



Taylor & Francis  
Taylor & Francis Group

---

The Role of Motivation among Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners of Russian

Author(s): Anna Geisherik

Source: *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 46, No. 1/2 (March-June 2004), pp. 9-22

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40870935>

Accessed: 06-02-2018 15:19 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Taylor & Francis, Ltd.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*

*Anna Geisherik*

## **The Role of Motivation among Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners of Russian**

**ABSTRACT:** Because motivation plays a major role in the development of language proficiency, it is important to understand what motivates learners. Unfortunately, instructors of heritage languages are not often aware of the specific motivations driving their students. This article considers motivation as an 'integrative orientation' and as an 'instrumental orientation' to understand heritage speakers who enroll in Russian language courses. My research project was devised to identify the motivations of Russian language learners and to compare the motivations of heritage learners with those of non-heritage learners. With this purpose in mind two questionnaires were applied: one that comprises a section of a placement test used in heritage learner classes; the other consisting of a formal questionnaire distributed among forty learners of Russian in two North American universities. My article discusses the results of both surveys as well as their implications for classroom use and further research. The findings of this study might encourage Russian language instructors to reexamine how their own students' motivational factors affect their own language development and how the curriculum addresses students' needs.

Motivation significantly determines the level of proficiency achieved by learners. Gardner (1985: 10) defines motivation as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and satisfaction experienced in this activity." Many second language acquisition researchers agree that an individual's motivation is based on the following factors: (1) attitudes towards the community and people who speak the language; (2) attitudes toward learning the language in question; (3) attitudes toward learning languages and language learning in general; and (4) the goals pursued through language learning (Ellis 1994, Noels and Clement 1989). Gardner and Lambert (1972) suggest that motivation is the main psychological factor in explaining second language achievement. Gardner (cited in Oxford and Shearin 1994) perceives motivation as consisting of four elements: a goal, the desire to attain the goal, positive attitudes toward learning the language, and effortful behaviour to that effect.

Research continues to show that motivation plays a major part in students' choices of L2 learning strategies as well as the proficiency levels they achieve. Thus, it is extremely important to understand the nature of student motivation. However, language instructors are often not aware of their students' specific motivations. As Oxford and Shearin (1994) indicate, optimal teaching demands

that teachers understand why their students are studying a language and how proficient the students want to become. According to these scholars, “actual motivations of students are infrequently employed for establishing the nature of classroom activities,” even though “a simple questionnaire or essay assigned at the beginning of the term could provide valuable information on student motivation” (1994: 16).

Because the teaching of heritage speakers is not yet well established, and because research about the needs of Russian heritage learners has appeared only in recent years (Andrews 2001; Bermel and Kagan 2000; Kagan and Dillon 2001; Polinsky 2000, and others), instructors often make assumptions about many important issues, including motivation. My goal in this article is to report on the primary motivations of heritage learners of Russian, and to make some generalizations that could provide another dimension to research on the motivation of heritage learners across languages.

I would like to focus on two particular types of motivation which, in current second language acquisition research, are labeled as ‘integrative orientation’ and ‘instrumental orientation.’ According to scholars, in the former orientation the learner wishes to learn a language in order to integrate into the culture and society of the language group. In the latter the learning of a language is motivated by the desire to achieve instrumental goals, such as academic achievement, and/or professional and economic advancement (Suarez 1998). These two orientations are at center stage of current research on language learning motivation.

Critics of this dichotomous model suggest that it might not cover all the possible kinds of L2 learning motivation. After examining the motivations of non-heritage learners of Russian, Romanov (2000) calls for expansion of the integrative/instrumental approach to foreign language motivation. He concludes that the leading reasons for studying Russian are “neither purely instrumental nor exclusively integrative and include mixed motives such as travel, a desire to know more about Russia, a wish to understand Russian culture better, and a desire to learn foreign languages” (2000: 155). Oxford and Shearin (1994) describe a survey conducted in 1991, involving 218 American high school students of Japanese who wrote an essay explaining their motivation for studying the language. Although many students displayed either an instrumental or an integrative motivational orientation, more than two-thirds of them had additional reasons for taking Japanese—among them: receiving intellectual stimulation; seeking a personal challenge; enjoying the elitism of taking a difficult language; showing off to friends; aiding world peace; and even having a private code that parents would not know (1994: 12). These results indicate that restricting language learning motivation research to integrative and instrumental

orientations only may not be sufficient and that there is a need for further research in this area. I believe, nonetheless, that these orientations are an important starting point. Also, they are the only motivations (out of those listed in this survey) that can be applied to Russian heritage learner research. Below is the discussion of the additional motivational reasons mentioned in Oxford and Shearin's (1994) survey and their relevance to Russian heritage learner research.

Unlike Spanish, French or German, both Russian and Japanese are among the Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTL) in American schools and universities. Moreover, both are considered among the most difficult to learn for an English-speaking student. I would like to point out that although learners of Japanese in this survey were not heritage speakers, it is not unreasonable to compare their attitudes to those of Russian heritage learners because the latter, in contrast to non-heritage learners, are not always consciously aware of having special language learning needs. Many schools do not offer special classes for heritage learners of Russian, nor do they label such students as heritage learners. Many language program coordinators simply keep in mind the background of heritage students and try to accommodate their needs to the best of their ability. Thus, while such learners might see their background as an advantage in studying the language (a factor that might play a role in their choice of a foreign language), they do not view themselves as a different group requiring a separate language class.

Because of such an attitude, the majority of Russian heritage students come to class actually unaware of the challenges that are ahead of them. They come to study a language, which most of them can speak, while some of them can read or write to some extent. Many of them believe it will be easier to advance in Russian rather than in another foreign language. In most cases the presumption turns out to be false. It also appears that seeking a personal challenge is not the main reason our students take Russian. The same can be said for the majority of other reasons listed in Oxford and Shearin's (1994) survey: the elitism of taking a difficult language and the desire to show off to friends may be offset by the fact that these students can say that they already have some knowledge of Russian. As for developing a private code that parents would not understand (a reason quite popular among learners of foreign languages, especially teenagers), this reason does not apply, since the language they study is native for their parents or grandparents.

As we can see, with the exception for the instrumental and integrative orientations, none of the additional reasons listed in Oxford and Shearin's (1994) survey can be applied to heritage learners of Russian. It needs to be emphasized that the integrative and instrumental orientations are among those reasons for taking a foreign language, which can be purposefully addressed in the design of

a language curriculum. For example, instructors can select and devise methodologies that address the needs of teaching literacy focused on business writing, on reading publicistic (or other) texts, and on writing social, informal letters, etc. However, instructors cannot select and devise methodologies that address their students' attitudes toward a language, as opposed to their goals for studying it. If students do not consider a language to be "elite," or if they believe—often erroneously—that studying their heritage language will be easier, less challenging than learning another foreign language, which they have never studied, there is little that the instructor can do. On the other hand, if instructors are aware that their students come to class with the clear intention of becoming members of the target language community (integrative orientation) or of using the language for future business reasons (instrumental orientation), the instructors are able to design the curriculum accordingly. This alone should alert us to the value of determining our students' reasons for learning Russian and to see which motivational model best describes their perspective.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) argue that because the integrative orientation came from positive attitudes toward the target language group, language learners with this orientation would be better motivated to learn than those with an instrumental orientation. Many studies have focused on the relationship between attitudes, motivation, and the achievement of learners. Although the majority of these studies agree on the existence of such a relationship and its influence on the outcome, their results were not always consistent with Gardner and Lambert's theory. Some researchers found that instrumentally-oriented language learners were more proficient in the second language (Lukmani 1972); others discovered that both orientations were associated with high levels of proficiency (Gardner and Santos 1970); and still others found a negative correlation between integrative orientation and second language proficiency (Oller, Hudson and Liu 1977).

An interesting study by Clement and Kruidenier (1983) focused on eight groups of students living in multicultural and unicultural environments and studying English, French or Spanish as a second language. After determining the specific orientations of these groups of students (for example, some students learned a second language in order to achieve pragmatic goals, i.e., the instrumental orientation, others in order to travel, to seek new friendships) the authors were able to show that these orientations were significant predictors of the student's motivation to learn the second language.

However, Clement and Kruidenier (1983), like many other researchers with similar findings, failed to address one important aspect, namely the ethno-linguistic background of the individual studying the second language. Noels and Clement (1989) were among the few researchers to consider this issue, focusing

on a systematic comparison between the orientations of students learning a heritage language with students learning the same language as a second language. They conducted a study among first-year students of German at the University of Ottawa and at Carleton. Fifty-nine percent of the students claimed no German background, and 41% indicated that one or both of their parents had German-speaking heritage. The point of the study was to elicit information regarding students' motivational orientations and to see whether they are different for students with and without German background. The students were given a questionnaire with orientation items, and their answers were analyzed to compare heritage and non-heritage language learners on orientation, motivation, attitude, and other factors. This approach was innovative and raised a very important question of possible differences in the needs of heritage versus non-heritage learners, which could prompt the search for different strategies in teaching to these groups of students.

The findings of the study were as follows: 1) Motivation in second language learners was associated with achievement and was related to an "integrative" orientation; 2) Students with German-speaking background, while demonstrating a higher incidence of contact and higher self-confidence, did not manifest stronger motivation or higher achievement. Noels and Clement (1989) suggest an interesting explanation for their findings:

...the core language courses available in the university situation are not conducive to encouraging development of language skills among these individuals. These students already have a German language background, a fact which may explain their general self-confidence... At the same time, however, their identity-influence orientation, which may concord with their life situation, may be contrary to goals addressed by the written exercises of the German class context. Thus, from the motivational point of view, the heritage learner finds him/herself in an environment which does not fulfill his/ her particular needs (1989: 255).

It is necessary to mention here the "Survey of Heritage Speakers: Motivation (2000)" by Kagan and Dillon (2001). This survey asked three groups of Russian heritage students (divided according to the highest level of education they completed in Russia) to choose from a list of reasons for studying the Russian language and literature. These reasons included: "Family; To preserve Russian culture; To read Russian literature; Career." The results of the survey indicated that approximately 70% of students who completed up to eight grades in Russia chose "Family" and "To preserve Russian Culture" as their reasons for studying Russian while only about 17% chose "Career" (2001: 518). These responses demonstrate that the overwhelming majority of Russian heritage students participating in this study are strongly guided by integrative motivation, as well as the desire to study Russian in order to preserve or to get acquainted

with their Russian cultural heritage and to obtain knowledge of Russian literature and history. Kagan and Dillon (2001) concluded that there should be another focus of instruction for heritage speakers, i.e., a culture/content-based curriculum.

Noels and Clement (1989) pointed out another extremely important aspect of heritage learners' attitudes that might influence their success in language acquisition, namely the fact that they might be inclined to concentrate on the development of particular language skills at the expense of others (1989: 256). The integrative orientation is linked to the desire to identify with the target language community, which means that the learner is likely to give primary importance to perfecting speaking and listening comprehension skills, while neglecting to develop writing and reading skills. While this has been the case in my experience of teaching Russian heritage students, it is also true that the majority of heritage students include some form of literacy in the list of goals they wish to pursue (for example, the ability to write letters in the heritage language, as indicated in the analysis of questionnaires below). So how do we explain the discrepancy between heritage students' neglect of literacy skills and their stated goals for achieving these skills? There are many reasons, but in my opinion, part of the answer lies in the fact that a typical heritage learner (and arguably a typical foreign language learner in general) lacks the understanding of literacy proficiency as a notion. Simply put, heritage learners consider literacy to be a mere transcription of spoken language, therefore they perceive the acquisition of literacy skills as secondary to the acquisition of speaking skills (with the exception of the need to learn the Cyrillic alphabet for those learners who do not know it). Consequently, the primary task for the instructor in a heritage classroom is to point out the difference between the literary written language and the spoken language, as well as the fact that the literacy skills have to be learned in conjunction with, but not secondary to, speaking skills.

For those students whose goals in learning the heritage language are indicative of their instrumental orientation, it is important to understand that in today's American multicultural society literacy is crucial to become successful and influential. However, this simple truth might not be that obvious to a heritage language learner, who associates literacy in English (rather than literacy in the heritage language) with being successful in America. Although these learners view their heritage language as an advantage for their future resume and/or field of work, when they come to the language class they simply want to "brush up" on their ancestral language. They do not, as a rule, realize that the ability to write grammatically and stylistically correct documents or letters, and the ability to read complex information in that language is extremely important for success in many fields. This is further complicated by the fact that most

heritage learners come from ethnic communities where the language environment is not conducive to successful literacy education. The complexity of this situation is that the language used by most heritage learners is not only deficient in prescriptive grammar and vocabulary but also heavily altered by various linguistic and social influences (Polinsky 2000).

In an attempt to reconcile the learners' desires with the reality of life instructors should consider the need for presenting literacy training in the context of learners' orientation, motivation and attitude. In order to do that we first need to: 1) examine the orientations of our learners; 2) bring these orientations into the context of Russian; and 3) compare them with those of non-heritage learners of Russian. The first two points will help us determine the optimal directions in which literacy training should proceed. The latter will help to determine the advantage of separate specialized classes for heritage learners versus the customary mixed classes with those who are learners of Russian as a foreign language.

#### QUESTIONNAIRES AND ANALYSIS

To answer at least some questions concerning the particular motivations of heritage learners of Russian, my study sought to elicit such information directly with the help of two questionnaires. The first one is a part of a placement test that is used in the heritage learner classes in order to determine the language level of the students before they begin the course. The second one was a formal questionnaire (discussed below).

#### QUESTIONNAIRE I

The placement test is conducted during the first (introductory) lesson of the semester and consists of two parts: the oral interview and the written part. For heritage speakers the written test has several general interest questions in Russian, a simple grammar assignment, a short translation from English into Russian, and for non-heritage students there are several general academic background questions in English. For both heritage and non-heritage students, these written assignments conclude with a question "Why do you want to take Russian?" This is an informal way of finding out the students' expectations when they sign up for the language class.

This project focused on forty placement tests submitted by heritage students during four semesters (academic years 2000-01 and 2001-02), and 23 tests submitted by non-heritage students in the Fall semester 2003. Out of forty tests submitted by heritage students, ten tests were incomplete, and fifteen tests had the same general answer: "I want to study Russian because I want to know it well." In some of these tests the particular skills mentioned were reading and

writing. The remaining fifteen tests had specific and extended answers, all of which consistently mentioned reading and writing as the goal of taking Russian. Below are some of these answers:

“My parents can speak and read, and I want to be able to.”

“I could write well a long time ago, and know I want to learn again. I became interested in Russian all over again, especially in reading and writing.”

“I want to learn Russian because I want to work in Russia.”

“I am embarrassed of the way I write, so I want to learn to write in script and without mistakes.”

“My grandparents and my father live abroad, and I want to write them letters in Russian. I can’t talk to them because I forgot Russian.”

“I am from the former Soviet Union and I should not forget my native language. I want to learn to write and read well.”

“I was born in Saint Petersburg and I was taught to read and write in Russian. Now I want to learn Russian grammar to improve my writing.”

From the answers it is overwhelmingly clear that the objective of the students is to learn to read and write. Moreover, the majority of the students acknowledge their present skills as insufficient, in need of improvement with the help of formal instruction. At the same time, they consider their speaking skills as acceptable. These findings are not consistent with the findings of Noels and Clement (1989), who concluded that goals addressed by the written exercises of the German class context are contrary to their students’ needs.

The responses submitted by non-heritage students were much less specific. None of them stressed any particular skills they wanted to focus on (unlike heritage students who mentioned reading and/or writing as a goal in the majority of their responses). Out of twenty-three responses submitted by non-heritages students three had an inclination toward the instrumental orientation:

“I have academic interests in one Central Asian former Soviet Republic.”

“I want to know Russian well so I can get a government job.”

“I would like to focus on translation of Russian writing one day.”

Most of the other responses indicated that exposure to various Russian environments sparked the students’ interest in learning the language. However this group of students, unlike the heritage students, did not indicate any specific goals for learning Russian. Below are some of the typical statements:

“I have friends who are Russian, and I am interested in the culture that goes along with the language.”

“My girlfriend is Russian and I have been living with her and her family.”

“My husband and his family speak Russian.”

“I have been interested in Russian language and culture ever since I was little.”

“Most of my friends speak Russian.”

## QUESTIONNAIRE 2

The main purpose of this questionnaire was to understand toward which motivational orientation heritage learners are inclined: instrumental or integrative, and to compare their orientation with that of non-heritage speakers. The questionnaire was adopted (with certain modifications) from the previously mentioned study by Noels and Clement (1989) who had studied the orientations of heritage learners of German in Canada. This questionnaire (cf. Appendix) consists of twenty reasons for students taking a Russian course. The questionnaire uses a five-point scale that allows students to indicate how much they agree with each item: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree, and, 1 = strongly disagree. All items are worded positively. When initially developed, the questionnaire contained twenty reasons for taking Russian: ten focused on instrumental orientation; seven focused on integrative orientation; and three were general items which were not included in the final calculation due to their neutral (neither integrative nor instrumental) nature. The latter were as follows: 9. "I took/intend to take a Russian language course to make me a more knowledgeable person"; 17. "To acquire new ideas and broaden my outlook"; and 19. "To understand and appreciate Russian art and literature." The instrumental and integrative items are placed in alternating order.

The questionnaire was distributed to forty student volunteers at State University of New York (Stony Brook) and the University of Southern California. All the participants were studying Russian at the time of the questionnaire, twenty-three were heritage speakers and seventeen were American students with no Russian background. The breakdown of students by levels of proficiency was as follows:

	Heritage speakers	Non-heritage speakers
Beginner	1	7
Intermediate	7	4
Advanced	6	6
Not indicated	9	

Separate calculations were made for the mean numbers of answers for heritage and non-heritage students. The goal was to find out the total mean value for each type of orientation, as well as the median which would allow us to see the tendencies of the two groups of students with respect to orientations (i.e., which questions were answered with the strongest opinions). Figure 1 represents the mean values of answers to each question according to the two groups of students. In the left column are the numbers of questions from the questionnaire in the original order. Odd numbers (in italics) represent integrative orientation,

whereas even numbers represent instrumental orientation (except questions 9, 17, and 19 which were general interest questions).

Figure 1

	Non-Heritage students		Heritage students	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
<i>1</i>	<i>3.29</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4.00</i>	<i>4.5</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3.00</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.52</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>1.46</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4.00</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>3.44</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>4.26</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>3.28</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4.26</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>3.17</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.39</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>2.63</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.91</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>8</i>	<i>3.29</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4.13</i>	<i>4</i>
<b><i>9</i></b>	<b><i>1.94</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>	<b><i>1.95</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
<i>10</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3.82</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>1.94</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2.73</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>12</i>	<i>2.34</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2.86</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>13</i>	<i>2.28</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>14</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3.95</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>3.22</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3.47</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>2.76</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>3</i>
<b><i>17</i></b>	<b><i>1.58</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>	<b><i>2.52</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
<i>18</i>	<i>3.76</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3.78</i>	<i>4</i>
<b><i>19</i></b>	<b><i>1.88</i></b>	<b><i>1</i></b>	<b><i>2.08</i></b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
<i>20</i>	<i>3.35</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.17</i>	<i>3</i>

The average mean values are:

- Integrative orientation of non-heritage students 2.58
- Instrumental orientation of non-heritage students 3.22
- Integrative orientation of heritage students 3.71
- Instrumental orientation of heritage students 3.61

This small, sample-size study was exploratory in practice and limited in its findings, but from the results of the survey we can see that the lowest motivation was found among non-heritage students concerning the integrative orientation (average mean 2.58), and the highest motivation was found in heritage students concerning the integrative orientation (average mean 3.71). Also, the instrumental orientation of heritage students is higher than either orientation of non-heritage students. With such subtle differences one should speak about

tendencies rather than well-defined patterns. However, the understanding of these tendencies can provide us with useful information as to how to approach our students' needs when designing the curriculum.

The results of the study pertaining to Russian heritage students are consistent with the results of the "Survey of Heritage Speakers: Motivation (2000)" by Kagan and Dillon (2001: 518), which concluded that the majority of Russian heritage students that participated in this study show strong integrative motivation. However, the findings of this study contradict the findings of the aforementioned study of German heritage students (Noels and Clement 1989), which indicated that heritage students had lower motivations compared to non-heritage students. A possible explanation of the inconsistency might arise from the fact that the Russian immigration is a relatively young one, and most of the students have one or both parents who were born or grew up in Russia. In contrast, Noels and Clement (1989) focused on German ancestry more broadly, and the participants of the survey could have been second generation immigrants, from households that do not speak German. It can be concluded that Russian heritage speakers do not feel sufficiently connected to, and integrated into, their heritage community. This might have made integrative orientation as their strongest motivation, and their motivation overall stronger than that of the non-heritage students. Also, we can see that integration into the language community is not the primary goal of non-heritage students of Russian. Rather, their goals are more practical. They are looking for instrumental application of their language skills.

#### ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

An important aspect of applying motivation theories to classroom situations is the relationship between motivation and individualized instruction. Ames and Archer (1988) have closely examined the issue of mastery vs. relative performance, where mastery is a criterion-referenced concept in which student performance is compared against a criterion or objective, and relative performance is a norm-referenced concept involving comparing students' performances against one another (Ames and Archer 1988; Oxford and Shearin 1994). They determined that attitudes of students differ when the two situations are compared. It seems that when a clear objective is to be achieved, students tend to value the learning process and the importance of effort much more than when their performance is compared to that of other students. In the latter case they tend to concentrate on outperforming others and achieving success with little effort. Ames and Archer suggest that focusing on using a clear objective and setting specific goals in designing a classroom curriculum (rather than

comparing students to one another) can bring positive motivational attitudes into the classroom and thereby develop long-term use of learning strategies.

This research is very relevant to the situation in Russian and other heritage classrooms, not only because it underscores the importance of goal setting, but also because we cannot compare student performances on an absolute scale since they start their language education on very different levels. It is practically impossible to find a classroom of heritage students with similar levels of language skills. When dealing with American learners of Russian as a foreign language, we can assess their language skills based on the number of years they have studied Russian and based on their exposure to Russian culture (communication with native speakers, trips to Russia, etc.) However, when dealing with heritage speakers of Russian (or any other language) we have to take into consideration their family background (urban or rural, including regional differences), the amount of exposure to the language in the family (daily basis or occasional), the development of all four skills (speaking, comprehension, reading and writing) according to formal and informal instruction and the age when it started. All these factors cannot be the same or even close for all the students in a heritage classroom.

Moreover, the goals of heritage language learners are very different, even if they fall under the same motivational orientation (instrumental or integrative). This underscores the importance of setting objectives for students and raises the question about setting individual goals for each student or groups of students within one classroom. It seems that the best way to approach instruction and assessment is to make them as personalized as possible. Some examples of individual attention include (but are not limited to) personalized homework assignments, group work in class when groups can be formed among similar-level students with the goal of working on common problems for that group, or alternatively mixed-level groups with the goal of getting the students to help one another. The findings presented in this paper might encourage Russian language instructors to reexamine how their own students' motivational factors affect their language development and what might be added or changed in their curriculum to better meet students' needs.

#### REFERENCES

- Ames, Carole and Jennifer Archer. 1988. "Achievement Goals in The Classroom: Students' Learning Strategies and Motivation Process," *Educational Psychology* 80: 260-67.
- Andrews, David R. 2001. "Teaching the Heritage Russian Heritage Learner: Socio- and Psycholinguistic Perspectives," *Slavic and East European Journal* 45.3: 519-31.

- Bermel, Neil and Olga Kagan. 2000. "The Maintenance of Written Russian in Heritage Speakers," in Kagan and Rifkin (2000): 405-37.
- Clement, Richard and Bastian G. Kruidenier. 1983. "Orientations in Second Language Acquisition: I. The Effects of Ethnicity, Milieu, and Target Language on Their Emergence," *Language Learning* 33: 273-91.
- Ellis, Rod. 1994. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, Robert C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Gardner, Robert C. and E. H. Santos. 1970. "Motivation Variables in Second Language Acquisition: A Philippine Investigation," *Research Bulletin* 149 (Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario).
- Kagan, Olga and Benjamin Rifkin, eds. 2000. *The Learning and Teaching of Slavic Languages and Cultures*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Kagan, Olga and Kathleen Dillon. 2001. "A New Perspective on Teaching Russian: Focus on the Heritage Learner," *Slavic and East European Journal* 45.3: 507-18.
- Lukmani M. 1972. "Motivation to Learn and Language Proficiency," *Language Learning* 7: 261-63.
- Noels, Kimberly A. and Richard Clement. 1989. "Orientations to Learning German: The Effects of Language Heritage on Second-Language Acquisition," *Canadian Modern Language Review* 45.2: 245-57.
- Oller, John W., Alan J. Hudson and Phyllis F. Liu. 1977. "Attitudes and Attained Proficiency in ESL: A Sociolinguistic Study of Native Speakers of Chinese in the United States," *Language Learning* 77: 1-27.
- Oxford, Rebecca and Jill Shearin. 1994. "Language Learning Motivation: Expanding the Theoretical Framework," *The Modern Language Journal* 78.1: 13-28.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2000. "A Composite Linguistic Profile of a Speaker of Russian in the U.S.," in Kagan and Rifkin (2000) 437-67.
- Romanov, Artemi. 2000. "Student Motivation For Studying Russian: Survey And Analysis," in Kagan and Rifkin (2000) 145-66.
- Suarez, Debra A. 1998. "Heritage Language Maintenance and Its Relationship to Second Language Instruction." Diss. State University of New York, Albany.

## APPENDIX

Level \_\_\_\_\_

H.S. \_\_\_\_\_

**Questionnaire 2**  
**Orientations to Learning Russian**

Please rate the following statements from 1 to 5 (where 1 is “strongly agree” and 5 is “strongly disagree”) as they reflect your personal motivation in taking Russian language courses. Please note: while some statements may look alike, all of them differ slightly from one another. So please consider each statement separately from others.

Circle the numbers. At the top left corner write the highest level of Russian you have taken or intend to take in the near future.

I took / intend to take a Russian language course:	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. To find out how people live in Russian-speaking areas	1	2	3	4	5
2. Because it is necessary in my future education plans	1	2	3	4	5
3. To travel to Russia (or the former Soviet Union) for personal reasons	1	2	3	4	5
4. To travel to Russia (or the former Soviet Union) for business reasons	1	2	3	4	5
5. To become a member of the Russian American community	1	2	3	4	5
6. Because it will be useful someday in getting a good job	1	2	3	4	5
7. To help me better understand Russian Americans and their way of life	1	2	3	4	5
9. To make me a more knowledgeable person	1	2	3	4	5
10. To help me to be successful in business	1	2	3	4	5
11. To meet some Russian people	1	2	3	4	5
12. Because it will be useful to me after I leave school	1	2	3	4	5
13. To gain good friends more easily among Russian-speaking people	1	2	3	4	5
14. To become an influential member of my community	1	2	3	4	5
15. Because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of another language	1	2	3	4	5
16. To get a job where I could use my Russian	1	2	3	4	5
17. To acquire new ideas and broaden my outlook	1	2	3	4	5
18. To get a better-paying job	1	2	3	4	5
19. To understand and appreciate Russian art and literature	1	2	3	4	5
20. Because it will be a good addition to my resume	1	2	3	4	5