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Researchers interested in the role of motivation in SLA have recently suggested a framework, “Directed Motivational Current” (DMC), which attempts to explain periods of intense learner motivation (Dörnyei, Muir, & Ibrahim, 2014). The recent nature of the development of this concept is reflected in the relatively small amount of research done on it. This mixed-methods exploratory study reports on efforts made to induce DMC states in Japanese students enrolled in a university English course. The course was designed around the three central components of a DMC. Student confidence and motivation levels were assessed through a variety of quantitative and qualitative instruments. The results of the study are mixed in the sense that it’s difficult to determine with precision whether or not students entered DMC states. However, the attempt at inducing these states provided an excellent framework around which a course syllabus could be planned.

INTRODUCTION

A DMC is a term that describes the surge of motivational energy commonly utilized by a person in pursuit of a very specific personal goal (Muir & Dörnyei, 2013). While this phenomenon can be observed in individuals pursuing any number of goal-oriented endeavors (such as losing weight), it can regularly be observed in successful language learners. While contexts for DMCs vary, all are similar in that they share three core components: “goal/vision orientedness, a salient facilitative structure, and positive emotionality” (Henry, Davydenko, & Dörnyei, 2015, p. 330). The aim of this paper is to detail an attempt at implementing a syllabus designed to induce DMC states among students enrolled in an EFL program in a Japanese university.

The element of vision-orientedness refers to an individual’s ideal potential self, the “personalized goal that the learner has made his/her own by adding to it the imagined reality of the goal experience” (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013, pp. 454-455). With regard to DMCs, “vision” refers to a multi-sensory goal-state that is clearly imagined—not simply an abstract idealized notion (Muir & Dörnyei, 2013). This vision can be thought of as a pre-defined finish line, and it represents the superordinate goal under which all other efforts are undertaken. In Japanese language-learning contexts, the vision is more than the goals of a specific TOEFL score or acceptance into a study-abroad program. The vision instead represents sensory elements of true L2 interactive competence, for example having a
meaningful conversation with a host parent, or successfully understanding lyrics to
a song in the target language.

The path toward becoming such a proficient user requires a variety of
coordinated efforts, which can be thought of as a facilitative structure, the second
component of a DMC. This structure is the series of lesser subgoals that allow the
individual to logically progress toward his/her vision. This structure does not
“merely frame the process, but also plays a vital role in facilitating the unfolding
action” (Dörnyei, Muir, & Ibrahim, 2014, p. 14). In language learning contexts in
Japan, these subgoals can include anything from vocabulary word acquisition to
successful conversation with international friends in topics of increasing complexity
to the completion of various activities in self-access learning environments
(Murray, 2011).

The third component of DMCs is positive emotionality, or “the enjoyment
experienced carrying out activities recognized as transporting the individual closer
to their goal” (Henry, Davydenko, & Dörnyei, 2015, p. 332). In other words, the
feelings of satisfaction and fulfillment that come with progressing through a DMC
constitute an essential aspect of the DMC. An aspect of this positive emotionality is
participant ownership, or the extent to which students have adopted the “ought-to
self image” as their own (Muir & Dörnyei, 2013).

It should be mentioned that DMCs have only been recently identified as a
particular motivational phenomenon, thus study into the area is quite limited; in
fact, only one study has empirically investigated the DMCs of language learners.
Henry, Davydenko, & Dörnyei (2015) studied learners of Swedish, identifying
those thought to have been in a DMC and plotting their motivational trajectories
retrospectively. The results support the existence of DMCs, as well as the role of
personal goal-setting in the phenomena. However, their findings didn’t reveal any
explicit definition of subjects’ initial long-term goals or specific visions of future
selves, possibly due to the overwhelming immersive aspect of their subjects’
learning situations. The authors maintain that while their findings lend support to
the validity of DMCs as a construct, more empirical grounding is necessary before
the concept is widely accepted as reality.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The objective of this study was to determine whether or not an entire course
could be structured around the goal of widespread DMC inducement, and the extent
to which such efforts might affect student motivation. Specifically, the study set out
to address the following research questions, each of which are pertinent to the three
central components of a DMC:

1. How might an instructor prompt a class of students to progress toward a
   common yet specific goal/vision that the students have democratically
   chosen?

2. How might an instructor design a curriculum to provide a salient facilitative
   structure that enables students to progress toward their goal/vision?
3. To what extent could students be encouraged to “take ownership” of their English growth, and feel positive emotionality regarding their potential and progress?

Additionally, this study utilizes a fourth research question, designed to ascertain the growth of student confidence in general:

4. To what extent have DMC inducement efforts prompted overall growth in student confidence?

The following section outlines the kind of methodological procedures employed in this classroom-based study. In this study, I have operationalized a DMC as changes in motivation levels over a semester.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Participants**

For this study, an entire semester of an intermediate-level 4-skills language course was designed to induce students into a DMC state. The course, “Intensive English 1 (IE-1)” consisted of 25 1st and 2nd year Japanese university students, 18 female and 7 male, from a variety of different majors. The students were selected for this particular section of IE-1 on the basis of their TOEIC scores, in this case 490-505. The students took a CEFR-J self-assessment, and the average levels in each learning category are listed in Table 1 below.

![Table 1: Initial CEFR-J Self-Assessment Descriptive Statistics](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Spoken Interaction</th>
<th>Spoken Production</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total AVG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDEV</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding CEFR-J Level</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>A1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each point indicates one level on the CEFR-J. A score of “1” indicates a level of “Pre-A1” while a score of “12” indicates level “C2”, the top level. See Table 2 for each point’s corresponding CEFR-J level.

As shown in Table 2, CEFR-J levels range from very low proficiency/confidence (Pre-A1) to very high proficiency/confidence (C2). The initial total average score of this particular class is A1.3, meaning their proficiency/confidence level is at 33%, indicating a lower-intermediate proficiency/confidence level.
TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-A1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be stated that CEFR-J levels do not, on their own, indicate DMC activity. However, growth in CEFR-J levels indicate an increase in learner confidence, which might be suggestive of the “positive emotionality” component of DMCs. Additionally, when taken into account alongside other indicators, unexpected CEFR-J confidence growth could suggest student induction into DMC states.

**DMC tasks**

In order to induce a DMC, students completed a series of tasks, which were designed to target the components of a DMC. The first homework task for the semester was a reflective assignment titled, “Vision Homework: ‘Now Self’ vs. ‘Future Self’” (Appendix 1). The assignment asked students to detail their current abilities and limitations in the four skill areas and then to detail their semester-end goal for each skill area. The assignment also asked them to quickly sketch their current self and also their future self. The rationale behind this assignment was to prompt students to engage in vision-oriented goal-making, the first step in the DMC process.

After the Vision Homework assignment was collected, students’ stated goals were examined and aggregated by the instructor in an effort to establish shared commonality, broken down into specific subgoals (for example, “I understand what the teacher is saying so I can participate actively in class” or “I can send e-mails in English to my foreign friends”) with specific dates (end of October, end of November, and end of semester), and then explained to the class in the subsequent lesson. These subgoals were mentioned throughout the semester in an effort to remind students of their original vision. Additionally, at two points during the semester, students were asked to reflect on whether or not they had achieved certain subgoals, and were also reminded of the next set of subgoals to focus on. The creation of these subgoals represented an effort to construct a facilitative structure, the second component of a DMC.
The third aspect of DMCs, positive emotionality, is difficult for an instructor to inculcate, yet deliberate efforts were made in the form of daily free-talk activities, conversation day with international students, and both Halloween and Christmas parties. Additionally, both major projects in the class—formal group presentations detailing analyses of song lyrics as well as wholly original dramatic presentations—were suggested and democratically selected by the students themselves. Class assessments of and responses to the group projects were 50% of each student’s grade on the project. This was done in an effort to impress upon the students that the community they were creating for themselves was an essential aspect to their overall grade in the course, and maintaining an atmosphere of positive emotionality was in their best interests.

**Data collection procedures**

At the end of the semester, students were asked to take the CEFR-J self-assessment again, retrospectively assess their motivation levels (on a 5-point likert scale) for each week throughout the semester (Appendix 2), and complete a short open-ended three-item questionnaire asking them to detail their thoughts on motivation (Appendix 3). Both the retrospective weekly motivation level instrument as well as the short questionnaire were completed anonymously.

All three data collection instruments were used to answer this study’s research questions. First, the CEFR-J self-assessment scores give a general picture of student growth in L2 confidence. Second, following the procedures of Henry et al. (2015), students were asked to retrospectively plot their motivational levels for each week during the semester. Finally, the short three-item open-ended questionnaire assessing student motivation was administered in the final week of semester. The purpose of the open-ended questionnaire was to collect qualitative data. The purpose of the retrospective motivation level assessment as well as the open-ended questionnaire was to determine whether students generally entered DMC states and to provide insights into the dynamic ebb and flow of students’ DMC.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**CEFR-J growth**

The results of implementing a curriculum designed to stimulate DMCs in students are presented below. First of all, the CEFR-J self-assessment scores give a general picture of student growth in L2 confidence, if not raw ability. Table 3, below, shows both the initial CEFR-J scores, taken at the beginning of the semester (September 27, 2015), above the scores of the same assessment, taken at the end of the semester (January 6, 2016).
TABLE 3
End-of-Semester CEFR-J Self-Assessment Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language skill</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>M 2.6</td>
<td>M 4.83</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.47</td>
<td>SD 1.83</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>M 4.56</td>
<td>M 6.63</td>
<td>+2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 2.74</td>
<td>SD 1.95</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>M 3.12</td>
<td>M 5.17</td>
<td>+2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td>SD 1.99</td>
<td>SD 1.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>M 3.04</td>
<td>M 5.25</td>
<td>+2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>SD 1.97</td>
<td>SD 1.78</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>M 4.16</td>
<td>M 6.04</td>
<td>+1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEFR-J level</td>
<td>SD 2.03</td>
<td>SD 1.73</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate growth in student confidence. While writing wasn’t given as much explicit attention in class as the other skill levels, students still progressed almost two CEFR-J levels in this category. At the beginning of the course, student confidence in listening skills was, on average, lowest among the skill groups, but the student confidence average in this category grew more than two levels. Student confidence in the Spoken Production category developed the most, possibly reflecting the lengthy projects (both of which revolved largely around speaking skills) or possibly the regular free-talk conversation time. While overall student progress in language confidence was surprising to see, it is unclear from this data whether or not students were engaged in DMCs.

To determine whether CEFR scores improve significantly from the start to end of semester, differences should ideally be subjected to a test of significance (e.g. a paired t-test). However, the results of such a test would not shed light on the motivational dispositions of students during semester, which is, after all, the more intriguing aspect of the DMC. Furthermore, the effect of the course on motivational end states is not relevant to the research question. Therefore, a significance test was not performed on the above data. The purpose of the data presented is to provide a purely descriptive picture of students’ motivation.

**Retrospective quantitative assessment of weekly motivation levels**

The students’ weekly motivation levels were assessed retrospectively via the Weekly Motivation Questionnaire (Appendix 2). The questionnaire was based on a five-point Likert scale, with “five” indicating the highest level of motivation. Weeks in which classes were cancelled (due to holidays or student festivals) were combined with other weeks. Additionally, the two shaded columns indicate weeks in which the students were given holistic grade reports and asked to reflect and focus on the subgoals for the course. At the bottom of the Weekly Motivation Questionnaire is a brief summary of what was focused on in class that week, so students could refresh their memory if they forgot. The results of which are presented below, in Table 4.
TABLE 4
Retrospective Weekly Motivation Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W1 &amp; W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
<th>W6 &amp; W7</th>
<th>W8</th>
<th>W9</th>
<th>W10</th>
<th>W11</th>
<th>W12</th>
<th>W13 &amp; 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Motivation Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDEV</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that student motivation started quite high, tapered off slightly, rose slightly in weeks six and seven as well as week eleven, and then garnered the highest average marks in weeks 13 and 14. Weeks six and seven as well as week eleven were the weeks in which students received their comprehensive grades in the class up to those points, as well as the weeks in which course subgoals were reviewed and reflected upon, followed by students being directed to focus on the next set of subgoals. Whether are not those elements correlate to the rise in motivation is unclear. Additionally unclear is whether or not the relatively high motivation levels throughout the semester indicate student inducement in a DMC-state.

Retrospective qualitative assessment of motivating and demotivating factors

Students were requested to complete a short open-ended questionnaire (Appendix 3), asking them to explain, very generally, motivating and demotivating factors, as well as whether they’ve come closer becoming the “future-self” they envisioned for “Vision Homework: ‘Now Self’ vs. ‘Future Self’” (Appendix 1). A variety of illuminative responses for each item of this questionnaire are printed below.

1) Were there times or activities that gave you a lot of motivation? Please explain.

- “In Japan, many English teacher teach us how to read and write. That’s boring. This class is very active, creative and interesting.”
- “When I participate in group work, because we can talk to each other more than usual.”
- “Drama project is most interesting and gave me a lot of motivation.”
- “Two parties gave me a lot of motivation. If I had no parties, I couldn’t do good jobs.”
- “The song activities gave me a lot of motivation. It was the first time that I do a presentation in English. The research for foreign music in detail was very interesting.”
- “When I did project 2, I had a lot of motivation. Because I think that this project is the last mission.”
- “The activities of conversation between me and my classmates were the best motivation for me. To talk about many kinds of topics with other people is one of the good ways to grow up our English skills.”
“Yes, there were many times. Especially, we could research our grade twice."
“Every class we had conversation time, so I could enjoy that.”

These responses indicate that the students drew motivation, generally speaking, from daily conversation activities, as well as large group projects which culminated in critically important presentations. Additionally, a few students mentioned the Halloween and Christmas parties were particularly motivating. Finally, a student mentioned that the two progress checks were a motivating factor. Whether or not any of these motivating factors contributed to a student inducement in a DMC-state is unclear; however, the responses indicate that those elements were helpful.

2) **Were there times or activities that lowered your motivation? Please explain.**
- “It were W9 and W10. Because these weeks hadn’t project. So we only did Interchange.” (*Interchange* 3 is the name of the textbook for the course.)
- “When I studied by Interchange, my motivation was low. I thought that this textbook was good. But when I used this textbook, I was boring. Particularly when using textbook continued, my motivation was very very low.”
- “I like almost your class, but I don’t like M-Reader. I think M-Reader help me to grow my English skill but it took me a lot of time.” (M-Reader is the website that tracked the students’ reading progress.)
- “The class that we don’t talk with classmate lowered my motivation. I want to speak in English!!”
- “When I did my homework, I didn’t have my motivation.”
- “Doing M-Reader. It takes me a lot of time. I don’t like it very much.”
- “IE Project 2 drama. I’m not good at performance. In addition, it made me tired. I like Project 1 more than Project 2.”
- “A little. I can’t explain what I wanted to say, when my motivation lower.”

These responses indicate that, generally speaking, students found the course M-Reader requirements as well as frequent textbook activity to be particularly demotivating. Whether or not those elements of the class prevented students from engaging in DMC states is unclear; however, it would appear as if those elements were unhelpful in that regard. One student mentioned that Project 2 was demotivating, but that particular opinion appears to be an outlier.

3) **At the beginning of the semester, you were asked to draw a picture of your future-self. Are you that person today? Have you come closer? What areas do you still need to work on?**
- “No, but I’ve come closer. My writing, vocabulary and speaking skill is low, so I need to work on them.”
- “In part, I think I was able to achieve my aim.”
- “Not yet. I should talk in English more and more times.”
- “I haven’t been that person today yet, but I do my best in the future. I work hard more and more. I want to be a good student.”
• “I could come a little closer, but I have to get more speaking skills. When Mr. Jon ask me a question in English, I can’t answer in perfect English. It’s my spring vacation’s homework.”
• “I became positive!! And I feel that speaking or listening or writing or reading English is very nice!! So I can become the person who I wanted to become.”
• “I think I have come closer with that draw I wrote. I could understand what you say.”
• “I think my listening skill comes closer to my vision especially. But I want more writing and speaking skills.”
• “I have come closer because I can go abroad to study next summer. However, my all skill isn’t still very good much. So I want to study hard.”
• “I think that I don’t become future-self completely. But I can speak in front of people!”
• “I come closer. I think my listening skill is better than before. I can understand almost Jon’s talking. The beginning of this semester, I could understand it 60%. But now it is 95%. It is amazing!! I will try to see movie in English in spring vacation.”

Initially, these responses were somewhat discouraging as no student completely achieved the goal of becoming the “future-self” they envisioned at the beginning of the semester, indicating that, while students might’ve been in a DMC, no one fully realized the “promise” of the DMC, at least with regard to the vision-oriented component. That said, students tended to reflect more on the aspects of their vision they had achieved rather than what they hadn’t. Also, the act of taking stock of their language development seems to have motivated quite a few students to push harder next semester, and possibly even during their vacation time between semesters. Perhaps this indicates that, while an instructor might plan a curriculum with the hopeful intent of inducing students into DMC-states, student entrance into a DMC is still largely determined by the individual learner themselves.

Research questions revisited
1. How might an instructor prompt a class of students to progress toward a common yet specific goal/vision that the students have democratically chosen?
   The vision homework assignment was successful in the sense that it (a) got the students conceiving themselves in concrete terms as proficient language users, and (b) gave the instructor considerable data around which semester-goals could be planned. Whether or not this homework assignment prompted initial DMC inducement is, as yet, difficult to determine.
2. How might an instructor design a curriculum to provide a salient facilitative structure that enables students to progress toward their goal/vision?
   The information obtained in the vision homework assignment helped to create a facilitative structure which guided the development of lesson plans throughout the semester. Students were reminded of this structure in terms of sub-goals, which were casually mentioned by the instructor throughout the
semester, and explicitly twice in conjunction with progress reports. Data from the retrospective quantitative motivation assessment indicate that student motivation collectively increased during those reminder periods, possibly (but not definitively) indicating the student inducement into DMC states.

3. To what extent could students be encouraged to “take ownership” of their English growth, and feel positive emotionality regarding their potential and progress?

Positive emotionality seemed to be a hallmark of this particular IE section, but whether or not that was related to the DMC inducement efforts is difficult to determine. Research into this area could be improved with more immediate data-collection instruments as well as, perhaps, regular interviews or learner diaries.

4. To what extent have DMC inducement efforts prompted overall growth in student confidence?

If the CEFR-J is any indication, student confidence developed significantly throughout the semester. Whether or not that is due to DMC inducement efforts is a matter of conjecture, but it is the opinion of this researcher/instructor that the inducement efforts were a key component to a successful semester. Furthermore, the inducement efforts will provide the framework for the next semester. Perhaps a greater variety of DMC inducement efforts will be attempted, and their efficacy subsequently assessed.

CONCLUSION

This humble little study suffers from a multitude of issues and thus delivers little substantive insight into the nature of DMCs or the value of designing curricula around the goal of inducing them in students. While this small scale study does have certain limitations, there are a number of intriguing elements that might be developed into future studies.

Among the most glaring deficiencies of this study is the use of the CEFR-J self-assessment. The CEFR-J isn’t the best standard by which to measure the progression of student language ability. However, it does measure learner confidence in certain skill areas, and while an individual’s confidence is quite fluid and difficult to quantify, so too are DMCs by their very nature. Ideally, however, the CEFR-J ought be paired with a standardized language ability test in order to determine true linguistic acquisition process.

Secondly, motivation levels might be better measured immediately and regularly rather than singularly and retrospectively. That said, solid instruments that could regularly collect such data are often problematic. Learner diaries could provide illumination into the nature of student motivation levels, but such diaries might also be viewed by students with contempt and be demotivating factors by themselves. Perhaps the best way to gauge student motivation regularly would be through a simple computer-based collection program, but such a program would require development.
Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, student entry into a DMC is largely
determined by the student herself on the basis of motivational factors both intrinsic
and extrinsic. While instructors might attempt to generate extrinsic motivational
factors and encourage the development of intrinsic factors, ultimately students are
responsible for their own motivational development. The goal of this study, and
indeed the semester, was to attempt to induce students into DMC states—the
possibility of which is debatable—and then attempt to assess whether or not
students are experiencing DMCs—the possibility of which is also debatable.

Weaknesses and doubts aside, however, planning a semester-long course
with the intent of inducing DMC states created an effective and successful
framework for the particular four-skills course in question. Students seemed more
motivated and progressed with greater intensity than students of the same course in
previous years.
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APPENDIX 1: “Vision Homework: ‘Now Self’ vs. ‘Future Self’”

Intensive English is a four-skills English course (listening, speaking, reading, writing). For your homework, you need to imagine yourself five months in the future. What specific goals do you have for your English language skills? Be creative and specific!

Now:

- Listening:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Speaking:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Reading:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Writing:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

Future:

- Listening:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Speaking:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Reading:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 

- Writing:
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
### APPENDIX 2: Retrospective Quantitative Motivation Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can determine your motivation level by looking at the table below. For each week, estimate your motivation level from 1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high. This will help you track your progress and identify areas for improvement.
APPENDIX 3: Retrospective Qualitative Motivation Assessment

Looking back at this semester...

1) Were there times or activities that gave you a lot of motivation? Please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2) Were there times or activities that lowered your motivation? Please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3) At the beginning of the semester, you were asked to draw a picture of your future-self. Are you that person today? Have you come closer? What areas do you still need to work on?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________