

Imagined Social Spaces:
Stereotypical Attributions That Do and Do Not Travel From Native Speakers to Teachers of German

By
Lucian Rothe

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
(German)

at the
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON
2020

Date of final oral examination: 05/11/2020

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Monika Chavez, Professor, German; Core Faculty Member, Ph.D. Program in Second Language
Acquisition

Mark L. Loudon, Professor, German

Jeanne Schueller, Faculty Associate, German

Catherine Stafford, Associate Professor, Spanish; Core Faculty Member, Ph.D. Program in Second
Language Acquisition

© Copyright by Lucian Rothe 2020

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgments

In many ways, writing a dissertation is similar to running a marathon race. It takes a lot of preparation and practice beforehand (e.g., coursework) and requires a well-structured plan with clear goals (e.g., preliminary exams and writing goals). In addition to one's persistence and endurance during the preparation phase and the actual race, the support by various people throughout this journey is critical for the runner (i.e., the doctoral student) to cross the finish line (i.e., the deposit of the dissertation). These people include coaches, running partners, and supporters on the sidelines, who encourage and help throughout practice and the race, especially when the course gets hilly or during unexpected challenges. Subsequently, I would like to thank some of the most influential supporters that have helped me reach the finish line.

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my head coach (i.e., advisor), Monika Chavez, for her mentoring over the past five years, her brilliant guidance and collaboration with respect to academic matters, and her never-ending support in personal matters. I would also like to thank the other coaches who have supported me throughout this journey, e.g., by providing feedback on my work and offering excellent learning opportunities for me. These coaches include Jeanne Schueller, Mark L. Loudon, Catherine Stafford, and Lauren Rosen, as well as other faculty and staff members in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic, and at the University of Wisconsin. Additionally, I would like to say thank you to the faculty and staff at the University of Missouri—Columbia and at the Philipps University of Marburg, who helped me start this race. Thank you very much!

Secondly, preparing for and running a marathon is no fun without training partners and co-racers. I would like to thank my fellow graduate students, particularly Brandy and my writing group members, JT, Julia, and Sarah, as well as the graduate students who participated in my study. Furthermore, I wish to thank all my peers who have supported my research and teaching over the past years. You all have been

fantastic supporters, academically, pedagogically, and personally. A special thank you also to Stanley A. Lubanski for assisting me with statistics. Thank you very much!

Finally, I would like to pay my special regards to my biggest supporters in Germany and the United States that have cheered me on from the sidelines (i.e., family and friends). First and foremost, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my family in the Harz, particularly my parents, Andrea and Uwe, who have been indefinitely supportive of me during all of my journeys, and my siblings and siblings-in-law, Isabell and Stephan, and Michel and Claudia. I would also like to express a very special thank you to my wonderful partner, Maggie, and to my family in Wisconsin, who have been an immeasurable source of support and encouragement. Also, many thanks to my best friends, Florian and Maria, who I was able to share parts of my academic journey in the United States with and who have been cheering me on from afar over the past years. Thank you all very much and vielen lieben Dank!

Abstract

This study investigated (1) what kinds of stereotypes about male and female native speakers (NS), as well as male and female NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German, 67 first-semester learners of German at a large Midwestern research university had heard. It also explored (2) what these accounts reveal about how stereotypical attributions to target-language members in global contexts, i.e., NSs of German, travel to members of learners' immediate target-language environments, i.e., the teacher. The study was grounded in motivational frameworks of foreign-language learning put forth by Norton and Dörnyei. The stereotypical notions described by respondents were sorted into categories of stereotypes, using principles of Grounded Theory. Inferential statistical analyses compared the stereotype categories attributed to the respective groups of NSs and teachers. Results showed that (1) respondents were well aware of an array of stereotypes about NS as well as teachers of German and (2) these stereotypical notions traveled via two pathways of association from NSs to teachers, i.e., either via birth, as for NS teachers, or via self-affiliation with the target-language community, as for NNS teachers. What is more, stereotypical notions revealed a link between perceived qualities of the language and its speakers. Gender was a factor that mattered with respect to NSs, including teachers, but not NNS teachers. Findings suggest that teachers—regardless of NS status and gender—are regarded to be affective gateways to the target community and representatives of NSs in the language classroom. Results also speak to the potential that stereotypical notions of NSs may apply to individuals who decide to associate with the community of German speakers. The idea that speaking and learning a specific language bestows specific other, personal characteristics contains attractive as well as repulsive potential when students select a language for study. Results call for closer investigations of (1) the stereotypes' accuracy according to learners of German, as well as of (2) stereotypical notions held by learners of other foreign languages and (3) by NS and NNS teachers of German and other languages. Implications for teaching address learners as cross-cultural mediators and members of a local community of foreign-language speakers.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables and Figures	viii
List of Abbreviations	x
1. Rationale.....	1
2. Review of Previous Research	4
2.1 Contextualization of This Study in L2 Motivation Research	5
2.1.1 Theoretical Foundations: The Power of Learners' Possible Selves and Imagination.....	8
2.2 The Role of Communities for Language Learners	14
2.2.1 Perceptions of Target Language Communities According to Learners and Teachers	15
2.2.2 Learners' Transformative Identities and Their Immediate and Imagined Communities....	17
2.3 Imaginings of Community: The Role of Stereotypes.....	20
2.3.1 Contexts of Stereotypes.....	23
2.3.2 Learners' Stereotypes About All Things German	25
2.3.3 Summary of Research on Stereotypes.....	32
2.4 The Community of the Classroom: The Role of Teachers.....	34
2.4.1 Perceptions of Native-Speaker Status.....	36
2.4.2 Perceptions of Gender	41
2.5 Summary of Previous Literature	44
2.6 Research Questions	45
3. Research Methods.....	48
3.1 The Pilot Phase of the Study	48
3.2 The Research Project From Which This Dissertation Study Was Derived in Overview	49
3.3 The Dissertation Study	56
3.3.1 Participants of the Dissertation Study	56
3.3.2 Research Instrument for the Dissertation Study	59
3.3.3 Data Collection Procedure for the Dissertation Study.....	63
4. Results	65
4.1 Research Theme 1: Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Native Speakers of German	66
RQ 1.1: What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German?	70

RQ 1.2.1: What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German, respectively?	74
RQ 1.2.2: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native speakers?... 76	
RQ 1.2.3: How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within each category compare between stereotypes about male and female native speakers?	78
4.2 Research Theme 2: Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Teachers of German	82
RQ 2.1: What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers of German?.....	83
RQ 2.2: What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male/female x native-speaker/non-native-speaker teachers of German, respectively?	86
RQ 2.3.1: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native-speaker teachers?.....	89
RQ 2.3.2: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female non-native-speaker teachers?.....	91
RQ 2.3.3: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male native-speaker and of male non-native-speaker teachers?	93
RQ 2.3.4: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of female native-speaker and of female non-native-speaker teachers?	95
RQ 2.4: How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within prevalent categories compare between stereotypes about native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers?	97
4.2.1 Summary of Research Theme 2	101
4.3 Research Theme 3: Relationships Between Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Native Speakers and Teachers of German	103
RQ 3.1.1: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?	104
RQ 3.1.2: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?	106
RQ 3.1.3: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?	107
RQ 3.2.1: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?	110

RQ 3.2.2: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?	111
RQ 3.2.3: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?	112
4.3.1 Summary of Research Theme 3	114
5. Discussion and Implications	117
5.1 Learners Are Well Aware of Stereotypes About Native Speakers of German	117
5.1.1 Unfavorable Stereotypes About Native Speakers as Most Prevalent Categories	119
5.2 The Connection Between the Language and Its Speakers	121
5.2.1 Future Explorations of Learners' Stereotypes about Native Speakers and Teachers.....	123
5.3 Stereotypes About Native-Speaker and Non-Native-Speaker Teachers of German Are out There	125
5.3.1 The Native-Speaker/Non-Native-Speaker Teacher Dichotomy Reflected in Stereotypes	127
5.3.2 Analyzing Stereotypes About Target Language Speakers Critically and Raising Bi-/Multilingual Awareness.....	129
5.4 Stereotypes Travel via Two Pathways of Association From Native Speakers to Teachers.....	131
5.4.1 Stereotypes Travel Primarily via Association by Birth	135
5.4.2 Non-Native-Speaker Teachers Get the Benefit of the Doubt	136
5.4.3 Traveling Hetero- and Auto-Stereotypes	137
5.4.4 Reflective Language Teachers and a Sense of Local Community	137
5.5 Gender Only Matters With Respect to Stereotypes About Native Speakers, Including Teachers	140
6. Limitations of the Present Study	142
6.1 Limitations That Pertain to the Research Instrument	143
6.2 Limitations That Pertain to the Data Analysis.....	145
6.3 Limitations That Pertain to Participants	146
7. Conclusion.....	147
References.....	149
Appendix A – IRB Approval.....	164
Appendix A.1 – IRB Approval Letter for SBS 2017-0832	164
Appendix A.2 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP001	165
Appendix A.3 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP002	166
Appendix A.4 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP003	167

Appendix A.5 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP004	168
Appendix A.6 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP005	169
Appendix A.7 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP006	170
Appendix A.8 – IRB Continuing Review Progress Report Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CR001	171
Appendix B – Main Questionnaire	172
Appendix B.1 – Main Questionnaire: Consent Form	172
Appendix B.2 – Main Questionnaire: Demographics Section	174
Appendix B.3 – Main Questionnaire: Classroom Community Scale	176
Appendix B.4 – Main Questionnaire: Learning Section	177
Appendix B.5 – Main Questionnaire: Stereotype Questionnaire	196
Appendix B.6 – Main Questionnaire: Other Foreign-Language Section	199
Appendix B.7 – Main Questionnaire: Cash Prize Drawing and Further Study Components	210
Appendix C – Tables in Appendix	211

List of Tables and Figures

<i>Table 1: Schulz and Haerle (1995) results (adapted from Schulz & Haerle, 1995).....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Table 2: Chavez (2020b) results (adapted from Chavez, 2020b)</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Table 3: Overview of research phases, instruments, recruited FLs, participants, and week/semester of administration.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Table 4: Summary of demographic information of participants who completed the Main Questionnaire</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Table 5: Overview of the 12 emerged categories of stereotypes about NSs of German and the verbatim responses assigned to each.....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Table 6: Ranked percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category of stereotype related to male NSs and female NSs of German, respectively</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Table 7: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NSs of German by category and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Table 8: Overview of the 12 categories of stereotypes about NSs of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both male and female NSs, uniquely to male NS, and uniquely to female NSs of German.....</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Table 9: Overview of all categories of stereotypes, including categorized responses, about Teachers of German</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Table 10: Grouped stereotype categories related to male/female x NS/NNS teachers of German into four tiers based on the percentage of respondents.....</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>Table 11: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Table 12: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NNS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>92</i>
<i>Table 13: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male NS and NNS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>94</i>
<i>Table 14: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to female NS and NNS teachers by category and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>96</i>

<i>Table 15: Overview of prevalent stereotype categories about teachers of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both NS and NNS teachers, uniquely to NS teachers, and uniquely to NNS teachers.....</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>Table 16: Overview of (almost) statistically significant differences between teachers of German, particularly between male and female NS as well as NNS teachers, between male NS and NNS teachers, as well as female NS and NNS teachers.....</i>	<i>102</i>
<i>Table 17: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to male NSs and stereotypes attributed to male NS teachers of German</i>	<i>105</i>
<i>Table 18: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to male NSs and stereotypes attributed to male NNS teachers of German.....</i>	<i>106</i>
<i>Table 19: Comparison of strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs male NSs x male NS teachers and male NSs x male NNS teachers in each of the categories and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>108</i>
<i>Table 20: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to female NSs and stereotypes attributed to female NS teachers of German</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Table 21: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to female NSs and stereotypes attributed to female NNS teachers of German.....</i>	<i>111</i>
<i>Table 22: Comparison of strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs female NSs x female NS teachers and female NSs x female NNS teachers in each of the categories and in order of the size of difference</i>	<i>113</i>
<i>Table 23: Overview of comparison of correlation strengths between stereotypical attributions in the pairs NSs x NS teachers and NSs x NNS teachers.....</i>	<i>115</i>
<i>Table 24: Percentage of respondents, ranks, and tiers of all categories of stereotypes pertaining to male/female x NS/NNS teachers.....</i>	<i>211</i>
<i>Table 25: Overview of all stereotype categories pertaining to teachers of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both NS and NNS teachers, uniquely to NS teachers, and uniquely to NNS teachers.....</i>	<i>213</i>

List of Abbreviations

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>What it Stands for</i>
ACTFL	The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
FL	Foreign language
L1	First/native language
L2	Second/non-native language
MLA	The (US) Modern Language Association
NNS	Non-native speaker
NS	Native speaker
RQ	Research question
SLA	Second language acquisition
TL	Target language

1. Rationale

Research into the motivation to learn a foreign language (FL) has emphasized the motivational role of learners' imagined communities (e.g., Norton, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2011) and of students' future visions of their own selves (e.g., Dörnyei, 2009; Dörnyei & Chan, 2013). However, little is known about what shapes learners' imaginations. Actual and imagined experiences with native speakers (NSs) as well as classroom experiences, including interactions with a teacher, all likely play a role. Recent studies (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Nikitina, 2019; Chavez, 2020b) have indicated that how actual and potential learners imagine the respective target language (TL) communities, responds to the *stereotypes* about these TL communities that learners have heard in their daily lives. The exact nature of this interaction, however, is not yet well understood.

Stereotypes are “pictures in our head”, according to Walter Lippmann (1922), who introduced the concept of stereotypes into the social sciences (cited in Heinzmann, 2014, p. 49). Spencer-Rodgers (2001), who researched beliefs about international students studying in the United States, concluded that

“stereotypes have been conceptualized as culturally shared beliefs about the attributes that characterize a group of people (consensual, cultural, or social stereotypes) and in terms of unique, personal beliefs about the attributes of a group (individual, personal, or idiosyncratic stereotypes). [...] Stereotypic representations vary along an evaluative dimension and they may contain both positive and negative attributes” (p. 632).

Stereotypes help shape the identities of individuals and groups. Hetero-stereotypes refer “to a group to which one does not belong (out-group), and auto-stereotypes [...] refer to a person's own group (in-group)” (Hass, Waechter, & Krause-Ono, 2016, p. 118). Research has shown that auto-stereotypes may contribute to favoritism of in-group members, and they reveal with which group an individual affiliates (e.g., Schoel, Roessel, Jacobsen, & Stahlberg, 2014). Hetero-stereotypes may lead to exclusion and devaluation of out-group members (e.g., Schoel et al., 2014; Kubota, 2018) but may also reflect aspired affiliations with a particular group that one is not a part of (yet) (e.g., Stein, Lu, & Ohler, 2019; Chavez, 2020b). The distinction between hetero-stereotypes and auto-stereotypes, however, is rather fluid as

both kinds of stereotypes “contain more information about the identity of those voicing them” than about any other group (Hass et al., 2016, p. 127). A person’s “perception depends on the knowledge contained in [their] already existing schemata,” and stereotypes “constitute a mirror for an [individual’s] experience and [their] worldviews” (Bolten, 2007, p. 128: cited in: Hass et al., 2016, p. 126). Therefore, the exploration of stereotypes can provide insights into how individuals, e.g., language learners, identify themselves and perceive their surroundings, locally and afar.

FL study has been frequently promoted as a mind-broadening experience (e.g., the Modern Language Association's Statement on Language Learning and United States National Policy, 2012). However, a quick look at how language programs often advertise the study of ‘their language’ (e.g., German) or, more broadly, how people discuss language study online, shows that stereotypical notions of languages, its speakers, and cultural practices, products, and perspectives are more dominant than we would like to think (see Chavez, 2020a).

In recent years, stereotypes about TL communities have seen a renewed interest by educational researchers (e.g., Hass et al., 2016; Kubota, 2018; Stein et al., 2019). In the context of learning German as an FL, Nikitina, Don, and Cheong (2014) found that “learners bring into the classroom an array of images about the TL country and culture and these images are often stereotypical in nature” (Nikitina et al., 2014, p. 114). These findings confirmed those of previous studies about stereotypical notions of the German language, culture, and its people (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Abrams, 2002). Chavez (2020b)¹ even showed that learners of FLs associated stereotypes about NSs of German “with qualities inherent in the language’s non-native learners” (p. 17). However, research has yet to investigate how learners’ stereotypical notions of the TL community—i.e., as represented by its NSs—travel from perceived or imagined global contexts to a particularly influential member of the FL classroom, i.e., the teacher (e.g., Hall, 2001; Seedhouse, 2008). For many students, the teacher is the first—perhaps for a long time, the

¹ I worked with the manuscript of this article.

only—direct personal link with the TL. Thus, teachers are the first target to which stereotypes can get attached or the first indicator that stereotypes are just that.

This dissertation hence investigates the questions of (1) which stereotypes about NSs of German beginning learners of German have heard; and (2) how these stereotypical attributions to NSs are reflected in learners' descriptions of stereotypes about teachers of German. This study can help researchers gain further insights into students' imaginings of TL communities, particularly how learners imagine the stereotypical qualities of both NSs and teachers of German and their relationship. Further, this study speaks to current motivational and identity theories in the field of second language acquisition.

Throughout this work, I use the following key terms that I define briefly as follows: (A) The reference to *social spaces* in the title indicates that people live and work in communities—social units or groups of humans—that an individual may be a part of or would like to affiliate with. For instance, NSs of German are members of the German-speaking communities mostly living in German-speaking countries and teachers of German work in the context of the FL classroom, a social environment with teachers and learners. (B) The verb *to imagine* and the noun *imagination* reference general mental images, ideas, and beliefs that individuals, i.e., learners, have about groups of people that learners have primarily heard about or envisioned in their minds instead of experienced or encountered personally. (C) The term *imagined communities* is understood, according to Norton and her associates, as “groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom [learners] connect through the power of the imagination” (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 241). (D) The verb *to travel* is used to indicate that the imaginings of an individual can spread to new contexts and do so with a discernible direction. (E) The present study defines *stereotypes* as a form of mental images and societal narratives about the attributes—qualities and behaviors—of people associated with the TL community. This definition emphasizes a rather general understanding of stereotypes at the intersection of community and individual, while not having an evaluative character. This study did not investigate to what degree participants believed these

stereotypical notions; it merely explored which stereotypes learners had heard. What is more, participants did not receive a definition of what the term stereotype entailed. Respondents were free to use their understanding of the term, which might have differed from how the term has been applied in this study.

In the following chapter, I will describe these theories as well as related research studies into the role of community in language learning. It will also show how the investigation of learners' stereotypes about a TL community has been contributing to this research. Additionally, I will outline research that has explored the teacher's role in the classroom. The subsequent chapters will address the following topics: Research Methods (Chapter 3); Results (Chapter 4); Discussion and Implications (Chapter 5); Limitations of the Present Study (Chapter 6); and Conclusion (Chapter 7).

2. Review of Previous Research

This study looks at how college foreign-language learners of German describe stereotypical qualities of teachers and native speakers of German. The overarching objective of this research is to trace how stereotypical attributions linked to native and non-native-speaker teachers of German reflect the perceived or imagined global contexts of the target language community as represented by its native speakers. After positioning this study in the broader context of individualistic and societal perspectives of L2 motivation research (Subchapter 2.1), the following subchapters will describe the central role of communities in language learning (Subchapters 2.2–2.2.2). Moreover, this literature review will illustrate the importance of stereotypes for learners' imaginings of target language communities (Subchapters 2.3–2.3.3) as well as the role of its potential representatives in the foreign language classroom—that is, the teachers (Subchapters 2.4–2.4.2). The final subchapters will provide a summary of central aspects described in the review (Subchapter 2.5) and a presentation of the resulting research questions (Subchapter 2.6).

2.1 Contextualization of This Study in L2 Motivation Research

This study can be situated in the broader context of research into L2 motivation. Motivation research has seen a significant interest by scholars worldwide over the past decades. Nevertheless, researchers have yet to agree upon a definition of *motivation*. Social psychologist Roy F. Baumeister (2016) recently explored guidelines toward a general theory of motivation. He stated that, in its broadest sense, “motivation is wanting. It is a condition of an organism that includes a subjective sense (not necessarily conscious) of desiring some change in self and/or environment” (p. 1). Based on previous research, Baumeister summarized that there are two aspects of motivation: the ‘what’ and the ‘how’: “The ‘what’ would be a list, or, better, a taxonomy, of the states and outcomes that people want. The ‘how’ would elucidate the manner in which desires are experienced and enacted, as motivation interacts with cognition, emotion, and behavior” (p. 2). In the context of second language acquisition (SLA), psychologist Robert C. Gardner (2006) concluded that “motivation is a very complex phenomenon with many facets” (p. 242). “It has cognitive, affective and conative characteristics, and the motivated individual demonstrates all facets” (p. 243). Similar to Baumeister’s observations about the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of motivation, Gardner explained that motivated individuals display reasons (also called motives) as well as sustained actions: “If one is motivated, he/she has reasons (motives) for engaging in the relevant activities, expends effort, persists in the activities, attends to the tasks, shows desire to achieve the goal, enjoys the activities, etc. A ‘reason’ is not motivation” (p. 243). The current study appeals to both aspects of motivation, the ‘what’—or reasons/motives—and the ‘how’—or sustained actions: Learners’ descriptions of stereotypical native speakers (NSs) and teachers of German (a) may provide insights into learners’ motives to study German and (b) learners’ imagined or perceived characteristics of their teachers may influence how learners experience and engage with the language learning process.

Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) summarized the historical development of L2 motivation research along the lines of the following major periods:

- (a) “The *social psychological period*² (1959—1990)—characterized by the work of Robert C. Gardner and his students and associates in Canada.
- (b) The *cognitive-situated period* (the 1990s)—characterized by moves to shift the research agenda away from its social psychological roots toward a realignment with mainstream educational psychology, mainly driven by cognitive theories originally developed in non-L2-specific research.
- (c) The *process-oriented period* (turn of the century to the present day)—characterized by an interest in motivational change, especially concerned with how motivation emerges from interaction between individuals and contexts” (pp. 73-74).

The first period was characterized by the work of Gardner (e.g., 1985) and his colleagues. Dörnyei and Muir (2016) explained that Gardner and his associates introduced the pairing of *integrative* and *instrumental orientation/motivation* with “the former referring to the desire to learn the L2 of a valued community so that one can communicate with its members and, in some instances, become more like them, with the latter referring to the more concrete benefits that such L2 proficiency might bring about (e.g., career opportunities or increased salary)” (p. 21). Gardner (1985) argued that learning an FL “involves the individual’s openness to other cultural communities and/or the target language community directly, and is seen as a major variable distinguishing the learning of a second language from other school subjects” (referenced in Gardner, 2006, p. 258). This implies that the interplay of learners’ attitudes toward and beliefs about the target culture/community, as well as life experiences, family beliefs and attitudes, and “possibly even genetic predispositions” account for differences in motivation (p. 247). At this point, it is worth pointing out that these periods cannot be considered discrete. As becomes evident in the case of Gardner, we can see that his work on motivation (e.g., his *socio-educational model*, initially proposed in 1975, revised in 1979, 1983, 1985, 2007, and 2000)³ has had a lasting impact across the

² Footnote added to quote to acknowledge that Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) coined the names for all three periods described.

³ This list of the revised models was compiled by Taie and Afshari (2015) who provided a critical review on the socio-educational model.

periods, e.g., as can be seen in the *L2 motivational self system* by Dörnyei (2005; 2009) or in the work by Nikitina (e.g., 2015).

The second period, according to Dörnyei and Muir (2016), saw the arrival of SLA researchers, e.g., Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda. They shifted the focus from a macro perspective, analyzing whole L2 communities to a micro perspective, investigating motivation as it relates to specific languages, classes, learners, and teachers. Dörnyei (1994), for instance, found that motivation is the primary determinant in learning an FL. The main goal of this period was to “understand the actual phenomena characterizing the reality of instructed SLA”, including the situated and temporal variations of motivation (Dörnyei & Muir, 2016, p. 22).

Research of the third—and current—period has been addressing the “interrelated complexity of the numerous factors related to the learner, the learning task, and the learning environment” (Dörnyei & Muir, 2016, p. 22). It is the research from this period that predominantly influenced this study. I was most intrigued by the interplay between learners’ imaginings of the learning environment—particularly the teacher—and learners’ aspired communities—that is, the target language community. The theoretical constructs that informed this study primarily are Dörnyei’s L2 motivational self system (2005; 2009), the concept of L2-related vision introduced by Dörnyei and his collaborators (e.g., Dörnyei & Chan, 2013; Muir & Dörnyei, 2013; Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014), and of Anderson’s concept of imagined communities as it has been applied to SLA contexts by Norton (2001)⁴. The following subchapter will describe these theoretical foundations in greater detail.

⁴ Other related studies and theories of this period can be found in Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan (2015) who compiled a systematic and comprehensive survey of L2 motivation research trends between 2005 and 2014.

2.1.1 Theoretical Foundations: The Power of Learners' Possible Selves and Imagination

For more than a decade, the field of L2 motivation research has focused on self-based approaches to investigate what motivates learners to start learning a language and what keeps them motivated and stay on their learning path (Boo et al., 2015). The most influential theoretical construct in this regard has been Dörnyei's L2 motivational self system. In his model, Dörnyei followed theoretical concepts from educational psychology, such as those concerning the notion of 'self'⁵, as synthesized in Markus and Nurius' (1986) *possible selves theory*. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) summarized that *possible selves*

“denote a powerful and at the same time versatile motivational self-mechanism, representing individuals' ideas of what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming. [...] [They are] representations of one's self in future states, involving thoughts, images, and senses, and are in many ways the manifestations, or personalized carriers, of one's goals and aspirations (or fears, of course)” (p. 87).

Markus and Nurius' theory (1986, p. 957) addressed self-conceptions and self-images, which they captured in terms such as *feared selves*, *ideal selves*, and *ought selves*. These same terms also play a central role in Dörnyei's model.

Informed by the possible selves concept, Dörnyei (2005) proposed a holistic motivation construct for learning another language. The L2 motivational self system (2005; updated 2009) centers around the learner's self-concept and the motivating power of mental imagery. It consists of three dimensions (Dörnyei & Muir, 2016):

- (1) The *ideal L2 self* reflects a “desirable self-image of the kind of L2 user that one would ideally like to be in the future.”
- (2) The *ought-to L2 self* describes the qualities that “one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and to avoid possible negative outcomes in the process of L2 learning.”
- (3) The *L2 learning experience* includes situated “motives related to the immediate learning environment (e.g., the impact of the L2 teacher, the curriculum, the peer group, and the experience of success)” (pp. 87-88).

⁵ For an overview, Leary (2007) reviewed research and theories related to self-related motives and self-conscious emotions and their interplay.

A learner's *ideal L2 self* may motivate them if they see a discrepancy between their desired future self and their current state (Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017). Motivation to achieve this positive future self-image may also be reinforced by “a counteracting *feared possible self* in the same domain: Vivid imagery relating to the negative consequences of failing to achieve the desired end-state” (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015, p. 92). The *ought-to self* represents an “‘imported’ image of the future [imposed by outside sources, e.g., friends, parents, and other authoritative figures] that the learner will then internalize to some extent” (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 32; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015, p. 88). What is more, Thompson and her collaborators (e.g., Thompson & Vásquez, 2015; Thompson, 2017) uncovered a counter-concept to the ought-to self in their research: The *anti-ought-to self* describes the motivation of language learners who “are strongly motivated by striving to do the opposite of external expectations” (2017, p. 484). Dörnyei (2009, p. 27) suggested that these possible selves are shaped in complex interactions by, for instance, the milieu, the vitality of the L2 community, the learner's cultural interest, attitudes towards L2 speakers, and integrativeness. All of these influences emphasize the “ties between the individual learner and various aspects of engagement with language communities” (Chavez, 2020b, p. 3).

The *L2 learning experience* is the third dimension of the L2 motivational self system. To define it more thoroughly, Dörnyei (2019c) recently described it as the “perceived quality of the learners' engagement with various aspects of the language learning process [e.g., the teacher]” (p. 26). In his meta-analysis of the L2 motivational self system, Al-Hoorie (2018) summarized that the L2 learning experience “operates on a different level from either the ideal L2 self or the ought-to L2 self” as this dimension of the model is not concerned with future self-images but with attitudes and evaluations of the present learning environment (p. 725). It can be a strong—perhaps the strongest—predictor of motivated behavior and learning achievement (e.g., Lamb, 2012; Teimouri, 2017; Al-Hoorie, 2018; Dörnyei, 2019c). Nevertheless, as Al-Hoorie (2018) and Dörnyei (2019c) concluded, most of the research has been focused on learners' future self-images. Researchers have shown only very little interest in investigating this dimension. Studies

that have been conducted primarily focused on students' course evaluations, their satisfaction with a course, and learning achievement. Results, however, have to be considered with care as students' ratings of course satisfaction have proven to be biased based on the teacher's age, ethnicity, gender, clothes, and attractiveness (Al-Hoorie, 2018, p. 725). The current study focuses on one of the variables of the L2 learning experience, the language teacher, so as to understand these biases better, in particular as they relate to native-speaker status.

In recent years, Dörnyei and his associates have further developed the notions of future-self-images by focusing on *L2-related vision* as a key motivator, particularly concerning sustained motivation involved in the long-term process of mastering an L2 (Dörnyei & Muir, 2016, p. 22). *Vision*, according to Muir and Dörnyei (2013, p. 357), is "the mental representation of the sensory experience of a future goal state (involving imagination and imagery)" (p. 357). With regard to L2 learning, You, Dörnyei, and Csizer (2016) concluded that the "combination of possible selves and imagery can be perceived as the learners' L2-related vision that has a strong motivational role" (p. 95). You et al. (2016) highlighted the importance of initial recognition and activation of imagery skills as well as "the subsequent nurturing and expansion of these activated skills (defining the future trajectory of one's mental imagery)" (p. 120). Processes, such as recognition and expansion of imagery skills, also apply to the current study with its focus on stereotypes—or broadly speaking, mental images. A powerful and motivating learning tool for both students and teachers may be to become aware of stereotypes and critically reflect on them. For students, reflective activities concerning their stereotypes about the target language, its speakers and culture, may be a starting point for learners to develop a critical vision of their learning, with the ultimate goal to overcome stereotypical notions and develop a deeper cultural awareness over the course of their language education (e.g., Nikitina & Furuoka, 2019). Teachers, when they learn about their students' stereotypes about teachers, can critically reflect on their own visions of being a language educator, including their hopes and fears. Dörnyei (2018) makes clear that "igniting—or, if necessary, reigniting—

the flame of teacher vision may well be the single most important step in any motivational agenda for classroom practitioners” (p. 5).

Similar to Dörnyei’s work, *imagination* takes a central role in the concepts adapted by Bonny Norton from Anderson (1983; 2006), i.e., *imagined communities*, and Wenger (1998), i.e., *communities of practice*, into theories of second language acquisition (SLA).

Benedict Anderson (1983) originally coined the term imagined communities to explain the origins and spread of nationalism. He defined a nation as an imagined community “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). Norton found Anderson’s concept to be useful to understand SLA for the following reasons: A sense of belonging to a community seems particularly critical in language learning since “the learning of another language, perhaps more than any other educational activity, reflects the desire of learners to expand their range of identities and to reach out to wider worlds” (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007, p. 670). Norton and Toohey (2011, p. 415) also pointed out that learners’ hopes “for the future (or their children’s future) are integral to language learner identity” (p. 415).

Etienne Wenger’s communities of practice “can be viewed as a social learning system” (Wenger, 2010, p. 179). It is a group “of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015, p. 1). Norton was not only interested in the *engagement*⁶ component—the “direct involvement with community practices and investment in tangible and concrete relationships”—of Wenger’s construct but also in the

⁶ Wenger described three *modes of belonging* (1998), which he later renamed to *modes of identification* (2010): engagement, imagination, alignment (Wenger, 2010, p. 184).

imagination aspect as another source of community (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 241). Wenger (2010)

characterized imagination⁷ as following:

“As we engage with the world we are also constructing an image of the world that helps us understand how we belong or not. [...] We use such images of the world to locate and orient ourselves, to see ourselves from a different perspective, to reflect on our situation, and to explore new possibilities. The world provides us with many tools of imagination (e.g., language, stories, maps, visits, pictures, TV shows, role models, etc.). These images are essential to our interpretation of our participation in the social world. Imagination can create relations of identification that are as significant as those derived from engagement” (p. 184).

As shown later in this chapter, characterizations of stereotypes intersect with this description of imagination as stereotypes are a form of mental imagery and that they, too, help individuals to orient themselves and interpret their surroundings.

Concerning language learning and grounded in Anderson’s and Wenger’s work, Kanno and Norton (2003) described imagined communities as following: “groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of the imagination” (p. 241). Imagined communities include “any community of the imagination that is desirable to the language learner, whether a community of professionals, sports fans, or comic book readers” (Norton, 2016, p. 477). Kanno and Norton (2003) concluded that “imagined communities are no less real than the ones in which learners have daily engagement and might even have a stronger impact on their current actions and investment” (p. 242).

It is worth emphasizing that communities have to be “desirable to the language learner.” The aspect of desirability speaks to research efforts into learner identities. It raises the question of which kinds of students find what kinds of communities desirable to affiliate with (e.g., compare Chavez' [2020b] concept of the plausible foreign-language self in Subchapter 2.2.2). It also bears implications for the self-representation and outreach strategies of language programs. That is, a program’s self-representation

⁷ According to Wenger (2010, p. 184), he was actually influenced by Benedict Anderson’s (1983) understanding of *imagination* in the context of *Imagined Communities*.

may not align with learners' imagination, or, in a worst case, learners may disqualify joining a respective language program at large based on their preconceived notions of the target language community, regardless of the program's outreach efforts or real-life practices. Chavez (2020a)⁸, who looked at (a) the self-representations of language programs (in French, German, Japanese, Russian, Spanish) and (b) language students' imagined and personal reasons for studying German, concluded that "even the best advertising campaign will fail if the product it aims to sell, does not appeal to the clientele" (p. 32).

Most pertinent to the present study, Norton's research has emphasized the motivational potential of community—particularly, learners' imagined communities—in language learning. Trentman (2013) demonstrated learners' desire to belong to an imagined community of students who studied abroad in the Middle East by "demonstrating the identities of cross-cultural mediator and dedicated language learner" (p. 545). Murphey, Jin, and Li-Chi (2005) showed that through writing, reading, and discussing their language-learning histories, Japanese and Taiwanese learners of English were able to imagine communities of English speakers as well as learners of English they identified with, even if they had initially lacked imagined communities that they would aspire to belong to. The authors highlighted the need for students to reflect on their own learning and identity and to develop a perception of the respective target language community. Magnan (2008) argued that educators should also consider "imagined communities brought forth through interactions with protagonists in the imagined spaces of novels and other writings or performance", in addition to digital communities and face-to-face communities (p. 362). She emphasized that "the notion of community applied to language learning must far exceed the classroom" (p. 362).

In sum, language learning resides "in the dialectic formed between communities and individuals" (Lantolf, 2006: cited in: Magnan, 2008, p. 358). In the context of Languages Other Than English (LOTEs),

⁸ I worked with the manuscript of this article.

the call for research into this dialectic was recently emphasized by the Modern Language Journal's special issue (2017) on the study of motivation to learn LOTEs. In their article, Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) called for bridging the gap between more individualistic and more societal perspectives within motivation research. They described that the “understanding of individual-level motivation with regard to such an inherently social phenomenon as language learning has always involved having to find some compromise between the two perspectives” (p. 459).

Following Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie's suggestion, Subchapters 2.2–2.4 will explore the dialectic between individuals, i.e., language learners, and communities.

2.2 The Role of Communities for Language Learners

The American Council On The Teaching Of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) addressed the role of communities in foreign-language (FL) learning by issuing the Standards for Foreign-Language Learning (SFL) in 1996⁹. The latest incarnation, the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages still include the five originally introduced goal areas (*the Five Cs*), addressing students' learning outcomes and FL teaching (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015). The five Cs are *Communication*, *Cultures*, *Connections*, *Comparisons*, and *Communities*. The fifth C—*Communities*—addresses goals that allow students to “communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world.” The first version of the Standards defined Communities rather broadly as “multilingual communities at home and around the world” (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996). The most recent ACTFL Standards have specified Communities as “school and globalized communities,” inspiring students to “use the language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate in their community and the globalized world” (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015).

⁹ For an elaborate summary of the history of the National Standards refer to Magnan, Murphy, and Sahakyan (2014).

Magnan et al. (2014, p. 239) determined the importance of all five goal areas to post-secondary language students. They found that learners ranked the Communities as well as the Communication goal area as the most important to them as both categories convey “the highly valued notion of language use.” Although FL learners place primary emphasis on the Communities standards, FL teachers often feel incapable of implementing this goal area in their classrooms (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2011; Magnan, Murphy, Sahakyan, & Kim, 2012). A central reason for this predicament is the unilateral definition of target language communities by both foreign language teachers and learners, as shown in Subchapter 2.2.1.

2.2.1 Perceptions of Target Language Communities According to Learners and Teachers

Magnan et al. (2014) found that students anticipated a future entry into target language (TL) communities (p. 235) and “evoked an ideal self (Dörnyei, 2009) who would interact with TL speakers easily in a variety of situations” (Magnan et al., 2014, p. 224). Concerning a timeline for meeting the Communities standards, students responded that both the “locus” and “time of learning” extended beyond the classroom (Magnan et al., 2014, p. 228). White (2016), investigating perceived and imagined TL communities in the context of German, further refined the parameters of students’ definition of Communities. She concluded that “learners’ definition of what constituted a TL community focused on native-speaker status and geographical location” (p. 124). Her participants did not even “consider the potential for a community of German speakers to exist in a local setting”, although they were given the opportunity to engage in the TL in a classroom setting as well as extracurricular events, such as conversation tables outside of class (pp. 135, 137).

According to The Standards Impact Survey administered by ACTFL (2011) with more than 2,100 participants, teachers were least likely to embrace the Communities goal area even after 15 years of

implementation.¹⁰ Teachers still perceived the Communities goal area “to be nebulous, out of their control, and not assessable,” as they require them to take their students “into the local community or abroad” (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2011, p. 11). Glisan (2012) explored teachers’ reasoning for these beliefs. She found that teachers believed that the Communities goal area could only be addressed via contact with NSs. This is not surprising as activities proposed to meet the Communities standards have often focused on contexts beyond the classroom, e.g., “travel and study abroad; service-learning projects; formal and informal interaction with native language speakers; visits to restaurants, ethnic festivals, or other locations where the TL is spoken or culture is celebrated” (Cutshall, 2012, p. 33). This perception, however, results in a dilemma between teachers’ actions and students’ priorities and expectations: Since teachers feel unable to address Communities in class, “they spend much less time on them than on Communication,” although both categories are perceived as similarly important by students (Magnan et al., 2014, pp. 224-225). Teachers’ understanding of this goal area—that is, contact with NSs—“places the achievement of this goal both outside the classroom and the teachers’ immediate control” (Chavez, 2020b, p. 2, referencing: Glisan, 2012). Therefore, educators “choices will likely be out of sync with the priorities of at least lower level post-secondary students” (Magnan et al., 2014, p. 224). This may result in “learner frustration or even disillusionment in instructed learning” (p. 225).

Magnan et al. (2014) urged educators to rethink the hierarchical organization of the five goal areas, i.e., with Communities at/toward the end: They suggested placing the Communities standards over other goal areas as “they are necessarily embedded in the broader notion of where interaction takes place” (p. 184). Similarly, White (2016) proposed that “beyond finding ways for students to access their idealized communities, it is even more important that instructors work to create more immediate and

¹⁰ The Communities standards have also been considered the *Lost C* due to the minimal attention it has received in both research and practice (Glisan, Phillips, Allen, Abbott, & Sauer, 2010; Shrum & Glisan, 2010; Glisan, 2012).

accessible communities for their students, [...] especially within the classroom and other local settings” (p. 142). The current study can contribute to this call by helping learners and educators reflect on their perceptions of TL communities and how these notions may (not) be reflected in the classroom, particularly through the person of the teacher.

2.2.2 Learners’ Transformative Identities and Their Immediate and Imagined Communities

Two critical questions become evident from the previous subchapter: (1) How do learners go about forming their identities with respect to their notions of the respective target language (TL) community? (2) How can the learning environment/learners’ immediate communities (e.g., the local setting, learners’ peers, and the teacher) influence learners’ perceptions of language community to help them feel closer to both the language communities they would like to affiliate with abroad and their immediate language communities locally?

Gardner (2006) emphasized the transformative power of language learning with respect to motivation: “A basic tenet of the socio-educational model is that language courses are different from most other school subjects in that they involve adoption of material associated with another cultural community, and that this difference should be recognized when considering student motivation” (p. 236). Language learners’ transformative potential concerning learner identities has been explored by studies related to learners’ possible selves and Dörnyei’s L2 motivational self system (see Subchapter 2.1.1). Recent researchers, however, have found shortcomings of the L2 motivational self system and have seen the necessity to extend the model by introducing additional concepts of self. For instance, Henry (2017) introduced the notion of the *ideal multilingual self*—a learner’s desire to become multilingual (also compare the concept of the *plurilingual future self* suggested by Busse, 2017). Thompson and her colleagues (Thompson & Vásquez, 2015; Thompson, 2017) coined the term of the *anti-ought to self*—a learner’s aspiration “strongly motivated by striving to do the opposite of external expectations” (2017, p. 484). Indeed, current research (e.g., Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017; Ushioda, 2017; Dörnyei, 2019a) has

pointed out that the L2 motivational self system has its deficiencies especially in the context of Languages Other Than English. Here, the model may not fully account for “contextual influences on the formation and operation of L2 selves” (Dörnyei, 2019a, p. 48). Dörnyei (2019a) acknowledged the need for an increased focus on social settings for the formation and development of possible selves by citing Lamb (2009, p. 245): The value of L2 selves would be “much enhanced if we also explore their origins in, and impact on, the social settings and situated activity of language learning” (Dörnyei, 2019a, p. 48).

Recent research has been emphasizing learner’s possible selves with respect to their immediate and imagined communities. MacIntyre, Baker, and Sparling (2017) coined the term of the *rooted L2 self*:

“a heritage-oriented concept defined by strong feelings of connection to speakers of the language, which can be tied to specific individuals [...] but more generally a defined community [...]. The sense of connection appears to emerge from factors closely associated with the language—such as place, shared history, and cultural practices [...]” (p. 512).

In the context of learning Gaelic in Nova Scotia, MacIntyre et al. (2017) investigated learners’ motivation to study this heritage language that had been on the decline for decades. However, cultural practices, particularly Gaelic dance and music, have been thriving in the region. MacIntyre et al. (2017) concluded that these cultural practices became a critical “part of community-supported language preservation” (p. 513). Chavez (2020b) introduced the concept of the *plausible foreign-language (FL) self*:

“The plausible or implausible FL self represents a learner’s self-concept in terms of whether the learner’s personal and dispositional characteristics (such as ethnicity, gender, socio-economic position, political views, etc.) suggest to the learner that membership in a specific foreign-language community [...] is feasible” (p. 7).

Concerning learning German at the college level, Chavez (2020b) connected her term of plausible foreign-language self with stereotypical perceptions of German NSs and learners of German, as they were held by learners of German as well as by learners of other FLs. Chavez described that “if learning another language indeed transforms through a process of affiliation with another cultural group, then whether this new self will be, in Dörnyei’s terms, feared or ideal, will depend on how the learner views that cultural group” (p. 5). The study revealed that both the communities that learners would like to affiliate themselves with

(NSs) and the community that they experience locally (fellow learners) are important for learners' motivation to (not) study a particular language. Chavez outlined two possible consequences with regard to how potential learners frame their decision to learn or not learn a given language: "(a) If the attributes of NSs are thought to be unattractive, learners of the language may become subjected to similarly negative attributions; and (b) if NSs are imagined to possess qualities that separate them from potential learners (e.g., in ethnicity), these potential learners are likely to imagine themselves as implausible learners of German" (p. 22). These findings invite a reconsideration of previous findings, namely that learners orient more toward NSs than their fellow learners when defining their language communities (e.g., Magnan et al., 2014; White, 2016). First, learners' orientation toward NSs and fellow learners may not be quite as separate as previously thought; and second, thoughts about either NS or potential fellow learners may exert influence in the choice of language itself, i.e., before potential learners either become learners or non-learners of the language. Chavez further explored the insight that it is not just learners of a language but also those who decided against the study of a given language, who have been exposed to, become aware of, and draw conclusions about stereotypical notions of not just NSs but also learners of that language. For example, she found that "every single group of non-learners of German gave more detailed descriptions of likely learners of German than of NSs" (p. 21). The specific descriptions of likely learners of German, as given by study participants, showed inclusionary as well as exclusionary potential. Listed attributes included "personal connections, including German heritage" and personal characteristics, "such as being White, European, Midwestern, male, or wealthy" (p. 22). Overall, these findings underscore that potential learners imagine their potential fellow learners.

In sum, both concepts—MacIntyre's rooted L2 self and Chavez' (im)plausible FL self—have in common that they, with respect to learner's self-concepts, highlight the importance of communities, whether it is the learners' immediate communities, e.g., fellow learners and cultural practices, or their imagined communities, e.g., NSs of the target language.

The present study aims to expand our understanding of the interactions between learners' views of their imagined and immediate communities. With a similar population and research methodology to that of Chavez (2020b), this study serves two purposes: (a) It creates a more extensive database on how learners' imagine NSs of German; and (b) it shows how students imagine or perceive another critical component of their immediate communities—besides fellow learners—namely, the teacher, including the relationship between perceptions of teachers and NS communities. In other words, how do learners of German imagine NSs of German and in the eyes of the learners, do teachers—regardless of native-speaker status—have the potential to act as stand-ins for learners' imaginings of the target language community?

2.3 Imaginings of Community: The Role of Stereotypes

Research into L2 motivation has been exploring learners' imaginings of community. However, only little is known about “how exactly learners go about imagining the communities with which they might affiliate” (Chavez, 2020b, p. 5). Recent research (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Nikitina et al., 2014; Nikitina, 2015, 2017, 2019; Chavez, 2020b) has indicated that how actual and potential learners imagine the respective target language (TL) communities, responds to the *stereotypes* about these TL communities that learners have heard in their daily lives. The exact nature of this interaction, however, is not yet well understood.

Stereotypes are, in their minimalistic definition, “generalized trait attributions” (Stein et al., 2019, p. 944). A more context-specific definition of stereotypes was provided by Kubota (2018) when she explored racial, ethnic, and cultural stereotypes in teaching English. She defined them as “a form of representation” that is “constructed by a simplified fixed belief about the characteristics of members who belong to a certain group” (p. 3651). Nikitina (2019) explored country stereotypes held by language learners in Malaysia, and she described stereotypes as “evaluative mental images and beliefs about a target language country held by language learners that have the potential to influence the learners' L2

motivation” (p. 2). Spencer-Rodgers (2001) researched beliefs about international students studying in the United States and concluded that,

“[...] stereotypes have been conceptualized as culturally shared beliefs about the attributes that characterize a group of people (consensual, cultural, or social stereotypes) and in terms of unique, personal beliefs about the attributes of a group (individual, personal, or idiosyncratic stereotypes). [...] Stereotypic representations vary along an evaluative dimension and they may contain both positive and negative attributes” (p. 632).

Based on the previous characterizations, the present study defines stereotypes as a *form of mental images and societal narratives about the attributes—qualities and behaviors—of people associated with the target language community*. This definition emphasizes a rather general understanding of stereotypes at the intersection of community and individual, while not having an evaluative character. This definition of stereotypes is beneficial in the context of the current study since (a) participants did not receive any definitions of what stereotypes are before completing their survey—they solely relied on their understanding of the term; and (b) they were not asked to evaluate the stereotypes that they had heard (e.g., positive or negative traits).

Stereotypes help individuals “classify people and objects into a coherent world view”, and they play a role in the formation of identities of individuals and groups (Sercu, 1998, p. 270). Hetero-stereotypes refer “to a group to which one does not belong (out-group), and auto-stereotypes [...] refer to a person’s own group (in-group)” (Hass et al., 2016, p. 118). Hetero-stereotypes may result in exclusion and devaluation of, or prejudice toward out-group members, e.g., in the context of racial or ethnic stereotypes (Kubota, 2018). Schoel et al. (2014), investigating relations between German and Turkish students in German high schools, found that “both groups share and express stereotypic views”. These views reflected “subtle linguistic in-group favoritism and out-group derogation” (p. 273). However, stereotypes about out-group members may also be positively connoted, as shown by Stein et al. (2019). They explored German and Chinese students’ hetero-stereotypes about each other and found a “very positive tenor” in both groups: Among other favorable traits, Chinese participants described Germans as especially

‘scientifically-minded’ and ‘practical’, and German participants rated Chinese people as very ‘industrious’ and ‘polite’” (p. 956). The distinction between hetero-stereotypes and auto-stereotypes, however, is rather fluid as both kinds of stereotypes “contain more information about the identity of those voicing them” than about any other group (Hass et al., 2016, p. 127). A person’s “perception depends on the knowledge contained in [their] already existing schemata,” and stereotypes “constitute a mirror for an [individual’s] experience and [their] worldviews” (Bolten, 2007, p. 128: cited in: Hass et al., 2016, p. 126). Hass et al. (2016) interviewed university students in Germany and Japan, asking them about their self-perception and the perception of members from the respective other group. They found that stereotypes and the perception of the other group help define one’s own group identity. That identity, however, is not a fixed concept. Hass et al. (2016) concluded, “depending on the momentary group of reference, auto-perception experiences a slight shift. [...] Thus, it can be stated that auto-stereotypes influence hetero-stereotypes just as hetero-stereotypes have a repercussion on auto-stereotypes” (p. 127).

Even though stereotypes may not be true, they can still be a powerful mechanism with regard to learner motivation. Chavez (2020b) summarized previous research (e.g., Barna, 1998; Vaisse, 2003; Drewelow, 2011) by concluding that even though stereotypes may not reflect the truth, they still affect learners’ perceptions and actions “in very real ways” (Chavez, 2020b, p. 5). Heinzmann (2014) summarized that stereotypes—as the cognitive dimension of learners’ attitudes toward speakers of a language—have an impact on learners’ willingness and motivation to (not) study that respective language. Both Nikitina (2019) and Chavez (2020b) confirmed that stereotypes are indicators of learners’ (de-) motivation to study a language. Nikitina (2019) explored this link with respect to 194 students of French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, and Italian at a university in Malaysia. She compared learners’ L2 motivation levels with learners’ stereotypes about the countries whose language they studied. She found that all aspects of students’ L2 motivation related positively and significantly with their country stereotypes, “concluding that language learners’ stereotypes and cultural beliefs about a TL country [...]

have a positive association with the students' L2 motivation" (p. 14). Chavez (2020b) looked at stereotypes that learners as well as non-learners of German had encountered about native speakers and likely learners of German. In her study with learners of German (126), French (39), Spanish (40), Russian (33), and Japanese (58) at a large research university in the United States, she found the way that students imagine stereotypical attributions of the target language community and its likely learners indicates a potential of students' affiliation—as well as the lack thereof—with the respective target language group. Given the impact of stereotypes, the following subchapter will outline research findings into various contexts that potentially promote stereotypes.

2.3.1 Contexts of Stereotypes

Stereotypes may be "formed through observation and direct contact with members of the target group", but they are most often socially learned, i.e., through "indirect sources such as parents, peers, teachers, leaders, school materials or the mass media" (Heinzmann, 2014, pp. 50, 58).

The media have a strong influence on people's stereotypes (e.g., Appel, 2008; Mastro, 2009; Mastro, Tukachinsky, Behm-Morawitz, & Blecha, 2014). A study by Bartram (2010: cited in: Busse, 2017, p. 569) about language attitudes held by Dutch, English, and German students showed that Dutch and English students are aware of negative portrayals of German and French people in the media. The media influenced students' attitudes toward learning these languages negatively. Drewelow (2011) found that French learners' perceptions of the French language and people were strongly colored by "images and impressions of the French people and French culture evoked in American autobiographical, journalistic, and scholarly writings" (p. 748). Stein et al. (2019) investigated the influence of mass media on the mutual perceptions of German and Chinese students, living in Germany. They found that the tonality of the mass media concerning China had an impact on the German students' stereotypes about China, whereas the data from their Chinese participants did not suggest such a connection. They suggested that "the circumstance of actually living in a foreign country may strongly reduce, or even 'overwrite', the media's

influence on its evaluation” (p. 958). Furthermore, Fukuda (2017) highlighted the fact that media outlets may actively play with stereotypes. She found that in Japanese TV shows, stereotypes about foreigners were constructed via both verbal and embodied features (e.g., bodily actions, facial expressions, laughter) as “contextualization cues to orient audiences to such stereotypes” (p. 12). Quasthoff and Hallsteinsdóttir (2016) explored the linguistic realization of stereotypes in mass media web corpora. They called for an increased exploration of stereotypes portrayed in other genres, particularly in films, literary works, as well as educational contexts and teaching materials.

In institutionalized learning, a variety of factors, e.g., language curricula, history lessons, learners’ and teachers’ backgrounds, teaching materials, or ways of instruction, carry the potential to either promote or impede learners’ stereotypical views. Ultanir, Ultanir, and Irkorucu (2016) found that stereotypes about an ethnic group—in their case, Balkans, may be positively or negatively connoted depending on the educational context (e.g., curriculum, history lessons). Flórez and Rodríguez (2016) indicated that both the teachers’ and learners’ backgrounds, as well as the socio-political context of their country, influence the stereotypes of the language studied—in their case, English in Columbia—but also stereotypes of each other. For instance, they found that on the one hand, the teachers’ prior experiences with students (particularly, academic majors) affected their views of students’ academic work, behavior, and attitudes. Students, on the other hand, formed stereotypic views of English class based on previous experiences in English courses. With respect to teaching materials, N. Coleman (2016) emphasized the importance of construction and deconstruction of stereotypes found in films used in German classrooms; and Singer (2016) showed how learners’ reflection on works of literature could influence their perceptions of the target language community positively. Byon (2007) showed that the use of a culture portfolio in a Korean language course helped “students to be aware of their own culture learning, recognize the impacts their first language perspectives have on learning the target culture, and thereby assist them in developing open attitudes toward the target culture.” Both Houghton (2010) and Drewelow (2013) stressed the

importance of learners' continuous reflections on their preconceived notions of the target language, its people and culture, at all language-levels. Drewelow (2013) also emphasized the need to explain the "interconnection between a language and its culture" through course content (p. 157). Furthermore, Fichtner (2015) showed that, contrary to beliefs, the use of students' L1 does not enhance learners' understanding of the target language and its culture in beginning-level German classes. Instruction in the L1 may even "reinforce learners' pre-conceived, stereotypical notions of the cultures associated with German-speaking countries" (p. 240).

In sum, stereotypes are promoted, intentionally or unintentionally, by the media, educational contexts, or other sources, such as parents and peers. That is why Busse (2017)—in her article on learners' attitudes toward Languages Other Than English—called on stakeholders in all these contexts. These stakeholders "hold responsibility for whether or not students develop favorable attitudes toward language diversity and come to pursue plurilingual aspirations" (p. 579).

2.3.2 Learners' Stereotypes About All Things German

The following paragraphs will present studies that were carried out at higher-education institutions in the United States (Katz & Braly, 1933; Taylor, 1977; Stapf, Stroebe, & Jonas, 1986; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Abrams, 2002; Chavez, 2009, 2020b) as well as at universities in China (Stein et al., 2019), Japan (Hass et al., 2016), New Zealand and Australia (Resch, 2008), and Malaysia (Nikitina et al., 2014; Nikitina, 2015, 2019).

In the US context, Katz and Braly (1933) were one of the first studies to explore learners' stereotypes of Germans (Nikitina et al., 2014, p. 118). They provided 100 students at Princeton with an adjective list and asked them to add their own descriptors to describe ten national groups, including the Germans. Over 25 percent of the participants referenced Germans' science, industry, ponderous and

methodical manner, and intelligence (the top-five adjectives were: “scientifically minded”, “industrious”, “solid”, “intelligent”, and “methodical” (Katz & Braly, 1933, p. 285: cited in: Nikitina et al, 2014, p. 118).

In her study, Taylor (1977) concluded that the images of 44 novice learners of German at an American college showed a rather “nostalgic-romantic Germany image of yesteryear [...] possibly maintained by the hundreds of German-America clubs with their annual Oktoberfests in this country” (p. 112). When asked about geographical places that came to mind when thinking of Germany, participants responded with “Munich 30 [responses], Berlin 27, Rhine 25, Hamburg 18, Black Forest 16, Berlin Wall 12, Frankfurt 12, Cologne 10, Heidelberg 8, Alps 7, Bonn 6, Bavaria 6; other miscellaneous places mentioned once numbered 37” (p. 112). The second question inquired about other associations with Germany, its past and present. Results included “folklore 27 [responses], wars 24, Hitler 21, beer 19, ties through family and/or friends 15, Olympics 12, classical music 10, food 9, Nazism 8, stereotyped national traits 7, miscellaneous items mentioned once 17” (p. 112). The third question expanded the national focus of the first two questions by asking participants to write down German-speaking countries. Responses were “Germany 41 [responses] (only 11 students specified both East and West Germany), Austria 28, Switzerland 27, Luxembourg 4, Belgium 2, other European and non-European countries mentioned once 1” (p. 112).

In a study with 1,439 students from twelve post-secondary institutions across the United States, Stapf et al. (1986: cited in: Schulz & Haerle, 1995, p. 3) showed that Germans and Germany received relatively low ratings (in comparison to other countries) on a number of indicators, e.g., likable, friendly, open-minded, enjoy life, attractive vacation destination.

The studies conducted by Schulz and Haerle (1995) revealed a more positive image. They asked 340 US college-level students of German to complete the phrase “Die Deutschen...” in 1992. They repeated the study in 1994 with 129 students of German by changing the prompt to English, i.e., “The

Germans...”. Schulz and Haerle (1995, p. 7) stated that the categories of stereotypes expressed with the German prompt remained the same when participants were asked in English. Responses to these categories, however, changed slightly, indicating that language proficiency has an “effect on the stereotypical imagery conveyed by students” (p. 8). Responses were grouped into the following eight categories, as provided in Table 1¹¹:

Table 1: Schulz and Haerle (1995) results (adapted from Schulz & Haerle, 1995)

#	category name	% of responses	examples of verbatim responses
1.	personal characteristics	43.41	
	positive qualities	73.21	Interesting; friendly; kind; etc.
	negative or neutral qualities	42.86	not friendly; (very) serious; strict; etc.
2.	beer/wine	9.30	love/drink lots of/like to drink beer; etc.
3.	cars	0.78	make some pretty nifty automobiles and a couple of motorcycles, too; etc.
4.	country/language	3.88	have a beautiful language; have a very difficult language to learn; have a beautiful country; etc.
5.	culture/schooling	14.73	have an (extremely) interesting/lovely/fascinating culture; etc.
6.	physical characteristics	1.55	a beautiful people; blue-eyed people; etc.
7.	history/historical or current events	19.38	have a (very) interesting/eventful/very complex and rich history; have a rough history; have a terrible past
8.	food/eating	6.98	make great foods/are good cooks/are known for their good food

Similar to other researchers cited previously (e.g., Spencer-Rodgers, 2001; Chavez, 2020b), Schulz and Haerle (1995) pointed out the fact that stereotypes are not necessarily negative and that they can serve a purpose if reflected upon critically in class. They concluded that “stereotypic categorization helps the human psyche to deal with uncertainties, to generalize from limited data, and to define the self and others. Stereotypes can be positive, neutral, or negative. They can be true, partly true, or patently false” (pp. 8-9).

¹¹ The following overview includes the response scores from the 1994 survey as the question was posed in English, similar to the scope of this current study.

Abrams (2002), in the context of an Internet-mediated project to explore cultural stereotypes, asked 68 intermediate-level students of German at a large university in the United States to provide as many answers as possible to the following question: “What do you know about Germans/Germany, Austrians/Austria, the Swiss/Switzerland or any of the other German-speaking countries?” (p. 147). Responses with a high frequency were related to “drink beer/drinking age (20 students)”, “food and bratwurst (18 students)” (p. 147). Only a few responses were related to personal characteristics, e.g., “they are friendly (4 students); they are punctual (3 students)” (p. 147). Other responses included the “language (4 students)”, “Austria (6 students)”, or “Switzerland (6 students)” (p. 147).

Chavez (2009) investigated language learners’ descriptions about the German language, i.e., its pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. She explored (a) preconceived notions that learners held before they began studying German and (b) their notions of the differences or similarities between German and English from their current vantage points in a German class. She found that German is perceived as a “difficult” (p. 6) and “harsh, throaty, or ‘phlegmy’ language” (p. 8)—stereotypes often portrayed in the media, “particularly films (e.g., mentions of *Indiana Jones*)” (p. 17). Moreover, “comparison of preconceived notions about the sound of German and observations from a current viewpoint implied that instruction improves only the ability to describe in greater detail what really is the same idea, i.e., German being a ‘harsh’ and ‘ugly’ language” (p. 17). However, for some students, these characteristics seemed rather attractive. They chose to study German as it was not a “sissy” language like “French and Spanish” (p. 6). Overall, Chavez concluded that German has a “sound problem” (p. 17). What is more, there were “parallels between the perceived roughness of the language’s sound and stereotypical notions of German speakers, especially Germans, as aggressive” (p. 17).

Chavez (2020b) explored stereotypes about both NSs and likely learners of German held by learners of German and of four other foreign languages (French, Russian, Spanish, Japanese) at a large Midwestern university. Through quantitative (scale-based) and qualitative (open-ended) questions, she

explored learners' perceptions of German, particularly its NSs, its affiliated cultures, and its learners. Chavez found that of all learners, learners of German (a) "were the least reluctant to offer common stereotypes about NSs of German" (p. 9) and (b) provided the "greatest diversity of stereotypes" (p. 12). She grouped all responses into the five umbrella categories portrayed in Table 2. The categories "denote different foci in the description of stereotypical NSs of German" (p. 10):

Table 2: Chavez (2020b) results (adapted from Chavez, 2020b)

#	Stereotypes about...	examples of verbatim responses
1.	disposition	
	negative cognition	stupid; not intelligent; etc.
	positive cognition	detail-oriented; logical; rational; etc.
	lack of emotion	robotic; stoic; cold; etc.
	abundant negative emotion	angry; rude; blunt; etc.
	all other, positive	jolly; polite; gentle; etc.
	all other, neutral	eccentric; forceful; risk-taker; etc.
	all other, negative	lazy, sloppy, selfish etc.
2.	social and political attitudes	socialist; conservative; Nazis, Aryan, racist, etc.; big families, different school system; etc.
3.	appearance	overweight; tall; muscular; blond; blue-eyed; wear lederhosen; etc.
4.	the language	loud; speak fast; yell; harsh/angry-sounding; have deep sounding words; can sight-read long words; etc.
5.	culinary and cultural interests	drink/love/brew beer (have been to real Oktoberfest); eat sausage, sauerkraut, schnitzel, bratwurst, pork, potatoes, pretzels, bread, strudel; obsessed with cell phones; like crazy art, modern architecture; love soccer; build/love/drive (fast, awesome) cars; etc.

For all language learner groups, the top ranks showed "stereotypes of (beer) drinking, negative emotions (such as anger), angry-sounding language, and Nazis" (p. 12). Chavez summarized that all learners, including learners of German, characterized NSs of German primarily with "negative or, at best, ambiguous qualities" (p. 13). With regard to descriptions of stereotypes about likely learners of German, she found that "some of the traits ascribed to NSs of German, such as articulatory and culinary preferences [...] appeared to have been transferred to the language's learners" (p. 16). Moreover, these descriptions

alluded “to a specific ethnicity [white, European], gender [male], and socio-economic status [wealthy] as well as personal traits, such as a desire—or lack of desire—to take on a challenge or political attitudes” (p. 16). These traits “appeared to be part of a broader trend of associating stereotypes about NSs of German with qualities inherent in the language’s non-native learners” (p. 17). She concluded that “learners who do not already have a personal connection or who do not possess specific ethnic, socio-economic, gender, and first-language attributes” are less likely to study German (p. 18). They simply did not see themselves as plausible learners of German.

The following paragraphs will outline three relevant studies conducted in non-US-university contexts. Nikitina and her associates in Malaysia have published a series of articles on the relationships between language learning motivation and stereotypes about target language countries, its people and cultures. (e.g., Nikitina, 2015; Nikitina, 2017, 2019; Nikitina & Furuoka, 2019). With respect to Germany, Nikitina et al. (2014) asked 26 beginner learners of German at a major university in Malaysia to write down their answers to the following question: “What images or mental pictures come to your mind when you hear the words ‘Germany’ and ‘German’?” (p. 122). Students also assigned a favorability rating to each of their responses, ranging from “very negative” to “very positive” (p. 122). Findings revealed 29 response categories, out of which 25 were positive. The most salient stereotype categories were “football”, “cars”, “technology”, “engineering”, “Volkswagen” and “big industries” (p. 114). Other categories included further references to cars (e.g., “BMW”), science (e.g., “scientists”), technology (e.g., “engineering”), sports (e.g., “Bayern Munich team”), culture (e.g., “Oktoberfest”; “song 99 Luftballons”), culinary interests (e.g., “sausages”; “beer”), history (e.g., “Hitler”; “Berlin Wall”), geography (e.g., Hamburg), language (e.g., “unique language”; “difficult language”). Only one of all categories referenced personal attributes, namely “disciplined people” (p. 126).

In a set of semi-standardized one-hour interviews, Hass et al. (2016) interviewed 15 students at a Japanese university to find out about their associations when they thought of (a) the country of Germany

or things German; (b) the German people; (c) particularly their personal attributes characteristics and behaviors; and (d) a typical German as a specific person. Results related to associations with the country of Germany and things German revealed that “sausages, meat, tasty food and beer” as well as “soccer and cars” were prevalent associations (p. 122). Participants also mentioned Germany’s difficult history (e.g., “Hitler, the Nazis, and World War II, [...] the division and reunification of the state”), but they mainly admired “how German society coped with its dark past” (p. 122). Furthermore, students provided associations related to politics (e.g., “role in European Union”), the renewable energy movement (e.g., “wind power”), the culture (e.g., “philosophy”, “Neuschwanstein”), and the German language (unspecified) (p. 122). Questions related to personal attributes of Germans elicited many responses—e.g., gender, socio-economic status, character traits—that were also described in other studies (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Chavez, 2020b). Personal attributes included favorable characteristics (e.g., “sober and earnest, polite, tidy, organized, punctual, [...] passionate [about their work]”) as well as less favorable characteristics (e.g., “egoistic and self-centered”; “strict”; “express their opinions directly and frankly, even overriding others”; “often react angrily”) (Hass et al., 2016, p. 122). Furthermore, participants described Germans’ appearance (e.g., “tall with muscular stature and broad shoulders”) (p. 122). With respect to gender and socioeconomic status, the typical German person is “clearly male”, either being a university student or “middle-aged craftsmen, who are often self-employed” (p. 122). Moreover, typical Germans were perceived to be family-, community-, as well as work-oriented (pp. 122-123).

In their study, Stein et al. (2019) explored the “mutual perceptions of Chinese exchange students and German natives at a German university.” Via an attribute list, 44 students from China and 44 students from Germany rated their stereotypes about themselves and each other on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from ““does not apply to this culture at all [...to] ‘fully applies to this culture’” (p. 948). The participants from China displayed primarily favorable perceptions of Germans. Highest mean ratings were found for positive adjectives, e.g., “scientifically-minded”, “eco-friendly”, and “practical”, followed by neutral

adjectives, e.g., “strict” and “direct” (pp. 950-951). The lowest mean ratings were observed for negative adjectives, e.g., “loud”, “sly”, “superstitious”, “straightforward”, and “dirty” (p. 951). Stein et al. (2019) explored differences between hetero-stereotypes (held by the Chinese students) and auto-stereotypes (held by the German students) about Germans. They found, among a few other qualities (e.g., “eco-friendly”), “particularly strong disagreements on the adjectives [...] ‘direct’ [...] and ‘strict’ [...]” (p. 954). In both instances, Chinese students gave higher ratings than Germans; the differences in mean ratings were statistically significant. These results indicate different perceptions in both cultures for concepts of directness and strictness. Previous studies (e.g., Kallia, 2005; Ogiemann, 2009) have also found that these concepts may depend on the cultural context.

2.3.3 Summary of Research on Stereotypes

In summary, the previous subchapters have shown that stereotypes—regardless of being positively, neutrally, or negatively connoted—play a role in how learners imagine target language communities. They can be an indication of learners’ motivation to (not) study a certain language. Studies also revealed that various contexts influence stereotypes. These contexts include observation and direct contact with members of the target language as well as indirect sources such as parents, peers, the media, and the school environment (e.g., language curricula, history lessons, learners’ and teachers’ backgrounds, teaching materials, or ways of instruction).

Despite different geographical locations, time of survey, and respondent groups, studies that investigated stereotypes about all things German have revealed a relatively steady variety of stereotypes related to the following aspects:

(1) Personal attributes of German speakers (e.g., Katz & Braly, 1933; Stapf et al., 1986; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2019; Chavez, 2020b) ranged from favorable traits likely to

promote professional success (e.g., hard-working) and personal relationships (e.g., friendly) to less desirable qualities likely to prevent relationships (e.g., serious) or to cause tension (e.g., aggressive).

(2) Appearance aspects (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Chavez, 2020b) generally emphasized blue eyes, Lederhosen, a muscular built, as well as an image of a male person.

(3) Qualities of the language (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Chavez, 2009, 2020b) were generally perceived as difficult and harsh-sounding, with the latter quality even affecting the perception of speakers as aggressive.

(4) Perceptions of a strong economy (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Nikitina et al., 2014; Hass et al., 2016) were often reflected in descriptions related to the car industry, for instance.

(5) Political and historical factors (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Chavez, 2020b) primarily referenced a problematic and eventful past (e.g., Hitler).

(6) Stereotypes about the culture (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Chavez, 2001; Abrams, 2002; Nikitina et al., 2014; Chavez, 2020b) often included references to culinary interests (e.g., sausages and beer), as well as to sports (e.g., soccer) and other events (e.g., Oktoberfest).

Additionally, a few studies (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Abrams, 2002) explored stereotypes about geographical locations of German-speaking regions. Furthermore, Chavez investigated how likely learners of German were perceived, showing that perceptions of native speakers of German as well as personal connections affect students' perceptions of likely learners of German.

What all these studies have in common is that they show how learners bring a variety of stereotypes to the German classroom, including students' stereotypical perceptions of the German target language community, including its culture, history, economy, language, and qualities of native speakers and learners of German. Nevertheless, in the German-language-learning context, one essential

component has been overlooked by research thus far: the teacher. That is, none of these studies have (a) explored learners' stereotypes about teachers of German or (b) investigated how teachers—as a critical link between target language communities abroad and the classroom locally—(do not) represent the stereotypical perceptions of the target language community, regardless of their native-speaker status. Such investigations seem particularly important as the teacher plays a central role in the foreign language classroom, as the following subchapters will show.

2.4 The Community of the Classroom: The Role of Teachers

This study will investigate whether the foreign-language (FL) teacher is (a) perceived against imaginings of NS communities and (b) can be understood as a potential gateway to a specific target language (TL) community, its speakers and culture. This research agenda is in line with White's (2016) recommendation that educators need to "expand their own notions of TL communities and take active steps to help students better understand the various types of community membership that are possible" (p. 142).

For many students, the teacher is the first—perhaps for a long time the only—direct link with the TL and the first target to which stereotypes can get attached or the first indicator that stereotypes are just that. Thus, investigating learners' perceptions of language instructors in relation to learners' imaginings of the TL community is key. After all, the instructor takes a prominent role in the classroom. Hall (2001) explained that although both teachers and students play an active role in creating learning communities, "the teacher's role is especially consequential" (p. 48). Seedhouse (2008), in his interactional architecture of the language classroom, concluded that it is still "the teacher who teaches the learners the L2" (p. 22). White (2016), as well, emphasized the importance of the teacher's role in building community, stating that instructors are "strongly encouraged to create more immediate and accessible communities for their students [...] especially within the classroom and other local settings" (p. 142).

By simply outlining a brief overview of research over the past 15 years into the role of teachers in the classroom, one can get an understanding of teachers' prominent position in classrooms. For instance, researchers have explored conceptualizations of both desirable (e.g., Brown, 2009; Nikitina & Furuoka, 2009; Al-Khairi, 2015; Raufelder, Nitsche, et al., 2016; De Costa & Norton, 2017; Zayac & Lenhard, 2018) and less desirable qualities of teachers (e.g., Demirtaş, 2016; Raufelder, Nitsche, et al., 2016). Other studies have looked at how teachers affect learners' motivation (e.g., Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Al Kaboody, 2013; Busse & Walter, 2013; Hornstra, Mansfield, van der Veen, Peetsma, & Volman, 2015; Busse, 2017) and demotivation (e.g., Kikuchi, 2009; Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009). Researchers have also explored the impact of teachers on classroom practices and engagement (e.g., Brown, 2009; Fichtner, 2015; Hagenauer, Hascher, & Volet, 2015; Dörnyei, 2019b). Moreover, the promotion of learner autonomy (e.g., Bajrami, 2015), learner satisfaction (e.g., Siming, Niamatullah, Gao, Xu, & Shafi, 2015), and learner achievement (e.g., Graham, Courtney, Marinis, & Tonkyn, 2017) have been critically examined for the role of the teacher. Also, the role of teachers as moral agents in the 21st century has been investigated (e.g., Kubanyiova & Crookes, 2016). Furthermore, research has stressed the impact of positive teacher-student relationships on various aspects, such as motivation and academic self-regulation of learners as well as teacher well-being (e.g., Bullough, 2008; Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011; Hagenauer & Volet, 2014; Farrell, 2015; Hagenauer et al., 2015; Raufelder, Scherber, & Wood, 2016; Henry & Thorsen, 2018). In the context of FL learning, researchers have also explored how teachers affect learners' FL enjoyment (e.g., Dewaele, Witney, Saito, & Dewaele, 2018; Dewaele, Magdalena, & Saito, 2019) as well as FL anxiety (e.g., Tsiplakides, Street, & Keramida, 2009; Horwitz, 2013; Dewaele, Witney, et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2019). Furthermore, research has paid attention to teachers' native-speaker status and gender in the FL classroom.

The last two variables—native-speaker status and gender of teachers—deserve a closer examination in the context of the present study. Such an investigation is key in light of (a) learners' and

teachers' definition of TL communities and (b) the fact that the German target-language community is often associated with male individuals.

2.4.1 Perceptions of Native-Speaker Status

The native speaker (NS) privilege entered language pedagogy with the turn toward spoken communicative competence in the 1970s (Kramsch, 1997). Despite efforts by researchers to contest the idealization of the NS—especially in the field of teaching English (e.g., Pavlenko, 2003; Kabel, 2009; Park, 2012; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014; J. Anderson, 2016; Aneja, 2016; Wolff & De Costa, 2017; Leonard, 2019)—the questionable authority of the NS has persisted in the minds of both educators and learners of foreign languages (FLs) until this day. Chavez (2020a), who investigated online self-representations of language programs, concluded that “after decades of criticism aimed at so-called native-speaker ideologies for their propensity to delegitimize non-native speakers as fully privileged members of a language community (e.g., Wang, 2014; Cook, 2016), the native speaker has returned or perhaps, never left” (p. 26).

Despite the prominence of the NS concept in research, scholars have yet to decide on a definition of an NS. Ghanem (2015) provided an overview of definitions. The summary ranged from a ‘bio-developmental definition’ based on the first language a human learns to speak (Bloomfield, 1933 cited in: Davies, 1991, p. 43 and Davies, 1996, p. 156) to ‘non-developmental definitions’. Those definitions incorporate characteristics such as the subconscious knowledge of a language (Kramsch, 1997), “the means to use the language creatively (Stern, 1983), identifying with a language community (Kramsch, 1997; Johnson & Johnson, 1998), and having the ability ‘to interpret and translate into the L1 of which s/he is a native speaker’ (Davies, 2003, p. 210)” (Ghanem, 2015, p. 171). Nevertheless, “the native speaker remains a nebulous concept”, yet one that is “commodified in language advertising and aspired to by learners” (Chavez, 2020a, p. 32).

From the learner's perspective, the NS ideal is being reflected in both definitions of target language communities (compare Glisan, 2012; Magnan et al., 2014; White, 2016 in Subchapter 2.2.2) and ultimate language goal. For the latter, Chavez (2013) explored how college learners of German envisioned their final attainment of various morpho-syntactic, phonological, pragmatic, and lexical features of German. Results showed, among others, that learners' contact with NSs was one variable that influenced students' positive outlook on their final attainment significantly. Chavez concluded that, despite efforts of SLA research to contest the privilege of the NS, "the NS has probably persisted as the standard of comparison in the minds of many learners" (p. 86).

Teachers alike place great emphasis on NS status. They associate the Communities goal area with contact to NSs (e.g., Magnan et al., 2014; White, 2016) and, whether consciously or not, often set native-like fluency as an ultimate goal for their students (e.g., Kramersch, 1997; Ricento, 2005; Wernicke, 2017). What is more, FL teachers still negotiate their own identity as educators along the lines of the NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) dichotomy (e.g., Wernicke, 2017).¹² Research into teacher identity has shown that, on the one hand, NS teachers tend to perceive themselves as superior and as authorities of their language and culture (e.g., Wolff & De Costa, 2017). However, this belief often neglects the fact that NSs "do not always speak according to the rules of their standard national languages; [...but] display regional, occupational, generational, class-related ways of talking that render the notion of a unitary native speaker arbitrary" (Kramersch, 1997, p. 359). NNS teachers, on the other hand, often question their legitimacy about teaching the target language and its culture; they are afraid of being perceived as inauthentic representatives of the languages they teach (e.g., Calafato, 2019). For instance, Ghanem (2015) showed in the context of teaching German "that NS/NNS identities influenced graduate instructors' self-

¹² This is not surprising given the fact that nativeness and non-nativeness still "influence a wide range of practices including hiring decisions (Clark & Paran, 2007), proficiency assessments (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012), and professional development (Llurda, 2004)" (Aneja, 2016, pp. 572-573).

perception, confidence, and comfort in the classroom in regard to teaching culture” (p. 169). NS instructors positioned themselves as “knowledgeable” concerning their language and perceived themselves as “authorities in teaching their own culture”, “forgetting the multiple cultures that exist in Germany and other German-speaking countries” (p. 182). In contrast, NNS teachers felt insecure and “non-legitimate” with respect to teaching culture; they saw themselves as “less authoritative due to their non-nativeness, and [felt] uncertain about the goals for and ways of teaching culture” (p. 182).

If both learners and instructors orient themselves toward the NS ideal, the following question arises: Does the perceived privilege of the native speaker influence learners’ perception of teachers—that is, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers? To the best of my knowledge, learners’ perceptions of teachers of German in an FL environment have not yet been explored. The majority of studies investigating FL learners’ perceptions of both NS teachers and NNS teachers have been conducted in the context of English-speaking teachers. Results from these studies suggest that students perceive advantages and disadvantages in both types of teachers.

According to research that has investigated language learners’ perceptions of NS teachers, these teachers are believed to be competent in target language-related (e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary, correct language use) and cultural aspects. However, they are also often associated with a lack of teaching skills (e.g., explaining grammar or complex items) and with difficulties building positive relationships with their students (e.g., lack of empathy for learning the target language and knowledge of students’ cultures). Via questionnaires, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) explored the perceived pros and cons of having an NS teacher of English at a university in Spain. Responses from 76 learners showed their preference for NS teachers in the areas of pronunciation, speaking, and listening. However, they did not prefer NS instructors when it came to explanations of more systematic aspects of the language, e.g., lexis and grammar, as NS teachers lacked the knowledge to explain these concepts. Benke and Medgyes (2005) investigated differences in teaching behavior between NS and NNS teachers of English, as seen by their

learners. 422 learners of English at various institutions in Hungary indicated in self-reported surveys that NS teachers were more friendly and lively, good models for imitation, and skilled at encouraging learners to speak. However, learners had difficulties understanding their NS instructors. What is more, differing linguistic and cultural background of the NS teachers sometimes prevented effective learning. In a more recent study, Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) examined English learners' perceptions of NS and NNS teachers of English in Vietnam and Japan. Self-reported survey responses by 100 students at universities in these two countries showed that NS teachers "were valued as models for authentic, natural pronunciation, despite comprehensibility issues" (p. 7). However, "grammatical explanations were not viewed as a [NS teacher] forte" (p. 7). Students enjoyed learning about the target language culture from the NS teachers, "but also experienced a cultural and communicative gap [...as NS teachers...] often could not communicate in their students' L1" (p. 7).

Research has shown that NNS teachers have been regarded as skilled instructors (e.g., with respect to preparation, grammar explanations) and relating better to their students, given their shared culture and experiences learning the target language. However, NNS teachers were often deemed inferior with respect to language-related aspects (pronunciation, vocabulary) and in terms of cultural knowledge of the target language communities. A study by Benke and Medgyes (2005) in Hungary showed that students valued NNS teachers' thoroughness in lesson-planning, learners' preparation for exams, homework assignments and their ability to explain complex grammar, if necessary in learners' L1 and with references to their own experiences of learning the target language. In the outlined study above by Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014), NNS teachers "were perceived as good teachers of grammar, and had the ability to resort to the students' first language when necessary" (p. 1). With regard to the target language, NNS teachers' pronunciation "was often deemed inferior to that of [NS teachers], but also easier to comprehend" (p. 1). Furthermore, participants enjoyed interactions with NNS teachers because of their shared culture. In their study with 210 learners of English at Spanish universities and secondary schools,

Dewaele et al. (2019), explored the effects of teacher characteristics, such as NS status, on learners' perceived FL enjoyment and FL anxiety. Results showed that the levels of FL anxiety were higher in NNS teacher courses, and levels of FL enjoyment lower compared to those courses with NS instructors. Dewaele et al. concluded that NNS teachers' lack of confidence or willingness to use the target language might have resulted in lower levels of student enjoyment and higher levels of anxiety due to the insecurities of the instructor. However, the authors urged readers to analyze these results with great care as the effect size was small, less than half of the participants responded to questions about NS status, and some participants might not have been sure about the instructor's NS status in their self-reported questionnaire responses. Zhang and Zhang (2018) explored language teacher identities of NS and NNS teachers of Chinese at a university in Denmark. Over four years, the researchers gathered data from in-depth questionnaires for students, audio-recorded interviews with teachers, classroom observations, and field notes. They found that being an NNS teacher did not create barriers. On the contrary, Zhang and Zhang (2018) found that NNS status had "positive advantages over teacher-student relationships and interactions" (p. 271). They concluded that in the case of the NNS teachers in their study, teaching Chinese was not only "about transmitting linguistic knowledge to their learners; what [was] valued more [was] their ability to align their personal language-learning experience and to activate their understanding of [Chinese as a second language] learning trajectory so as to support their students effectively" (pp. 288-289).

In sum, in the minds of learners as well as teachers, the NS ideal still prevails. However, when it comes to learners' perceptions of their instructors, that ideal is not as prevalent. Both groups—NS teachers and NNS teachers—are believed to possess desirable and less desirable qualities. What is missing in the research thus far is a close examination of the relationship between learners' perceptions of the former—NSs of the target language—and the latter—teachers of the target language, NSs and NNS teachers, respectively. The findings of the current study will help gain a better understanding of this

relationship in the context of learning German. This study speaks not only to the potential that learners see in their teachers to act as representatives of the target language community but also to how teachers can develop their own identities and teaching practices as NS or NNS instructors further. The latter seems particularly important considering the call for research into a better understanding of “the complex practices and processes of teacher socialization and identity development” as put forth by Wolff and De Costa (2017, p. 79) in their recent MLA article on *Expanding the Language Teacher Identity Landscape*.

2.4.2 Perceptions of Gender

As research has shown, learners’ stereotypical perceptions of NSs of German are often associated with male individuals (compare Hass et al., 2016; Chavez, 2020b). Indeed, “gender is considered a primary feature in person perception” (Ellemers, 2018, p. 277). Thus, a distinction not only by native-speaker status but also by gender was important in this study.

Ellemers (2018) provided a review of the research into gender and stereotypes conducted in the field of psychology. She summarized that stereotypes about men emphasize *agency*, e.g., through qualities of assertiveness and performance; stereotypes about women primarily stress aspects of *communality*, such as warmth and care for others. Sharipova (2015) showed that positive connotations of men typically included qualities such as competence, activity, and rationality; perceived negative qualities involved rudeness and authoritarianism (cited in: Mollaeva, 2018, p. 750). Women were generally associated with positive qualities such as sociability, warmth, and emotional support; perceived negative traits of women included inactivity and excessive emotionality (p. 750). Mollaeva (2018) concluded that “most common representation of men and women on each other are stereotyped in nature” (p. 751).

Gender stereotypes influence people’s behaviors and life choices. Ellemers (2018) described that even though “many people would be reluctant to explicitly make such claims [about men and women]”, “their private convictions and implicit beliefs still often rely on these stereotypical associations—without

them realizing that this is the case” (p. 280). Ellemers showed how these general concepts about men and women affect how they “behave and the life choices they make”, e.g., men tend to make more risky choices, whereas women tend to be more careful in, for instance, their sexual behavior, alcohol and drug use, gambling, and driving (study by Byrnes et al., 1999: cited in: Ellemers, 2018, p. 277). Furthermore, survey and census data from over 30 industrialized countries about occupations revealed a dominance of men in certain occupations, e.g., policing, “whereas other occupations (such as nursing) are dominated by women” (study by Jarman et al., 2012: cited in: Ellemers, 2018, p. 277).

Ellemers (2018) explained that gender differences are more affected by ‘nurture’ than by ‘nature’. It is historically-developed societal norms and social roles rather than biological distinctions that account for these differences: “Research evidence strongly indicates that the different societal roles and power positions of men as economic providers and women as homemakers emphasize and enlarge initial [biological] differences” (p. 278). Social roles—over and above gender—have been found to impact hormonal regulation, self-regulation, and social regulation, which ultimately elicit different thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in men and women” (study by Eagly & Wood, 2013: cited in: Ellemers, 2018, p. 278). Eyal and Epley (2017) explored perceived differences between male and female participants through social sensitivity tests and judgment tests about other participants’ performances in the experiments. They found that gender stereotypes influenced participants’ judgment about the performance of others: “The predicted gender difference was significantly larger than the actual gender difference” (p. 1327). What is more, Eyal and Epley (2017) showed that participants’ gender stereotypes exaggerated “actual group differences only on the traits that are defining features of gender stereotypes, namely, traits presumed to differentiate men and women [i.e., social sensitivity and self-esteem]” (p. 1331).

The gender of teachers affects the way their students perceive them. The effects of these perceived differences can be seen in gender bias in teaching evaluations (e.g., Stark, Ottoboni, & Boring, 2016; Mengel, Sauermann, & Zölitz, 2019). Mengel et al. (2019), for instance, showed in their study with

a data set of 19,952 student evaluations from universities in the Netherlands that “women receive[d] systematically lower teaching evaluations than their male colleagues” from both male and female students” (p. 535). They did not find evidence that these differences were “driven by gender differences in teaching skills”, students’ current or future grades, or their learning effort, “measured as self-reported study hours” (p. 564). Arbuckle and Williams (2003) explored perceptions about instructors’ expressiveness held by 352 college students at a US university. Participants’ responses to slides with a gender- and age-neutral stick figure presenting a lecture in a neutral voice revealed that “students rated the ‘young’ male professor higher than they did the ‘young’ female, ‘old’ male, and ‘old female’ professors on speaking enthusiastically and using a meaningful voice during the class lecture regardless of the identical manner in which the material was presented” (p. 507). The researchers concluded that “students may expect their professors to express themselves in the classroom according to sociocultural transcripts that limit full human development and influence people to appraise men and women differently even when they are displaying identical behaviors” (p. 514).

In the context of the foreign language (FL) classroom, Chavez (2001) concluded that teacher gender does not only affect “the way they teach but also the manner they are perceived by their students.” Due to the special ‘architecture’ of FL classrooms—i.e., the variety of variables involved in FL classroom research (e.g., the status of the teacher, native-speaker status, age, association with target culture, relatively small class sizes)—the results with respect to gender of FL teachers need to be interpreted with even greater care as they may have been influenced by other variables (p. 114). Studies seem to suggest that socio-cultural gender norms (from learners’ first-language socialization) also affect students’ perceptions of their FL teachers, particularly their teaching styles. In her book on *Gender in the Language Classroom*, Chavez (2001) summarized previous studies by describing that male teachers were associated with a more teacher-centered, hierarchical teaching style. In contrast, female instructors were linked to a more collaborative, communicative style of teaching (p. 114). What is more, these perceptions

also affected learners' expectations of the instructor's teaching style. For instance, learners "may react with particular aversion to female teachers who try to" "run the class in a more hierarchical style" as in students' minds "female teachers may be more strongly bound by the code of the typical female, cooperative style" (p. 112). Furthermore, the way student and teacher gender match up mattered. Chavez showed that preferences for feeling "comfortable in class" and being encouraged to pair work in a class led by a female instructor, was "more pronounced among female students" (p. 115). Concerning other factors in FL classrooms, e.g., FL enjoyment and FL anxiety, recent studies suggested that teacher gender did not play a role (e.g., Dewaele, Gkonou, & Mercer, 2018; Dewaele, Witney, et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2019). Instead, these studies have shown that students placed greater emphasis on teachers' friendliness, humor, respectfulness, preparedness, or native-speaker status.

2.5 Summary of Previous Literature

A review of the scholarship has shown learners' strong orientation toward target-language (TL) communities (e.g., Pavlenko & Norton, 2007; Magnan et al., 2012; Magnan et al., 2014). Learners demonstrate a desire to connect with and belong to the target community in order to interact with TL speakers. However, both learners and teachers feel unable to achieve Communities-oriented goals in the classroom (e.g., Glisan, 2012; Magnan et al., 2012; Magnan et al., 2014). A central reason for this predicament may be the unilateral definition of TL communities by both foreign language (FL) teachers and learners. They often define TL communities as communities of native speakers (NSs), living in a different geographical location (White, 2016). This understanding excludes local groups—language learners and teachers—from membership in the TL community and disqualifies local settings—the classroom—as a viable community. Therefore, it is critical to explore the question of how the learning environment/learners' immediate communities (e.g., the local setting, learners' peers, and the teacher) can influence learners' perceptions of a language community to help them feel closer to both the language communities they would like to affiliate with abroad and their immediate language communities locally?

Research into the motivation to learn an FL has emphasized learners' future visions of their own selves (e.g., Dörnyei, 2009; Muir & Dörnyei, 2013) as well as their imagined communities (e.g., Norton, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2011). However, little is known about what shapes learners' imaginations. Actual and imagined experiences with NSs as well as classroom experiences, including interactions with a teacher, all likely play a role. Recent studies (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Nikitina, 2019; Chavez, 2020b) have indicated that how actual and potential learners imagine the respective TL communities, responds to the stereotypes about the respective target language countries (e.g., Nikitina et al., 2014; Nikitina, 2015, 2019), its native speakers (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Stein et al., 2019), as well as likely learners (e.g., Chavez, 2020b).

However, research has yet to explore how learners' imaginings of TL native speakers are being reflected in teachers of the TL. The teacher is the first—perhaps for a long time the only—direct link with the TL for many students and the first target to which stereotypes can get attached or the first indicator that stereotypes are just that. Thus, I have embarked on an investigation to find out whether there is a relationship between learners' stereotypical imaginings of NSs of German and their stereotypical perceptions of teachers of German. The following subchapter will outline the specific research themes and research questions exploring this topic.

2.6 Research Questions

There are three overarching research themes: First, there is an examination of learners' descriptions of stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) of German, male and female, respectively. Pertinent responses were used to create categories of stereotypes. Second, I examined learners' descriptions of stereotypes about NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German, male and female, respectively. This data set created overlapping as well as additional response categories. Finally, the third research theme was the ultimate objective of this study. I wanted to find out how descriptions of stereotypical attributions of NSs of German were reflected in the descriptions of both NS and NNS teachers of German. The comparison

was carried out by analyzing the two sets of overlapping stereotype categories derived from students' descriptions for Research Themes 1 and 2. Each of these themes has multiple questions in order to develop each overarching theme fully.

Research Theme 1: Learners' descriptions of stereotypes about native speakers of German

1.1 What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German?

1.2.1 What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German, respectively?

1.2.2 How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native speakers?

1.2.3 How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within each category compare between stereotypes about male and female native speakers?

Research Theme 2: Learners' descriptions of stereotypes about teachers of German

2.1 What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers of German?

2.2 What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male and female native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers of German, respectively?

2.3.1 How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native-speaker teachers?

2.3.2 How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female non-native-speaker teachers?

2.3.3 How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers?

2.3.4 How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of female native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers?

2.4 How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within prevalent categories compare between stereotypes about native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers?

Research Theme 3: Relationships between learners' descriptions of stereotypes about native speakers and teachers of German

3.1.1 Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

3.1.2 Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

3.1.3 Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?

3.2.1 Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

3.2.2 Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

3.2.3 Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to both female teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?

3. Research Methods

In this chapter, I will first provide an overview account of the mixed-method pilot study that was conducted during the fall semester of 2016 (Subchapter 3.1). Then, I will briefly outline the scope of the research project from which the data for the dissertation derived (Subchapter 3.2). Finally, I will discuss the methods with which the data for the dissertation study were obtained.

3.1 The Pilot Phase of the Study

During the fall semester of 2016, the pilot phase of the study was conducted as part of a course assignment¹³. During the pilot phase, several research instruments and procedures were designed, deployed, and evaluated to address a broad spectrum of related research questions (RQs), all united under the themes of collegiate foreign-language (FL) classroom communities and teacher-student relationships. The following initial RQs were addressed in the pilot study. They were subsequently revised and refined into the dissertation RQs, which were listed at the end of the previous chapter (Subchapter 2.6).

RQ 1: What kinds of stereotypes about native speakers of German have learners of German heard?

RQ 2: What kinds of stereotypes about (a) native-speaker and (b) non-native-speaker teachers of German have learners of German heard?

RQ 3: How do the kinds of stereotypes described about native speakers relate to the kinds of stereotypes described about teachers of German?

The pilot phase's primary goal was to test out whether initially drafted RQs were viable and whether the instruments devised originally would enable me to answer the proposed RQs. A total of 206 first-, second-, and third-year students of German, representing nine intact FL course sections, as well as eight of their graduate student teaching assistants (TAs), participated in the pilot phase of the study over the course of one semester. None of the participants in the pilot phase were later included in the actual

¹³ Due to the fact that the pilot phase was part of a course assignment, IRB approval was not required. Since the pilot phase did not undergo IRB review, specific results cannot be discussed here.

research study. Research instruments were continuously revised, redesigned, and administered to additional classes over one semester (15 weeks). They comprised student and TA surveys with quantitative (scored and ranked items) and qualitative portions (open-ended items), three alternative descriptive written tasks for students (such as ‘if language learning were a board game ...’), and a TA discussion group. I distributed the research instruments at the end of class time in courses whose instructors invited me to their class; participants completed the surveys outside of class. Instructors did not have access to their students’ responses.

Instruments designed and used in the pilot phase were later revised according to the feedback received at my preliminary examinations, further discussions with my advisor and colleagues, as well as current academic discourses in the field. The design methodology of the resulting research project will be described below (Subchapter 3.2). The dissertation itself is based on a subset of data derived from this larger study. Its specific methods will be explained in Subchapter 3.3.

3.2 The Research Project From Which This Dissertation Study Was Derived in Overview

The data for the research project were collected during the 15-week fall semester in 2017 and the 15-week spring semester in 2018. The research project was approved by the Education and Social/Behavioral Science Institutional Review Board at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in August 2017. The Notices of Approval (protocol 2017-0832) of the project, as well as of changes to the protocol, as necessitated throughout the study, are shown in Appendix A.

Overarchingly, the project aimed to investigate the multi-faceted nature of classroom communities and teacher-student relationships in various foreign languages (FLs). The data were collected at a large Midwestern research university and included responses from students and instructors of sections of the following first-semester courses in these languages: German, Russian, and Spanish, with data collected in Fall 2017; and French, with data collected in Spring 2018.

All participating course sections were taught by graduate-student teaching assistants (TAs), under the supervision of a faculty member (coordinators). Before the semester started, I contacted the TA coordinators of the programs in the languages mentioned above. The coordinators permitted me to introduce my project to the first-semester language TAs at the respective orientation sessions before the start of the semester. Participation in this study was voluntary and was not related to student participants' or TAs' evaluations by their supervisors. Both students and TAs were informed about the scope of the project, the research instruments, risks, benefits, and compensation before each of the individual components of the project. All participants had to be at least 18 years old.

Six TAs in German, four TAs in Russian, five TAs in Spanish, and five TAs in French agreed to participate personally in the study. They also allowed me to come to their course sections so as to recruit participants from among their students. Eventually, a total of 100 students of German, 72 students of Russian, 112 students of Spanish, and 95 students of French participated in the study also, across various research instruments¹⁴. Participants from all four languages completed the main research instruments—the *Main Questionnaire* (week 7) and four rounds of the *Classroom Community Surveys* (weeks 1–3; 7; 10–11; 13–14). The total of participants varied across these instruments (please refer to Table 3 below for a summary of research instruments and participants). Additionally, I recruited focal course sections and focal participants from the pool of participants in German and French courses¹⁵ to complete additional research tasks, namely, *Classroom Observations*, *Descriptive Tasks*, and *Focus Group Discussion Sessions*. Four focal course sections in German and three focal course sections in French were chosen on the basis of highest and lowest scores of the first *Classroom Community Scale Survey* for four rounds of *Classroom*

¹⁴ For reasons of clarity and readability, I will subsequently italicize the names of the research instruments administered in this research project.

¹⁵ This population was in part a convenience sample. Due to financial and logistical reasons, I decided to focus on course sections in German and French. Thus, students and TAs of Russian and Spanish only received the *Classroom Community Scale Surveys* four times throughout the semester, as well as the *Main Questionnaire*, which they had to complete only once.

Observations during the second half of the semester (weeks, 7, 9, 11, 14). TAs and students from German and French course sections who volunteered to complete additional components of the study (after indicating their interest on the *Main Questionnaire*) participated in written *Descriptive Tasks* (weeks 11–13) and *Focus Group Discussion Sessions* (weeks 14–15). Ten student participants and five TAs of German, as well as four student participants and five TAs of French, completed the written *Descriptive Tasks* individually. Eight student participants of German took part in one of the two *Focus Group Discussion Sessions* (with four students each). Five TAs of German participated in one *Focus Group Discussion Session*. From French course sections, three students participated in one *Focus Group Discussion Session*, and five TAs took part in one *Focus Group Discussion Session*. The dissertation study only focused on responses to parts of the *Main Questionnaire* provided by students of the six German course sections, as described in Subchapter 3.3.1.

As indicated above, this mixed-method study included a variety of research instruments with quantitative (e.g., scored and ranked items) and qualitative (e.g., open-ended items, field notes, interviews) components that were administered either once or multiple times over the course of the respective semester. Table 3 shows an overview of all research instruments with their time of administration and the number of participants from the course sections of the four different FLs. The dissertation study only focused on a small subset of the data, particularly responses from students (but not TAs) of German to six items of the *Main Questionnaire*. Subsequently, I will refer to this set of questions as the *Stereotype Questionnaire*. This research instrument that addressed the RQs of the dissertation study, as well as the participants to which it was administered and the time of the semester when it was distributed, are highlighted in gray in Table 3. It will be described in detail in the Subchapters 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.

Table 3: Overview of research phases, instruments, recruited FLs, participants, and week/semester of administration

Phase	Instrument	Quantitative or qualitative Data	Language	Number of participating first-semester...			Week & semester (F=Fall; S=Spring)
				course sections	students	TAs	
I	<i>Classroom Community Scale Survey I</i>	quantitative (scored items)	German	6	96	6	3 (F)
			French	5	91	5	3 (S)
			Russian	4	71	4	2 (F)
			Spanish	5	112	5	1 (F)
II	<i>Main Questionnaire, including Stereotype Questionnaire</i>	quantitative (scored and ranked items) and qualitative (open-ended items)	German	6	67	6	7 (F)
			French	5	14	5	7 (S)
			Russian	4	12	1	7 (F)
			Spanish	5	16	5	7 (F)
	<i>Classroom Community Scale Survey II</i>	quantitative (scored items)	German ¹⁶	6	67	5	7 (F)
			French	5	83	5	7 (S)
			Russian ¹⁷	4	12	1	7 (F)
			Spanish ¹⁷	5	16	5	7 (F)
	<i>Classroom Observation I, including post-lesson survey</i>	quantitative (scored items) and qualitative (field notes)	German (focal sections)	4	53	4	7 (F)
			French (focal sections)	3	52	3	7 (S)
III	<i>Classroom Observation II, including post-lesson survey</i>	quantitative (scored items) and qualitative (field notes)	German (focal sections)	4	49	4	9 (F)
			French (focal sections)	3	43	3	9 (S)
	<i>Classroom Community Scale Survey III</i>	quantitative (scored items)	German	6	92	6	11 (F)
			French	5	68	5	10 (S)
			Russian	4	63	4	10 (F)
			Spanish	5	106	5	10 (F)
IV	<i>Descriptive Tasks</i>	quantitative (scored and ranked items) and qualitative (open-ended items)	German (focal participants)	6	10	5	11-13 (F)
			French (focal participants)	5	4	5	11-13 (S)
	<i>Classroom Observation III, including post-lesson survey</i>	quantitative (scored items) and qualitative (field notes)	German (focal sections)	4	50	4	11 (F)
			French (focal sections)	3	40	3	11 (S)

¹⁶ Administered as part of the *Main Questionnaire*. Lower response rate in course sections participating in the fall semester of 2017 (German, Russian, Spanish) led to separate administration of *Classroom Community Scale Survey II* and *Main Questionnaire* for French courses in the following semester.

V	<i>Classroom Community Scale Survey IV</i>	quantitative (scored items)	German	6	86	6	14 (F)
			French	5	72	5	13 (S)
			Russian	4	65	4	14 (F)
			Spanish	5	98	5	14 (F)
	<i>Focus Group Discussion Sessions</i>	qualitative (interviews and notes)	German (focal participants)	6	8	4	14-15 (F)
			French (focal participants)	5	3	4	14-15 (S)
	<i>Classroom Observation IV, including post-lesson survey</i>	quantitative (scored items) and qualitative (field notes)	German (focal sections)	4	50	4	14 (F)
			French (focal sections)	3	42	3	13 (S)

For purposes of data collection, a semester (Fall 2017 or Spring 2018) was split into five phases of data collection (a three-week rhythm) during which the following instruments were administered either to all participants (instruments [1] and [2] as listed below) or to only focal participants (instruments [3]–[5] as listed below):

- (1) A two-page *Classroom Community Scale Survey* was administered four different times throughout the semester. It investigated learners' and TAs' sense of classroom community based on scored items from Rovai's (2002) classroom community scale.

The researcher had arranged a day to visit the respective course section with the TA beforehand. At the end of the pre-arranged class period, the researcher administered this instrument, which took about five to ten minutes to complete. In the end, students and TA placed their surveys, whether they completed them or not, in an envelope that the researcher had brought. The researcher was in the classroom during the time the survey was administered. Participants were not compensated for this part of the study. However, all students and the instructor were offered candy, regardless of whether they participated or not.

(2) The 37-page *Main Questionnaire* was language-specific¹⁷ with three similar¹⁸ versions for each language (A, B, C), i.e., there were three versions of the *Main Questionnaire* for participants of German course sections, three versions for participants of French course sections, three versions for participants of Russian course section, and three versions for participants of Spanish course sections. The *Main Questionnaire* was administered only once during the middle of the semester. A copy of the *Main Questionnaire* distributed in German course sections can be found in Appendix B. This instrument explored a broad spectrum of topics related to classroom communities, teacher-student relationships, the language learning process, and stereotypes about native-speakers and teachers of languages. Parts of this research instrument, namely the *Stereotype Questionnaire*, built the foundation of the dissertation study. Thus, this research instrument will be described in greater detail in Subchapter 3.3.2.

Only focal participants from German and French course sections took part in completing these three additional research instruments:

(3) 50-minute *Classroom Observations* with a two-page post-lesson survey (with scored items about participants' classroom experience) were administered to students and TAs of the respective focal course section four times throughout the semester. Observations were intended to provide further qualitative insights into classroom dynamics to help interpret questionnaire data. Dates of classroom visits were prearranged with the TA of the respective course section. The researcher observed the course sections himself and took field notes without taking notes of direct quotes or other identifiable information related to students and TA.

¹⁷ The majority of items on the questionnaire was related to the participant's chosen FL.

¹⁸ The three versions only differed in items related to interpretations of metaphorical descriptions of teacher-student relationships and in items related to participants' perceptions of one other FL that students did not study. The three versions were created to limit the number of items of the questionnaire without jeopardizing the opportunity to receive at least some responses about all metaphors chosen as well as about all FLs involved in this project.

- (4) Two different written *Descriptive Tasks* for focal participants were administered once at the end of the semester to gain further insights into the norms and dynamics of FL classrooms. In one task, participants formulated rules for an FL classroom contract. In the other task, participants completed questions (scored, multiple-choice, and open-ended items) that required them to imagine and describe the FL classroom as a game.

Participants who had earlier indicated their interest in completing this component of the study on their *Main Questionnaire* became potential candidates for taking part in this portion of the study. Student participants were all entered into a pool of potential participants for filling out the descriptive tasks. The principal investigator drew a random sample of volunteers that were numbered in the order they were drawn. Participants were contacted in the order they were drawn and had to confirm whether they wanted to complete the tasks or not. The first ten students of German and four students of French who confirmed their participation completed the descriptive tasks individually during a 90-minute session. All teacher participants who indicated their interest in this part of the study were invited to complete the tasks. Participants were compensated for this part of the study with \$15.

- (5) 90-minute *Focus Group Discussion Sessions* were administered at the end of the semester to discuss themes and a few preliminary results of the research project, e.g., teacher-student relationships, classroom communities, and stereotypes. Participants who indicated their interest in this component on the *Main Questionnaire* became potential candidates for this part of the study. Student participants were all entered into a pool of potential participants. The principal investigator drew a random sample of students who were numbered in the order they were drawn. Participants were contacted in the order they were drawn and had to confirm whether they wanted to participate. The first eight students of German who confirmed their participation joined one of the two focus group discussion sessions with four participants each. The three

participating French students were all in one focus group discussion session. All teacher participants who indicated their interest in this part of the study were invited to complete the tasks. The researcher conducted the discussion session himself. The researcher guided the discussion, made sure that every participant was able to share their opinions, and took notes. Each session was audio-recorded. Student participants were compensated with \$10 each if they only participated in the focus group discussion or with \$20 each if they had participated in both focus group discussion and descriptive tasks. Teachers received \$10 each if they only participated in the focus group discussion and \$30 each if they participated in both further components of the study.

Data analysis has only focused on the data pertaining to the dissertation study thus far, namely the responses to the *Stereotype Questionnaire* provided by students of the six German course sections. The details of this data analysis and other methodological considerations will be described subsequently.

3.3 The Dissertation Study

In the following subchapter, I will explain the methods that were used to obtain the data for the dissertation study. All were collected from sections of first-semester German.

3.3.1 Participants of the Dissertation Study

In the fall semester of 2017, I recruited student participants from six intact first-semester German course sections (German 101) at an institution that is situated in a state in which, according to a Census Bureau Report of 2004, 42.6 percent of the population claimed German heritage, the second-highest percentage among all US states (p. 6). Representations—often of the stereotypical variety—of ‘German culture’ occur regularly, such as in festivals, advertising, or colloquialisms. I will discuss limitations that result from this circumstance in Subchapter 6.2. German 101 is the first level of German-language instruction at this institution; it is taught in multiple sections; and also counts toward a foreign-language graduation

requirement. All sections are taught by a different graduate student TA, under the supervision of a faculty member. The TAs of six out of seven total course sections permitted me to recruit from their sections. All six TAs were female. Five TAs were native speakers (NS) of American English; one TA was an NS of German. Subsequently, I will refer to the six course sections as Sections A, B, C, D, E, and F. Sections A–E met five times a week for a 50-minute class period per day; Section F met three times a week for a 90-minute class period. Each of the six sections had between eight and 23 students, which resulted in a total of 101 students who were informed about this study.

This population was in part a convenience sample. German course sections were chosen as I am a member of the German program in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic. I chose first-semester language learners for this project because of the following two reasons: (1) beginning-level language courses are usually the largest groups of learners in a language program; therefore, findings based on this student population usually have the greatest possible range of applications; and (2) first-semester learners have not yet been shaped (to an extensive amount) by practices, activities, teaching beliefs, requirements, and opportunities within the specific programs of the language they were trying to learn. The second reason was particularly crucial as I was curious about students' initial perceptions and thoughts of the language learning process (and its related protagonists, such as teachers and NSs), without (extensive) prior instruction, prompting, or supervision¹⁹.

A total of 67 students from all six course sections completed the *Main Questionnaire*, which included the *Stereotype Questionnaire* that forms the basis of this dissertation, outside of class. Table 4 shows a summary of the number of participating students, the average response rate relative to invited

¹⁹ I cannot rule out the possibility of false beginners among participants, i.e., students who had previously received instruction in German, and/or the fact that learners' beliefs about stereotypes may have been shaped outside instructional contexts. I will, in fact, return to the latter point in Discussion (Chapter 5).

participants, the average age of participants, their gender, their domestic or international student status, as well as other demographic information, with respect to individual sections and in total.

Table 4: Summary of demographic information of participants who completed the Main Questionnaire

	Section A	Section B	Section C	Section D	Section E	Section F	TOTAL
Number of participants	16	11	10	9	6	15	67
Response rate	80%	47.8%	71.4%	52.9%	75%	78.9%	66.3%
Average age in years; months	19;7	20;1	19;10	20;1	19;6	19;2	19;8
Gender							
Males	9 (56.3%)	2 (18.2%)	8 (80.0%)	4 (44.4%)	2 (33.3%)	6 (40.0%)	31 (46.3%)
Females	7 (43.8%)	9 (81.8%)	2 (20.0%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (66.7%)	8 (53.3%)	35 (52.2%)
Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	1 (6.7%)	1 (1.5%)
Domestic and international Students							
Home country – USA	12 (75.0%)	9 (81.8%)	7 (70.0%)	4 (44.4%)	5 (83.3%)	12 (80.0%)	49 (73.1%)
Home country – other	4 (25.0%)	2 (18.2%)	3 (30.0%)	5 (55.6%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (20.0%)	18 (26.9%)
Other demographic information							
Current grade (self-reported)	9xA (56.3%)	7xA (63.6%)	9xA (90.0%)	5xA (55.6%)	3xA (50.0%)	7xA (46.7%)	40xA (59.7%)
	4xAB (25.0%)	2xAB (18.2%)	1xAB (10.0%)	2xAB (22.2%)	3xAB (50.0%)	8xAB (53.3%)	20xAB (29.9%)
	3xB (18.8%)	2xB (18.2%)		1xB (11.1%)			6xB (9.0%)
				1x N/A (11.1%)			1xN/A (1.5%)

Males and females were roughly evenly divided in the participating population, with a slight female majority (52.2%). The average age was 19 years and eight months. Most participants indicated that their home country was the United States; only about a quarter of the participants said that they came from a different home country. The majority of participants self-reported an A as their current

grade. Participants' demographics will not be considered as variables in the present study, although they may interact with the stereotypes that participants encounter, perceive, and report. A more fine-grained analysis that focuses on demographics-based variation in reported stereotypes will be useful in future analyses.

3.3.2 Research Instrument for the Dissertation Study

The dissertation's data analysis was based on six items from the *Main Questionnaire* administered in all six first-semester German sections. A copy of the complete *Main Questionnaire* can be found in Appendix B. The *Main Questionnaire* consisted of six components, namely (1) Demographics Section (see Appendix B.2) ; (2) Classroom Community Scale (see Appendix B.3); (3) Learning Section (see Appendix B.4); (4) Stereotype Questionnaire (see Appendix B.5); (5) Other Foreign-Language Section (see Appendix B.6); and (6) Cash Prize Drawing and Further Study Components (see Appendix B.7). I will outline the content of each component briefly:

- (1) In the *Demographics Section* of the questionnaire, students created an individualized code that later served as the personal ID for each participant²⁰. The code will be used to connect responses given by the same individual on different research instruments for comparative analysis. The Demographic Section also included questions about participants' demographics and self-assessed language proficiency.
- (2) The *Classroom Community Scale Survey* included scored items based on Rovai's (2002) classroom community scale.²¹ The *Classroom Community Scale Survey* was administered at four different time points throughout the semester (three times separately and once as part of the *Main Questionnaire*);

²⁰ This was a unique ID that each respondent had created based on the following instructions in the questionnaire: "Personal Code (6 digits): first 2 letters of birth city + your birth month (TWO digits) + the last two digits of your phone number. For example, if you were born in Detroit in June (06) and your phone number is 123-4567 your code name would be DE0667."

²¹ Participants' responses to the Classroom Community Scale Survey are not considered in the dissertation as they are beyond the scope of this study.

responses to this component given in the *Main Questionnaire* were considered the second of the four time points.

- (3) The *Learning Section* included multiple-choice, open-ended, scaled, and rated items related to participants' perceptions of the German learning and teaching experience, perceived German classroom norms, perceived and hypothetical teacher-student relationships in a German class (e.g., via metaphor interpretations), as well as their perceptions of ideal and nightmare qualities of teachers and students of German.²² The *Main Questionnaire* differed slightly in this component, specifically, in the metaphor interpretation section, depending on the version participants received (either A, B, or C). This was done to limit the number of items related to metaphor interpretations without jeopardizing the opportunity to receive at least some responses about all metaphors chosen.
- (4) The *Stereotype Questionnaire* built the foundation of the current study. At the beginning of this section, participants were once again reminded that there were no correct or incorrect answers. They were then introduced to the following items: six open-ended and six rated questions²³ related to stereotypes that participants had heard about native speakers of German (NSs), male and female, respectively (Questions 1 and 2), as well as NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German, male and female, respectively (Questions 3; 4; 5; and 6). Each question began with 'What stereotypes have you heard about...'. The second part of the questions was related to the particular type of speaker, namely 'male native speaker' (Question 1); 'female native speaker' (Question 2); 'male native-speaker teacher' (Question 3); 'female native-speaker teacher' (Question 4); 'male non-native-speaker teacher' (Question 5); and 'female non-native-speaker teacher' (Question 6). The questions were formulated in this manner to avoid participants' disclosure apprehension (Mathew, 2010)—a

²² Participants' responses to the Learning Section are not considered in the dissertation as they are beyond the scope of this study.

²³ These items are not considered in this study. Participants entered in any number including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate) depending on how accurately they believed each described stereotype was. Participants were reminded that they could use the same score multiple times.

reluctancy to describe sensitive data, such as stereotypes (e.g., J. E. Coleman, 1998; Tusting, Crawshaw, & Callen, 2002). Thus, participants were asked to provide any stereotypes they had heard about native speakers, instead of asking them to give stereotypes they believed in personally. Chavez (2020b) pointed out that questions phrased in this manner “cannot be taken as synonymous with the respondents’ personal views, [but] they give insights into the societal narratives that respondents referenced” (p. 8).

In six separate tables—one for each type of speaker—participants filled in stereotypes that they had heard about the respective groups of people. Participants wrote their responses to the posed questions into the left column consisting of 11 rows. It was possible to enter more than one stereotype into one row. The free-response approach was chosen to allow participants to “list their own images about the study object” (Nikitina et al., 2014, p. 117). This approach reduces the chance of findings being “an artefact of research methodology” (Spencer-Rodgers, 2001, p. 642). This would entail “participants simply [endorsing] the traits on the list including those which they would not have mentioned themselves” (Nikitina et al., 2014, p. 117).

I acknowledge that the research design as well as analyses relied on binary and oppositional abstractions, such as NSs/NNSs as well as male/female, that do not accommodate the full spectrum of human experiences and self- and other-perceptions. I concede that the construct of gender may also be understood in a non-binary way and that there is gender diversity (e.g., Omercagic & Martino, 2020). Researchers have criticized the distinction between NS teachers and NNSs teachers; it oversimplifies the identities of language teachers and categorizes them as homogenous groups, which they are, in fact, not (e.g., Calafato, 2019; Leonard, 2019).

I nevertheless elected to use these binary constructs so as to enable inferential statistical analyses that are capable of showing patterns, even as they neglect unique positions taken by individuals.

These binary categories also persist in public discourses and, as a result, in the minds of research participants, such as language learners, teachers, and with regard to the NS/NNS distinction, in particular, advertising practices employed by language programs. These same reasons probably account for these terms to still be deployed in research. For example, studies have shown that being a male or female teacher (e.g., Stark et al., 2016; Mollaeva, 2018; Mengel et al., 2019) or an NS or NNS teacher (e.g., Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014; Ghanem, 2015) has an impact on how teachers are perceived by learners or how they perceive themselves. What is more, learners' perceptions of teachers may also depend on variables that are not being considered in the present study, such as age (e.g., Peterson, 1980; Arbuckle & Williams, 2003), appearance (e.g., Buck & Tiene, 1989; Gorham, Cohen, & Morris, 1997; Roach, 1997), sexual orientation (e.g., Russ, Simonds, & Hunt, 2002), educational background and teaching ability (e.g., Kayi-Aydar, 2011; M. M. Sánchez, Pecino, Rodríguez, & Melero, 2011; Haamer, Lepp, & Reva, 2012), and personal qualities, e.g., ability to build rapport and positive relationships (e.g., C. A. G. Sánchez, Scholes Gilings de Gonzáles, & Lopez Martinez, 2013; Mehrparvar & Karimnia, 2018; Oskouei, Dabaghi, & Nejad Ansari, 2018).

I also acknowledge the ambiguity inherent in the term 'German'. The questionnaire did not define the term so that responses are based on respondents' interpretations of the term. As a mental representation, this term likely neither focuses only on citizens of Germany nor on an abstracted 'essential' form of the German language but rather captures in ambiguous ways all who speak a 'form' of German—including dialectal versions—'natively', regardless of the speakers' nationality, ethnicity, or regional provenance.

The *Other Foreign-Language Section* included all items previously described in components (3) and (4), however, in this instance, in the context of one other FL.²⁴ The *Main Questionnaire* differed

²⁴ Participants' responses to items of the Other Foreign-Language Section are not considered in the dissertation as they are beyond the scope of this study.

in this component, depending on the version participants received (either A, B, or C). All questionnaire versions included the same types of items but, depending on the particular version, these items had a different scope, i.e., questions related to Russian (version A), Spanish (B), or French (version C). This was done to limit the number of items related to other FLs without jeopardizing the opportunity to receive at least some responses about all three other FLs involved in this project.

- (5) The *Cash Prize Drawing and Further Components of the Study* were described on the very last page of the *Main Questionnaire*. Participants were able to indicate their interest in a cash prize drawing (with cash prizes of up to \$50) or whether they wanted to participate in further components of the study.

3.3.3 Data Collection Procedure for the Dissertation Study

Toward the middle of the fall semester of 2017 (week 7 of 15), students in the six participating sections of German 101 received a paper copy of the *Main Questionnaire*. They were told that if they chose to participate in the study, they had to complete it outside of class over the course of about two weeks. The time required for completion was estimated to be about 90 to 120 minutes based on trial runs with graduate students not targeted for participation. I informed all prospective participants of the scope, risks, and benefits of this component of the study; and reminded them that there were no correct or incorrect responses and that their participation would have no influence on their grade or standing in their course. Respondents had three options to return the completed questionnaires: (1) After one week of when the survey was distributed, the researcher regularly returned for slightly more than a week to all participating course sections to collect surveys in front of the classroom. Students could hand him hard copies of their completed questionnaires; (2) participants could place completed copies of the surveys in the researcher's departmental mailbox; or (3) participants could email the researcher to arrange a time and place to drop off the survey directly with him. The latter two options were created to help participants minimize the risk of other participants or the teacher identifying their participation if they preferred to keep it

confidential. All student participants were compensated with a payment of 5 US\$ upon turning in a completed survey to the researcher.

For the dissertation study, only the data related to the items about stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) and teachers of German—the *Stereotype Questionnaire*—were analyzed. I first digitized participants' verbatim responses (words and short phrases) pertaining to stereotypes about NSs and teachers by entering them into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, using 148 columns (B–ES)²⁵ and one row per respondent (rows 2 through 68). Column A showed the personal ID number of each participant. Each adjective (e.g., “strict”), noun phrase (e.g., “no sense of humor”), or verb phrase (e.g., “drink beer”) was counted as a separate response.

Participants' descriptions of stereotypes about male NSs spanned 30 columns (Columns B through AE); descriptions of stereotypes about female NSs spanned 30 columns (Columns AF through BI); descriptions of stereotypes about male NS teachers spanned 22 columns (Columns BJ through CE); descriptions of stereotypes about female NS teachers spanned 22 columns (Columns CF through DA); descriptions of stereotypes about male NNS teachers spanned 22 columns (Columns DB through DW); and descriptions of stereotypes about female NNS teachers spanned 22 columns (Columns DX through ES).

Analyses proceeded based on principles of Grounded Theory (GT), as described by Charmaz (2014). Constructivist GT is an inductive method that includes coding of qualitative data, comparisons between data and analyses, and theoretical conceptualizing. It “begins with inductive data, invokes iterative strategies of going back and forth between data and analysis, uses comparative methods, and keeps [the

²⁵ For the dissertation study, what mattered was only whether a respondent had mentioned a stereotype and what kind of stereotype they described. However, respondents also rated how firmly they believed in each of the stereotypes they had named (see footnote 23). These scores were recorded in the adjacent column of the respective stereotype named but will not be considered in analyses for the dissertation. Thus, data from the following 74 columns were excluded: Columns C, E, G, I, K, M, O, Q, S, U, W, Y, AA, AC, AE; AG, AI, AK, AM, AO, AQ, AS, AU, AW, AY, BA, BC, BE, BG, BI; BK, BM, BO, BQ, BS, BU, BW, BY, CA, CC, CE; CG, CI, CK, CM, CO, CQ, CS, CU, CW, CY, DA; DE, DG, DI, DK, DM, DO, DQ, DS, DU, DW; DY, EA, EC, EE, EG, EI, EK, EM, EO, EQ, ES.

researcher] interacting with [their] data and emerging analysis” (p. 1). This method has also been used in recent studies in the L2 context (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Flórez & Rodriguez, 2016; Henry & Thorsen, 2018). I will describe the outcome of how I applied GT to the data in Results: Research Theme 1 (Subchapter 4.1).

Before proceeding to the reporting of the results, I need to acknowledge the situatedness of this study. According to Vannini (2012), “situatedness refers to involvement within a context” (p. 815). The researcher, as well as the study participants, are involved or “situated in the contexts” that are being studied (p. 815). In other words, “situatedness means involvement of social beings with symbolic and material dimensions of sites and with the various social processes occurring in those domains” (p. 815). I recognize my positionality as a white male scholar from Germany with blond hair and blue eyes, who has been living and studying in the Midwest and has also been teaching German to college learners. Furthermore, I acknowledge that responses, particularly with respect to stereotypes, may depend on the study population, including the situatedness of the institution in a state with German heritage, as well as the socio-political context during the investigation. I will point to the resulting limitations in Subchapter 6.2.

4. Results

The presentation of results follows the three research themes outlined in Subchapter 2.6: (1) stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) of German, (2) stereotypes about NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German, and (3) relationships between stereotypes about NSs of German, on the one hand, and, on the other, NS teachers and NNS teachers of German, respectively. Analyses within each research theme also distinguished between stereotypes attached to men as compared to women. Each research theme will be addressed via specific research questions that are outlined further below.

Results derive from analyses of data that were gathered through the *Stereotype Questionnaire* (see Appendix B.5), specifically, students’ responses to the open-ended questions that inquired about

stereotypes that they had heard about male and female NSs (Questions 1 and 2), male and female NS teachers of German (Questions 3 and 4), and male and female NNS teachers of German (Questions 5 and 6), a total of six questions.

The ultimate objective of this study is reflected in Research Theme 3. It was to find out how stereotypical descriptions of NSs of German were reflected in the stereotypical descriptions of both NS and NNS teachers of German. To carry out this comparison, two sets of overlapping response categories needed to be derived from students' descriptions: (1) Categories of stereotypes that captured participants' responses with regard to stereotypes about NSs (Research Theme 1) and (2) categories of stereotypes that represented their descriptions of stereotypes about teachers of German (Research Theme 2). I will describe specific analytic procedures as they become relevant—to begin with, as they pertain to Research Theme 1.

4.1 Research Theme 1: Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Native Speakers of German

Four specific research questions (RQs) were addressed as part of Research Theme 1. The first RQ of this theme (RQ 1.1) examined categories of stereotypes about male and female native speakers (NSs) of German that emerged in descriptions given by first-semester learners of German; the second RQ (RQ 1.2.) compared descriptions of male and female NSs and was divided into three questions that looked at the importance of each category of stereotypes (RQ 1.2.1); the size difference in the percentage of respondents for each category (RQ 1.2.2); and the specific attributions in each category with regard to male and female NSs of German, respectively (RQ 1.2.3).

Results derive from analyses of data that were gathered through students' responses to two open-ended questions, i.e., what stereotypes students had heard about male and female NSs of German, respectively. In analysis, I initially conflated responses about male and female NSs during the coding process. I aimed to develop responses categories that were shared across the two sets of data to enable

subsequent cross-categorical comparisons. Analysis proceeded based on principles of Grounded Theory (GT), as described by Charmaz (2014). Constructivist GT is an inductive method that includes repeated coding of qualitative data, iterative comparisons between data and analyses, and theoretical conceptualizing. It “begins with inductive data, invokes iterative strategies of going back and forth between data and analysis, uses comparative methods, and keeps [the researcher] interacting with [their] data and emerging analysis” (p. 1). I used participants’ original responses to perform initial coding and final coding.

In the initial cell-by-cell coding of responses about NSs of German, each word or phrase was assigned to a matching umbrella category. The goal during the initial coding stage was “to remain open to all possible theoretical directions indicated” by the readings of the data (Charmaz, 2014, p. 114). Examples of how original entries were assigned to umbrella categories include assigning initial entries “like beer” and “drink beer” to the umbrella category ‘drinking alcohol’ or responses “aggressive” and “rude” to the umbrella category of ‘possessing negative character traits.’

Once I had assigned all entries into the umbrella categories, I continued with the focused, selective phase of the coding process. This part of coding used “the most significant or frequent initial codes to sort, synthesize, integrate, and organize large amounts of data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 113). This was a self-informing approach between coding of entries (similar and semantically related descriptions of NSs of German were grouped into the same category) and revising of categories based on the matched entries. This process resulted in the following preliminary stereotype categories: (1) ‘cognition, positive’; (2) ‘lack of emotions’; (3) ‘negative emotions/dispositions’; (4) ‘positive emotions/dispositions’; (5) ‘all other dispositions, unassigned’; (6) ‘all other dispositions, negative’; (7) ‘social and political views’; (8)

‘appearance’; (9) ‘qualities of the language’; (10) ‘cultural, including culinary,²⁶ interests’; (11) ‘global situatedness’; and (12) ‘absence of stereotypical attributions’.

During the focused coding stage, I used theoretical sampling as a “technique to develop and refine” my preliminary categories (Charmaz, 2014, p. 205). Theoretical sampling includes the review of findings from previous research. Chavez (2020b) analyzed stereotypical attributions about NSs of German as described by learners of German and students that did not study German at a large Midwestern research university. She, too, found stereotype categories about “disposition”, “social and political attitudes”, “appearance”, “about the language”, as well as “culinary and cultural interests” (p. 10). Overlaps in Chavez’ data and the data of this study may be due to the circumstance that the data was collected from similar populations at the same US university. Nikitina et al. (2014) analyzed stereotypical images that beginner learners of German in Malaysia had about Germany, its culture and people. They summarized their findings in 29 cultural stereotypes. These stereotypes resembled the data collected for the present study as it included stereotypical aspects related to politics, history, sports, economy, culinary preferences, music and arts, or the language. Consequently, during the process of focused coding, I decided to keep the categories related to the following as they resembled findings of the previously cited studies: ‘social and political views’ (Category 7); ‘appearance’ (Category 8); ‘qualities of the language’ (Category 9); ‘cultural, including culinary, interests’ (Category 10); ‘global situatedness’ (Category 11); and ‘absence of stereotypical attributions’ (Category 12).

However, I decided to adjust the preliminary categories related to any type of personal dispositions (preliminary Categories 1–6²⁷) for two reasons: First, only a minority of responses initially labeled as

²⁶ I decided to emphasize “culinary interests” in the name of the category, as the majority of responses was related to this part of the culture.

²⁷ This comprised the following preliminary categories: (1) ‘cognition, positive’; (2) ‘lack of emotions’; (3) ‘negative emotions/dispositions’; (4) ‘positive emotions/dispositions’; (5) ‘all other dispositions, unassigned’; (6) ‘all other dispositions, negative’.

‘positive’ or ‘negative’ in their verbatim form contained a relevant predicate (e.g., “good”) in explicit form; most responses would have required further interpretation to be categorized as either ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. Respondents’ original choice of words likely reflects divergent associations across individual respondents that could not be accessed post-hoc.²⁸ Second, Charmaz (2014) suggested focusing the “coding on actions and processes” as this encourages the researcher to begin analysis from the participants’ perspective (pp. 121, 245). Thus, I revisited the entries assigned to the preliminary six categories related to dispositions so as to emphasize the active and process-oriented aspects in the data. I finally established six new categories that described qualities and behaviors from a broader societal perspective and with an emphasis on likely outcomes rather than on evaluative judgments of whether these outcomes are inherently ‘positive’ or ‘negative.’ I constructed the societal guidelines based on conversations with colleagues and an examination of public and academic discourses. My consultants were professionals with a background in language-related fields and included graduate students in German, who had grown up in the United States, and my academic advisor, who had grown up in a German-speaking country but has been working in a US higher-education context for more than 30 years.

The six categories were described as behaviors and dispositions that are likely to do the following: (1) ‘promote professional success’; (2) ‘promote personal relationships’; (3) ‘promote tension or discord’; (4) ‘prevent personal relationships’; (5) ‘are concerned with tension or discord that may result’; and (5) ‘connote deviance from social norms’. Category 5 contained responses such as “direct” or “strict”. Its entries differed from entries into Category 3, with sample responses such as “angry”, in that their specific outcome could be expected to depend on cultural context. For example, while ‘anger’ likely promotes discord under most circumstances, ‘directness’ may be appreciated in some cultural contexts and cause

²⁸ I did not ask participants to indicate whether they perceived the described stereotype as positive or negative. Nikitina Nikitina et al. (2014), however, applied a favorability approach in their research on stereotypical images held by beginning learners of German from Malaysia. Participants indicated on a scale from -3 (for the most negative images) to +3 (for the most positive images) their perception of each stereotypical image. This helped to categorize responses into more positive or more negative stereotypical images (p. 120).

social disturbance in others. The process of focused coding resulted in a total of 12 final stereotype categories for NS of German. I will show the categories and categorized responses under RQ 1.1.

Before proceeding to the reporting of results, I need to concede that it was impossible to disambiguate the assignment of responses to a given category entirely and that the categories function as heuristic devices and are not entirely conceptually discrete. What is more, I was unable to access each respondent's precise intent behind the wording. In this vein, Chavez's findings (2009, pp. 6, 8) indicated that what the participant had intended and what the researcher perceived may diverge.

Results reported under RQ 1.1 show the outcome of this initial and comprehensive analysis to establish analytic categories that, in turn, will be applied in analyses pertaining to each of the two subgroups—male and female NSs (RQ 1.2.1; 1.2.2; 1.2.3).

RQ 1.1: What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German?

Based on the analytic procedure outlined above, Table 5 (below) summarizes the 12 categories of stereotypes pertaining to native speakers (NSs) of German that emerged in descriptions given by first-semester learners of German. Table 5 also lists in alphabetical order all verbatim responses that were assigned to each category. In a few instances, a response related to more than one category. In such an instance, the category with the more precise fit was chosen. These decisions were made on the basis of conversations with colleagues and an examination of academic discourses (theoretical sampling). Specific cases of such overlap and how it was dealt with, will be explained in the context of the description of categories (below Table 5).

Table 5: Overview of the 12 emerged categories of stereotypes about NSs of German and the verbatim responses assigned to each

#	Categories of stereotypes	Verbatim descriptions of stereotypes about NSs of German (male and female) assigned to each category
Attributions related to qualities and behaviors that...		
1	... are likely to promote professional success	always on time; analytical; bold; careful; confident; detail-oriented; disciplined; hard workers; independent; informative; mature; motivated; on time; organize; organized; passionate; practical; precise; productive; punctual; punctuality; reliable; smart; successful; tech-savvy; timely; very accurate; workhorses
2	... are likely to promote personal relationships	approachable; caring; classy; don't gossip as much ²⁹ ; energetic; friendly; funny; humorous; jolly; kind; loving; noble; outgoing; playful; respectful; social; talkative; tolerant; very friendly
3	... are likely to prevent personal relationships	aren't funny; cold; cold demeanor; distant; don't laugh; formal; humorless; introverts; lack of empathy; lacking empathy; more judgmental of non-native speakers; no humor; no jokes; no sense of humor; not approachable; not funny; not welcoming; reserved; serious; serious in communication; shy; unapproachable; understand no jokes; unhappy; unromantic; unwelcoming of outsiders
4	... are likely to promote tension or discord	aggressive; aggressiveness; always angry; angry; angry all the time; arrogant; gruff; intimidating; less politeness; loud; mean; not nice; rude; self-centered; self-involved; short-tempered; snobby; stubborn; unfriendly
5	... are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	aren't friendly; demanding; detail-demanding; direct; direct communication; direct communication can come off as rude; hardcore; harsh; harsh personalities; honest; intense; intolerant; love making schedules; love rules; narrow-minded; not very understanding; rigorous; severe; straightforward; strict; strict about rules; strict in communication; strong-willed; to the point about things; tough; tough personalities
6	... connote deviance from social norms	bad sense of humor; crazy; weird sense of humor
7	... describe political & social views	conservative; intolerant of Americans; like talking about politics; love tradition; Nazi; racist
8	... describe appearance	attractive; beautiful; blond; blond hair; blue eyes; built for winter; dress uniformly (not diverse); dress well; fair skin; fit; handsome; hunky; more muscular ³⁰ ; muscular; physically strong; sporty; strong; tall; ugly; wear Dirndl; wear Lederhosen every day; wear Lederhosen

²⁹ ... as American women

³⁰ ... than most women

9	... describe the qualities of the language	accent; aggressive language; don't show expression with voice when speaking; emphasis on consonants; fast speaker; fast talker; harsh dialogue; lots of emphasis on hard consonants; loud speakers; overenunciate; say a lot of curse words; sense of urgency in voice; sense of urgency when speaking; shout; sound angry; sound angry when speaking; sounds like they're choking when speaking; speak aggressively; speak from the throat; speak German fast; speak with their cheekbones; speaks loudly; spit a lot; talk fast; their sound has a ring to it; they shout everything; tough in speaking; ugly language; unpleasant first names; words are gibberish; yell; yelling
10	... describe cultural, incl. culinary, interests	beer drinkers; beer drinking; beer-loving; cannot cook; churn butter; drink a lot; drink a lot of beer; drink beer; drink lots of beer; drunkards; eat a lot of cake; eat a lot of sausage; eat gross things; eat lots of sausage; eat potatoes; eat sausage; eat thick meals; frequently drunk; good at soccer; healthy; in charge of cooking and cleaning; know how to make bakery; like beer; like sausage; like to drink; like to play soccer; listening to lots of techno music; listening to techno music; love beer; love cars; love heavy foods; love soccer; love to eat meat; love to party; only eat bratwursts; really like David Hasselhoff; soccer-soccer-soccer; tend to smoke
11	... describe global situatedness	love to travel; well-traveled
12	... reflect an insistence on the absence of stereotypical attributions	I don't really know any; N/A; no stereotypes heard; none; nothing

Responses under Categories 1 through 6 all exemplify qualities and behaviors related to personal or professional relationships between speakers. Attributions in Categories 1 and 2 described personal and interpersonal traits that are probably perceived as desirable since they are likely to promote professional success, i.e., “punctual” and “reliable” (Category 1) or personal relationships, e.g., “approachable” or “funny” (Category 2). In contrast, Categories 3 and 4 included stereotypical attributions that seem far less desirable, i.e., to prevent personal relationships, e.g., “not approachable” (Category 3), or to promote tension and discord, e.g., “angry” (Category 4). In short, Categories 1 and 2 may be viewed as opposite to Categories 3 and 4. Descriptions in Category 5 connote a focus on self-perceived truths and rules that make no allowance for interpersonal relationships. Even as these qualities do not necessarily promote

tension and discord (as do entries in Category 4), they may result in them, depending on the preferences and outlook of those involved.

Stereotypical attributions expressing political or social views presumably held by NSs of German are listed under Category 7. Pertinent entries refer to the German past, e.g., “love tradition” and “Nazi”, or to a more general political viewpoint, e.g., “conservative”, as well as references to NSs’ attitudes toward Americans (“intolerant of Americans”).

Category 8 includes stereotypical descriptions of the appearance of NSs of German. Examples from this category paint a picture of a physically well-built, good-looking, blue-eyed person with blond hair wearing either Lederhosen or a Dirndl.

Stereotypical descriptions listed under Category 9 represent qualities attributed to the German language (e.g., “words are gibberish”) and language-related qualities and behaviors of speakers of German (e.g., “unpleasant first names” or “sound angry when speaking”). Some of these descriptions, such as “speak aggressively” or “don’t show expression with voice when speaking”, in parts resemble descriptions that were assigned to other categories, i.e., “aggressive” (Category 4), “angry (Category 4), or “cold” (Category 3). Apparently, respondents were sensitive to similar trains of thought across categories, so that they attached overlapping predicates either to the native speakers themselves or, alternatively, to affiliated cultural expressions, e.g., the language.

Category 10 contains references to cultural interests. The particular emphasis on culinary interests in terms of how Category 10 was named, reflects the numerous mentions of beer and sausages.

Category 11 comprises attributions of how NSs of German situate themselves globally, e.g., “well-traveled” or “love to travel”.

Category 12 encompasses all responses that indicated respondents' insistence on the absence of any stereotypical attributions. Some participants wrote that they had not heard any stereotypes or simply put "none". Others crossed out the section, which was entered as "N/A" into the database. Responses in this category indicate that (a) respondents have indeed never heard of any stereotypes in regard to the question (e.g., "nothing") or (b) they did not feel comfortable providing any (e.g., "I don't *really* know any").

RQ 1.2.1: What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male and female native speakers of German, respectively?

To address this RQ, I used descriptive statistics³¹. I calculated the percentage of respondents who had given at least one response in a given category. I chose to focus on the percentage of respondents rather than of responses because the former number indicates the frequency or prevalence of specific categories in the population. This method also accounts for data outliers, i.e., instances in which a single participant described multiple characteristics that all belonged to the same category.

Table 6 lists the 12 categories, broken down by male and female NSs of German in the rank order of percentages, from highest to lowest. Based on natural breaks in the data, the categories were divided into three tiers of prevalence.

³¹ I would like to emphasize that I consulted with educational psychologist and statistician, Stanley A. Lubanski, regarding all statistical analyses presented in this study. I would like to thank him for his work.

Table 6: Ranked percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category of stereotype related to male NSs and female NSs of German, respectively

Stereotypes about									
Male NSs (N = 67)					Female NSs (N = 67)				
Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	% of respondents	Tiers	Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	% of respondents	Tiers
1a	3	prevent personal relationships	18.09	TIER 1	1	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	16.75	TIER 1
1b	4	promote tension or discord	18.09		2	3	prevent personal relationships	16.08	
3a	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	17.42		3	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	14.07	
3b	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	17.42		4	1	promote professional success	13.40	
5	1	promote professional success	16.75		5	4	promote tension or discord	10.05	TIER 2
6	9	language	11.39	TIER 2	6	9	language	9.38	
7	8	appearance	10.72		7	8	appearance	8.71	
8	2	promote personal relationships	4.69	TIER 3	8a	2	promote personal relationships	6.03	
9	7	political & social views	4.02		8b	12	absence of stereotypical attributions	6.03	
10	12	absence of stereotypical attributions	2.68		10a	6	deviance from social norms	2.01	TIER 3
11a	6	deviance from social norms	1.34		10b	7	political & social views	2.01	
11b	11	global situatedness	1.34		12	11	global situatedness	1.34	

Concerning male NSs of German, the percentage of respondents for a category of stereotypes ranged from 1.34 percent (rank 11; Categories 6 ‘deviance from social norms’ & 11 ‘global situatedness’) to 18.09 percent (rank 1; Categories 3 ‘prevent personal relationships’ & 4 ‘promote tension or discord’) of respondents. The five categories in the top tier (spanning ranks 1–5) all fell within 1.5 percent of each other, from 16.75 percent to 18.09 percent. Stereotypes about how male NSs relate to others occupied

the top three categories—none with inherently positive connotations. The following two categories among the top-tier ranks included stereotypical descriptions about NSs’ cultural interests and qualities and behaviors that promote professional success.

With regard to female NSs of German, the percentage of respondents for a category of stereotypes ranged from 1.34 percent (rank 12; Category 11 ‘global situatedness’) to 16.75 percent (rank 1; Category 5 ‘unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord’). The four categories in the top tier (spanning ranks 1–4) ranged from 13.40 percent to 16.75 percent. Stereotypes about how female NSs relate to others occupied the top two categories—again, none with inherently positive connotations. The other two categories in the top tier related to stereotypes about NSs’ cultural interests as well as qualities and behaviors promoting professional success.

RQ 1.2.2: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native speakers?

The statistical significance of differences between descriptions of male and female native speakers (NSs) was assessed by a non-parametric inferential statistical test, namely, a paired sample sign test. One test was performed to compare the categories pertaining to male and female NSs. This test focused on respondents who, in a specific category, had given at least one response when they described NSs of one gender but not given a response in the same category when they described NSs of the other gender. For this test, results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$. Despite repeated family-wise testing, I did not apply a Bonferroni correction³². The small number of participants and the study context that was limited to one single institution already require this study to be considered exploratory in nature. The study's intent was to scope out parameters for future research and not to present definitive conclusions. The decision not to decrease the alpha level of $p < 0.05$ may lead to a Type-I error, i.e., some

³² This applies to all statistical analyses in this study.

results may show as 'significant' even though they are due to chance. However, given the objectives of the study, the converse Type-II error (underreporting significant results) appeared more consequential. I will discuss these and other limitations in greater detail in Chapter 6.

Table 7 shows the results of the comparison. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the percentages of respondents who had given at least one response when describing male as compared to female NSs, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in gray. Categories in which the absolute difference almost amounted to a statistical significance (with an alpha level of $p < 0.1$) are highlighted in lighter gray.

Table 7: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NSs of German by category and in order of the size of difference

Rank of size difference	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Percentage of respondents who gave at least one response in a category for...		Size of difference in % of respondents for male & female NSs (calculated as male NSs % - female NSs %)	Paired sign test p-value of < 0.05	# of respondents used for the test
			Male NSs	Female NSs			
1	4	promote tension or discord	18.09	10.05	8.04	0.002	14
2a	1	promote professional success	16.75	13.40	3.35	0.063	5
2b	12	absence of stereotypical attributions	2.68	6.03	-3.35	0.063	5
2c	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	17.42	14.07	3.35	0.125	7
5a	3	prevent personal relationships	18.09	16.08	2.01	0.510	9
5b	7	political & social views	4.02	2.01	2.01	0.250	3
5c	8	appearance	10.72	8.71	2.01	0.375	5
5d	9	language	11.39	9.38	2.01	0.453	7
9	2	promote personal relationships	4.69	6.03	-1.34	0.500	2
10a	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	17.42	16.75	0.67	1.000	7
10b	6	deviance from social norms	1.34	2.01	-0.67	1.000	1
12	11	global situatedness	1.34	1.34	0	N/A	0

The difference amounted to a statistically significant level ($p = 0.002$) in only one instance, i.e., the promotion of tension and discord—a rank-1 category in descriptions of male NSs and a rank-5 category in descriptions of female NSs. There were two categories with a difference that came close to being statistically significant, i.e., the top-tier Category 1 ‘promote professional success’ ($p = 0.063$) and Category 12 ‘absence of stereotypical attributions’—a third-tier category for male NSs and a second-tier category for female NSs ($p = 0.063$).

Only three out of the 12 categories of stereotypes were more likely to be attached to a female than a male NS: Category 12 ‘absence of stereotypical attributions’; Category 2 ‘promote personal relationships’; and Category 6 ‘deviance from social norms’. None of the three were top-tier categories, however. Further differences between male and female NSs that go beyond the quantitative results found in the data will be examined in the next RQ.

RQ 1.2.3: How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within each category compare between stereotypes about male and female native speakers?

This RQ examined the verbatim responses under each category for male and female native speakers (NSs). This RQ was motivated by a desire to further explore trends indicating differences between described stereotypes about male and female NSs by exploring the uniqueness of responses to male or female NSs within each category. The analysis of these data will complement the interpretation of the results in the Discussion chapter (Chapter 5). Table 8 (below) shows all categorized verbatim responses alphabetically pertaining to male and female NSs, starting with responses attributed to both male and female NSs and followed by responses that applied to only one of the subgroups in each category.

Table 8: Overview of the 12 categories of stereotypes about NSs of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both male and female NSs, uniquely to male NS, and uniquely to female NSs of German

#	Categories of stereotypes	Verbatim descriptions of stereotypes that were assigned ...		
		... to both male and female NSs of German for each category	... uniquely to male NSs of German for each category	... uniquely to female NSs of German for each category
Attributions related to qualities and behaviors that ...				
1	... are likely to promote professional success	always on time; analytical; careful; disciplined; on time; organize; organized; passionate; precise; productive; punctual; smart; timely	bold; confident; detail-oriented; hard workers; independent; informative; mature; practical; punctuality; reliable; successful; tech-savvy; very accurate; workhorses	motivated
2	... are likely to promote personal relationships	humorous; playful; respectful; social; very friendly	classy; funny; jolly; noble; tolerant	approachable; caring; don't gossip as much ³³ ; energetic; friendly; kind; loving; outgoing; talkative
3	... are likely to prevent personal relationships	cold; distant; introverts; more judgmental of non-native speakers; no humor; no sense of humor; reserved; serious; unapproachable; unhappy; unwelcoming of outsiders	aren't funny; don't laugh; lacking empathy; no jokes; not approachable; not funny; not welcoming; serious in communication	cold demeanor; formal; humorless lack of empathy; shy; understand no jokes; unromantic
4	... are likely to promote tension or discord	aggressive; always angry; angry all the time; arrogant; intimidating; less politeness; loud; mean; rude; unfriendly	aggressiveness; gruff; not nice; self-involved; short-tempered	self-centered; snobby; stubborn

³³ ...as American women

5	... are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	aren't friendly; demanding; direct; direct communication; harsh; harsh personalities; intense; love making; schedules; love rules; narrow-minded; rigorous; severe; strict; to the point about things; tough; tough personalities	detail-demanding; direct communication can come off as rude; hardcore; honest; straightforward; strict about rules; strict in communication	intolerant; not very understanding; strong-willed
6	... connote deviance from social norms	bad sense of humor; weird sense of humor		crazy
7	... describe political & social views	like talking about politics; Nazi; racist	conservative; intolerant of Americans; love tradition	
8	... describe appearance	attractive; blond hair; blue eyes; dress well; fit; sporty; strong; tall; wear Lederhosen	built for winter; handsome; hunky; muscular; physically strong; wear Lederhosen every day	beautiful; blond; dress uniformly (not diverse); fair skin; more muscular ³⁴ ; ugly; wear Dirndl
9	... describe the qualities of the language	aggressive language; harsh dialogue; sound angry; sound angry when speaking; sounds like they're choking when speaking; speak aggressively; speak from the throat; speak German fast; spit a lot; talk fast; ugly language; yell	accent; don't show expression with voice when speaking fast talker; lots of emphasis on hard consonants; loud speakers; overenunciate; say a lot of curse words; sense of urgency when speaking; shout speaks loudly; they shout everything; tough in speaking; words are gibberish	emphasis on consonants; fast speaker; sense of urgency in voice; speak with their cheekbones; their sound has a ring to it; unpleasant first names; yelling

³⁴ ...than most women

10	... describe cultural, including culinary, interests	beer drinkers; beer-loving; drink a lot of beer; drink beer; drink lots of beer; eat a lot of sausage; eat gross things; eat potatoes; eat thick meals; healthy; like beer; like sausage; like to drink; love beer; love soccer; tend to smoke	beer drinking; drink a lot; drunkards; eat a lot of cake; eat lots of sausage; frequently drunk; good at soccer; like to play soccer; listening to lots of techno music love cars; love heavy foods; love to eat meat; love to party; only eat bratwursts; really like David Hasselhoff; soccer-soccer-soccer	cannot cook; churn butter; eat sausage; in charge of cooking and cleaning; know how to make bakery; listening to techno music
11	... describe global situatedness	love to travel; well-traveled		
12	... reflect an insistence on the absence of stereotypical attributions	none		I don't really know any; N/A; no stereotypes heard; nothing

Both male and female NSs of German elicited descriptions of stereotypical attributions pertaining to each of the 12 categories. In addition to the responses that were given for male and female NSs, some categories showed responses that were either primarily related to male or female NSs.

With respect to personal qualities, only male NSs were associated with confidence, independence, practicality, and technologies (Category 1 'promote professional success'). Female NSs were particularly associated with qualities related to outgoingness, e.g., "outgoing" or "talkative", as well as attributes related to providing/taking care of someone, e.g., "kind", "caring", or "loving" (Category 2 'promote personal relationships'). Responses pertaining to the other three categories related to personal qualities only showed similar themes for both male and female NSs.

With regard to NSs' appearance (Category 8), it is worth pointing out that the response "wear Lederhosen" was assigned to both male and female NSs, despite the fact that Lederhosen are usually worn by men. The description "wear Dirndl", however, was only assigned to female NSs.

Concerning cultural interests (Category 10), attributions that primarily described male NSs were related to soccer, cars, and going on parties. Female NSs, in turn, were primarily associated with behaviors related to taking care of a household.

For Category 12 'absence of stereotypical attributions' it is worth pointing out that, besides the shared response of "none", all other responses were only given for female NSs.

4.2 Research Theme 2: Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Teachers of German

Research Theme 2 examined categories of stereotypes that emerged from participants' responses with regard to stereotypes about teachers of German. The data analyzed for each of this research theme's seven RQs were based on students' responses to a total of four open-ended questions. These questions inquired about stereotypes that participants had heard about male and female NS and NNS teachers of German. In order to establish in what regards and how strongly all possible categories of stereotypes about teachers of German manifested in descriptions of stereotypes about specific subgroups (male NS teachers; female NS teachers; male NNS teachers; and female NNS teachers), I first collated responses given to the four questions, i.e., with regard to each of the four subgroups, into one data set. This comprehensive set of responses was taken to represent a full account of all possible stereotypes about teachers, male and female, as well as NS and NNS, and was subjected to the same analytical procedures, based on Grounded Theory, as described for data analysis under Research Theme 1.

Results reported under RQ 2.1 show the outcomes of this initial and comprehensive analysis to establish analytic categories that, in turn, will be applied in analyses pertaining to each of the four subgroups—male and female NS teachers as well as male and female NNS teachers (RQs 2.2–2.4).

RQ 2.1: What categories emerged when first-semester learners of German were asked to describe stereotypes about male and female, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers of German?

During the coding process for Research Theme 2, the categories that originally had been established for accounts of stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) of German remained viable. However, additional categories were needed to capture the full scope of responses, specifically those that related to the pedagogical context.

Based on the analytic procedure described above, Table 9 (below) displays the 15 categories of stereotypes that emerged when first-semester learners of German described stereotypes about four types of teachers of German (male/female x NS/non-native-speaker [NNS]). Table 9 also lists in alphabetical order all verbatim responses that were assigned to each category.

Table 9: Overview of all categories of stereotypes, including categorized responses, about Teachers of German

#	Categories of stereotypes	Verbatim descriptions of stereotypes about teachers of German (male/female x NS/NNS) assigned to each category
Attributions related to qualities and behaviors that...		
1	... are likely to promote professional success	always on time; analytical; careful; collaborative; confident; dedicated; detail-oriented; disciplined; efficient; gifted; hard-working; informative; motivated; organize; organized; passionate; precise; productive; punctual; qualified; relatively timely; reliable; responsible; smart; timely; well-organized; well-oriented; worldly
2	... are likely to promote personal relationships	accepting; approachable; appropriate; bubbly; calm; caring; chill; communicative; cool; dynamic; easy to communicate; easy-going; empathetic; energetic; engaging; entertaining; enthusiastic; fair; friendly; fun; funny; happy-go-lucky; helpful; humorous; kind; loving; nice; open-minded; playful; positive; respectful; social; supportive; talkative; tolerant; understanding; warm; welcoming; willing to help
3	... are likely to prevent personal relationships	boring; calculating; cold; distant; emotionless; introverted; less communicative; no sense of humor; non-entertaining; not as extroverted ³⁵ ; not very communicative; reserved; serious; shy; unapproachable

³⁵ ...as a female

4	... are likely to promote tension or discord	always angry; angry; arrogant; can be mean; mean; mocking; rude; unfriendly; unkind
5	... are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	critical; demanding; detail-demanding; direct; dominant; forceful; hard personalities; harsh; honest; intense; intolerant; love making schedules; love rules; rigorous; somehow forceful; somewhat strict; stern; straightforward; strict; strong personality; too honest; tough; tough personalities
6	... connote deviance from social norms	childish; eclectic; goofy; inappropriate; strange; weird
7	... describe political & social views	Americanized; traditionalist
8	... describe appearance	blond; lanky; masculine; tall; wear Lederhosen
9	... describe the qualities of the language	appear unfriendly through voice; fast-spoken; hard-spoken; loud speakers; overenunciation; sound angry; sound unfriendly; spit while talking; strong accents; yell
10	... describe cultural, incl. culinary, interests	active; animal lovers; drink a lot of beer; like chocolate
11	... describe global situatedness	been to Germany; like Germany; speak multiple languages; well-traveled; went to Germany; would rather live in Germany
12	...reflect age	elderly; typically older; young; youthful
13	... promote a positive learning experience	a little more patient; after class generally less strict; authentic; careful about things they teach; easier on students; leadership; less harsh than native speaker; more experienced; more knowledgeable; more relaxed atmosphere; not strict at all; seem to care a lot about grammar; try hard to be "German-like"; understanding of student struggles

14	... impede a positive learning experience	academically strict; are not authentic; are not German; aren't as qualified as a native German speaker; aren't as qualified as native speakers; different ways of pronouncing 'r's based on whom they've learned German from; difficulty to teach pronunciations; don't actually know how native speakers talk; don't know what they are doing; don't speak German correctly all the time; don't understand how we learn their language; don't understand some German words; give very hard tests; grammatic errors; harder on students; harder to teach pronunciations; have accents; have unnatural German accents; high expectations; high maintenance; impatient; intolerant of errors; judge your understanding; lack of knowledge; lack of enough knowledge; lack of vocabulary knowledge; lacking in talent; leave you to learn on your own; less informed; no confidence when they teach; not as good as a native; not as good of a grasp of the language as a native; not qualified; unfamiliar with Germans; ununderstandable; with accent
15	... reflect an insistence on the absence of stereotypical attributions	haven't heard any; honestly, I haven't heard any; I don't know any; I don't know German teacher stereotypes; I have no idea on this question; I have not been exposed to any stereotypes; I have not heard stereotypes; I haven't heard any; I haven't heard anything; I just have not encountered any stereotypes this specific; I've also never heard any for female non-natives; I've heard no stereotypes; N/A; none; none heard; nothing; sorry, I never heard any stereotypes

12 categories (Categories 1–11 and 15) overlapped with the 12 categories originally developed for NSs of German, and three categories (Categories 12–14) were added to accommodate specific responses about teachers of German. Due to adding three categories to the initially created 12 categories for NSs of German, I changed the number of Category 'absence of stereotypical attributions' to 15.³⁶

The additional categories included Category 12 'age' (e.g., "youthful" or "elderly"), Category 13 'promote a positive learning experience' (e.g., "understanding of student struggles"), and Category 14 'impede a positive learning experience' (e.g., "lack of knowledge"). Concerning Categories 13 and 14, it is worth pointing out that descriptions listed in these categories show similarities to descriptions listed in the originally developed categories (e.g., Category 1 or Category 5). However, attributions in Categories 13 and 14 often specifically reference teaching or learning experiences, e.g., "careful [Category 1] *about*

³⁶ This was Category 12 in Research Theme 1.

the things they teach” (Category 13) or “don’t understand [Category 5] *how we learn their language*” (Category 14.)

RQ 2.2: What was the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about male/female x native-speaker/non-native-speaker teachers of German, respectively?

As for RQ 1.2.1, to answer RQ 2.2, I relied on the percentage of respondents who had given at least one response in a category to calculate the relative prevalence of each category in the total pool of responses. Natural breaks in the data were used to assign the categories into four tiers, each specified for one of the four teacher types. Table 10³⁷ shows the four tiers with the corresponding stereotype categories related to the four teacher subgroups (male and female native-speaker [NS] and non-native-speaker [NNS] teachers, respectively), including bottom and top of range in percentage of respondents. Colors indicate individual stereotype categories across subgroups of teachers to help visualize patterns and track individual categories that ranked in the first and second tier.

³⁷ Table 24 in Appendix C.1 shows a complete summary of percentage of respondents, ranks, and tiers of all categories of stereotypes pertaining to male/female x NS/NNS teachers.

Table 10: Grouped stereotype categories related to male/female x NS/NNS teachers of German into four tiers based on the percentage of respondents

Tier	Teacher group with attributions	Percentage of respondents (N = 67)		Categories of stereotypes in tier	
		Bottom of range	Top of range	#	name
1	Male NS	15.41	20.10	5	unconcerned w/ resulting tension/discord
				15	absence of stereotypical attributions
	Female NS	16.75	16.75	5	unconcerned w/ resulting tension/discord
				15	absence of stereotypical attributions
	Male NNS	18.76	18.76	15	absence of stereotypical attributions
2	Female NNS	19.43	19.43	15	absence of stereotypical attributions
	Male NS	10.05	11.39	1	promote professional success
				3	prevent personal relationships
	Female NS	8.04	10.72	1	promote professional success
				2	promote personal relationships
	Male NNS	10.72	12.06	2	promote personal relationships
				14	impede a positive learning experience
	Female NNS	9.38	11.38	2	promote personal relationships
				14	impede a positive learning experience
3	Male NS	4.02	6.70	2	promote personal relationships
				4	promote tension or discord
				9	language
				14	impede a positive learning experience
	Female NS	4.69	6.03	3	prevent personal relationships
				4	promote tension or discord
				14	impede a positive learning experience
				1	promote professional success
	Male NNS	3.35	4.69	3	prevent personal relationships
				5	unconcerned w/ resulting tension/discord
				13	promote a positive learning experience
				1	promote professional success
	Female NNS	3.35	6.03	3	prevent personal relationships
				5	unconcerned w/ resulting tension/discord
				13	promote a positive learning experience
				6	deviance from social norms
4	Male NS	0.00	2.68	7	political & social views
				8	appearance
				10	cultural, including culinary, interests
				11	global situatedness
				12	age
				13	promote a positive learning experience

	Female NS	0.00	2.68	6	deviance from social norms
				7	political & social views
				8	appearance
				9	language
				10	cultural, including culinary, interests
				11	global situatedness
				12	age
				13	promote a positive learning experience
	Male NNS	0.00	2.68	4	promote tension or discord
				6	deviance from social norms
				7	political & social views
				8	appearance
				9	language
				10	cultural, including culinary, interests
				11	global situatedness
				12	age
	Female NNS	0.00	2.01	4	promote tension or discord
				6	deviance from social norms
				7	political & social views
				8	appearance
				9	language
				10	cultural, including culinary, interests
				11	global situatedness
				12	age

All four teacher subgroups are similar in that they received high percentages for an absence of stereotypical attributions (Category 15) as well as for favorable qualities that promote personal relationships (Category 2). Tier 1 shows that the most prevalent category across all four teacher subgroups indicated an absence of stereotypical attributions with respect to teachers (Category 15). The second tier reveals rather favorable personal dispositions—i.e., promotion of personal relationships (Category 2) for three of the four subgroups, namely, female NS and NNS teachers, as well as male NNS teachers. Male NS teachers, however, received fewer mentions with respect to qualities promoting personal relationships. Consequently, this category only ranked in the third tier for them. This trend is supported by the fact that the opposite qualities, namely unfavorable dispositions preventing personal relationships (Category 3), ranked among the second-tier categories for male NSs. This was not the case for the other three subgroups, for which these undesirable features were a third-tier category.

NS teachers were primarily associated with stereotypes describing culturally connoted personal qualities and features that promote professional success. Specifically, for both NS teacher subgroups, qualities that are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord (Category 5) were ranked in the top tier. However, these features only ranked in the third tier for both NNS teacher subgroups. A similar trend became evident regarding qualities promoting professional success (Category 1)—a category ranked among the second-tier categories for both NS teacher subgroups but only ranked in the third tier for both subgroups of NNS teachers. Contrary to the above trends, NNS teachers were more often associated with stereotypes that reflect features impeding a positive learning experience (Category 14 in tier 2), whereas this category ranked in the third tier for both NS teacher subgroups.

The findings discussed above have shown that categories in the first two tiers were primarily related to (a) a lack of stereotypes, as well as to (b) how teachers relate to others and (c) how they impede positive learning experiences. Low percentages of respondents across all four teacher subgroups were related to the following categories found in the third or last tier: (6) deviance from social norms; (7) social and political views; (8) appearance; (9) language; (10) cultural interests; (11) global situatedness; (12) age; as well as (13) promotion of a positive learning experience.

RQ 2.3.1: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female native-speaker teachers?

As for RQ 1.2.2, to answer RQ 2.3.1, I assessed the statistical significance of differences—here between descriptions of male and female native-speaker (NS) teachers—via paired sample sign tests. For this test, results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$.

Table 11 shows the results of the comparison. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the percentages of respondents who had given at least one response when describing male as compared to female NS teachers, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the

absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in darker gray. Categories in which the absolute difference almost amounted to a statistical significance (with an alpha level of $p < 0.1$) are highlighted in lighter gray.

Table 11: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference

Rank of size difference	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Percentage of respondents who gave at least one response in the category		Size of difference in % of respondents for male & female NSs (calculated as male NS teacher % - female NS teacher %)	Paired sign test p-value of < 0.05	# of respondents used for the test
			Male NS Teacher	Female NS Teacher			
1a	2	promote personal relationships	4.02	8.04	-4.02	0.070	8
1b	3	prevent personal relationships	10.05	6.03	4.02	0.070	8
3	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	20.10	16.75	3.35	0.227	11
4	9	language	4.69	2.01	2.68	0.125	4
5	4	promote tension or discord	6.70	4.69	2.01	0.375	5
6	15	absence of stereotypical attributions	15.41	16.75	-1.34	1.000	1
7a	1	promote professional success	11.39	10.72	0.67	1.000	3
7b	6	deviance from social norms	0.00	0.67	-0.67	1.000	1
7c	7	political & social views	0.67	0.00	0.67	1.000	1
7d	8	appearance	2.68	2.01	0.67	1.000	1
7e	12	age	1.34	0.67	0.67	1.000	1
7f	13	promote a positive learning experience	2.01	2.68	-0.67	1.000	1
7g	14	impede a positive learning experience	4.02	4.69	-0.67	1.000	3
14a	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	2.01	2.01	0.00	1.000	2
14b	11	global situatedness	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	0

The differences did not amount to a statistically significant level in any of the instances. However, there were two categories with a difference that came close to being statistically significant, i.e., Category

2 'promote personal relationships' ($p = 0.070$), and Category 3 'prevent personal relationships' ($p = 0.070$). One of these two categories, namely Category 2 'promote personal relationships', was more likely to be attached to a female than a male NS teacher.

RQ 2.3.2: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male and of female non-native-speaker teachers?

Similar to the previous RQ (2.3.1), the statistical significance of differences between categories pertaining to male and female non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers were assessed by paired sample sign tests. For this test, results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$.

Table 12 shows the results of the comparison. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the percentages of respondents who had given at least one response when describing male as compared to female NNS teachers, from largest to smallest.

Table 12: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male and female NNS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference

Rank of size difference	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Percentage of respondents who gave at least one response in the category		Size of difference in % of respondents for male & female NNSs (calculated as male NNS teacher % - female NNS teacher %)	Paired sign test p-value of < 0.05	# of respondents used for the test
			Male NNS Teacher	Female NNS Teacher			
1a	4	promote tension or discord	2.68	0.67	2.01	0.25	3
1b	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	4.02	6.03	-2.01	0.25	3
3a	1	promote professional success	4.69	6.03	-1.34	0.625	4
3b	13	promote a positive learning experience	4.69	3.35	1.34	0.500	2
3c	14	impede a positive learning experience	4.69	9.38	1.34	0.625	4
6a	2	promote personal relationships	12.06	11.39	0.67	1.000	3
6b	6	deviance from social norms	1.34	0.67	0.67	1.000	3
6c	8	appearance	0.67	0.00	0.67	1.000	1
6d	9	language	0.67	0.00	0.67	1.000	1
6e	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.00	0.67	-0.67	1.000	1
6f	12	age	1.34	0.67	0.67	1.000	1
6g	15	absence of stereotypical attributions	18.76	19.43	-0.67	1.000	1
13a	3	prevent personal relationships	3.35	3.35	0.00	1.000	4
13b	7	political & social views	0.67	0.67	0.00	N/A	0
13c	11	global situatedness	2.01	2.01	0.00	N/A	0

None of the differences amounted to a statistically significant level or came close to being statistically significant.

RQ 2.3.3: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of male native-speaker and of male non-native-speaker teachers?

Similar to the described procedure in RQs 2.3.1–2.3.2, paired sample sign tests were performed to compare the categories pertaining to male native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers, respectively. For this test, results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$.

Table 13 shows the results of the comparison. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the percentages of respondents who had given at least one response when describing male NS teachers as compared to male NNS teachers, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in darker gray. Categories in which the absolute difference almost amounted to a statistical significance (with an alpha level of $p < 0.1$) are highlighted in lighter gray.

Table 13: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to male NS and NNS teachers of German by category and in order of the size of difference

Rank of size difference	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Percentage of respondents who gave at least one response in the category		Size of difference in % of respondents for male NS & male NNS teachers (calculated as male NS teacher % - male NNS teacher %)	Paired sign test p-value of < 0.05	# of respondents used for the test
			Male NS Teacher	Male NNS Teacher			
1	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	20.10	4.02	16.08	0.000	24
2	2	promote personal relationships	4.02	12.06	-8.04	0.002	14
3a	1	promote professional success	11.39	4.69	6.70	0.002	10
3b	3	prevent personal relationships	10.05	3.35	6.70	0.006	12
3c	14	impede a positive learning experience	4.02	10.72	-6.70	0.021	16
6a	9	language	4.69	0.67	4.02	0.070	8
6b	4	promote tension or discord	6.70	2.68	4.02	0.146	12
8	15	absence of stereotypical attributions	15.41	18.76	-3.35	0.267	13
9	13	promote a positive learning experience	2.01	4.69	-2.68	0.125	4
10a	8	appearance	2.68	0.67	2.01	0.250	3
10b	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	2.01	0.00	2.01	0.250	3
10c	11	global situatedness	0.00	2.01	-2.01	0.250	3
13	6	deviance from social norms	0.00	1.34	-1.34	0.500	2
14a	7	political & social views	0.67	0.67	0.00	1.000	2
14b	12	age	1.34	1.34	0.00	1.000	2

Five categories (ranks 1–3) showed a statistically significant difference; these categories were primarily related to personal dispositions and teaching: Category 5 ‘unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord’ ($p = 0.000$); Category 2 ‘promote personal relationships’ ($p = 0.002$); Category 1 ‘promote professional success’ ($p = 0.002$); Category 3 ‘prevent personal relationships’ ($p = 0.006$); and Category 14 ‘impede a positive learning experience’ ($p = 0.021$). One category came close to being statistically significant, i.e., Category 9 ‘language’ ($p = 0.070$).

Two of the five categories with statistically significant differences showed a higher percentage of respondents for male NNS teachers than for male NS teachers: Category 2 ‘promote personal relationships’ and Category 14 ‘impede positive learning experience’. Concerning Category 2, it is worth highlighting that the opposite—Category 3 ‘prevent personal relationships’—also had a statistically significant difference, yet with a higher percentage for male NSs teachers.

RQ 2.3.4: How did the percentage of respondents with at least one response in a given single category of stereotypes compare between descriptions of female native-speaker and of female non-native-speaker teachers?

As for the previous RQs (2.3.1–2.3.3), the statistical significance of differences between descriptions of female native-speaker (NSs) and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers were assessed by paired sample sign tests. For this test, results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$.

Table 14 shows the results of the comparison. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the percentages of respondents who had given at least one response when describing female NS teachers as compared to female NNS teachers, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in darker gray. Categories in which the absolute difference almost amounted to a statistical significance (with an alpha level of $p < 0.1$) are highlighted in lighter gray.

Table 14: Difference between percentages of respondents with at least one response in a given category as they pertain to female NS and NNS teachers by category and in order of the size of difference

Rank of size difference	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Percentage of respondents who gave at least one response in the category		Size of difference in % of respondents for female NS & female NNS teachers (calculated as female NS teacher % - female NNS teacher %)	Paired sign test p-value of < 0.05	# of respondents used for the test
			Female NS Teacher	Female NNS Teacher			
1	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	16.75	6.03	10.72	0.000	18
2a	1	promote professional success	10.72	6.03	4.69	0.065	11
2b	14	impede a positive learning experience	4.69	9.38	-4.69	0.144	17
4	4	promote tension or discord	4.69	0.67	4.02	0.070	8
5	2	promote personal relationships	8.04	11.39	-3.35	0.227	11
6a	3	prevent personal relationships	6.03	3.35	2.68	0.344	10
6b	15	absence of stereotypical attributions	16.75	19.43	-2.68	0.388	12
8a	8	appearance	2.01	0.00	2.01	0.250	3
8b	9	language	2.01	0.00	2.01	0.250	3
8c	11	global situatedness	0.00	2.01	-2.01	0.250	3
11	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	2.01	0.67	1.34	0.625	4
12a	7	political & social views	0.00	0.67	-0.67	1.000	1
12b	13	promote a positive learning experience	2.68	3.35	-0.67	1.000	3
14a	6	deviance from social norms	0.67	0.67	0.00	1.000	2
14b	12	age	0.67	0.67	0.00	N/A	0

The difference between the two subgroups of female teachers amounted to a statistically significant level ($p = 0.000$) in only one instance, i.e., Category 5 ‘unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord’. There were two categories with a difference that came close to being statistically significant, i.e., Category 1 ‘promote professional success’ ($p = 0.065$) and Category 4 ‘promote tension or discord’ ($p = 0.070$).

RQ 2.4: How did the specific attributes that were mentioned within prevalent categories compare between stereotypes about native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers?

Results under this RQ show the verbatim responses of prevalent categories for male and female native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German, i.e., categories grouped in the first tier, second tier, and third tier based on the percentage of respondents, as presented under RQ 2.2. These categories comprised qualities that describe how teachers relate to others (Categories 1–5), how they impede a positive learning experience (Category 14), as well as teachers' qualities related to the German language (Category 9). This RQ was motivated by a desire to examine further unique qualities pertaining to NS teachers and NNS³⁸ teachers with respect to these categories. This analysis will complement the interpretation of the results in Discussion (Chapter 5).

Table 15³⁹ lists in alphabetical order all verbatim responses that were assigned to each of the prevalent categories, divided by responses that were attributed to both NS and NNS teachers and followed by responses that only applied to either NS teachers or NNS teachers for each of the respective categories.

³⁸ I decided not to differentiate between verbatim responses for male and female teachers as differences in statistical analyses did not amount to a statistical significance (see RQs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2).

³⁹ Table 25 in Appendix C.2 provides an overview of all stereotype categories pertaining to teachers of German, including the verbatim responses assigned to both NS and NNS teachers, uniquely to NS teachers, and uniquely to NNS teachers.

Table 15: Overview of prevalent stereotype categories about teachers of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both NS and NNS teachers, uniquely to NS teachers, and uniquely to NNS teachers

#	Categories of stereotypes	Verbatim descriptions of stereotypes that were assigned ...		
		... to both NS and NNS teachers of German for prevalent categories	... uniquely to NS teachers of German for prevalent categories	... uniquely to NNS teachers of German for prevalent categories
Attributions related to qualities and behaviors that ...				
1	... are likely to promote professional success	confident; detail-oriented; disciplined; efficient; informative; motivated; organize; organized; precise; punctual; qualified; reliable; smart	always on time; analytical; careful; hard-working; passionate; timely; well-organized; well-oriented	collaborative; dedicated; gifted; productive; relatively timely; responsible; worldly
2	... are likely to promote personal relationships	approachable; appropriate; bubbly; caring; communicative; dynamic; energetic; entertaining; fun; funny; helpful; humorous; kind; nice; positive; supportive; tolerant; understanding; willing to help	calm; friendly; happy-go-lucky; playful; social; talkative; welcoming	accepting; chill; cool; easy to communicate; easy-going; empathetic; engaging; enthusiastic; fair; loving; open-minded; respectful; warm
3	... are likely to prevent personal relationships	boring; cold; distant; serious; unapproachable	calculating; emotionless; less communicative; no sense of humor; non-entertaining; not as extroverted; reserved; shy	introverted; not very communicative
4	... are likely to promote tension or discord	arrogant; rude	always angry; angry; can be mean; mean; mocking; unkind	unfriendly

5	... are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	demanding; honest; love rules; strict; too honest	critical; detail-demanding; direct; dominant; forceful; hard personalities; harsh; intense; intolerant; love making schedules; rigorous; somehow forceful; stern; straightforward; strong personality; tough; tough personalities	somewhat strict
9	... describe the qualities of the language		appear unfriendly through voice; fast-spoken; loud speakers; spit while talking; strong accents; sound angry; sound unfriendly; overenunciation; yell	hard-spoken
14	... impede a positive learning experience		academically strict; don't understand how we learn their language; harder on students; high expectations; impatient; intolerant of errors; judge your understanding; leave you to learn on your own; ununderstandable	are not German; are not authentic; aren't as qualified as a native German speaker; aren't as qualified as native speakers; different ways of pronouncing 'r's based on whom they've learned German from; difficulty to teach pronunciations; don't actually know how native speakers talk; don't know what they are doing; don't speak German correctly all the time; don't understand some German words; give very hard tests; grammatic errors; harder to teach pronunciations; have accents; have unnatural German accents; high maintenance; lack of enough knowledge; lack of vocabulary knowledge; lacking in talent; less informed; no confidence when they teach; not as

				good as a native; not as good of a grasp of the language as a native; not qualified; unfamiliar with Germans; with accent
--	--	--	--	---

Both NS and NNS teachers were perceived to possess similar favorable personal dispositions, e.g., qualities that promote professional success (Category 1) or personal relationships (Category 2). Concerning rather undesirable qualities, however, descriptions unique to NS teachers indicated more extreme qualities. For instance, whereas all teachers received stereotypical descriptions reflecting ‘unapproachability’ or ‘rudeness’, only NS teachers were described possessing a “lack of humor” (Category 3) and as being “mean” and “angry” (Category 4). These unfavorable characteristics were also primarily found in descriptions of NS teachers’ language (Category 9), e.g., “sound angry” or “appear unfriendly”. What is more, in addition to themes indicating ‘strictness/order’ and ‘directness’ for both teacher subgroups, only NS teachers yielded descriptions reflecting their strong/harsh personalities (e.g., “intense” or “tough personalities”).

Category 14 reflected responses related to the pedagogical context, particularly qualities that ‘impede a positive learning experience’. NS teachers, on the one hand, were uniquely described as instructors with “high expectations” who are “academically strict” or “harder on students”. They also have “high expectations” and do not seem to be understanding of their students’ needs or language learning experiences. NNS teachers, on the other hand, were perceived against NSs (or NS teachers) of German as many of the responses started with ‘are not’ (e.g., “aren’t as qualified as native speakers”) or ‘do not’ (“don’t actually know how native speakers talk”). Responses generally reflected a lack of knowledge (e.g., “don’t understand some German words” or “less informed”) as well as a lack of (teaching) skills/qualification, such as “difficulty to teach pronunciations” or “don’t know what they’re doing”.

4.2.1 Summary of Research Theme 2

Table 16 illustrates the (almost) statistically significant differences in the percentage of respondents in a single category of stereotypes between all four subgroups of teachers of German, male and female as well as native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers, respectively. The statistically significant differences with respect to each category are based on the results described in the previous four RQs (RQs 2.3.1–2.3.4). Statistically significant differences (with an alpha level of $p < 0.05$) are highlighted in darker gray, whereas differences that almost amounted to a statistically significant level (with an alpha level of $p < 0.1$) are marked in lighter gray. Arrows indicate which of the respective subgroups received a higher percentage of respondents with at least one response in a single given category of stereotypes.

Table 16: Overview of (almost) statistically significant differences between teachers of German, particularly between male and female NS as well as NNS teachers, between male NS and NNS teachers, as well as female NS and NNS teachers

Category #	Category name	Teachers of German			
		Male vs. Female		NS vs. NNS	
		Male NS vs. Female NS	Male NNS vs. Female NNS	Male NS vs. Male NNS	Female NS vs. Female NNS
1	promote professional success	NO	NO	YES (>)	NO (close; >)
2	promote personal relationships	NO (close; <)	NO	YES (<)	NO
3	prevent personal relationships	NO (close; >)	NO	YES (>)	NO
4	promote tension or discord	NO	NO	NO	NO (close; >)
5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	NO	NO	YES (>)	YES (>)
6	deviance from social norms	NO	NO	NO	NO
7	political & social views	NO	NO	NO	NO
8	appearance	NO	NO	NO	NO
9	language	NO	NO	NO (close; >)	NO
10	cultural, including culinary, interests	NO	NO	NO	NO
11	global situatedness	NO	NO	NO	NO
12	age	NO	NO	NO	NO
13	promote a positive learning experience	NO	NO	NO	NO
14	impede a positive learning experience	NO	NO	YES (<)	NO
15	absence of stereotypical attributions	NO	NO	NO	NO

Statistically significant differences existed in comparisons between NS teachers and NNS teachers with regard to six of the eleven categories of stereotypes and three categories coming close to a statistically significant difference. When compared to NNS teachers, both male and female NS teachers were more likely to be described with stereotypes that reflect favorable qualities promoting professional success (Category 1). However, NS teachers (male and female) were also more likely to be regarded to

possess rather undesirable qualities that are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord, as well as qualities that prevent personal relationships (in case of male teachers) or that promote tension and discord (in case of female teachers). Furthermore, only male NS teachers were more often perceived than male NNS teachers to show qualities that are related to the German language⁴⁰. Male NNS teachers, however, were more likely to be regarded as someone with qualities that promote personal relationships on the one hand but also attributions that impede a positive learning experience, on the other hand.

None of the comparisons between male and female teachers showed a statistically significant difference, with two categories being close to a significant difference. Trends related to gender only became visible for NS teachers; female NS teachers may be more likely to be regarded as possessing qualities that promote personal relationships, whereas male NS teachers may be more likely to be perceived as someone with qualities that prevent personal relationships.

Finally, it is worth highlighting that categories related to personal dispositions show statistically significant differences (or trends thereof) with regard to gender or native speaker status. However, categories unrelated to personal dispositions, such as political and social views, appearance, the language, cultural interests, or the promotion of a positive learning experience, generally⁴¹ did not show any statistically significant differences.

4.3 Research Theme 3: Relationships Between Learners' Descriptions of Stereotypes About Native Speakers and Teachers of German

The final Research Theme 3 reflects the ultimate objective of this study: It was to find out how descriptions of stereotypical attributions to native speakers (NSs) of German were reflected in the descriptions of both native-speaker and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German. In order to explore this objective, two

⁴⁰ This category came close to a statistically significant difference with regard to male teachers.

⁴¹ Category 14 'impede a positive learning experience' for male NS vs. NNS teachers is the exception.

rounds of analyses became necessary: First, attributions of stereotypes to male and female NSs, respectively, were compared to the attributions of stereotypes to the corresponding (male or female) teacher subgroups, NS and NNS teachers, respectively, i.e., correlations between the stereotypes pertaining to NS subgroups and teacher subgroups were explored (male NSs x male NS teachers; male NSs x male NNS teachers; female NSs x female NS teachers; female NSs x female NNS teachers). Second, correlations that these analyses established between attributions were compared in terms of their direction (positive or negative) and strength (coefficient size) to assess whether stereotypes attributed to NSs, males or females, are more or less likely to travel to gender-respective NS or NNS teacher subgroups. The following RQs (3.1.1–3.2.3) reflect these objectives.

The first set of RQs was related to male NSs and male teachers: RQs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 examined how attributions to male NSs related to attributions of stereotypes to male NS teachers and male NNS teachers, respectively. RQ 3.1.3 compared the correlations pertaining to male NSs and male NS teachers and the correlations pertaining to male NSs and male NNS teachers. The second set of RQs was related to female NSs and female teachers: RQs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 explored how attributions to female NSs related to attributions of stereotypes to female NS teachers and female NNS teachers, respectively. RQ 3.2.3 compared correlations pertaining to female NSs and female NS teachers and the correlations pertaining to female NSs and female NNS teachers.

RQ 3.1.1: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

Given the binary nature of the data, i.e., respondents either having given a response in a category (option 1) or not (option 0), the tetrachoric correlation method was used to assess whether stereotype attributions to male native speakers (NSs) were related with attributions to male NS teachers. Correlations were computed only for categories of stereotypes that applied to both NSs and teachers. Results were considered significant at the alpha level of $p < 0.05$. Correlation coefficients (r) below 0.4 (positive or

negative) were considered weak; between 0.4 and 0.6 (positive or negative) were considered moderate; and above 0.6 (positive or negative) were considered strong, according to common practice in the social sciences (e.g., Dancey & Reidy, 2017, p. 182; Akoglu, 2018). These same choices and parameters were applied to all related RQs (3.1.1; 3.1.2; 3.2.1; 3.2.2).

Table 17 shows the results of the correlation analysis, ranked by the relative strength of correlation coefficients. Categories in which the relationship between NSs and teachers was considered statistically significant, as described above, are highlighted in gray. Two response categories had drawn attributions to male NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to male NS teachers, i.e., Categories 6 ‘deviance from social norms’ and 11 ‘global situatedness’. As a result, it was impossible to construct correlations, and these categories had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses for this RQ.

Table 17: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to male NSs and stereotypes attributed to male NS teachers of German

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Results of correlation analysis		
			r	strength	p-value
1	1	promote professional success	0.709	strong	0.000
2	3	prevent personal relationships	0.687	strong	0.000
3	8	appearance	0.633	strong	0.000
4	4	promote tension or discord	0.610	strong	0.000
5	2	promote personal relationships	0.483	moderate	0.000
6	9	language	0.477	moderate	0.000
7	7	political & social views	0.362	weak	0.003
8	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.329	weak	0.006
9	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	0.323	weak	0.008
-	6	deviance from social norms	N/A	N/A	N/A
-	11	global situatedness	N/A	N/A	N/A

Correlations for nine out of 11 categories showed significant positive correlations. Strong relationships were found in four of the nine categories with significant correlations. A category that describes positive personal qualities, namely Category 1 ‘promote professional success’, showed the

strongest correlation ($r = 0.709$), followed by two categories that capture rather unfavorable personal qualities, namely Categories 3 ‘prevent personal relationships’ (rank 2; $r = 0.687$) and 4 ‘promote tension or discord’ (rank 4; $r = 0.610$). The fourth category for which a strong relationship was found was Category 8, ‘appearance’ (rank 3; $r = 0.633$).

RQ 3.1.2: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

Table 18 shows the results of the correlation analysis, ranked by the relative strength of correlation coefficients. Categories in which the relationship between native speakers (NSs) and teachers were considered statistically significant, as described in RQ 3.1.1, are highlighted in gray. Category 10 ‘cultural, including culinary, interests’ had drawn attributions to male NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to male non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers. As a result, it was impossible to construct a correlation for this category, which had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses for this RQ.

Table 18: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to male NSs and stereotypes attributed to male NNS teachers of German

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Results of correlation analysis		
			r	strength	p-value
1	2	promote personal relationships	0.783	strong	0.000
2	11	global situatedness	0.752	strong	0.000
3	3	prevent personal relationships	0.682	strong	0.000
4	1	promote professional success	0.672	strong	0.000
5	6	deviance from social norms	0.458	moderate	0.000
6	8	appearance	0.440	moderate	0.000
7	9	language	0.423	moderate	0.000
8	7	political & social views	0.362	weak	0.003
9	4	promote tension or discord	0.124	weak	0.319
10	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	-0.080	weak	0.518
-	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	N/A	N/A	N/A

Eight out of 11 categories yielded significant positive correlations. Strong relationships between responses for male NSs and male NNS teachers were observed in four of the eight statistically significant correlations. Among these top categories, three categories describe rather favorable qualities: Categories 2 'promote personal relationships' (rank 1; $r = 0.783$), 11 'global situatedness' (rank 2; $r = 0.752$), and 1 'promote professional success' (rank 4; $r = 0.672$). Only one of the top four categories describes unfavorable personal qualities, namely Category 3 'prevent personal relationships' (rank 3; $r = 0.682$).

RQ 3.1.3: Do the attributions of stereotypes to male native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to male teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?

A Steiger's Z-test for dependent correlations was used to compare the strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs native speaker (NSs) x NS teacher and NS x non-native-speaker (NNS) teacher in each of the categories that had yielded a correlation in both pairs. Each pair of correlations were considered dependent as both correlations in a pair shared a common variable, i.e., stereotypes attributed to male NSs. Differences between correlations were considered statistically significant at the alpha level $p < 0.05$. These same choices and parameters were applied to the related RQ 3.2.3.

Some response categories had drawn attributions to male NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to either male NS teachers (Categories 6 'deviance from social norms' and 11 'global situatedness') or male NNS teachers (Category 10 'cultural, including culinary, interests'). As a result, it was impossible to construct a complete pair of correlations for comparison, and these categories had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses under this RQ. Nevertheless, these categories were considered in answering.

Table 19 shows the results of the comparisons. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the correlations, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in gray.

Table 19: Comparison of strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs male NSs x male NS teachers and male NSs x male NNS teachers in each of the categories and in order of the size of difference

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Correlations of male NSs vs. male NS teachers			Correlations of male NSs vs. male NNS teachers			Difference between r of NS/NST – NS/NNST	P-value of z-test
			r	strength	p-value	r	strength	p-value		
1	4	promote tension or discord	0.610	strong	0.000	0.124	weak	0.319	0.487	0.000
2	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	0.323	weak	0.008	-0.080	weak	0.518	0.404	0.000
3	2	promote personal relationships	0.483	moderate	0.000	0.783	strong	0.000	-0.301	0.000
4	8	appearance	0.633	strong	0.000	0.440	moderate	0.000	0.193	0.007
5	9	language	0.477	moderate	0.000	0.423	moderate	0.000	0.054	0.663
6	1	promote professional success	0.709	strong	0.000	0.672	strong	0.000	0.037	0.388
7	3	prevent personal relationships	0.687	strong	0.000	0.682	strong	0.000	0.005	0.939
8	7	political & social views	0.362	weak	0.003	0.362	weak	0.003	0.000	1.000
-	11	global situatedness	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.752	strong	0.000	-0.752	N/A
-	6	deviance from social norms	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.458	moderate	0.000	-0.458	N/A
-	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.329	weak	0.006	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.329	N/A

In six out of the 11 categories, correlations of male NSs and NS teachers were stronger than correlations of male NSs and NNS teachers (ranks 1; 2; 4–7). This result was expected due to the fact that NS teachers are a subgroup of NSs. In three of these six categories, the difference between correlations amounted to a statistically significant level: Results showed that attributions of stereotypes to NSs were more likely to predict the attributions of stereotypes to NS teachers than those to NNS teachers in (a) two categories that reflect rather unfavorable qualities of how NSs and teachers relate to others (4 ‘promote tension or discord’; rank 1; $p = 0.000$; and 5 ‘unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord’; rank 2; $p = 0.000$) and in (b) one category that describes ‘appearance’ (Category 8; rank 4; $p = 0.007$).

One out of the 11 categories, i.e., Category 2 ‘promote personal relationships’ (rank 3), revealed a stronger relationship between male NSs and NNS teachers than between male NSs and NS teachers. The difference between correlations amounted to a statistically significant level ($p = 0.000$).

Category 10 ‘cultural, including culinary, interests’ had drawn attributions to NSs and NS teachers but was lacking responses in attributions to NNS teachers. Nevertheless, this category may be relevant to consider, particularly, the fact that it had drawn no attributions to NNS teachers.

Two response categories had drawn attributions to male NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to NS teachers, i.e., Categories 6 ‘deviance from social norms’ and 11 ‘global situatedness’. Although it was impossible to construct a complete pair of correlations for comparison, these two categories may be important to consider. Specifically, the circumstance that correlations between stereotypical attributes to male NSs and those to male NNS teachers were either strong (Category 11; $r = 0.752$) or moderate (Category 6; $r = 0.458$), while these categories had drawn no attributions to NS teachers.

RQ 3.2.1: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

Table 20 shows the results of the correlation analysis, ranked by the relative strength of correlation coefficients. Categories in which the relationships between native speakers (NSs) and teachers were considered statistically significant, as described in RQ 3.1.1, are highlighted in gray. Two response categories had drawn attributions to female NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to female NS teachers, i.e., Categories 7 ‘political and social views’ and 11 ‘global situatedness’. As a result, it was impossible to construct correlations, and these categories had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses for this RQ.

Table 20: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to female NSs and stereotypes attributed to female NS teachers of German

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Results of correlation analysis		
			r	strength	p-value
1	8	appearance	0.768	strong	0.000
2	9	language	0.751	strong	0.000
3	1	promote professional success	0.709	strong	0.000
4	4	promote tension or discord	0.693	strong	0.000
5	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.641	strong	0.000
6	3	prevent personal relationships	0.620	strong	0.000
7	6	deviance from social norms	0.506	moderate	0.000
8	2	promote personal relationships	0.494	moderate	0.000
9	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	0.368	weak	0.002
-	7	political & social views	N/A	N/A	N/A
-	11	global situatedness	NA	NA	N/A

Correlations for nine out of 11 categories showed significant positive correlations. Strong relationships were observed in six of the nine categories with significant correlations. The strongest correlations showed Category 8 ‘appearance’ (rank 1; $r = 0.768$) and 9 ‘language’ (rank 2; $r = 0.751$) showed the strongest correlations. Also among the six categories that showed strong correlations were

three categories that describe how NSs and teachers relate to others: one category reflects rather favorable qualities (1 'promote professional success'; rank 3; $r = 0.709$), and two categories describe rather undesirable personal features (4 'promote tension or discord'; rank 4; $r = 0.693$ and 3 'prevent personal relationships', rank 6; $r = 0.620$). Furthermore, the sixth category for which a strong relationship was found was Category 10 'cultural, including culinary, interests' (rank 5; $r = 0.641$).

RQ 3.2.2: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female non-native-speaker teachers in each of the categories?

Table 21 shows the results of the correlation analysis, ranked by the relative strength of correlation coefficients. Categories in which the relationships between native speakers (NSs) and teachers were considered statistically significant, as described in RQ 3.1.1, are highlighted in gray. Two response categories had drawn attributions to female NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to female NNS teachers, i.e., Categories 8 'appearance' and 9 'language'. As a result, it was impossible to construct correlations, and these categories had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses for this RQ.

Table 21: Correlations between stereotypes attributed to female NSs and stereotypes attributed to female NNS teachers of German

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Results of correlation analysis		
			r	strength	p-value
1	11	global situatedness	0.752	strong	0.000
2	2	promote personal relationships	0.634	strong	0.000
3a	6	deviance from social norms	0.506	moderate	0.000
3b	7	political & social views	0.506	moderate	0.000
5	4	promote tension or discord	0.459	moderate	0.000
6	1	promote professional success	0.410	moderate	0.001
7	3	prevent personal relationships	0.321	moderate	0.008
8	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	0.285	weak	0.019
9	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.018	weak	0.884
-	8	appearance	N/A	N/A	N/A
-	9	language	N/A	N/A	N/A

Eight out of 11 categories yielded significant positive correlations. Strong relationships between responses for female NSs and female NNS teachers were found in two of the eight statistically significant correlations. Both categories reflect rather favorable qualities: Categories 11 'global situatedness' (rank 1; $r = 0.752$) and 2 'promote personal relationships' (rank 2; $r = 0.634$).

RQ 3.2.3: Do the attributions of stereotypes to female native speakers predict the attributions of stereotypes to female teachers, native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers, respectively, equally well?

Similar to RQ 3.1.3, a Steiger's Z-test was used to compare the strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs native speaker (NSs) x NS teacher and NS x non-native-speaker (NNS) teacher in each of the categories that had yielded a correlation in both pairs. Differences between correlations were considered statistically significant at the alpha level $p < 0.05$.

Some response categories had drawn attributions to female NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to either female NS teachers (Categories 7 'political and social views' and 11 'global situatedness') or female NNS teachers (Categories 8 'appearance' and 9 'language'). As a result, it was impossible to construct a complete pair of correlations for comparison, and these categories had to be omitted from inferential statistical analyses under this RQ. Nevertheless, these categories were considered in answering.

Table 22 shows the results of the comparisons. It displays the categories according to the size of the absolute difference in the correlations, from largest to smallest. Categories in which the absolute difference amounted to statistical significance, as described above, are highlighted in gray.

Table 22: Comparison of strength of correlations between stereotypical attributions in the pairs female NSs x female NS teachers and female NSs x female NNS teachers in each of the categories and in order of the size of difference

Rank	Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Correlations of female NSs vs. female NS teachers			Correlations of female NSs vs. female NNS teachers			Difference between r of NS/NST – NS/NNST	P-value of z-test
			r	strength	p-value	r	strength	p-value		
1	10	cultural, including culinary, interests	0.641	strong	0.000	0.018	weak	0.884	0.623	0.000
2	1	promote professional success	0.709	strong	0.000	0.410	moderate	0.001	0.299	0.000
3	3	prevent personal relationships	0.620	strong	0.000	0.321	moderate	0.008	0.299	0.005
4	4	promote tension or discord	0.693	strong	0.000	0.459	moderate	0.000	0.235	0.027
5	2	promote personal relationships	0.494	moderate	0.000	0.634	strong	0.000	-0.139	0.031
6	5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	0.368	weak	0.002	0.285	weak	0.019	0.083	0.318
7	6	deviance from social norms	0.506	moderate	0.000	0.506	moderate	0.000	0.000	1.000
-	8	appearance	0.768	strong	0.000	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.768	N/A
-	11	global situatedness	NA	NA	N/A	0.752	strong	0.000	-0.752	N/A
-	9	language	0.751	strong	0.000	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.751	N/A
-	7	political & social views	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.506	moderate	0.000	-0.506	N/A

In five out of the 11 categories, correlations of attributes of stereotypes to female NSs and NS teachers were stronger than correlations of attributes of stereotypes to female NSs and NNS teachers (ranks 1; 2; 3; 4; 6). This result was expected due to the fact that NS teachers are a subgroup of NSs. In four of these six categories, the difference between correlations amounted to a statistically significant

level: Results showed that attributions of stereotypes to NSs were more likely to predict the attributions of stereotypes to NS teachers than those to NNS teachers in (a) the category that describes 'cultural, including culinary, interests' (Category 10; rank 1; $p = 0.000$); in (b) one category that reflects desirable personal features (1 'promote professional success'; rank 2; $p = 0.000$); and in (c) two categories that reflect rather unfavorable qualities of how NSs and teachers relate to others (3 'prevent personal relationships'; rank 3; $p = 0.005$; and 4 'promote tension or discord'; rank 4; $p = 0.027$).

One out of the 11 categories, i.e., Category 2 'promote personal relationships (rank 5), revealed a stronger relationship between female NSs and NNS teachers than between female NSs and NS teachers. The difference between correlations amounted to a statistically significant level ($p = 0.031$).

Two response categories had drawn attributions to female NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to female NNS teachers, i.e., Categories 8 'appearance' and 9 'language'. Although it was impossible to construct a complete pair of correlations for comparison, these two categories may be important to consider. Specifically, the circumstance that correlations between stereotypical attributes to female NSs and those to NS teachers were strong (Categories 8; $r = 0.768$; and 9; $r = 0.751$), while these categories had drawn no attributions to NNS teachers.

Two response categories had drawn attributions to female NSs but were lacking responses in attributions to female NS teachers, i.e., Categories 7 'political and social views' and 11 'global situatedness'. These categories may be important to consider as correlations between stereotypical attributes to female NSs and those to female NNS teachers were either strong (Category 11; $r = 0.752$) or moderate (Category 7; $r = 0.506$), while these categories had drawn no attributions to NS teachers.

4.3.1 Summary of Research Theme 3

Table 23 shows a summary of the comparison of correlation strengths between stereotypical attributions in the pairs native speakers (NSs) x NS teachers and NSs x non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers in each of

the categories. The summary is based on the tetrachoric correlation results described in RQs 3.1.1–3.1.2 and RQ 3.2.1–3.2.2 as well as on the Steiger’s Z-test results shown in RQs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3. Statistically significant differences in the correlation coefficients (with an alpha level of $p < 0.05$) are highlighted in gray. Crosses indicate which of the stereotypical attributions to the respective teacher subgroups had a stronger relationship with the stereotypical attributions to the respective NSs in each category⁴².

Table 23: Overview of comparison of correlation strengths between stereotypical attributions in the pairs NSs x NS teachers and NSs x NNS teachers

Category #	Category name	Correlations with NSs were stronger for					
		male		p-value of Z-test	female		p-value of Z-test
		NST	NNST		NST	NNST	
1	promote professional success	X		0.388	X		0.000
2	promote personal relationships		X	0.000		X	0.031
3	prevent personal relationships	X		0.939	X		0.005
4	promote tension and discord	X		0.000	X		0.027
5	unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	X		0.000	X		0.318
6	deviance from social norms		(X)	N/A	=		1.000
7	political and social views	=		1.000		(X)	N/A
8	appearance	X		0.007	(X)		N/A
9	language	X		0.663	(X)		N/A
10	cultural, including culinary interests	(X)		N/A	X		0.000
11	global situatedness		(X)	N/A		(X)	N/A

⁴² (X) indicates the correlations that could only be constructed for either the pair NSs x NS teachers or the pair NSs x NNS teachers, resulting in a lack of a complete pair of correlations for comparisons.

Stronger relationships between responses to NSs and NS teachers than between the responses to NSs and NNS teachers were observed in seven of the 11 categories. These categories comprised one category that describes favorable personal dispositions (1 'promote professional success'), three categories that reflect unfavorable qualities (3 'prevent personal relationships'; 4 'promote tension or discord'; and 5 'unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord'), as well as categories related to the 'appearance' of speakers (8), the German 'language' itself (9), and speakers' 'cultural, including culinary interests' (10).

In three of the seven categories (Categories 4; 5; 8), the difference in correlation strengths between the stereotypical attributes in the pairs male NSs x male NS teachers and male NSs x male NNS teachers amounted to a statistically significant level ($p < 0.05$). In four of the seven categories (Categories 1; 3; 4; 10) differences in correlation strengths between the stereotypical attributes in the pairs female NSs x female NS teachers and female NSs x female NNS amounted to a statistically significant level ($p < 0.05$).

Whereas stronger correlations between stereotypical attributions to NSs and the ones to NS teachers were expected since NS teachers are a subgroup of NSs, stronger correlations between stereotypical attributions to NSs and the ones to NNS teachers were not foreseen. However, in two of the 11 categories, correlations between stereotypical attributions to NSs and the ones to NNS teachers were stronger than the ones between NSs and NS teachers (Categories 2 and 11). Both categories reflected favorable qualities. The difference amounted to a statistically significant level ($p < 0.05$) in one category describing the promotion of personal relationships (Category 2). Category 11 'global situatedness' had only drawn attributions to NSs and NNS teachers but was lacking responses in attributions to NS teachers.

5. Discussion and Implications

In this chapter, I will contextualize the results of the present study against the backdrop of research presented in Chapter 2 and will discuss conclusions and implications. The structure of this chapter will be organized around the following main topics that emerged across Research Themes 1–3, presented in Chapter 4: (1) Learners Are Well Aware of Stereotypes about Native Speakers of German; (2) The Connection between the Language and Its Speakers; (3) Stereotypes about Native-Speaker and Non-Native-Speaker Teachers Are Out There; (4) Stereotypes Travel via Two Pathways of Association From Native Speakers to Teachers; and (5) Gender Only Matters With Respect to Stereotypes About Native Speakers, Including Teachers.

5.1 Learners Are Well Aware of Stereotypes About Native Speakers of German

Imagined communities are “groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of the imagination” (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 241). In their concept, Norton and her associates have built upon Wenger’s notions of imagination. Imagination serves as a tool that creates mental images that help us “locate and orient ourselves, to see ourselves from a different perspective, to reflect on our situation, and to explore new possibilities” (Wenger, 2010, p. 184). Recent research (e.g., Drewelow, 2011; Nikitina et al., 2014; Nikitina, 2015, 2017, 2019; Chavez, 2020b) has indicated that the investigation of stereotypes allows insights into how actual and potential learners imagine respective target language communities. Similar to the concept of imagination, stereotypes, too, are a form of mental imagery and beliefs that help individuals orient themselves and interpret their surroundings (e.g., Sercu, 1998; Spencer-Rodgers, 2001; Nikitina, 2019).

Larsen-Freeman (2018) recently emphasized a need for SLA researchers to explore the socio-political context that “shape any particular acquisition context”. Scholars may help uncover “prevailing beliefs held by others, including the general public” and potentially challenging “unhealthy [beliefs and] ideologies” (p. 60). The investigation of stereotypes can contribute to this call. Stereotypes about the respective target

community often develop in learners' native cultures (e.g., Gabillon, 2005; Drewelow, 2013; Heinzmann, 2014). This study supports this insight. The stereotypes described by this study's participants reflect community beliefs that these learners have been aware of. These stereotypes may not represent students' personal views, but "they give insights into the societal narratives that respondents referenced" (Chavez, 2020b, p. 8). The fact that these learners—who were at the very beginning of their language study—were able to provide such a variety of stereotypical notions suggests that learners heard these narratives in their communities before starting their first-semester German course.

Societal narratives about native speakers (NSs) of German—reflected in stereotypes expressed by learners of German—have been documented in previous studies. Researchers have found stereotypical notions related to NSs of German that revealed the following six themes: (1) personal attributes (e.g., Katz & Braly, 1933; Stapf et al., 1986; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2019; Chavez, 2020b); (2) appearance aspects (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Chavez, 2020b); (3) qualities of the language (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Chavez, 2009, 2020b); (4) economical aspects (e.g., Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Nikitina et al., 2014; Hass et al., 2016); (5) political and historical factors (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Chavez, 2020b); and (6) cultural interests (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Chavez, 2001; Abrams, 2002; Nikitina et al., 2014; Chavez, 2020b).

Results of this study, as reported under RQ 1.1 and RQ 1.2.1, have shown that participants were well aware of an array of stereotypes that mirror the themes found in the previous studies listed above. Specifically, learners described a diversity of stereotypical notions of qualities of NSs of German, i.e., 11 categories that reflect NSs' character dispositions, appearance, language, political and social views, as well as cultural interests. Only a fraction of participants was unable or unwilling to describe any stereotypes (2.68% of respondents with respect to male NSs; 6.03% of respondents with respect to female NSs). In a recent study with a similar population, Chavez (2020b) explored stereotypical perceptions of German NSs and learners of German as they were held by learners of German as well as by learners of other foreign

languages. She found that learners of German provided “elaborate accounts” and were not reluctant “to offer common stereotypes about NSs of German” (p. 9). The current study confirms these findings. Participants provided a similar array of stereotypical descriptions as reported by Chavez, i.e., stereotypes related to NSs’ personal “disposition”, “social and political attitudes”, “appearance”, “about the language”, as well as “culinary and cultural interests” (p. 10). Learners of German in Chavez’ and the current study seem to have paid close attention to the stereotypes related to German perpetuated in society (Chavez, 2020b, p. 21). In other words, learners of German may be particularly aware of these stereotypes given their choice of foreign language. The following subchapters will discuss the implications of learners’ awareness of these stereotypes in greater detail.

5.1.1 Unfavorable Stereotypes About Native Speakers as Most Prevalent Categories

Previous studies into stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) of German have described attributes of how NSs relate to others. Findings ranged from primarily favorable qualities that are likely to promote personal relationships (Schulz & Haerle, 1995; Hass et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2019) to primarily unfavorable qualities that are likely to prevent relationships or to cause tension (Stapf et al., 1986; Chavez, 2020b).

The present study supports the findings in Stapf et al.’s (1986) and Chavez’ (2020b) studies, in which responses indicating less desirable stereotypes about NSs’ personal dispositions predominated. The most prevalent categories associated with NSs (see RQ 1.2.1) were related to descriptions of unfavorable attributes that either (a) prevent personal relationships (e.g., “cold”; “humorless”); (b) promote tension or discord (e.g., “aggressive”; “rude”); or (c) are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord (e.g., “direct”; “strict”). An explanation for these findings may be, as Chavez (2020b) suggested, that learners of German have felt comfortable enough “to express the full array of negative stereotypes” (p. 21).

Implications of students' awareness of these unfavorable stereotypes maybe that learners, given their choice to study German, feel judged by others, e.g., non-learners, parents, or friends. Learners may also feel the need to explain their association with German. Therefore, teachers should help students to become "cross-cultural mediators" (Trentman, 2013, p. 553). Trentman described this concept with respect to 54 college learners of Arabic studying abroad in the Middle East. She concluded that participants desired to understand the target culture community better. Participants wanted to get a "perspective of what life is like" there, e.g., "how they feel about world affairs [...], how they go about everyday life", and then wanted to communicate these insights with people from learners' home communities. Learners perceived that the people from their home communities often did not "have a cultural understanding of [the target community]" (p. 553). Trentman's concept of language learners as cross-cultural mediators may also be applied to the present study. With the help of the teacher, students would learn to mediate between stereotypical notions—prevalent in society—and their own, hopefully, more nuanced perceptions of the target language (TL) and its speakers. Eventually, students may engage in discourses about these notions with those outside the German-speaking community.

To lay the groundwork for the discourse with those outside the German-speaking community, teachers may implement a variety of activities that help learners deconstruct stereotypical notions and construct more nuanced perceptions. For instance, Drewelow (2013) suggested activities for introductory learners of a language in which students reflect critically on both the target culture as well as their habits and environments to understand the interconnection between a language and its culture better. Drewelow's examples included activities in which teachers shared their personal experiences they had with speakers of the TL. This had the effect that "explicitly addressing images of rudeness or arrogance by recounting personal experiences prompted reflections and resulted in radically altered images" (p. 165). She also described that investigating the language itself, e.g., linguistic forms of politeness/the use of the pronouns 'tu' or 'vous', may lead "to a reflection on how language embodies cultural acts and practices"

(p. 168). In addition to these activities, teachers may employ works of literature and films to help learners mediate between stereotypical views and more nuanced perceptions. Singer (2016) illustrated how the use of literature, in combination with commenting on self and foreign imagery, as well as dialogue between class members, could contribute to a critical and productive discussion of stereotypes. N. Coleman (2016) described how learners of German could deconstruct stereotypical notions and increase intercultural awareness by analyzing characters as well as representations of the target culture in films. Often, the depiction of movie protagonists does not follow clear-cut stereotypical categories, which is why an analysis of these characters allows for critical reflections on both the target culture as well as one's own culture. Moreover, teachers could create long-term projects that "focus on history, art, high culture, important 'keywords' or cultural notions" (Nikitina, 2019, p. 15). For instance, Byon (2007) created a semester-long culture portfolio for language learners which helped them become more aware of their own culture and its impact on how they perceived the target culture. In multiple assignments, learners discussed their definitions of culture and views of the target culture with each other and conducted research about the target culture via the internet, libraries, and online interviews with native speakers.

5.2 The Connection Between the Language and Its Speakers

Chavez (2009) found "parallels between the perceived roughness of the language's sound and stereotypical notions of German speakers, especially Germans, as aggressive" (p. 17). Results of the current study (see RQ 1.1 and RQ 2.4) support Chavez' finding. Descriptions of stereotypes related to how native speakers (NSs) are believed to speak, in part, resemble descriptions that were assigned to categories portraying rather unfavorable personal qualities. This pattern also became evident in stereotypical descriptions of teachers, more so for NS teachers than for non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers, however. Apparently, respondents seemed to be sensitive to similar trains of thoughts across categories but attached these predicates either to the speakers of German themselves or, alternatively, to affiliated cultural expressions, i.e., the language.

The found link between beginning learners' negative descriptions of the German language itself and their negative descriptions of German speakers' personal characteristics can be interpreted in the light of Chavez' (2020b) plausible foreign-language self. Depending on the learners' personal and dispositional characteristics, this self-concept suggests whether the membership in a specific foreign-language community is feasible for the learner or not. The connection between perceived characteristics of the language and its speakers contains attractive as well as repulsive ('do not learn the language lest you become/are perceived to be X') potential when students select a language to learn. Although this study was not able to explore whether respondents actually believed the stereotypes described, the stereotypical notions of German speakers and their language found in this study might lead learners to feel compelled to justify, e.g., to parents, friends, or peers, why they would like to affiliate with that language and its community. Put into Norton's framework of imagined communities, these societal narratives about the imagined community of German speakers have the potential to make such an affiliation not "desirable to the language learner" (Norton, 2016, p. 477). Ultimately, such imaginings may then exert their influence in learners' choice of language, i.e., before language study even begins.

Chavez (2020b) found that the "mere awareness of negative stereotypes about NSs of German does not discourage the study of German" (p. 21). The present study confirms Chavez' insights. Additionally, this study has shown that the mere awareness of negative stereotypes about teachers of German, NS and NNS teachers, respectively, did not discourage learners to study German, either. Explanations may include the following: These learners of German may have (a) been particularly aware of these stereotypes but did not believe in them; (b) thought that other features of the target language (TL) community, e.g., its cultural or professional promises (also top-tier stereotype categories for NSs and teachers), would outweigh the negative qualities; or (c) possessed a self-concept that suggests that an affiliation with the TL community is still feasible. The latter may apply in cases of learners with a plausible foreign-language self, e.g., via personal connections to the TL community (Chavez, 2020b), or learners with an anti-ought-

to self-image that is attracted by the opposite of external expectations (Thompson & Vásquez, 2015; Thompson, 2017).

5.2.1 Future Explorations of Learners' Stereotypes about Native Speakers and Teachers

Chavez (2020b) suggested that “how potential learners deal with [...] stereotypes appears to be more relevant” than the mere awareness of (negative) stereotypes about the language and its speakers (p. 21). The current study investigated which stereotypes learners had heard about native speakers and teachers of German; it did not explore whether participants evaluated the stereotypes to be positive or negative or to what degree respondents believed the stereotypical notions listed to be accurate. Therefore, future research may gain further insights into how learners deal with these stereotypes by the following investigations.

(1) The accuracy of the stereotypes described according to learners of German: Asking learners about what kinds of stereotypes they have heard only provides insights into societal narratives that learners have come across; it does not, however, provide an insight into whether these learners believe in the stereotypes they described. Participants of this study also rated on the *Main Questionnaire* how accurate they believed the respective stereotypes to be, on a scale ranging from 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate). This task was not considered for analyses in the dissertation as it would have exceeded the scope of the current study. Nevertheless, in future research, participants' ratings will be added to the current data set for analysis so as to provide a more comprehensive picture of learners' stereotypes about speakers of German.

(2) Stereotypical notions about native speakers and teachers of German and their believed accuracy according to learners of other foreign languages (FL): Future studies may investigate (a) whether learners of other FL describe similar stereotypes about NSs and teachers of German to those referenced by learners of German and (b) to what degree learners of other FLs believe in these stereotypes.

Comparisons of such results with the findings of the present study would contribute to a better understanding of how learners position themselves vis-à-vis the societal narratives that depict the German language and its speakers. In other words, do learners' stereotypical notions heard and believed about the TL and its speakers relate to learners' language choice? Such studies would speak to research on learner identities and their possible future selves, particularly the idea that FL learning helps students to transform themselves. In their report on *Foreign Language and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*, the MLA described FL learning as a positive transformational experience: "Our whole culture [...] must become less ethnocentric, less patronizing, less ignorant of others, less Manichaeian in judging other cultures, and more at home with the rest of the world. Higher education can do a lot to meet that important challenge" (2007, pp. 1-2). Referencing the work by Gardner (e.g., 2006), Dörnyei (e.g., 2005, 2009; 2013), and their respective associates, Chavez (2020b) described that "the idea that language learning is a transformative endeavor, has gained traction in research (e.g., Ushioda, 2016)" (Chavez, 2020b, p. 5). However, one question often remains unclear with respect to learners' transformation: What do learners expect to be 'transformed into'? Perhaps learners have no idea, really, and they may be tempted to resort to stereotypes as they form 'goals', i.e., which FL they should choose and what community they would like to affiliate with. An investigation of the stereotypes heard and believed about NSs and teachers of German according to learners of various FL languages would provide insights into whether learners' stereotypes about a FL and its speakers may be an indication for what language they decide to study. Such an exploration would speak to Dörnyei's call to explore the concept of L2 selves further by investigating the impact of the "social settings and situated activity of language learning" on learners' self-images (Dörnyei, 2019a, p. 48).

(3) Multiple viewpoints and the formation of stereotypes: Future research may explore different viewpoints of stereotypes by taking learners' backgrounds and perspectives on stereotypical notions into account. Heinzmann (2014) explained that stereotypes might be "formed through observation and direct

contact with members of the target group”, but they are most often socially learned, i.e., through “indirect sources such as parents, peers, teachers, leaders, school materials or the mass media” (pp. 50, 58). An investigation of learners’ backgrounds and their perspectives on stereotypes may be able to speak to the different processes of generating and sharing stereotypical notions. Therefore, future studies may not only investigate the stereotypes heard and believed by learners but may also take into consideration domestic and international student students, the different degrees of exposure to NSs that learners had, and a distinction between learners and non-learners of German. Additionally, future investigations may cross-reference learners’ stereotypical notions with strategies of how language programs deploy stereotypes to advertise ‘their’ language (e.g., Chavez, 2020a).

5.3 Stereotypes About Native-Speaker and Non-Native-Speaker Teachers of German Are out There

Chavez (2020b) showed that learners of German and other foreign languages heard not only stereotypical notions of native speakers (NSs) of German but also about likely learners of the language. The present study was able to expand these insights to another member of the German-language classroom, i.e., the teacher. Results reported under RQs 2.1 and 2.2 show that learners of German were able to describe a variety of stereotypes about both NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers. 14 stereotype categories reflect attributes pertaining to teachers’ character dispositions, appearance, language, political and social views, cultural interests, age, and the learning experience in a course with a specific type of teacher. Nevertheless, the most prevalent category across all four teacher subgroups, i.e., male and female NS and NNS teachers, indicates an absence of stereotypical attributions heard by learners (about between 15 to 20 percent of respondents). In comparison, only 2.68 percent of respondents concerning male NSs and 6.03 percent of respondents concerning female NSs had not heard any stereotypes (see RQ 1.2.1). The categories attributed to teachers that followed in terms of the percentage of respondents describe how teachers relate to others and how they influence their students’ learning experience.

Previous research has indicated the importance of teacher-student relationships to learners at the college level, e.g., with respect to first-year college students (Wilcox, Winn, & Fyvie-Gauld, 2005; Brinkworth, McCann, Matthews, & Nordström, 2009) or in the context of foreign-language learning (Henry & Thorsen, 2018). Studies have also shown that learners' perceptions of 'good' teachers are primarily mediated through relationship-oriented dimensions (e.g., Nikitina & Furuoka, 2009; Zayac & Lenhard, 2018). These dimensions include the teacher's approachability and support of learners as well as other affective aspects, e.g., honesty, trust, respect (Hagenauer & Volet, 2014). The findings of this study support these insights. Affective dimensions of how teachers relate to others became visible in the prevalent categories describing both favorable stereotypes about teachers, e.g., "approachable", "supportive", "caring", or "respectful", as well as in categories reflecting less favorable qualities of teachers, e.g., "hard personalities", "forceful", or "dominant".

In his L2 motivational self system, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) highlighted the importance of the learning experience—learners' attitudes and evaluations of the present learning environment—as these factors can be a strong predictor of motivated behavior and learning achievement (e.g., Lamb, 2012; Teimouri, 2017; Al-Hoorie, 2018; Dörnyei, 2019c). Besides other aspects of the learning environment, the teacher shapes the students' learning experience significantly (e.g., Farrell, 2015; Hagenauer et al., 2015; Dörnyei, 2019b). Thus, it was not surprising to find that respondents of this study provided accounts of how certain teachers are regarded to impact their students' learning experience.

In sum, the results of this study show that learners have heard a variety of stereotypical notions of teachers of German, particularly with respect to how teachers relate to others and how they affect students' learning experience. Subchapter 5.3.1 will examine these categories regarding the described differences between NS and NNS teachers.

5.3.1 The Native-Speaker/Non-Native-Speaker Teacher Dichotomy Reflected in Stereotypes

Studies have shown that the dichotomy between native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers, e.g., with respect to their personal dispositions and teaching skills, still exists in the minds of language learners (e.g., Calafato, 2019).

Benke and Medgyes (2005), Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), and Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) showed that learners believed their NS teachers to be competent in target language-related, e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary, correct language use, as well as cultural aspects. However, NS teachers were also often associated with a lack of teaching skills, e.g., explaining grammar or complex items, and with difficulties building positive relationships with their students, e.g., lack of empathy for learning the target language and knowledge of students' cultures. The current study supports insights from previous studies that NS teachers are regarded to lack empathy for learning the target language and to have difficulties in building positive relationships with their students (e.g., Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Results under RQ 2.4 showed that participants described NS teachers as not understanding of their students' needs ("leave you to learn on your own") and target language learning experiences (e.g., "don't understand how we learn their language"). What is more, findings presented under RQs 2.2, 2.3.3, and 2.3.4 revealed that the most prevalent categories of stereotypes attributed to both male and female NS teachers reflect qualities that are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord, e.g., directness and strictness. When compared to NNS teachers, both male and female NS teachers were more likely to be described with stereotypes reflecting these characteristics. Even as these qualities do not necessarily promote tension and discord, they may result in them or make it more challenging to build relationships, depending on the preferences and outlook of those involved. Research has shown that especially the understanding of directness, politeness, and strictness—all concepts reflected in the respective category—differs across cultures and languages (e.g., Kallia, 2005; Ogiermann, 2009; Hass et al., 2016). Stein et al. (2019), for instance, investigated the differences between hetero-stereotypes (held by Chinese

students) and auto-stereotypes (held by German students) about Germans. Among other findings, they found “particularly strong disagreements on the adjectives [...] ‘direct’ [...] and ‘strict’ [...]” (p. 954). Chinese students perceived Germans to be significantly more direct and stricter than Germans perceived themselves. These cultural differences between NS teacher and their students may result in intercultural misunderstandings and difficulties building positive relationships in the foreign language classroom.

Studies by Benke and Medgyes (2005), Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014), and Zhang and Zhang (2018) have indicated that learners regarded NNS teachers as skilled instructors, e.g., with respect to preparation or grammar explanations. They were also perceived to be good at relating to their students, given their shared culture and experiences learning the target language. However, Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) also showed that NNS teachers were often deemed inferior with regard to language-related aspects (pronunciation, vocabulary) and in terms of cultural knowledge of the target language communities. Dewaele et al. (2019) found that the levels of foreign-language (FL) anxiety were higher in courses taught by NNS teachers, and levels of FL enjoyment lower compared to those courses with NS instructors. Dewaele et al. concluded that NNS teachers’ lack of confidence or willingness to use the target language might have resulted in lower levels of student enjoyment and higher levels of anxiety due to the insecurities of the instructor.

Results reported under RQ 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 confirm previous studies indicating that NNS teachers are perceived to be better at relating to their students (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). When compared to NS teachers, male as well as female NNS teachers were more likely to be described with qualities promoting personal relationships. Additionally, verbatim responses reported under RQ 2.4 support findings of NNS teachers’ perceived lack of target-language-related knowledge (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014).

However, stereotypical notions expressed about NNS teachers contradict insights from prior studies indicating that NNS teachers were perceived to be skilled instructors (e.g., Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Results reported under RQs 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 showed that, when compared to NS teachers, NNS teachers received higher percentages of respondents pertaining to qualities that impede a positive learning experience. This difference in percentage of respondents was significant concerning male teachers. Additionally, verbatim responses listed in this category (see RQ 2.4) revealed stereotypes indicating a lack of teaching skills (e.g., “difficulty to teach pronunciations”, “lacking in talent”) as well as a lack of teaching qualification (e.g., “don’t know what they’re doing”; “not qualified”) of NNS teachers. An explanation may be that in societal narratives about teachers, the NS ideal persists as the standard of comparison. Chavez’ (2013), who investigated how college learners of German envisioned their attainment of language-related features of German, concluded that the privilege of “the NS has persisted as the standard of comparison in the minds of many learners” (p. 86). In fact, the results presented in this study seem to support this insight. Responses showed that perceptions of NNS teachers were compared to those of NSs of German. For instance, stereotypical descriptions included that NNS teachers ‘are not X (=native-speaker quality), e.g., “are not as good as a native”, “are not authentic”, or “aren’t as qualified as native speakers”. Other responses were structured in the form of NNS teachers ‘do not do X (=native speaker quality)’, e.g., “don’t actually know how native speakers talk” or “don’t speak German correctly all the time”.

5.3.2 Analyzing Stereotypes About Target Language Speakers Critically and Raising Bi-/Multilingual Awareness

Subchapter 5.1–5.3.1 have shown that learners are not only aware of a diversity of stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) of German but also about teachers of German, NS and non-native speakers (NNS), respectively. A goal of teaching should be to acknowledge these stereotypes and offer them for critical analyses. Teachers may help learners deconstruct stereotypes about both NSs and teachers. Educators

may develop activities and language curricula that help learners explore the cultural situatedness of stereotypes, e.g., stereotypes that Americans have of Germans (or other people) may be quite different from stereotypes that others have of Germans, and that emphasize the cultural and linguistic diversity of all TL speakers. For instance, Thompson and Fioramonte (2012) suggested assignments in which students learn about “different dialects of the language. By exposing students to different dialects, they will be less likely to negatively judge a [NNS teacher] who sounds ‘different’ than [an NS teacher] they might have had in the past” (p. 577). One way to expose students to different speakers of the TL may be through virtual environments. White (2015) has shown that teachers should not assume that learners make use of these opportunities by themselves. In the context of learning German at the college level, White found that although learners “described ways that digital tools could be used to learn about German speakers and their cultures, [only] few acknowledged the potential role of virtual environments for establishing contact with those speakers. In other words, they did not have access to the tools, activities, and experienced people in the community that would be necessary to gain membership in that community” (p. 318). Teachers could help students navigate these challenges and provide task-based telecollaborative exchange opportunities, e.g., via twitter, blogs, and podcasts (e.g., Godwin-Jones, 2013; Lee & Markey, 2014), online discussion boards (e.g., Lin, 2016), emails, messenger, and Skype-like services (e.g., Jin, 2013), or mobile games (e.g., Head, Xu, & Wang, 2014).

Eventually, the deconstruction of stereotypes and the construction of more nuanced perceptions should only be starting points of a more critical conversation between learners and teachers that goes beyond the distinction of who is an NS or NNS of the TL. This conversation centers around the question of what it means to learn and speak another language or to live in another culture or country. For instance, Thompson and Fioramonte (2012) concluded that “being competent users of more than one language should be the focus of teachers’ [and learners’] linguistic backgrounds, as opposed to the NS/NNS dichotomy,” “as bilingual and multilingual individuals have a heightened metalinguistic” (p. 577). In most

instances, NS teachers, just like NNS teachers, would be able to contribute to this conversation as many NS teachers are indeed not monolingual and may be teaching abroad (Ellis, 2016). They, too, can relate to what it means to learn another language and live in a different country. They simply have to let students know about this fact as learners may not realize this themselves. As part of this conversation, students would learn to reflect on their emerging bilingual or multilingual identities (e.g., Busse, 2017; Calafato, 2019).

5.4 Stereotypes Travel via Two Pathways of Association From Native Speakers to Teachers

The following three indicators (a–c) suggest that learners seemed to distill their imaginings from their views of native speakers (NSs) and then project them onto teachers, and not the other way around. In other words, stereotypical attributions seem to be first attributed to NSs of German and may then travel to teachers of German. Findings presented under RQs 1.2.1 and 2.2 showed that (a) the percentage of respondents for the Category ‘absence of stereotypical attributions’ was lower for male and female NSs (2.68–6.03 %) than for any of the teacher subgroups (15.41–19.43 %). Findings also indicated that (b) the percentage of respondents was more evenly distributed across all categories of stereotypes pertaining to NSs than across those pertaining to teachers. If one assumes that the essence of a stereotypical prototype possesses equal amounts of all kinds of stereotypes, the more evenly an individual is believed to possess all kinds of stereotypes, the closer this individual is to the essence of the stereotypical prototype. In other words, stereotypical imaginings about this individual or group of individuals that is believed to possess (almost) all stereotypes may be distilled and may potentially get attached to other individuals and groups that affiliate with the ‘original’ individual or group. To find out how evenly the percentage of respondents was distributed across all categories of stereotypes, I calculated a ratio based on the total percentage of respondents pertaining to Categories 7–11 (e.g., descriptions of speakers’ appearance; cultural, including culinary, interests; or the language) to the total percentage of respondents pertaining to Categories 1–6 (broadly speaking, descriptions of how speakers relate to others). Specifically, for both male and female

NSs a response in Categories 1–6 was almost twice as likely to occur than a response in Categories 7–11 (ratios of: 1: 1.70 [male NSs]; and 1: 1.81 [female NSs]). However, for teachers a response in Categories 1–6 was between five to eight times more likely to occur than a response in Categories 7–11 (ratios of: 1: 5.20 [male NS teachers]; 1: 7.78 [female NS teachers]; 1: 7.00 [male NNS teachers]; and 1: 8.40 [female NNS teachers]). Furthermore, results showed that (c) the average number of responses per respondent was higher for both male and female NSs (4.38/3.71 responses) than for any of the teacher subgroups (male/female NS teachers: 3.36/3.31 responses; male/female NNS teachers: 3.23/3.24 responses). The average number of responses, however, has to be considered with care as the order of which the questions were asked (items about NS before items about teachers) might have influenced the response rate.

However, even as all three findings (a–c) taken together indicate that stereotypes travel from NSs to teachers, the source of stereotypes and the process of transmission/travel requires further investigation. Both the exact nature of transmission/travel and the possibility of at least partial bidirectionality need to be assessed more closely. Future analyses may also distinguish between student respondents who reported more and those who reported fewer stereotypes.

Results presented under RQs 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2 revealed significant relationships between categories of stereotypes attributed to NS and NS teachers and also between categories attributed to NSs and NNS teachers. Specifically, correlations for nine out of 11 categories attributed to NSs and NS Teachers and eight out of 11 categories attributed to NSs and NNS teachers showed significant positive correlations.

These findings show that stereotypes about NSs of German can travel via two pathways of association to teachers of German, i.e., (1) via birth—as in the case of NS teachers, or (2) via self-affiliation with the target-language (TL) community—as in the case of NNS teachers. In other words, the first pathway signifies that stereotypical notions of NSs of German are attributed to NS teachers given their innate

position as NSs; the second pathway means that stereotypical notions of NSs of German are attributed to NNS teachers as they decided to self-affiliate with the TL community by learning and teaching German. These results suggest that both NS and NNS teachers of German were believed to represent stereotypical qualities of NSs of German to some degree⁴³. The findings imply that both groups of teachers can be understood as stand-ins for NSs in the classroom serving as an affective gateway for learners to the community of target language (TL) speakers.

For many students, the teacher is the first—perhaps for a long time the only—direct link with the TL and the first target to which stereotypes can get attached or the first indicator that stereotypes are just that. Jernigan and Moore (1997) showed that teachers in the foreign language classroom act as transmitters of cultural information. This information is transmitted through the filter of the teacher’s cultural paradigm. Therefore, teachers should first critically “reflect on their own cultural assumptions about the TL and culture they teach” (Drewelow, 2011, p. 757). They “need to be aware of their own stereotypes” as they otherwise “may be inadvertently promoting stereotypes” (p. 757). In addition to these self-reflections, teachers should help learners become cross-cultural mediators that develop nuanced perceptions of the target language community, including NSs and teachers, as described previously (compare Subchapters 5.1.1 and 5.3.2).

Research has shown that the Communities goal area can seem elusive to both learners (Magnan et al., 2014; White, 2016) and teachers (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2011; Glisan, 2012). For instance, Glisan (2012) found that teachers believed that the Communities standards could only be addressed via contact with NSs. White (2016) showed that the learners of German in her study associated the idea of a community of target speakers with NSs who live in a geographical location abroad. White proposed that “beyond finding ways for students to access their idealized communities, it

⁴³ Subchapters 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 will describe in detail which categories of stereotypes attributed to NSs were more likely to be attached to NS teachers or NNS teachers.

is even more important that instructors work to create more immediate and accessible communities for their students, [...] especially within the classroom and other local settings” (p. 142). If teachers—regardless of their NS status—are believed to reflect qualities of NSs, teachers need to realize that they can act as representatives of the TL community in the classroom. They bring the TL community—that often seems out of reach to students—closer to learners, not only through materials or activities but actually physically by *being a German* teacher in the classroom. They should use that position to create a sense of connectedness among classroom members that centers around both the TL and members’ expectations, emotions, and needs.

Heidrich (2017) investigated categories of connection that learners of German had with the TL community in relation to their perceived sense of classroom community and foreign language anxiety. She concluded that “specifically, variables, such as personal connections to the language and culture and classroom anxiety mediate how students view the class as a whole and situate themselves in the classroom community” (p. 96). She suggested that “a multi-pronged approach could be used to increase the sense of classroom community” (p. 96). This approach included awareness-raising activities concerning learners’ connections (1) with the TL community as well as (2) with each other (p. 108).

Concerning the former, learning objectives may be for students to explore and describe their personal relationship as well as the relationship of their immediate environment with the TL (e.g., Drewelow, 2013; Darwin & Norton, 2016; Wolff & De Costa, 2017). Such assignments will vary depending on learners’ situational contexts, e.g., the geographical location of the institution or learners’ backgrounds. Potential activities may include tours of the students’ (university) city to find traces of the TL, interviews of family members, mini-presentations on items that learners connect with German, or small projects on why learners decided to learn the language. As for the latter of the multi-pronged approach, Heidrich suggested: “The teachers can first focus on the parts of the [classroom community] over which they have direct control (timing of feedback, encouraging students to ask questions, being available to students

when they have questions, etc.) and then create activities for the class which give the students opportunities to work together and learn about one another” (p. 97). Dörnyei and Muir (2019) provided an overview of “a variety of methods [from an L2 teaching perspective] through which teachers can promote acceptance and cohesiveness within a class group” as put forward by Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) (Dörnyei & Muir, 2019, p. 722). Among others, these general methods included learning about each other, group activities and legends, extracurricular activities, or cooperation toward common goals. However, teachers have to remember, as Mercer (2019) noted, that despite the fact that the FL classroom often requires cooperation with others, learners “working in groups does not in itself mean they are cooperating or collaborating effectively. Cooperation works best when learners have a genuine need to work together in order to complete the task successfully. They need to recognize a common goal and feel a sense of shared responsibility for achieving it” (p. 13). She also suggested that teachers may “discuss group working strategies with learners such as asking for people’s opinions or help, listening actively, giving constructive feedback, and negotiating” (p. 13).

Strategies and activities like the ones described previously may help learners feel a sense of community within the language classroom and may show them that TL communities do not need to be far. After all, “even as learners aspire to membership—or at least, participation—in ‘authentic’ language communities that by their own definition lie beyond the boundaries of the classroom, their learner peers form the prime and sometimes only L2 community that they will ever encounter” (Chavez, 2020b, p. 3).

5.4.1 Stereotypes Travel Primarily via Association by Birth

As discussed previously, stereotypes attributed to native speakers (NSs) of German can travel via two pathways to teachers of German, i.e., (1) by birth—as in the case of NS teachers, and (2) by self-affiliation with the target-language (TL) community—as in the case of NNS teachers. One goal of this study was to examine which of the two pathways was more likely to predict the stereotypes attributed to teachers of German.

Results reported under RQs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 (summarized in Subchapter 4.3.1) revealed that the first pathway—by birth—was the most prevalent pathway described by learners of German. This was true for all comparisons between male and female NSs and teachers. The fact that stereotypes travel primarily by birth was not surprising as NS teachers are NSs after all. Thus, it was expected for stereotypes about NSs to apply to NS teachers primarily. Particularly stereotype categories that were most prevalent among NSs were very likely to be associated with NS teachers. That is, categories reflecting (1) negative qualities that promote tension or discord, e.g., angeriness or rudeness; (2) speaker's cultural, including culinary, interests, e.g., drink beer; and (3) speakers' appearance, e.g., blond and wear Lederhosen were most likely to be transferred from NSs to both male and female NS teachers. To put it bluntly, these stereotypes capture an angry, beer-drinking German speaker with blond hair. A reason for these categories to have traveled via association by birth may be the circumstance that they are such common tropes in the portrayal of speakers of German in the media/films (e.g., Gast, 1994; Chavez, 2009; Bartram, 2010) and in the context of how the German-heritage is often held alive in the United States, e.g., Oktoberfests (e.g., Taylor, 1977; Abrams, 2002).

5.4.2 Non-Native-Speaker Teachers Get the Benefit of the Doubt

In her study on stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) and likely learners of German held by learners of German and other foreign languages (FLs), Chavez (2020b) showed that learners of FLs associated stereotypes attributed to NSs of German “with qualities inherent in the language’s non-native learners” (p. 17). Chavez described that “if the attributes of NSs are thought to be unattractive, learners of the language may become subjected to similarly negative attributions” (p. 22).

The present study supports the insight that stereotypes attributed to the NSs of a given FL attach to people that associate with that language, i.e., non-native speakers. Specifically, participants of the present study associated stereotypes attributed to NSs of German with qualities of non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers of German. In contrast to Chavez' findings, stereotypes that were more likely to travel

from NSs to NNSs were positive attributes. That is, categories describing the promotion of personal relationships (e.g., approachability and friendliness) and global situatedness (e.g., well-traveled) showed greater compliance between NSs and NNS teachers than between NSs and NS teachers. In other words, if a person decides to self-affiliate with the community of German speakers by teaching the language, they will receive the benefit of the doubt with respect to stereotypical perceptions of German speakers. This finding can be understood as an encouragement for individuals who consider teaching German as an NNS of the language.

5.4.3 Traveling Hetero- and Auto-Stereotypes

The current study explored stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) and teachers of German that learners of German had heard. These stereotypes can be considered hetero-stereotypes as participants did neither belong to the group of NSs nor teachers (compare Hass et al., 2016, p. 118). Given the diversity of stereotypes heard by learners, one may assume that teachers of German have come across similar stereotypes, too. Exploring the stereotypical notions held by teachers would contribute to the growing body of research into teacher identities (e.g., Aneja, 2016). The development of a teacher identity “is the central project novice teachers” and experienced instructors should engage in (Kanno & Stuart, 2011, p. 250; Wolff & De Costa, 2017, p. 87). For instance, researchers may investigate how NS and non-native speaker teachers of German imagine themselves in comparison to NSs of German. Such a project would expand the insights gained from learners’ hetero-stereotypes about teachers described in the present study by teachers’ auto-stereotypes. Results may speak to how these imaginings affect teachers’ identity formations or translate into their daily practices in the classroom (e.g., Ghanem, 2015; Aneja, 2016).

5.4.4 Reflective Language Teachers and a Sense of Local Community

This study has shown that learners of German heard stereotypes about native speakers (NSs) and teachers of German and that stereotypical notions travel from NSs to teachers. In previous subchapters, I focused on practical implications of these findings for learners, e.g., how teachers may help learners become cross-

cultural mediators (Subchapter 5.1.1) or become more aware of their emerging bi-/multilingual identities (Subchapter 5.2.2), and experience a sense of connectedness among classroom members that centers around the target language (Subchapter 5.4). This subchapter will explore implications that apply to teachers themselves as well as to language programs.

If learners are aware of stereotypical notions of NS and non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers, teachers are most likely aware of these stereotypes, too. They are probably also aware of the possibility that learners' stereotypical notions may be more or less desirable and may depend on the teacher's status as NS or NNS of the target language. It is then up to the teachers not to enforce any of these stereotypical notions phrased by learners (Drewelow, 2011, p. 757). Therefore, teachers should be reflective about their own identity as an educator. Research has shown that language teachers define their own identities to some extent along the lines of being an NSs or NNSs of the target language, which then also influences their teaching (e.g., Ghanem, 2015; Wernicke, 2017). Ghanem, for instance, showed that NS teachers of German assumed superior knowledge of their language and culture, whereas NNS teachers were insecure about teaching the target language and its culture. They felt "less authoritative due to their non-nativeness" (p. 182). Teachers "need to recognize the advantages they carry as either NSs or NNSs and discard the belief that being an NS will lead to being a more efficient teacher" (p. 183). Being a reflective educator is not only beneficent to teachers' identity work but also leads to better teacher-student relationships and more enjoyment in class, for both teacher and learners (e.g., Hagenauer et al., 2015; Dewaele, Witney, et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2019).

Language programs should address stereotypes about NS and NNS teachers in their teacher trainings and encourage teachers' continuous self-reflection. Dörnyei (2018) makes clear that "igniting—or, if necessary, reigniting—the flame of teacher vision may well be the single most important step in any motivational agenda for classroom practitioners" (p. 5). Teachers, when they learn about their students' stereotypes about teachers, can critically reflect on their own visions of being a language educator,

including their hopes and fears. Therefore, teacher trainings may include sessions that focus on teachers' experiences and concerns regarding their status as a native-speaker (NS) or non-native-speaker (NNS) teacher in the classroom (Ghanem, 2015, p. 183). Teachers may reflect on and discuss the stereotypes found in this study or share their concerns and ideas regarding teacher roles and concepts of multilingual/multicompetent teachers. Language programs could also implement monthly workshops on a variety of teaching-related topics (e.g., J. Anderson, 2016). For instance, (e.g., Ghanem, 2015) suggested workshops that promote collaborative development of materials and lesson plans. Wolff and De Costa (2017) suggested workshops in which teachers can discuss best practices of how they can adapt their teaching to the respective student audiences. These workshops could help educators—each with their own cultural and educational background—gain a better understanding of themselves and their students, share materials for teaching, and exchange experiences of successful or less successful teaching practices. Furthermore, language programs should encourage regular peer observations. Teachers would be able to gain insights “into what colleagues are doing, [...] how they cope with different issues”, and disprove “the myths that exist for NS and NNS instructors” (Ghanem, 2015, p. 183).

What is more, foreign-language (FL) programs should critically review the strategies of how they advertise their programs and what they promise to learners. In her analysis of language program's online self-representations and FL learners' reasons to study German, Chavez (2020a) found that German programs “were disproportionally inclined to reference cultural products created by native speakers. Direct contact with native speakers, however, figured less prominently [...] in advertising [...]. From the perspective of potential learners, it remains unclear how they could personally share in either the advertised cultural products or the community that has produced them” (p. 26). Therefore, instead of promoting connections to NS communities afar (that may always be out of reach for learners), language programs should emphasize the local community of German learners and teachers on campus. Learners and teachers may form a sense of belonging through engagement with the target language. After all, an

affinity to the language itself seems to be an important personal reason for FL learners to study German (Chavez, 2020a, p. 28). Activities to support a connectedness among members of this local community can span from the classroom, e.g., projects that help learners explore the language in the context of their own lives, careers, and communities, to regular events beyond the classroom, e.g., small conferences at which students present their language-related projects to the campus community. Via outreach channels, e.g., social media accounts, language programs may share local events for the campus community that have been organized by learners and teachers of German. They may also share stories of individuals, i.e., learners and teachers, that describe their diverse language-learning and teaching goals as well as success stories related to learning and teaching German. Current students' increased sense of belonging to a community of German speakers locally may also contribute to language programs' student retention efforts. Furthermore, showcasing the local community of German speakers and learners' word-of-mouth recommendations to peers may attract students that have initially been skeptical about choosing this language. In the end, the local community of learners and teachers of German can help current and potential learners of the language to see beyond the societal narratives indicating that learners and teachers are stereotypical representations of NSs of German, that one may (not) like to affiliate with.

5.5 Gender Only Matters With Respect to Stereotypes About Native Speakers, Including Teachers

In her review of the research on gender and stereotypes, Ellemers (2018) summarized that stereotypes about men emphasize agency, e.g., through qualities of assertiveness and performance; stereotypes about women primarily stress aspects of communality, such as warmth and care for others. Sharipova (2015) showed that positive connotations of men typically included qualities such as competence, activity, and rationality; perceived negative qualities involved rudeness and authoritarianism (cited in: Mollaeva, 2018, p. 750). Women were generally associated with positive qualities such as sociability, warmth, and emotional support; perceived negative traits of women included inactivity and excessive emotionality (p. 750). Eyal and Epley (2017) supported these findings when they explored perceived differences between

male and female participants. They found “the predicted gender difference was significantly larger than the actual gender difference” (p. 1327). They showed that participants’ gender stereotypes exaggerated “actual group differences only on the traits that are defining features of gender stereotypes, namely, traits presumed to differentiate men and women [i.e., social sensitivity and self-esteem]” (p. 1331).

The current study found similar stereotypical perceptions concerning gender, as described by Sharipova (2015), Eyal and Epley (2017), and Ellemers (2018). Specifically, these notions described qualities associated with rudeness/unapproachability for male NS, including male NS teachers, and characteristics related to communality for female NSs, including female NS teachers. Findings reported under RQs 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 show that male NSs were more likely to be viewed as someone who promotes tension or discord when compared to female NSs. Verbatim responses indicate that female NSs were more often perceived to be fostering communal aspects. Communality became evident in responses such as “caring”, “loving”, and “in charge of cooking and cleaning” that only applied to female NSs. Results pertaining to RQ 2.3.1 reveal similar differences between stereotypical attributions to male NS teachers and the ones to female NS teachers that almost amounted to a statistically significant level. That is, male NS teachers may be more likely to be described as someone with qualities that prevent personal relationships, whereas female NS teachers may be more likely to be regarded to possess qualities that promote personal relationships.

The fact that these stereotypical gender differences have been found with respect to NSs of German was not surprising, given the fact that these notions are considered universal gender stereotypes as described previously. However, it was unexpected to see that there were slight gender differences with respect to NS teachers but not with NNS teachers (see RQs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). This finding may indicate that these gendered stereotypes have been more prominent in learners’ minds with regard to NS teachers than with NNS teachers. An explanation may be that NNS teachers, regardless of gender, are generally

believed to be better at relating to their students than NS teachers, as discussed previously in Subchapter 5.3.1.

Stereotypes are most often socially learned in one own's native culture, e.g., through "indirect sources such as parents, peers, teachers, leaders, school materials or the mass media" (Heinzmann, 2014, pp. 50, 58). Since the stereotypes described about NSs of German reflect universal gender stereotypes, one can assume that similar stereotypes also exist in learners' home countries. Therefore, teachers may address the topic of stereotypes about gender in the target culture as well as learners' native cultures through course units or assignments. For instance, Abrams (2002) implemented a semester-long internet-mediated project in which students explored their cultural stereotypes about the TL by comparing them to media sources from the TL countries, library and internet resources, as well as online interviews with members of the target cultures. An example in the German context may be an exploration of what societies in German-speaking countries look like today. Students could, for instance, research trends and ratios related to females in STEM professions (e.g., see azubify.de, 2019).

Future research may explore stereotypical notions described by learners of other foreign languages, employing a similar research design to this study. Such investigations may allow further insights into whether stereotypes about gender only become apparent with respect to NSs and NS teachers but not NNS teachers.

6. Limitations of the Present Study

The present study has provided a foundation for explorations of how stereotypical attributions travel from native speakers to teachers of German. Nevertheless, some limitations pertained to the research instrument, data analysis, and participants that may be mitigated in future research.

6.1 Limitations That Pertain to the Research Instrument

Data for this study were collected through six open-ended questions that inquired about stereotypes that participants had heard about native speakers and teachers of German. Each question began with ‘What stereotypes have you heard about...’. The second parts of the respective questions were related to the particular type of speaker, namely ‘male native speaker’ (Question 1); ‘female native speaker’ (Question 2); ‘male native-speaker teacher’ (Question 3); ‘female native-speaker teacher’ (Question 4); ‘male non-native-speaker teacher’ (Question 5); and ‘female non-native-speaker teacher’ (Question 6).

Participants may have had differing understandings of what the terms ‘stereotype’, ‘native speaker’, ‘teacher’, and ‘German’ meant as the questionnaire did not provide a definition of any of these terms. Nassaji (2012) pointed out that it is not “clear [in questionnaires] whether all respondents have the same interpretations of questions” (p. 358). Participants’ understandings of the term ‘stereotype’ may have resulted in a spectrum of responses. These may have ranged from participants’ general mental images that came to mind when thinking about native speakers (NSs) and teachers of German to presumably negative preconceived notions about these persons as the term may have been associated with negative qualities, particularly in the US context. If participants took the term to mean ‘negative qualities’, this may have accounted for some of the imbalance in results, specifically pertaining to prevalent categories of stereotypes attributed to NSs. The term ‘teacher’ allowed for a variety of interpretations, too. Interpretations may have been a combination of the following or simply just one particular kind of teacher, e.g., elementary-, secondary-, or post-secondary teacher, as well as professors, or graduate teaching assistants. Furthermore, it was unclear what respondents understood as native speakers and how they interpreted the ambiguous term German that stands in for various regions, dialects, or the language, as well as for nationalities and ethnicities.

The order in which the items were presented to participants may have had an influence on (a) response rates and (b) verbatim responses provided. As for the former, mean numbers ranged from a

minimum of 3.23 entries per respondent (for stereotypes about male NNS teachers) to a maximum of 4.38 entries per respondent (for stereotypes about male NSs of German). Participants described the most stereotypes for the first two items—inquiring about NSs (male: 4.38; female: 3.71), followed by the third and fourth items—NS teachers (male: 3.36; female: 3.31), and the fifth and sixth items—NNS teachers (male: 3.23; female: 3.24). The differential between the mean number of stereotypes for males and females was the most notable for descriptions of NSs (0.67); it was much less for teachers, even though the differential was somewhat larger for NS (0.05) than NNS (0.01) teachers. In other words, among NSs—especially non-teachers—more stereotypes were attached to males than females, and generally, more stereotypes were attached to NSs than to NNSs. Explanations for these mean numbers may be: (1) Participants had simply heard fewer stereotypes about the respective subgroups with lower mean numbers of responses. (2) Participants may have experienced survey fatigue given the nature of items, i.e., open-ended questions that all had the same layout (with stereotypes about male speakers for the respective subgroups first) and a very similar scope (Hugick & Best, 2008, p. 660). In addition to an impact on the response rates, the order of items may have affected participants' verbatim responses. I was unable to assess whether participants' trains of thought may have led to attachments of stereotypical attributes to a specific group of speakers based on participants' responses provided to a previous group of speakers.

I acknowledge limitations that result from deploying binary constructs, such as NSs/NNSs and male/female, for the reasons described in Subchapter 3.3.2. Foremost, they bury gradations in self- and other-perception. What is more, as also explained in Subchapter 3.3.2, I understand that learners' perceptions of teachers are not only affected by the variables mentioned above but also by other characteristics that I did not explicitly ask about, e.g., age, sexual orientation, educational background, teaching ability, and interpersonal abilities.

Finally, participants were asked to report the stereotypes they have heard. However, the very question may have induced participants to articulate stereotypes in their minds for the very first time so that, in essence, they did not merely report stereotypes that had traveled to them but that they also formed and then reported their own versions of stereotypes.

Whereas the implications of articulation processes for the outcome of this study cannot be ascertained, the consequences for student participants' personal learning experiences were addressed. As a follow-up to the study, I implemented a semester-long diversity project in a second-semester German course in which some of the participants of this study had enrolled. In that project, learners explored the diversity of societies in German-speaking countries and investigated traces of Germanness in their local environments.

6.2 Limitations That Pertain to the Data Analysis

The free-response approach, combined with a relatively small sample size ($N = 67$), played a limiting role in the analysis of the data. With respect to calculations of Z-scores (RQs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3), some response categories had drawn attributions to native speakers (NSs) but were lacking responses in attributions to either NS teachers or non-native-speaker (NNS) teachers. As a result, it was impossible to construct a complete pair of correlations for comparison of correlation strengths. Furthermore, the paired sample sign tests (RQs 1.2.2; 2.3.1–2.3.4) had to be calculated on a very small number of respondents in some instances, e.g., 1, 2, or 3 respondents. This was particularly common in comparisons of stereotype categories pertaining to teachers (RQs 2.3.1–2.3.4), given the low percentage of respondents for some of these categories. What is more, despite repeated family-wise testing with respect to the paired sample sign tests (RQs 1.2.2; 2.3.1–2.3.4), tetrachoric correlations (RQs 3.1.1–3.1.2; 3.2.1–3.2.2), and Steiger's-Z-tests (RQs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3), I did not apply a Bonferroni correction. The decision not to decrease the alpha level of $p < 0.05$ may have led to a Type-I error, i.e., some results may have shown as 'significant' even though they are due to chance. However, given the objectives of the study, the converse Type-II error

(underreporting significant results) appeared more consequential. Furthermore, I was unable to fully investigate the directionality of how stereotypes travel from one group of speakers to the other via statistical analyses. I relied on three indicators, as described in Discussion (Subchapter 5.4). However, the exact nature of travel/transmission of stereotypes remains unknown. The study intended to scope out parameters for future research and not to present definitive conclusions. Therefore, results must be viewed as exploratory rather than definitive in nature.

I need to acknowledge the situatedness of this study, including my positionality as a scholar and the context of where the study was conducted, as already partially described in Subchapter 3.3.1. According to Rowe (2014), “positionality refers to the stance or positioning of the researcher in relation to the social and political context of the study—the community, the organization or the participant group” (p. 628). Describing a researcher’s positionality is common practice in qualitative research (e.g., Bourke, 2014; Rowe, 2014). The present study occupied a space in between qualitative and quantitative research. The original data were composed of qualitative responses, but these were then categorized and quantified by the researcher and subjected to inferential statistical analyses by a statistical consultant. Both study participants and the researcher exercised situated agency. Participants’ situated agency included the strong presence of German heritage in the state and, by extension, the institution (a public state university). The researcher exercised agency in data construction (e.g., establishing of categories) and interpretation (Olesen, 2007). Both participants and researcher entered into a situated relationship when the researcher—a blond and blue-eyed German national—solicited participation in the study among enrolled students.

6.3 Limitations That Pertain to Participants

As described in Subchapter 3.3.1, I recruited participants from six intact first-semester German course sections. The personal appeal was the only way I recruited participants. I informed all prospective participants of the scope, risks, and benefits of the questionnaire. I also reminded them that there were

no correct or incorrect responses and that their participation would have no influence on their grade or standing in their course. Participation was voluntary. Participants completed the questionnaire outside of class over the course of about two weeks. I returned to the individual course sections at multiple later dates to collect the questionnaires. I was not present when students completed their questionnaires. However, I cannot rule out that students had me in mind when they responded to the respective stereotype questions as I had I presented the study to them in person and returned to the individual course sections multiple times to collect questionnaires.

Only 3.2 percent of the items pertaining to this study, i.e., six open-ended questions, were left unanswered by participants.⁴⁴ The very low number of unanswered items indicates that respondents took time to respond to the questions analyzed in the present study.

The major limitation of this study with respect to participants is sampling. The average response rate relative to invited participants was relatively high, with 66.3 percent, i.e., 67 respondents out of 101 prospective participants. However, due to the self-selection approach, I do not know how this sample came to be and how representative of the whole population this sample is (e.g., Sterba & Foster, 2008). It remains unclear whether participants were representative of typical groups of learners of German at this institution, and findings cannot be generalized to other populations either.

7. Conclusion

Perhaps the two most fundamental findings of this research are that (1) beginning learners of German are well aware of an array of stereotypes about native speakers (NS) of German and (2) these stereotypical notions travel via two pathways of association to teachers of German. Specifically, the first pathway is the association via birth, which signifies that stereotypical notions of NSs are attributed to NS teachers given their innate position as NSs. The second pathway is the association via self-affiliation with the target

⁴⁴ Unanswered items were not excluded from analysis. They were entered into the database as “N/A”.

language community, which means that stereotypical notions of NSs of German are attributed to NNS teachers as they decided to self-affiliate with the TL community by learning and teaching German. When comparing the likelihood of stereotypes traveling via one of the two pathways of association, the first pathway—by birth—was the most prevalent with respect to both male and female teachers, NS teachers and NNS teachers, respectively. Rather unexpected was the finding that stereotypes about qualities that promote personal relationships were more likely to travel from NSs to NNS teachers than to NS teachers, male and female, respectively.

These findings suggest that stereotypes travel from perceived or imagined global contexts to the immediate environment of the classroom and that teachers—regardless of NS status and gender—may be understood as stand-ins of NSs in class. Results also speak to the potential that stereotypical notions may not only be applied to teachers but also students if they decide to associate with the community of German speakers. The idea that speaking and learning a specific language bestows specific other, personal characteristics contains attractive as well as repulsive ('do not learn the language lest you become are perceived to be X') potential when students select a language for study.

In practical terms, these findings support pedagogical approaches that help learners become cross-cultural mediators and members of a local community of foreign-language speakers. Such a community engages learners and teachers through the target language and invites campus members with diverse goals and backgrounds. Concerning future research, results call for a closer investigation of how accurate learners of German believe these stereotypical notions to be and whether NS and NNS teachers, as well as learners of other foreign languages, have heard and believe in stereotypes about the respective NSs and teachers of the specific foreign language.

References

- Abrams, Z. I. (2002). Surfing to cross-cultural awareness: Using internet-mediated projects to explore cultural stereotypes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(2), 141–153.
- Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 18(3), 91–93. doi:10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001
- Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2018). The L2 motivational self system: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(4), 721–754. doi:10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.4.2
- Al-Khairi, M. (2015). Qualities of an ideal English language teacher: A gender-based investigation in a Saudi context. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(15), 88–98.
- Al Kaboody, M. (2013). Second language motivation: The role of teachers in learners' motivation. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 3(4), 45–54.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2011). *A decade of Foreign Language Standards: Impact, influence, and future directions*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/standards/StandardsImpactSurvey.pdf>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). ACTFL proficiency guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelinesand-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012/english>
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (revised ed.). London: Verso.
- Anderson, J. (2016). Initial teacher training courses and non-native speaker teachers. *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 261–274.
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). (Non)native speakerhood: Rethinking (non)nativeness and teacher identity in TESOL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 572–596. doi:10.1002/tesq.315
- Appel, M. (2008). Medienvermittelte Stereotype und Vorurteile [Media-mediated stereotypes and prejudices]. In B. Batinić & M. Appel (Eds.), *Medienpsychologie* (pp. 313–335). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Arbuckle, J., & Williams, B. (2003). Students' perceptions of expressiveness: Age and gender effects on teacher evaluations. *Sex Roles*, 49(9/10), 507–516.
- azubify.de. (2019). Frauenanteil in MINT-Berufen [Ratio of women in STEM-fields]. Retrieved from <https://www.azubify.de/news/frauenanteil-in-mint-berufen/>
- Bajrami, L. (2015). Teacher's new role in language learning and in promoting learner autonomy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(3), 423–427.

- Barna, L. M. (1998). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In M. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 173–189). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural.
- Bartram, B. (2010). *Attitudes to modern foreign language learning*. London: Continuum.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2016). Toward a general theory of motivation: Problems, challenges, opportunities, and the big picture. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(1), 1–10. doi:10.1007/s11031-015-9521-y
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and nonnative speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Nonnative language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195–215). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bolten, J. (2007). *Einführung in die interkulturelle Wirtschaftskommunikation [Introduction to intercultural business communication]*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005-2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System*, 55, 145–157. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.10.006
- Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(33).
- Brinkworth, R., McCann, B., Matthews, C., & Nordström, K. (2009). First year expectations and experiences: Student and teacher perspectives. *Higher Education*, 58(2), 157–173.
- Brittingham, A., & de la Cruz, G. P. (2004). *Ancestry: 2000 (United States Census)*. Retrieved from <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/2000/briefs/c2kbr-35.pdf>
- Brown, A. V. (2009). How Spanish teachers and their beginning-level university students perceive FL teaching practices: Ideally and concretely. *Hispania*, 92(3), 550–566.
- Buck, S., & Tiene, D. (1989). The impact of physical attractiveness, gender, and teaching philosophy on teacher evaluations. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 82(3), 172–177. doi:10.1080/00220671.1989.10885887
- Bullough, R. V. J. (2008). The writing of teachers' lives: Where personal troubles and social issues meet. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 7–26.
- Busse, V. (2017). Plurilingualism in Europe: Exploring attitudes toward English and other European languages among adolescents in Bulgaria, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 566–582.
- Busse, V., & Walter, C. (2013). Foreign language learning motivation in higher education: A longitudinal study of motivational changes and their causes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 435–456.
- Byon, A. S. (2007). The use of culture portfolio project in a Korean culture classroom: Evaluating stereotypes and enhancing cross-cultural awareness. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 20(1), 1–19. doi:10.2167/lcc323.0

- Byrnes, J. P., Miller, D. C., & Schafer, W. D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(3), 367–383.
- Calafato, R. (2019). The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009-2018. *Lingua*, 227. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2019.06.001
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Chavez, M. (2001). *Gender in the language classroom*. Boston: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Chavez, M. (2009). Learners' descriptions of German pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar: A folk linguistic account. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42(1), 1–18.
- Chavez, M. (2013). How college learners of German envision their final attainment: Between community and future self. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 46(1), 75–90.
- Chavez, M. (2020a). German in the marketplace of languages: Why students of German and of four other languages say that they and others might choose German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 54, np.
- Chavez, M. (2020b). "Made" to study German? - Imagined native-speaker & learner communities and the im/plausible German language self. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, np.
- Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System*, 35, 407–430. doi:10.1016/j.system.2007.05.002
- Coleman, J. E. (1998). Intercultural perceptions. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 45–75). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Coleman, N. (2016). Filmische Stereotype im interkulturellen Landeskundeunterricht: Theorie und Praxis [Cinematic stereotypes in intercultural regional/cultural studies lessons: Theory and practice]. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 49(1), 47–56. doi:10.1111/tger.10210
- Cook, V. (2016). Where is the native speaker now? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 186–189.
- Cutshall, S. (2012). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Communities" in your language instruction. *The Language Educator*, 32–37.
- Dancey, C. P., & Reidy, J. (2017). *Statistics without maths for psychology* (7th ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Langage et société*, 157(3), 19–38.
- Davies, A. (1996). Proficiency or the native speaker: What are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 145–157). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, transdisciplinarity, and the good language teacher. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(Supplement), 3–14.
- Demirtaş, H. (2016). The relationship between university students' perceptions of faculty members' undesirable behaviors, their trust for faculty members and class participation. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 8(4). doi:10.15345/iojes.2016.04.007
- Dewaele, J.-M., Gkonou, C., & Mercer, S. (2018). Do ESL/EFL teachers' emotional intelligence, teaching experience, proficiency, and gender affect their classroom practice? In J. d. D. M. Agudo (Ed.), *Emotions in second language teaching: Theory, research and teacher education* (pp. 125–141). Berlin: Springer.
- Dewaele, J.-M., Magdalena, A. F., & Saito, K. (2019). The effect of perception of teacher characteristics on Spanish EFL learners' anxiety and enjoyment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2). doi:10.1111/modl.12555
- Dewaele, J.-M., Witney, J., Saito, K., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Foreign language enjoyment and anxiety: The effect of teacher and learner variables. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(6), 676–697. doi:10.1177/1362168817692161
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(3), 3–32.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–41). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2018). Motivating students and teachers. In J. I. Lontos (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (Vol. 7, pp. 4293–4299). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019a). From integrative motivation to directed motivational currents: The evolution of the understanding of L2 motivation over three decades. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 39–70). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019b). Task motivation: What makes an L2 task engaging? In Z. Wen & M. J. Ahmadian (Eds.), *Researching L2 task performance and pedagogy: In honour of Peter Skehan* (pp. 53–66). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2019c). Towards a better understanding of the L2 learning experience, the Cinderella of the L2 motivational self system. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 19–30.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). The motivational foundation of learning languages other than global English: Theoretical issues and research directions. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 455–468. doi:10.1111/modl.12408

- Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 437–462.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2019). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In X. A. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 719–736). New York: Springer.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner: Revisited*. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Drewelow, I. (2011). American learners of French and their stereotypes of the French language and people: A survey and its implications for teaching. *The French Review*, 84(4), 748–762.
- Drewelow, I. (2013). Impact of instruction on shaping or reshaping stereotypical cultural representations in an introductory French course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46(2), 157–174. doi:10.1111/flan.12029
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2013). The nature-nurture debates: 25 years of challenges in understanding the psychology of gender. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(3), 340–357.
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275–298. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011719
- Ellis, E. M. (2016). “I may be a native speaker but I’m not monolingual”: Reimagining all teachers’ linguistic identities in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 597–630. doi:10.1002/tesq.314
- Eyal, T., & Epley, N. (2017). Exaggerating accessible differences: When gender stereotypes overestimate actual group differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(9), 323–336.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). Reflecting on teacher-student relations in TESOL. *ELT Journal*, 69(1), 26–34.
- Fichtner, F. (2015). Learning culture in the target language: The students’ perspectives. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 48(2), 229–243. doi:10.1111/tger.10197
- Flórez, E., & Rodríguez, G. (2016). Teachers and students’ stereotypes about the teaching and learning of English. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 13, 75–92. doi:10.26817/16925777.313
- Fukuda, C. (2017). Gaijin performing gaijin (‘A foreigner performing a foreigner’): Co-construction of foreigner stereotypes in a Japanese talk show as a multimodal phenomenon. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 109, 12–28.

- Gabillon, Z. (2005). L2 learner's beliefs: An overview. *Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 233–260.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Language learning motivation: The student, the teacher, and the researcher. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 6(1), 1–18.
- Gardner, R. C. (2006). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: A research paradigm. In S. H. Foster-Cohen, M. Medved Krajnovic, & J. Mihaljević Djigunović (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook* (Vol. 6, pp. 237–260): John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gast, W. (1994). 'Typische Deutsche' im amerikanischen Fernsehen ['Typical Germans' on American TV]. In L. Bredella, W. Gast, & S. Quandt (Eds.), *Deutschlandbilder im amerikanischen Fernsehen: Inhalte, Formen, Funktionen* (pp. 253–275). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Ghanem, C. (2015). Teaching in the foreign language classroom: How being a native or non-native speaker of German influences culture teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 169–186. doi:10.1177/1362168814541751
- Glisan, E. W. (2012). National Standards: Research into practice. *Language Teaching*, 45(4), 515–526. doi:10.1017/s0261444812000249
- Glisan, E. W., Phillips, J., Allen, H., Abbott, A., & Sauer, T. (2010). *The lost C: The Communities goal area*. Paper presented at the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Conference, Boston, MA.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2013). Integrating intercultural competence into language learning through technology. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(2), 1–11.
- Gorham, J., Cohen, S. H., & Morris, T. L. (1997). Fashion in the classroom II: Instructor immediacy and attire. *Communication Research Reports*, 14(1), 11–23. doi:10.1080/08824099709388641
- Graham, S., Courtney, L., Marinis, T., & Tonkyn, A. (2017). Early language learning: The impact of teaching and teacher factors. *Language Learning*, 67(4), 922–958. doi:10.1111/lang.12251
- Haamer, A., Lepp, L., & Reva, E. (2012). The dynamics of professional identity of university teachers: Reflecting on the ideal university teacher. *Studies for the Learning Society*, 2(2-3), 110–120. doi:10.2478/v10240-012-0010-5
- Hagenauer, G., Hascher, T., & Volet, S. E. (2015). Teacher emotions in the classroom: Associations with students' engagement, classroom discipline and the interpersonal teacher-student relationship. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 30(4), 385–403.
- Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. E. (2014). Teacher-student relationship at university: An important yet under-researched field. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), 370–388. doi:10.1080/03054985.2014.921613

- Hall, J. K. (2001). *Methods for teaching foreign languages: creating a community of learners in the classroom*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Hass, J., Waechter, S., & Krause-Ono, M. (2016). The dialectics of auto- and hetero-stereotypes in the perception of German and Japanese students. *Memoirs of the Muroran Institute of Technology*, 66, 117–128.
- Head, A., Xu, Y., & Wang, J. (2014). *ToneWars: Connecting language learners and native speakers through collaborative mobile games*. Paper presented at the Intelligent Tutoring Systems 2014, LNCS 8474, Honolulu, HI, USA.
- Heidrich, E. S. (2017). *The interaction of students' reported personal connections to German and their experiences in the German foreign language classroom*. (Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation), University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI.
- Heinzmann, S. (2014). *Young language learners' motivation and attitudes: Longitudinal, comparative and explanatory perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Henry, A. (2017). L2 motivation and multilingual identities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 548–565. doi:10.1111/modl.12412
- Henry, A., & Thorsen, C. (2018). Teacher-student relationships and L2 motivation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(1). doi:10.1111/modl.12446
- Hornstra, L., Mansfield, C., van der Veen, I., Peetsma, T., & Volman, M. (2015). Motivational teacher strategies: The role of beliefs and contextual factors. *Learning Environments Research*, 18, 363–392.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2013). *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second language learning and teaching* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Pearson.
- Houghton, S. (2010). Managing stereotypes through experiential learning. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19(1), 182–198.
- Hugick, L., & Best, J. (2008). Questionnaire length. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (pp. 660). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Jarman, J., Blackburn, R. M., & Racko, G. (2012). The dimensions of occupational gender segregation in industrial countries. *Sociology*, 46(6), 1003–1019.
- Jernigan, C. G., & Moore, Z. (1997). Teaching culture: A study in the Portuguese classroom implications for the National Standards. *Hispania*, 80(4), 829–841.
- Jin, L. (2013). Language development and scaffolding in a Sino-American telecollaborative project. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(2), 193–219.
- Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Kabel, A. (2009). Native-speakerism, stereotyping and the collusion of applied linguistics. *System*, 37(1), 12–22. doi:doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.09.004
- Kallia, A. (2005). Directness as a source of misunderstanding: The case of requests and suggestions. In R. T. Lakoff & S. Ide (Eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (Vol. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241–249.
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). The development of L2 teacher identity: Longitudinal case studies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236–252.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. W. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 28(3), 280–290.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2011). Re-exploring the knowledge base of language teaching: Four ESL teachers' classroom practices and perspectives. *TESL Reporter*, 44(1/2), 25–41.
- Kikuchi, K. (2009). Listening to our learners' voices: What demotivates Japanese high school students? *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 453–471.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, 112(3), 359–369.
- Kubanyiova, M., & Crookes, G. (2016). Re-envisioning the roles, tasks, and contributions of language teachers in the multilingual era of language education research and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(Supplement), 117–132.
- Kubota, R. (2018). Racial, ethnic, and cultural stereotypes in teaching English. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (Vol. Teaching Cultural Awareness, pp. 1–7).
- Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 229–247). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*, 62 (4), 997–1023. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x
- Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Re(de)fining language proficiency in light of the concept 'languaculture'. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Looking ahead: Future directions in, and future research into, second language acquisition. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 55–72.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native-speaker teacher? In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Nonnative language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 217–242). New York, NY: Springer.

- Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 317–344. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085658
- Lee, L., & Markey, A. (2014). A study of learners' perceptions of online intercultural exchange through web 2.0 technologies. *ReCALL*, 26(3), 281–297. doi:10.1017/s0958344014000111
- Leonard, J. (2019). Beyond '(non) native-speakerism': Being or becoming a native-speaker teacher of English. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 10(4), 677–703.
- Lin, Y.-L. (2016). Development of multi-word sequences by adolescent EFL learners through online interaction. *English Today*, 32(4), 27–32. doi:10.1017/s0266078416000201
- Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 314–323. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2004.00068.x
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., & Sparling, H. (2017). Heritage passions, heritage convictions, and the rooted L2 self: Music and Gaelic language learning in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 501–516. doi:10.1111/modl.12417
- Magnan, S. S. (2008). Reexamining the priorities of the National Standards for Foreign Language Education. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 349–366.
- Magnan, S. S., Murphy, D., & Sahakyan, N. (2014). Goals of collegiate learners and the Standards for Foreign Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), i–viii, 1–293. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12056_3.x
- Magnan, S. S., Murphy, D., Sahakyan, N., & Kim, S. (2012). Student goals, expectations, and the Standards for Foreign Language Learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(2), 170–192. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01192.x
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954–969. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.41.9.954
- Mastro, D. (2009). Effects of racial and ethnic stereotyping. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 325–341). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Mastro, D., Tukachinsky, R., Behm-Morawitz, E., & Blecha, E. (2014). News coverage of immigration: The influence of exposure to linguistic bias in the news on consumer's racial/ethnic cognitions. *Communication Quarterly*, 62(2), 135–154. doi:10.1080/01463373.2014.890115
- Mathew, J. (2010). *Disclosure apprehension: The influence of media and survey technique on the disclosure of sensitive information*. (Doctoral Thesis), The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.
- Mehrpour, F., & Karimnia, A. (2018). Second language teaching effectiveness from the perspective of university students: A case study of departments of applied linguistics. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 9(1), 64–78. doi:10.2478/dcse-2018-0005

- Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zölitz, U. (2019). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17(2), 535–566. doi:10.1093/jeea/jvx057
- Mercer, S. (2019). Language learner engagement: Setting the scene. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching*. Cham: Springer.
- Modern Language Association. (2012). Modern Language Association statement on language learning and United States national policy by the MLA executive council [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Executive-Council/Executive-Council-Actions/2012/MLA-Statement-on-Language-Learning-and-United-States-National-Policy>
- Mollaeva, E. A. (2018). Gender stereotypes and the role of women in higher education (Azerbaijan case study). *Education and Urban Society*, 50(8), 747–763.
- Muir, C., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). Directed motivational currents: Using vision to create effective motivational pathways. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(3), 357–375.
- Murphey, T., Jin, C., & Li-Chi, C. (2005). Learners' constructions of identities and imagined communities. In P. Benson & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 83–100). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nassaji, H. (2012). The relationship between SLA research and language pedagogy: Teachers' perspectives. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 337–365.
- National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. In (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- Nikitina, L. (2015). Country stereotypes and L2 motivation: A study of French, German and Spanish language learners. *Studies in Linguistics*, 37(4), 483–509.
- Nikitina, L. (2017). Stereotypes as an interdisciplinary construct: Implications for applied linguistics research. *Suvremena Lingvistika*, 43(83), 1–19. doi:10.22210/suvlin.2017.083.01
- Nikitina, L. (2019). Do country stereotypes influence language learning motivation? A study among foreign language learners in Malaysia. *Moderna Sprak*, 113(1), 58–79.
- Nikitina, L., Don, Z. B. M., & Cheong, L. S. (2014). Investigating stereotypes about the target language country: A case of German language learners. *Rla-Revista De Linguistica Teorica Y Aplicada*, 52(2), 113–131. doi:Doi 10.4067/S0718-48832014000200006
- Nikitina, L., & Furuoka, F. (2009). Teacher-student relationships and the conceptualization of the “good language teacher”: Does culture matter? *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 163–187.
- Nikitina, L., & Furuoka, F. (2019). Language learners' mental images of Korea: Insights for the teaching of culture in the language classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(9), 774–786.

- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities, and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Norton, B. (2016). Identity and language learning: Back to the future. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 475–479.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 412–446. doi:10.1017/s0261444811000309
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research-Language Behaviour Culture*, 5(2), 189–216. doi:10.1515/Jplr.2009.011
- Olesen, V. L. (2007). Feminist qualitative research and grounded theory: Complexities, criticisms, and opportunities. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 417–435): SAGE Publications.
- Omercajic, K., & Martino, W. (2020). Supporting transgender inclusion and gender diversity in schools: A critical policy analysis. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 5(27). doi:10.3389/fsoc.2020.00027
- Oskouei, A. O., Dabaghi, A., & Nejad Ansari, D. (2018). Exploring effective foreign language teaching from the eyes of Iranian learners: Reporting a qualitative interview study. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(10), 2453–2473.
- Papi, M., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2012). Teacher motivational practice, student motivation, and possible L2 selves: An examination in the Iranian EFL context. *Language Learning*, 62(2), 571–594.
- Park, G. (2012). “I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNEST”: One teacher’s journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 127–151.
- Pavlenko, A. (2003). “I never knew I was a bilingual”: Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 251–268.
- Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning. In C. J. & D. C. (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 15, pp. 669–680). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Peterson, C. C. (1980). Are young people biased against older teachers? *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 136(2), 309–310. doi:10.1080/00221325.1980.10534129
- Quasthoff, U., & Hallsteinsdóttir, E. (2016). Stereotype in Webkorpora: Strategien zur Suche in sehr großen Datenmengen. *Linguistik online*, 79(5), 347–379.
- Raufelder, D., Nitsche, L., Breitmeyer, S., Keßler, S., Herrmann, E., & Regner, N. (2016). Students’ perception of “good” and “bad” teachers: Results of a qualitative thematic analysis with German adolescents. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 57(10), 31–44.

- Raufelder, D., Scherber, S., & Wood, M. A. (2016). The interplay between adolescents' perceptions of teacher-student relationships and their academic self-regulation: Does liking a specific teacher matter? *Psychology in the Schools*, 53(7), 736–750.
- Resch, S. (2008). 'Vorsprung durch Deutsch?': Reflections on the perception of Germany and the German language in New Zealand. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, 34, 8–13.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning* (pp. 895–911). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Roach, K. D. (1997). Effects of graduate teaching assistant attire on student learning, misbehaviors, and ratings of instruction. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(3), 125–141.
doi:10.1080/01463379709370056
- Rovai, A. P. (2002). Development of an instrument to measure classroom community. *Internet and Higher Education*, 5, 197–211.
- Rowe, W. E. (2014). Positionality. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research* (pp. 628). London: SAGE Publications.
- Russ, T. L., Simonds, C. J., & Hunt, S. K. (2002). Coming out in the classroom ... an occupational hazard?: The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. *Communication Education*, 51(3), 311–324.
- Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37(1), 57–69.
- Sánchez, C. A. G., Scholes Gilings de Gonzáles, B., & Lopez Martinez, C. d. J. (2013). The impact of teacher-student relationships on EFL learning. *HOW: A Columbian Journal for Teachers of English*, 20(1), 116–129.
- Sánchez, M. M., Pecino, R. M., Rodríguez, Y. T., & Melero, P. T. (2011). Student perspectives on the university professor role. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 39(4), 491–496.
doi:10.2224/sbp.2011.39.4.491
- Schoel, C., Roessel, J., Jacobsen, A., & Stahlberg, D. (2014). Communication of stereotypes in the classroom: Biased language use of German and Turkish adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(4), 266–277. doi:10.1111/jasp.12213
- Schulz, R. A., & Haerle, B. M. (1995). "Beer, fast cars, and ...": Stereotypes held by U.S. college-level students of German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 28(1), 29–39.
- Seedhouse, P. (2008). The interactional architecture of the language classroom. *Babylonia*, 3(8), 22–24.
- Sercu, L. (1998). In-service teacher training and the acquisition of intercultural competence. In M. Byram & M. Flemming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 255–289). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Sharipova, N. (2015). Образование с точки зрения гендерного знания [Education in terms of gender knowledge] (Proceedings of Hujand State University named after academician B.G. Gafurov). *Journal of Humanities*, 1(42), 233–235.
- Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2010). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Siming, L., Niamatullah, Gao, J., Xu, D., & Shafi, K. (2015). Factors leading to students' satisfaction in the higher learning institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(31), 114–118.
- Singer, G. (2016). Fremdsprachendidaktik anhand von Literatur: Reflexion über Stereotype [Foreign language didactics through literature: Reflections on stereotypes]. *Linguistik online*, 79(5), 165–177. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.13092/lo.79.3341>
- Spencer-Rodgers, J. (2001). Consensual and individual stereotypic beliefs about international students among American host nationals. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(6), 639–657.
- Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: The importance of teacher-student relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(4), 457–477.
- Stapf, K. H., Stroebe, W., & Jonas, K. (1986). *Amerikaner über Deutschland und die Deutschen* [Americans about Germany and the Germans]. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Stark, P., Ottoboni, K., & Boring, A. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*. doi:10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1
- Stein, J.-P., Lu, X., & Ohler, P. (2019). Mutual perceptions of Chinese and German students at a German university: Stereotypes, media influence, and evidence for a negative contact hypothesis. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 49(6), 943–963. doi:10.1080/03057925.2018.1477579
- Sterba, S. K., & Foster, E. M. (2008). Self-selected sample. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (pp. 807–808). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Taie, M., & Afshari, A. (2015). A critical review on the socio-educational model of SLA. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(3). doi:10.17507/tpls.0503.21
- Taylor, I. C. (1977). Beware of cultural clichés. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 10(2), 108–114.
- Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(4), 681–709. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263116000243>
- The Modern Language Association of America. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher Education: New structures for a changed world*. Retrieved from Profession: <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>

- Thompson, A. S. (2017). Language learning motivation in the United States: An examination of language choice and multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 483–500.
- Thompson, A. S., & Fioramonte, A. (2012). Nonnative speaker teachers of Spanish: Insights from novice teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(4), 564–579.
- Thompson, A. S., & Vásquez, C. (2015). Exploring motivational profiles through language learning narratives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 158–174.
- Trentman, E. (2013). Imagined communities and language learning during study abroad: Arabic learners in Egypt. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46(4), 545–564. doi:10.1111/flan.12054
- Tsiplakides, I., Street, N., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: Theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 39–44.
- Tusting, K., Crawshaw, R., & Callen, B. (2002). I know, 'cos I was there: How residence abroad students use personal experience to legitimate cultural generalizations. *Discourse & Society*, 13(5), 651–672. doi:10.1177/0957926502013005278
- Ultanir, G., Ultanir, E., & Irkorucu, A. (2016). A comparison of stereotypes of German and Turkish students towards Balkans. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(1), 93–106. doi:10.12973/iji.2016.918a
- Ushioda, E. (2016). Thinking allowed: Language learning motivation through a small lens: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 564–577. doi:10.1017/s0261444816000173
- Ushioda, E. (2017). The impact of global English on motivation to learn other languages: Toward an ideal multilingual self. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 469–482.
- Vaisse, J. (2003). American francophobia takes a new turn. *French Politics, Culture & Society*, 21(1), 17–33.
- Vannini, P. (2012). Situatedness. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 815–816). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan. *Sage Open*, 1–9. doi:10.1177/2158244014534451
- Wang, D. (2014). Effects of study abroad on teachers' self-perceptions: A study of Chinese EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(1), 70–79.
- Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. Retrieved from Wenger-Trayner.com website: <http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf>
- Wenger, E. (2010). Communities of practice and social learning systems: The career of a concept. In C. Blackmore (Ed.), *Social learning systems and communities of practice* (pp. 179–198). London: Springer.

- Wernicke, M. (2017). Navigating native-speaker ideologies as FSL teacher. *The Canadian Modern Language Review-La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 73(2), 208–236. doi:10.3138/cmlr.2951
- White, K. D. (2015). Orientations and access to German-speaking communities in virtual environments. In E. Dixon & M. Thomas (Eds.), *Researching language learners interactions online: From social media to MOOCs* (Vol. 13, pp. 303–321). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.
- White, K. D. (2016). Students' perspectives on Communities-oriented goals. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 124–145. doi:10.1111/flan.12175
- Wilcox, P., Winn, S., & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': The role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(6), 707–722.
- Wolff, D., & De Costa, P. I. (2017). Expanding the language teacher identity landscape: An investigation of the emotions and strategies of a NNEST. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(Supplement), 76–90.
- You, C. J., Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2016). Motivation, vision, and gender: A survey of learners of English in China. *Language Learning*, 66(1), 94–123. doi:10.1111/lang.12140
- Zayac, R. M., & Lenhard, W. (2018). Characteristics of master teachers: German university students' perceptions of high-quality instruction. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2018(156), 67–74. doi:10.1002/tl.20318
- Zhang, C., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Language teacher identity construction: Insights from non-native Chinese-speaking teachers in a Danish higher educational context. *Global Chinese*, 4(2), 271–291. doi:10.1515/glochi-2018-0013

Appendix A – IRB Approval

Appendix A.1 – IRB Approval Letter for SBS 2017-0832



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB

8/23/2017

Submission ID number: [2017-0832](#)

Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities

Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ

Point-of-contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE

IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIEN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced initial application. The study was approved by the IRB member for the period of 12 months with the expiration date of 8/22/2018. The study qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110 in that the study presents no more than minimal risk and involves:

Category 7: Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Prior to starting research activities, please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (http://www.irb.wisc.edu/documents/Principal_Investigator_Responsibilities.pdf) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

Please contact the appropriate IRB office with general questions: Health Sciences IRBs at 608-263-2362 or Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.2 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP001



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB

9/15/2017

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP001](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member for the remainder of the approval period. This study expires on 8/22/2018. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (http://www.irb.wisc.edu/documents/Principal_Investigator_Responsibilities.pdf) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

Please contact the appropriate IRB office with general questions: Health Sciences IRBs at 608-263-2362 or Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.3 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP002



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB 10/11/2017

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP002](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIEN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.4 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP003



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB 11/21/2017

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP003](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIEN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.5 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP004



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB 1/8/2018

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP004](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.6 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP005



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB 1/25/2018

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP005](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE, JEANNE M SCHUELLER
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIEN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.7 – IRB Change of Protocol Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CP006



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB

4/17/2018

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CP006](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-Contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE, JEANNE M SCHUELLER
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix A.8 – IRB Continuing Review Progress Report Letter for SBS 2017-0832-CR001



Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB

11/2/2018

Submission ID number: [2017-0832-CR001](#)
Title: Students, Teachers, and Their Relationships in Foreign Language Classroom Communities
Principal Investigator: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ
Point-of-contact: MONIKA MARIA T CHAVEZ, LUCIAN ROTHE, JEANNE M SCHUELLER
IRB Staff Reviewer: CASEY PELLIN

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced continuing review progress report form. As part of its review, the IRB determined this study does not require continuing review either under federal regulations or institutional policy, or both. Please note, however, that although this study is not required to undergo continuing review, you must still submit the following to the IRB:

1. Changes of protocol prior to their implementation (unless the change is necessary to eliminate an apparent immediate hazard to subjects)
2. Addition of new study personnel
3. Funding updates
4. Reportable events (unanticipated problems, noncompliance, new information) in accordance with institutional policy
5. Closure report

In addition, please be aware that the type of funding that supports a study or whether the study falls under FDA regulations can affect whether continuing review may be required in future.

The study qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110:

Category 7: Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms and recruitment materials, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group99/shared/BSIR>), which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting personnel changes, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

Appendix B – Main Questionnaire

Appendix B.1 – Main Questionnaire: Consent Form

Lucian Rothe
Ph.D. Candidate in German and Second Language Acquisition
Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic
University of Wisconsin - Madison



Study: Classroom Communities – Main Survey

Dear German Language Student,

My name is Lucian Rothe and I am a Ph.D. student in the Department of German, Nordic, & Slavic. For my doctoral research, I would like to explore student and teacher thoughts about various aspects of foreign language classroom environments. I am asking for your participation in my research on "Classroom Communities."

This survey will take about 90-120 minutes to complete. Please give me your frank assessment of your experiences in your foreign language classrooms. There are no correct or incorrect answers and your responses will be confidential. In order to assess trends and offer possible explanations, I will also ask you about your background and to create a personal code, which only you will know and will use throughout this study. This information will be used to group responses for analysis. Furthermore, at the end of this survey, you will need to provide your name and email address if you are interested in participating in further components of the study and/or a cash prize drawing. If you agree to participate in further components and/or the cash prize drawing and provide your contact information, you may be contacted at a later date to participate in further components of the study and/or to inform you about the results of the cash prize drawing. In order to protect your privacy, the last two sections of this survey ("Further components of the study" and "Cash Prize Drawing") with your name and email address will be destroyed once all components of this study have been conducted, ensuring that your data is not linked with that name and email address.

If you are in possession of this survey, it means that your instructor has allowed me to distribute it to you. Your instructor will never have access to your survey. I will distribute this survey only once this semester. However, your participation is voluntary and has no bearing on your grade or standing in this course. You can withdraw from the study any time. If you have any questions, please email me (rothe2@wisc.edu), or the Principal Investigator and advisor of my dissertation, Monika Chavez (mmchavez@wisc.edu).

Please keep this information for your records.

Please note: You **must be 18 years or older to participate** in this study.

Are there any risks to me?

There is a risk of breach of confidentiality, e.g., by juxtaposing individual pieces of information (e.g. by using your personal code) that together indicate a high probability of the respondent being a specific person. However, this risk is minimized by the fact that the data is secured safely and only study team members (the researcher and his advisor) will have access to the data.

Furthermore, the last section of this survey asks for directly identifiable information (your name and email address) if you decide to participate in further components of the study and/or a cash prize drawing. However, in order to protect your privacy, the last two sections of this survey ("Further components of the study" and "Cash Prize Drawing") with your name and email address will be destroyed once all components of this study have been conducted, ensuring that your data is not linked with that name and email address.

Are there any direct benefits to me?

There are no direct benefits to you.

Will I be compensated for participating in this study?

Yes, you will receive **\$5 for completion of this survey**. There may also be an opportunity to participate in **further components of the study (for up to \$35)** later this semester if you provide your contact information at the end of this survey. The two additional components of the study, explained in greater detail at the end of the survey, include **focus group discussions** and **written descriptive tasks**. Furthermore, all first-year German, Spanish, and Russian students can enter a **drawing for cash prizes of 1x \$50, 2x \$30, 3x \$20, 4x \$10, and 10x \$5**. At the end of this survey, you can provide your contact information if you are interested in participating in further components of the study and/or the drawing.

Lucian Rothe
Ph.D. Candidate in German and Second Language Acquisition
Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic
University of Wisconsin - Madison



Until what date can I return the survey?

You will have one week to complete the survey.

How can I return the survey?

If you agree to complete this survey, you can choose from **ONE** of several ways of returning the completed survey to me:

- **OPTION 1:** I will come to your class approximately one week after distribution to collect the completed student surveys. You may give me your survey at that time in return for \$5 directly at this [time](#);
- **OPTION 2:** Place it in my mailbox in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic Van Hise 818 – My mailbox is one of the wooden mailboxes inside the main office; choose the box labeled “Rothe.” Keep in mind the office is open only from 8:30am – 12pm and from 1 – 4pm. You will need to provide your email address or other method of contact so that I can arrange payment of your \$5;
- **OPTION 3:** Send a message to rothe2@wisc.edu to arrange a time and place to drop off the survey directly with me. You will receive your \$5 once you dropped off the survey.

Please contact me with any questions at rothe2@wisc.edu.

Thank you very much for your participation!

Lucian Rothe

Appendix B.2 – Main Questionnaire: Demographics Section

German Student – Questionnaire (A)

Personal Code (6 digits): first 2 letters of birth city + your birth month (TWO digits) + the last two digits of your phone number.

For example, if you were born in Detroit in June (06) and your phone number is 123-4567 your code name would be DE0667.

PERSONAL CODE:

1. Please check the boxes that best describe who you are.

age: _____ years old

gender: ☐ male ☐ female ☐ other ☐ prefer not to say

home country: ☐ USA ☐ other (please specify): _____

home state: ☐ Wisconsin ☐ Illinois ☐ Minnesota ☐ other (please specify): _____

What is your native language? _____

Which languages have you studied formally at the UW or elsewhere? Mark all that apply!

☐ German ☐ Russian ☐ Spanish ☐ French ☐ other (please specify): _____

For which type of language class are you completing THIS SURVEY? Please mark only one!

☐ German ☐ Russian ☐ Spanish ☐ French

What is the course meeting time of THIS course? (Please circle one)

MTWRF 8:50-9:40am MTWRF 9:55-10:45am MTWRF 11:00-11:50am

MTWRF 12:05-12:55pm MTWRF 1:20-2:10pm MTWRF 2:25-3:15pm MWR 3:30-4:50pm

What would you estimate your current German grade to be?

☐ A ☐ AB ☐ B ☐ BC ☐ C ☐ D ☐ Other

What final grade do you expect in your German course?

☐ A ☐ AB ☐ B ☐ BC ☐ C ☐ D ☐ Other

2. Please check the boxes that best describe your current teacher of German.

gender of current German teacher: ☐ male ☐ female ☐ other ☐ prefer not to say

Is your teacher a native speaker of German?

☐ 0% ☐ 25% ☐ 50% ☐ 75% ☐ 100%
 most certainly NO probably NO equally likely probably YES most certainly YES

3. Please check the boxes that best describe your interactions with native speakers of German. Please be reminded that some of these questions may sound odd to you. However, for comparative reasons, students and teachers must answer nearly similar questions.

Item	Question	Range	Response
3.1	How many native speakers of German have you met in person?	0	
		1-3	
		4-6	
		7-15	
		more than 15	
3.2	How many native speakers of German have you seen or interacted with via public media (e.g. film, TV)?	0	
		1-3	
		4-6	
		7-15	
		more than 15	

Item	Question	Range	Response
3.3	How many native speakers of German have you <u>observed or interacted with on social media</u> ?	0	
		1-3	
		4-6	
		7-15	
		more than 15	
3.4	For how much <u>time in total</u> have you spoken at least some German with native speakers of German?	0 minutes	
		1 minutes to 1 hour	
		more than 1 hour but less than 10 hours	
		more than 10 hours but less than a week	
		more than a week but less than a month	
		more than a month	

4. Please indicate your proficiency level below from several perspectives but always on a scale between 0% and 100%.

item	Language Proficiency (0% - 100%)
4.1	This is how I would rate my German language proficiency compared to that of my classmates. (0% = [I am the worst student in class] vs. 50% = [I am an average student in the class] vs. 100% = [I am the best student in class])
4.2	This is how my teacher would rate my German language proficiency compared to that of my classmates. (0% = [I am the worst student in class] vs. 50% = [I am an average student in the class] vs. 100% = [I am the best student in class])
4.3	This is how most other students in class would rate my German language proficiency compared to their own. (0% = [I am the worst student in class] vs. 50% = [I am an average student in the class] vs. 100% = [I am the best student in class])
4.4	This is how I would rate my German language proficiency compared to that of a native speaker of German. (0% = [no German knowledge at all] vs. 100% = [exactly like a native speaker])
4.5	This is how a native speaker of German would rate my German language proficiency compared to his/her own. (0% = [no German knowledge at all] vs. 100% = [exactly like his/her proficiency])
4.6	This is how a native speaker of German would rate my German language proficiency compared to that of my classmates. (0% = [no German knowledge at all] vs. 100% = [exactly like a native speaker])

Appendix B.3 – Main Questionnaire: Classroom Community Scale

5. Please check the boxes that best describe your views of your current German class.

How important is it to you to feel a sense of community in your CURRENT language course? Please choose only ONE box that best describes your feelings.

<i>I prefer not to be part of this course.</i>	<i>Not important at all.</i>	<i>Not very important.</i>	<i>Somewhat important.</i>	<i>Important.</i>	<i>Very important.</i>

How well do each of the following statements represent how you feel about your CURRENT language course? For each statement, please choose the ONE box that best describes your view.

ITEMS	Statement	Your Rating				
		<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1	I feel that students in this course care about each other.					
2	I feel that I am encouraged to ask questions.					
3	I feel connected to others in this course.					
4	I feel that it is hard to get help when I have a question.					
5	I do not feel a spirit of community.					
6	I feel that I receive timely feedback.					
7	I feel that this course is like a family.					
8	I feel uneasy exposing gaps in my understanding.					
9	I feel isolated in this course.					
10	I feel reluctant to speak openly.					
11	I trust others in this course.					
12	I feel that this course results in only modest learning.					
13	I feel that I can rely on others in this course.					
14	I feel that other students do not help me learn.					
15	I feel that members of this course depend on me.					
16	I feel that I am given ample opportunities to learn.					
17	I feel uncertain about others in this course.					
18	I feel that my educational needs are not being met.					
19	I feel confident that others will support me.					
20	I feel that this course does not promote a desire to learn.					

Appendix B.4 – Main Questionnaire: Learning Section

6. Please determine how well each of the criteria listed below match the requirements of your German course as they are laid out in the syllabus. Assign a percentage of 0 (no match/total divergence) to 100 (perfect match/no divergence).

<i>item</i>	How would you assess the match between the course requirements as laid out in the syllabus and each of the following:	<i>Percentage 0 (total divergence) to 100 (perfect match)</i>
6.1	Your teacher's application and interpretation of these requirements.	
6.2	Your personal interests (what you want to learn, emphasize, etc.)	
6.3	Your teacher's personal interests (what he/she wants you to learn, emphasize, etc.)	
6.4	Your skills and abilities (what you are good at).	
6.5	Your teacher's skills and abilities (what he/she is good at).	
6.6	Your efforts (what you allocate your time and effort to).	
6.7	Your teacher's efforts (what he/she allocates his/her time and effort to).	
6.8	Others, please specify:	

7. What or who, do you imagine, determines how the syllabus is laid out? Please assign each potential contributor a score that reflects its relative degree of influence.

Assign 0 to a potential contributor with no influence at all and 10 to a potential contributor that is decisive. You can assign any score including and between 0 and 10 and use the same score multiple times.

<i>item</i>	<u>Who</u> , do you imagine, determines how the syllabus is laid out?	<i>Score including and between 0 - 10</i>
7.1	The individual teacher.	
7.2	The group of teachers that teach this course.	
7.3	The supervisor of the language program.	
7.4	The German department faculty.	
7.5	The college/ university.	
7.6	The students.	
7.7	Other (please specify, if applicable):	

<i>item</i>	<u>What considerations</u> , do you imagine, determine how the syllabus is laid out?	<i>Score including and between 0 - 10</i>
7.8	The individual teacher's interests and personal disposition.	
7.9	The individual teacher's beliefs about language learning.	
7.10	The individual teacher's skills, expertise, and abilities.	
7.11	The individual teacher's knowledge of research and professional best practices.	
7.12	The course supervisor's interests and personal disposition.	
7.13	The course supervisor's beliefs about language learning.	
7.14	The course supervisor's skills, expertise, and abilities.	
7.15	The course supervisor's knowledge of research and professional best practices.	
7.16	The students' interests and personal dispositions.	
7.17	The students' beliefs about language learning.	
7.18	The students' skills, expertise, and abilities.	
7.19	The students' knowledge of research and professional best practices.	

8. Please complete the following statements about learning in a GERMAN classroom.

<i>item</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Your Answer</i>
8.1	In order to promote learning GERMAN in the most effective way, a teacher ...	
8.2	In order to promote learning GERMAN in the most effective way, a student ...	

9. Please answer the following questions.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Your Answer</i>
If you had to describe the job of a German teacher , what would be some essential components of the task ?	

10. Please complete the following statements about GERMAN by writing a saying or giving a metaphoric comparison.

<i>item</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Your Saying OR Metaphoric Comparison</i>
10.1	A GOOD TEACHER of GERMAN is like	
10.2	A BAD TEACHER of GERMAN is like ...	
10.3	LEARNING GERMAN is like ...	
10.4	TEACHING GERMAN is like...	

11. Please answer the first question (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. Then, rate how well each of the words describe the worst and best teacher of German that you have ever had. The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>5 Essential Qualities</i> (order bears no implications)	How much does the WORST teacher of German that you have ever had possess each of these qualities? 0% [not at all present] vs. 100% [fully present]	How much does the BEST teacher of German that you have ever had possess each of these qualities? 0% [not at all present] vs. 100% [fully present]
11.0. 1/2/3	What essential qualities characterize an IDEAL TEACHER of GERMAN?	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

11.1 Please re-enter the same 5 qualities that characterize an ideal teacher of German from the table above (item 11). Then, rate what percentage of native speaker/non-native speaker/male/female teachers of German each term applies to, in your estimation between 0% (none) to 100% (all).

<i>item</i>	Essential qualities characterizing an IDEAL TEACHER of German [copy from table above]	Percentage of ... (between 0% [none] to 100% [all])			
		...Native Speaker Teachers of German	...Non-Native Speaker Teachers of German	...Male Teachers of German	...Female Teachers of German
11.1.1	1.				
11.1.2	2.				
11.1.3	3.				
11.1.4	4.				
11.1.5	5.				

12. Please answer the first question (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. Then, rate how well each of the words describe the worst and best teacher of German that you have ever had. The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>5 Essential Qualities</i> (order bears no implications)	How much does the WORST teacher of German that you have ever had possess each of these qualities? 0% [not at all present] vs. 100% [fully present]	How much does the BEST teacher of German that you have ever had possess each of these qualities? 0% [not at all present] vs. 100% [fully present]
12. 1/2/3	What essential qualities characterize a <u>NIGHTMARE TEACHER of GERMAN?</u>	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

12.1 Please re-enter the same 5 qualities that characterize a nightmare teacher of German from the table above (item 12). Then, rate what percentage of native speaker/non-native speaker/male/female teachers of German each term applies to, in your estimation between 0% (none) to 100% (all).

<i>item</i>	Essential qualities characterizing a <u>NIGHTMARE TEACHER of German</u> [copy from table above]	Percentage of ... (between 0% [none] to 100% [all])			
		...Native Speaker Teachers of German	...Non-Native Speaker Teachers of German	...Male Teachers of German	...Female Teachers of German
12.1.1	1.				
12.1.2	2.				
12.1.3	3.				
12.1.4	4.				
12.1.5	5.				

13. Please answer the following questions by using 3 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	What 3 essential qualities characterize an IDEAL DOCTOR? (order bears no implications)	What 3 essential qualities characterize a NIGHTMARE DOCTOR? (order bears no implications)
13.1/2	1.	1.
	2.	2.
	3.	3.
13.3/4	What 3 essential qualities characterize an IDEAL LAWYER? (order bears no implications)	What 3 essential qualities characterize a NIGHTMARE LAWYER? (order bears no implications)
	1.	1.
	2.	2.
13.5/6	3.	3.
	What 3 essential qualities characterize an IDEAL SOCIAL WORKER? (order bears no implications)	What 3 essential qualities characterize a NIGHTMARE SOCIAL WORKER? (order bears no implications)
	1.	1.
	2.	2.
	3.	3.

14. Please answer the questions (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. Then, rate how well each of the words describe you. The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>5 Essential Qualities</i> <i>(order bears no implications)</i>	How well does each of these words describe you? 0% [not at all] vs. 100% [completely]
14.1/2	What 5 essential qualities characterize an IDEAL STUDENT of GERMAN?	1.	1.
		2.	2.
		3.	3.
		4.	4.
		5.	5.
14.3/4	What 5 essential qualities characterize a NIGHTMARE STUDENT of GERMAN?	1.	1.
		2.	2.
		3.	3.
		4.	4.
		5.	5.

To aid your imagination, you will be presented with some metaphoric situations below. Please follow directions and know that there are no correct or incorrect answers.

15. How frequently do interactions between the people below play out like this? Please rate each scenario on a scale between 0% of the time and 100% of the time.

<i>item</i>		Interactions between yourself and a NATIVE SPEAKER of GERMAN (% of the time)	Interactions between yourself and a TEACHER of GERMAN (% of the time)
15.1/2	Playing in a band with a kindhearted band teacher.		
15.3/4	Being on a plane with an attentive flight attendant taking care of the passengers.		
15.5/6	Dancing with a partner who is taking a strong lead.		
15.7/8	Having an enjoyable evening at the movies by yourself.		

16. Please choose 3-5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own that describe that you associate with (a) yourself and (b) the other person in each of the four scenarios.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	Scenario	3-5 words that describe you	3-5 words that describe the other person
16.1/2	You are playing in a band led by a kindhearted band teacher.	1.	1.
		2.	2.
		3.	3.
		4.	4.
		5.	5.
16.3/4	You are on a plane with an attentive flight attendant taking care of the passengers.	1.	1.
		2.	2.
		3.	3.
		4.	4.
		5.	5.
16.5/6	You are dancing with a partner who is taking a strong lead.	1.	1.
		2.	2.
		3.	3.
		4.	4.
		5.	5.
16.7	You are having an enjoyable evening at the movies by yourself.	1.	NOT APPLICABLE
		2.	
		3.	
		4.	
		5.	

17. You will read four metaphors that have been used to characterize the teacher-student relationship. Please describe for each (a) what attitudes and behaviors you would associate with a teacher; (b) what attitudes and behaviors you would associate with the students; and (c) on 11-point scales, answer three questions that gauge how you would experience such a class.

Metaphor 1:

The teacher-student relationship should be like playing in a band with a kindhearted band teacher.

item	Teacher's Attitudes and Behaviors
17. 1	
	Students' Attitudes and Behaviors
17. 2	
17. 3	This is how much I would like such a teacher-student relationship...
17. 4	This is how I would describe myself in a class with such a teacher-student relationship...
17. 5	This is how much I would learn in a class with such a teacher-student relationship...

Metaphor 3:

The teacher-student relationship should be like dancing with a partner who is taking a strong lead. There are, however, certain responsibilities for both dancing partners.

item	Teacher's Attitudes and Behaviors
17. 11	
	Students' Attitudes and Behaviors
17. 12	
17. 13	This is how much I would like such a teacher-student relationship... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 totally hate it totally love it
17. 14	This is how I would describe myself in a class with such a teacher-student relationship... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 totally disengaged totally engaged
17. 15	This is how much I would learn in a class with such a teacher-student relationship... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 nothing at all everything that one could possibly learn in this class

18. Please choose a metaphor or comparison to complete each statement (for example: a game with no winners). Then, try to explain what may have prompted you to choose this metaphor or comparison.

item	Complete the statement in the column to the right...➡	...with this metaphor or comparison.	What considerations might have prompted you to choose this metaphor?
18. 1/2	As a student of German, I would <u>love</u> to envision my relationship with the teacher like... [describe a metaphor or comparison]		
18. 3/4	As a student of German, I would <u>hate</u> to envision my relationship with the teacher like ... [describe a metaphor or comparison]		
18. 5/6	I would <u>love</u> to have a teacher of German who envisions the teacher-student relationship like... [describe the teacher's metaphor or comparison]		
18. 7/8	I would <u>hate</u> to have a teacher of German who envisions the teacher-student relationship like... [describe the teacher's metaphor or comparison]		

19. For the following questions, please indicate the relative proportions (a fraction of 100%) in which (1) students, (2) teachers, and (3) other considerations contribute to the TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP. The larger the contribution the higher the percentage. The total of the three proportions need to add up to 100%. Last, please give examples of what could be included under 'other.'

Example:

Proportions: Rating between 0% and 100%			
TEACHER	STUDENT	OTHER	
50	40	10	=100%

items	Questions	Proportions: Rating between 0% and 100%			
		TEACHER	STUDENT	OTHER	
19.1	How much <u>DO</u> students, the teacher, and other considerations, respectively, contribute to how TEACHER AND STUDENTS relate to each other?				=100%
19.2	How much <u>SHOULD</u> students, the teacher, and other considerations respectively, contribute to how TEACHER AND STUDENTS relate to each other?				=100%
19.3	If you assigned a percentage to "other", please give examples of what this "other" can be.				

20. What actions and attitudes on the students' part contribute to the TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP?

Students' Actions and Attitudes

21. What actions and attitudes on the teacher's part contribute to the TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP?

Students' Actions and Attitudes

22. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of TEACHERS OF GERMAN who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her students.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	FEMALE teacher of German who has a GOOD relationship with her students	FEMALE teacher of German who has a BAD relationship with her students	MALE teacher of German who has a GOOD relationship with his students	MALE teacher of German who has a BAD relationship with his students
22. 1/2/ 3/4				

23. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of STUDENTS OF GERMAN who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her teacher.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	FEMALE student of German who has a GOOD relationship with her teacher	FEMALE student of German who has a BAD relationship with her teacher	MALE student of German who has a GOOD relationship with his teacher	MALE student of German who has a BAD relationship with his teacher
23. 1/2/ 3/4				

24. For the following questions, please indicate the relative proportions (a fraction of 100%) in which (1) students, (2) teachers, and (3) other considerations contribute to the STUDENT-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP. The larger the contribution the higher the percentage. The total of the three proportions need to add up to 100%. Last, please give examples of what could be included under 'other.'

Example:

Proportions: Rating between 0% and 100%			
TEACHER	STUDENT	OTHER	
50	40	10	=100%

items	Questions	Proportions: Rating between 0% and 100%			
		TEACHER	STUDENT	OTHER	
24.1	How much <u>DO</u> students, the teacher, and other considerations, respectively, contribute to how STUDENTS relate to each other ?				=100%
24.2	How much <u>SHOULD</u> students, the teacher, and other considerations respectively, contribute to how STUDENTS relate to each other ?				=100%
24.3	If you assigned a percentage to "other", please give examples of what this "other" can be.				

25. What actions and attitudes on the students' part contribute to the STUDENT-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP?

Students' Actions and Attitudes

26. What actions and attitudes on the teacher's part contribute to the STUDENT-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP?

Students' Actions and Attitudes

27. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of STUDENTS OF GERMAN who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her peers.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	FEMALE student of German who has a GOOD relationship with her peers	FEMALE student of German who has a BAD relationship with her peers	MALE student of German who has a GOOD relationship with his peers	MALE student of German who has a BAD relationship with his peers
27. 1/2/ 3/4				

28. Imagine you were speaking to different people in German. How do you imagine (1) you would come across in (a) a best-case; and (b) a worst-case scenario? And how do you imagine (2) the other person to come across in (c) a best-case and (d) in a worst-case scenario. Again, use the word box or provide words of your own.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	You speaking German with Person X	(1a) Words that describe how I come across, <u>best case</u> :	(1b) Words that describe how I come across, <u>worst case</u> :	(2c) Words that describe how the <u>other person</u> comes across, <u>best case</u> :	(2d) Words that describe how the <u>other person</u> comes across, <u>worst case</u> :
28.1	When I speak German to a <u>NON-NATIVE SPEAKER</u> teacher of German.				
28.2	When I speak German to a <u>NATIVE SPEAKER</u> teacher of German.				
28.3	When I speak German to my <u>CLASSMATES</u> .				
28.4	When I speak German to a <u>NATIVE SPEAKER</u> of German who is not a teacher.				

Appendix B.5 – Main Questionnaire: Stereotype Questionnaire

The following questions are related to stereotypes that you have heard about male and female native speakers of German, as well as male and female native speaker teachers of German, and male and female non-native speaker teachers of German. Please be reminded that there are no correct or incorrect answers.

29. What stereotypes have you heard about MALE NATIVE SPEAKERS of GERMAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE native speakers of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

30. What stereotypes have you heard about FEMALE NATIVE SPEAKERS of GERMAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE native speakers of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

31. What stereotypes have you heard about **MALE NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of GERMAN**? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE native speaker TEACHERS of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

32. What stereotypes have you heard about **FEMALE NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of GERMAN**? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE native speaker TEACHERS of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

33. What stereotypes have you heard about MALE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of GERMAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE NON-native speaker TEACHERS of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

34. What stereotypes have you heard about FEMALE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of GERMAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE NON-native speaker TEACHERS of German</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

Appendix B.6 – Main Questionnaire: Other Foreign-Language Section

For comparative purposes, you will now be presented with questions that refer to students and teachers of RUSSIAN. First, would you please tell us whether you have any experience as a student or teacher of Russian. Please check the applicable box. If you answered with yes, describe your experiences briefly.

Do you have any experience as a student or teacher of Russian?

☐ NO

☐ YES, please specify: _____

Next, please answer the following questions regardless of your answer to the question above. If you have no familiarity with teaching or learning Russian, draw on your imagination.

35. Please complete the following statements about learning in a RUSSIAN classroom.

<i>item</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Your Answer</i>
35.1	In order to promote learning RUSSIAN in the most effective way, a teacher ...	
35.2	In order to promote learning RUSSIAN in the most effective way, a student ...	

36. Please answer the following question.

<i>Question</i>	<i>Your Answer</i>
If you had to describe the job of a Russian teacher , what would be some essential components of the task ?	

37. Please complete the following statements about RUSSIAN by writing a saying or giving a metaphoric comparison.

<i>item</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Your Saying OR Metaphoric Comparison</i>
37.1	A GOOD TEACHER of RUSSIAN is like	
37.2	A BAD TEACHER of RUSSIAN is like ...	
37.3	LEARNING RUSSIAN is like ...	
37.4	TEACHING RUSSIAN is like...	

38. Please answer the question (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. Then, rate what percentage of native speaker/non-native speaker/male/female teachers of Russian each term applies to, in your estimation between 0% (none) to 100% (all). The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	What 5 essential Qualities characterize an IDEAL TEACHER of RUSSIAN? (order bears no implications)	Percentage of ... (between 0% [none] to 100% [all])			
		...Native Speaker Teachers of Russian	...Non-Native Speaker Teachers of Russian	...Male Teachers of Russian	...Female Teachers of Russian
38. 1/ 2/3/ 4/5	1.				
	2.				
	3.				
	4.				
	5.				

39. Please answer the question (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. Then, rate what percentage of native speaker/non-native speaker/male/female teachers of Russian each term applies to, in your estimation between 0% (none) to 100% (all). The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	What 5 essential Qualities characterize a <u>NIGHTMARE TEACHER of RUSSIAN?</u> (order bears no implications)	Percentage of ... (between 0% [none] to 100% [all])			
		...Native Speaker Teachers of Russian	...Non-Native Speaker Teachers of Russian	...Male Teachers of Russian	...Female Teachers of Russian
39. 1/ 2/3/ 4/5	1.				
	2.				
	3.				
	4.				
	5.				

40. Please answer the questions (second column from the left) by using 5 words from the word box below AND/OR provide words of your own. The order in which you list the words bears no implications!

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

<i>item</i>	<i>Questions</i>	<i>5 Essential Qualities</i> (order bears no implications)
40.1	What essential qualities characterize an <u>IDEAL STUDENT</u> <u>of RUSSIAN?</u>	1.
		2.
		3.
		4.
		5.
40.2	What essential qualities characterize a <u>NIGHTMARE STUDENT</u> <u>of RUSSIAN?</u>	1.
		2.
		3.
		4.
		5.

41. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of **TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN** who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her students.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	<u>FEMALE teacher of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with her students	<u>FEMALE teacher of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with her students	<u>MALE teacher of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with his students	<u>MALE teacher of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with his students
41. 1/2/ 3/4				

42. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of STUDENTS OF RUSSIAN who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her teacher.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	<u>FEMALE student of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with her teacher	<u>FEMALE student of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with her teacher	<u>MALE student of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with his teacher	<u>MALE student of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with his teacher
42. 1/2/ 3/4				

43. In your view, what qualities characterize the following types of STUDENTS OF RUSSIAN who stand in each of two types of relationships (described below) with his/her peers.

Please use words from the word box AND/OR provide words of your own! You can use every word as often as needed, so one word could occur in more than one column. The order of the words in your list bears no implications.

analytical approachable appropriate arrogant attentive authentic boring caring childish
 communicative collaborative demanding detail-oriented direct disciplined distant dominant dynamic
 empathetic energetic entertaining experienced fair flaky forceful funny gifted happy helpful
 honest humorous inappropriate inconsistent independent informative interesting intolerant
 introverted kind loving motivated narrow-minded natural organized outgoing playful positive
 productive punctual qualified reliable reserved respectful serious social strict strong successful
 superficial supportive talented tolerant transparent trustworthy understanding warm worldly

item	Qualities of a...			
	<u>FEMALE student of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with her peers	<u>FEMALE student of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with her peers	<u>MALE student of Russian</u> who has a GOOD relationship with his peers	<u>MALE student of Russian</u> who has a BAD relationship with his peers
43. 1/2/ 3/4				

The following questions are related to stereotypes that you have heard about male and female native speakers of Russian, as well as male and female native speaker teachers of Russian, and male and female non-native speaker teachers of Russian. Please be reminded that there are no correct or incorrect answers.

44. What stereotypes have you heard about MALE NATIVE SPEAKERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE native speakers of Russian</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

45. What stereotypes have you heard about FEMALE NATIVE SPEAKERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE native speakers of Russian</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

46. What stereotypes have you heard about MALE NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE native speaker TEACHERS of Russian</u>	Score <i>0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)</i>

47. What stereotypes have you heard about FEMALE NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE native speaker TEACHERS of Russian</u>	Score <i>0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)</i>

48. What stereotypes have you heard about MALE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>MALE NON-native speaker TEACHERS of Russian</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

49. What stereotypes have you heard about FEMALE NON-NATIVE SPEAKER TEACHERS of RUSSIAN? Please describe all stereotypes in the column on the left AND indicate how accurate you believe each stereotype is by assigning any score including and between 0 (completely inaccurate) and 10 (completely accurate). You can use the same score multiple times.

Stereotypes that you have heard about <u>FEMALE NON-native speaker TEACHERS of Russian</u>	Score 0 (completely inaccurate) to 10 (completely accurate)

Appendix B.7 – Main Questionnaire: Cash Prize Drawing and Further Study Components

Further components of the study

I am looking for (1) up to eight people to participate in a **focus group discussion** (in December) on the questionnaire and some related topics; and (2) up to nine people to participate in two **written descriptive tasks** (in November) about foreign language classroom dynamics.

Participants may receive up to **\$35** if they decide to participate in **both the focus group discussion and written descriptive tasks**; or **\$10** each for the **focus group discussion only** and **\$15** for the **written descriptive tasks only**.

I will contact everyone who responds, however, participation will be limited and I cannot guarantee that everyone who wishes to participate in these components will be able to do so.

Please note: In order to protect your privacy, this section ("Further components of the study") of this survey with your name and email address will be destroyed once all components of this study have been conducted, ensuring that your data is not linked with that name and email address.

	Yes, I am interested in participating in further components of this study! I am interested in...	If you responded yes, please provide your contact information (name and a valid email address) below:
	Both the focus group discussion AND the descriptive tasks [\$35].	Name:
	Focus group discussion only [\$10].	
	Descriptive tasks only [\$15].	Valid email address:
	Either the focus group discussion [\$10] OR the descriptive tasks [\$15].	
	No, I am not interested in further components of this study.	

Cash Prize Drawing (1x \$50, 2x \$30, 3x \$20, 4x \$10, and 10x \$5)

At the end of the semester, I will have a cash prize drawing for cash prizes of **1x \$50, 2x \$30, 3x \$20, 4x \$10, and 10x \$5 for all 101 students!** All first-year German, Spanish, and Russian students and teachers, whether they participated in the study or not, are welcome to enter in their drawing by providing their name and valid email address below or by emailing their contact information to me (rothe2@wisc.edu) by December 1st, 2017. It would be much appreciated, however, if only those students and teachers provide their contact information who have participated in a majority of the research components, namely at least in the classroom community scale surveys and in the mid-October survey.

Yes, I am interested in entering the drawing for one of the cash prizes listed above and have read the guidelines below. By providing my name and valid email address or by emailing my contact information to rothe2@wisc.edu by Friday, December 1st, 2017, I am entering the drawing.

Name:

Valid email address:

Guidelines for cash prize drawing: Each participant who indicates that they are interested in the larger cash prize drawings will be assigned a number. At the end of the study period, I will select numbers using a random number generator and contact the winners. If the winner(s) cannot be contacted (for example, if an invalid email address was provided), another winner(s) will be chosen. If the winner(s) do not reply to me and make arrangements for delivery of payment within fourteen (14) days of contact, the winner forfeits the prize and the researcher will select another number. The odds of winning depend on the number of people of participate in the drawing. All first-year German, Spanish, and Russian students and TAs are invited to participate. **Please note:** In order to protect your privacy, this section ("Cash Prize Drawing") of this survey with your name and email address will be destroyed once all prizes have been distributed, ensuring that your data is not linked with that name and email address.

Thank you very much for your participation!!!

Appendix C – Tables in Appendix

Table 24: Percentage of respondents, ranks, and tiers of all categories of stereotypes pertaining to male/female x NS/NNS teachers

Under RQ 2.2, I presented the relative prevalence of each category of stereotypes about female/male x native-speaker/non-native-speaker teachers of German. Table 10 summarized the findings by grouping the stereotype categories into four tiers without providing the respective percentage of respondents for each stereotype of categories. Table 24 (below) shows all stereotype categories pertaining to male/female x native-speaker/non-native-speaker teachers, including the percentage of respondents, tier, and rank of each category. To visualize the top-two tiers in this table, I highlighted the respective percentage of respondents, as well as the rank and tier number in the following ways: tier-1 categories are highlighted in green, tier-2 categories in yellow, and tier-3 categories in blue.

Category #	Categories of stereotypes	Teachers of German							
		NS				NNS			
		male		female		male		female	
		% of respondents	rank (TIER)	% of respondents	rank (TIER)	% of respondents	rank (TIER)	% of respondents	rank (TIER)
1	promote professional success	11.39	3 (II)	10.72	3 (II)	4.69	4a (III)	6.03	4a (III)
2	promote personal relationships	4.02	7a (III)	8.04	4 (II)	12.06	2a (II)	11.39	2 (II)
3	prevent personal relationships	10.05	4 (II)	6.03	5 (III)	3.35	7 (III)	3.35	6a (III)
4	promote tension or discord	6.70	5 (III)	4.69	6a (III)	2.68	8 (IV)	0.67	9a (IV)
5	unconcerned with resulting tension or discord	20.10	1 (I)	16.75	1a (I)	4.02	6 (III)	6.03	4b (III)
6	deviance from social norms	0.00	14a (IV)	0.67	12a (IV)	1.34	10a (IV)	0.67	9b (IV)
7	political & social views	0.67	13 (IV)	0.00	14a (IV)	0.67	12a (IV)	0.67	9c (IV)
8	appearance	2.68	9 (IV)	2.01	9a (IV)	0.67	12b (IV)	0.00	14a (IV)
9	language	4.69	6 (III)	2.01	9b (IV)	0.67	12c (IV)	0.00	14b (IV)
10	cultural, including culinary, interests	2.01	10a (IV)	2.01	9c (IV)	0.00	15 (IV)	0.67	9d (IV)
11	global situatedness	0.00	14b (IV)	0.00	14b (IV)	2.01	9 (IV)	2.01	8 (IV)
12	age	1.34	12 (IV)	0.67	12b (IV)	1.34	10b (IV)	0.67	9e (IV)
13	promote a positive learning experience	2.01	10b (IV)	2.68	8 (IV)	4.69	4b (III)	3.35	6b (III)
14	impede a positive learning experience	4.02	7b (III)	4.69	6b (III)	10.72	2b (II)	9.38	3 (II)
15	absence of stereotypical attributions	15.41	2 (I)	16.75	1b (I)	18.76	1 (I)	19.43	1 (I)

Table 25: Overview of all stereotype categories pertaining to teachers of German and the verbatim responses assigned to both NS and NNS teachers, uniquely to NS teachers, and uniquely to NNS teachers

Under RQ 2.4, I presented how the specific attributes that were mentioned within prevalent categories compared between stereotypes about native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers of German. Table 25 (below) lists in alphabetical order all verbatim responses that were assigned to each of the 15 categories pertaining to teachers of German, divided by responses that were attributed to both NS and NNS teachers and followed by responses that only applied to either NS teachers or NNS teachers for each of the respective categories.

#	Categories of stereotypes	Verbatim descriptions of stereotypes that were assigned ...		
		... to both NS and NNS teachers of German for prevalent categories	... uniquely to NS teachers of German for prevalent categories	... uniquely to NNS teachers of German for prevalent categories
Attributions related to qualities and behaviors that ...				
1	... are likely to promote professional success	confident; detail-oriented; disciplined; efficient; informative; motivated; organize; organized; precise; punctual; qualified; reliable; smart	always on time; analytical; careful; hard-working; passionate; timely; well-organized; well-oriented	collaborative; dedicated; gifted; productive; relatively timely; responsible; worldly
2	... are likely to promote personal relationships	approachable; appropriate; bubbly; caring; communicative; dynamic; energetic; entertaining; fun; funny; helpful; humorous; kind; nice; positive; supportive; tolerant; understanding; willing to help	calm; friendly; happy-go-lucky; playful; social; talkative; welcoming	accepting; chill; cool; easy to communicate; easy-going; empathetic; engaging; enthusiastic; fair; loving; open-minded; respectful; warm

3	... are likely to prevent personal relationships	boring; cold; distant; serious; unapproachable	calculating; emotionless; less communicative; no sense of humor; non-entertaining; not as extroverted; reserved; shy	introverted; not very communicative
4	... are likely to promote tension or discord	arrogant; rude	always angry; angry; can be mean; mean; mocking; unkind	unfriendly
5	... are unconcerned with possibly resulting tension or discord	demanding; honest; love rules; strict; too honest	critical; detail-demanding; direct; dominant; forceful; hard personalities; harsh; intense; intolerant; love making schedules; rigorous; somehow forceful; stern; straightforward; strong personality; tough; tough personalities	somewhat strict
6	... connote deviance from social norms		eclectic	childish; goofy; inappropriate; strange; weird
7	... describe political & social views		traditionalist	Americanized
8	... describe appearance		blond; masculine; tall; wear Lederhosen	lanky
9	... describe the qualities of the language		appear unfriendly through voice; fast-spoken; loud speakers; spit while talking; strong accents; sound angry; sound unfriendly; overenunciation; yell	hard-spoken
10	... describe cultural [...] interests	active	animal lovers; drink a lot of beer; like chocolate	
11	... describe global situatedness			been to Germany; like Germany; speak multiple languages; well-traveled; went to Germany; would rather live in Germany

12	...reflect age		elderly; typically older	young; youthful
13	... promote a positive learning experience	authentic	after class generally less strict; more experienced; more knowledgeable; more relaxed atmosphere	a little more patient; careful about things they teach; easier on students; leadership; less harsh than native speaker; not strict at all; seem to care a lot about grammar; try hard to be "German-like"; understanding of student struggles
14	... impede a positive learning experience		academically strict; don't understand how we learn their language; harder on students; high expectations; impatient; intolerant of errors; judge your understanding; leave you to learn on your own; ununderstandable	are not German; are not authentic; aren't as qualified as a native German speaker; aren't as qualified as native speakers; different ways of pronouncing 'r's based on whom they've learned German from; difficulty to teach pronunciations; don't actually know how native speakers talk; don't know what they are doing; don't speak German correctly all the time; don't understand some German words; give very hard tests; grammatic errors; harder to teach pronunciations; have accents; have unnatural German accents; high maintenance; lack of enough knowledge; lack of vocabulary knowledge; lacking in talent; less informed; no confidence when they teach; not as good as a native; not as good of a grasp of the language as a native; not qualified; unfamiliar with Germans; with accent

15	... reflect an insistence on the absence of stereotypical attributions	haven't heard any; I have not heard stereotypes; I haven't heard any; I just have not encountered any stereotypes this specific; I've heard no stereotypes; N/A; none; none heard; nothing	I don't know German teacher stereotypes; I haven't heard anything	honestly, I haven't heard any; I don't know any; I have no idea on this question; I have not been exposed to any stereotypes; I've also never heard any for female non-natives; sorry, I never heard any stereotypes
----	---	--	---	--