



Theses and Dissertations

2020-07-30

An Exploration of Mental Contrasting and Social Networks of English Language Learners

Adam T. Pinkston
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Pinkston, Adam T., "An Exploration of Mental Contrasting and Social Networks of English Language Learners" (2020). *Theses and Dissertations*. 9155.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/9155>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

An Exploration of Mental Contrasting and Social Networks of English Language Learners

Adam T. Pinkston

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Dan P. Dewey, Chair
Ben McMurry
Norman W. Evans

Department of Linguistics
Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2020 Adam T. Pinkston

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

An Exploration of Mental Contrasting and Social Networks of English Language Learners

Adam T. Pinkston
Department of Linguistics, BYU
Master of Arts

This study focuses on how applying MCII, a wish-fulfillment and goal-setting method researched by Gabriele Oettingen, benefits the quantity and quality of English language learners' (ELLs) social networks while participating in a study abroad program in the United States. This is done by instructing participants in the use of MCII, giving them weekly reminders on that instruction and the goals they set, and by measuring change from beginning to end. Analyzing the social networks of 36 English language learners at an intensive English program (IEP) after 14 weeks of instruction shows that the ELLs displayed growth in the number of ways they met new people and in the depth of their relationships. This study also shows although learners who used MCII largely perceived it positively and noted using it in their lives, there was no significant difference between that group and those who did not use MCII in terms of proficiency development.

Keywords: intensive English program, mental contrasting, social network, study abroad, WOOP

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my parents, Tom and Mary Pinkston, for supporting me, not only in my journey to obtaining a Master's degree, but in everything I have aspired to accomplish in my life thus far. I would also like to thank my brother, Ryan Miller, who helped me numerous times throughout the writing and analysis process of this document. I also give special thanks to my friend Liz, who has inspired me and helped me believe in myself.

I recognize the assistance of Dr. Dennis Eggett, who supplied his statistical expertise in the analysis of the data presented. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the members of my thesis committee, Drs. Norm Evans and Ben McMurry, for their time and efforts in supplying vital feedback and assistance on this project. Lastly, I give thanks to my thesis chair, Dr. Dan Dewey, for being a great mentor, teacher, and friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature.....	2
Methods.....	9
Participants.....	9
Materials.....	10
SASIQ.....	10
MCII Survey and Writing Prompts.....	11
Design.....	12
Procedures and Analyses.....	12
Results.....	14
SASIQ Data.....	14
MCII Survey & Writing Prompts.....	18
Discussion.....	20
Social Network Measures.....	21
MCII Survey and Writing Prompts.....	25
Limitations.....	26
Conclusion.....	28
References.....	29
Appendix A.....	35
Appendix B.....	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 *SASIQ Terms and Definitions* 10

Table 2 *Change Over Time Data from Pre- to Post-SASIQ: Control vs Treatment (MCII)* 15

Table 3 *Independent Samples T-Test for Change Over Time from Pre- to Post-SASIQ* 17

Table 4 *Percentage of Agreement to MCII Survey Questions for Treatment Group*..... 19

Introduction

Many language learners who participate in a study abroad (SA) program do so with social interaction as a key focus. These learners could stay home and continue to study English in a foreign language context, but they recognize the importance of being immersed in the language culture and the opportunities provided by interacting with native speakers. However, despite the benefits of social interaction on language learning, communicating with native speakers presents its own set of issues despite the best intentions of any study abroad program. SA programs do not have the ability to force participants into socializing. Tasks and assignments can be given that ask for a certain number of hours but at the end of the day, if someone does not wish to socialize, whether that is due to being shy or tired or any other reason, that person will not socialize.

Mental contrasting with implementation intentions (MCII) is a self-regulation strategy designed to help its users alter behavior, stop or start habits, and increase the rate of successful individual goal attainment (Oettingen, 2012; Kirk, Oettingen, & Gollwitzer 2013). It has been applied to a number of social interaction scenarios (Łakuta, 2020; Lee, Dewey, Brown, & Belnap, 2018). Previous research in this area suggests a positive relationship between the use of MCII and the building of social networks during study abroad programs. The research of Lee et al. (2018) and Brown et al. (in press) seeks to shed some light on the influence of MCII on social networks, a novel application of MCII. In their pioneering small-scale study, Lee et al. found that MCII could be credited for increasing the durability and dispersion of learners' social networks, leading them to conclude that MCII "show[ed] potential to enhance social network formation with L2 speakers." Brown et al. took that a step deeper gathering data from additional comparable participants and seeking to identify other trends. They found that two other aspects of social networks were most impacted by MCII instruction: size and intensity. Both studies

indicated benefits of MCII in terms of social network development, but the fact that these benefits showed in different aspects of learners' social networks suggests the need for further research.

The researchers of this study analyzed the social networks of 36 English language learners at the English Language Center (ELC), an intensive English program (IEP) in Provo, Utah, comparing the difference in social network gains between a treatment and control group after 14 weeks of instruction. Surveys and student journal responses provide additional data, further aiding in the analysis of MCII's effect on social networks.

Review of Literature

Researchers have recognized the importance of social interaction in terms of language learning since at least Allwright's 1984 article introducing the idea as the interaction hypothesis (Johnson, K., & Johnson, H., 1999; Allwright, 1984), a name by which it would be known for the next couple of decades. Allwright's hypothesis directly reflects common beliefs on L2 face-to-face interaction promoting proficiency gains. Interaction is also central in communicative language teaching (CLT), a popular language instruction approach introduced in the late 90s that focuses on authentic language use and communication (Savignon, 1997). Much of the well-known second language acquisition research, like Long's 1985 study on interaction in terms of target language use, negotiation of meaning, and comprehensible input or Krashen's 1985 study on comprehensible input and $i+1$ during interaction, has led to the contemporary focus on communicative teaching practices and the importance of authenticity, immersion, and social interaction. Despite the mystery surrounding the positive impact of interaction on L2 acquisition, many agree that it is valuable, and possibly vital, to second language teaching and acquisition.

For the purposes of this study, interaction is defined as a social event between two or more individuals. Social interactions can be isolated events, like asking an attendant at a store for help or signing for a package delivery, and they can be contiguous in nature like daily exchanges with a neighbor, roommate, or family member. Milroy (1980), a researcher specializing in sociolinguistics, looked at L1 social groups and suggested that these groups have a noticeable effect on language, meaning that the closer one's social ties are to a given community, the more dialectical speech that individual will use. Milroy helped bring social science research, including that of social networks, to the linguistic world and, by extension, the world of second language acquisition. Social networks are informal groups of people that have contracted themselves together on the basis of various qualifiers, including, but not limited to: proximity, family, work, and shared interests (see Milroy, 1980 and Scott, 2017). This definition will be used when referring to social networks.

Exploring social networks even further, social researchers have taken Milroy's ideas and developed them. One addition of note is the research of Lin et al. (1981) that talks about social networks in terms of social resources. Lin et al. define social resources as wealth, status, power, and social ties. These resources contribute to social interaction and provide a potential reasoning for why interaction aids language acquisition and for the interlocutor's motives (Tong et al., 2010). Social networks also lay a foundation for how individuals use the resources provided to them by their social networks to maintain or promote self-interests, of which language acquisition can be considered one (Lin 1982).

Viewing language as a shareable social resource further strengthens the suggestion that L2 development and proficiency is influenced by social interaction. To determine if a link existed between social networks and language use, Dewey et al. (2014) surveyed a group of

study abroad participants and found that “social network size was a positive predictor for out-of-class hours [of language use]” (p. 53), denoting that greater amounts of language use were correlated with larger social networks. Additional research by Fraser (2002) also supports a positive relationship between social networks and L2 language use by connecting positive gains in reading and writing among SA participants to the use of experiential learning (like joining a sports team, orchestra, or theatre troupe); experiences that require the building and maintaining of social network.

Research suggests that social network size is important for L2 use and development (Brown et al., in press; Dewey et al.; 2014; Fraser, 2002; Surra and Milardo, 1991). In a study done on social network quality, researchers found that social network size led to an increase in overall quality. In this case, quality is defined as the shared resources of a social network. As one’s social network increases in size, so, too, do the shared resources (or quality) of that group. Such a definition helps explain how increased quantity, in this instance, can also mean increased quality (Tong, Hung, & Yuen, 2010). We recognize this link between quality and size but want to make it clear that when referencing social network quality in this study, we equate it with intensity (closeness of relationships), durability (frequency of interaction) and other such descriptive social network metrics and not size alone.

Study abroad offers students a special learning experience that includes the combination of social interaction and the opportunity to enhance their social networks. Those in charge of study abroad programs understand this link and often encourage students to interact with native speakers as frequently as possible, using tools like speaking journals (where students are encouraged to interact with others and to record their experiences) and interviews. Even without the encouragement of professors, making these moments happen, creating bonds and friendships,

seems to come naturally for many students studying abroad (Dewey, Bown, Baker, Martinsen, Gold, & Eggett, 2014); despite this, however, many study abroad students still struggle due to deeper sociolinguistic complexities (Ring, Gardner, & Dewey, 2013; Wilkinson, 1998a, 1998b). These sociolinguistic complexities may include: personality differences, gender norms and differences, and lack of time and opportunity to interact with locals (Dewey, Ring, Gardner, & Belnap, 2013; Ring, Gardner, & Dewey, 2013; Baker-Smemoe, Dewey, Bown, & Martinsen, 2014). Beyond the amount and variability of these challenges, studies that have examined the effects of study abroad programs have shown that students often end up disappointed by not making the language improvements that they had hoped for (Wilkinson, 1988b; DeKeyser, 2010), further increasing demotivation.

Notwithstanding the thoughtful program interventions that seek to enhance the overall study abroad experience (Trentman, 2012; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009), the students themselves must take on the primary responsibility of making study abroad experiences count for them, meaning that they should be actively involved in creating multiple positive communication experiences with locals. The vast array of individual differences makes it impossible for any one study abroad program to meet the needs of every learner. Bown, Dewey and Belnap (2015) outlines some of the key responsibilities that each student has, “learners themselves must regulate their own learning and the learning environment, inasmuch as the sociohistorical context allows them to” (p. 216). Lantolf & Pavlenko (2001) back up this idea of learner responsibility by describing students as agents who “actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning” (p. 145). Hence, it is not sufficient for study abroad programs to create a well-designed, organized, and implemented program because the students

must head their own study abroad experience and learning, especially in terms of social network building.

For language learners to take charge of their own learning and social network building, they need to be able to self-regulate. Self-regulation is the processes that individuals use to manage actions, attitudes, behaviors, thoughts, and emotions. For the purposes of academia, self-regulation refers to effective planning, goal-setting, strategy use, and self-evaluation. Beyond the ability of self-regulation to help language learners achieve greater academic success (Zimmerman, 1990), it can also help language learners with proficiency gains in the target language, make learning more effective and enjoyable, and help learners face anxieties and complicated challenges (Oxford, 2011; Wen-Ta Tseng, Dörnyei, & Schmitt, 2006; Ortega, 2013). Self-regulated learners tend to be the ones who learn the best from study abroad experiences (Macaro, 2001).

The research of Bown et al. (2015) displays how self-regulation strategies aid students in a study abroad setting, even amidst high-quality program interventions. Bown et al. looked at Arabic learners studying abroad in Jordan and their use of self-regulation to evaluate their actions and social engagements; this led to generally favorable social networking experiences for these students. The researchers discovered that these learners set L2 use goals, interacted with interlocutors by displaying interest in them and asking worthwhile questions, maintained L2 use even if the native Arabic speaker did not, and incorporated pre-speaking strategies like studying new vocabulary, specifically among topics of interest to the students. In this case, self-regulation allowed the learners to create for themselves a positive study abroad experience through the use of social networks.

A prominent self-regulation tool, known as MCII, is actually a combination of two different strategies: mental contrasting and implementation intentions. Mental contrasting is a self-regulation strategy developed by Gabriele Oettingen (2000). It starts with visualizing a wish or goal and then contrasting that goal with the obstacles of the present. By visualizing the wish and contrasting it with the reality and with potential obstacles, it exercises the mind and prompts it to act (Oettingen et al., 2009). The second strategy, implementation intentions, typically take the form of if-then statements (“if X happens, then I will do Y and Z”), promoting a positive reaction to the challenges presented (Gollwitzer & Sheeran, 2006). Uniting mental contrasting and implementation intentions further emphasizes the connection between the initial visualization of the wish and the perceived outcome of that wish (Oettingen & Cachia, 2016). MCII is sometimes referred to by the acronym WOOP, which stands for wish, outcome, obstacle, and plan.

Beyond the increase in goal attainment that MCII provides over simple goal-setting, it has also proven itself as an effective strategy for modifying behavior within a wide variety of ages, ethnicities, and circumstances (Oettingen & Cachia, 2016). Research has shown that those who use MCII have been able to: improve their health through increased physical activity (Marquardt, Oettingen, Gollwitzer, Sheeran, & Liepert, 2017), modify eating habits (Loy, Wieber, Gollwitzer, & Oettingen, 2016), better relationships (Houssais, Oettingen, & Mayer, 2013), boost time management abilities (Oettingen, Kappes, Barry, Guttenberg, & Gollwitzer, 2015), and advance in a multitude of other areas (see Appendix A, based on <https://woopmylife.org/en/science>).

MCII’s effectiveness in other areas indicates that it would also be an effective strategy for language acquisition and social network development (specifically during a study abroad

program). MCII applied to study abroad is a relatively fresh field of study, with comparatively little research having been done, warranting additional examination. Brown et al. (in press) provides a recent example:

K. Belnap (personal communication, March 29, 2018) taught MCII to Arabic speaking study abroad students during a semester in Jordan in 2017, and he reported that several students praised this strategy because it led to them having the confidence to talk to native speakers, having patience with the culture, and staying motivated to continue practicing Arabic. One student reported that this technique really helped him see past certain aspects of the culture he didn't understand or appreciate and to ultimately love the people and culture more (B. Stimpson, personal communication, April 13, 2018). (p. 8-9)

Another recent example includes the research of Lee et al. (2018). In this study, Lee et al. looked at 84 English language learners (ELLs) at an intensive English program (IEP) in the United States, evaluating the impact of MCII on the students' social networks while studying abroad. The ELLs were split into a treatment group of 43 students and a control group of 41 students. All the students took a social network survey before and after the 14-week semester. Results reported that students who used MCII outperformed those who did not (specifically in relation to English use, total number of social groups, and the total number of people who were in more than one social group). However, no significant difference was found in social network size or closeness of the relationship.

The most recent research, performed by Brown et al. (in press), surveyed 107 ELLs (47 in the control group and 60 in the treatment group) in a similar study to that of Lee et al. (2018). Participants in Brown's study were given a pre and post test using the Study Abroad Social

Interaction Questionnaire (SASIQ), as well as a day of MCII instruction and weekly writing prompts that focused on participants' usage of MCII. Brown et al. found that use of MCII by students in a study abroad setting had positive impacts: increasing the size of ELLs' social networks, boosting overall English usage throughout the day, and fostering closer relationships with members of students' social networks. The biggest gains were made by new students in the study abroad program using MCII versus returning students.

The current study seeks to further increase understanding of how MCII can promote social networks for L2 learners while on study abroad. The research of Lee et al. (2018) and Brown et al. (in press) were necessary and paramount, but our study looks to appraise and add to previous research findings by asking the following research questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the social network development of those taught to use MCII (experimental) and those not taught (control)?
2. Do participants perceive MCII as helpful in regard to developing their social networks?

Methods

Participants

In order to best address the research questions outlined above, we used two writing classes at the BYU English Language Center (ELC) in Provo, Utah, each with 17 students, for a total of 34 participants. Of these students, 19 were male and 15 were female. They come from various first-language backgrounds including: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Spanish. The students were all non-matriculated students preparing for undergraduate studies in the U.S. with general proficiency estimated to be around the intermediate mid level on the ACTFL proficiency scale (ACTFL, 2012.).

Materials

SASIQ

Information on the participants' social networks was collected using the Study Abroad Social Interaction Questionnaire (SASIQ) and supplemented with survey data on participants' perceptions of and attitudes toward MCII.

Dewey and other collaborators (Dewey et al., 2012; Dewey, Belnap, et al., 2013; Dewey, Ring, Gardner, & Belnap, 2013) created the SASIQ for use in study abroad research, and that questionnaire has been used thereafter in numerous other studies that measure the social networks of language learners abroad. In Dewey et al.'s 2014 study, SASIQ reliability estimates were found to range from .75 to .95 based on test-retest. The SASIQ has been used to determine size, durability, intensity, density, and dispersion of learners' social networks (Dewey et al., 2014; Baker-Smemoe, Dewey, & Bown, 2014). Table 1 defines these SASIQ related terms.

Table 1

SASIQ Terms and Definitions

SASIQ Term	Definition
Size	Refers to the number of friends a learner interacts with and was measured by asking learners to list the names of their English-speaking friends.
Durability	Measures the frequency of interaction with an individual . It was measured by asking participants to indicate how often they spoke English with each of the individuals they had listed.
Intensity	The closeness of the relationship between members of a social network . It was determined through use of a Likert scale with descriptors ranging from acquaintance to very-close friend, numerically represented from 1 to 8, respectively.

SASIQ Term	Definition
Density	Refers to the number of connections within a social group.
Dispersion	Measures the number of social groups that an individual belongs to , such as a school class, a church group, roommates, work peers, etc.
English Frequency	Refers to how often a participant uses English with members of their social network. Measured by the participants on a scale of 1 to 3.
NL Frequency	Refers to how often a participant uses their native language with members of their social network. Measured by the participants on a scale of 1 to 3.
English Proficiency	Refers to the level of proficiency of the people that a participant indicated as being a part of their social network. Measured by the participants on a scale of 1 to 5.
Participant Proficiency	Refers to the proficiency level of the participants themselves. Measured by the participants on a scale of 1 to 5.
Hours Per Month	The hours per month that participants conversed with members of their social networks.
Methods	Refers to the number of different methods employed by the participants for the purpose of social interaction and social network growth. Such methods could include meeting people from their area of residence (like roommates, neighbors, or host family members), through school, or as part of a sports team.
English Percentage	The percentage of time that the participants estimated spending time doing activities in English.
NL Percentage	The percentage of time that the participants estimated spending time doing activities in their native language.

MCII Survey and Writing Prompts

In order to provide us with the participants' perceptions on the effectiveness of MCII, participants in the treatment group were also given weekly writing prompts that focused on

various aspects of MCII and social network growth, including: goal-setting, envisioning ideal outcomes and possible obstacles, planning, and personal reflection (see Appendix B).

Participants in the treatment group, those who were given instruction in MCII and how to implement it, were given targeted questions. The treatment group were asked weekly to reflect on their goal as formed through the MCII process and were also asked three questions that were alternated weekly: “What is an outcome you expect from speaking English with other people?” and “What is an obstacle to your socializing goal? What is your plan to overcome it this week?” At the end of the 14-week semester, those in the treatment group were also asked to reflect on their level of socializing as well as the following four questions: “Has your WOOP goal changed at all since the start of the semester? If yes, please explain why it changed. If no, please explain how close you have come to accomplishing your goal.”, “How has WOOP helped your level of social interaction this semester?”, “Will you continue to use WOOP for other life goals? Please answer truthfully.”, and “Would you recommend WOOP to your friends and family? Why or why not?”

Design

The treatment and control groups were composed of two writing classes, both approximately intermediate mid proficiency level (ACTFL, 2012.); one class was the control group and one class was the treatment group. To manage the teacher variable, the same teacher taught both the control and treatment classes. A total of 34 students, 17 in each group, participated in the study.

Procedures and Analyses

During the course of the 14-week semester, the SASIQ was administered twice, once near the beginning of the semester (during week two) as a pre-test and once near the end of the

semester (during the penultimate week) as a post-test. The SASIQ was the same for all participants; however, it was modified from pre-test to post-test. Pre-test SASIQ had some language altered to reflect the preliminary nature of its use, as well as had some questions left out that pertained to social groups which had not yet been formed at the beginning of the study. Size was determined based on participant reported numbers from the SASIQ and understood to be the overall number of people in a participant's social network. After data collection, change over time was analyzed from pre- to post-SASIQs using various statistical measures (seen below in Tables 2 and 3).

MCII instruction was given to the treatment class the same week that they took the pre-SASIQ. The instruction centered on the how and why of WOOP, meaning that participants were taught how to use it, its potential benefits (linguistic, social, personal, etc.), and why they should make use of it. Presentation material was taken straight from WOOP and MCII material prepared and created by Oettingen (see Appendix A). These materials elicited each step of WOOP (wish, outcome, obstacle, plan) from the participants. The final step of Plan required an if-then statement. Students were encouraged to utilize MCII in their social network development throughout the semester.

All participants responded to weekly writing prompts. These weekly prompts were done as an in-class, 10-minute, timed-writing exercise. Those in the control group responded to prompts that reflected on general socializing, being careful not to focus on goal-setting. Those in the treatment group, however, were given prompts that focused on principles of WOOP so they could reflect on their own goals for the semester and be reminded of the process they were supposed to be following. At the end of the semester, these weekly prompts also included some additional questions to help us assess interest and participant perceptions, specifically in regard

to the treatment group. Implementing principles of investigator triangulation, responses to these writing tasks were read, coded, and analyzed by members of the research team, looking for patterns and for participant perceptions of MCII. By approaching the data this way, we could crosscheck each other, helping ensure accuracy and consistency in our analysis and reporting.

An imperative observation to make here is that all students in the intensive English program at the ELC received limited self-regulation training throughout the semester, possibly including learning strategies, self-evaluation, and physical and mental well-being. Such training was not mandated nor performed program-wide and depended on individual teachers integrating such ideas into their classes.

Results

SASIQ Data

Changes over time between the pre- and post-SASIQ, for both the treatment and groups are reported in Table 2. According to the SASIQ data, the treatment group gained more than the control group in only three categories— English Frequency, English Proficiency, and Methods (see Table 1 for terms and definitions), but none of these differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$). Note that, of these three categories, only English Proficiency and Methods showed positive gains for the MCII group. The control group showed signs of increased native language use, English Proficiency, number of hours spent on social interaction, and percentages of that time using their native language and English. Both groups showed growth in Intensity, a measure that describes the closeness of relationships within one's social network, but the control group had an overall greater improvement in this category (though not significant). Both groups also displayed negative change over time in Size, with the treatment group decreasing most.

Table 2*Change Over Time Data from Pre- to Post-SASIQ: Control vs Treatment (MCII)*

	Group	Size	English Frequency	NL Frequency	Methods	English Proficiency	Participant Proficiency	Intensity	NL Percentage	English Percentage	HPM
Mean	MCII	-4.46	-0.125	-0.32	0.0769	0.265	-0.141	0.569	-11.3	-1.58	-19.7
	Control	-2.59	-0.141	0.306	-0.824	-0.318	0.371	1.37	22.7	17.4	19.4
Standard deviation	MCII	5.08	0.622	1.63	1.12	0.76	0.703	1.9	42.5	50.6	40.1
	Control	5.6	0.567	1.48	1.47	0.877	0.837	1.86	50.5	52.4	79.1
Skewness	MCII	-0.481	0.436	-0.629	1.53	-0.234	0.41	0.803	-0.216	0.00684	-2.18
	Control	0.758	-0.5	0.106	-0.0749	-2.38	-0.676	-0.297	-0.153	-0.66	-0.174
Std. error skewness	MCII	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.616
	Control	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55

Note. HPM stands for Hours Per Month.

Table 3 shows change over time statistics for just the treatment group. In terms of statistical significance (p), no differences reached the threshold of significance ($p \leq .05$). but a few categories did draw close; these include English Proficiency, Participant Proficiency, Methods, and Native Language Percentage. These data would seem to indicate that MCII might have an effect on proficiency gains and on the number of ways one chooses to meet new people. However, looking at effect size can help us further interpret the data.

Regarding effect size, Plonsky and Oswald (2014) review a relatively large number and range of SLA studies using Cohen's d for effect size and note that "[f]or mean differences between groups, d values in the neighborhood of .40 should be considered small, .70 medium, and 1.00 large. These estimates of (roughly) small, medium, and large effects were chosen based on their approximate correspondence to the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles, respectively, for between-group contrasts in primary and meta-analytic research." (p. 889). Thus, in terms of effect size rather than statistical significance alone, there were roughly no large effect sizes, four medium effect sizes or effects approaching medium (English Proficiency, Participant Proficiency, Methods, and NL Percentage), one small to medium effect size (Hours Per Month), four small effect sizes or effects approaching small (Size, NL Frequency, English Proficiency, and Intensity), and one virtually non-existent effect (English Frequency). While being in the 25th percentile of studies involving cross-group and other such comparisons is not particularly noteworthy, being in the 50th (medium effect size) suggests results from this study are comparable to other control-experimental group designs aimed at facilitating SLA among an experimental group.

Table 3*Independent Samples T-Test for Change Over Time from Pre- to Post-SASIQ*

	<i>p</i>	Mean difference	SE	Cohen's <i>d</i> (Effect Size)	95% CI	
					LL	UL
Size	0.353	-1.8733	1.983	-0.348	-5.9359	2.1893
English Frequency	0.94	0.0164	0.218	0.0278	-0.4297	0.4626
NL Frequency	0.282	-0.6263	0.57	-0.4045	-1.7949	0.5422
English Proficiency	0.066	0.5833	0.305	0.7036	-0.0424	1.209
Participant Proficiency	0.087	-0.512	0.288	-0.6542	-1.1026	0.0786
Methods	0.076	0.9005	0.489	0.678	-0.1019	1.9028
Hours Per Month	0.115	-39.1126	24.062	-0.5989	-88.4013	10.1761
NL Percentage	0.061	-34.0363	17.407	-0.7204	-69.6928	1.6202
English Percentage	0.328	-18.9492	19.03	-0.3669	-57.9312	20.0327
Intensity	0.255	-0.8029	0.691	-0.4279	-2.2192	0.6133

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit, UL = upper limit, NL = native language

Based on our data, we begin to answer our first two research questions. Our first question asks if there are significant differences in the social network development of those taught to use MCII (experimental) and those not taught (control). There is a near significant difference in the social network measures between the MCII treatment group and the control group. Those measures (see Table 1 for terms and definitions) include English Proficiency (0.066), Participant Proficiency (0.087), Methods (0.076), and Native Language Percentage (0.061). Looking at effect size we see these same four measures have medium effect sizes: English Proficiency (0.7036), Participant Proficiency (-0.6542), Methods (0.678), and Native Language Percentage (-0.7204). The negative effect sizes of Participant Proficiency and Native Language Percentage shows more growth in these measures from the control group. Since the data show somewhat confusing results in both groups, we look to our second research question on participant perception of MCII to shed further light on the subject.

MCII Survey & Writing Prompts

Using weekly writing prompts, which included a survey on the last two from the semester, participants' perceptions toward MCII were gathered and analyzed. The survey asked participants to respond 'Yes' or 'No' (and provide some explanation) to five questions: 1. Did you use WOOP daily, 2. Did your goal change from the beginning of the semester to the end, 3. Did you find WOOP helpful, 4. Will you continue to use WOOP, 5. Would you recommend WOOP to friends/family. Table 3 shows the responses shown in percentage of agreement. Note that roughly half of those surveyed provided a response. Of the responses given, participants demonstrated general favor toward MCII, indicating that most found it helpful, they used it daily, and that they would both continue to use it after the semester was over and would recommend it to their friends and family.

Table 4*Percentage of Agreement to MCII Survey Questions for Treatment Group*

% of Agreement	Daily Use	Goal Change	Perceived Helpfulness	Continue WOOP	Recommend to Others
% Agree	30%	30%	49%	38%	38%
% Disagree	19%	22%	5%	11%	11%
% NR	51%	49%	46%	51%	51%

Note. NR = no response

After analyzing the data from the survey, we evaluated individual responses from participants to garner additional information. Beyond the shortage in responses, many respondents included vague, off-topic, or otherwise unhelpful responses. For example, many of the participants who reported that MCII was not helpful for them merely replied that “it was ok” or that it was “not really” useful. When asked if they used MCII on a day-to-day basis, the dissenters were again rather vague: “No, I didn’t get used to [it].” or when referring to the created goal, “Sometimes. I forgot to look everyday.” Some responses were sometimes even off topic, leading us to believe that they did not understand the questions or that they were rushing through the task. For instance, when asked how using MCII aided in social interaction, one response said, “Time scheduling was tough.” However, one, more helpful, response indicated that they forget due to lack of focus. Another participant mentioned that work and school got in the way of socializing and MCII. Either way, coupling the subpar responses with the average 49.6% response rate makes it difficult to determine if they were truly negative responses or not.

Looking at Table 4, despite the higher percentage of participants who did not use MCII daily, many still found it helpful and indicated that they would continue to use it and even recommend it to their friends or family. However, many positive participant responses were also obscure with responses along the lines of “Yes. I speak with English speakers everyday.” Although, there were more indicative responses like “yes, it helps me to stay focus[ed] in speaking more English and have goals that requires more of me,” showing that some students took this self-regulation tool to heart and tried hard to stretch themselves. These participants reported having positive social experiences because of their goals, like this participant: “I invited people to have dinner with me. We did have good conversation. One of people started inviting people to have breakfast at his apartment.” Such an experience demonstrates that MCII can indeed help develop social networks. Another positive experience states, “I was at work and there was a silence between me and my co-worker, so I remember I set this goal (MCII) and I started talking with him about whatever. I think that helped to remember my goal and act.”

Examining the survey data in addition to the other quantitative data allows us to triangulate our findings, deepening our understanding of the attitudes towards, and implementation of, MCII by the participants. Overall, it appears that the participants had a positive view towards MCII, considering it useful and helpful to their social network development, despite the fact that some did not use it regularly and/or would not recommend it to others.

Discussion

This study sought to answer the question of MCII’s influence on social network development and how users of MCII perceive its effectiveness. As a reminder, here are the research questions and focus of this study:

1. Are there significant differences in the social network development of those taught to use MCII (experimental) and those not taught (control)?
2. Do participants perceive MCII as helpful in regard to developing their social networks?

Results from the study show the treatment group had four medium effect sizes or effects approaching medium (English Proficiency, Participant Proficiency, Methods, and NL Percentage), one small to medium effect size (Hours Per Month), four small effect sizes or effects approaching small (Size, NL Frequency, English Proficiency, and Intensity), and one virtually non-existent effect (English Frequency). Of these effect sizes, seven were negative, meaning that more growth occurred in the control group for those specific measures (Size, NL Frequency, Participant Proficiency, Hours Per Month, NL Percentage, English Percentage, and Intensity).

Survey results on participants' perceptions show an average 49.6% response rate on the survey questions. Of those who did respond, 30% indicated that they used MCII daily, 49% viewed it as helpful, 38% said they would continue to use it and 38% also would recommend MCII to members of their social networks. Despite seven of our ten measures showing more growth in the control group, participants' responses indicated that MCII was still helpful for them, leaving us to wonder why such a disparity exists between the survey data and the quantitative data. The results will be examined based on the SASIQ data received and on the MCII weekly prompts and perception survey given.

Social Network Measures

Size, density, durability, and intensity are common factors considered when analyzing social networks. First, looking at the overall change in the size of social networks (number of

friends) between the two groups, we see that both trended negatively (mean = -4.46 for treatment and -2.59 for control), meaning that over the course of the semester, participants' social networks decreased in size.

However, if these participants lost members of their social network, the logical conclusion would be that it was to focus on deepening connections with already existing members of their social network, which appears to be the case here. In fact, studies by Dewey and his colleagues (see review of literature), including that of Brown et al. (in press), also suggested a similar trend in decreased size but increased intensity, which measures the closeness of relationships within a social network. Specifically, the research by Brown et al. focused on the impact of MCII on new students to study abroad (SA) compared to returning students. Their research showed that new students tended to show greater increase in size while returning students displayed a decrease in size but an increase in intensity. Since our study did not compare new and returning students, it is difficult to say whether our new and returning students would exhibit patterns like Brown et al.'s. However, we can suggest that participants in our study were most likely returning students and not new students, since we saw decreased size and increased intensity. Future research could separate out new and returning as Brown et al. did to assess that variable. Also based on these findings, we can suggest that the research done by Lee et al. (2018) had mostly new students since their research showed an increase in both size and intensity.

Returning to our research, both the treatment and control groups of our study saw an increase in intensity. The treatment group had a mean change over time of 0.57 while the control group had a mean change over time of 1.37. The curious thing here is having that the control group outperformed the treatment group. This signifies a departure in our research from that of

Brown et al. because their findings showed a greater increase in intensity for the treatment group. This could mean that 1) participants in the control group were given some kind of training in or focus on their social networks outside the confines of this study, 2) the treatment group were apathetic towards the experiment, 3) MCII proved ineffective compared to traditional means of building and maintaining social networks (in the case of this study), or 4) there was some combination of the three previous options. Overall, a difference of less than one point on the scale might also be considered inconsequential.

Another metric to consider was the durability of the participants' social networks. Durability refers to the frequency of interaction between an individual and members of that individual's social network. Durability, perhaps most of all, showed us the most confusing data. Going back to Table 2 and the descriptives of Hours per Month (HPM), Native Language (NL) Percentage, and English Percentage, we could see that the treatment group, in terms of mean change over time throughout the semester, spent less time with members of their social network (-19.7) and spent less time conversing in their native language (-11.3) and in English (-1.58). Contrarily, the control group spent more time with their social network (19.4), and spent more time conversing in their native languages (22.7) and in English (17.4). Here we find another difference between our research and that of Brown et al., which found the treatment group speaking and interacting with members of their social networks more than the control group. Again, we consider the options that: 1) participants in the control group received outside training on developing the social networks, 2) the treatment group displayed signs of apathy and neglect towards the experiment, 3) MCII could possibly be ineffective compared to conventional means of building and maintaining social networks, or 4) there is a combination of all three options.

Confusion regarding reporting of social group members may also be to blame. If learners reported L2 speakers of English with the same L1 in their social networks, then it is logical that they would also speak more in their native language with those people. The fact that they used English more than the experimental group may be attributable to the notion that sometimes associating speakers of one's L1 can lead to opportunities to speak one's L2 in situations like immersive study abroad (see Dewey et al., 2014). Regarding the possibility of misreporting, this is certainly a limitation of the current study.

Despite various irregularities, some beacons of light for MCII shone through. Looking back at Table 3, using statistical significance (p) and effect size (d), we can see where the treatment group demonstrated MCII's possible effectiveness. Although no statistically significant differences were present ($p \leq 0.05$), a few categories were close; these include: English Proficiency ($p = 0.066$), Participant Proficiency ($p = 0.087$), Methods ($p = 0.076$), and Native Language Percentage ($p = 0.061$). These four measures also had medium effect sizes (the largest of all the effect sizes in this study) which are as follows: English Proficiency (0.7036), Participant Proficiency (-0.6542), Methods (0.678), and Native Language Percentage (-0.7204). For a reminder on what these measures mean and how they were determined, see Table 1. These data would suggest that MCII might have an effect on proficiency gains and on the number of ways one chooses to meet new people, which is part of the density measure for social networks. While this potential change in behavior and outcomes via MCII is somewhat promising, it does not show the level of promise seen in other MCII studies, where significant changes over time are seen and differences between control and experimental groups are clearer and more substantial (Loy et al., 2016; Houssais, Oettingen, & Mayer, 2013; Kirk, Oettingen, & Gollwitzer, 2013).

Earlier studies, like ours, often show that SA participants have larger social networks at the start of a program, which tend to decrease in size while increasing in intensity by the end (Brown et al., in press; Hillstrom, 2011; Granovetter, 1982). Our study also exhibits kinship with its predecessors by showing that, even at a minor degree, participants that maintain or develop close relationships during SA can benefit linguistically, socially, and emotionally (Dewey, Belnap, and Hillstrom, 2013; Baker-Smemoe et al., 2014). This is likely due to the higher grade of social and linguistic nuance that is involved with closer friendships and relationships, such as how deeper relationships typically involve language use that goes further than pleasantries and small talk into personal and emotional concerns. These sorts of relationships afford participants the obvious linguistic benefits, but if made with members of the target culture, allow for deeper integration into said culture, furthering the linguistic benefits and possibly increased motivation to learn the target language (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006). We hope that continued spread and use of MCII, particularly at the beginning of SA programs to provide the greatest possible boon, will allow for more people to experience these benefits.

MCII Survey and Writing Prompts

In order to add an extra dimension to the quantitative data, we ought to also analyze the survey data. This will provide more meaning to the numbers while also painting a clearer picture of this study's overall results (Kinging, 2009; Dewey, Belnap, Hillstrom, 2013). As a reminder, Table 4 shows us the percentage of agreement that participants had with the primary questions found on the MCII surveys and writing prompts, including the fact that only about half of participants responded to the questions. Beyond the shortage in responses, many respondents included vague, off-topic, or otherwise unhelpful responses.

As mentioned earlier, such responses include, “it was ok” or that it was “not really” useful, “No, I didn’t get used to [it]” when asked about daily use, and the off-topic, “Time scheduling was tough” when asked how using MCII aided in social interaction. This apathy and lack of participation we attribute to learners not being adequately motivated to participate fully in the study. Perhaps the participants needed more intervention and instruction or heard testimonials from peers who had used MCII in the past to increase their motivation.

Despite the lack and clarity of responses, we still can see bright spots and determine that, for those who took MCII seriously, they had positive social network development experiences. Of those who replied positively to the survey questions, many gave specific details on how the use of MCII aided them in their daily lives and in the formation and maintenance of their social networks. For instance, when asked if they found MCII helpful, one participant replied, “yes, it helps me to stay focus[ed] in speaking more English and have goals that requires more of me.” Another participant, when asked to describe social experience from using MCII mentioned, “I invited people to have dinner with me. We did have good conversation. One of people started inviting people to have breakfast at his apartment.” Another positive experience states, “I was at work and there was a silence between me and my co-worker, so I remember I set this goal (MCII) and I started talking with him about whatever. I think that helped to remember my goal and act.” Such experiences demonstrate that MCII can indeed help develop social networks.

Limitations

One crucial limitation is the use of the weekly writing prompts that produced self-reported data. Although studies focused on social networks often use self-reported data, this study is limited by it because of the inaccuracies produced by self-reporting. They are

implemented for participants' perceptions and to help measure and analyze trends; however, including additional qualitative information, such as interviews with the participants and with members of their social networks, would add valuable insights. For future research, member checking the survey data would also help reduce the level of inaccuracy stemmed from self-report data. Another possible method of enhanced qualitative data collection could include performing a case study by selecting a handful of participants, interviewing them and the members of their social networks periodically, and following up with them on a weekly basis. Such a process would surely allow researchers to see deeper into the minds of the participants and how individuals apply MCII to their social interaction goals.

Despite the weekly writing prompts being given to the participants as a way to remind them of MCII, their goals, and the task of social interaction, many gave lackluster responses and still more gave no response. To combat this, increasing participant motivation is a top priority for any future study in order to receive higher quality responses. The small sample size was already an issue for this study and coupling that with the low motivation that appears to have been prevalent gave us less than ideal data with which to work. One way to change this could also be to include increased follow-up and instruction in MCII. The treatment group in this study was only given instruction one time but, if this study were done again, increasing the number of interventions to once a month, or even once a week, could greatly benefit the findings.

As mentioned before, low overall sample size was an issue for this study. On top of lower quality survey responses, it surely affected the other quantitative data as well. If we had more people, it is likely that the numeric findings would have been more stable, allowing for clearer understanding. One such fault with the numbers discussed was with the lack of growth. The lack of growth could be a result of participants having a limited number of places to form new

friendships. Since the participants were attending four English classes each day, their classmates remained the same in each class due to the IEP's structure. Moreover, it is unlikely that, once situated, participants would seek new living arrangements in the middle of a semester, implying that they would be with the same roommates and neighbors over the course of the 14-week semester. Performing a similar study in the future in a more dynamic environment could provide different results and additional insights. Such changes to the environment could include a longer period of time over which the study takes place or having students change living arrangements once or twice. Such modifications could see participants branching out and forming new connections, enhancing their social networks.

Conclusion

This study considered the impact of MCII on English language learners and their social networks in a study abroad setting, discovering that users of MCII displayed growth in the number of ways they met new people and in the depth (or intensity) of their relationships. This study also showed that minimal growth occurred in proficiency for these English language learners. Despite the low number of participants, their perceptions of MCII were highly positive, meaning that MCII may have had a worthwhile impact on their lives and on their goal setting and fulfilment. The participants who took MCII seriously tended to have positive experiences and reported an increased number of social interaction opportunities and deeper connection forming. However, continued research is needed in order to decide if MCII makes enough of an impact on users to warrant continued use in such programs as study abroad or IEPs.

References

- ACTFL. (2012). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012*. Retrieved July 24, 2020, from <https://www.actfl.org/resources/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012>
- Allwright, D. (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach? The interaction hypothesis. In D. M. Singleton and D. G. Little (Eds.), *Language learning in formal and informal contexts* (pp. 3-18). Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics.
- Baker-Smemoe, W., Dewey, D. P., Bown, J., & Martinsen, R. A. (2014). Variables affecting L2 gains during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(3), 464-486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12093>
- Bown, J., Dewey, D. P., & Belnap, R. K. (2015). Student interactions during study abroad in Jordan. In R.F. Mitchell, K. McManus, & N. T. Ventura (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 199-222). Essex, UK: Eurosla Monograph Series Four.
- Brown, H. T., Dewey, D. P., Lee, V., Eggett, D. (in press). Implementing mental contrasting to improve English language learner social networks. In N. Kurata & A. J. Carhill-Poza (Eds.), *Social networks in language learning and language teaching*. London: Bloomsbury Press.
- DeKeyser, R. (2010). Monitoring processes in Spanish as a second language during a study abroad program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01061.x>
- Denzin, N. (2006). *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook* (5th ed.). Piscataway, New Jersey: Aldine Transaction.

- Dewey, D. P., Belnap, R. K., & Hillstrom, R. (2013). Social network development, language use, and language acquisition during study abroad: Arabic language learners' perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 22, 84-110.
<https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v22i1.320>
- Dewey, D. P., Bown, J., Baker Smemoe, W., Martinsen, R. A., Gold, C., & Eggett, D. (2014). Language use in six study abroad programs: An exploratory analysis of possible predictors. *Language Learning*, 64(1), 36-71. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/lang.12031>
- Dewey, D. P., Ring, S., Gardner, D., & Belnap, R. K. (2013). Social network formation and development during study abroad in the Middle East. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 41(2), 269-282.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.02.004>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53, 3-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.53222>
- Fraser, C. C. (2002). Study abroad: An attempt to measure the gains. *German as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1, 45-65.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2776392>
- Hillstrom, R. (2011). *Social networks, language acquisition, and time on task while studying abroad in Jordan*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, Utah
- Houssais, S., Oettingen, G., & Mayer, D. (2013) Using mental contrasting with implementation intentions to self-regulate insecurity-based behaviors in relationships. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37(2), 224-233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9307-4>

- Isabelli-García, C. L. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation and attitudes: Implications for second language acquisition. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 231-258). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (Eds.). (1999). "Interaction hypothesis". In *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics: A handbook for language teaching* (p. 174). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kirk, D., Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2013). Promoting integrative bargaining: Mental contrasting with implementation intentions. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 24*(2), 148-165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10444061311316771>
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman
- Łakuta, P. (2020). Using the theory of self-affirmation and self-regulation strategies of mental contrasting and forming implementation intentions to reduce social anxiety symptoms. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 33*, 370-386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1746283>.
- Lee, V., Dewey, D. P., Trimble, H., & Belnap, R. K. (2018). Mental contrasting with implementation intentions, social networking and second language development. In J. Mynard & I. Brady (Eds.), *Stretching boundaries. Papers from the third International Psychology of Language Learning conference, Tokyo, Japan 7-10 June, 2018*. Tokyo: International Association of the Psychology of Language Learning (IAPLL). <http://unsworks.unsw.edu.au/fapi/datastream/unsworks:57332/bin38e88b7c-30bf-44f2-bb2c-b75c16d71001?view=true#page=51>.

- Lin, N. (1982). Social resources and instrumental action. In P. V. Marsden, & y N. Lin (Eds.), *Social structure and network analysis* (pp. 131-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lin, N., Ensel, W., & Vaughn, J. (1981). *Social resources and strength of ties: structural factors in occupational status attainment*. *American Sociological Review*, *46*(4), 393-405.
www.jstor.org/stable/2095260
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Loy, S. L., Wieber, F., Gollwitzer, P.M., Oettingen, G. (2016) Supporting sustainable food consumption: Mental contrasting with implementation intentions (MCII) aligns intentions and behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*(562), 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00607>
- Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms*. London: Continuum
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and social networks*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Publisher
- Oettingen, G. (2000). Expectancy effects on behavior depend on self-regulatory thought. *Social Cognition*, *18*(2), 101-129. <http://dx.doi.org.erl.lib.byu.edu/10.1521/soco.2000.18.2.101>
- Oettingen, G. (2012). Future thought and behaviour change. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *23*(1), 1-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2011.643698>
- Oettingen, G., & Cachia, J. Y. (2016). The problems with positive thinking and how to overcome them. In K. D. Vohs & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (3rd ed., pp. 547-570). New York: Guilford

- Oettingen, G., Kappes, H.B., Guttentag, K.B., & Gollwitzer, P.M. (2015). Self-regulation of time management: Mental contrasting with implementation intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(2), 218-229. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1002/ejsp.2090>
- Oettingen, G., Mayer, D., Sevincer, A.T., Stephens, E. J., Pak, H. J., & Hagenah, M. (2009). Mental contrasting and goal commitment: The mediating role of energization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 608-622. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208330856>
- Ortega, L. (2013). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000492>
- Ring, S. A., Gardner, D., & Dewey, D. P. (2013). Social network development during study abroad in Japan. In K. Kondo- Brown, Y. Saito-Abbott, S. Satsutani, M. Tsutsui, & A. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *New perspectives on Japanese language learning, linguistics, and culture* (pp. 95–122). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, National Foreign Language Resource Center
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice: Texts and contexts in second language learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Scott, J. (2017). *Social network analysis*. London: Sage Publications. https://uk.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/81249_Scott___Social_Network_Analysis___Chapter_1.pdf
- Tong, K. K., Hung, E. P. W., & Yuen, S. M. (2010). The Quality of Social Networks: Its Determinants and Impacts on Helping and Volunteering in Macao. *Social Indicators Research, 102*, 351-361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9686-4>

Trentman, E. (2012). *Study abroad in Egypt: Identity, access, and Arabic language learning*.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, M.R. (2009). The Georgetown consortium project:

Interventions for student learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 18, 1-75. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ883690.pdf>

Wen-Ta Tseng, W. Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic

learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition, *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 78-102. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami046>

Wilkinson, S. (1998a). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant

perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4, 121-138.

<https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v4i1.65>

Wilkinson, S. (1998b). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common

beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals* 31(1), 23-39. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1998.tb01330.x)

[9720.1998.tb01330.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1998.tb01330.x)

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview.

Educational Psychologist, 25(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2501_2

Appendix A

Sample WOOP Material from woopmylife.org (screenshot)

WOOP Kit – WOOP in one Glance

Wish: What is your wish, a wish that is challenging, but feasible?

Note your Wish in 3-6 words: _____

Outcome: What would be the best outcome of fulfilling your wish?

Note your best Outcome in 3-6 words: _____



Obstacle: What is your main inner obstacle that holds you back from fulfilling your wish?

Note your main inner Obstacle in 3-6 words: _____



Plan: What can you do to overcome your obstacle?

Note your action or thought in 3-6 words: _____

Fill in the blanks below:

If... _____ then I will... _____
(your obstacle) (your action or thought to overcome obstacle)

Imagine once more: If... (obstacle), then I will... (action).

Appendix B

*Weekly MCII Treatment Group Writing Prompts**

WOOP Survey 1

This is a follow up form to provide a space for you to reflect and report on your social interaction goals.

WOOP

Wish - your goal or desire

Outcome - the end result (What are the effects of reaching your goal?)

Obstacle - the things keeping you from reaching your goal

Plan - If... Then... (How will you get past the obstacles to reach your goal?)

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an outcome you expect from speaking English with other people?

WOOP Survey 2

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an obstacle to your social interaction goal? What is your plan to overcome it this week? (Remember, the obstacle needs to be in your control!)

WOOP Survey 3

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).

2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an outcome you expect from speaking English with other people?

WOOP Survey 4

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an obstacle to your social interaction goal? What is your plan to overcome it this week? (Remember, the obstacle needs to be in your control!)

WOOP Survey 5

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an outcome you expect from speaking English with other people?

WOOP Survey 6

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. What is an obstacle to your social interaction goal? What is your plan to overcome it this week? (Remember, the obstacle needs to be in your control!)

WOOP Survey 7

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).

2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. How did using WOOP help your social interaction last week? If you don't think it helped, please explain why.

WOOP Survey 8

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. Is WOOP something you use everyday? Please explain why or why not.

WOOP Survey 11

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required).
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. Has your WOOP goal changed at all since the start of the semester? If yes, please explain why it changed. If no, please explain how close you have come to accomplishing your goal.
4. On a scale of 1 to 10, how social do you think you've been this semester?

WOOP Survey 12

1. Please write your student ID number (dashes are not required). *
2. Describe your WOOP goal or wish. Remember that this needs to be a social interaction goal.
3. How has WOOP helped your level of social interaction this semester?

4. Will you continue to use WOOP for other life goals? Please answer truthfully.

a. Yes

b. No

5. Would you recommend WOOP to your friends and family? Why or why not?

**Note that WOOP Surveys 9 and 10 were omitted due to scheduling conflicts with the classroom teacher of the treatment group.*