling to resolve the ambiguity of ordinality. This scale enabled any individual’s multitudinous and diverse beliefs to be rendered into thought in the form of a value on each of a small number of dimensions. Therefore, the Likert-scale is a technique of constructing statements such that an individual’s response to a particular item facilitated predictability for other items on a particular dimension. It indexes responses at acceptable intervals and assumes that each item has about the same intensity as the rest. Upon the basis of this argument, statistics associated with interval scales can be applied to the Likert-scaled data. Babbie, E.R. (1979). The practice of social research (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Rose, N. (1990). Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self. New York: Routledge.


3. In a correspondence of May, 1996, Elaine Horwitz reported that several students at the University of Texas-Austin had repeated her study: G. Park (1995) and Susan Truitt (1995) sampled Korean students of EFL, Theresa Oh (1996) sampled U.S. students of Japanese, and Nacije Kunt (work in progress) sampled Turkish students of EFL.

   In 1996, as a project for a seminar on classroom research of motivation and learning strategies directed by Sally Magnan, students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison also used the BALLI to collect data:

   Mary Curran (ESL) and Ken Miura (Japanese), Language teaching assistants’ beliefs about language learning [54 TAs (1=Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Portuguese, Norwegian; 2=Italian; 3=Russian; 6=Japanese, 8=ESL, German; 10=French, Spanish)]

   Jill Destree, university students of Italian

   Katie Lahr, Beliefs about language learning of high school Spanish students [I = 31, II = 35, III = 41, IV = 19]

4. H.S. (Pete) Smith, University of Texas-Arlington, shared information from memory concerning his research in a communication during May, 1994. Marita Nummikoski, University of Texas-San Antonio, was unable to provide any written documentation.

5. The sample reliability for Korean students of English found by Park (1995) and Truitt (1995) was $\alpha = 0.61$—a reliability below the typically acceptable rate.
6. Benjamin Rifkin (Slavic Languages & Literature), who collaborated in developing the KRI and in gathering the Wisconsin data, is in the midst of tracking a cohort of students at Wisconsin of the non-African languages through the second year of instruction. In addition, he collected data from the teaching assistants for each level using the same instrument.
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BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE LEARNING INVENTORY
(Horwitz, 1988)

Students are asked to read each statement and indicate:
(A) Strongly agree  (B) Agree  (C) neither agree nor disagree
(D) Disagree  (E) Strongly disagree

1. It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language.
2. Some people are born with a special ability which helps them learn a foreign language.
3. Some languages are easier to learn than others.

***

4. The language I am trying to learn is:
   A = Very difficult  B = Difficult  C = Medium difficulty
   D = Easy  E = Very Easy

5. The language I am trying to learn is structured in the same way as English.
6. I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak this language very well.
7. It is important to speak a foreign language with an excellent accent.
8. It is necessary to know the foreign culture in order to speak the foreign language.
9. You should not say anything in the foreign language until you can say it correctly.
10. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.
11. It is better to learn a foreign language in the foreign country.
12. If I heard someone speaking the language I am trying to learn, I would go up to them so that I could practice speaking the language.
13. It is okay to guess if you do not know a word in the foreign language.

***

14. If someone spent one hour a day learning a language, how long would it take him/her to become fluent?
   A = less than a year
   B = 1-2 years
   C = 3-5 years
   D = 5-10 years
   E = you can’t learn a language in 1 hour a day

15. I have a foreign language aptitude.
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16. Learning a foreign language mostly a matter of learning many new vocabulary words.
17. It is important to repeat and practice often.
18. I feel self-conscious speaking the foreign language in front of other people.
19. If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.
20. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning many grammar rules.
21. It is important to practice in the language laboratory.
22. Women are better than men at learning foreign languages.
23. If I speak this language very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.
24. It is easier to speak than understand a foreign language.
25. Learning a foreign language is different from learning other school subjects.
26. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from English.
27. If I learn to speak this language very well it will help me get a good job.
28. It is easier to read and write this language than to speak and understand it.
29. People who are good at math and science are not good at learning foreign languages.
30. Americans think that it is important to speak a foreign language.
31. I would like to learn this language so that I can get to know its speakers better.
32. People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.
33. Americans are good at learning foreign languages.
34. Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language.
## Appendix B

### Horwitz’s Research Components and Expansions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horwitz</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>BALLI-ESL 27</td>
<td>? (Texas)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horwitz</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>BALLI-Teachers 27</td>
<td>? Student teachers (Texas)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horwitz</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>BALLI-ESL (changed order)</td>
<td>32 ESL (Texas)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horwitz</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>BALLI-FL 34</td>
<td>63 French 80 German 96 Spanish (Texas)</td>
<td>Sem 1</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>Learning Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 4 10 14</td>
<td>1 2 22 29 32</td>
<td>8 16 20 25 26 28</td>
<td>7 9 13 17 19 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>Learning Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 22 29 32</td>
<td>3 4 10 14</td>
<td>8 16 20 25 26 28</td>
<td>7 9 11 13 17 19 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>L &amp; C Strategy</td>
<td>Motivation &amp; Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 33 10 29</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 22 32 34</td>
<td>3 4 6 14 24 28</td>
<td>8 11 16 20 25 26</td>
<td>7 9 13 17 18 19 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>L &amp; C Strategy</td>
<td>Motivation &amp; Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>1 2 10 15 22</td>
<td>8 11 16 20 25 26</td>
<td>7 9 12 13 17 18 19 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 24 28</td>
<td>29 32 33 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers (instrument/theme groups) are statements from the foreign language BALLI (1988)
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Expansion of the Horwitz BALLI Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>BALLI-FL 34</td>
<td>? Russian (Texas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon &amp; Finnemann</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>109 &quot;survey&quot;</td>
<td>938 Spanish (2? Midwest univ US)</td>
<td>Qu 2/3</td>
<td>factor analysis Cronbach Alpha multiple regression Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell/Ortiz</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>16 SASFLC (attitude of anxiety FLCAS statements)</td>
<td>176 mixed 172 mixed 37 mixed 3 mixed (DLI-US)</td>
<td>Day 1 Wk 2 Sem 2 End</td>
<td>frequency Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumposky</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>BALLI-FL 34</td>
<td>54 EFL (USSR) 15 Spanish 21 French (USA)</td>
<td>2nd yr +</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>BALLI-FL 34 + 1 completion</td>
<td>498 English (EFL) (6 univ. Taiwan)</td>
<td>Yr 8</td>
<td>frequency means/SD prin. components factor analysis Cronbach Alpha MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et. al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>BLL (BALLI short-form, 7 statements + 1 completion)</td>
<td>20 French 50 Spanish (2? Midwest univ, US)</td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Selected BALLI 1 2 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 14 16 17 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26</td>
<td>147 French-TAs (SUNY-Albany)</td>
<td>Yr 1</td>
<td>frequency, means/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantle-Bromley</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Selected BALLI 1 2 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 24 25 26 28 29 32 33 34</td>
<td>94 French/Spanish (middle schools, Kansas City)</td>
<td>2/3-9wks</td>
<td>frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>BALLI ESL + 10</td>
<td>338 EFL (2 univ. Korea)</td>
<td>Yr. 7</td>
<td>frequency, mean/SD, factor analysis, Cronbach Alpha, Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truitt</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>BALLI FL 34 + 2 2 completions</td>
<td>204 EFL Yonsei Univ. (Korea)</td>
<td>Yr. 7 Sem. 2</td>
<td>frequency, mean/SD, factor analysis, Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntz/</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>BALLI FL 34 +</td>
<td>81 Arabic, 48 French, 45</td>
<td>Mon 1</td>
<td>frequency, mean/SD, prin. component factor analysis, Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifkin</td>
<td>/3</td>
<td>9 demographic</td>
<td>31 Italian, 50 Japanese,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kruskal-Wallis, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 statements</td>
<td>51 Russian, 65 Spanish,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Swahili (WI + FL, IL,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN, MSU, OSU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntz</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>BALLI FL 34 +</td>
<td>193 French/Spanish</td>
<td>Sem 2</td>
<td>frequency, mean/SD, prin. component factor analysis, Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 demographic</td>
<td>(secondary schools - St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kruskal-Wallis, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 statements</td>
<td>Lucia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>BALLI</td>
<td>? Japanese (Texas)</td>
<td></td>
<td>frequency, mean/SD, factor analysis, Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon &amp;</td>
<td>5 factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnemann</td>
<td>authentic texts</td>
<td></td>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>Theme 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell/Ortiz</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>L &amp; C Strategy</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 6 10 11 16 19 30 33</td>
<td>3 4 5 15 25 34</td>
<td>8 12 17 23 27 28</td>
<td>7 9 13 14 18 21 22 26</td>
<td>20 24 29 31 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumposky</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Nature of Learning</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Formal Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 6 12 15 18 33</td>
<td>7 9 11 17 27 30 34 (29)</td>
<td>2 8 10 22 29 31 32</td>
<td>16 19 20 24 26 28 (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>Grammar Difficulty</td>
<td>Language Aptitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et. al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantle-Bromley</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Nature of Language</td>
<td>L &amp; C Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 4 6 14 24 28</td>
<td>1 2 10 15 22 29 32 33 24</td>
<td>8 11 16 20 25 26</td>
<td>7 9 12 13 17 18 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Motivation &amp; Formal En.</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy &amp; Social I.</td>
<td>Learning Spoken En.</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 20 23 26 30 31 32 (32 37)</td>
<td>4 6 8 12 15 18 (25)</td>
<td>7 9 11 13 (8)</td>
<td>2 3 22 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>Theme 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truitt</td>
<td>Value &amp; Nature of Learning</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy &amp; Confidence</td>
<td>Correct &amp; Formal Learning</td>
<td>Ease of Learning</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 7 8 11 17 30</td>
<td>12 15 28 (24)</td>
<td>9 16 19 20 26 32</td>
<td>2 4 6 22 34</td>
<td>23/7 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntz/Rifkin</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntz</td>
<td>FL Aptitude</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Personal Interests</td>
<td>People &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Linguistic Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers (instrument/theme) are statements from the foreign language BALLI (1988).
Appendix D

A Web of Research Based on the BALLI

Spanish (Horwitz)  [CTLs]  -- HORWITZ -- [English]
French (Fox, Horwitz, Kern)
German (Horwitz)

[CTL] Arabic (Yemen/Kuntz)

{Teachers}

Spanish (Horwitz, Kuntz)
French (Horwitz, Kern, Kuntz)

[French/Spanish] (Univ: Campbell, Tumposky)
(K-12: St.Lucia/Kuntz, USA/Mantle-Bromley)

German (Horwitz, Kuntz)

[Ancient Egyptian] (Kuntz)
Arabic (Yemen-USA/Kuntz)
Italian (Kuntz)

Japanese (Kuntz, Oh)
Russian (Kuntz, Smith)
Swahili (Kuntz)

Korea (Park, Truitt)
Taiwan (Yang)
Turkey (Kuntz)

[USSR] (Tumposky)

[CTLs] -- -- HORWITZ -- -- [EFL] [ESL]