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Abstract

This purpose of this study was to examine the motivation of first-year female Japanese university students towards university study in general and towards the study of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in particular. The study used Maehr’s multiple goal model of Personal Investment (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986), as its theoretical basis. Two forms of a bilingual Inventory of University Motivation (IUM) were created. One refers to university study in general, the IUM-Gen; the other refers specifically to the study of EFL, the IUM-Eng. The two forms of the IUM were adaptations of McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) (McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995), and were also translated into Japanese and then back-translated. Data from these questionnaires were collected from 501 first year university students at a Japanese women’s university and analysed using four sets of exploratory Principal Components Analyses (PCA). These analyses produced clear scales with solid loadings, thus supporting the construct validity of the instrument. Each scale had strong reliability as measured by Cronbach’s alpha.

Mean scales, based on the items loading on the derived factors, were used to develop an overall motivational profile of the students. Some features of this profile contradicted strongly held beliefs about Japanese university students’ lack of motivation, as well as about their supposed collectivist qualities. Other features provided support for the argument that the study of EFL is important to female Japanese university students, suggesting that English ability is perceived as a skill which can provide them with attractive personal and professional possibilities.
Abstract

Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were conducted, with the independent variable being the three university departments to which the students belonged, in order to determine the significant differences amongst these three groups of students on these scales. As expected, students in the Department of British and American Studies were found to have significantly higher values for most of the scales of the IUM-Eng than students in either of the other two departments. Surprisingly, similar significant differences were also produced on the majority of scales of the IUM-Gen, suggesting that there is an important relationship between EFL motivation and general university study motivation for female Japanese university students.

Outcome measures of academic English proficiency as measured by Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) scores, and end-of-semester grades for compulsory English classes, were also collected from the students. Multiple regression analyses were performed using the resulting scales of the IUM-Gen and IUM-Eng separately against the above outcome measures. Significant relationships were found between some of the predictor variables, the scales of the two forms of the IUM, and some of the criterion variables, the outcome measures. The three IUM-Eng subscales of Sense of Competence in English, Competition in English, and Social Concern in English (negative), and the two IUM-Gen subscales of Affiliation at University and Self-esteem at University, were the predictor variables of most significance.

The results of these analyses provide support for the applicability of the theoretical model and both forms of the measurement instrument in this socio-cultural context. They also show the instrument to be very useful at extracting important predictors of
academic success at studying EFL at a Japanese university, and make some important contributions to the growing research agenda in motivation in EFL.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Foreign language teachers and researchers usually consider student motivation to be one of the most important factors that determine success in learning a foreign language. Many teachers also name motivation, or more accurately the lack of it, as the greatest challenge they face in the classroom (McInerney, 2000). Partly because of this, there has been a burgeoning of research in the area of second language (L2) learning motivation in the past 15 years, and this has been well documented by Dörnyei (1998, 2001b, 2003). The present research has been aimed at addressing many of the limitations of the previous research agenda. The present study, focusing on female Japanese university students, aims to address some of these limitations.

The present stage in this L2 motivation research has been characterised by a welcome diversity of models of motivation, forms of analyses, related psychological concepts, target languages, and research contexts, as exemplified by Dörnyei and Schmidt’s (2001) edited volume, and by a focus on process, such as Dörnyei and Ottó’s (Dörnyei, 2001a, 2001b, 2005; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) process model of motivation, and Ushioda’s (e.g. 2001) work on motivational change over time. However, there are still many challenges ahead in order to address some of the present limitations.
Three of these challenges facing current research in L2 motivation are addressed in this study. The first is that of context (Dörnyei, 2001b). A great deal of research has focused on this recently (e.g. McGroarty, 2001), but more research is needed in this area, as much of this research is by necessity qualitative, with small samples of participants. The present thesis aims to contribute to this challenge by focusing on the sociocultural context, Japan, and the more specific context, a women’s university, and by devising a measurement instrument that is sensitive to the emic aspects of this context. This situating of motivation, in terms of the sociocultural context, is also seen in the recent literature on motivation and learning in general (e.g. McInerney & Van Etten, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004).

The second challenge is to extend L2 motivational theory regarding constructs related to the self. Concepts of self-confidence and self-worth are part of Dörnyei and Ottó’s (e.g. Dörnyei, 2005) process model, and recently some researchers (e.g. Norton, 2000; Syed, 2001), have focused on the impact of learning a foreign language, on the self. However, this area is still in need of further development. This study addresses the issue by including a focus on the students’ sense of self as represented by measures of sense of purpose, sense of competence and self-esteem.

The third challenge is what Dörnyei (2001b) refers to as the challenge of ‘parallel multiplicity’ (p. 13). By this he means multiple goals and activities that learners focus on simultaneously. The present study addresses this challenge in two ways: by using an expanded view of goals to include social goals (Covington, 2000; Ford, 1992; Urdan & Maehr, 1995), and by comparing students’ domain-specific L2
motivational and sense of self characteristics with their general academic motivations and sense of self characteristics. Both of these aspects, social goals and the recognition of overlap between L2 motivation and general academic motivation in institutional contexts, have not been explicitly addressed in Gardner’s research tradition (e.g. Gardner, 1985; Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997) in L2 motivation research, or in more recent research developments, though there are connections between social goals and Gardner’s construct of ‘integrativeness’, and also concepts in studies combining motivation with group dynamics (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

L2 motivation researchers have rightfully treated L2 learning as different to learning other academic subjects. Learning a new language, especially one that is a global language, has an impact on one’s cognitive processes and identity that is qualitatively different to learning Mathematics and Chemistry. However, in an institutional context where English is a required subject for all students, as it is in most schools and universities in Japan, and in a sociocultural context where English is one of the most important subjects for university entrance, the similarities between English and other subjects become more marked. Other aspects of the sociocultural context of Japan and its education system also reinforce these similarities. The main purpose of the present thesis, therefore, is to contribute to our understanding of motivation in the field of L2 learning by using a general model of motivation, previously unused in the L2 field, in order to produce new perspectives on L2 motivation. The theoretical model chosen for this thesis, Maehr’s Personal Investment Theory (Maehr, 1984; Maehr, & Braskamp, 1986) incorporates social goals in its multiple goal approach, includes Sense of Self aspects, and recognises the importance of context.
The study seeks to extend the present research agenda by: a) devising a measurement instrument which addresses both the emic and etic aspects of the wider sociocultural context and the specific situation of a women’s university; b) assessing the instrument’s construct validity and reliability, and, at the same time, the theoretical framework’s applicability to the context; c) using the instrument to establish the distinguishing features of female university students’ motivational characteristics toward general university and specific English as a Foreign Language (EFL) study, as well as to extract differences amongst students from different departments of the university; and d) to determine the significant predictors of performance, as provided by objective test scores and less objective grades on compulsory English classes.
Chapter 2

L2 Motivation in Perspective: The Broader Achievement Motivation Field, and the Japanese Context

Introduction

As stated in Chapter One, the primary purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the development of motivation in the field of L2 learning using a general model of achievement motivation. This chapter therefore first provides an overview of motivation in educational psychology. Next, it describes the theoretical model used as the basis for the research. It then gives a detailed background of L2 motivation research and the perceived limitations. It then appraises the theoretical model in terms of its appropriateness to address these limitations. Finally, important aspects of the context of the present study are summarised.

Achievement Motivation

Studies in achievement motivation have their roots in the early work of McClelland and Atkinson (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953). According to this theory, individuals were judged to be high on need for achievement if they were driven to achieve excellence for its own sake. The development of this need in the individual was considered to be influenced by the family and the social context.
Research in achievement motivation has expanded and developed greatly since then. There has been a change from a focus on constructs such as drives to a focus on goals, beliefs, and values (Wigfield & Eccles, 2002). Modern models of motivation include these three constructs in terms of goal theory and expectancy-value theory.

Goal theory (e.g. Ames, 1984, 1992; Dweck, 1992; Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Elliot, 1999; Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Ford, 1992; Locke & Latham, 1990) places goals as central to an understanding of motivation and achievement. The focus is usually on goals or goal orientations, but there is often some confusion between the two. Wentzel (2002) provides a useful definition of goals as “cognitive representations of future events that are powerful motivators of behavior” (p. 222). A goal is thus a specific and concrete conceptualisation. Goal orientation, on the other hand, includes the reasons for engaging in a task, and “reflects a type of standard by which individuals judge their performance and success or failure in reaching that goal” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 214). Typically, the focus has been on two types of goal orientations: learning or task or mastery goal orientation, where the focus is on meeting challenges and improving on particular tasks, and performance or ability goal orientation, where the major concern is approval of performance compared to others and by others (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1992, 2000; Nicholls, 1984). Other researchers have argued for the expansion of goal theory to include social goals and a social goal orientation (Blumenfeld, 1992; Ford, 1992; Ford & Nichols, 1991; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 2002).

Expectancy-value theory (e.g. Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2000) is another important modern model of achievement motivation. The expectancy component refers to
expectations of success on the activity or task. It includes constructs such as self-efficacy (e.g. Bandura, 1997), self-esteem or self-worth (Covington, 1992), and other self conceptions of ability (e.g. Dweck, 2000), and addresses the question, “Can I do it?” The value component refers to the value of achievement of the goal, and thus addresses the question, “Do I want to do it, and why?”

Maehr’s Personal Investment Model

Maehr’s Personal Investment Model (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986) is a comprehensive, multiple-goal model of motivation which theorises that student behaviours are the result of the meaning they make of their context. This personal meaning derives from three core concepts: their Personal Incentives or goals, their Sense of Self, and what they perceive as Action Possibilities. Four contributing factors—Information, the Teaching-Learning Situation, Personal Experiences, and the Sociocultural Context— influence these three core concepts, which, in turn, determine Personal Investment. The first core concept, Personal Incentives, refers to four kinds of achievement goals: task goals, ego goals, social solidarity goals, and extrinsic rewards. The second concept, Sense of Self, comprises Sense of Purpose, Sense of Competence, and Self-esteem. The third core concept, Action Possibilities, refers to what students perceive to be achievable, given their individual ability and their social context. These three core concepts thus include an extended version of goals and goal orientations, as well as the two components of expectancy and value, as represented by the various goals and by sense of competence. Figure 2.1 gives a diagrammatic description of the model.
The Personal Investment Model of motivation has been used in a variety of contexts, including the context of adult work behaviour, and by McInerney (McInerney, 1991, 1995a, 1995b; McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995) as the basis for his Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) in his study of indigenous groups, Australian Aborigines and the Navajo in North America and other ethnic groups in the Australian cultural context. The three core concepts of Personal Incentives, Sense of Self, and Action Possibilities, are thus considered to be generalisable, etic constructs able to be used to make cultural comparisons, as well as being capable of reflecting the unique emic aspects of cultural groups.
Motivation in Foreign Language Learning

Comprehensive accounts of second language acquisition theory and research (e.g., Ellis, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Spolsky, 1989) usually list a variety of factors as explanations for differential success in learning foreign languages. These include the age at which exposure to the language begins, language aptitude, cognitive or learning style, learning strategies, personality, the environment in which the learning takes place, and motivational and attitudinal factors. But as Stern (1983) has so clearly pointed out, “empirical research in studying language learning has come up against a number of obstacles. The constructs used, such as ‘proficiency’, ‘motivation’, ‘aptitude’, ‘language learning context’, are ambiguous. They are difficult to describe or measure. The learning process itself is elusive, and the relationship among different factors, for example, aptitude and motivation, or the specific contributions of individual characteristics, the social context and the effect of teaching, is hard to isolate” (pp. 338-339).

Though these concerns still exist to some extent, much progress has been made in many of these areas in the past two decades.

Breen (2001a), in summarising the contributions in his edited volume (Breen, 2001b), expands the above so-called individual differences to include gender, self, social and cultural identity, agency, metacognitive knowledge and other “learner attributes, conceptualisations and affects” (p. 9). In addition, he mentions factors related to “learner action in context” (p. 9), such as autonomy, self-regulation, and overt participation, as well as classroom and wider community context factors.
Dörnyei’s (2005) very recent update of the area of individual differences in language learning broadens the field to include creativity, a willingness to communicate, self-esteem, and personality traits, such as those represented by the “Big Five” personality factors model: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion-introversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism-emotional stability.

Of all of the above individual differences, motivation has especially experienced a burgeoning of interest during this period. Prior to the early 1990s, Robert Gardner’s socioeducational model (Gardner, 1979, 1980, 1983, 1985, 1988), which gives motivation a central role in the language acquisition process, was the pioneering and dominant research and theoretical paradigm. His work stimulated calls for an expansion of the concept of motivation and of the research agenda (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1990), leading to a continuing discussion in the mid 1990s about the focus of research on motivation, (Dörnyei, 1994a, 1994b; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997; Oxford, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Oxford (1996) and Dörnyei (1998) followed up their earlier arguments, and brought L2 motivation closer to theory and research in motivation in education, in general (e.g. Pintrich & Schunk, 1996, 2002). Dörnyei’s (1998) overview showed the burgeoning interest in this area, with, apart from a few exceptions (e.g. Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996), most of the work aimed at supplementing Gardner’s model. Dörnyei (2001a, 2001b, 2005), in particular, has been steadily advancing the area in theory, research, and practice. Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) have been very instrumental in contributing to the goal of diversifying research in foreign language learning. Their collection includes various quantitative techniques and qualitative approaches, covering numerous target
languages and cultural contexts, involving learners of all ages. However, many of the challenges mentioned by Stern (1983) remain. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this study addresses three challenges: Dörnyei’s (2001b) challenge of context, which is addressed by focusing on contextual and sociocultural influences; Dörnyei’s (2001b) challenge of “parallel multiplicity” (p. 13), which is addressed by focusing on other interacting goals and activities; and the challenge of extending L2 motivation theory regarding self-related constructs.

However, in the following section, in order to give a review of advances in the field over the past twenty years, I will first outline the origin and development of the socioeducational model, and then present its most recent version.

*The Socioeducational Model*

Gardner and Lambert (1972) explain how their original ideas of motivation and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) sprang from theoretical ideas from first language development, especially Mowrer’s notion of “identification”, the tendency on the part of young children to imitate the language of their parents. They considered that a similar process lay behind the long-term motivation to learn a second language. They proposed “an integrative motive”: “a willingness to become a member of another ethnolinguistic group,” (p. 12), as the second-language learning equivalent of identification. Gardner and Lambert (1959) introduced the core ideas of their socio-psychological theory, and continually presented changes and developments (Gardner, 1968, 1979, 1980, 1983; Gardner, Clement, Smythe, & Smythe, 1979; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lambert, 1967).
Gardner (1985) seems to have been the catalyst for a spurt of interest in motivation in Foreign Language Learning (FLL)/SLA. In the same issue of *Language Learning*, there was both a critique of the earlier version (Au, 1988), followed by a response (Gardner, 1988), and a very positive review (Crookall & Oxford, 1988). According to Gardner (1985), motivation “refers to the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 10). Reasons for studying the language are classified as an “integrative” orientation if they stress a positive attitude towards the target language community, and “instrumental” if they stress usefulness or pragmatic reasons. His studies have consistently showed a positive correlation between an integrative orientation and L2 achievement, but he also recognises the importance of an instrumental orientation (Gardner & McIntyre, 1991).

During the 1990s, Gardner and his colleagues continued to work on building a full model of SLA with motivation as an integral component (e.g. Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997). Figure 2.2 shows the most recent version of the socioeducational model proposed by Gardner (2001). The socioeducational model has proposed that the two main influences on achievement in learning a foreign language are motivation and language aptitude. In this latest version, the core concept of integrative motivation is composed of three variables: integrativeness, attitudes towards the learning situation, and motivation.

Integrativeness “reflects a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the other language community” (Gardner, 2001, p. 5). However, it is more than just a reason for studying the other language. It is also “a complex of
attitudes involving more than just the other language community” (Gardner, 2001, p. 5), including an openness towards other groups in general. In the testing of Gardner’s model, it is measured by three scales on Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB): an integrative orientation scale, an interest in foreign languages scale, and an attitudes towards the target community scale.

*Figure 2.2. The newest version of the socioeducational model (Gardner, 2001)*

*Attitudes towards the learning situation* refers to all aspects of the course, including the teacher, materials, classmates, and extra-curricular aspects of the course. This construct is measured by two scales on Gardner’s AMTB (Gardner, 1985): an evaluation of the teacher scale, and an evaluation of the course scale.
Gardner has not changed his definition of motivation from the earlier version (Gardner, 1985), quoted earlier. It includes the three components of effort, desire to learn the language, and satisfaction, all of which are considered to be necessary but not sufficient components. These three components are measured by three scales of his AMTB (Gardner, 1985): motivational intensity, desire to learn the target language, and attitudes towards the target language.

Integrative motivation thus includes motivational, goal-directed and attitudinal aspects, but the motivational variable is the one that directly relates to language achievement. As shown in Figure 2.2, other supporting factors feed into the motivation variable. These include Gardner’s own, earlier contrast with integrative motivation, instrumental motivation (Gardner, 1985), which comprises more practical reasons for studying the target language. In this latest version of the socioeducational model of SLA, Gardner has deliberately been parsimonious. In reducing the number of variables in his model he has omitted, in addition to instrumental motivation, variables that he and his colleagues had recently introduced to the model: goal salience, attention and persistence (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995), and learning strategies, anxiety, and confidence (Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997).

Limitations of the Socioeducational Model

As the dominant model of motivation in SLA, the socioeducational model has been the target of various forms of criticism. Its continued development acknowledges some of its limitations and attempts to address them. The major weaknesses are:

- an overemphasis on the product of learning as opposed to the process,
a definition of motivation which is unorthodox and exclusive,

• a limited view of goals,

• a limited concept of self,

• a lack of focus on the specific context,

• a weak emic aspect, and

• a lack of recognition of the possibility of success being a cause as well as an effect of motivation.

Overemphasis on product versus process of learning.

Gass and Selinker (1994), and Ellis (1994), two of the most comprehensive accounts of current SLA theory and research, have both referred to the socioeducational model’s focus on the long term, or the product of learning, ignoring the short term, or process of learning. This can be seen as being an inherent difficulty as it is a proposed model of Second Language Acquisition in general, with motivation playing a central role, but not the only issue of concern. The focus has been on how motivation affects achievement or proficiency, as measured by tests, and grades. However, if motivation is to be addressed by both teachers and learners, then there is the need for a focus on the present, and the short-term, as well as the long-term. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) and Dörnyei (1990, 1994b) were important voices in arguing for the inclusion of the learning situation, or the micro level, in the study of motivation. As mentioned previously in the introductory chapter, this is an area in which much research and theorising has been done in the past few years, such as Dörnyei and Ottó’s (Dörnyei, 2001a, 2001b, 2005; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) process model of motivation, and Ushioda’s (e.g. 2001) work on motivational change.
Unorthodox definition of motivation.

In an earlier expanded version of the socioeducational model, Gardner (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) made the distinction between motivational antecedents and motivational behaviour, which brought his definition of motivation closer in line with standard psychological definitions of motivation, which have effort as the result of motivation. However, Gardner has consistently refrained from making any basic changes to the model. He (Gardner, 1985, pp.10-11) explains why, in his model, desire to learn the language without effort, or effort at study without real desire to learn the language, is not really motivation to learn the language. Both of these assumptions are problematic. The former, because desire to learn a foreign language militated by any of a great variety of factors may lead to no or little effort, but the motivational goals may remain quite strong and eventually produce great effort with the removal of the militating factors. The latter is especially significant from my perspective, as it specifically excludes effort based on reasons such as “subject requirement” as valid sources of motivation. Dörnyei (2005) also refers to this as a problematic issue in terms of Gardner’s operationalisation of his “motivation” construct (see Figure 2.2). Gardner has included items related to behaviour, along with the items related to antecedents of behaviour, motivation.

Limited view of goals.

Gardner’s definition of motivation includes the goal-directed component of desire to learn the language. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) also introduced goal salience in the earlier model. This was measured by scales for goal specificity and goal frequency, which however have been removed from the latest version. For Gardner, goals are only relevant if they are directly related to the ultimate goal of learning the language.
“To qualify as goals of second language learning, the reasons must relate to learning the language” (1985, p. 51). As mentioned previously in the section on achievement motivation, there has been an appeal by some researchers to extend the typical focus on two types of goals (learning or mastery goals, and performance or ability goals) to include social goals (Blumenfeld, 1992; Ford, 1992; Ford & Nichols, 1991; Urdan & Maehr, 1995; Wentzel, 2002). This is especially critical if we are seeking to apply a model of motivation in a variety of sociocultural contexts.

Gardner’s position on goals and his definition of motivation also reflect his view of learning a foreign language as being different to learning other school or university subjects. He justifiably believes that learning a foreign language to a high level involves a change in one’s sense of identity. However, a large proportion of foreign language students throughout the world are studying the language as a required subject, and at that particular stage of their foreign language learning may not have achieved nor wish to achieve a high level of proficiency. Gardner’s belief also fails to recognise that high achievement in other school or academic subjects may also involve adjustments to one’s sense of self or identity, though this may not be as profound or as obvious as that involving the learning of another language. Gardner’s construct of integrativeness does have some overlap with social goals, but it is limited.

Limited concept of self.

Gardner’s construct of integrativeness also has some overlap with self-concept, but again this is quite limited. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) also explicitly introduce the concept of self to their model. However, the measuring of this construct is limited to
language use anxiety, language class anxiety, and self-confidence as expressed by expectancy. In criticising present motivational theory in SLA, Norton Peirce (1995), maintains that the self is multiple, changing over time, and inseparable from the social context. This is supported by cultural and cross-cultural psychologists such as Triandis (1995), who refers to three kinds of selves—the private, the public, and the collective—and argues that “a major determinant of social behaviour is the kind of self that operates in the particular culture” (p. 357). It is important, therefore, when measuring motivation towards learning a foreign language, to obtain data about a more complex self, or social identity. This is especially the case when attempting to study motivation in different cultural contexts.

*Lack of focus on specific context.*

Ellis (1994) highlights another shortcoming of Gardner’s model, “Missing from the model is any account of how particular settings highlight different factors that influence attitudes, motivation, and achievement, although Gardner recognises the need to play close attention to the social milieu in order to identify alternative factors” (p. 238). In theory, the socioeducational model recognises the importance of the sociocultural context in which the second or foreign language learning is taking place. Gardner (1985) provides a detailed account of how social factors influence proficiency. However, in its methodology, it has focused on attitudes within the individual, though these are seen as developing from the society in which the individual is placed. From an SLA perspective, Norton Peirce (1995) voices criticism of this, whilst from an educational psychology viewpoint Hickey (1997) argues that methods for studying motivation need to be expanded to accommodate both the factors that are identified as residing more in the individual, and those that are more
contextualised. Holliday (1994), Pennycook (1994), and Phillipson (1992), from political perspectives, have argued for the importance of the sociocultural context when considering the teaching of English as a foreign language. Referring to the socioeducational model, Pennycook (1994) is unequivocal: “we cannot reduce questions of language to such social psychological notions as instrumental and integrative motivation, but must account for the extent to which language is embedded in social, economic and political struggles: (p. 15).

**Weak emic aspect.**

The etic/emic duality, first introduced by Pike (1954) and still of relevance to studies in intercultural psychology (Jahoda, 1995), refers to the contrasting viewpoints one can take in order to study human behaviour in different cultures. The etic is the perspective from the outside looking in. It assumes that the phenomena under study are generalisable or universal. The emic takes the standpoint of looking from within at the unique, or particularities of the object of study. Regarding human motivation in general, the dichotomy of collectivist and individualist societies has emerged as the main factor that would cause cultural differences. Care needs to be taken then with the instrument of measurement to ensure that it is culturally sensitive. Gardner considers his model to be generalisable to other contexts and cultures, but warns that the specifics of the situation would demand adaptation of his instrument, the AMTB. Kraemer (1993) tested Gardner’s model in Israel, and found support for its basic components. Belmechri and Hummel (1998) in Canada, and Nakata (1995) in Japan, qualified their support by adding new orientations or motives to his model. Berwick and Ross’s (1989) results also suggest that at least the earlier version was inadequate to assess the motivation of Japanese university students, as their results showed no
form of motivation, neither instrumental nor integrative, amongst these students. Ely (1986) attempted to focus on the particularities for a group of university students studying Spanish in the US. His findings supported the two orientations of the socioeducational model, but included a requirement orientation which, as mentioned above, is specifically omitted by Gardner. Sawaki (1997), following Ely’s exploratory method, found that the socioeducational dichotomy of integrative and instrumental orientations did not adequately account for her Japanese subjects’ motivation towards the study of English. Kubo (1997) in a study of Japanese university students, discarding the relevance of the socioeducational model for the Japanese situation, found orientations that would be difficult to place within that model. Yashima (2000) also failed to find support for an integrative orientation, an integral component of Gardner’s model, finding nine factors showing the importance of English to non-English majors at college. These findings suggest that the socioeducational model or its measurement tools, or both, are at present imperfectly suited to application in all situations. Gardner (1985) does recognise the possibility of this in his theory: “If, however, the programme focused on the cognitive aspects of language, as in traditional grammar-translation courses or courses which stress a reading knowledge of the language, it seems possible that such attitudes would be involved to a lesser extent” (p. 7).

Limited view of success.
In Gardner’s model success is the dependent variable, the result of motivation, the achievement of the ultimate goal of learning the language. Gass and Selinker (1994), and Ellis (1994) both suggest that Gardner’s model limits the possibility of “resultative motivation”, where learning experiences or achievement may have a
positive effect on future motivation. The cross-sectional nature of his studies does not allow for perception of changes in motivation over time, in which success or failure could be a factor. Ushioda (1993) argues that from the point of view of the learner, success is an important cause of motivation. Success, or at least students’ own definition of success, can be measured by constructs of self-efficacy or sense of competence. Previously, as mentioned above, Gardner (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) introduced self-confidence and anxiety to his model, but these have been dropped.

The above criticisms notwithstanding, the socioeducational model of SLA with motivation as a central component has, until recently, been the only comprehensive model of motivation used in research on foreign language learning. It has also brought us a long way towards understanding how attitudes contribute to motivation to learn a foreign or second language, and Gardner has used advanced psychometric techniques to build up a history of solid empirical results. However, the weaknesses described above, point to areas in which research needs to be directed.

Recent Research Developments Outside the Socioeducational Model

Oxford’s (1996) edited volume draws from other theories in general psychology, such as goal theory and expectancy value theory, and includes research which explores: numerous factors of the internal structure of motivation and its connections with learning strategies and instructional preferences (Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996), motivation, self-efficacy and anxiety (Erhman, 1996), and motivation and learner strategies of learners of languages other than English (Okada, Oxford, & Abo, 1996).
Dörnyei (2001a, 2001b) has developed his own process model of motivation based on Kuhl’s Action Control Model, and his and Schmidt’s (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001) edited volume has brought a welcome richness and depth to the area, with the introduction of new models of motivation, forms of analyses, related psychological concepts and research contexts. Dörnyei (2005) also extends the theoretical boundaries of L2 motivation by arguing for a reinterpretation of Gardner’s construct of integrativeness. He labels this new construct as the L2 motivational self-system.

The present challenge, then, is to design a research program that would address the above weaknesses of the socioeducational model, and make valuable contributions to the recent research and theoretical literature. To assist in this project, I focus on the Personal Investment Model and how it can contribute to the study of L2 motivation, especially in relation to the specific points discussed above, referring to the limitations of the socioeducational model of motivation.

*The Personal Investment Model and Foreign Language Learning*

Maehr’s Personal Investment Model (PIM) has not previously been applied to the area of Foreign Language Learning, although the term “investment” has been used by both Gold (1982) and Norton Peirce (1995) to refer to something akin to motivation. However, as mentioned above, the PIM has proved to be flexible enough to be applied to a variety of social and cultural contexts. It is also ideal for the present study in that it can be used as the basis for both general academic motivation as well as specific motivation towards the study of English as a Foreign Language. In addressing the above stated weaknesses of the socioeducational model, the Personal Investment Model performs well.
Product versus process of learning.

Regarding the focus on the process of motivation, Maehr and Braskamp (1986) are explicit about the importance of viewing motivation as a process: “Motivation is a process that is embedded in the ongoing stream of behaviour” [Italics in the original] (p. 47). In practice also the model is designed to study that process, especially through the interplay of the three core concepts (See Figure 2.1).

Definition of motivation.

Regarding the definition of motivation, the PIM seems to be similar to the expanded socioeducational model when it comes to effort or behaviour. Behaviour and motivation are separate but vitally connected: “The study of motivation begins and ends with the study of behavior” (Maehr & Braskamp, 1986, p. 45). However, the meaning of the situation to the individual plays a central role in the PIM, and therefore effort without specific desire to learn the language would rate as motivated behaviour worthy of studying, a crucial point of difference with the socioeducational model for teachers and learners both inside and outside of the classroom.

View of goals.

One of the most important differences between the PIM and the socioeducational model is the area of goals. The PIM’s three core concepts are Personal Incentives, Sense of Self, and Action Possibilities or perceived options. The first, personal Incentives, includes four kinds of goals: task goals, ego goals, social solidarity goals, and extrinsic rewards. It is not only the larger variety of goals that is different, but also the complexity of interaction. Goals, for example task and social solidarity
goals, may conflict with each other. The PIM also explicitly recognises that present or short-term goals may have more force than longer-term ones. The socioeducational model does include a motivational strength component including intensity, persistence and effort, but goals unrelated to the ultimate goal of learning the language are ignored.

**Concept of self.**

With regard to self-concept, the PIM has as a core concept a “Sense of Self”, as well as the ego goals and social solidarity goals mentioned above. In addition, the interaction between these components is considered to be very important in creating the meaning of the situation to the learner. Compared to the socioeducational model’s limited “self”, this model provides a context for understanding the micro level of motivation. It may, for example, help us to understand Ushioda’s (1993) finding that students’ reports on motivation tended to focus more on the present and past than on future goals. It could be that task goals (present) and personal experiences (past) are interacting directly with the Sense of Self component, and are more meaningful to the learner at the time, than future goals or orientations.

**Emic aspects.**

Both models, in theory, recognise the importance of the sociocultural context. In practical research, the socioeducational model has not been very successful at explaining how specific contexts affect different components. In contrast, McInerney’s work (McInerney, 1991, 1995a, 1995b; McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995) shows success at this with his Inventory of School Motivation based on the PIM. It also has
been successful at showing its ability to bring out both the emic and etic elements of motivation.

View of success.
Finally, regarding the possibility of success being an antecedent of motivation, the PIM, with its complexity of goals and their interaction with Sense of Self, especially the sense of competence, which would be directly related to previous perceived successes or failures, recognises success as an important mediating variable.

Table 2.1 summarises the Personal Investment Model in relation to the above points.

The Sociocultural Context
According to Maehr’s (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986) model, the sociocultural context plays a very important role in the individual’s definition of the meaning of the situation and their personal investment. This is most clearly seen in terms of action possibilities the individual perceives as appropriate. It also shapes the personal incentives the person aims for. The context of the present study, a small women’s university in Tokyo, is part of the larger context of Japan. The next section explores certain aspects of Japan, and in particular: its supposedly collectivist nature; its higher education; the options available for, and social expectations of, Japanese young women; and the role in society of languages other than Japanese.
Table 2.1

*Important Aspects of the Personal Investment Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Product versus Process of Learning.</strong></th>
<th>“Motivation is a <em>process</em> that is embedded in the ongoing stream of behavior” (Maehr &amp; Braskamp, 1986, p. 47).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Definition of Motivation** | “The study of motivation begins and ends with the study of behavior” (Maehr & Braskamp, 1986, p. 45).  
Personal Investment in a particular situation is determined by:  
1) beliefs about self,  
2) perceived action possibilities, and  
3) perceived goals. (Maehr, 1984) |
| **View of Goals** | Four categories:  
1) task goals,  
2) ego goals,  
3) social solidarity goals, and  
4) extrinsic rewards. |
| **Concept of self** | • sense of competence,  
• self-esteem,  
• sense of purpose. |
| **Emic Aspects** | Verified in different cultural contexts  
Able to address the emic/etic duality due to its important concepts:  
Multiple goals  
Perceived action possibilities or alternatives  
Antecedents of meaning:  
• personal experience,  
• the teaching–learning situation,  
• information,  
• sociocultural context. |
| **Success as both Cause and Effect of Motivation.** | With the complexity of goals and their interaction with Sense of Self, especially the sense of competence, recognises success as an important mediating variable. |
The Japanese Sociocultural Context

In this section I describe in detail four aspects of the Japanese sociocultural context which are directly addressed in this study: the supposedly collectivist nature of Japanese society and the resulting interdependent self-concept of Japanese people that it reportedly creates; Japanese higher education and the assumed lack of student motivation; social expectations of women and the options available for them in Japanese society; and the role of languages other than Japanese in Japanese society.

Collectivism and the Japanese self-concept.

One of the characteristics of Japanese society and its people, which has been proposed as an important factor in its successes has been its collectivist, as opposed to individualist, nature. The individualism–collectivism dualism has been a popular dimension for study in cross-cultural psychology (e.g., Hofstede, 2000; Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi, Choi, & Yoon, 1994). Countries such as the United States, Australia and Britain are usually considered typical examples of individualistic cultures. In these cultures the individual’s independence is valued over the group’s interdependence. The opposite is considered to be the case in countries such as Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, which are seen as typical examples of collectivist cultures. In collectivist cultures, cooperation and conformity, rather than competition and uniqueness, are encouraged.

A related duality, on the individual level as opposed to the societal level, is that of independent and interdependent self construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Kitayama & Markus, 1995). Markus and Kitayama propose that people in
individualistic cultures develop independent self-concepts while people in
collectivistic cultures develop interdependent self-concepts. A person with an
independent self-concept has a self-concept which is separate from significant others,
with a clear boundary between them. Important aspects of the self are those
considered to be constant and inherent to the self, such as abilities and individual
rights. A person with an interdependent self-concept has a self which overlaps with
others and has a more flexible boundary. Important aspects of the self occur in these
overlapping areas, and thus are always related to relationships and context. These
differing self-concepts naturally lead to differences in both the perception of the
situation and in different forms of behaviour. Matsumoto (1994) suggests the
implications of these differing self-concepts for achievement motivation including a
study in Japan correlating achievement motivation with affiliation.

These dualities do not apply only to Japan. They are general cross-cultural
comparisons. Japanese-specific theoretical constructs that fit with these analyses
include shudan ishiki (group consciousness; e.g., Davies & Ikeno, 2002) or shudan
seikatsu (group life; e.g., Kelly, 2001; Peak, 2001), which suppose that Japanese
people are primarily group-oriented, giving priority to group harmony over the
individual, and omoiyari (sensitivity to others, or empathy; e.g., Lebra, 1976), which
drives the forms of behaviour in interpersonal situations.

Some researchers (e.g., Matsumoto, 2002) argue that Japanese have become more
individualistic as they have become more Westernised or Americanised. However,
other researchers, while recognising the influence of imported ideas of individualism
argue that certain Japanese emic concepts expressing the relationship between self
and society transform these imported individualistic ideas into a distinctive non-Western self. These concepts, many of which are dualities, include: *uchi/soto* (inside/outside; e.g., Bachnik & Quinn, 1994) referring to people and groups, a relational concept which acts as an “orientation to the world” (Bachnik, 1994); *omote/ura* (front/back; e.g., Doi, 1986; Tobin, 1992) as dimensions of the self; *tatemaehonne* (onstage/backstage; e.g., Doi, 1986), referring to personal feelings and how they are presented to others; and *kejime* (the ability to make distinctions; e.g., Bachnik, 1992; Tobin, 1992), referring to the ability that Japanese need to learn—to be able to distinguish between these and other important dualities related to the development of self-concept.

Shimizu (2001a, 2001b) argues against the utility of the duality of individualism and collectivism for understanding the personal lived experience of individuals, on the grounds that they are not exclusive, but in fact are both present in a continuing conflict. Rosenberger and others (Rosenberger, 1992b) support this inclusive view of the Japanese self, arguing that it is “multiple, moving and changing” (Rosenberger, 1992a, p. 14).

*Japanese higher education and the lack of student motivation.*

According to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2004) there were 704 universities in Japan in 2003. These institutions are very diverse, in terms of size, status, range of faculties and quality. About 25% of these are public universities, including many of the most prestigious, such as the Tokyo and Kyoto Universities. Of the remaining 75% private universities, some are prestigious, such as the well-known Keio and Waseda Universities. Many are hardly
known even within Japan and according to Sugimoto (1997), because of the low quality of education, do not deserve the title of university. Large corporations and the public bureaucracy employ and promote people based on the rank of the university attended, rather than the discipline studied, grades attained, or other criteria. Thus the competition to enter prestigious universities is fierce. Once students have entered university, regardless of rank, the general belief is that they do not need to study hard because their grades will not have an important impact on their futures.

According to Sugimoto (1997), Japan has one of the highest levels of formal education in the world, with over 90% of young people completing 12 years of schooling. Around 38% (30% of males and 45% of females) go on to tertiary education at four-year universities or two-year junior colleges, but of these, 60% of females study at two-year junior colleges (Okano & Tsuchiya, 1999).

It is considered common wisdom that Japanese university students lack motivation to study, compared to their counterparts in other countries. University is seen as a kind of “moratorium” (Sugimoto, 1997). University and high school teachers, parents, the students themselves, and society at large frequently comment on this phenomenon. This is explained as the aftermath of the university entrance “examination hell”, from which students need a rest. In addition, since the rank of the university rather than the grades achieved in their university study plays the major role in their future, they see very little value in doing well at university. While agreeing with this analysis, McVeigh (2002) damns the majority of higher education in Japan, referring to its supposedly high quality, in his title, as “myth.” The importance of McVeigh’s analysis, for the purpose of this study, is that it contextualises this reported lack of
student motivation by focusing on problems within the education system which
derive from its specific sociocultural context.

One of the problems with this view though is that it doesn’t consider the full
complexity of the concept of motivation. It focuses on certain behaviours, but not on
the underlying cognitive or emotional processes that produce or do not produce the
behaviours. The present study addresses this problem by using a multiple goal model
of motivation which seeks to understand students’ perceptions of the relevance and
promise of the situation.

_Social expectations and options available for women in Japanese society._
Sugimoto (1997) argues that the basis of gender stratification in Japan is the
patriarchal _koseki_ (family registration) system and _ie_ (family/household) ideology.
The basic unit of registration is the household, not the individual. This system gives
both governmental and nongovernmental organisations much power and control over
individuals. This perhaps is one of the main reasons why the peripheral role of
women in Japanese public life and their central role in the family has continued to be
a characteristic of Japanese society.

The traditional expectations of women were that of being _ryosaikenbo_ (good wives
and wise mothers; e.g., Davies & Ikeno, 2002). Though this notion is not as
dominant as it was in the past, many researchers have focused on the importance of
motherhood and its special nature in Japan (e.g., Ohinata, 1995; Rice, 2001; White,
2001). As both men and women marry later in life, have fewer children, and have
them later in life, this maternal role, though powerful, is not as socially limiting as it used to be. How then has the role of women in society expanded?

Tanaka (1998), in her analysis of popular women’s magazines, concludes with some disappointment that although the content of magazines has changed from ryosaikenbo in the 1950s and ‘60s, after which traditional categories began to break down, the language of current popular magazines treats “their readers as pupils who aspire to achieve standards defined by the editors” (p. 127). The content, though, does reflect the power of young Japanese females as consumers. While these researchers focus on the continuing limited social expectations of young women, Iwao (1993) argues that women are gaining more control outside the home, as their options expand through legal changes as well as employment alternatives offered by “woman friendly” (p. 169) employers, especially foreign companies. Kelsy (2001) focuses on this attraction to the foreign, arguing that it is not purely a career attraction but includes the personal. She claims that by rejecting what they perceive as traditional lifestyles and the traditional values of Japanese men, by “refraining from having children, and traveling, studying, and working abroad, more and more Japanese women are exploiting their position on the margins of corporate and family systems to engage in a form of ‘defection’ from expected life courses” (Kelsy, 2001, p. 2). She uses the term akogare (longing) to analyse young women’s romanticised idea of the West, especially English-speaking countries and their peoples, as well as a desire to escape from the restrictions of life as a female in Japan.

There is, of course, a wide variety of reasons why Japanese women study English. However, the options that young women perceive to be available to them, both
within and outside of Japan, will greatly influence these reasons, through their sense of self and motivational goals.

While generally agreeing with Sugimoto’s overview of the Japanese education system (Sugimoto, 1997), Okano and Tsuchiya (1999) and Fujimura-Fanselow (1995) argue that it doesn’t do justice to an understanding of young Japanese women’s attitudes towards education. According to Okano and Tsuchiya (1999), male-female differences in education are most noticeable at the tertiary level. Compared to 26.5% for male high-school graduates, 18.7% of female high-school graduates enrol at 4-year universities. This figure is lower than that for any Western industrialised country. The percentage of females at Japan’s top universities is also very small. Overall, thirty percent of four-year university students are female, the great majority studying in the humanities, social sciences, home sciences and education. The reasons for this gender difference are not any barriers within the education system per se, but the still-existing obstacles in the labour market, and traditional gender-related societal norms and expectations. A recent Japanese government report, based on UN standards, supports this view, ranking Japan 41st among 70 countries in gender equality in the work force (“Women have far to go,” 2001). In addition, because of its “glass ceiling,” in 2003, “Japan was ranked 69th out of 75 World Economic Forum member countries in the area of empowering women” (Pesk, 2003, p. B2).

Of the women who go on to university, some will compete for careers with men, on an equal basis. Such women in the main, go to coeducational and higher ranking
universities. Others choose more culturally constructed “feminine” futures and will mainly attend medium and lower ranking coeducational and women’s universities.

The role of languages other than Japanese.

Japan is often described as homogeneous, monocultural, and monolinguistic. Though this may be argued from a relative perspective, compared with other countries with populations of over 100 million, from an absolute perspective, it is a myth. Recent publications on multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual Japan (Denoon, Hudson, McCormack, & Morris-Suzuki, 2001; Goebel Noguchi & Fotos, 2001; Lie, 2001; Maher & Yashiro, 1995) clearly support the view that there is a diversity of cultures and languages in Japan, from the aboriginal Ainu in the north to Okinawans in the south. The increasing internationalisation of Japan, especially through the increase in international marriages and children educated abroad, has also enhanced this diversity.

This increasing internationalisation and language diversity is often regarded as Americanisation or Westernisation, and is dominated by the English language. From a global English viewpoint, in terms of Kachru’s (Kachru & Nelson, 1996) classification of three concentric circles of countries according to the role of English in society, Japan falls within the Expanding Circle, which encompasses countries where English is widely studied, but does not play a major role in society at large. The Inner Circle of countries are those where English is the native or dominant language: the US, Australia, Britain, Canada, and New Zealand; The Outer Circle comprises those countries where English has a long history of importance in various areas of society, such as education, government, and popular culture, for example,
India, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Singapore. Other examples of countries in the Expanding Circle are: Indonesia, China, South Korea, and Nepal.

While this categorisation is not foolproof, it does capture the situation of English in Japan as compared with other countries. The prime importance of English for university entrance, and the effect this has on the English education system, is well-documented (Ingulsrud, 1994; LoCastro, 1996), as is also the history of English teaching in Japan (Ike, 1995; Koike & Tanaka, 1995; Tanaka & Tanaka, 1995). On the other hand, perhaps it does not capture the attractive power of English, as the main international language, to a young person with vague dreams of becoming a cosmopolitan user of English. It also doesn’t fully explain the ambivalence many Japanese feel about English (English: Bane or blessing? 2000; Nakatsu, 2000). English is seen as being very important, and at the same time, very difficult. This results in continuing debates over whether to make English the second official language, and how early to introduce English in the school curriculum (Torikai, 2000).

One further important feature of the sociocultural context at large, related to language, is the discourse of “Japaneseness” ("nihonjinron"; Kubota, 1998; Lie, 2001; LoCastro, 1996)—the uniqueness of the Japanese, their language and culture—which supports the notion that Japanese are not good at learning foreign languages. It also supports the argument that Japan is in danger of losing its identity and culture because of the dominance and attractiveness of English as a global language (Miyai, 2000).
Research on Motivation to Learn English in Japan

Quite a few studies have been carried out on motivation towards the study of English in Japan, especially with university or college students. Berwick and Ross (1989) found a lack of either integrative or instrumental orientations amongst first year students. Fotos’ (n.d.) subjects exhibited both instrumental and integrative orientations, though these were not useful as predictors of effort, and Nakata (1995) suggested the introduction of a new category of orientation for Japanese students: internationalisation. Teweles (1996) in a comparative study of Japanese and Chinese learners found differences in orientations between these groups, but the positive integrative attitudes of the Japanese did not translate into a commitment to use the language.

As mentioned earlier, both Kubo (1997) and Sawaki (1997) eschewed the socioeducational model and found factors and orientations among university students which do not seem to fit into this model. Kubo’s (1997) theoretical basis suggested six orientations: fulfilment, training, practice, relation, self-esteem and reward. Her factor analyses resulted in two factors quite different to the socioeducational model: a fulfilment-training orientation, which is similar to a mastery goal orientation, and a self-esteem-reward orientation, which is similar to a performance goal orientation. Sawaki (1997), using an open-ended, exploratory approach following Ely (1986), found eight factors some of which were unusual combinations of items: 1) use of English for academic purposes and desire for broadening view of the world, 2) significance of English proficiency for real-life communication, 3) desire to pursue career / academic goals abroad, 4) interest in the English language, 5) willingness for intercultural communication, 6) interest in pop culture, 7) fulfilment of requirements
and interest in target language culture / people, and 8) needs and potential benefits of English proficiency in the international community. Some of these factors are related to the integrative and instrumental orientations of the socioeducational model, but some are not, which leads her to reflect on “the effectiveness of the open-ended approach used in the instrument development phase” (Sawaki, 1997, p. 96).

More recently, Yashima (2000), following Sawaki’s (1997) exploratory approach, found nine orientations, many of which do not fit the Gardner model. Her orientations were: 1) intercultural friendship, 2) travel and passive sociocultural, 3) interest in Anglo/American culture, 4) academic importance of English 5) instrumental orientation, 6) work in the international community / international-mindedness, 7) American / British music, 8) vague sense of necessity, and 9) information. Orientation 3 was the most similar to Gardner’s integrative orientation, and orientation 5 equivalent to Gardner’s own instrumental one, while orientation 9 was most related to the participants’ major area of study. Others were either considered to be subsumed or hidden under Gardner’s dichotomy of orientations, or completely unrelated. These results highlight the need for the development of instruments which are sensitive to the sociocultural context.

Irie’s (2003) analysis of patterns found in many of these studies, some of which are in Japanese and thus not reviewed by researchers who do not read Japanese, suggests that we need to continue searching for appropriate constructs for this particular context. She concludes that the main constructs used or resulting from the research, Gardner’s duality of instrumental and integrative orientations or similar orientations, and the other dichotomy of performance and mastery goal orientations or similar
ones, have only been able to partially explain Japanese university students’ motivation towards the study of EFL. These studies illustrate the limited success of the socioeducational model when applied in Japan or to Japanese students and highlight the need for theory and research that can reflect both etic and the above emic features of Japanese students, and Japan as a research context.

**Summary**

The above emic aspects of Japan as a research context are all potential intervening factors on the motivation of Japanese university students. Research being done in this context will need to be based on a theoretical model that can incorporate these emic features, and will need to utilise an instrument that reflects them, in order to produce valid results. The Personal Investment Model has been shown to be sensitive to the emic features of a variety of cultural contexts and cultural groups, whilst maintaining a strong etic focus, in its study of general academic motivation. Figure 2.3 maps important aspects of the Japanese sociocultural and educational contexts onto a diagram of Maehr’s Personal Investment Model for general university motivation.

In relation to the study of English as a Foreign Language, Personal Investment theory has the potential to address the weaknesses of the previously dominant socioeducational model. In theory it places great importance on motivation as a process, defines motivation in a way which does not exclude certain goals or behaviours, has at its core an emphasis on multiple goals and a variety of self constructs, is sensitive to emic aspects because of the interaction of its core antecedent components, and accommodates success as both cause and effect of motivation.
The Personal Investment Model is also particularly appropriate as a model for the study of English as a Foreign Language at university, as the importance of studying foreign languages as an academic subject has been largely ignored. There is thus a real need for research that can incorporate this additional level of context. Figure 2.4 attempts to express EFL motivation of female Japanese university students, in the form of Maehr’s Personal Investment Model.
Figure 2.3. The Japanese context and Maehr’s personal investment model.
Personal Investment towards the study of EFL

Figure 2.4. Maehr’s personal investment model and EFL motivation of female Japanese university students.
Aims of the Present Study

As a result of the preceding survey, this study seeks to:

1. validate the adapted instrument, the Inventory of University Motivation (IUM) for use at university level, with Japanese students, and towards the study of English as a Foreign Language (EFL);
2. validate the applicability of the theoretical model;
3. assess the reliability of the measurement instrument;
4. describe the motivational dimensions of first-year students in three departments of Keisen University towards the study of EFL;
5. describe the motivational dimensions of the same students towards university study in general;
6. identify the important predictors of successful performance;
7. assess the predictive power of the instrument;
8. suggest recommendations based on the findings.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction
As stated in the introduction, the main purpose of this study is to produce new perspectives on L2 motivation, by using a general model of motivation previously unused in the L2 field. The study aims to do this by: devising a measurement instrument that is sensitive to both the emic and etic aspects of the sociocultural context, a Japanese women’s university; by assessing the instrument’s construct validity and reliability, and thus establishing the theoretical framework’s applicability to the context; by using the instrument to ascertain the distinguishing features of female university students' motivational characteristics toward both general university and specific EFL study, as well as to extract differences amongst students from different departments of the university; and to determine the significant predictors of performance, as measured by English proficiency test scores and grades on compulsory English classes.

In this chapter, I present the methodology of the study, first describing the characteristics of the students who participated in the study and the site of the study. Then I detail the development of the measurement instruments, including translation procedures. This is followed by a description of the outcome measures, an explanation of the administration of the survey, and an overview of the statistical
analyses that are described in detail in the following chapters. Finally, I provide a list of the research questions and hypotheses that are addressed in the following chapters.

Participants

The participants were all first year students, 501, from the three departments of Keisen University—British and American Studies (211), Japanese Studies (87), and International Sociocultural Studies (203). All participants were female Japanese nationals aged 18-19. They had mostly come directly from high schools in or around Tokyo, though a few had come from prefectures further afield, and some had spent a year after graduating from high school preparing for university entrance examinations. The tuition fees at Keisen are relatively high compared to other women’s universities, and students in general are from middle to upper-middle class families. For many of these students, Keisen is a second choice. They have tried, and failed, to enter more prestigious national or private universities.

Keisen students are often judged to be polite, quiet, considerate and typical of the average student at a women’s university. Their dreams and aspirations for their futures are considered to be representative of the majority of middle-class female Japanese university students who, as described in Chapter Two, tend to choose culturally-constructed “feminine” futures.

Site

Keisen University is a small, mid-ranked women’s Christian university on the outskirts of western Tokyo. The educational institution of Keisen was founded in 1929 by Michiko Kawai, starting with a junior high school, with the intention of providing educational opportunities for girls. It has slowly grown over the years,
adding a high school, junior college, and the university, which was started in 1988 with a Faculty of Humanities with two departments—British and American Studies, and Japanese Studies. A new Department of International Sociocultural Studies was started in 1997. The data for this study were collected in the first semester of 1999 from students of these three departments. After the data were collected another department (Human Ecological Studies) was started, in 2001, along with a Graduate School.

The three main educational pillars of Keisen are: Christianity, Horticulture, and International Studies. Because of this focus on International Studies, Keisen has had a strong reputation for English language education since its founding. Most students want to get a “feminine” job, with many within the Departments of British and American Studies and International Sociocultural Studies hoping to use English in their future, for example as English teachers, airline employees, travel agency employees, or working in foreign companies and non-government organisations. These two departments therefore have a wide range of compulsory and elective English classes, in order to help students be able to communicate using English, as well as to be able to study academic content in English. Some examples of these classes are: Readings in British and American Studies, Current Affairs in English, Language Laboratory, Internet English, English through Music and Video, and English Expression. In addition to these department-specific classes, all first and second year students at Keisen University have to complete compulsory Communicative English classes in the four language skill areas of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, in order to be able to graduate. This is quite
common at Japanese universities in general, but is especially so for women’s universities, which mainly focus on the Humanities.

*Measurement Instruments*

McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM; McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995), based on Maehr’s theory of Personal Investment (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986), was adapted for use with Japanese university students. The ISM is an exploratory instrument which can be, and has been, used to define scales for both etic and emic purposes. Items have been validated with Navajo populations (McInerney & Swisher, 1995), and across a variety of other cultural samples. It has also been recently revised, as the Inventory of School Motivation Revised (ISMR), and validated in Hong Kong (McInerney, Yeung, & McInerney, 2001).

Two forms of this questionnaire were devised: one to assess student motivation towards learning English specifically, the Inventory of University Motivation towards English (IUM-Eng), and the other to measure student motivation towards university study in general, the Inventory of University Motivation in General (IUM-Gen). The total number of items for both forms of the questionnaire was 146. Items were scored using a Likert-type scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Items were chosen to reflect seven motivational dimensions and three Sense of Self dimensions. The seven motivational dimensions were: Task/Effort, Competition, Power, Affiliation, Social Concern, Recognition, and Token Rewards. The three Sense of Self dimensions were: Sense of Purpose, Self-esteem, and Sense of Competence.
Adaptation and Translation Issues and Procedures

Many English teachers who were to help administer the survey requested that it be in English, for two main reasons: it would be conducted in an English class, and many of the non-Japanese teachers do not read Japanese. However, for validity reasons, it was felt very strongly that the items should be translated into Japanese. Eventually, it was decided to have all items in both languages, with the English version of each item preceding the Japanese language one. Written instructions to students at the start of the questionnaires were in Japanese only.

Translation Guidelines

Based on a review of the literature on instrument adaptation and translation, García Duncan (2002) lists five recommendations that she considers should be followed in order to create well-designed, conceptually equivalent translated tests or survey instruments. The guidelines relevant to survey instruments, and the way in which the procedures of the present study correspond with them, are listed below:

1. Use of a translation team

The translation team for the present study consisted of three people: two translators, who were Japanese academic staff from different universities in Tokyo, and myself as the project co-ordinator. One of the translators was a trained EFL teacher, the other an Anthropology teacher. Both had studied in the United States at the post-graduate level. I met with these translators individually both before and after their translations.
2. The translated instrument should undergo both forward and backward translation, with the backward translation being checked by a content area expert. The Anthropology teacher performed the forward translation of items into Japanese, and the EFL teacher the backward translation. The forward translation was followed by two Question and Answer sessions between the translator and myself, in order to clarify the meaning of some of the English items. Direct translations were impossible for many items, so interpretations were necessary. On a few occasions the initial interpretations were inaccurate. Another difficulty here was the translation of general items that were very similar. These consultation sessions were very important as they helped to minimise problems at the following, backward translation stage, when the Japanese draft was back-translated into English. This was so as to independently check that the meaning of the Japanese version matched that of the English one. Some items, indeed, did need to be modified, when I met with the EFL teacher who carried out the back translation.

3. The quality of a translation can be improved by both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Some new items were written specifically for the context of a Japanese university. These questions were based on interviews conducted with 20 first year students from the previous year, 1998, and on a survey of the literature in the Japanese language on motivation of Japanese university students.

4. The instrument should be modified by simplifying the vocabulary and syntax. The instrument was already quite simple grammatically. All items were first adapted in English, adjusting them for the specifics of the situation—Japan,
university and English study. One particular, problematic vocabulary issue that arises when translating from English to Japanese is that of choice of word between a borrowed form of the English word and the closest equivalent in standard Japanese. For example, the word “motivation” is often used in its borrowed form, pronounced “mochivashun” and written using the Japanese Katakana syllabary. Two standard Japanese equivalent words are “doki” and “yaruki”. In recent years there has been a huge increase in the number of English terms being borrowed and given Japanese pronunciation. The borrowed form of these words is often used in translating English texts, especially recent or new ideas, such as Information Technology terms. However, the borrowed form brings a foreign nuance to the meaning of the text. The team of translators were all quite confident that the borrowed form “mochivashun” would be understood by the students, but in fact, it needed to be explained to a few students during the administering of the instruments.

Outcome Measures

The outcome measures obtained from teachers and from the university’s administrative office were: semester grades for each of the four compulsory Communicative English (CE) classes, and two Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Institutional Test Program (ITP) scores—one being students’ scores on entering the university in April, and the other their scores at the end of the year in December, 1999. Students’ grades are generally a composite of attendance, active participation in class, performance on at least one test, and a class assignment. The four CE classes were: CE 1—a first semester Speaking and Listening class, CE 2—a Reading class, CE 3—a second semester Speaking and Listening class, and CE
4—a Writing class. These outcome measures are detailed further in Chapter 6.

Descriptive statistics on these outcome measures across departments are given in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1.

Scores on Outcome Measures by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese Studies</th>
<th>British and American Studies</th>
<th>International Sociocultural Studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N S. D.</td>
<td>Mean N S. D.</td>
<td>Mean N S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>363.92</td>
<td>8413.44</td>
<td>378.98 20631.15</td>
<td>371.70 19237.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>373.45</td>
<td>48234.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>362.55</td>
<td>7636.61</td>
<td>388.59 16036.89</td>
<td>382.78 14939.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38539.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>861.06</td>
<td>3.07 2111.00</td>
<td>3.08 2031.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5001.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>86 .93</td>
<td>3.07 2111.06</td>
<td>2.92 2031.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5001.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>86 1.05</td>
<td>3.07 2111.13</td>
<td>2.89 2031.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>5001.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>86 1.02</td>
<td>2.94 2101.15</td>
<td>2.80 2031.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4991.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration of the Survey

The questionnaire was administered towards the end of Semester 1, in June and July of 1999. Students are allocated to English classes of about 25 students per class. In each of the departments of British and American Studies and International Sociocultural Studies there were 8 class groups. In the Japanese Studies Department there were 4. The cooperation of Communicative English 2 teachers (14 teachers, all Japanese, mostly part-time) was requested, but they were given the opportunity not to participate if they preferred not to. All teachers showed interest in the survey and
were willing to participate. They were asked to administer the questionnaires during the last three weeks of the semester, before their final tests or assignments. A brief explanation of the study and instructions on administering the survey was given to all teachers, in English.

On completion of the questionnaires, teachers returned them to me. They were all checked for omission of name/student numbers and sorted by department and student number for input into the database. Omitted name/numbers were excluded from the analysis.

**Statistical Analyses**

Three main forms of statistical analyses were conducted:

1. The data were analysed using Factor Analysis, or more accurately Principal Components Analysis, in order to identify groups of variables (components), which would represent types of goal orientations and Sense of Self components, as well as to reduce the number of items, eliminating those items which did not load clearly and logically on any one of the components. Generally, Exploratory Factor Analysis is used when there is no a priori theory guiding the analysis, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis is used to confirm the existing a priori theoretical base. However, in the present study, the sociocultural context is very different to those in which the theoretical model has been previously applied. In this situation, Exploratory Factor Analysis was considered more appropriate than Confirmatory Factor Analysis, in order to explore for existing emic aspects of the context that the theoretical model may not have covered. As described above, some items
were written specifically for the context of a Japanese women’s university.
These items were not originally part of McInerney’s ISM (McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995), on which the IUM was based.

This decision to use Exploratory Factor Analysis is also supported by recent researchers in this field of study and in this sociocultural context. As mentioned previously in Chapter 2, Kubo (1997), Sawaki (1997), and Yashima (2002) all used a bottom-up or open-ended approach when developing their instruments, recognizing the limitations of their theoretical bases to address the emic aspects of the sociocultural context and specific situation. They also all then used Exploratory Factor Analysis to validate the measurement instruments. The results of their studies supported their expressed concerns not to use a top-down approach when developing their instruments.

Another decision that needs to be made in Factor Analysis is choosing the type. The main choice is between Principal Components Analysis (PCA) and Principal Axis Factoring (PAF), also called common factor analysis. While PAF is preferred for purposes of confirmatory factor analysis, PCA is the most commonly used technique for exploratory purposes (Garson, 2006; Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; H. Marsh, personal communication, March 17, 2006).
Other details such as the kind of rotation and criteria for selecting factors are given in further detail in Chapter 4.

2. Four sets of Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were conducted in order to ascertain any significant differences amongst the three groups of students from the three departments of Keisen University. MANOVA is the appropriate procedure when there is more than one dependent variable. Tests of significance differences amongst the means were conducted simultaneously. Further details of the analyses are provided in Chapter 5.

3. Multiple regression analyses were performed on the data for two main purposes: first, to determine if there was a significant relationship between either or both of the measurement instruments, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, and the six outcome measures described above, and secondly, to establish which of the variables on the measurement instruments were of the most significance. Of the three forms of multiple regression, the simultaneous method of input was chosen. Further details on this, and on the diagnostic tests, are provided in Chapter 6.

Table 3.2 summarises the statistical analyses completed using SPSS for Windows, Version 9.0.
Table 3.2

*Summary of Statistical Analyses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IUM-Eng</td>
<td>Principal Components Analysis</td>
<td>To validate the hypothesised dimensions of the questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUM-Eng</td>
<td>Reliability tests</td>
<td>To establish the reliability of the factor scales of the two forms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUM-Gen</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td>To test for differences across university departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUM-Gen</td>
<td>Multiple regression analyses against outcome</td>
<td>To test the significance of the relationships between the factors of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measures.</td>
<td>the two forms of the instrument and the outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research Questions and General Hypotheses*

The following research questions and general hypotheses are addressed in subsequent chapters. A rationale for each of these questions and hypotheses is provided in the relevant chapter. The specific research questions addressed are:

1. Are the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, valid for use with Japanese university students?
2. What are the factor structures of the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen?
3. Do these factor structures support the dimensions of Personal Investment Theory?
4. What is the reliability of the factor scales derived from the Principal Components Analyses for the two forms of the IUM?

5. What proportion of items loaded on the factors at which they were targeted?

6. What is the motivational profile of first-year female Keisen University students towards the study of English as a Foreign Language?

7. What is the motivational profile of these students towards university study in general?

8. What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen University students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Eng?

9. What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen University students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Gen?

10. Is there a significant relationship between the predictor variables derived from the two forms of the IUM and the criterion variables?

11. What are the particular predictor variables of most significance, and how do these relate to theoretical perspectives on potential motivators of Japanese university students?

General hypotheses were proposed for both the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen.

**IUM-Eng hypotheses.**

*Hypothesis 1:* The Motivational scale of Recognition (RECE) will be very low (i.e., < 2).

*Hypothesis 2:* The Sense of Self scale of Sense of Competence (SECE) will be very low (i.e., < 2).
Hypothesis 3: The Motivational scales of Praise (PRAE) and Task/Effort (TASE) will be low (i.e., ≥ 2 < 2.4).

Hypothesis 4: The Motivational scales of Power (POWE) and Competition (COME) will be low (i.e., ≥ 2 < 2.4).

Hypothesis 5: The Motivational scales of Social Concern (SOCE) and Affiliation (AFLE) will be high (i.e., ≥ 3).

Hypothesis 6: The Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPE) will be high (i.e., ≥ 3).

Hypothesis 7: Students in the Department of British and American Studies (BA) will have significantly higher scores on all of the IUM-Eng scales than students in the other departments—Japanese Studies (J) and International Sociocultural Studies (IS).

IUM-Gen hypotheses.

Hypothesis 8: Two Sense of Self scales: Self-esteem (ESTU) and Sense of Competence (SECU) will be very low (i.e., < 2).

Hypothesis 9: The Motivational scales of Praise (PRAU), Task/Effort (TASU), and Token Rewards (TOKU), and the Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPU) will be low (i.e., ≥ 2 < 2.4).

Hypothesis 10: The Motivational scale of Power (POWU) will be very low (i.e., < 2).

Hypothesis 11: The Affiliation/Social Concern scale (AFLU) will be high (i.e., ≥ 3).

Hypothesis 12: There will be no significant difference between students in the three departments on the dimensions of the IUM-Gen. If significant differences are found, it is considered that these would reflect the
importance that English may play in providing a concrete or clear focus for students’ university study in general.
Chapter 4

The Inventory of University Motivation: Is it a valid measure for Japanese university students?

Introduction

In the previous chapter the overall methodology of the study was outlined. This chapter will focus on establishing the construct validity and reliability of the measurement instruments, the IUM-Gen and IUM-Eng, on analysing their factor structures, and on confirming whether these factor structures were equivalent to the predicted factor structures and whether they support Personal Investment theory.

Specification of the Problem

As stated previously, in Chapter 2, Japanese university students are considered by many, including themselves, to have very low motivation towards study. Sugimoto (1997) refers to university life as a “moratorium” after the examination hell of studying for university entrance examinations, and before entering the workforce. However, Japanese university students spend a lot of their time at university, in class as well as at extra-curricular activities—their clubs and circles—with their university friends. It is considered that some aspects of university life, including study, are motivating for students, and some aspects not. The present challenge lies in identifying the motivational and non-motivational features of English as a Foreign
Language (EFL) study and university study in general for Japanese first year university students.

Maehr’s Personal Investment Model (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986) is a comprehensive model of motivation that can help us identify some of the important characteristics of Japanese university student life. Maehr’s theory holds that students’ behaviours are the result of the meaning they make of their context, the events happening around them, their academic tasks, and a variety of other factors. The personal meaning that an individual constructs of a situation derives from their goals, their Sense of Self, and what they perceive as Action Possibilities. The core components of this model are illustrated in Chapter 2.

McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) is designed to measure the central aspects of Personal Investment within an educational environment. There are the four kinds of Achievement Goals: task goals, ego goals, social solidarity goals, and extrinsic rewards; and Sense of Self: specifically, sense of purpose, self-esteem, and sense of competence. The ISM is not a standardised inventory but an exploratory one, which allows for adaptation to the specific cultural context. As described in Chapter 3, it was adapted for this study by devising two forms of the instrument: one to measure university students’ motivation towards learning English specifically, the Inventory of University Motivation towards English (IUM-Eng), and the second, to measure student motivation towards university study in general, the Inventory of University Motivation in General (IUM-Gen). “A priori” items were developed targeting the constructs of Personal Investment Theory. Many of these items were close adaptations of the ISM, but some were developed based on the existing literature, outlined in Chapter 2, and my experience of teaching and talking to
Japanese university students. One of the overall aims of this chapter is to discover how well these theorised factors and item selection matched the resulting data.

The specific research questions addressed in this chapter are:

1. Are the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, valid for use with Japanese university students?
2. What are the factor structures of the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen?
3. Do these factor structures support the dimensions of Personal Investment Theory?
4. What is the reliability of the factor scales derived from the Principal Components Analyses for the two forms of the IUM?
5. What proportion of items loaded on the factors at which they were targeted?

Method

Subjects and procedures.
The subjects and procedures used are described in Chapter 3.

Materials.
As previously mentioned, McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) was adapted for use with Japanese university students. The two forms of the instrument, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen had a total of 146 items. Items were scored using a Likert-type scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Items were chosen to reflect seven motivational dimensions and three Sense of Self dimensions, reflecting the scales reported in McInerney, Roche, McInerney, and
Marsh (1997). In this version the original Task and Effort scales are collapsed into one Task/Effort scale. Sample items for each dimension on each of the forms are shown in Table 4.1 along with the number of items in parentheses.

The ideal number of items for each dimension was considered to be between five and eight. The dimension of Power in the IUM-Eng form of the inventory has only three items specifically written for it. In adapting the ISM for both forms of the IUM the dimension of Power was considered to be the least open to being subject-specific, and thus two general IUM items: “It’s very important for me to be a group leader” and “I often try to be the leader of a group” were included for the IUM-Eng analyses.

From the review of the literature related specifically to motivation towards the study of English amongst Japanese university students, a wide variety of goals, attitudes, and reasons for studying English have been suggested as important. In particular, Sawaki (1997) found a variety of purposes for studying English amongst fourth year students at a women’s university in Japan. These included: the desire to broaden one’s view of the world, to use English for real-life communication, to pursue one’s career or academic goals abroad, and interest in pop culture. For this reason three dimensions on the IUM-Eng contained more than 8 items: Task/Effort (9), Self-esteem (12), and Sense of Purpose (18). These high numbers of items reflect my concern to include as many relevant aspects as possible of Japanese university students’ motivation. Further details about the materials and their translation into Japanese are given in Chapter 3.
Table 4.1.

*Sample Items for the Seven Motivational Dimensions and Three Sense of Self Dimensions of the Two Forms of the IUM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Goals</th>
<th>Sample Item For IUM-Eng (Number of items)</th>
<th>Sample Item for IUM-Gen (Number of items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task/Effort</td>
<td>I try hard in my study of English because I like my English class. (9)</td>
<td>I work hard to try to learn something new at university. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my English classes. (5)</td>
<td>I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my university classes. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>I want to be good at English so that I can feel important in front of my friends. (3)</td>
<td>I study hard because I want to feel important in front of my university friends. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>I try to study with friends as much as possible when I study English. (7)</td>
<td>I try to study with friends as much as possible. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Concern</td>
<td>I care about other people in my English class. (7)</td>
<td>I care about other people at university. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Praise from my teachers for my English study is important to me. (8)</td>
<td>Praise from my teachers for my university study is important to me. (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token Rewards</td>
<td>I study English best when I can get some kind of reward. (6)</td>
<td>I study best at university when I can get some kind of reward. (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sense of Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Competence</th>
<th>Most of the time I feel I can do my English study. (8)</th>
<th>Most of the time I feel I can do my university study. (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>I succeed at whatever I study in English. (12)</td>
<td>I succeed at whatever I study at university. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Purpose</td>
<td>I want to do well at English so that I can have a good future. (18)</td>
<td>I want to do well at university so that I can have a good future. (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underlying approach.**

As previously explained in Chapter 3, Exploratory Factor Analysis was considered to be appropriate for this study, rather than Confirmatory Factor Analysis, as it was important to allow the emic aspects of the specific sociocultural context to determine which items defined which scales. Given the exploratory nature of the study, Principal Components Analysis was chosen, as it is the most commonly used for this purpose (Garson, 2006; Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; H. Marsh, personal communication, March 17, 2006), as is also evidenced by its being the default choice in SPSS.

As correlation amongst components was considered possible, oblique (Oblimin) rotation was chosen for all of the analyses. The two main criteria for selecting factors were the eigen values and the theoretical model. Missing values were excluded listwise, as this is the most commonly used, as demonstrated by its being the default choice in SPSS.
Following this approach and using these criteria, initially a number of results were carefully compared. These different results were based on decisions concerning the estimated number of factors. The number of components to be extracted was set at one or two higher than the seven theorised motivational dimensions and the three Sense of Self ones (according to McInerney’s inventory based on Maehr’s model described above). This was done, as mentioned previously, in order to be open to the emic aspects of the context, that is, to be confident of catching components not predicted by the pre-existing theory.

Further refining of the scales was done by examining the cross-loadings on other factors, the contribution of individual items to the reliability of the scale, and the face validity or theoretical meaningfulness of each item. A loading of 0.4 was selected as the criterion for classifying an item on a scale. If it cross-loaded greater than 0.3 it was kept in the targeted dimension only if it greatly contributed to the overall reliability of the scale.

Preliminary statistical analysis.

Preliminary analyses suggested four separate analyses. These are explained in the following order:

1. IUM-Eng Motivational Goals
2. IUM-Eng Sense of Self
3. IUM-Gen Motivational Goals
4. IUM-Gen Sense of Self
**IUM-Eng Motivational Goals**

**Statistical analysis.**

Principal Components Analyses were first performed on 46 items, 43 of the 46 items relating to motivation towards English study plus 3 general motivational ones—“Winning is important to me,” “It’s very important for me to be a group leader,” “I often try to be the leader of a group. These general Power and Competition items were considered to be applicable to the specific English form as English is a very important academic subject for high school students wanting to enter university. As English is not widely used in society in Japan, specific items relating the students’ use of English to Power and Competition were considered unrealistic. Items that did not make any theoretical sense for the factors they loaded on, and those that cross-loaded on other factors were discarded. The lowest loading retained was .395. A total of 11 items were excluded from the next stage of analysis, which meant 35 items were analysed, with the NFACTOR set at nine. Seven theoretically meaningful factors were produced. These and the factor loadings greater than .3 are shown in Appendix B.

From this, some additional items were discarded: Item 94 because its loading on Component 1 was low at .331; Items 33, 91, 38, and 69, which all loaded primarily on Component 4, but together did not make any theoretical sense in terms of targeted dimensions (they also cross-loaded on other components); and Item 6, which was the only item which loaded on Component 8. These items are shown shaded in Appendix B. A further PCA was done on the remaining 29 items, with NFACTOR set at eight as a total of 17 items had been discarded. The resulting components, and the loadings of all items, are shown in Appendix C. From this analysis one item, Item number 9
(shaded in Appendix C), did not draw any other items with it, and was discarded. A final PCA without this item was done with components set at seven, the number of components so far produced.

Results.
In this final analysis, 65.4% of variance was explained by these seven components. These components were then labelled:

1. Praise
2. Task/Effort
3. Social Concern
4. Power
5. Recognition
6. Affiliation
7. Competition

These components differ slightly from the targeted ones. The new component, Praise, is a more precise label for the combination of remaining items that initially were targeted at the Recognition scale. The present Recognition scale is a combination of items originally targeted at the Recognition, Power and Token Rewards scales. The labels were selected based on the strongest single focus suggested by the set of questions. Table 4.2 shows the items, their loadings on these components and the Cronbach alpha reliability for each component.

Table 4.3 shows the component correlation matrix for these seven components. The highest correlation is -.366, between Component 4 (Power in English) and
Component 7 (Competition in English). The lowest correlation, -.036, is between Component 3, Social Concern in English, and again Component 7, Competition in English. Component 6, Affiliation in English, and Component 7, Competition in English, had negative correlations with all other components except with each other. This suggests that, despite their seeming similarities, the scales of Affiliation in English and Social Concern in English, and those of Power in English and Competition in English, are very different measures.

It is worth reiterating here that the reason why two of the items on the Power component do not refer specifically to English is that in the typical Japanese university context, where students do not use English as a means of communication, a specific measure of Power related to English use is not considered relevant, while a general measure can capture the students’ recognition of English as one of the important academic subjects. Thus, the items were written to ensure that the scales had emic validity, the importance of which is explained in Chapter 2. It is also worth noting here that the great majority of items fitting onto these seven scales were originally targeted at the scales they fitted onto. This is discussed further, at the end of this chapter.
Table 4.2.

*IUM-Eng Motivational Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my parents for my English is important to me.</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my teachers for my English study is important to me.</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my friends for my English study is important to me.</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be praised for my English.</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having other people tell me that my English is good is important to me.</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task/Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard in my study of English because I like my English class.</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English in itself is interesting.</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to make sure that I do well at my English study.</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m always trying to do even better in my English classes.</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to take as many classes as possible in English at Keisen.</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m improving in my English I try even harder.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work hard to try to learn something new in my English</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy helping others with their English even if I don’t do so well myself.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to help other students do well at English.</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s very important for me to be a group leader.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to be the leader of a group.</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be good at English so that I can feel important in front of my friends.</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I study English hard for presents from my parents.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at English for rewards from teachers.</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to do well at English to please my teachers and parents.</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at English because I want my classmates to take notice of me.</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can do best at English when I’m studying with others.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to study with friends as much as possible when I study English.</td>
<td>-.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like studying English with other people. & -.644 \\
*Competition* & .78 \\
Getting the highest grade in my English classes is very important to me. & -.719 \\
Getting good grades is the most important thing in my English classes. & -.669 \\
Winning is important to me. & -.663 \\
I want to do well at English to be better than my classmates. & -.526 \\

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.

*IUM-Eng Motivational Goals Component Correlation Matrix*
IUM-Eng Sense of Self

Statistical analysis.

As mentioned above, the Sense of Self items were analysed separately from the motivational goal items. Principal Components Analyses were performed on 43 items, with factors limited to three and four. Both analyses produced three clear factors, but the four-factor-limited solution was cleaner, having the least number of items cross-loading at the 0.3 level or higher, or not loading on any factor at the 0.4 level. These items were discarded, leaving 29 items remaining. These were analysed, with factors limited to three.

Results.

This analysis resulted in three clear factors, with no cross-loadings nor any items with a loading of less than 0.4 (see Table 4.4). The three factors accounted for a total variance of 52.1%. The three factors were then labelled:

1. Sense of Purpose (comprising 17 items). As mentioned earlier, this large number of items was used in order to represent both emic and etic aspects of the research context. Two of the items were very close adaptations of the original ISM (I want to do well at English so that I can have a good future; I try hard to learn English so that I can get a good job when I graduate). The other items were more specific to the context of EFL at Japanese universities and were guided by a review of the literature, and previous interviews with students. They were written to represent the emic aspects of the context. Some were similar to the ISM (e.g., Increasing my TOEFL score is very important to me). Others were very different (e.g. I study English to be able to understand movies, and TV/radio programs in English). In the literature,
these items usually reflect separate scales. This will be addressed later in this chapter.

2. Sense of Competence (comprising nine items). This described a more “private” feeling of confidence and ability to work on one’s own, and

3. Self-esteem (comprising three items). These three items were written specifically to reflect the emic aspects of the context and do not reflect original ISM items. They refer to the contribution that English ability makes to their overall self-esteem.

Table 4.4 also shows the factor loadings of the items on the three scales. Cronbach’s alpha reliability tests were conducted on each scale. The level of reliability was very good for each of the scales. This is also shown in Table 4.4. Once again the large majority of items landed on the scales at which they were originally targeted.

Table 4.5 shows the component correlation matrix for these three components. The highest correlation is .268, between Components 1 and 2, Sense of Purpose in English, and Sense of Competence in English. The other correlations are almost the same, just under .200.

The results of these analyses support the validity of Maehr’s model of Personal Investment as the theoretical basis for study of Japanese university students’ motivation towards the study of EFL. The results above also support the validity of the present instrument, the IUM-Eng, an adaptation of McInerney’s ISM, as a means of understanding the underlying structure of students’ motivation towards the study of EFL. This is discussed further at the end of this chapter.
Table 4.4.

*IUM-Eng Sense of Self*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Purpose</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I study English to be able to understand movies, and TV/radio programs in English.</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to be able to deal with situations where English is needed.</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to broaden my view of the world.</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English because it’s necessary in the international community.</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to be able to read books, magazines, etc. in English.</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to learn English so that I can study or work abroad.</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to do well at English so that I can have a good future.</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English because it’s important for me to understand other cultures.</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to learn English because it can be useful in my present life.</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to take as many classes as possible in English at Keisen.</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to gain a certificate (STEP, TOEFL, TOEIC).</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to feel the pleasure of using my English ability and knowledge.</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing my TOEFL score is very important to me.</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to learn English so that I can get a good job when I</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
graduate.

I want to learn English to make friends with people who don’t speak Japanese.  \textit{.584}

I study English to help me when I travel abroad.  \textit{.530}

I study English to maintain the skill and knowledge I already have.  \textit{.487}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Competence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I can do quite well in English.</td>
<td>\textit{.809}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do as well as other students in my English class.</td>
<td>\textit{.793}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I’m as good as everyone else in my English class.</td>
<td>\textit{.771}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I feel I can do my English study.</td>
<td>\textit{.743}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very confident in my English study.</td>
<td>\textit{.721}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I’m studying alone, difficult English homework doesn’t bother me.</td>
<td>\textit{.684}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am intelligent enough to learn English to a high level.</td>
<td>\textit{.587}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the whole, I’m pleased with myself in my English classes.</td>
<td>\textit{.584}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I succeed at whatever I study in English.</td>
<td>\textit{.564}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self esteem</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I can use English I’m considered to be well-educated.</td>
<td>\textit{.884}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I can use English I’m considered by others to be intelligent.</td>
<td>\textit{.873}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I can use English I feel superior to others.</td>
<td>\textit{.769}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5.

*IUM-Eng Sense of Self Component Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IUM-Gen Motivational Goals*

*Preliminary statistical analysis.*

As with the English-specific items, Sense of Self and Motivational Goals were analysed separately for the general university items. Preliminary Principal Components Analyses were performed on the 41 items targeting the seven dimensions related to general motivation at university. Three initial analyses were compared with factors limited to seven, eight, and nine. The eight and nine factor solutions produced six components but with more cross-loading items, items loading on non-targeted components, doublets, and singlets. The seven factor solution produced five clear components. This solution is shown in Appendix D, with loadings greater than 0.3.

As can be seen, three items: 111, 51, and 46, at the bottom of the table in Appendix D, did not load on any of the first five components. These were eliminated from the next stage of analysis. Following the underlying approach for refining of scales described above, items 50, 106, 134, and 139 were also eliminated from the next stage. Other items that cross-loaded greater than 0.3, Items 52, 84, 108, 32, 137, 81, 21, 124, 49, 48, and 37, were retained as they were considered to be strong enough
on the main factor, and contributed considerably to the reliability of the scale. One item, Item 48, was retained with a loading of below 0.4 (0.379) on the targeted dimension, and cross-loading of above 0.3. It was retained because of its contribution to overall scale reliability, and its theoretical consistency with the other items on the scale. In total, seven items were cut. These are shown shaded in Appendix D.

Statistical analysis.
Principal Components Analysis was then again performed on the remaining 34 items, with the NFACTOR set at five.

Results.
The resulting five factors accounted for a total variance of 53.1% of variance explained, and are shown in Appendix E with factor loadings greater than 0.3. Two items, 137 and 124, shaded in Appendix E, were omitted from the final analysis using the criteria described above. Other items which cross-loaded were retained because they contributed to reliability when included and because their main loading was the targeted ones, and were therefore theoretically meaningful. The five factors were labelled:

1. Praise at university—eight items
2. Task/Effort at university—six items
3. Affiliation/Social Concern at university—five items
4. Power at university—eight items
5. Token Rewards at university—five items.
These are shown in Table 4.6 with their Cronbach alpha reliabilities, the lowest of which is 0.76. Once again, most of these items loaded on their originally targeted scales.

Table 4.6.

**IUM-Gen Motivational Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praise at university</strong></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my teachers for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my parents for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise from my friends for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be praised for my university study.</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having other people tell me that I did well is important to me.</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At university I do best when I’m praised.</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting good grades is the most important thing for me at university.</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my university classes.</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task/Effort at university</strong></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard in my study at university because I’m interested in my classes.</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m always trying to do even better in my university studies.</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Factor Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to make sure that I do well at my university studies.</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work hard to try to learn something at university.</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m doing well in my university study I try even harder.</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work harder at university if I’m trying to do better than others.</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation/Social Concern at university</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like studying with other people at university.</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do best at university when I’m studying with others.</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to study with friends as much as possible at university.</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to help other students do well at university.</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy helping others with their university studies even if I don’t do so well myself.</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power at university</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s very important for me to be a group leader.</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to be the leader of a group.</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning is important to me.</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard because I want to feel important in front of my university friends.</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at university so that I will be put in charge of things.</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my university study to be compared to others.</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at university because I want the class to take notice of me.</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting the highest grade in my university classes is very important to me.  .407

**Token Rewards at university**  .79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at university for presents from my parents.</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at university for rewards from teachers.</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study best at university when I can get some kind of reward.</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to do well at university to please my teachers and parents.</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting merit certificates would make me study harder at university.</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows the component correlation matrix for these five components. The highest correlations are amongst Components 1 (Praise at university), 4 (Power at university), and 5 (Token Rewards at university). The correlation between 1 and 4 is the highest at .358, followed by that between 1 and 5 (.352), and then by that between 4 and 5 (.312).
Table 4.7.

*IUM-Gen Motivational Goals Component Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IUM-Gen Sense of Self*

*Statistical analysis.*

Initial Principal Component Analyses were performed on the 22 items with factors limited to four and five. Both analyses came out quite clearly, with very little cross-loading or single-item factors. The difference between the four and five factor results was that the five factor one split the fourth component into two doublets. Three out of the four items loading on each of the third and fourth components for the 4-factor solutions were targeted as Sense of Competence. Therefore, a final analysis was done with factors limited to three.

*Results.*

This analysis resulted in the three components accounting for 42.6% of variance. The full solution is shown in Appendix F, with all loadings greater than 0.3. One item (shaded in Appendix F, Item 72: “I like to think things out for myself in my university study.”) loading on the second factor was deleted, as it didn’t contribute to reliability and it cross-loaded on the third factor at which it was originally targeted.
Two items (Item 102: “Most of the time I feel I can do my university study” and Item 73: “If I’m studying alone, difficult homework doesn’t bother me”) loading on the first factor were originally targeted at the third factor but have strong loadings on this factor and do not cross-load. They also make theoretical sense on this factor. The item with the lowest loading (.380), Item 104, on the third factor was originally targeted at the first factor and cross-loaded on it, but was retained, based on its correlations with other items as derived from the reliability test. Three of the items loading on the third factor were negatively worded. These three items (“I always choose easy work for myself to do at university, so that I don’t have too much trouble.” “I usually do the wrong thing at university.” “Other students have to help me a lot with my university study.”) were recoded prior to doing the Reliability test.

The three factors were labelled:

1. Self-esteem at university—seven items
2. Sense of Purpose at university—seven items
3. Sense of Competence at university—seven items.

These are shown with their loadings and reliabilities in Table 4.8. Again the majority of items landed on the scales at which they were targeted.

Table 4.9 shows the component correlation matrix for these three components. The highest correlation (-.278) is that between Components 1 (Self-esteem at university) and 3 (Sense of Competence at university).

These results parallel the results of the IUM-Eng Sense of Self results, with the main difference being that the IUM-Eng Sense of Self scales were less balanced. Overall
the IUM-Gen results further support the theoretical validity of Maehr’s Personal Investment Model, within the context of a Japanese university.

Table 4.8.

*IUM-Gen Sense of Self*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Self-Esteem at University</em></th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I can do quite well at university.</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I feel I can do my university study.</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I’m as good as everyone else at university.</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do as well as other students at university.</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I succeed at whatever I study at university.</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am intelligent enough to graduate from university.</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I’m studying alone, difficult homework doesn’t bother me.</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Sense of Purpose at University</em></th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is good to plan ahead so that I can do well at university.</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good to plan ahead to complete my studies at university.</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to do well at university to show that I can do it.</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study hard at university so that I can graduate.</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to do well at university so that I can get a good job when I graduate.</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I aim my studies at university so that I can get a good job.</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to do well at university so that I can have a good future.</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9.

*IUM-Gen Sense of Self Component Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean scales.*

From the above analyses, mean scales were derived from the items comprising each of the components for both the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen. These mean scales were also used for further analyses, described in future chapters.
IUM-Eng Sense of Purpose Scale

As mentioned earlier, the Sense of Purpose Scale of the IUM-Eng was a very large scale comprising 17 items. Many of these items were written to represent the emic aspects of the Japanese context. As mentioned in Chapter 2, researchers in the Japanese context (Kubo, 1997; Nakata, 1995; Sawaki, 1997; Yashima, 2000) found different orientations to that of Gardner’s (1985) socioeducational model. Items were written based on this literature, previous interviews with students and on my experience of teaching at a women’s university in Japan. The IUM-Eng Sense of Self analyses were very successful, but within that large Sense of Purpose factor, it is assumed that there are some constructs which relate specifically to the reasons for studying English as a Foreign Language within the Japanese context.

The literature on EFL motivation in general, including Gardner’s paradigmatic model (Gardner, 1985) and Dörnyei’s numerous works (e.g. Dörnyei, 2005), also suggests there are sub-components.

From the above literature on EFL motivation in Japan and in general, it was estimated that there were three or four sub-factors within this large one. Initial Principal Components Analysis was performed on these 17 items using the same rotation, oblique (Oblimin), the same criteria for selecting factors and for excluding missing values, listwise.

This initial analysis produced three very clear factors. Three items cross-loaded on other components and were omitted from further analysis. This final analysis of 14
items with the NFACTOR set at three produced three clean, clear components. These were labelled:

1. Social/Cultural—comprising five items which describe an interest in foreign cultures and people.
2. English Certification—comprising four items which describe the benefits of test scores.
3. Utility Value of English—comprising five items which describe the usefulness or instrumentality of English.

These are shown with their loadings and reliabilities in Table 4.10.

Table 4.11 shows the component correlation matrix for these three components. As is to be expected for components that already comprise an over-arching scale, the correlations are quite high. The highest correlation (.575) is that between Components 1 (Social/Cultural) and 3 (Utility Value of English). The lowest (-.381) is that between Components 1 (Social/Cultural) and 2 (English Certification).

Interestingly, both correlations between Component 2 (English Certification) and the other two Components (Social/Cultural and Utility Value of English) are negative.

The scales will be used separately in the multiple regression analyses in Chapter 6, where the aims are to determine whether the scales produced in this chapter could predict success on certain outcome measures, and to determine which scales were most salient in predicting success.
Table 4.10.

*IUM-Eng Sense of Purpose Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to be able to read books, magazines, etc. in English.</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to be able to understand movies, and TV/radio programs in English.</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to learn English to make friends with people who don’t speak Japanese.</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English because it’s important for me to understand other cultures.</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to learn English so that I can study or work abroad.</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing my TOEFL score is important to me.</td>
<td>-.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to gain a certificate (STEP, TOEFL, TOEIC).</td>
<td>-.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English to maintain the skill and knowledge I already have.</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to learn English so that I can get a good job when I graduate.</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Value of English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to learn English because it can be useful in my present life.</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I study English because it’s necessary in the international community.</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I want to feel the pleasure of using my English ability and knowledge.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

In general, the four sets of Principal Components Analyses performed above were successful in finding answers to the research questions asked at the beginning of this chapter. Individually these were:

1. *Are the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, valid for use with Japanese university students?*

Content validity of the two forms of the instrument derives mainly from the etic components of their basis, McInerney’s ISM, which was adapted and expanded on for this study, and from the emic components, especially for the IUM-Eng, which were based on the existing literature and the preliminary pilot study, both of which suggested items to be included on the instruments. Construct validity evidence was
provided by the results of the various sets of exploratory PCAs, which produced
clear scales with solid loadings. Each scale had strong reliability as measured by
Cronbach’s alpha.

2. **What are the factor structures of the two forms of the IUM, the IUM-Eng and the
   IUM-Gen?**

The resulting factor structures of the two forms of the IUM vary slightly from the
targeted structures and from each other. They are shown in Table 4.11. The three
targeted Sense of Self dimensions were all produced on both forms of the inventory.
For the IUM-Eng, seven Motivational scales were targeted and seven produced, with
one slight difference being that items written for the Recognition Scale split into
some targeted Token Rewards items (the resulting Recognition scale), and the Praise
Scale. This split of the Recognition Scale is interesting and seems to represent
something specific to the study of EFL in Japan, as it was not reproduced with the
IUM-Gen. The IUM-Gen produced only five separate scales, as the targeted Social
Concern collapsed onto Affiliation (the Social Concern/Affiliation at university
Scale) and targeted Power and Competition items also combined into one scale
(Power at university). Overall, the data matched the a priori theorised factors and
selected items very well, with an overwhelming number of items loading on the
targeted factors.
Table 4.12.

**Resulting Dimensions of the Two Forms of the IUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Goals</th>
<th>IUM-Eng</th>
<th>IUM-Gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise (5) [0] {.86}</td>
<td>Praise at university. (8) [2] {.87}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task/Effort (7) [0] {.87}</td>
<td>Task/Effort at university (6) [1] {.79}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Concern (2) [0] {.70}</td>
<td>Affiliation/Social Concern at university (5) [0] {.76}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (3) [0] {.74}</td>
<td>Power at university (8) [0] {.84}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (4) [1] {.74}</td>
<td>Token Rewards at university. (5) [1] {.79}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation (3) [0] {.68}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition (4) [1] {.78}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Self</th>
<th>IUM-Eng</th>
<th>IUM-Gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Competence (9) [5]</td>
<td>Sense of Purpose (7) [0] {.76}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{.88}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (3) [0] {.84}</td>
<td>Sense of Competence (7) [2] {.65}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

(Number of items)

[Number of non-target items]

{Cronbach’s alpha}
3. **Do these factor structures support the dimensions of Personal Investment Theory?**

In general these factor structures strongly support the dimensions of Maehr’s Personal Investment Theory. As described in Chapter 2, Maehr’s Personal Investment Model theorises that there are four kinds of achievement goals: task goals, ego goals, social solidarity goals and extrinsic rewards. As we can see from Table 4.11, these are all reproduced in both the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen. It also theorises three Sense of Self dimensions, which again are all reproduced on both forms of the IUM. These results thus provide support for the cross-cultural sensitivity of Personal Investment Theory, its applicability in the Japanese context, with regard to university students’ general academic motivation as well as their specific motivation towards the study of EFL. The utility of Personal Investment Theory, with its multiple goals, will become clearer in the following chapter.

4. **What is the reliability of the factor scales derived from the Principal Components Analyses for the two forms of the IUM?**

The reliability of the factor scales derived from the component analyses for the two forms of the IUM is generally very good. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for all of the scales are shown in Table 4.11. The highest is .92 and the lowest .65. The average reliability for the IUM-Eng scale was .80 and for the IUM-Gen scale .79.

5. **What proportion of items loaded on the factors at which they were targeted?**

All of the items originally had labels that identified their a priori target scale (e.g. TASE—Task/Effort in English). This allows for easy estimation of how well the items loaded on targeted dimensions. Table 4.11 also lists the number of items that
loaded on scales at which they were not originally targeted. Seventeen items (or 15.5% of the 110 items) loaded on dimensions at which they were not targeted. This means that nearly 85% of scale items were originally target items. The Exploratory Principal Components Analyses therefore combined the etic aspects of the theoretical model with the emic aspects of the sociocultural context to produce results which strongly support the model in a culturally sensitive way.

Summary

Overall, the results support the validity and theoretical underpinnings of the present instrument, for first-year female Japanese university students. However, they also suggest some areas for improvement or refinement of the instruments, such as the Social Concern scale for the IUM-Eng, which drew only two items, and the Sense of Competence and Self-esteem scales of the IUM-Eng, as five items targeted at the latter scale loaded on the former one. Further studies, with new samples of students, should also be undertaken using Confirmatory Factor Analysis to ascertain the generalised validity and reliability of the instrument, across a number of Japanese groups. Nevertheless, the two forms of the instrument can be said to be valid and reliable for these students and the results strongly support Personal Investment Theory and its usefulness in eliciting the emic as well as the etic aspects of this particular sociocultural context.

This part of the study has thus been able to address Dörnyei’s (2001b) three challenges referred to in Chapter 1. It has addressed the challenge of context, by using Exploratory Principal Components Analyses to develop and validate a culturally-sensitive instrument to measure students’ motivation towards EFL and
university in general. It has addressed the challenge of extending L2 motivation theory regarding constructs related to the self, as the instrument developed in this chapter, the IUM-Eng, includes three Sense of Self constructs: Sense of Competence, Sense of Purpose, and Self-esteem. It has addressed the challenge of “parallel multiplicity” (Dörnyei, 2001b, p.13) as the IUM-Eng has an expanded view of goals, including social goals. Using the IUM-Eng with its parallel instrument, the IUM-Gen, we can compare students’ domain-specific L2 motivation with their general academic motivation.

The wider implications of this part of the study are that both theory and instrument can be successfully used, in a similarly exploratory way, in different sociocultural contexts to describe general as well as specific motivational dimensions.

In the next chapter the above three challenges are further addressed by illustrating the usefulness of the instrument, and of Maehr’s model, in detecting and describing distinguishing features of, and differences amongst, Japanese university students.
Chapter 5

The IUM-Eng & IUM-Gen:

Motivational characteristics of female Japanese university students

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the validity and reliability of the measurement instruments, IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen, were shown to be supported for this sociocultural context. In this chapter the data are used to develop a motivational profile of female Japanese university students towards EFL study and towards university study in general. The characteristics of this profile can be very valuable for a number of reasons, and to at least three different groups of people.

First, this profile will be of great assistance to universities in their endeavour to understand their present and future students. Higher education in Japan has undergone great change in the past decade and is continuing to do so (see Eades, Goodman, & Hada, 2005). Universities are having to change partly because of the rapid demographic changes occurring in Japan, and partly because of changes in society in general. A clear understanding of students’ motivational goals and Sense of Self characteristics can provide very important information to reform committees
and future planning administrators. Second, the characteristics of these students’ profiles will be of great use to teachers, of EFL and of other academic areas, in their approach to their teaching and in their evaluation of students. And third, these characteristics will be of great interest to researchers of Japanese society and Japanese people. Since the early ‘90s, Japan has undergone profound change in society in general, ranging from a very low and still declining birth rate to a low satisfaction with life despite greater affluence (Diener & Oishi, 2000). Many of these changes are not peculiar to Japan, and have occurred in other countries as a by-product of increased globalisation. However, these changes have put into question some of the previous assumptions or analyses of the characteristics of Japanese society and its people. The present motivational characteristics of female Japanese university students may represent a drastic change from the past, or, because of the cultural sensitivity of the measurement instruments, they may provide a different perspective of these students as Japanese, as university students and as young women.

Description of the Context

As stated previously, the participants in this study were first-year female students enrolled in the three departments of Keisen University, the Departments of British and American Studies, Japanese Studies, and International Sociocultural Studies. These departments all belong to the one faculty, the Faculty of Humanities. Keisen University is a small, Christian, women’s university on the outskirts of Tokyo. Academically, it is a middle- to lower middle-ranked university. It is expected that Keisen students would share some motivational features with the average Japanese university student, either male or female, and some features with other female
Japanese university students, in addition to exhibiting features specific to Keisen University.

As described in Chapter Two, four aspects of the Japanese context are particularly relevant to this study: the supposedly collectivistic nature of Japanese society, the “common wisdom” that Japanese university students are unmotivated, the options available for Japanese women in modern Japanese society, and the role of English in Japanese society. These are expected to influence students’ motivational attitudes and behaviour towards both university study in general and English in particular. Based on these aspects of the sociocultural context, and on some aspects of the Keisen specific context, some expectations can be stated. These are explained in the following paragraphs in terms of high, medium, and low expected values. Cut-off points for categorising these values will be indicated later in the chapter.

Considering the first aspect, that of Japan as a collectivistic society and its related concepts on the individual level, the social solidarity motivational subscales of Affiliation and Social Concern of both the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen should be quite high, and the ego-goals motivational subscales of Power and Competition particularly low, for the average Japanese university student. High values on the social solidarity scales are also supported by the literature on Japanese higher education, which claims that university life is more important as a time for making new friends and joining clubs and circles than it is as a time for study (Sugimoto, 1997; McVeigh, 2002).
Another related common cross-cultural description of Japanese culture is that of “tightness.” According to Triandis (1995), tight cultures are “rigid in requiring that ingroup members behave according to the ingroup norms” (p. 339). Cultures that are both collectivist and tight tend to produce behaviour based on the “public” self, as opposed to the “private” and “collective” selves. The public self is “an assessment of the self by the generalized other” (p. 329). This should lead to behaviour that is “proper” and defined by society. Kuwayama (1992) refers to this as “generalized reference others” (p. 143) and Greer (2000), writing specifically about Japanese students in the English language classroom, refers to it as “the eyes of hito” (p.183). According to these ideas, the average Japanese student will not want to perform in a way that risks a negative judgement by others. In the classroom, this can mean that the student is afraid of being judged as considering herself “superior” and thus is afraid of performing openly better than the other students. In the English language classroom, this means that a student will not want to “show off” her English language skills for fear of other students thinking she considers herself better or more sophisticated than them. Accordingly, the Recognition (RECE) scale on the IUM-Eng is expected to be low.

Considering the second aspect of the present context, that of Japanese university students in general lacking motivation to study (McVeigh, 2000; Sugimoto, 1997), and the accepted idea that first-year students in particular are thought not to have as yet developed clear academic goals, first-year students at Keisen and at other universities across Japan should be relatively low on most of the IUM-Gen Motivational and Sense of Self scales.
The third aspect of the Japanese context is that of the social expectations of women, and the options that they perceive as available to them. As mentioned in the previous chapter, existing literature suggests that Japanese students have a wide variety of reasons for wanting to learn English. One of the reasons for women wanting to learn English is to expand their possibilities of employment in the future, especially in socially-constructed “feminine” occupations. Another is to find employment at foreign companies in Japan or abroad in order to escape the gender restrictions that come with employment in Japanese companies. Keisen High School and University has a reputation for having a strong English focus and a reasonably high level of English classes. As a result, it can be expected that the average Keisen student will score relatively high on the IUM-Eng Sense of Purpose (SOPE) scale.

The final aspect of the present context, that of the role of English in Japanese society, produces many effects. One of these effects is students’, and even the greater Japanese population’s, strongly held belief that their level of English ability is very poor, despite many years of studying English. This is often indicated as both a low level of communicative ability, especially when they compare themselves to students from other countries, as well as low self-confidence in their ability to learn foreign languages (“English: Bane or blessing,” 2000; Nakatsu, 2000). Based on these ideas, scores on the Sense of Competence in English (SECE) and Self-esteem in English (SESE) scales of the IUM-Eng are expected to be very low.

There may also be some differences with other universities’ students due to Keisen’s distinctive characteristics, mentioned above and in Chapter 3. Keisen’s students have often decided to enter Keisen after having failed in their attempts to be accepted by
the more famous, prestigious, co-educational universities, private or public. As such, it may be expected that Keisen students would have relatively low scores on the IUM-Gen Sense of Self subscales of Self-esteem at University (ESTU) and Sense of Competence at University (SECU), though this may be mitigated by students comparing themselves to other Keisen students, and not to the Japanese university population as a whole. Regardless, it is expected that these two scales would be relatively low. Low scores on the Self-esteem at university scale may not necessarily be peculiar to Keisen students. Teachers (e.g. Karino, 2004), theorists and researchers (e.g. Matsumoto & Juang, 2004) suggest that Japanese people in general may have low self-esteem.

It is also expected that although Keisen students would share some of the characteristics distinctive of Keisen, that there would be some differences amongst students from the three departments. In particular, it is expected that English would be more important for students in the Department of British and American Studies than for students in the two other departments. At the very least, these students would be expected to have to read more English sources in their later studies. It is also natural that students choose this Department because of their interest in Britain, the U.S. and other English-speaking countries such as Australia and Canada, and may visit one or more of these countries in the near future. Thus, it is expected that students in the Department of British and American Studies would score more highly on all of the IUM-Eng scales.

On the other hand, the IUM-Gen consists of scales which measure students’ motivational attitudes towards study at university in general. Students in the different
departments at Keisen are considered to be more similar than different on these scales, as they come from the same high schools and generally choose their university first, based on their knowledge about the university in general, and then the department. The two most important subjects on Keisen University entrance examinations are English as a Foreign Language and Japanese Language and Literature. There are usually noticeable differences between students across the departments on these two subjects of the entrance examinations. In particular, the average for students in the British and American Studies Department on the English entrance examination is expected to be higher than that for students in the Japanese Studies Department, and vice versa for Japanese Language and Literature. However, there is usually no noticeable difference for the composite total. Thus, differences in general academic motivation across the departments are not expected.

This chapter, therefore, attempts to test the usefulness of both the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen in describing the motivational and Sense of Self features of female Japanese university students in general, as represented by Keisen university students, and in identifying specific features of Keisen students, including the commonalities and differences amongst students in the three departments of Keisen.

*Research Questions*

The specific research questions addressed were:

1. What is the motivational profile of first-year female Keisen University students towards the study of English as a Foreign Language?
2. What is the motivational profile of these students towards university study in general?
3. What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen University students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Eng?

4. What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen University students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Gen?

Hypotheses

Proceeding from the above description of the present research context, twelve hypotheses were tested based on the literature and my interviews with, and experience of teaching, Keisen university students. As described in Chapter 3, items were scored using a five point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) as follows:

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

The scale was translated into Japanese in the student questionnaire and can be seen in Appendix A. For the hypotheses, the mean for each scale was given a descriptor based on the value ranges listed in Table 5.1.

These descriptors and the ranges were decided on, based on my experience of using questionnaires with Japanese students. They tend not to choose extreme values (perhaps, they generally do not hold extreme opinions) and thus, scores tend to cluster around the mid-range. The descriptors and values decided on are thus an attempt to deal with this emic aspect of the sociocultural context in order to describe finer differences in values amongst the scales.
Table 5.1.

*Hypotheses’ Descriptors and Their Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low range</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relatively Low range| $\geq 2$  
|                     | < 2.4     |
| Mid-range           | $\geq 2.4$
|                     | < 2.6     |
| Relatively High range| $\geq 2.6$
|                      | < 3       |
| High range          | $\geq 3$  |

The hypotheses were:

**IUM-Eng hypotheses**

*Hypotheses Related to the Collectivist/Individualist Duality*

*Hypothesis 1:* The Motivational scales of Power (POWE) and Competition (COME) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., $\geq 2 < 2.4$).

*Hypothesis 2:* The Motivational scales of Social Concern (SOCE) and Affiliation (AFLE) will be in the Relatively High (i.e., $\geq 2.6 < 3$) to High range (i.e., $\geq 3$).

*Hypothesis 3:* The Motivational scale of Recognition (RECE) will be in the Low range (i.e., < 2).
Hypotheses Related to Lack of Student Motivation

Hypothesis 4: The Motivational scale of Praise (PRAE) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., $2 < 2.4$).

Hypotheses Related to Options for Young Japanese Women and the Study of English

Hypothesis 5: The Motivational Scale of Task/Effort (TASE) and the Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPE) will be in the Relatively High (i.e. $2.6 < 3$) to High range (i.e., $≥ 3$).

Hypotheses Related to Sense of Self in English

Hypothesis 6: The Sense of Self scales of Sense of Competence (SECE) and Self-esteem (SESE) will be in the Low range (i.e., $< 2$).

Hypotheses Related to Similarities and Differences Among Students

Hypothesis 7: Students in the Department of British and American Studies (BA) will have significantly higher scores on all of the IUM-Eng scales than students in the other departments—Japanese Studies (J) and International Sociocultural Studies (IS).

IUM-Gen hypotheses

Hypotheses Related to the Collectivist/Individualist Duality

Hypothesis 8: The Motivational scale of Power (POWU) will be in the Low range (i.e., $< 2$).

Hypothesis 9: The Affiliation/Social Concern scale (AFLU) will be in the Relatively High (i.e. $2.6 < 3$) to High range (i.e., $≥ 3$).
Hypotheses Related to Lack of Student Motivation

Hypothesis 10: The Motivational scales of Praise (PRAU), Task/Effort (TASU), and Token Rewards (TOKU), and the Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPU) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., $2 < 2.4$).

Hypotheses Related to Keisen Students’ Sense of Self

Hypothesis 11: Two Sense of Self scales: Self-esteem (ESTU) and Sense of Competence (SECU) will be in the Low range (i.e., $< 2$).

Hypotheses Related to Similarities and Differences Among Students

Hypothesis 12: There will be no significant difference between students in the three departments on the dimensions of the IUM-Gen. If significant differences are found, it is considered that these would reflect the importance that English may play in providing a concrete or clear focus for students’ university study in general.

Method

Dependent variables.

The dependent variables were mean scales, the mean of the scores on the items comprising each scale, based on the items loading on the factors derived from the Principal Components Analyses described in the previous chapter:

1. The IUM-Eng Motivational Goals Scales:
   - Praise in English (PRAE)
   - Task/Effort in English (TASE)
• Social Concern in English (SOCE)
• Power in English (POWE)
• Recognition in English (RECE)
• Affiliation in English (AFLE)
• Competition in English (COME)

2. The IUM-Eng Sense of Self Scales:
• Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE)
• Sense of Competence in English (SECE)
• Sense of Self-esteem in English (SESE)

3. The IUM-Gen Motivational Goals Scales:
• Praise at university (PRAU)
• Task/Effort at university (TASU)
• Affiliation/Social Concern at university (AFLU)
• Power at university (POWU)
• Token Rewards at university (TOKU)

4. The IUM-Gen Sense of Self Scales:
• Self-esteem at university (ESTU)
• Sense of Purpose at university (SOPU)
• Sense of Competence at university (SECU).

Statistical analysis.

Descriptive statistics were calculated on the above scales. Their means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5.2. Four separate Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA), one for each of the sets of scales above, were conducted, with the independent variable being the departments that the students belong to. These
were done in order to determine any significant differences amongst the three groups of students on these scales. MANOVA is the appropriate procedure here, because of the numerous dependent variables being analysed. Tests of significance differences amongst the means were conducted simultaneously. Table 5.3 shows the F ratios and significant differences for these, with the means and standard deviations of the scales by department. The most conservative of post-hoc tests, Scheffe’s, was used to determine inter-departmental differences (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; Huck, 2000).
Table 5.2.
*IUM-Eng & IUM-Gen Scales, Means and Standard Deviations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Mean (N = 413)</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivational Goals in English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASE</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAE</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLE</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCE</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWe</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Relatively Low</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECE</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Self in English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPE</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESE</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECE</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivational Goals at University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASU</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAU</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Relatively High</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLU</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWU</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Relatively Low</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKU</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Self at University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPU</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTU</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Relatively Low</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*
TASE = Task/Effort in English
PRAE = Praise in English
SOCE = Social Concern in English
RECE = Recognition in English
SESE = Sense of Purpose in English
SECE = Sense of Competence in English
TASU = Task/Effort at University
PRAU = Praise at University
AFLU = Affiliation at University
POWU = Power at University
TOKU = Token Rewards at University
SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University
SECU = Sense of Competence at University
ESTU = Self-Esteem at University
### Table 5.3.

**IUM-Eng & IUM-Gen Scales—Inter-Departmental Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>J (N = 74)</th>
<th>BA (N = 169)</th>
<th>IS (N = 170)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Inter-dep’t differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Goals in English</td>
<td>6.46*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASE</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>41.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>13.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAE</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLE</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>7.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCE</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECE</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>5.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECE</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Self in English</td>
<td>18.38*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPE</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>52.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESE</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Goals at University</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASU</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>12.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAU</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLU</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>6.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWU</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKU</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Self at University</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPU</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>13.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTU</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**Note.**

J = Dep’t of Japanese Studies  
BA = Dep’t of British & American Studies  
IS = Dep’t of International Sociocultural Studies  
TASE = Task/Effort in English  
COME = Competition in English  
PRAE = Praise in English  
AFLE = Affiliation in English  
SOCE = Social Concern in English  
POWE = Power in English  
RECE = Recognition in English  
SOPE = Sense of Purpose in English  
SESE = Self-Esteem in English  
SECE = Sense of Competence in English  
TASU = Task/Effort at University  
PRAU = Praise at University  
AFLU = Affiliation at University  
POWU = Power at University  
TOKU = Token Rewards at University  
SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University  
SECU = Sense of Competence at University  
ESTU = Self-Esteem at University
Results and Discussion

Overall there are five factors which are in the High range (≥ 3.0): Task/Effort in English (TASE), Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE), Task/Effort at University (TASU), Affiliation at University (AFLU), and Sense of Purpose at University (SOPU), with the highest, SOPE, at 3.89. On the other hand, three scales are in the Low range (< 2.0): Recognition in English (RECE), Sense of Competence in English (SECE), and Token Rewards at University (TOKU). Thus it would appear that students’ sense of purpose and intrinsic motivation or mastery goals (both in English and at university in general) are the strongest aspects of their motivation. Conversely, it appears that extrinsic motivation in the form of token rewards or recognition is of little importance to students. Social goals at university are also very important for students. Students’ very low sense of competence in English is evident as well.

Figures 5.1 (IUM-Eng) and 5.2 (IUM-Gen) graphically show these characteristics of the students’ motivation. Figures 5.3 and 5.4 show the inter-departmental differences on the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen, respectively, with the average values for students in the Department of British and American Studies higher than those of students in the two other departments on many of the scales, noticeably on the highest scales, the two Task/Effort scales (TASE and TASU) and the two Sense of Purpose scales (SOPE and SOPU).
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Figure 5.1. IUM-Eng subscale means

**Note.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASE</td>
<td>Task/Effort in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAE</td>
<td>Praise in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCE</td>
<td>Social Concern in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECE</td>
<td>Recognition in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESE</td>
<td>Self-Esteem in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>Competition in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLE</td>
<td>Affiliation in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>Power in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPE</td>
<td>Sense of Purpose in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECE</td>
<td>Sense of Competence in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **< 2** Low range
- **≥ 2 < 2.4** Relatively Low range
- **≥ 2.4 < 2.6** Mid-range
- **≥ 2.6 < 3** Relatively High range
- **≥ 3** High range
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Figure 5.2. IUM-Gen subscale means

Note.

TASU = Task/Effort at University     PRAU = Praise at University
AFLU = Affiliation at University    POWU = Power at University
TOKU = Token Rewards at University   SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University
SECU = Sense of Competence at University   ESTU = Self-Esteem at University

< 2  Low range
≥ 2 < 2.4  Relatively Low range
≥ 2.4 < 2.6  Mid-range
≥ 2.6 < 3  Relatively High range
≥ 3  High range
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Figure 5.3. Inter-departmental differences on IUM-Eng subscale scores

Note.

TASE = Task/Effort in English
PRAE = Praise in English
SOCE = Social Concern in English
RECE = Recognition in English
SOPE = Sense of Purpose in English
SECE = Sense of Competence in English
COME = Competition in English
AFLE = Affiliation in English
POWE = Power in English
SESE = Self-Esteem in English

BA = Dep’t of British & American Studies
IS = Dep’t of International Sociocultural Studies
J = Dep’t of Japanese Studies
Note.

TASU = Task/Effort at University  
PRAU = Praise at University  
AFLU = Affiliation at University  
POWU = Power at University  
TOKU = Token Rewards at University  
SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University  
SECU = Sense of Competence at University  
ESTU = Self-Esteem at University  

BA = Dep’t of British & American Studies  
IS = Dep’t of International Sociocultural Studies  
J = Dep’t of Japanese Studies

Figure 5.4. Inter-departmental differences on IUM-Gen subscale scores
The a priori hypotheses are addressed in numerical order below.

**IUM-Eng hypotheses:**

*Hypotheses Related to the Collectivist/Individualist Duality*

**Hypothesis 1:** The Motivational scales of Power (POWE) and Competition (COME) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., $2 \leq \frac{2}{4}$).

**Hypothesis 2:** The Motivational scales of Social Concern (SOCE) and Affiliation (AFLE) will be in the Relatively High (i.e., $2.6 \leq \frac{3}{3}$) to High range (i.e., $\geq 3$).

There was little support for these hypotheses, with the scale of Competition (COME, 2.97) being higher than either Affiliation (AFLE, 2.73) or Social Concern (SOCE, 2.65). This result questions the relevance of the collectivist/individualist distinction to the determinants of motivation for female Japanese university students towards the study of English. It is possible, though, that this is a characteristic of Keisen, or of Tokyo and other large urban cities, rather than of Japan as a whole.

This result may also reflect the role that English plays in Japanese society. As mentioned previously, English plays an important role in the Japanese educational system as it is one of the most important subjects on university entrance exams. It is also used as a criterion at job interviews and for promotion within companies. However, it plays a very minor role in society in general as it is not commonly used. Students may perceive English as a tool which helps them get ahead, but not a resource for maintaining group solidarity or contributing to groups they belong to.
Hypothesis 3: The Motivational scale of Recognition (RECE) will be in the Low range (i.e., < 2).

This was strongly supported by the results. Recognition of their English ability by, or in front of, their peers is not an important element of female Japanese university students’ motivation (RECE, 1.82). This is the lowest score of all the scales, and may even suggest that it can be a “demotivating” factor in the English language classroom, in the sense that students may not volunteer to give the right answer or perform well on tasks, if this places them in a situation where they are openly recognised for their success or ability. This result agrees with the predicted resulting behaviour of Triandis’ (1995) tight cultures, with Kuwayama’s (1992) notion of “generalized reference others” (p. 143), and Greer’s “the eyes of hito” (p. 183). EFL teachers, especially non-Japanese ones, need to consider these aspects of class dynamics when planning class tasks and activities. Teachers often choose students of high ability to answer questions and expect these students to respond to their attempts to elicit answers, as ways of increasing student involvement and “motivated” behaviour. These strategies often do not work in Japanese classrooms.

Hypotheses Related to Lack of Student Motivation

Hypothesis 4: The Motivational scale of Praise (PRAE) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., ≥ 2 < 2.4).

In contrast with the preceding hypothesis, this hypothesis is not supported by the results. Praise in English (PRAE) is in the Relatively High range at 2.73. This and the result above suggest that students would prefer to be praised or given positive feedback privately, rather than publicly.
This result may also now seem obvious or even a universal aspect of teaching and learning, however, as Deci and Ryan (1986; 2000) have pointed out, how praise is perceived by the student is crucial. Praise may be seen as being informational regarding certain standards or goals, or it may be seen as being controlling, in which case it will have negative effects. Though it was not the intention to differentiate between these types of praise, the items represent the former informational type. Other important issues related to praise that need to be considered are when the praise is given and the target of the praise – the person, the achievement or performance of the task, or the process or effort leading to the performance of the task.

Hypotheses Related to Options for Young Japanese Women and the Study of English

Hypothesis 5: The Motivational Scale of Task/Effort (TASE) and the Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPE) will be in the Relatively High (i.e. $\geq 2.6 < 3$) to High range (i.e., $\geq 3$).

This hypothesis is strongly supported. TASE is in the High range (3.47), as is (SOPE, 3.89), which is the highest of all the scales. These two scales are considered to reflect a common characteristic of students at Japanese women’s universities, and suggest that English study is a strong focus for their study at university and their future plans. The strength of these scales suggests that English ability is perceived as a factor which can provide attractive possibilities both personally and professionally, many of which may involve a form of opting out of traditional social expectations of women. This result also challenges the widely held belief, as addressed by Hypothesis 4, that Japanese university students lack intrinsic motivation towards
study. This result implies that students’ intrinsic motivation towards the study of EFL, especially that of female students, has not been sufficiently acknowledged.

**Hypotheses Related to Sense of Self in English**

*Hypothesis 6:* The Sense of Self scales of Sense of Competence (SECE) and Self-esteem (SESE) will be in the Low range (i.e., < 2).

This hypothesis is only partially supported by the results. Keisen students have a very low sense of competence in English (SECE, 1.98). The result on this scale only provides slight support for the hypothesis. This low sense of competence in English is considered to be representative of the general Japanese population, who compare themselves unfavourably with other nationalities learning English as a foreign language. Japanese people often talk of their English allergy or complex. The fact that the average Japanese students’ score on TOEFL is one of the lowest in the world is often mentioned by students, teachers, and other concerned educators as proof that Japanese students have not been as successful at learning English as a Foreign Language as other nationalities. This ignores the important detail that the average Japanese student can easily afford to take the TOEFL any number of times to assess their level of academic English even if they have no immediate intention to study abroad. Most other TOEFL candidates from other countries do not take the TOEFL so readily.

However, Self-esteem in English (SESE) is in the Relatively High range (2.75). This result suggests that students’ self-esteem in English is not a direct consequence of their Sense of Competence. There are a few possible reasons for this. Students may not place a high value on English, but this would contradict the previous result on
Hypothesis 5. Students may feel that they have not had the opportunity to develop their English language skills to a high degree, or have not devoted the necessary effort. Their self-esteem in English would not be threatened by a lack of competence in English. The standard deviation for SESE, 1.03, is also much greater than that for SECE, .64, indicating that the spread of scores for Self-esteem in English is much greater than that for Sense of Competence in English. Whatever the reason for these differences, this is a positive result to balance the very low sense of competence in English.

Hypotheses Related to Similarities and Differences Among Students

Hypothesis 7: Students in the Department of British and American Studies (BA) will have significantly higher scores on all of the IUM-Eng scales than students in the other departments—Japanese Studies (J) and International Sociocultural Studies (IS).

This is also strongly supported by the results, as seen in Table 5.3, and graphically in Figure 5.3. Significant differences were indicated across the groups for all but two of the IUM-Eng scales: Recognition in English (RECE) and Self-esteem in English (SESE). As mentioned above, MANOVA multivariate tests were conducted on the Sense of Self scales and the motivational scales separately. For the Sense of Self subscales of the IUM-Eng, multivariate tests (Wilk’s lambda) indicated significant differences across the groups (F = 18.378, 6/816, p < .000). Follow-up univariate F-tests indicated significant differences on Sense of Purpose in English (F = 52.59, 2/410, MS = 19.09, p < .000), and Sense of Competence in English (F = 3.10, 2/410, MS = 1.25, p = .046). No significant differences were indicated for Self-esteem in English (F = 0.23, 2/410, MS = 0.25, p = .792). SESE (2.75) is in the Relatively
High range. The lack of significant difference is interesting and surprising, as English teachers have often assumed that students in the Japanese Studies Department have lower Self-esteem in English than students in the other departments. From Figure 5.3, we can clearly see the lack of departmental differences on this scale. From Tables 5.2 and 5.3, we can see from its high standard deviation that it is the scale with the most individual variability, taken as a whole as well as within departments.

One possible interpretation of this result is that students may not attach any importance or value to English ability and thus their lower level of English does not affect their English-related self-esteem. Another is that though their English ability may be lower than students in other departments, it was good enough for them to enter Keisen, which has had a positive reputation for its English teaching. They may thus be using an external comparison frame of reference – with the general Japanese population – rather than an internal one with other Keisen students.

The differences on Sense of Competence in English (SECE) were only significant between BA (2.07), which was in the Relatively Low range, and IS (1.90) which was in the Low range. No significant differences were indicated between Japanese Studies Department (J) students (2.00), on the line between Relatively Low and Low, and students from the other two departments. This result may add support to second possible interpretation in the previous paragraph. Although, scores on TOEFL and teachers’ evaluations consistently show J students to have lower levels on English, they do not perceive this to a significant level. Their reference group might be wider than within Keisen.
Sense of Purpose (SOPE) seems to be the most noteworthy scale of all the scales on both forms of the IUM, as it is the only one that showed significant differences amongst all of the departments. British and American Studies Department (BA) students (4.23) scored significantly higher than International Sociocultural Studies Department (IS) students (3.76), who in turn scored significantly higher than J students (3.44). This was also the highest scale overall, as discussed with Hypothesis 6. This can be seen clearly in Table 5.3 and graphically in Figure 5.3. From this we can argue that Sense of Purpose may be one of the main defining and distinguishing features of female Japanese university students’ motivation towards the study of English.

Comparing the three Sense of Self scales, rather than perceived English ability, or an English-specific self-esteem, having more focused goals towards the study of English is what differentiates students in British and American Studies Department most from students in other departments.

For the motivational scales on the IUM-Eng, multivariate tests (Wilk’s lambda) indicated significant differences across the groups (F = 6.46, 14/808, p < .000). Follow-up univariate F-tests indicated significant inter-departmental differences between BA students and both IS and J students on the following two scales:

- Task/Effort in English (TASE) (F = 41.13, 2/410, MS = 18.68, p < .000) on which BA students (3.82) scored significantly higher than both other departments (IS, 3.29; J, 3.09). TASE was also the second highest scale of the IUM-Eng, as we saw in Hypothesis 3. TASE can thus also be seen as a
defining feature of Japanese university students’ motivation towards the study of English.

- Competition in English (COME) ($F = 13.11, 2/410, MS = 9.63, p < .000$), again on which BA students scored in the High range (3.23), which was significantly higher than both other departments (IS: 2.80; J: 2.77), which were in the Relatively High range. COME was the third overall highest scoring scale of the IUM-Eng.

These two scales, one an intrinsic motivational scale, Task/Effort in English, and the other an extrinsic motivational one, Competition in English, seem to work in tandem, and may be driven by the Sense of Self scale, Sense of Purpose in English. They are the highest scales and the ones with the most significant departmental differences.

Follow-up univariate F-tests also indicated significant inter-departmental differences between BA students and IS students only on the following four motivational scales of the IUM-Eng:

- Praise in English (PRAE) ($F = 4.89, 2/410, MS = 4.09, p = .008$), on which both BA (2.89) and IS (2.62) were in the Relatively High range. J scores (2.59) were slightly lower than IS. The difference between J and BA approached significance ($p = .058$).

- Social Concern in English (SOCE) ($F = 3.52, 2/410, MS = 2.69, p = .030$), on which BA’s score was in the Relatively High range (2.77) and IS in the Mid-range (2.52). J’s score (2.66) was just in the Relatively High range and not significantly different to BA.
• Power in English (POWE) ($F = 5.12, 2/410, MS = 3.61, p = .006$), on which all departments (BA = 2.38, J = 2.20, IS = 2.09) were in the Relatively Low range, but only BA and IS were significantly different.

• Affiliation in English (AFLE) ($F = 7.20, 2/410, MS = 3.77, p = .001$), on which both BA (2.88) and J (2.73) were in the Relatively High range and IS in the Mid-range (2.58). Again, differences were significant only between BA and IS.

As mentioned above, one scale on the IUM-Eng, Recognition in English (RECE) ($F = 2.15, 2/410, MS = 0.93, p = .118$) indicated no significant inter-departmental differences amongst students in the three departments. It is also the scale with the lowest value and, as discussed earlier, may have a negative effect on motivation for all Japanese students.

These results can be seen in the MANOVA results in Table 5.3 and clearly show the differences in motivation for the study of English amongst students in the three departments of Keisen University. The fact that the majority of significant differences were between students in the Department of British and American Studies and those in the Department of International Sociocultural Studies is surprising. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the Department of International Sociocultural Studies had been recently created, but it was expected that students in this new department would hold more similar attitudes towards English as BA students than J students. The opposite seems to be the case. IS students’ attitudes towards English seem to be more different to BA students’ attitudes than J students. J students have, from the inception of the university, been thought of as having more
negative attitudes towards English, so the differences between J and BA students
were expected to be at least the same as for that between BA and ISC students.

**IUM-Gen hypotheses:**

*Hypotheses Related to the Collectivist/Individualist Duality*

**Hypothesis 8:** The Motivational scale of Power (POWU) will be in the Low range

\(i.e., < 2\).

This is not completely supported by the results. The scale POWU is in the Relatively
Low range (2.33) but not in the Low range.

**Hypothesis 9:** The Affiliation/Social Concern scale (AFLU) will be in the Relatively

High \(i.e., \geq 2.6 < 3\) to High range \(i.e., \geq 3\).

This hypothesis is supported by the results. AFLU (3.07) is just in the High range.
While the result supports the hypothesis, it is not as strong as expected. These results
along with the above results for Hypothesis 8, and the results of the IUM-Eng
Hypotheses 1 and 2, support Shimizu (2001a, 2001b) and Rosenberger and others
(Rosenberger, 1992b) who argue that these mixed results describe the complexity of
the lived experience of self, and question the relevance of the
collectivist/individualist distinction to Japanese people. They also may apply to
Japanese university students in general, as there is nothing particularly distinctive
about Keisen or about female students on this social solidarity scale. However, one
possibility is that it is limited to Tokyo and to other large urban cities, rather than
being representative of Japan as a whole. Matsumoto (2002) suggests that this is a
lasting change that has occurred over the past few years, and argues that this change
is not temporary; that is, that these university students will not suddenly become
more collectivist as they graduate from university and enter the workforce.
If this is correct, the implications for education, and for society as a whole are immense. Hofstede (2000) compares the differences in school issues between collectivist and individualist societies. These include issues such as teachers’ expectations of students and vice versa students’ expectations of teachers, classroom dynamics and group activities, and indeed the overall purpose of education – in collectivist societies the purpose of education is learning how to do, while in individualist societies it is learning how to learn. If this is a recent change from collectivism to individualism then there is likely to be a gap between the expectations of students and those of the teachers, and also between students’ expectations of education and educational policy and practice. The recent increase in problems at schools such as absenteeism, bullying, suicide and school violence may be an indication of the existence of this gap.

In society in general there have been signs of changes in recent years. A recent decision by the High Court to award the financial rewards of inventions and patents to the individual worker, and to reject the arguments of the company that it was the result of group effort and company support, highlights these changes. However, these results can also be interpreted as a new perspective provided by the theoretical model and measurement instrument used in this research, rather than evidence of a recent change, and thus may describe a more complex set of factors than the collectivist/individualist dichotomy explains.
Hypotheses Related to Lack of Student Motivation

Hypothesis 10: The Motivational scales of Praise (PRAU), Task/Effort (TASU), and Token Rewards (TOKU), and the Sense of Self scale of Sense of Purpose (SOPU) will be in the Relatively Low range (i.e., $\geq 2 < 2.4$).

This hypothesis has limited support as two of these four scales are in the High range: TASU (3.66) and SOPU (3.63). Intrinsic motivation towards university study, as measured by these scales, thus appears to be a very important aspect of students’ motivation at university. These two results suggest that students’ intrinsic motivation towards university study, as measured by these scales, is not being recognised. These results together suggest that universities themselves are as responsible for the lack of motivational behaviour as the students, perhaps focusing too much on grades or other extrinsic rewards, and not enough on students’ intrinsic motivation, or on providing enough feedback for students. A third scale PRAU (2.86) is in the Relatively High range. Thus feedback, especially in the form of praise from teachers, parents and friends, appears to be a relatively important aspect of students’ motivation at university. The only result which supports the hypothesis is that on the fourth scale, TOKU (1.86) which is in the Low range. In fact it is the second lowest amongst all the scales. Token rewards clearly are not an important aspect of student motivation at university, but as with Hypotheses 4 and 5 for the IUM-Eng, the overall result for this hypothesis challenges the unfortunate stereotype that Japanese students are completely unmotivated.

The results also point to a way in which this motivation should be nurtured. As stated earlier in relation to the result on the Praise in English scale, praise can have negative effects if it is perceived as being controlling, that is, if students see the praise as
being contingent on doing what the teacher wants them to do, or what the teacher
thinks they should do. The items on the Praise scales of the IUM, however, represent
a more informational type of praise, which should enhance students’ intrinsic interest
and effort.

Hypotheses Related to Keisen Students’ Sense of Self

Hypothesis 11: Two Sense of Self scales: Self-esteem (ESTU) and Sense of
Competence (SECU) will be in the Low range (i.e., < 2).

This is not supported, as ESTU is in the Relatively Low range (2.07), just outside the
Low range, but SECU surprisingly is in the High range (3.0). ESTU is a
comparative, evaluative scale including items that ask students to compare
themselves with other students, whilst SECU is based more on an individual’s sense
of being able to succeed at university. Thus, students comparing themselves with
other university students may report relatively low Self-esteem at university, but may
report feeling capable of success on their own standards. The relatively low reported
levels of ESTU substantiate Keisen teachers’ opinions of students’ low self-esteem at
university. One possible explanation is that first year students at Keisen University
(especially in the first semester when the data were collected) have yet to develop a
sense of how they compare to other students and rate themselves poorly as a result.
Another possible cause may be that students’ past academic results at high school
and, most recently, on university entrance examinations, have not been strong. This,
in combination with the previous idea, would make this result comparable to other
mid-ranked Japanese universities. Some researchers (e.g., Matsumoto, 1994) have
suggested that this is a characteristic of Japanese university students when compared
with the higher self-esteem of students from the United States. Others (e.g. Karino,
2004, Matsumoto & Juang, 2004) suggest that Japanese people in general have low self-esteem. The relationship amongst Sense of Self aspects and motivational goals is complex and not the focus of this study, but it is worth noting Deci and Ryan’s (1985) concept, “amotivation,” akin to a complete lack of motivation, is produced by feelings of helplessness and lack of competence.

**Hypotheses Related to Similarities and Differences Among Students**

**Hypothesis 12:** There will be no significant difference between students in the three departments on the dimensions of the IUM-Gen. If significant differences are found, it is considered that these would reflect the importance that English may play in providing a concrete or clear focus for students’ university study in general.

This hypothesis is not supported by the results, as can be seen from Table 5.3, and graphically from Figure 5.4. As with the IUM-Eng, Sense of Self and motivational goals scales were analysed separately. The Sense of Self scales are described first.

Multivariate tests (Wilk’s lambda) indicated significant differences across the groups (F = 5.59, 6/816, p < .000). Follow-up univariate F-tests indicated significant differences on the Sense of Purpose at University (SOPU) scale (F = .13.68, 2/410, MS = 4.49, p < .000), but not on the Sense of Competence at University (SECU) scale (F = 1.31, 2/410, MS = .406, p = .270), nor on the Self-esteem at University (ESTU) scale (F = 1.86, 2/410, MS = .712, p = .157). The significant differences on the Sense of Purpose scale were between BA students (3.81) and both IS (3.49) and J students (3.57), all of which are in the High range. While the difference between IS and J students was not significant on this scale, and thus is not as distinguishing a
feature as Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE) on the IUM-Eng, the results suggest it is an important defining and distinguishing characteristic of these students’ general academic motivation at university.

Regarding the motivational goals scales, multivariate tests (Wilk’s lambda) indicated significant differences across the groups \( (F = 3.62, 10/812, p < .000) \). Follow-up univariate F-tests indicated significant differences on three scales:

- **Task Effort at University (TASU)** \( (F = 12.76, 2/410, MS = 4.57, p < .000) \). BA students (3.84) scored significantly higher than students from both other departments \( (J = 3.56; IS = 3.33) \) on this scale. All of these scores are in the High range. This subscale, along with SOPU on the Sense of Self scales, are the only two scales of the IUM-Gen where BA students are significantly different to students from both other departments. It can therefore also be considered an important defining and distinguishing characteristic of these students’ general academic motivation at university. These two subscales are also the highest of all those on the IUM-Gen, and thus provide parallel results with the IUM-Eng, and their equivalent scales, SOPE and TASE.

- **Affiliation at University (AFLU)** \( (F = 6.84, 2/410, MS = 2.33, p = .001) \). BA students (3.18—High range) were significantly higher than IS students (2.95—Relatively High range), but not significantly higher than J students (3.09—High range).

- **Power at University (POWU)** \( (F = 5.64, 2/410, MS = 2.71, p = .004) \). BA students (2.46—Mid-range) were significantly higher than IS students (2.21—Relatively Low range), but not significantly higher than J students (2.33—Relatively Low range).
No significant differences were found amongst students from the three departments on the final two subscales:

- Praise at University (PRAU) \((F = 2.90, 2/410, MS = 2.06, p = .056)\). The difference between BA students (2.98—at the top end of the Relatively High range) and IS students (2.76—Relatively High range) approached significance \((p = .061)\).

- Token at University (TOKU) \((F = 0.55, 2/410, MS = 0.27, p = .577)\).
  Departmental scores were all in the Low range (BA = 1.88; J = 1.91; IS = 1.82).

These are interesting, unexpected results. It is especially noteworthy in that the significant results were all in the same direction. This suggests that the study of EFL and/or the focus of the Department of British and American Studies (BA) may have an important impact on students’ general motivation at university. One possible explanation is that the study of EFL may act as a kind of organising principle for other aspects of students’ study within the Department of British and American Studies, and that this is missing from the other departments. In any case, it suggests that BA students are not differentiating between the study of EFL and the study of other university subjects. This result also suggests that BA students are more positively engaged in their studies than students in the two other departments.

English teachers at Keisen have commented on this on various occasions at meetings and informal discussions, in terms of the average student or the majority of students, but, apart from English grades, there are no other data with which to compare students amongst departments objectively.
Overall, the results demonstrate the capacity of both the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen to describe the salient motivational and Sense of Self features of first year Keisen University students, by extracting the emic aspects of the Japanese context. Many of the stereotypes of Japanese people as well as of Japanese students, which were the bases for the hypotheses, were disconfirmed by the data. The results also showed the instruments to be capable of measuring expected and unexpected distinguishing features, in terms of significant differences amongst students of the different departments of Keisen University.

Specific answers to the four research questions asked at the beginning of this chapter are:

1. **What is the motivational profile of first year female Keisen university students towards the study of English as a Foreign Language?**

The motivational profile of first year female Keisen university students towards the study of EFL can be clearly seen from the top half of Table 5.2 and from Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.3. The variables which best describe these students’ strongest motivational determinants towards the study of English are Sense of Purpose (SOPE) and Task/Effort (TASE). These two variables are clearly prominent and as mentioned above, show that these students are strongly intrinsically motivated towards the study of English. This result supports the ideas of researchers like Iwao (1993), who argues that there are now more opportunities for women to gain control over their lives outside the home than previously, and that one of the avenues for such opportunities is through ability in English. Kelsy (2001) broadens this argument from a purely vocational basis to include the personal dimension.
In contrast, two variables, Recognition in English (RECE) and Sense of Competence in English (SECE), are conspicuously low. Again, as mentioned above, students feel very strongly that their English ability or competence is not good enough. They feel even more strongly that they do not wish to be publicly recognised, for example in class or in front of their peers, for any success they might have with English.

The results on these four variables provide us with unmistakeable valuable information about the most salient motivational features of these students towards the study of English. The results of other variables are also useful in completing this profile. Competition in English (COME) is the third highest variable (2.97). This may conflict with theory that regards Japan as a collectivistic society and competition as an individualistic characteristic. The result is not surprising though, considering the examination pressures that many students experienced prior to university. The result offers an insight into the limited options available to students, and the pathways necessary to achieving those possibilities.

Only one other variable is below the mid-range, Power in English (2.23). The other variables, Praise in English (2.73), Affiliation in English (2.73), Self-esteem in English (2.75), and Social Concern in English (2.65) are all in the Relatively High range. Students thus have an overall positive attitude towards the study of English. The results on the scales of Affiliation and Social Concern suggest that though students do place importance on social goals these are not nearly as high as the research literature, the media, and general public believe. The majority of the above
features can be considered to be generalisable to first year students at women’s universities in Japan.

2. **What is the motivational profile of these students towards university study in general?**

The complete profile of these students for university study in general can be seen from the bottom half of Table 5.2, Figure 5.2 and Figure 5.4. Similarly to Research Question 1, the variables which best define the most salient features of students’ motivation towards university study in general are the Sense of Purpose at university (SOPU) scale, and the Task/Effort at university (TASU) scale. These two variables again are clearly prominent, and in combination with the results for Research Question 1, show that, contrary to the research literature and generally accepted belief, these students are strongly intrinsically motivated towards university study in general.

These results may suggest that the bases for the perception of lack of motivation among university students may found in educational institution’s policy and practice, or in society as a whole, rather than within students themselves. However, care needs to be taken when attempting to generalise these results. They may be limited to students at women’s universities, who may choose to go to a single sex university to avoid distractions. They may also be level-limited or limited to certain areas of study. For example, it may be that students in certain departments or at higher level universities may need to continue focussing on high grades in order to progress in their studies or chosen career. They may thus show much higher levels of extrinsic
motivation than intrinsic. Conversely, students in some other departments or at lower level universities may fit the stereotypical image of university students.

The variable with the lowest value, Token at University, shows clearly that these students do not place value on extrinsic rewards in the form of token rewards or grades for their university study. This is the only variable in the Low range. Two other variables lie within the Relatively Low range, Self-esteem at university and Power at university. While this low academic self-esteem is of some concern, as it may be related to “amotivation,” as mentioned above in the discussion for Hypothesis 12, it is somewhat mediated by Sense of Competence (SECU) and Sense of Purpose at university (SOPU), which are relatively high. Thus students’ overall sense of self is not completely negative.

The remaining two scales, Praise at university (PRAU), in the Relatively High range, and Affiliation at university (AFLU), in the High range, show a sensible need for positive feedback on their university study, and a healthy interest in the development of their social selves. The results on the Affiliation scale again suggest, along with the parallel result for Research Question 1, that students do not place undue importance on social goals.

3. What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Eng?

The differences amongst first-year Keisen students across the departments they belong to on the dimensions of the IUM-Eng are shown in the top half of Table 5.3 and in Figure 5.3. The most obvious difference is that students in the Department of
British and American Studies have significantly higher values for most of the scales than students in either of the other two departments of Keisen University. As stated above, this is easily understood, as the BA Department has a much stronger focus on English, with many classes using textbooks in English, some courses taught in English, and many students planning to become English teachers or pursue careers in which they can use English. The scales with the most marked differences are the Sense of Purpose scale (SOPE), the Task/Effort (TASE) scale, and the Competition (COME) scale. No significant difference was found for two of the scales, Recognition in English (RECE), which was in the Low range for all departments, and Self-esteem in English, which was in the Relatively High range for all departments.

4. **What are the differences amongst first-year Keisen students across the departments according to the dimensions of the IUM-Gen?**

The departmental differences amongst first-year Keisen students, according to the dimensions on the IUM-Gen can be clearly seen in the bottom half of Table 5.2 and in Figure 5.4. Surprisingly, significant differences were produced on the majority of scales of the IUM-Gen. As mentioned above, especially noteworthy is the fact that the significant results were all in the same direction. This result suggests that English language study and/or the focus of the Department of British and American Studies (BA) may have an important impact on students’ general motivation at university. Again as mentioned above, one possible explanation is that the study of EFL may act as a kind of organising principle for other aspects of students’ study. This is then reflected in the overall higher values placed on many of the variables by students within the Department of British and American Studies. The most notable
differences are for the Task/Effort scale (TASU), and the Sense of Purpose scale (SOPU).

Summary

In summary, the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen have both been valuable in eliciting the emic characteristics of female first-year Japanese university students’ motivation towards study in general as well as specifically towards learning English as a Foreign Language. The profile produced can be very valuable to a variety of groups involved in education, as well as to researchers interested in Japanese society in general. Individual characteristics of the profile contradict some widely held beliefs about Japanese people and Japanese university students. The widely held belief in Japan of Japanese university students as unmotivated was disconfirmed. The stereotype of Japanese people as group-oriented and therefore not driven by competition or power goals was also disconfirmed.

Some important data for teachers were provided, notably by the confirmation of the hypotheses referring to Recognition and Praise, which suggest the kind of feedback that students prefer or would respond best to. There were also some results that suggest that the study of EFL is strongly connected to the study of other academic subjects, at least for female Japanese university students. This was suggested by the parallel results of the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen, as well as the significant differences indicated between students in the Department of British and American Studies and students in the other two departments on general academic motivation. This is one area that would benefit from further research. The following chapter will investigate the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen in terms of the important predictors of achievement.
Chapter 6

Japanese university students and the IUM:
The significant predictors of performance

Introduction

In Chapter 4, the construct validity and reliability of the two forms of the Inventory of University Motivation, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, both adapted from McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995), were examined. The theoretical basis of these instruments, Maehr’s Personal Investment Model (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986), was supported as an appropriate and important one for use in studying the motivation of Japanese university students towards study at university in general, as well as specifically towards English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Based on the exploratory Principal Components Analyses conducted, mean scales were developed in order to further test the instruments and the model. In this chapter I outline how these mean scales were used, in multiple regression analyses, to measure the utility of the instruments and of Maehr’s model, to predict student performance and achievement.
**Specification of the Problem**

As mentioned previously in Chapter 2, a wide variety of factors are usually provided as explanations for differential success in learning foreign languages. But, as is also mentioned in the same section, constructs such as “proficiency” and “achievement” are difficult to describe or measure, and the relationship among different factors, such as aptitude and motivation, or the specific contribution of each factor is difficult to isolate.

As described previously in Chapter 3, in this study measures of proficiency or achievement used were grades on four first-year English classes and two TOEFL scores taken at the start and end of the academic year. These criterion variables are specific to English study, so the IUM-Eng was expected to be stronger at predicting scores and grades than the IUM-Gen. However, the criterion variables are all compulsory aspects of students’ university education, and therefore, some correlation was expected amongst them and the subscales of the IUM-Gen. The following research questions were addressed:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the predictor variables derived from the two forms of the IUM and the criterion variables?

2. What are the particular predictor variables of most significance, and how do these relate to theoretical perspectives on potential motivators of Japanese university students?
Method

Subjects and procedures.

The subjects and procedures used are described in Chapter 3.

Criterion variables.

Six criterion variables were used for the multiple regression analyses of the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen. The first four variables were grades on students’ four compulsory first year English classes, Communicative English (CE) 1, 2, 3, and 4. These grades are composed of three main factors: Attendance (approximately 25%), Participation in Class (approximately 25%), and Performance on set tasks and assignments (approximately 50%). These weightings are approximate guidelines for teachers, who design or choose their own materials and evaluate their own classes. There is no program-wide evaluation. However, there are program-wide meetings at the start and end of the semester, with the main intention of maximising consistency of grades across classes. Teachers teaching the same groups of students, as well as those teaching different groups, share information about their grades and individual criteria. However, because of the subjective components of the cumulative grade, and the obvious possibility that there may be no relationship between attending class and performing well, these grades may not act as a solid outcome variable. Possible grades for these classes are: AA (≥ 90%), A (≥ 80%), B (≥ 70%), C (≥ 60%), and Fail (< 60%). These were recoded to ordinal values: F = 1, C = 2, B = 3, A = 4, AA = 5.

The final two variables were two results on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Institutional Testing Procedure (ITP) that all first year students
take in early April as a part of their placement into English classes, and then again
towards the end of their first academic year in December to measure their
improvement on this internationally-recognised academic English test. The ITP is a
version of the TOEFL test that individual institutions can conduct at dates of their
choice and for their own purposes. It consists of three sections: Listening
Comprehension, Structure and Written Expression, and Reading Comprehension.
Possible total scores range from 217 to 677. These TOEFL variables are clearly
objective standardised measures, recognised by universities around the world, and
thus are more likely than the more subjective class grades, which are open to other
intervening factors, to be well predicted by the motivation scales.

Individually, the six criterion variables are:

- **CE 1**— Final grade on the first semester Listening/Speaking class taught by
  a native-speaking teacher of English. This class meets for 3 hours a
  week for 12-13 weeks, from April to July. It is a “content-based”
  class, with each teacher preparing their own materials based on a
  Theme. The main set task for this class is a small group presentation
  to the whole class. Individual teachers decide on other tasks, such as
  listening quizzes, small group discussions, and recorded
  assignments.

- **CE 2**— Final grade on the first semester Reading class taught by a Japanese
  teacher of English. This class meets for 3 hours a week for 12-13
  weeks from April to July. Teachers of these classes are free to
  choose a textbook of their own preference in consultation with the
  coordinating teachers. The guidelines for grades are the same as
explained above, but activities and tasks vary according to the
teacher. This is an intensive reading class and the main set tasks are
an exam consisting of comprehension and/or translation questions,
and vocabulary/grammar quizzes.

- **CE 3**—Same as CE 1 but taught in the second semester from September to January.

- **CE 4**—Final grade on the second semester Writing class taught by a
Japanese teacher of English. This class meets for 3 hours a week for
12-13 weeks from September to January. The main set task for this
class is an extended piece of writing, ranging from a single
paragraph to a five-paragraph essay, depending on the level of the
class. Individual teachers decide on textbooks and other activities
and tasks.

- **TOEFL 1**—Results on this test in April. This is usually conducted before classes
start in April, and is one of the bases for placing students in either
an Advanced or Standard class. This is the first time for students to
take this particular test. They usually find it very difficult, as
TOEFL is a test for assessing students’ ability to study at the
university level in English in the United States. Most universities
require a score of 500 or higher.

- **TOEFL 2**—Results on this test in December. This is conducted in students’ last
class before the Christmas vacation. The purpose is to objectively
measure students’ improvement over the 8 months, and to give
students who are interested in studying overseas during their second
or third year some idea of their level of proficiency. Some students
do not show any improvement in TOEFL. The main reasons for this are considered to be: the students’ attitude towards the test itself, the range of error, which is estimated to be ±20, and the lack of a Speaking component in the test. Though their English classes at university are not geared towards training students for this test, the activities and content of their classes should help them prepare for the reading, listening, vocabulary, and grammar aspects of it.

Table 6.1 gives descriptive statistics for these six criterion variables.

Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>373.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>381.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor variables.

The predictor variables were the Mean Scales developed in the previous chapter:

1. the IUM-Eng
   - Motivational Goals Scales:
     - Praise in English (PRAE)
- Task/Effort in English (TASE)
- Social Concern in English (SOCE)
- Power in English (POWE)
- Recognition in English (RECE)
- Affiliation in English (AFLE)
- Competition in English (COME)

- Sense of Self Scales:
  - Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE)
  - Sense of Competence in English (SECE)
  - Self-esteem in English (SESE)

2. the IUM-Gen

- Motivational Goals Scales:
  - Praise at university (PRAU)
  - Task/Effort at university (TASU)
  - Affiliation/Social Concern at university (AFLU)
  - Power at university (POWU)
  - Token Rewards at university (TOKU)

- Sense of Self Scales:
  - Self-esteem at university (ESTU)
  - Sense of Purpose at university (SOPU)
  - Sense of Competence at university (SECU)

In addition, as was explained in Chapter 4, the Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE) scale comprised a large number of items, 17, which were again factor analysed. The
result was three sub-factors comprising 14 items. Mean scales of these three sub-factors were also used as predictor variables:

- Social/Cultural—comprising five items which described an interest in foreign cultures and people.
- English Certification—comprising four items which described the benefits of test scores.
- Utility Value of English—comprising five items which described the usefulness or instrumentality of English.

Hypotheses.

Based on the above, three hypotheses were formulated:

**Hypothesis 1**: The IUM-Eng will be stronger at predicting TOEFL scores than CE grades.

**Hypothesis 2**: The IUM-Gen will be stronger at predicting TOEFL scores than CE grades.

**Hypothesis 3**: The IUM-Eng will be stronger at predicting scores and grades than the IUM-Gen.

Based on one of the results of Chapter 5, where it was suggested, supported by the related literature, that the subscale Recognition in English (RECE) could act as a “demotivator,” the following additional hypothesis was formulated:

**Hypothesis 4**: The subscale of the IUM-Eng, Recognition in English (RECE), will have a negative relationship with grades and TOEFL scores.
Finally, based on the literature described in Chapter 5, relevant to the question whether Japanese university students are more interested in developing and maintaining friendships, and value social activities over academic study, and to the results which partially supported the literature (see Chapter 5), two further hypotheses were formulated:

**Hypothesis 5:** Two subscales of the IUM-Eng, Social Concern in English (SOCE), and Affiliation in English (AFLE), will have a negative relationship with grades and TOEFL scores.

**Hypothesis 6:** The subscale of the IUM-Gen, Affiliation/Social Concern at university (AFLU), will have a negative relationship with grades and TOEFL scores.

**Analysis procedures.**

Using SPSS 9.0, multiple regression analysis was performed for two main purposes: first, to determine whether or not the instruments could predict success on the six outcome measures, and second, to determine which scales were most salient in predicting success. Each of the above two scales, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen, and the three subscales of the SOPE scale, were analysed separately to examine their effect on the six criterion variables of four CE class grades and two TOEFL test scores. Table 6.2 shows the correlation matrix for the criterion variables and the predictor variables of the IUM-Eng. Table 6.3 shows the correlation matrices for the same criterion variables and the predictor variables of the IUM-Gen, and Table 6.4 shows the correlation matrix for the same six criterion variables and the three predictor variables of the subscales of the SOPE scale. In general, the intercorrelations amongst the predictor variables are moderate to low (< .5).
However, a small number of relatively high correlations (> .6) exist between related constructs: SOPE and TASE (+.77), and COME and PRAE (+.61) for the IUM-Eng, and for the IUM-Gen, SOPU and TASU (+.67), PRAU and TOKU (+.61), and POWU and PRAU (+.60). As is to be expected, the correlations for the three subscales of the SOPE factor are high (> .6). All correlations fall below .80, suggested by Hatch and Lazaraton (1991) as the point at which multicollinearity starts to become a problem. However, the multicollinearity statistics were examined to ensure they met appropriate criteria for inclusion in multiple regression.

In this study, the main purpose of the multiple regression was to test the relative utility of the two complete scales, rather than to build a separate model of predictor variables for each of the dependent variables for this population of students. Thus the simultaneous method of input of variables was selected along with the SPSS diagnostic tests for collinearity. This test produces a tolerance statistic ranging from zero to one. A small value (close to 0) indicates high multicollinearity, while a high value (close to 1) indicates low multicollinearity. The first analysis was performed with the combined IUM-Eng Scales of Motivational Goals and Sense of Self as the ten predictor variables. These were regressed on each of the criterion variables: the four end-of-semester grades on the students’ compulsory English classes, CE 1-4, and the two scores on the TOEFL. The second analysis was performed with the combined IUM-Gen Scales of Motivational Goals at University and Sense of Self at University as the eight predictor variables regressed on the same set of criterion variables. The third analysis was performed with the three SOPE subscales as the predictor variables regressed on the same set of criterion variables.
Table 6.2.

Correlation Matrix for Criterion Variables and Predictor Variables of the IUM-Eng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOEFL 1</th>
<th>TOEFL 2</th>
<th>CE1</th>
<th>CE2</th>
<th>CE3</th>
<th>CE4</th>
<th>SOPE</th>
<th>SECE</th>
<th>SESE</th>
<th>TASE</th>
<th>SOCE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>AFLE</th>
<th>COME</th>
<th>PRAE</th>
<th>RECE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE3</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE4</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPE</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECE</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESE</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASE</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCE</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLE</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COME</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAE</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECE</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  TOEFL 1 & 2 = Test of English as a Foreign Language April, 1999 & December, 1999  
CE 1-4 = Communicative English Classes 1-4 End-of-semester grades  
SOPE = Sense of Purpose in English  SECE = Sense of Competence in English  
SESE = Self-Esteem in English  TASE = Task/Effort in English  
SOCE = Social Concern in English  POWER = Power in English  
AFLE = Affiliation in English  COME = Competition in English  
PRAE = Praise in English  RECE = Recognition in English
Table 6.3.

**Correlation Matrix for Criterion Variables and Predictor Variables of the IUM-Gen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOEFL 1</th>
<th>TOEFL 2</th>
<th>CE 1</th>
<th>CE 2</th>
<th>CE 3</th>
<th>CE 4</th>
<th>PRAU</th>
<th>TASU</th>
<th>AFLU</th>
<th>POWU</th>
<th>TOKU</th>
<th>ESTU</th>
<th>SOPU</th>
<th>SECU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAU</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASU</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLU</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWU</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKU</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTU</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPU</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

TOEFL 1 & 2 = Test of English as a Foreign Language April, 1999 & December, 1999

CE 1-4 = Communicative English Classes 1-4 End-of-semester grades

PRAU = Praise at University

TASU = Task/Effort at University

AFLU = Affiliation at University

POWER = Power at University

TOKU = Token Rewards at University

ESTU = Self-Esteem at University

SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University

SECU = Sense of Competence at University
Table 6.4.

Correlation Matrix for Criterion Variables and SOPE Subscale Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOEFL 1</th>
<th>TOEFL 2</th>
<th>CE 1</th>
<th>CE 2</th>
<th>CE 3</th>
<th>CE 4</th>
<th>Soc/Cul</th>
<th>CERT</th>
<th>UTIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc/Cul</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Multiple regression analysis: IUM-Eng.

Of the first four criterion variables considered, grades on students’ Communicative English classes, CE 1 - 4, only one, CE 3, was able to be predicted by the IUM-Eng variables. A low 4.5% of the variance ($p = .043$) in CE 3 grades could be explained by the IUM-Eng scales, with the significant predictors being Self-esteem in English (beta weight = -.136) and Power in English (beta weight = -.131), both having an inverse relationship with the CE 3 grade. Table 6.5 shows these beta weights and correlation coefficients.

The IUM-Eng Scales were much more effective in predicting academic English proficiency, as measured by the TOEFL 1 and 2 criterion variables, as can be seen from Table 6.5. The IUM-Eng scales could explain 16.2% of the variance in TOEFL 1 ($p < .000$). Five individual scales made significant contributions to this. In order of
standardised beta weight these were: Sense of Competence in English (positive),
Competition in English (positive), Social Concern in English (negative), Recognition
in English (negative), and Power in English (negative).

For TOEFL 2, the predictive strength increased slightly. The predictor scales could
explain 19.2% of the variance ($p < .000$). The strongest significant predictor was
again Sense of Competence in English (positive), followed by Self-esteem in English
(negative), Competition in English (positive), and Social Concern in English
(negative). Beta weights and correlation coefficients for the IUM-Eng and TOEFL
tests are also shown in Table 6.5.
### Table 6.5.
**IUM-Eng Beta Weights and Multiple Correlation Coefficients for the Six Criterion Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Mul R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>PRAE</th>
<th>TASE</th>
<th>SOCE</th>
<th>POWE</th>
<th>RECE</th>
<th>AFLE</th>
<th>COME</th>
<th>SOPE</th>
<th>SECE</th>
<th>SESE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.206*</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.043*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.131*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.136*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.154*</td>
<td>-.122*</td>
<td>-.126*</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.155*</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.308*</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**
- **PRAE** = Praise in English
- **TASE** = Task/Effort in English
- **SOCE** = Social Concern in English
- **POWE** = Power in English
- **RECE** = Recognition in English
- **AFLE** = Affiliation in English
- **COME** = Competition in English
- **SOPE** = Sense of Purpose in English
- **SECE** = Sense of Competence in English
- **SESE** = Self-Esteem in English
- **CE 1-4** = Communicative English Classes 1-4 End-of-semester grades
- **TOEFL 1** = Test of English as a Foreign Language (April, 1999)
- **TOEFL 2** = Test of English as a Foreign Language (December, 1999)

*Coefficients in bold and shaded are significant at the .05 level.*
For these multiple regression analyses, the lowest level of tolerance produced was .343, which is considered to be high enough to avoid problems of multicollinearity (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991).

*Multiple regression analysis: IUM-Gen.*

For general motivation at university there were eight predictor scales. Of the first four criterion variables considered, CE 1-4, the IUM-Gen scales could predict a significant, but low, percentage of the variance (6.7%) for one of the two first semester grades, CE 1 ($p < .000$). The prediction approached significance for the other first semester grade, CE 2 ($p = .051$). The two second semester grades could not be significantly explained by the IUM-Gen, although CE 4 approached significance ($p = .058$). For CE 1, the two significant predictors in order of standardised Beta weight were: Task/Effort at University (positive), and Sense of Purpose at University (negative). Table 6.6 shows these beta weights and correlation coefficients.

Regarding the final two criterion variables, the TOEFL tests, again the IUM-Gen could significantly explain only a low percentage. For TOEFL 1 it could explain 7.4% of the variance ($p < .000$), and for TOEFL 2 it could explain 5.3% of the variance ($p = .017$). For TOEFL 1, the significant predictors, in order of standardised Beta weights, were: Self-esteem at University (positive), Token at University (negative), and Affiliation at University (negative).
### Table 6.6

**IUM-Gen Beta Weights and Multiple Correlation Coefficients for the Six Criterion Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Mul R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>PRAU</th>
<th>AFLU</th>
<th>TASU</th>
<th>POWU</th>
<th>TOKU</th>
<th>ESTU</th>
<th>SOPU</th>
<th>SECU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.314*</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.218*</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.147*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.132*</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.144*</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.115*</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficients in bold and shaded are significant at the .05 level.

**Note.**

- PRAU = Praise at University
- AFLU = Affiliation at University
- TASU = Task/Effort at University
- POWU = Power at University
- TOKU = Token Rewards at University
- ESTU = Self-Esteem at University
- SOPU = Sense of Purpose at University
- SECU = Sense of Competence at University
- CE 1-4 = Communicative English Classes 1-4 End-of-semester grades
- TOEFL 1 = Test of English as a Foreign Language (April, 1999)
- TOEFL 2 = Test of English as a Foreign Language (December, 1999)
For TOEFL 2, the predictive strength decreased slightly. 5.3% of its variance was explained by the IUM-Gen ($p = .017$). The main significant predictor was again Self-esteem at University (positive), followed by Affiliation at University (negative). These results for the TOEFL tests are also shown in Table 6.6. Again, tests of tolerance were conducted for these analyses. The lowest value produced was .447, which is again high enough to avoid problems of multicollinearity (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991).

*Multiple regression analysis: SOPE subscales.*

As described in Chapter 4, the Sense of Purpose scale comprised a large number of items and was itself analysed using PCA. The result was three subscales, which were named Social/Cultural, Utility Value of English, and English Certification. The SOPE scale as a whole was not a significant predictor in the previous IUM-Eng multiple regression analyses. Here, the subscales were regressed on the six criterion variables separately, to determine if they were useful predictors separately. Of the six criterion variables, TOEFL 1 was the only variable for which the scale as a whole was a significant predictor ($p < .000$) and for which individual subscales were also significant predictors. The percentage of variance explained was 7.8%, and all of the subscales were significant predictors. Their standardised Beta weights were:

- Social/Cultural (positive, .253),
- Utility Value of English (negative, -.190), and
- English Certification (positive, .169).

Table 6.7 shows these beta weights and correlation coefficients. TOEFL 2 was also significantly predicted by the scale as a whole ($p = .002$), with 4.3% of variance explained. However, none of the subscales were significant predictors individually.
In the above descriptions of variance explained, the $R^2$ statistic is used. The reader should note that there is some shrinkage, as can be seen by the Adjusted $R^2$ statistic in Tables 6.5, 6.6, and 6.7.

Table 6.7.

**SOPE Subscales Beta Weights and Multiple Correlation Coefficients for the Six Criterion Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Mul R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>SOC/CUL</th>
<th>CERT</th>
<th>UTIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-146*</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-065*</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 4</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 1</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.169*</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 2</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficients in bold and shaded are significant at the .05 level.*

**Note.**

SOC/CUL = Social/Cultural
CERT = English Certification
UTIL = Utility Value of English
CE 1-4 = Communicative English Classes 1-4 End-of-semester grades
TOEFL 1 = Test of English as a Foreign Language (April, 1999)
TOEFL 2 = Test of English as a Foreign Language (December, 1999)
Discussion

Overall, the first thing we can say about the above results is that the two forms of the IUM have some utility, though limited in some respects, in predicting or explaining student academic performance. It is important here to remember that the two forms of the instrument have the same theoretical basis and were developed by adapting McInerney’s ISM for these two areas of focus—general university motivation and English-specific motivation. The fact that both forms of the instrument have been successful at significantly predicting results on many of the criterion variables adds to the validity of the findings. Regarding the first research question:

1. *Is there a significant relationship between the predictor variables derived from the two forms of the IUM and the criterion variables?*

*IUM-Eng.*

The IUM-Eng scales could significantly explain some of the variance for three of the criterion variables: CE 3, TOEFL 1, and TOEFL 2. The variance explained for the CE 3 grade (4.5%) was much lower than that explained by both TOEFL scores (16.2% for TOEFL 1 and 19.2% for TOEFL 2). This result provides support for the first hypothesis, which proposed that the IUM-Eng would be stronger at predicting TOEFL scores than CE grades. Two important results are the IUM-Eng’s usefulness at explaining variance in TOEFL scores, and conversely its failure to significantly predict student grades on three of their English classes. TOEFL is an academic proficiency test which aims to measure students’ ability to undertake study at university level in English. CE 1-4 represent student end-of-semester grades which are supposed to assess students’ achievement on a variety of tasks and assignments.
over the course of the semester. Apart from the general differences between proficiency tests and achievement tests, these CE grades are different to the TOEFL scores in that they include components unrelated to ability or competence, such as Attendance and Class Participation. They also include assessment on tasks that are open to subjective grading, such as presentations and written assignments. Teachers’ grading of these often includes an element for effort, as evidenced by the amount written and/or the visual material prepared for presentations. The fact that CE grades and TOEFL scores are measuring quite different attributes is reflected in the very low correlation coefficients between CE 1-4 and TOEFL 1 (0.09-0.17), and the low coefficients between CE 1-4 and TOEFL 2 (0.31-0.33), as can be seen in Tables 6.2 and 6.3.

Teachers of CE 1 and 3, the non-Japanese teachers of Listening and Speaking classes, are often not concerned about the low correlations between their grades and TOEFL scores. They argue that TOEFL is not a good test of students’ communicative competence, and that students can attain high scores on TOEFL through training in test-taking strategies and still not be able to carry on a reasonable conversation in English. These teachers also argue that some of the goals of their classes, such as increasing students’ confidence in understanding and using English, increasing students’ awareness of their specific strengths and weaknesses, and increasing their repertoire of communication and learning skills and strategies, do not show immediate results as measured by proficiency tests, but will help students in the longer run. Teachers of CE 2 and 4, Japanese teachers of Reading and Writing classes, would be more concerned than CE 1 and 3 teachers about the low correlation with TOEFL scores, but would still argue for the appropriateness of their grades.
Many of these teachers take a process-oriented approach, focusing on the writing or reading process, as opposed to a product-oriented approach, which focuses on the final product itself. The increase in correlations between CE grades and TOEFL scores, as measured from TOEFL 1, taken in April, and TOEFL 2, taken in December, supports some of these arguments to some extent. However, notwithstanding the above arguments, the correlations between CE grades and TOEFL scores are still too low to be ignored. It should be of great concern because TOEFL is one of the most internationally recognised proficiency tests, and students use their scores on these tests to gauge their level of proficiency and improvement over time. For students, scores on these proficiency tests are the most important feedback they receive.

Furthermore, the ability of the motivation scales to better predict TOEFL scores over CE grades is even more cause for concern for teachers, the Communicative English Centre’s academic staff, and the university administration. Students’ motivational goals and sense of self characteristics are not being translated into behaviour and performance valued by their teachers. It is tempting to assume, as many teachers and researchers do (e.g. King, 2005; Krieger, 2005), that this is because of different cultural expectations of classroom behaviour and/or of learning between the non-Japanese teacher and the Japanese students. These different expectations do play a role in determining the group dynamics in the classroom. However, it is not simply a personal cultural expectation. Correlations amongst CE grades themselves are quite high (0.57-0.66) and half of these classes are taught by Japanese teachers. The evaluation criteria themselves for all CE classes could be a more important issue. A large proportion of students’ CE grades derives from attendance and from subjective
criteria such as class participation and effort, which may reflect obedience to the
teachers’ expectations rather than motivated learning behaviour. Keisen University is
not unusual in having these subjective grading criteria for its language courses.

Breen (2001c) refers to “overt participation” (p. 114) as being an accepted valued
aspect of current communicative language teaching (thus practised by language
teachers of many cultural backgrounds), but questions whether it contributes to
language acquisition itself. Conversely, he argues for acquisition that occurs covertly
through focused individual work, which may often be judged as non-participation by
the teacher, as this focused work is often done at the expense of teacher-allocated
tasks.

Extending Breen’s (2001c) argument to these students, we may suggest that students
who receive As and AAs are participating overtly in terms of attendance and
attending to the teacher, doing all the assigned homework, tasks and activities to a
good or very good level, showing interest in the content of the classes, participating
actively in group work, perhaps being good leaders, and getting to know, and be
noticed by, the teacher. In other words, what these A and AA students may be
focusing on is meeting the standards of participation as defined by the teacher. They
may be “good” students in the sense of fulfilling the role required of them by the
teacher, a role that they’ve been socialized to perform throughout their school life. In
one sense, it may be most likely that students who do not have clear goals for the
future (Sense of Purpose goals) may be the ones most likely to willingly accept, and
diligently perform, the role of “good” student.
On the other hand, students guided by strong, clear motivational and Sense of Self goals may not so readily accept this role. These students may actually, consciously or unconsciously, reject this role, if they feel it detracts from their own attempts to learn. These attempts might include, for example, constantly using an English-Japanese dictionary in class, and using their native language, Japanese, to check understanding with the student next to them, both of which are often considered negative behaviours in the communicative English classroom. These students may also not be coming to class as regularly, or not be doing their homework or preparation outside of class because they feel they have bigger plans – for example, to study abroad during the summer or for longer. They may consider the few hours per week for about 26 weeks of the year, to be irrelevant to their goals.

Related to this interpretation of the finding that the motivational scales are not very good at predicting CE grades, is the other result that students are not motivated by the Token Rewards scales. In many students eyes, grades at university, including CE grades, are just that, token rewards.

As stated previously, the correlations amongst CE grades themselves are quite high (0.57-0.66). They show good consistency and validity of the grades, especially considering the following two main reasons for these correlations not being even higher:

1) it is quite common for students to perform well on reading and writing tasks but not to perform well on speaking and listening tasks and vice versa; and

2) student performance can vary greatly during their first year at university. Some students excel in their first semester and their results drop off in the
second semester, whilst others find the first semester at university very confusing but adjust during the second semester.

These differences amongst CE classes—first semester/second semester and Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing skills—mean that very rarely do students excel in all four classes. Apart from these reasons, there are other compounding factors, such as students responding to individual teachers differently and teachers valuing fluency and accuracy differently. These are some of the reasons for the difficulty in measuring foreign language achievement mentioned earlier, and the rationale for having a variety of measures, including the more objective TOEFL tests.

Given these difficulties, the high correlations point to the grades as being valid criterion variables for this study, and their contrast with TOEFL in terms of predictability in relation to the motivational goals and sense of self characteristics, points to an important area for future research.

The percentage of variance explained by the IUM-Eng scales in their prediction of the variance in TOEFL scores was 19%. This is of considerable importance, given the variety of other factors that may account for variance not explained. These include the list of factors mentioned in the introduction, such as language aptitude, personality factors, language learning strategies, and the age at which students were first exposed to English, as well as other factors not readily accessible to measurement such as students’ general test-taking skills and strategies, the different materials and teaching methods used by their teachers, their teachers’ varying expectations of success, and the amount of time that students actually study, which
may be dependent on such factors as their home environment and the amount of part-time work that they do.

\[ \text{IUM-Gen.} \]

The IUM-Gen scales could significantly explain some of the variance for three of the criterion variables: CE 1, TOEFL 1, and TOEFL 2. This result supports the second hypothesis, which proposed that the IUM-Gen would be stronger at predicting TOEFL scores than CE grades. This parallels the results supporting the first hypothesis related to the IUM-Eng, substantiating the argument that more objective scores would be better predicted by the IUM than more subjective assessment.

Though the number of criterion variables predicted by the IUM-Gen is the same as that predicted by the IUM-Eng scales, the percentage of variance explained by the IUM-Gen scales for the two TOEFL scores (7.4% and 5.3%) is less than half of that explained by the IUM-Eng scales (16.2% and 19.2%). This supports the third hypothesis, which proposed that the IUM-Eng would be stronger at predicting scores and grades than the IUM-Gen. This would seem natural, considering that these criterion variables are English-related. TOEFL is essentially a test of students’ ability to undertake academic study at the university level in English. For the majority of Japanese university students it is quite a difficult test, as it requires extended concentration on English readings, conversations, and lectures related to academic content and situations, over a period of about two hours. The TOEFL test serves as an international measure of students’ academic English level rather than as a general academic measure. It is thus considered natural that the IUM-Gen, the general
motivational scale, did not predict as well as the IUM-Eng, the English-specific scale.

However, this result is somewhat counteracted by the results for the CE grades. The variance explained by the IUM-Gen for CE 1 (6.7%) was slightly higher than that explained by the IUM-Eng for CE 3 (4.5%). In addition, results for CE 2, the other first semester class, approached significance ($p = .051$).

This superiority of the IUM-Gen over the IUM-Eng at significantly predicting variance in the English-specific CE grades is both interesting and important. This result suggests that, at least in the first semester, student performance in Communicative English classes was as much as, or more, a function of their general academic motivation at university than of their specific motivation towards the study of English as a Foreign Language.

This result provides additional corroboration to the claim made in the previous chapter that the results suggest that the study of EFL is strongly connected to the study of other academic subjects. This is related to Dörnyei’s (2001b) “parallel multiplicity” (p. 13), mentioned in the introductory chapter as one of the main challenges facing research in EFL, and one taken up by the present research by this comparison of students’ domain-specific L2 motivational and sense of self characteristics with their general academic motivational and sense of self characteristics.
A related interesting result is the IUM-Gen’s ability to significantly predict some variance in the first semester CE 1 grade and approach significance in the first semester CE 2 grade, but not second semester grades. It suggests a kind of honeymoon period between students’ motivational dispositions and their grades in first semester, which ends with the summer vacation. In first semester, teachers often focus on clarifying their expectations and evaluation criteria to students as part of an attempt to orient them to university study. Both teachers and students may be interacting more positively with each other, with teachers providing more feedback and clearer explanations, and students being more positively engaged.

The second research question asks:

2. *What are the particular predictor variables of most significance, and how do these relate to theoretical perspectives on potential motivators of Japanese university students?*

*IUM-Eng.*

The three IUM-Eng subscales of Sense of Competence in English (positive), Competition in English (positive), and Social Concern in English (negative) were the only variables to significantly explain both TOEFL 1 and TOEFL 2 scores. Sense of Competence in English with the highest standardised beta weight for both TOEFL 1 and 2, is the predictor of most significance. Together with the other two scales, these three scales tell a consistent story about students related to TOEFL. According to these results, students who rate their competence in English higher than other students achieve higher TOEFL scores. Developing a sense of competence in students seems to be an essential step towards enhancing performance. This sense of
competence may be giving them the confidence to concentrate at the high level and extended length of time that TOEFL requires.

Students who score more highly on TOEFL are also more motivated by competition goals and are low in terms of social concern goals. Competition thus also seems to be a necessary ingredient for performing well on TOEFL, again perhaps because of the high level and length of time that TOEFL involves. The lower students are on social concern, the higher their TOEFL scores are, and vice versa. This means that individualism seems to be an important ingredient of achievement at TOEFL. This combination of scales is consistent and is not surprising, as first year students would still have fresh memories of their exam-oriented university entrance high school English classes. To enter a prestigious national or private university is very competitive, and English is one of the more important subjects on these exams.

This result partially supports Hypothesis 5, which proposed that the two subscales Social Concern in English (SOCE) and Affiliation in English (AFLE) would have a negative relationship with grades and TOEFL scores. SOCE has a negative relationship with TOEFL scores but not CE grades, and AFLE did not have a significant negative or positive relationship with any of the criterion variables.

These results are also interesting in that they may be in conflict with many of the beliefs and assumptions that teachers hold about good language teaching practice. Modern language teaching has been strongly influenced by the Communicative Approach, which encourages pair and group work with students working together cooperatively, not competitively. There is also a tendency by teachers influenced by
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this approach to teaching, to focus on practising language to develop fluency and to ignore error correction or feedback to students regarding accuracy. The effect, negative or positive, that this might have on different students’ sense of competence, is an area that has not received much attention.

Two other scales were significant predictors for two criterion variables: Self-esteem in English (negative) for CE 3 and TOEFL 2; and Power in English (negative) for CE 3 and TOEFL 1. This finding is interesting, in that it is reasonable to expect that either these scales would not be significant predictors or that they would have a positive significant relationship with success on these measures. One possible interpretation of this result is that for both Power in English and Self-esteem in English scales, students’ self-ratings may be limited in scope to Power and Self-esteem at using spoken English in social and inter-personal communication with native-speakers of English. Thus, students high on these scales may dismiss CE grades and TOEFL scores as not really being related to the use of English for communicative purposes with native speakers, and therefore focus their effort on other endeavours. Cummins (1979) refers to these two aspects of language as basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) and considers them to be quite distinct proficiencies.

This may explain the lack of a relationship between the scales and outcomes, but doesn’t, however, sufficiently explain the negative relationship. A more plausible explanation may be possible if these two scales are considered in combination with one other scale, Recognition in English (RECE), which was the focus of the fourth hypothesis and is addressed in the following paragraph.
Recognition in English (RECE) was significant at predicting one variable: TOEFL 1 (negative). This result supports the fourth hypothesis, which stated that this subscale of the IUM-Eng would have a negative relationship with grades and TOEFL scores. The basis for this hypothesis was the results from Chapter 5, where the mean scale score for RECE was seen to be the lowest of all the scales, and the literature reported in the same chapter, which suggested that in tight, collectivist cultures (Triandis, 1995) attitudes and behaviour are self-regulated according to a public self, which is “an assessment of the self by the generalised other” (p. 329). This is equivalent to Kuwayama’s (1992) “generalised reference others” (p. 143), and Greer’s (2000) “the eyes of hito” (p.183). This public self should lead to behaviour that is “proper” as defined by society.

The subscales of Self-esteem in English (SESE) and Power in English (POWE) may also be related to this public self with regard to learning EFL. Students high on these three scales may be focusing on behaviour which undermines learning behaviour, in a similar way, albeit for different reasons, that students more focused on the Social Concern in English (SOCE) goal, are less focused on learning goals.

Whatever the reasons, it is clear that for the group of students participating in this study these three factors, Self-esteem in English, Power in English and Recognition in English are negatively related to their achievement on academic English tests. If we refer to the correlation matrix in Table 6.2, we can see that Self-esteem in English has very low correlation with Task/Effort in English (.077), and low correlation with Sense of Purpose in English (.244). Task/Effort in English is a composite of intrinsic motivation and effort, while Sense of Purpose includes items describing specific
reasons for studying English. Thus, there seems to be little relationship between Self-esteem in English and effort or Self-esteem in English and having clear reasons for studying English, both of which are important for high achievement on TOEFL. This is also the case for Recognition in English, which has low correlation with Task/Effort in English (.151) and with Sense of Purpose in English (.220). The correlations of Power in English with Sense of Purpose in English (.336) and Task/Effort (.285) are also low. If we look at the items that comprise this scale (Table 4.2 in Chapter 4), we see that the scale is a composite of both general Power and specific Power in English items. It may initially seem that wanting to be a group leader in general may be detracting from English study. However, the Power at University scale, of the IUM-Gen, did not have this significant negative relationship. The result for this specific Power in English scale thus suggests that specific English ego goals detract from the intensive effort and concentration that TOEFL requires.

Of additional interest is the result for the SOPE subscales analysis, which was done separately. As part of the IUM-Eng scale, Sense of Purpose in English (SOPE) was not a significant predictor of achievement or performance. However, when analysed separately, the scale as a whole was a significant predictor of TOEFL 1, as were the three individual scales.

These results should be of interest to English language teachers, especially non-Japanese ones, who may not be aware of these culturally-specific factors. Again, they may be in conflict with accepted beliefs. Using ideas from humanistic psychology, teachers often use activities aimed at building students’ self-esteem in English class. It is also common for teachers to try to motivate students by drawing students’
attention to the empowerment that English proficiency can bring them. Finally, praise of work done or of achievement by individual students, is a common teaching technique. Further study is warranted on the specific effects of these factors on students’ learning.

IUM-Gen.

From the IUM-Gen results, two scales, Affiliation at University and Self-esteem at University, were most significant for predicting two criterion variables, interestingly the same two: TOEFL 1 and TOEFL 2. The first scale, Affiliation at University, had a significant inverse relationship with both TOEFL 1 and TOEFL 2. This result gives some support to the generally accepted idea that Japanese university students’ social priorities at university conflict with their studies. However, though these social goals may conflict with their academic goals, as Boekaerts (2003) argues, they are important even if only because they give meaning to students’ lives. Especially in their first year at university, it is natural and healthy for students to show a strong interest in the development of their social selves, though this may initially detract from some measures of academic performance.

The second scale, Self-esteem at University, had a significant positive relationship with TOEFL 1 and TOEFL 2. The positive direction of this relationship is especially interesting as it contrasts with the inverse relationship between the IUM-Eng’s Self-esteem in English and two criterion variables. Students’ more general Self-esteem at University has an opposite impact on performance in English classes and tests than the more specific Self-esteem in English. In fact, this Self-esteem at University may be the most significant predictor variable, as the standardised beta weights are the
highest for both TOEFL scores. Referring to Dörnyei’s (2001b) “parallel multiplicity” mentioned in Chapter Two, this result suggests that students’ general academic self-esteem is as, or perhaps more, important than their self-esteem in English specifically, in terms of the impact on their academic English performance. As Ushioda (1998) suggests, these students, and perhaps students in academic institutions around the world, may not be differentiating between their English study and their general university study as much as researchers in the area of EFL motivation assume, especially when the measure of their level of English achievement is an academic language test. Cummins’ (1979) argument of the two aspects of language, as mentioned previously, may also be pertinent here. The cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) aspect may be at the fore here.

Three further scales of the IUM-Gen, Task/Effort at University (positive), Sense of Purpose at University (negative), and Token Rewards at University (negative) were significant predictors of one criterion variable. Task/Effort at University, a measure of students’ intrinsic motivation towards university study in general, could predict CE 1 grades, the first semester Speaking and Listening class grade. Students’ intrinsic motivation towards study in general is thus a good indicator of their oral/aural English grades, at least in the first semester of their first year at university. This also supports the argument above, that students in academic institutions around the world may not be differentiating greatly between their English study and their general university study.

Sense of Purpose at University, on the other hand, has a significant inverse relationship with the same grade, CE 1. These two scales, Sense of Purpose at
University and Task/Effort at University, surprisingly, seem to be in conflict regarding students’ English classes in their first semester at university. In Chapter Five we saw that these two subscales were the highest scoring scales of the IUM-Gen, and as such represent the most salient aspects of students’ general university motivation. Task/Effort at University is a composite of intrinsic motivation and effort at university study in general (see Table 4.4 in Chapter 4 for the items). This enjoyment of, and effort at, general academic study may not translate to all of students’ numerous classes in their first semester, many of which are compulsory. However, it certainly seems to include their required English classes in the first semester. Sense of Purpose at University, on the other hand, comprises items (See Table 4.5, Chapter 4) that focus on students’ future four years at university, and beyond. This broader and longer-term perspective is negatively related to students’ performance as measured by grades on their first semester compulsory Speaking/Listening English class. In other words, high Sense of Purpose at University is related to poorer scores on this English class. This may reflect the way in which students are assessed for their CE 1 grades, in particular, as it seems unlikely that this scale would have an inverse relationship with students’ performance on all of their first semester classes. As mentioned before, all CE class grades include components for attendance, effort, and participation in class. CE 1 may be the class that is most different to their high school English classes, as it includes a group presentation, which is assessed for clear communication of the content and presentation skills, rather than for accuracy. It is possible that this different assessment style suits students who are highly intrinsically motivated in the form of enjoyment (i.e. high on the Task/Effort at University scale), but does not
immediately suit students who have a high sense of purpose at university that focuses on accuracy and individual study.

Once again, referring to Cummins’ language duality of basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP), the CE 1 grade reflects a focus on BICS, and even a negative focus on CALP, in the sense that students are encouraged to focus on fluency, using vocabulary and grammatical structures that they are comfortable with, and discouraged from focusing on using new or unfamiliar vocabulary and grammar. Students with high scores on TASU may be focused on the BICS rather than the CALP aspect, and vice versa for students with high scores on SOPU. Whatever the reason may be, this is a surprising result which deserves further investigation.

Finally, Token Rewards at University has an inverse relationship with TOEFL 1. In Chapter 5, we saw that this had the lowest score of the subscales of the IUM-Gen. Here we see that it is a significant negative predictor, supporting arguments about the negative effects of extrinsic motivators in the form of rewards (Deci, 1996; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory argues that extrinsic rewards, when given in controlling ways, may achieve the behaviour desired by the teacher or student, but that this behaviour does not usually become self-determined. In other words, extrinsically rewarded behaviours usually do not persist in the long-term, and do not lead to deeper learning and understanding, all of which are important for success on TOEFL.
It is also interesting that this negative relationship was not produced by CE grades, assessment of which may be perceived by students as, at least partially, extrinsic.

Summary

In this chapter, the Personal Investment model of motivation and both forms of the IUM based on it have been shown to be very useful at extracting important predictors of academic performance and achievement at a Japanese university, as measured by scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language. The results provide support for belief in the importance of a strong sense of competence, as this was the most salient positive predictor of both TOEFL scores. English-specific competition was also an important variable predicting both TOEFL scores. This particular result is natural, considering the university entrance examination system, but does not correspond with the educational philosophy of many English teachers, nor perhaps with the dominant language teaching paradigm. The results also confirm the negative relationship that social goals have with performance and achievement, but these social goals are considered to be healthy to the social development of students. It is also held that in practice, the effect of social goals on performance is perhaps limited to the first year of university. The negative effects of extrinsic rewards is another important result. Not only are these types of rewards not important to students, as we saw in Chapter 5, they also have a negative relationship with performance. There were also some surprises, in terms of the inverse relationships of some of the predictor variables, such as Self-Esteem in English and Sense of Purpose at University, with some of the criterion variables. The results also highlighted the difficulty of measuring the outcome of language learning, and raised questions about the evaluation of the compulsory English classes at Keisen University, as students’
grades on their English classes were less likely to be predicted by different scales than TOEFL scores. As these English classes reflect accepted practice in modern language teaching, aspects of this may also be questioned. The results also suggest some aspects of Japanese culture, and the university context, which may have an impact on students’ motivation and sense of self, and on achievement on an international academic English test. In particular, the ego goals, Power in English and Recognition in English, and the Sense of Self goal, Self-Esteem in English, had negative relationships with some of the criterion variables. While these results still leave many of Dörnyei’s (2001b) challenges, mentioned in Chapter Two, unanswered, they make some important contributions to the growing research agenda in motivation in EFL.
Chapter 7

Summary, limitations, and conclusion

Summary

The expansion of the research agenda in L2 motivation that has occurred over the past decade has helped to both broaden and deepen our understanding of student motivation to learn a foreign language. It has also helped to bridge at least two gaps which previously were extremely wide. One was the gap between theory and research on the one hand, and teaching practice on the other. The other gap was that between L2 motivation and general achievement motivation. The main purpose of this study has been to contribute to this broader and deeper understanding of L2 motivation and to assist in the quest to bridge gaps in our theoretical knowledge and our practical use of this knowledge.

This study first set out to develop a measurement instrument that would have at least two main advantages over other instruments. The first expected advantage was that the instrument would be culturally sensitive to the emic aspects of the sociocultural context, Japan. The second expected advantage was that the instrument would assist in the comparison and contrast of EFL motivation and general academic motivation in the specific and sociocultural context of a Japanese women’s university.
Chapter 2 of the study, reviewed the literature in the fields of achievement motivation, L2 motivation, L2 motivation in Japan, aspects of the sociocultural context of Japan, and described the potential for the motivational model chosen for the study.

Chapter 3 described the methodology used, including the participants in the study, the site where the survey was administered, adaptation, translation and back-translation of the measurement instruments, the outcome measures obtained, the statistical analyses that were to be performed, and the research questions and hypotheses posed. The measurement instrument, the Inventory of University Motivation, was adapted for the specific sociocultural context, from McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM; McInerney, Roche, McInerney, & Marsh, 1997; McInerney & Sinclair, 1991; McInerney & Swisher, 1995), which itself was based on Maehr’s theory of Personal Investment (Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986). The two forms of the bilingual instrument, one specific to EFL, the other related to general academic motivation, were administered to 501 first-year female university students at a mid-ranked women’s university in Tokyo. The outcome measures were four EFL-specific class grades and two TOEFL scores.

In Chapter 4 of the study, exploratory Principal Components Analysis was used to successfully establish the construct validity of the two forms of the measurement instrument, the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen. The IUM-Eng resulted in seven motivational and three Sense of Self scales, while the IUM-Gen resulted in five motivational and three Sense of Self scales. Their internal consistency or reliability was also found to be very high, with the average Cronbach alpha for the IUM-Eng
being .80, and that for the IUM-Gen being .79. The theoretical basis for the instruments, Personal Investment Theory, was also strongly supported, as the majority of dimensions of the theory, which were theoretically predicted a priori, were reproduced on both forms of the IUM. Maehr’s Personal Investment Model theorises that there are four kinds of achievement goals: task goals, ego goals, social solidarity goals and extrinsic rewards. These were all reproduced in both the IUM-Eng and the IUM-Gen. It also theorises three Sense of Self dimensions, which were again all reproduced on both forms of the IUM.

Chapter 4 addressed Dörnyei’s (2001b) three challenges referred to in Chapter 1. It addressed the challenge of context, by developing and validating a culturally-sensitive instrument to measure student’s motivation towards EFL and university in general. It addressed the challenge of extending L2 motivation theory regarding constructs related to the self, as the IUM-Eng and IUM-Gen both include three Sense of Self constructs: Sense of Competence, Sense of Purpose, and Self-esteem. It addressed the challenge of “parallel multiplicity” (Dörnyei, 2001b, p.13), as both forms of the IUM have an expanded view of goals, including social goals. Using the IUM-Eng with its parallel instrument, the IUM-Gen, we can compare students’ domain-specific L2 motivation with their general academic motivation.

Chapter 5 produced a valuable profile of students’ motivational goals and Sense of Self. Some individual characteristics of the profile supported hypotheses related to emic aspects of Japanese student behaviour, such as the low Recognition in English scales, as well as the importance of social goals. Other individual characteristics of the profile contradicted some widely held beliefs about Japanese people and Japanese
university students. The belief that Japan is a collectivist society and so Japanese people would not demonstrate individualist characteristics such as competitiveness was contradicted. The widely held belief in the lack of university students’ motivation was also contradicted. There were also some results suggesting that the study of EFL is strongly connected to the study of other academic subjects, at least for female Japanese university students. This is one area that would benefit from further research, as it is a largely ignored aspect of EFL motivation. The importance of English for female university students, in terms of the options available to them in Japanese society, was also supported in this chapter. In addition, the importance of intrinsic goals, as measured by the Task/Effort scales and Sense of Purpose scales on both forms of the IUM, and conversely, the lack of importance of extrinsic goals, is also noted. Finally, in this chapter, MANOVA analyses produced results showing significant departmental differences amongst students. The most interesting and important result was the significant differences found on the general academic motivation scale, paralleling those on the English-specific motivation scale, suggesting an important relationship between domain-specific EFL motivation and general academic motivation.

Chapter 6 also produced some valuable results. It established the utility of the measurement instruments, especially the IUM-Eng, in predicting performance as measured by TOEFL scores. While the IUM-Eng, the EFL-specific motivation measure, was naturally superior to the IUM-Gen, the general academic motivation measure, the fact that the IUM-Gen was also an important predictor of achievement points to the need for future research in this area. The results in this chapter also delineated which predictor variables were of most significance. The importance of a
strong domain-specific sense of competence in English was strongly supported by
the findings. Individualism, in the form of strong competition goals and low social
corncern and affiliation goals, had a positive relationship with some outcome
measures. Another noteworthy result was the confirmation of the negative
relationship of extrinsic rewards with outcome measures. Some other interesting
results were that general self-esteem at university was found to be an important
positive predictor of performance, while domain-specific self-esteem had a
significant negative relationship with performance, and sense of purpose at university
showed a significant inverse relationship with one of the outcome measures.

Limitations
Some limitations of this study are recognised. The study was undertaken at one
university, a women’s university. The results may partially be limited to these
particular students. However, while Keisen University may have unique
characteristics, such as its horticultural background, students come from a wide range
of schools across Japan, and for diverse reasons. Many of them had applied to other
universities, famous and not so famous, coed and single-sex, big and small, public
and private, Christian and non-Christian, and not been accepted. Many of the results
should at least be generalisable to female students at other women’s universities.
Some results may be partially generalisable to other universities. However, it is
accepted that a study of this size cannot claim to be representative of all Japanese
university students.

Another limitation is that there is no comparison group from another country.
Comparison groups from other Asian universities with some similar sociocultural
characteristics, and with other European, American, or Australian groups, would have increased the importance and value of the results.

A further limitation is the lack of solid qualitative data to support the discussion of results at the end of each of the chapters. Additional data in these areas would have helped to put these students’ motivation and sense of self in clearer perspective, and made the findings more compelling and valuable.

Finally, the study was limited in its scope. The results of the statistical analyses conducted have limited authority. The exploratory approach of Chapter 4, whilst appropriate for the aims of this study, provides initial support for the theoretical model and measurement, but does not provide their confirmation. The multiple regression analyses in Chapter 6 provide evidence of positive and negative relationships amongst predictor and criterion variables, but do not provide causal evidence. The results of this study thus provide strong supportive evidence for the validity, reliability, utility, and predictive power of the instrument, and important information about female, Japanese university students, but these results need to be supported by future research in these areas.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study expanded the research agenda in the area of EFL motivation, addressed some of the challenges identified in the literature, and attempted to bridge gaps between theory and research, and practice, as well as between EFL motivation and general academic motivation. While many questions,
challenges and gaps remain, the study has provided some important and useful results that may be of great value to teachers and other participants in the Japanese tertiary education system, to researchers of Japanese society, and to educators and researchers everywhere who are interested in the important areas of academic and foreign language motivation.
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Appendices
APPENDIX A

The Inventory of University Motivation

アンケート B 1999 年 月 日
名前： 学籍番号：

この調査は、恵泉での勉強全般にわたる学習動機及び、英語学習の動機についての考え方を見つけることを目的としています。このアンケートを通じて自分の学習動機を知るためにも、自分の意見や考えに従って、正直に質問に答えてください。答えには正誤や、良し悪しはありません。それぞれの項目に対して、以下のスケールの中からもっとも適切な数字に○をつけてください。このアンケートは、研究目的以外で使われることはありません。

全然そう そう どちらとも 思わない 思わない いえない そう思う そうでない 非常にそう思う

1. I try hard in my study of English because I like my English classes.
私は英語のクラスが好きなので、一生懸命英語をしようと心がけている。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

2. I work hard to try to learn something new at university.
私は大学で、何か新しいことを学ぼうと、一生懸命勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

3. Winning is important to me.
私にとって、勝つことは重要である。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

4. I study hard because I want to feel important in front of my university friends.
私は大学の同級生の前で自分が重要だと感じたいので、一生懸命勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

5. I can do best at English when I'm studying with others.
私は他の人と一緒に英語を勉強すると、ベストを尽くせる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

6. It's very important for students to help each other in English class.
学生にとって、英語のクラスで互いに助け合うことはとても大切なことである。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

7. I study English to promote better understanding of Japanese culture and people among various countries.
私は他の国の人々に日本文化や日本人への理解を深めてもらうために、英語を勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

8. I like to be encouraged for my English study.
私は英語の勉強をするように励まされるのが好きだ。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う
9. I study English best when I can get some kind of reward.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

10. I want to do well at university so that I can have a good future.
    より良い将来のために大学の勉強が良くできるようになりたい。
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

11. Increasing my TOEFL score is very important to me.
    TOEFLのスコアを伸ばすことは、私にとってとても重要である。
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

12. I study English because I want to go to graduate school in Japan.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

13. I am very confident at university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

14. I usually do the wrong thing in my English class.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

15. I succeed at whatever I study in English.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

16. I try hard in my study at university because I’m interested in my classes.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

17. When I’m improving in my English I try even harder.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

18. I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my university classes.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

19. I want to be good at English so that I can feel important in front of my friends.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

20. I try to study with friends as much as possible at university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

21. I like to help other students do well at university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
22. I try to do well at English to please my teachers and parents.

私は先生や両親を喜ばすために、英語が良くできるようにがんばる。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

23. At university I do best when I’m praised.

私は大学で誉められると、ベストを尽くせる。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

24. I study hard at university for presents from my parents.

私は両親からプレゼントをもらうために、大学で勉強する。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

25. I want to do well at English so that I can have a good future.

より良い将来のために英語が良くできるようになりたい。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

26. I want to feel the pleasure of using my English ability and knowledge.

自力で英語能力や知識を使う喜びを感じたい。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

27. I study English to help me when I travel abroad.

海外旅行の時に役に立つので、英語を勉強する。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

28. I am very confident in my English study.

私は英語のクラスでとても自信を持っている。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

29. I can do as well as other students in my English class.

私は英語のクラスで他の学生と同じくらいできる。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

30. I think I’m as good as everyone else in my English class.

私は英語のクラスで皆と同じくらいできると思う。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

31. I need to get feedback from my teacher about my English study.

私は英語の勉強や宿題に対するフィードバックを先生からもらいたい。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

32. When I’m doing well in my university study I try even harder.

私は大学で勉強ができるようになっていくと、もっと頑張る。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

33. I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my English classes.

私は英語のクラスで優秀者の一人になった時には、幸せである。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

34. It’s very important for me to be a group leader.

私にとって、グループのリーダーになることは非常に大切である。

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う
35. I try to study with friends as much as possible when I study English.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

36. I like to help other students do well at English.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

37. I try to do well at university to please my teachers and parents.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

38. In my English class I do best when I’m praised.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

39. I study English hard for presents from my parents.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

40. I aim my studies at university so that I can get a good job.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

41. I want to learn English because it can be useful in my present life.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

42. I study English because it’s necessary in the international community.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

43. Other students have to help me a lot with my university study.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

44. I can do as well as other students at university.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

45. If I can use English I feel superior to others.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

46. I need to know that I’m getting somewhere with my university study.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

47. I’m always trying to do even better in my English classes.
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
48. Getting the highest grade in my university classes is very important to me.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

49. I study hard at university because I want the class to take notice of me.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

50. When I study in groups at university I don’t do my best.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

51. I care about other people at university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

52. Having other people tell me that I did well is important to me.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

53. I want to be praised for my university study.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

54. Getting merit certificates would make me study harder at university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

55. I try to do well at university so that I can get a good job when I graduate.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

56. I study English to maintain the skill and knowledge I already have.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

57. I often try new things on my own.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

58. Other students have to help me a lot with my English study.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

59. I am intelligent enough to graduate from university.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

60. If I can use English I’m considered to be well-educated.
    全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
61. I try hard to make sure that I do well at my English study.
   私は英語の勉強が得意になるようにがんばる。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

62. I’m always trying to do even better in my university studies.
   私は大学の学業でもっとよくできるように、いつも努力している。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

63. Getting the highest grade in my English classes is very important to me.
   私にとって、英語のクラスで一番良いグレードをとることは非常に大切である。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

64. I study hard at English because I want my classmates to take notice of me.
   私はクラスの注目を集めたいので、英語を一生懸命勉強する。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

65. When I study English in groups I don’t do my best.
   私はグループで英語を勉強すると、ベストを尽くせない。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

66. I care about other people in my English class.
   私は英語のクラスで他の人のことをいつも気にかけている。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

67. Having other people tell me that my English is good is important to me.
   英語がよくできることを他人から言われることが私にとって重要である。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

68. I want to be praised for my English.
   私は英語の勉強について誉められたい。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

69. Getting merit certificates would make me study English harder.
   賞状をもらうために、さらに、一生懸命英語を勉強する。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

70. I try hard to learn English so that I can get a good job when I graduate.
   卒業したとき、良い仕事ができるように、英語を一生懸命勉強している。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

71. I study English to broaden my view of the world.
   私は視野を広げるために、英語を勉強する。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

72. I like to think things out for myself in my university study.
   私は大学の勉強において、自分の力で答えを見つけ出すのが好きだ。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

73. If I’m studying alone, difficult homework doesn’t bother me.
   私は一人で勉強しても、難しい宿題で悩むことはない。
   全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
74. I am intelligent enough to learn English to a high level.

私は上級レベルの英語まで学べる知性がある。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

75. If I can use English I’m considered by others to be intelligent.

もし英語が使えたなら、私は他の人に知的な人だと思われる。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

76. I try hard to make sure that I do well at my university studies.

私は大学で、勉強が得意になるようにがんばる。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

77. Learning English in itself is interesting.

英語学習自体がおもしろい。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

78. I like my university study to be compared to others.

私は大学の勉強に関して他の人と比較するのが好きだ。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

79. I study hard at university so that I will be put in charge of things.

私は大学でいろいろなことを任されたいので、一生懸命勉強する。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

80. I want to learn English to make friends with people who don’t speak Japanese.

私は日本語が話せない人と友達になるために、英語を学びたい。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

81. I enjoy helping others with their university studies even if I don’t do so well myself.

たとえ、私自身が大学の宿題がよくできないとしても、他の人を助けてあげるのが好きである。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

82. Praise from my teachers for my university study is important to me.

大学の勉強に対する先生からの誉め言葉は、私にとって重要である。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

83. Praise from my parents for my university study is important to me.

大学の勉強に対する両親からの誉め言葉は、私にとって重要である。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

84. Getting good grades is the most important thing for me at university.

大学で良い成績をもらうことが、私にとって最も重要なことである。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

85. I study hard at university so that I can graduate.

私は大学を卒業できるように、一生懸命勉強する。

全然そう思わない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
86. I like to think things out for myself when I study English.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

87. I study English to be able to understand movies, and TV/radio programs in English.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

88. If I’m studying alone, difficult English homework doesn’t bother me.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

89. On the whole, I’m pleased with myself in my English classes.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

90. I think it’s natural that Japanese people can learn English to some degree.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

91. I like to see that I’m improving in my English.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

92. English was one of my best subjects at high school.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

93. I like my English to be compared with others.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

94. I study hard at English so that I will be put in charge of things.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

95. My friends study English hard so I do too.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

96. Praise from my teachers for my English study is important to me.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う

97. I enjoy helping others with their English even if I don’t do so well myself.

all然そう思うわけではない 1  2  3  4  5 非常にそう思う
98. Praise from my parents for my English is important to me.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

99. Getting good grades is the most important thing in my English classes.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

100. I want to learn English because it will help me with my other studies at university.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

101. I study English to be able to read books, magazines, etc. in English.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

102. Most of the time I feel I can do my university study.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

103. I always choose easy work for myself to do at university, so that I don’t have too much trouble.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

104. On the whole, I'm pleased with myself at university.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

105. If I can’t use English I think I’m inferior.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

106. I like to see that I’m improving in my university studies.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

107. I plan to take as many classes as possible in English at Keisen.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

108. I work harder at university if I’m trying to be better than others.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

109. I like studying with other people at university.

全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う
110. I want to learn English because people around me whom I respect learn English. 全然そう思わないと、英語を勉強したい。

111. It makes me unhappy if my friends aren’t doing well at university. 全然うらうらしくない。

112. Praise from my friends for my university study is important to me. 苦労して、英語を勉強する。

113. I study hard at university for rewards from teachers. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

114. I study English mainly to get credit so that I can graduate. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

115. I want to learn English so that I can study or work abroad. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

116. I study English to be able to understand and sing English songs. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

117. Most of the time I feel I can do my English study. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

118. I always choose easy work for myself in English, so that I don’t have too much trouble. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

119. I think I can do quite well in English. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

120. I work hard to try to learn something new in my English classes. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。

121. I want to do well at English to be better than my classmates. 苦労して、一生懸命勉強する。
122. I work harder at English if I’m trying to be better than others.
私は英語に関して、他の人より良くなりたいと思っている時は、いつもより一層勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

123. I like studying English with other people.
私は他の人と英語を勉強するのが好きだ。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

124. Making friends at university is very important to me.
大学で友達を作ることが、私にとって非常に大切なことである。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

125. It makes me unhappy if my friends aren’t doing well at English.
私は友達が英語の勉強が良くできないと、気分が良くない。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

126. Praise from my friends for my English study is important to me.
英語の勉強に対する友達からの誉め言葉は、私にとって重要である。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

127. I study hard at English for rewards from teachers.
私は先生からのご褒美のために、英語を一生懸命勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

128. I want to do well at university to show that I can do it.
私は自分がやればできるということを示すために、大学の勉強をがんばる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

129. It is good to plan ahead so that I can do well at university.
私は大学で上達するように、計画を立てることはいいことだと思う。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

130. I study English to be able to deal with situations where English is needed.
私は英語が必要な場面で対処できるように、英語を勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

131. I don’t need anyone to tell me to study hard at university; I do it myself.
私は誰かに大学で一生懸命勉強しなさいと言われなくても、自分でできる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

132. I usually do the wrong thing at university.
私は大学でだいたい間違ったことをする。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

133. I think I can do quite well at university.
私は大学で良くできるほうがだと思う。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

134. I want to do well at university to be better than my classmates.
私は大学でクラスメートより勉強ができるようになりたい。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う
135. I often try to be the leader of a group.
私はよくグループのリーダーになるようとする。
全然そう思わないと 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

136. I can do best at university when I’m studying with others.
私は大学で他の人と一緒に勉強すると、ベストを尽くせる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

137. It’s very important for students to help each other at university.
学生にとっては、大学で互いに助け合うことはとても大切なことである。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

138. I study English because it’s important for me to understand other cultures.
他の文化を理解することは私にとって重要なので、英語を勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

139. I like to be encouraged for my university study.
私は大学の勉強をさらに励まされるのが好きだ。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

140. I study best at university when I can get some kind of reward.
私は何かご褒美がもらえると、大学でがんばって勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

141. I want to do well at English to show that I can do it.
私は自分がやればできるということを示すために、英語の勉強をがんばる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

142. It is good to plan ahead to complete my studies at university.
大学での勉強を終わらせるために、計画を立てるのはいいことだと思う。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

143. I study English to gain a certificate (STEP, TOEFL, TOEIC).
私は免状（英検、TOEFL、TOEIC）を取得するために、英語を勉強する。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

144. I don’t need anyone to tell me to study English hard; I do it myself.
私は誰かに一生懸命英語を勉強しなさいと言われなくても、自分でできる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

145. I succeed at whatever I study at university.
私は大学で何を勉強をしても、良い結果が得られる。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う

146. I think I’m as good as everyone else at university.
私は大学で皆と同じくらいできると思う。
全然そう思わない 1 2 3 4 5 非常にそう思う
**APPENDIX B**

**IUM-Eng Motivational Goals Preliminary Analysis 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix(a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Getting the highest grade in my English classes is very important to me. (COME)</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Getting good grades is the most important thing in my English classes. (TOKE)</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Winning is important to me. (COMU)</td>
<td>0.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. I want to do well at English to be better than my classmates. (COME)</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. I study hard at English so that I will be put in charge of things. (POWE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I try hard in my study of English because I like my English class. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Learning English in itself is interesting. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. I try hard to make sure that I do well at my English study. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. I plan to take as many classes as possible in English at Keisen. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When I’m improving in my English I try even harder. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I’m always trying to do even better in my English classes. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. I work hard to try to learn something new in my English classes. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. I enjoy helping others with their English even if I don’t do so well myself. (SOCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I like to help other students do well at English. (SOCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my English classes. (COME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. I like to see that I’m improving in my English. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. In my English class I do best when I’m praised. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69. Getting merit certificates would make me study English harder. (TOKE)</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It’s very important for me to be a group leader. (POWU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. I often try to be the leader of a group. (POWU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I want to be good at English so that I can feel important in front of my friends. (POWE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. I study hard at English because I want my classmates to take notice of me. (POWE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can do best at English when I’m studying with others. (AFLE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I try to study with friends as much as possible when I study English. (AFLE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. I like studying English with other people. (AFLE)</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I study English hard for presents from my parents. (TOKE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I study English best when I can get some kind of reward. (TOKE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.637 .382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I try to do well at English to please my teachers and parents. (RECE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. I study hard at English for rewards from teachers. (TOKE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It’s very important for students to help each other in English class. (SOCE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Praise from my parents for my English is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Praise from my teachers for my English study is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Praise from my friends for my English study is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I want to be praised for my English. (RECE)</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Having other people tell me that my English is good is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C
IUM-Eng Motivational Goals Preliminary Analysis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix(a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Praise from my parents for my English is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Praise from my teachers for my English study is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Praise from my friends for my English study is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I want to be praised for my English. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Having other people tell me that my English is good is important to me. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Learning English in itself is interesting. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I try hard in my study of English because I like my English class. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. I try hard to make sure that I do well at my English study. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When I’m improving in my English I try even harder. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. I plan to take as many classes as possible in English at Keisen. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I’m always trying to do even better in my English classes. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. I work hard to try to learn something new in my English classes. (TASE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. I enjoy helping others with their English even if I don’t do so well myself. (SOCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I like to help other students do well at English. (SOCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It’s very important for me to be a group leader. (POWU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. I often try to be the leader of a group. (POWU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I want to be good at English so that I can feel important in front of my friends. (POWE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I study English hard for presents from my parents. (TOKE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Extraction Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. I study hard at English for rewards from teachers. (TOKE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I try to do well at English to please my teachers and parents. (RECE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. I study hard at English because I want my classmates to take notice of me. (POWE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can do best at English when I’m studying with others. (AFLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I try to study with friends as much as possible when I study English. (AFLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. I like studying English with other people. (AFLE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I study English best when I can get some kind of reward. (TOKE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Getting the highest grade in my English classes is very important to me. (COME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Getting good grades is the most important thing in my English classes. (TOKE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Winning is important to me. (COMU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. I want to do well at English to be better than my classmates. (COME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.
## APPENDIX D

IUM-Gen Motivational Goals Preliminary Analysis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix(a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Praise from my teachers for my university study is</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Praise from my parents for my university study is</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Praise from my friends for my university study is</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I want to be praised for my university study.</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Having other people tell me that I did well is</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. At university I do best when I’m praised.</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Getting good grades is the most important thing for</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. I’m always trying to do even better in my university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I try hard in my study at university because I’m</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in my classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I try hard to make sure that I do well at my</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I work hard to try to learn something at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. I work harder at university if I’m trying to do</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better than others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. When I’m doing well in my university study I try</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even harder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. I like to see that I’m improving in my university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. I like studying with other people at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. I can do best at university when I’m studying with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. It’s very important for students to help each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I try to study with friends as much as possible at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Loading Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. I enjoy helping others with their university studies even if I don’t do so well myself.</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. When I study in groups at university I don’t do my best.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I like to help other students do well at university.</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Making friends at university is very important to me.</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It’s very important for me to be a group leader.</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. I often try to be the leader of a group.</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Winning is important to me.</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I study hard because I want to feel important in front of my university friends.</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. I study hard at university so that I will be put in charge of things.</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I study hard at university because I want the class to take notice of me.</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. I like my university study to be compared to others.</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. I want to do well at university to be better than my classmates.</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Getting the highest grade in my university classes is very important to me.</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I study hard at university for presents from my parents.</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. I study hard at university for rewards from teachers.</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. I study best at university when I can get some kind of reward.</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I try to do well at university to please my teachers and parents.</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Getting merit certificates would make me study harder at university.</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. I like to be encouraged for my university study.</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. It makes me unhappy if my friends aren’t doing well at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I care about other people at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I need to know that I’m getting somewhere with my university study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.
# APPENDIX E

## IUM-Gen Motivational Goals Preliminary Analysis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix(a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Praise from my teachers for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Praise from my parents for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Praise from my friends for my university study is important to me.</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 I want to be praised for my university study.</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Having other people tell me that I did well is important to me.</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 At university I do best when I’m praised.</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Getting good grades is the most important thing for my at university.</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I’m happy only when I’m one of the best in my university classes.</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I try hard in my study at university because I’m interested in my classes.</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 I’m always trying to do even better in my university studies.</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 I try hard to make sure that I do well at my university studies.</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I work hard to try to learn something at university.</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 When I’m doing well in my university study I try even harder.</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 I work harder at university if I’m trying to do better than others.</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 I like studying with other people at university.</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 I can do best at university when I’m studying with others.</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I try to study with friends as much as possible at university.</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I like to help other students do well at university.</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 I enjoy helping others with their university studies even if I don’t do so well myself.</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 It’s very important for students to help each other at university.</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 It’s very important for me to be a group leader.</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 I often try to be the leader of a group.</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Winning is important to me.</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I study hard because I want to feel important in front of my</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university friends.</td>
<td>79 I study hard at university so that I will be put in charge of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 I like my university study to be compared to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 I study hard at university because I want the class to take notice of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 Getting the highest grade in my university classes is very important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 I study hard at university for presents from my parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113 I study hard at university for rewards from teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140 I study best at university when I can get some kind of reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 I try to do well at university to please my teachers and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 Getting merit certificates would make me study harder at university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 Making friends at university is very important to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.
## APPENDIX F

### IUM-Gen Sense of Self Preliminary Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133 I think I can do quite well at university.</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Most of the time I feel I can do my university study.</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 I think I’m as good as everyone else at university.</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 I can do as well as other students at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 I succeed at whatever I study at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 I am intelligent enough to graduate from university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 If I’m studying alone, difficult homework doesn’t bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 It is good to plan ahead so that I can do well at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 It is good to plan ahead to complete my studies at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 I want to do well at university to show that I can do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 I study hard at university so that I can graduate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 I try to do well at university so that I can get a good job when I graduate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 I aim my studies at university so that I can get a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I want to do well at university so that I can have a good future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 I like to think things out for myself in my university study.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 I always choose easy work for myself to do at university, so that I don’t have too much trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 I usually do the wrong thing at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 I don’t need anyone to tell me to study hard at university; I do it myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I am very confident at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Other students have to help me a lot with my university study.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 I often try new things on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 On the whole, I’m pleased with myself at university.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>