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Abstract

This study aimed to learn what sort of motivation Japanese university students have for learning English as a foreign/second language, as well as their attitudes and behaviors toward *lifelong learning* in general. The present research scrutinized the significance of learning English in the long run for Japanese university students. It investigated how the two sorts of motivation for L2 learning (*instrumental* and *integrative*) are related to attitudes towards *lifelong learning* by analyzing associations between them. A 14-item survey for L2 motivation (seven questions for each type of motivation) and a 16-item survey for attitudes toward *lifelong learning* were used to collect data from 130 students at 4-year universities (private and public) in Hiroshima City, Japan. The results showed little difference between the means of the two types of motivation but variability in correlations between attitudes towards *lifelong learning, instrumental* and *integrative* motivation were observed among different categorized groups. By and large, a higher level of correlation between *lifelong learning* and *integrative* motivation among all participants was observed, which seemed to indicate Japanese EFL university students look to the significance of understanding the linguistic and L2 culture along with longstanding motivation.
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1 Introduction

Our society has been increasingly interconnected and conceivably improving social arrangements. The intercourse of different values and new ideas, which are substantially desired for social growth, could enhance our society, aid our personal and professional development and help us be healthier. Diversity of perspectives is the basic nature of development and advancement (Hytten, 2009). In today’s technologically advanced society, people are enabled to embrace opportunities for interchange on a global scale which would aid us in appreciating varied ways of justification, a vast array of different perceptions and various attitudes, or to put it another way, it would be beneficial and advantageous to exchange and experience varying modes for common undertakings such as lifelong education. Otherwise, members of society would be less likely to adequately lead up to and be in touch with their desired intellectual stimulation. What is more remarkable is that diversity of stimulation may contribute to a breakthrough which would provide new outlook and solutions, that is to say, a “challenge to thought” (Dewey, 1916). In other words, however, behind the trend of the growing pace of globalization is the fact that we cannot afford to stay provincial nor stagnant in order to progress by coping with issues for the future.

In the early 1930’s, Whitehead (1933) foresaw the shift to the ever-increasing rapidity identifying the necessity to take some sort of action to manage the challenging situation which our society was facing. He stated:

in the past the time-span of important change was considerably longer than that of a single human life. Thus mankind was trained to adapt itself to fixed conditions. To-day (sic) this time-span is considerably shorter than that of human life, and accordingly our training must prepare individuals to face a novelty of conditions. (Whitehead, 1933, p.118)

Cutting-edge innovations in various fields including communication technology, which is abundantly instrumental in acquiring various experiences such as learning other languages and cultures without boundaries, have been a great driving force behind the unprecedented
trend of the fast-tracked pace of human life. It enables individuals to pursue personal, social and professional development to achieve more productive and meaningful lives from and with wider-ranging perspectives. At the same time, these hasty expansions are creating demand for constant learning which brings up the point that knowledge, skills and values become obsolete in less than no time at all (Dave, 1976). The circumstances today are extremely fluid and so unforeseeable that this is out of the question.

Fundamentally, human beings have an inherent and continuing need to revise themselves in order to carry on their lives productively in society on the grounds that it is the nature of living things to capitalize on the things in the surrounding condition which have been molded by the dynamics of the time and continue to be altered at all times (Dewey, 1916). Related to this, Lengrand (1975, p.57) saw the learning process throughout life as;

an effort to reconcile and harmonise these different stages of training in such manner that the individual is no longer in conflict with himself. By laying stress on the unity, the all-roundness and the continuity of development of the personality, it leads to the formulation of curricula and instruments of education that create permanent communications between the needs and lessons of the various situations for and through which every individual completes and fulfills himself.

Individuals would not have the necessity to endeavor to lifelong learning if they were not involved in their social environment in view of the fact that learning is responsive to social change. In fact, but in spite of that, it is essential to maintain the degree of freedom to which individuals pursue their own personal attainment so that they are not merely a duplication of society but are the active producers of the common interests as well as being unique creations that represent the contemporary society (Jarvis, 2007). Human thought is creative, visionary and capable of apprehending the evolving situation to make appropriate provision for an unforeseen ever-shifting future for which humans have to break new ground in various fields including technology and education (Bandura, 1986). Just as importantly, individuals ought to act reasonably to pursue their objectives which derive from their imaginative, ingenious and sincere intuition for their learning process.
In so doing, the pursuit must be initiated by individuals themselves, in order to be sustainable because self-initiative could be the reasoning that may provide motive for learning. The process of one’s life course is a trajectory that extends through life in which individuals carry out with ambition by giving themselves a free rein and “latent powers from within” and by “formation from without” in the societal context of the time where individuals proceed by growth undergoing reorganization and reconstruction of experience that reach an “immediate end” in each case by all means as far as the effort entails learning (Dewey, 1916).

This era of change and innovation is certainly forcing individuals to realize the need of assuming an attitude of activeness toward achieving self-actualization, corresponding to limitless possibilities and availability. In such situations, means of social communication to exchange points of views could pave the way for unfolding and the growth of individuals and society. Society of multicultural egalitarianism thrives on a healthy exchange of perspectives, which may be realized by an agent that allows interaction between diverse people with varying visions and opinions.

In today’s globalized and diversified society, English is the most widely used language for communication in cross-cultural situations that may take place in daily life, academic as well as business settings. Under these conditions, English is more than just a hobby or an elective course in school. It has something to add learners’ lives other than pure formal study. It enables individuals to access and interact with other cultures and experience various ideas, opinions, perspectives and ways of thinking. It opens up other study opportunities and career paths. Moreover, it mediates to increase more cultural and economic capital all over the globe. In Japan, English is studied as a foreign language in both formal and informal educational settings. It is required in school from the elementary through university level (the formal educational setting), while also being a huge business for non-students in general society (the informal social aspect, most often pursued in such national private English-language schools).
In non-ethnocentric occasions where people have to communicate somehow without their first language, people may well have to resort to English as the bridge language, so by way of explanation, there is technically no other means that is useful enough to get away with such a situation other than English. Under such conditions where English as the L2 appears to be the solution, some behave positively in the situation, others react rather negatively. Those who are less motivated by any means often seem to turn their backs on the language and cross-cultural occasions where it is used. On the contrary, motivated L2 learners find their ways to appreciate the opportunity. It is undeniable that practical reasons could play out as motivating factors for acquiring English language proficiency in such a society where the government and corporations offer the highest encouragement in internationalization. However, there seems to be some strong reasoning held by learners that emerge from their sincere feeling towards the target language and culture, that is, unmingled interest, as well as cross-cultural communication which they would like to be engaged in with the natives and non-natives.

When it comes to learning English, Japanese learners show different attitudes and progress. Some people learn quickly and successfully, given the same opportunities and materials. Others wouldn’t do as well as those learners who learn efficiently even while enjoying it. It is often said that some people just have a knack or natural talent for such things as music, sports and language learning. With that being said, however, it is not a clear explanation with any sufficient reasoning. What should be paid attention to is that everyone learns and acquires a first language, unless hindered by a disability, or to put it another way, everyone has the potential to learn a language. Gardner and Lambert (1959) asserted:

Most research on second-language acquisition has been concerned with the measurement of an "ability for languages," the assumption being that achievement is largely due to a linguistic aptitude. However, when measures of aptitude are correlated with grades in language courses, the validity coefficients show considerable variability from situation to situation even with tests developed through factor analytic methods, suggesting that variables other than linguistic aptitude are involved.
This author is convinced, after teaching English and Japanese as a second language (L2) in Japan and Thailand for 10 years, that what his high school guitar teacher said: “No one is born to be tone deaf” is highly relevant and believes that this principle could be applied to language learning. What is perhaps more noteworthy is that learners who are more successful may maintain a different or complex mind system for managing language learning that should not be exclusive for only certain people. The approach of the system should be governed by such agentive driving forces as *instrumental* motivation or *integrative* motivation, or both (described in detail later). They just seem to somehow manage their mindset affirmatively focused on acquiring the language and culture that interest them.

There are problems, however, when applying general socio-educational L2 motivational theories to Japan, as it is a unique culture for such research. There are many researchers who argue that the conventional view of *integrative* motivation in the socio-educational model does not apply to English as a foreign language (EFL) within such contexts because of a lack of a targeted culture held among Japanese people for learning English and that no language community exists for them to make reference to. The principle does not seem to fit the contexts in Asia where English is perceived more as an ‘international language’ used by essentially anybody not part of the first language (L1) community (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009). In other words, applying L2 motivational theories to Japan in particular, an island country, is problematic.

Research by Gardner (2010, p. 174), however, strenuously pointed out that this interpretation of *integrative* motivation is misguided, and contended that motivation comes from ‘*integrativeness*’ (openness to other cultures and the language community) and ‘attitudes toward the learning situation’. In this way, Gardner views the socio-educational model has elements of both individual (affective) and social (context) variables. As a matter of fact, many recent studies which utilize the “L2 possible selves” concept (e.g. You, Dörnyei & Csizér, 2016) demonstrate that variables pertaining to attitudes toward language learning and motivational effort, both elements of the socio-educational model, maintain the strongest influences on motivation.
This kind of open-mindedness and interest in other cultures and languages would contribute to the longstanding motivation that is essential for acquiring another language, which is a demanding task (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p.12) and very often a long-term scenario for average Japanese learners (such as this author). In such Japanese populations, learning English is often extremely challenging because of their lower prerequisites of proficiency in the language as well as the lack of opportunities to interact in English. It is that precise interaction in the target language which facilitates learners and helps them get used to the culture of the English-speaking world. Language acquisition comes with dedication and commitment to maintain learning. In other words, it is the nature of language learning to require learners to be aware and conscious about the effort in the long run. It is essential and effectual to work through lifelong learning when it comes to L2 acquisition in such a context as Japan.

In the case of Japanese university students, the young generation who will play a greater role in the near future, encounter and interact with people from various cultural backgrounds much more in this increasingly globalized society. Therefore, higher education in Japan is necessitated not only to pass on knowledge, but also to teach with a focus on lifelong learning, which facilitates training on how to learn with effective strategies and critical thinking backed up with continued motivation for personal and professional development. Japan needs a population capable of taking the initiative for their own education in general as well as L2 learning with adequate motivation to continue learning throughout their lives in response to the demand of unprecedented shifts in society. It is for this reason that the present research aims to uncover how willing Japanese university students actively work towards acquiring English as a second/foreign language (L2), what motivates them to do so, and what will maintain their lifelong English language learning. To achieve this, it will begin with a discussion on one Asian population, and the main focus of this paper, Japanese students.
2 Motivation in Asian Contexts: A Focus on Japan

It is generally believed by the majority of ordinary Japanese people that Japan is a monolingual and monocultural nation. Average Japanese people are very often unfamiliar with intercultural relationships, especially outside big metropolitan areas such as Tokyo. However, Japanese people are increasingly exposed to English speaking opportunities in their lives, now more than ever. Besides a huge increase in visitors to Japan, bringing non-Japanese speakers much closer in proximity to them, they have seen many changes in formal education which have made English education a requirement from a much younger age than the education system previously required. It currently begins in elementary school for most students in the country. The Ministry of Education (MEXT, 2019) states as follows:

In our nation, opportunities where people use foreign languages including English in daily life is limited. However, not to mention the year 2020 when we host Tokyo Olympic and Paralympics, by the year around 2050 when students who are currently learning in school are actively working in the society, it is predicted that our society will be multinational where people of different cultures, languages, ethnicities co-exist and also compete, therefore, each citizen will have more situations in which the communication is done in foreign language in various social and working settings. (MEXT, 2019, translated from Japanese by the author.)

In short, no matter how uniformly and cliquishly the nation is organized, English is becoming harder to avoid. In any case, they inevitably have some kind of reactions to English language opportunities. That is, Japanese university students often find either economical and advantageous reasons (instrumental orientation) or affective reasons (integrative orientation), or both, to be motivated to learn English (discussed in detail later).

Language acquisition entails not only practicality but also understanding the value and the perspective of the target culture and target language, in doing so, learners with integrative motivation would seek and practice social interaction with the people from the
linguistic cultural community as well as L2 community to learn such quintessence as the nuanced aspects that are characterized by the linguistic culture and practical communication in the language. The integrative concept is similar to processes of social identification, which is the ground for first language acquisition through which infants make an effort to imitate the verbalizations of their caretakers for the reinforcement of feedback, aiming to become a member of the community by effectively interacting with other members (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). For L2 speakers, interpersonal relationships with members of the linguistic cultural community as well as the L2 community would accommodate communicative behavior, which enhances the effort to improve ones’ ability and competency in the target language and culture, as well as continuity of desire and devotion to the pursuit. As Gardner and Lambert (1972, p. 12) proposed, “a process similar to social identification ‘extended to a whole ethnolinguistic community’ may sustain the long-term motivation needed to master a second language”, integrative orientation would be one of the motivational factors that contributes to learners to continue learning throughout life in the diversified global community.

Nevertheless, there are university students who have less integrative motivation due to their disposition, lack of opportunities and confidence in English communication (or in any L2), and they are unlikely to pursue interaction with non-Japanese speakers. In point of fact, average Japanese people are not obliged by any necessity to be able to communicate in English with people from different cultural backgrounds in their daily life. Notwithstanding, an increasing number of Japanese businesses are asking job-seeking university students to possess English ability as a requirement, which is often measured by their scores on the recognized standardized tests. Among the language tests out there, more companies adopt TOEIC for their hiring and promotion process than other tests such as TOEFL or IELTS. As a matter of fact, Japan is one of the largest markets for TOEIC, that is, approximately 1.7 million take the test in Japan annually while around five million people take it in about ninety countries (The Institute for International Business Communication, 2009). However, human resources departments of many Japanese companies do not seem to realize the nature of the test and are not aware of why they need it unless they have another criterion for sifting applicants for elimination.
In substance, the TOEIC test appears to be elaborate to an extent for measuring the four language skills, listening, reading, speaking and writing, including such abilities in vocabulary, grammar and syntax. Still, the examination contents and measurement methods are in a fixed and consistent manner, which are not designed to effectively assess such essential linguistic cultural understanding elements as interactive English communication skills in myriad distinctive situations. The speaking part of the TOEIC test only examines the ability to put words into own self for uttering, unlike IELTS, which has a face-to-face interview to assess interpersonal communication capability on general and different topics that also involve questions and answers about utterance contents between the interviewer and interviewee. To that end, the TOEIC test would not do much for Japanese companies to find candidates who will demonstrate good command in practical English in the professional work environment that involves communication between co-workers and clients who are from diverse backgrounds. It does not make any direct measurement of interactive English communication skills that are important for L2 speakers to practice in order to proficiently communicate in international business settings.

To get a high mark on the test, what it technically takes is to become all too used to the test format and increase attention span and energy, which follow one another intensively from one minute to the next, in addition to administrative procedures including instructions, audio check and filling out candidate information. Here is the format:

- Administrative procedures: 25 minutes
- Listening & Reading Tests: 2 hours (45 minutes + 75 minutes)
- Speaking & Writing Tests: 1 hour and 30 minutes (20 minutes + 60 minutes)

That is, high scorers are from the effective test takers who succeed in marking correct answers that are often solely grammatical and text analytical, as well as performing language output to just enough extent to acquire the full allocated mark, but no more, on each task. During testing, it is crucial to be efficient when choosing the right items without oversight and constructing answers without extra elements that lead to risk taking. Also, they must avoid careless errors in accordance with the designated grading scales to cover the entire test within the time limit. In other words, the test does not concern ability to
structure creativity and critical thinking to develop and express owns’ thought effectively in English. Also, there is little initiative to encounter, interact and create unprecedented value and expansion which students need to pursue a meaningful life in our global society. Because of this, as is so often the case with most test takers, they need preparation that is specifically designed for getting used to the test format and task patterns as well as time management by training as analyzing the test item configuration and drilling past test questions and mock tests, especially for such Japanese test takers who have limited exposure to English in their daily circumstances.

That being the case, learners often find the contents and test-tackling effort platitudinous and dreary, especially learners with integrative motivation, if they are required to take such a test. Also, they realize it is less effective for practical English communication occurring in the diverse society since the concept and procedure of the test are monolithic, and contain different contents with allotted patterns. The strong priority is placed on standardization and readiness for the consumers, including test takers and recipients of official score certificates, as well as test training material distributors, which learners with instrumental motivation might prefer. For that reason, task patterns and expected successful answers seem to bear resemblance to ready-to-assemble products. With all things considered, however, the test would still gauge constituent abilities of language aptitude, which could have a place in performance in L2 acquisition contexts of both formal and informal situations (the details introduced later, from p.33) to certain degree, although it does not evaluate candidates with extensive interest, practical skills and experience in the language highly enough. Hence, such a test could be employed as part of the process to place students in different oversea programs in conjunction with taking into account their motivations for engaging themselves in the program.

For acquiring experience in both formal and informal settings in the linguistic cultural community or the L2 community, more and more Japanese universities are sending students on overseas programs with a focus on English, including Hijiyama University, the institution the author graduated from. Such programs are sending students
to both English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries (and the four Japanese universities sending students to the University of Eastern Finland each semester). During their stay in the community, they go through multiple formal and informal occasions that are woven with both native and non-native speakers of English from various cultural backgrounds, which enable them to learn the practicability and significance of English as an L2. Consequently, they come into contact with wide varieties of accents in spoken English that is the practical aspect of English as a lingua franca, on which most part of English language education in Japan do not focus on enough. The result is that they could learn to expect what they would deal with when outside Japanese society. TOEIC evaluates test takers using standard accents from English-speaking countries. However, Japanese university students are expected to explore the global community by encountering, perceiving and remembering more accents from L2 speakers who they may have chances to interact with from a country they never knew before.

Each semester, many students come to the University of Eastern Finland to encounter others and study together from around the world. The author took part in many sessions of Study Group that involved presentation and discussion while at the university, which had students who speak English as their L2 or L3 from numerous different countries, including Finland, Austria, Tanzania, Iran, Hong Kong, and so forth. On such occasions, which are considerably rare in Hiroshima, students would encounter in the community of their study-abroad destination would allow them to brush up their L2 skills to communicate with people from many cultures and expand their visions by getting to know them, their opinions on different issues and how things are in their countries, as well as by introducing and discussing the culture and manifold dimensions of educational situation in Japan. Along with linguistic outcomes, those dynamical social experiences could yield non-linguistic outcomes such as cross-cultural social connections, which could be the inspiration for Japanese university students to generate new creative thoughts, as well as to pursue L2 learning for such intensions. In keeping with the changes of the times, Japanese university students today are blessed with more opportunities to pitch themselves
into the linguistic cultural communities and L2 communities to experience cultural and practical communication in English than students from previous decades.

For all that, however, a good deal of Japanese students do not seem to be genuinely interested in the linguistic culture. They do not appear to actually devote themselves to learning it with sufficient effort as dealing with bona fide materials of veracious English, such as novels and documentaries (with or without English subtitles) or such hands-on experience in cultural patterns as interacting with the people, even though they have more or less curiosity about the language and the culture. As an illustration, there are phenomena characterized by perceptions and lukewarm attitudes toward English language and culture that quite a few Japanese people appear to have, which include the use of the linguistic cultural elements for fashion, decoration or behavior to appear modern, intelligent, sophisticated or appealing. That is to be expected because English has become the reflection of fascination with western culture, including America in particular, that has exercised notable through history, specifically, by forcing the opening of ports to American trade in 1853, and the defeat in World War II in 1945, and more recently, being the economic envy of Japan. That is to say, English has been “the language of success, profit and international accessibility” (Dougill, 1987).

However, those phenomenal occurrences illustrate needlessness and impracticality of English in Japanese society, which could have been the demerit for potential expansion of trade on a global scale until recent decades. Those who consider and treat English language and culture in much the same casual way as wearing a jewelry seem to have irrelevant ideas or attitudes of indifference toward the linguistic culture, which derives from the apprehension of English language contents as materials to wear and/or expend purely for the “design” or “decorative” purpose, not the language for academic and/or practical uses, or for integrative reasons. They do not seem to be motivated to make much progress in mastering the language by making use of it for certain purposes or strive to develop English language competency to get involved in the linguistic cultural community or the L2 community.
Learners with *integrative* motivation would observe the meaning of English in materials they come across in their lives more scrupulously to develop a better understanding by reason of their interest in the language, the culture and the people. On the other hand, learners with *instrumental* motivation might not bother to pay as much attention to linguistic cultural facets unless it is practically advantageous or indispensable to examine the meaning and appreciate it correctly since they are more likely to pursue the effort by not necessarily understanding the target linguistic culture for affinity but more caring about the pragmatic aspects (such as to score a high mark on a required examination to gain a competitive edge for their career). To put it another way, learners with *instrumental* motivation may well come to regard the linguistic cultural elements from glamorous and/or materialistic associations without considering the cultural values. In the fullness of time, they might abandon their interest and effort once the goal they raised is accomplished because of loss of reasons to continue.

The author observes these aspects of English in Japan time after time as he scrutinizes the attitude and behavior of Japanese people and society towards learning English language and culture, as well as the promotion of internationalization by the government and businesses. Although it would be crucially important for such innovative agendas to carry significance, when it comes to the correct meaning of the English words and accurate, idiomatic usage, Japanese people and society do not seem to be interested very much to consider and deal with these matters. On the contrary, they could be even annoyed when given voice to definitions, legitimate uses and interpretations of the language. To all appearances, linguistic cultural knowledge of English does not seem to matter to a degree that it is unavoidable or motivating in Japanese society at the present time.

As a necessary consequence, it is likely to be the case that they fail to realize the misguided and malapropos contents most of the time. As a case in point, in 2020, the Japanese government named a new campaign ‘Go To Travel’, which is incorrect English grammar, and did not rename it with grammatical accuracy after getting it pointed out to them. The cabinet secretariat only explained, “As an English expression, um, it would be
that (a grammatical error), but… These English words, ‘go’, ‘to’ and ‘travel’ are known by most Japanese people. We attached special importance to explicitness on the gist. We would like many of our citizens to share feeling of going on a trip and foster momentum. That is our intension.” (The Asahi Shimbun, July 23, 2020, translated from Japanese by the author.). Despite the extensive promotion of English language skill improvement and internationalization by the authorities and schools, such erroneous or unnatural English is still ubiquitous and stances or efforts to have it right do not appear prevalent in Japanese context yet.

The authorities and schools in Japan have been emphasizing the importance of English and advocate with the Japanese term, *kokusaika*, which could be understood as internationalization, globalization, transnationalism, interconnectedness, or similar terms. In fact, it was not until 1970s that the growing discourse of *kokusaika* started appearing in Japan at the rear of *kindaika* modernization, as the political rhetoric (Goodman, 2007). Come what may, the concept *kokusaika* is given a great nod by the authorities in the present climate, and institutions in Japan have been enjoying a positive image of the term and beating the drum for it. However, it does not seem to act a very clear role in regard to practicality for the actual situations of multiculturality inside and outside Japan. Not to mention the importance of L2 acquisition for playing an active role in the international community, significant changes are continuously occurring throughout Japanese society and the domestic situation will not remain as insular, which affect the language situation in the country and subsequently English will be spoken as the vehicular language for practical communicative use even more often in various situations without choice rather than just being meaninglessly used for decoration or propaganda in Japan as an L2 community.

Students should have various aims and visions lined up in their sights when they choose to pursue living and working in the diversified global society. That is, they have to cultivate passion and long-term motivation for their future lives through their years in school. The present research examines what orientation and motivation Japanese university students in Hiroshima conceive when they actively study English language and
culture. This project wanted to understand what Japanese undergraduate students are pursuing through linguistic cultural experiences and, in their efforts to learn English, what they are striving for in their course of life by capitalizing on such linguistic cultural achievement. In the final analysis, the present research examines if Japanese EFL students in Hiroshima are truly motivated to learn the target language in the long run for either instrumental or integrative orientation, or possibly both.
3 Theoretical Framework: Motivation in English as an L2

This section scrutinizes the elements and the mechanism of the Socio-Educational Model in detail, looking at relevant instances in different situations. It contrasts two cultures, Japan and Finland, to understand factors that either contribute or discourage learners from gaining intercultural competence and acquiring an L2. Furthermore, it explores the four components of the individual differences that are essential determinants of the model, which play fundamental roles in learning English as an L2. Based on this, distinct settings, formal and informal, are analyzed with potential effects that need to be taken into account for successful L2 and intercultural learning. Ultimately, outcomes may be linguistic and/or non-linguistic, which derive from each element of the system of the Socio-Education Model. This treatise, above all, focuses on two types of motivation, which appear to exert significant effects in learning English as an L2: instrumental and integrative motivation.

3.1 The Socio-Educational Model (SEM)

This discussion will introduce the “Socio-Educational Model,” which describes the process involved in learning a second language, primarily entailing orientation and motivation. The early empirical investigations of the SE Model of second language acquisition derive from research on bilingual dominance conducted by Lambert (cited in Gardner, 2010), in which he found consistent patterns of differences on various measures of French proficiency and bilinguality. From that, he concluded that development of bilingualism is comprised of miscellaneous criteria including the essential element with which the individuals demonstrate proficiency in the L2 in the manner of native speakers (cited in Gardner, 2010).

It was not until 1972 that the research began, which led to the development of the SE Model, when Gardner and Smythe formed the Language Research Group at the University of Western Ontario (Gardner, 2010). Thereafter, it was formally proposed in
1974 through a final grant report authored by Gardner, Smythe, Kirby and Bramwell (Gardner, 1985). Schumann (1975) reproduced the model and defined it as facilitating “a powerful framework within which the dynamic social and psychological facts involved in second language acquisition can be understood” (p.220). The SE Model centers on two essential features linked up with L2 learning, the cultural context and the educational context.

### 3.1.1 Rationale on the SEM

Many educational systems include second language as one of the main subjects, which some might attribute success to scholarly interest and ability although it would involve taking on behavior patterns of the target cultural community. Gardner and Smythe (1975) were interested in identifying and understanding the process that underlies different individuals’ second language learning in a formal setting. They were devoted to finding out what variables play a role in L2 learning after observing the phenomena in which each individual seemed to operate either of these two processes for their learning:

1) Learn the language to adopt it as a means of communication; and

2) Learn the language to simply pass a course in school.

The researchers investigated students who learned French and later did self-assessment of the students when they graduated, in which some of them showed confidence in using the language while others said they were not. Although those two different types of students went through basically the same instruction and had comparable academic results, the unsuccessful students ascribed that they did not get proper instruction and exposure to the language, and were uncomfortable and in despair (Gardner, 2010). The key may be to instruct students so they are able to see the essence and joy, which could derive from learning about the linguistic cultural community and interacting.

Such dismissive reasonings are common among a lot of Japanese EFL learners, presumably due to the fact that English language lesson in formal education in Japan is predominantly training for periodic exams in school and entrance exams, which fundamentally lack communicative approach. The materials Japanese students are instructed to work on are essentially monotonous drills to a large extent and often contain
little contexts that could interest readers. Rote learning gives students in Japan a higher chance to be demotivated to study English because the aim of the effort is just to repeat the content from memory rather than learning in order to understand it. Nevertheless, they still have to spend substantial amount of time solely because it is required as a class assignment and also for exam preparation. As a rule of thumb, it is essential and indispensable for learners to find pleasure in learning and desire to use the language for the sake of acquiring, in another words, uninteresting, uncomfortable and stressful experiences are most likely to result in unsuccessful and meaningless language learning.

The reality of Japanese EFL education is that the great majority of Japanese students seem deprived of communicative tasks in their lessons in the current instructional system and unfortunately there are students who do not get to cultivate English communication skills nor much potential interest in English-language culture and L2 communities. It is pivotal for students to learn cultural aspects of the language focusing more on communicating to obtain insatiable curiosity and fondness toward the culture and passion and devotion for learning that could create a feeling of confidence in using the language. Gardner (2010:80) stated in his address to the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics in 1974:

We have argued that the task facing the student of a second language is not merely the acquisition of a new set of skills such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, etc. In addition to acquiring new skills, the child is also acquiring behavior patterns of another linguistic cultural community. The vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation have a meaning over and above that which you the teacher are trying to present. They are representations of another cultural group and consequently the student’s attitude toward the group or toward other group in general will affect the extent to which he can incorporate the behavior patterns of that cultural group. It is not simply a matter of wanting to learn the language. The student who is integratively motivated will actually receive reinforcement for his participation in class. The student without the integrative motive on the other hand may experience the entire situation as somewhat punishing. As such it is easy to see how the two students will differ in their level of achievement. The attitudinal makeup of the student can be as facilitating
or detrimental to achievement in the second language as are differences in language aptitude or intelligence.

Learning contents should deal with cultural contexts in more depth, as well as interesting stories that intrigue learners rather than making them simple assuming it would be easier to learn. One of the class books approved for use by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), namely *New Horizon*, (published by Tokyo Shoseki and was used at junior high schools in Hiroshima city in the 1990s) was not an exception. It was a book in which there were unelaborate contents in the main part of the book. Each section had considerably shorter stories that contained too few details to interest students. The book had a few longer stories after the main part. One of those stories that interested the author (when he was a student) was a story about a homicide case in which the detectives visit possible suspects. However, teachers were not required to cover those contents during the semester but set it aside only for students’ own interest, for spare time work, or extra work to compensate cancelled lessons or holiday homework, which would be only copying the texts or just read it a few times in a voice by oneself. Unfavorably, the latest version of *New Horizon* still does not appear to have much difference in the contents since that time (see Tokyo Shoseki, 2020). As a rule, the subject matter could be more captivating when it entails unusual, unexpected and unique ideas.

Moreover, many Japanese learners, including teachers in point of fact, seem to have preconceived ideas about second language acquisition by failing to be properly informed about what it actually takes to learn it. It would stand to reason that what is presented and how it is done are crucial for learners. The author worked as a junior high school English teacher between 2006 and 2010 in Hiroshima. The education board at that time required English teachers to attend workshops and conferences on a regular basis to update and improve their teaching methods and skills. One of the areas for improvement in high school English education in Japan pointed out by ESL/EFL teachers from other English-speaking countries was about the class book. The teachers alleged that the main stories of the book were irrelevant to the context of the English-language community and also pointed out that the dialogues and stories in the book are too plain, and unnatural. It
should be essential to contain culturally relevant contents with adequate details for learners to be interested and understand the target language.

The education board sets up teacher training meetings from time to time which have different themes. They are often times observations on different types of teachers, such as experienced vs. young teachers, with up-to-date methods and followed by a discussion session afterwards. It would be beneficial to allocate time also for learning cultural aspects and communicative usage of the language so teachers themselves become more informed and interested and thus could present contents with more curiosity, more passion and understanding of the English-language community. Gardner (2010, p.79) asserts that “to the extent that the ultimate success in the language was the development of a means of communicating with individuals who spoke the language, success would depend on the ability or capacity to make the language material part of the individual’s own being.” It could be even more advantageous to invite native teachers to join those meetings to share their opinions, learn English-language culture from them and have closer communication, which could make team-teaching more functional and productive. It could accommodate increased understanding of the behavior pattern of the linguistic cultural community for Japanese English teachers to perform their job with sufficient and suitable motivation, that is, an increased desire to communicate.

Despite the fact that many students manage to put in considerable amounts of workload and attain certain skills, some students seem to make the effort only in order to get a passing grade (their prime objective). Over and above that, these types of students are not likely to be interested to learn more in depth by continuing to develop their skills and knowledge in the language and the culture, which could lead them to acquire further proficiency and competence in the language, and furthermore, to explore the world of diverse cultures. That is to say, some students learn the language to be successful in academic performance, hence “providing the cognitive foundation” to yield results, on the one hand, while other students strive to acquire the language to communicate with people from another cultures, thereby enabling them to “make it part of their emotional and
cognitive functioning” (Gardner, 2010, p.79). Language is a system of communication with distinctive values based on the culture in which it is used and which would necessarily require deeper understanding that can be effectively achieved by sincere interest. The Socio-Educational Model is designed to “account for this bi-partite function in language learning, to identify individual difference measures that would tap these two domains, to provide measures of these variables, and to test the validity of the model in different contexts” (Gardner, 2010, p.80).”

3.1.2 Scheme of the SEM

![Diagram of Socio-Educational Model](image)

**Figure 1: Schematic Representation of the Theoretical SE Model (Gardner, 1985)**

The schematic in **Figure 1** depicts four categories of variables in the SE Model: the social milieu, individual differences, language acquisition contexts and outcomes, which all play a role in the language acquisition process that involves phenomenal causal interplay (Gardner, 1985). It posits that “the beliefs in the community concerning the importance and meaningfulness of learning the language, the nature of skill development expected, and the particular role of various individual differences in the language learning process will influence second language acquisition” (Gardner, 1985, p.146). As an illustration, the general level of achievement could be low if it is generally believed in the
society that learning a second language is particularly hard and cumbersome, but the other side of the coin is that the general level of achievement could be high if it is common to learn a second language in the society (Gardner, 1985). According to the same research, individual differences in intelligence, aptitude, motivation and anxiety, and noteworthy, high achievements performed in the society where most individuals are assumed to be proficient to a certain degree have stronger relationships with intelligence and aptitude than with the other variables (Gardner, 1985).

3.1.2.1 Social Milieu based on the SEM

The following two sections investigate two different cultures, which show dissimilar attitudes and behaviors in cross-cultural settings as well as their performance in L2 proficiency. Attitudes of governments and educational authorities appear to differ in their responsibility for the effects of L2 learning and intercultural competency. It seems Finland has characteristics Japan could learn and gain insight from in order to develop effective L2 and intercultural learning.

3.1.2.1.1 A Social Milieu in a Finnish Context

Language education in Finland appears to appreciate efforts of learning different languages. Finnish basic education offers four different syllabi to students: A1, B1, A2 and B2. Syllabus A1 is mandatory and students normally study it in the third grade with a possible optional syllabus, A2 that is usually taken between the third grade and the sixth grade. Syllabus B1 is also mandatory and studied in the sixth grade. B2 is another optional syllabus that could be taken between the seventh grade and the nineth grade. The national core curriculum employs the Finnish adaptation of the six-point scale of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR 2003), which consists of the range of proficiency levels from A1 to C2 with sub-scales that have criteria of all the different language skills; listening comprehension, speaking, reading comprehension and writing (see Table 1, Hilden, Härmälä, Rautopuro, Huhtanen, Puukko & Silverström, 2015).
The Finnish system allows students and schools to elect the languages to learn and use in their grade level in accordance with their needs and will. The majority of Finnish elementary students elect English as a first foreign language, that is, for A1 language in the third grade as a general rule (City of Helsinki, 2019). Conventionally, many Swedish-speaking students often take Finnish for A1 language and English for A2 language since more than 90% of Finnish citizens speak Finnish as their first language (Inha, n.d.). As is the case with A1 language, B1 language is also mandatory and generally starts in the sixth grade and most students choose the other national language, Swedish or Finnish, unless the student has taken it for A1 language or A2 language (see: Inha, n.d.: City of Helsinki, 2019). In that manner, students in Finland would learn at least two languages on top of their mother tongue by committing themselves to studying languages of their choice through the course of formal comprehensive education, which accommodates them with a capacity for learning linguistic cultural diversity.

Table 1: Language Proficiency Scale in Finnish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>A1.1</th>
<th>A1.2</th>
<th>A1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>A2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>B1.2</td>
<td>B1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1–C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managing regular interaction with native speakers

Managing all the different language skills in a variety of demanding use situations

Table 2: Scale of Developing Language Proficiency Levels in Finnish High Schools

(Source: Opetushallitus – Board of Education, n.d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Interaction in different situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>The student, with the occasional support of a communication partner, copes with a few most commonly recurring and routine communication situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td>The student is able to communicate, participate in discussions and express their opinions quite effortlessly in everyday communication situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Choices of Foreign Languages in Comprehensive School Education for Syllabus A in Grade 3, Finland (Source: Education Statistics Finland - Vipunen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sámi</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On these grounds, it would be common for Finnish students to learn at least three languages (or possibly more) since linguistically inclined students who have been taking their first, second and third languages in the lower grade levels are allowed to take up to a fourth language in high school (Björklund & Suni, 2000). But for all that, many Finnish-speaking Finns, in reality, do not seem to perceive Swedish as a language that is as substantial as Finnish and English is to their lives. In 1990s Finland, a majority of the students in grade three selected English to study as their second language, whereas only a small number of them chose Swedish, which would show that the students and parents were attaching more importance to English as the lingua franca, as well as other languages that are more widely used across many European countries (Björklund & Suni, 2000). This trend has been demonstrated more and more since 2000 (see Table 3).

On the contrary, the National Agency for Education and the OAJ (the Teachers’ Union) are concerned that it might lead to narrowing the range of language learning if students focus too much on English in the early stage and see it as a potential problem which might appear later in their lives (Yle Uutiset, January 9, 2020). That is, the range of career choice could be narrowed on account of the fact that Finnish businesses and
industries are not exceptions that seek human resources with a diverse range of language skills. In a related move, the city of Tampere is a forerunner to breaking ground on broadening the future of children by offering more choices for language learning. Specifically, first graders have seven languages to choose from for their first foreign language: English, Swedish, German, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese (Yle Uutiset, January 9, 2020). The city of Tampere also offers a program named *Foreign-language basic education* in which students study subjects using the chosen language, with the exception of the national subjects such as Finnish language, history and social studies. (City of Tampere, 2018).

Sanni Grahn-Laasonen, the Minister of Education in Finland, announced that foreign language learning will generally start in the first grade as of 2020, referring to the research data on children’s natural sensitivities to learning new things and concerns about declining language skills of students. Due to this, she asserted that motivation could be created at its best during the first school years as that is the critical period for it since it can carry active and sustained language learning throughout life (Finnish Government, 2019). On this matter, Grahn-Laasonen pointed out that there are regional differences in investment in early language education, therefore the nationwide reform is essential and demanded equal opportunities to mitigate the effects of socioeconomic disparities (Helsinki Times, April 13, 2018). In Finland, it is generally believed that schooling is an agent for social equality and this consensus remains essential and more prevalent than those in many other western nations (Simola & Rinne, 2011).

As a matter of fact, however, Finland is one of the last European countries to build a compulsory education system. The constitution in Finland only made six-year elementary education compulsory in 1921 (the same year as Thailand) (Sangnapaboworn, 2007). On the other hand, nearby Scandinavian countries had already developed legal systems for mandatory education, namely, Denmark in 1814, Sweden in 1842, and Norway in 1848 (Simola & Rinne, 2011). Even after that implementation, it did not spread and gain a foothold in Finland before long, that is, it was not until just before the World War II that all children started to appreciate the opportunity for learning at elementary
schools in Finland (Ramirez & Boli-Bennet, 1982; Rinne, 1984; Rinne & Salmi, 1998; Simola & Rinne, 2011). Another thing to consider is that the process of industrialization and urbanization was stagnating before the World War II. To be specific, 70 percent of the population lived in rural areas, where approximately 60 percent were engaged in agriculture and forestry in 1945 (Simola & Rinne, 2011). Therefore, due to these facts, the educational gap between older generations and younger generations has turned out to be among the highest in Europe.

Through the process of social development at a rapid pace, the Finns seem to have proceeded with “a strong collective experience of causality between progress in formal education and simultaneous social advancement” (Simola & Rinne, 2011). This is akin to the way in which the Japanese expeditiously made a great deal of effort in the post-war period and became the second largest economy in the world. Although Finland was, in fact, one of the most indigent and agrarian nations in Europe in the early nineteenth century, in this day and age, Finland is amongst the world leaders in education and technology. At every turn, the Finns always had inner strength to persevere in difficult situations such as the Winter War (1939-1940) against a much superior nation, the Soviet Union. The Finns maintained a determination and ability to endure and give themselves many hardships, which is defined as a concept in the Finnish culture, called sisu. The construct derives from latent power, which is “more about the visceral and somatic than conscious and cognitive,” that could be the source of endurance to surmount significant adversity such as economic suffering, war and loss of loved ones (Lahti, 2019).

The momentum and the progress of Finnish society that should come from determination, guts and integrity is based on the belief that all people are equally important. The Finnish word that could be best translated as equity or equality is ‘oikeus,’ which is written in a Finnish-English dictionary as ‘right’, and “which complies with justice, law or reason” (“Oikeus,” 2020). Similarly, as also explained by Simola, Rinne, Varjo, and Kauko, (2013), ‘oikeudenmukaisuus’ which is translated in the dictionary as ‘justice’, or a “state of being just or fair” (“Oikeudenmukaisuus,” 2020). According to the Finnish Education Evaluation Council (2004):
The economic and social welfare of Finnish society is based on an egalitarian public system of schooling. Its mission is to guarantee for every citizen both educational opportunities of good quality, regardless of his/her sex, dwelling place, age, mother tongue and economic position and the right to tuition accordant with his/her capabilities and special needs and his/her self-development.

In Finland, it is generally believed that education is so essential for yielding a strong national resource and it plays a significant role for social mobility, that is, equal opportunities in education would aid and level out disparities in society and maximize talent reserves of society members (Kyrö & Nyyssölä, 2006). To achieve the national agenda of education, Finland disallows any school league tables for the sake of assuring equal educational opportunities for everyone and aims to provide education based on the philosophy of lifelong learning (Nyyssölä, 2005).

As a consequence of all concerns about reasonableness and the rapid shift in the global society in the 21st century, the consciousness level toward education, including language learning in Finland, appears to be elevated and there seems to be a prevalent assumption of average English language competency in Finnish society. It is likely that Finnish university students are assumed to be proficient in English to a certain extent no matter what their majors are. The author had an experience of presupposition about this when he was moving into his new apartment in Joensuu, Finland. He asked the student-flat realtor for language support to arrange some things with his new unacquainted Finnish flat mate before he carried in his things, then only to be told that he should be speaking English with the author since he is a university student. There seems to be preferable settings that facilitate independent and self-sufficient language learning in which individuals could suit themselves in both education and real life in Finland that is actualized by the beliefs in the society concerning the importance and meaningfulness of language learning, as well as egalitarianism.

In addition to language learning, societal attitude toward languages could facilitate individuals with self-identification and cultural understanding, as well as impartiality, which would raise greater self-awareness that could lead to conscious knowledge of one’s
own character, motives and desires. The legislation in Finland is well developed and organized for general public to see the whole picture of the language situation of the society, which could be of great consequence for individuals to gain fundamental understanding and perspectives on the context of languages in the society. The Constitution of Finland states in the Section 17 of Chapter 2, “Right to one’s language and culture” as follows:

The national languages of Finland are Finnish and Swedish. The right of everyone to use his or her own language, either Finnish or Swedish, before courts of law and other authorities, and to receive official documents in that language, shall be guaranteed by an Act. The public authorities shall provide for the cultural and societal needs of the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking populations of the country on an equal basis. The Sami, as an indigenous people, as well as the Roma and other groups, have the right to maintain and develop their own language and culture. Provisions on the right of the Sami to use the Sami language before the authorities are laid down by an Act. The rights of persons using sign language and of persons in need of interpretation or translation aid owing to disability shall be guaranteed by an Act. (Ministry of Justice, Finland, 1999).

Explicit recognition of one’s own self and cultural diversity may accommodate cultural awareness, which is “the ability and willingness to objectively examine the values, beliefs, traditions and perceptions” within one’s own culture and other cultures that could contribute to developing higher competence in L2 by providing overall picture of measure for language learning (O'Brien, 2017).

3.1.2.1.2 A Social Milieu in a Japanese Context

The essential idea of education in Japan ought to be to gain knowledge and insight through learning that is based on facts and the policy of a broad outlook. The leaders of the country always have to seek to develop reasonable and practicable system that facilitates skills, competence and values to cope with the ever-changing diversified society. In 2007, Bunmei Ibuki, the Education Minister of Japan at the time, said, “Japan has been historically governed by the Yamato (Japanese) race. Japan is an extremely homogenous
country,” which the Prime Minister at the time, Shinzo Abe, understated commenting “I think he was referring to the fact that we (Japanese public) have been gotten along with each other fairly well so far. I don’t see any specific problem with that.” (The Japan Times, February 27, 2007). In the previous year when Ibuki became the Education Minister, he had presented his viewpoint in the introduction of English-language education in all public elementary schools across Japan, saying “I think there is absolutely no need to make English language lesson compulsory at elementary schools. Children have to acquire ‘beautiful Japanese language’ in the first place. Otherwise, that does not make any sense at all.” (The Asahi Shimbun, September 27, 2006, translated from Japanese by the author.).

Hagiwara (2006) points out that it is one thing to acquire beautiful Japanese language, it is another thing to learn a foreign language, and it is to be noted that the opinion typified by Ibuki may be reaching out for visceral sympathy, but actually is only a conceptualization and simplified affective reasoning. Japanese leaders including Ibuki advocate the importance of internationalization on numerous occasions, emphasizing the necessity of improving the linguistic ability of Japanese people. That notwithstanding, they do not appear to commonsensically acknowledge and raise awareness of diversity by sharing historical accuracies in Japanese society. Early language education may not be the only answer to manage accommodating language and cross-cultural competency, but gaining experience for identifying and acknowledging diversities to understand multiculturalism, as well as learning the tradition and taking pride in own culture is primary and indispensable.

Compared to the climate of language and culture in Finnish society, Japanese society does not yet seem to develop much attitude of permissiveness toward plurality in society even to this day. It was not until 26 of April in 2019 that the new act legally recognizing the Ainu as the indigenous people of Japan was promulgated and went into effect in the following month (Comprehensive Ainu Policy Office, n.d.). In 1986, Yasuhiro Nakasone, the Prime Minister at the time, described Japan as a nation of homogeneous race and faced a strong backlash from minority indigenous people including the Ainu (The Japan Times, February 27, 2007). It was ignorant of the leader of the
government to make such a remark, which is nowhere near the truth. Nakasone also expressed his view that Japanese people achieve higher level of education and intelligence owing to the homogenous nature of the society and contrasted it to American society by commenting that the level of education and intelligence in the United States turn out to be lower due to the fact that America has the high number of minority population, including African Americans and Hispanics (Los Angeles Times, September 27, 1986). In spite of that, the general public in Japan at the time did not take it as an issue that the leader of the country held such a narrow-minded perspective toward diversity but nonetheless seemed to bear the concept that the society could be well organized to be successful when people “look, think, and act alike” rather than having ethnic diversity which they believe causes social discord and dissension (The Washington Post, September 28, 1986).

Tracing back to the nineteenth century, Japan was striving to unify the country and thought establishing an absolute status of the national language disallowing diversity would be crucial to achieve that scheme. Meiji period linguist and educator Kazutoshi Ueda (1867-1937) devoted his life to the effort and worked out the nationalist ideology after studying linguistics and observing linguistic nationalism in Germany (Tollefson, 2012). In 1894 after returning from Europe, he delivered a speech titled Our Nation and Its Language, the contents of which were included in his publication in 1895, For the National Language, in which he wrote the reasons for the importance of the national language of Japan. Ueda stated:

Japanese language is the spiritual blood of Japanese people. The national polity of Japan is primarily maintained by this spiritual blood and Japanese race does not break up thanks to the strongest that is meant to be preserved for the longest time. In a state of great difficulty, as long as the voice spreads out, the forty million citizens hear the message at any time to be fully committed to the last breath. And upon hearing delightful news, the whole nation, from the end of the Kuril Islands to the edge of Okinawa islands, commemorate and dedicate themselves with the national anthem all at once. (Ueda, 1897, translated from Japanese by the author.)
Every now and again, some Japanese political figures still let out this tradition of linguistic nationalism even today, although the official status of the Japanese language is not stated in the Constitution of Japan (National Diet Library, 2003). On January 14 of 2020, over a century later, Deputy Prime Minister Tarō Asō, the former Prime Minister of Japan (2008 to 2009), again made another inappropriate remark saying, “No country but this one has lasted 2,000 years with one language, one ethnic group and one dynasty” (The Japan Times, January 14, 2020). This was not the first time he made such a remark. He had made a similar comment in 2005, when he was serving as the International Affairs and Communications Minister, saying “Japan is a one race nation” (The Japan Times, October 18, 2005).

This idea of monolingualism and monoculturalism seems to arise from the prevailing assumption that Japan is monoethnic. Befu (2009) highlights the fact that Japan was presumably the most multi-ethnic and multicultural in Japanese history when Japan was carrying out the ambitious imperial expansion from 1895 to 1945, during which Japan occupied Taiwan, the south half of Sakhalin, the Kuril islands, the Korean Peninsula and Micronesia. The exclusionary self-concept of identity as a monoethnic nation still appears to remain in political circles and even in the popular imagination in Japan today. Nevertheless, every time leading politicians make improper comments, they do not seem to be taken seriously as an issue in the public mind in Japan. From the author’s personal observation of Japanese people and reacting opinions on the social media, there are not many negative public reactions that show disapprovals to those remarks, reflecting their short-sighted perspectives. It is undeniable that the Japanese society today is not isolated amidst the diversified global society, hence it is inevitable to take into account the circumstances and what it means to be internationalized. Also, developing a positive attitude toward sharing cultures is preeminent, as well as relaxing the mindset on the social belief of monolingualism and monoculturalism while being aware of one’s own perspectives. It would be constitutive to recognize differences in understanding instead of turning to exclusionary practice to cultivate confidence in interacting with people across many different cultures.
In the academic year of 2020, third and fourth graders started to learn English as mandatory Foreign Language Activities, and English became a formal subject for fifth and sixth graders in public elementary schools across Japan (MEXT, 2019). It first started off in the academic year of 2011 for fifth and sixth graders to learn one lesson of Foreign Language Activities per week. For the academic year of 2008, the author was assigned as an instructor to teach English for the Foreign Language Activities at one of the designated hub pilot schools (one out of every forty elementary schools were pilots). The intention was to prepare the staff for this language task since elementary school teachers did not have experience in teaching English. During that period, the author observed the necessity to facilitate understanding of intercultural competency and using English as a second language in diverse communities. However, the whole project seemed insufficient and unclear. Rather, it was only preoccupied with fun and meaningless English activities. One of the fundamental issues which have not been solved yet is a lack of skilled English teachers. As reported by an Education Ministry survey in fiscal 2015, only 4.9 percent of elementary school teachers were qualified to teach English (The Japan Times, September 5, 2016). Without expertise in the field of language and culture, it might fall into merely a simplification of the English language education of the upper schools which are lacking communicative approaches and a strong cultural understanding. Of the greatest concern is that inexpert instruction may confuse or demotivate students to understand English-language culture which takes roots in the linguistic cultural community. Learning a particular language would require learners to perceive and interpret the nature of the culture of the language both sympathetically and knowledgeably.

Education is obliged to expand potential capacity to flexibly adapt oneself by providing learning experiences and the ability to improve different skills and cultural sensitivities on the grounds that it is imperative to develop affirmative attitudes in cultural competence and language learning. This will allow the L2 learner to communicate with people from a range of different social and ethnic backgrounds in order to advance with various perspectives to achieve desired and commonsensible change. Moreover, individuals could perform advantageously with proactive social motivation in an equitable and open-minded atmosphere to acquire capability of behaving and interacting in the
society of multiple identities that may accommodate sensation with which individuals could build self-assuredness to act with confidence in the society where people and nations are closely connected and interdependent. Under the circumstances, it is instrumental and essential to be well aware of the social fluidity and enhance ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills to cope with the limitlessly altering situation.

3.1.2.2 Four Types of Individual Personality Differences in the Social Language Learning Process

The SE Model centers on the following four different types of individual differences in the language learning process, assuming that they affect second or foreign language learning without intermediary:

1) Intelligence
2) Language Aptitude
3) Motivation
4) Situational Anxiety

These four factors are postulated to have effects in individual differences in achievement. Supposedly, there are other possible factors including personality, it is assumed that they would exert influence through one of these four factors (Gardner, 1985).

Intelligence could be referred to as the capacity for understanding information and logics as well as for perceiving emotions, which may have a hand in structured and consistent learning. In a systematic approach, language learning contents including vocabulary words and grammar are presented and which learners need in order to plan out their learning and to achieve their goals. For such rote learning, “learning capacity” could serve efficaciously in cooperation with “the capacity to acquire capacity” with which the learner is able to expand the ability to retain and produce (see: Cattell, 1987, p.12) considering that L2 learning is such a longstanding effort, although it may not be directly concerned with semantic generalization for language acquisition. Moreover, “the ability to think abstractly” would also play a role in view of the fact that it is requisite to get a sense of ideas and attitudes of the linguistic cultural community, leading to success in acquiring the target language (see: Cattell, 1987, p.12). Above all, human beings are born
with the ability to fit in to the immediate or new situation, though the degree to which one is capable may vary by individual. That could be defined as one of the functions of intelligence, yet, it is not just in the sense of capacity to tolerate “unusual abstractions” (Cattell, 1987). Just as importantly, intelligence may be instrumental with multiple potentials, which have not been understood to the fullest extent, and it could be harnessed to effectively understand and acquire the language. In other words, L2 learning could be explored for possibilities.

The four distinct constituent abilities below of Language Aptitude were determined by Carroll (1981):

- Phonetic coding ability: the ability to perceive and remember distinct sounds and their associated symbols.
- Grammatical sensitivity: the ability to recognize the function of a lexical element in a sentence.
- Rote learning ability: the ability to learn and retain associations between words and their meanings in a new language.
- Inductive language learning ability: the ability to infer or induce rules governing the structure of a language.

Let’s look at each of these more closely.

Phonetic coding ability is recognizing sounds to identify with proper spellings and could play a great role in demonstrating more accurate perceptions of orthographic conventions (Carroll, 1981). In other words, the learner could know a word or a phrase only by the sound without knowing the meaning. It could effectively contribute to achieving academic learning as well as practical communication and could possibly be enhanced through experience in the linguistic cultural community. It would also be significant to be capable of perceiving grammatical construction to understand and proficiently use the language. It is the ability to perceive syntactic patterning of sentences, that is, grammatical arrangements and functions of individual elements in the language (Carroll, 1990). Grammar is the natural purpose of structuring sentences to be functional for transferring meaning that is indispensable for comprehension. Thus, it is fundamental to be able to recognize and have a good command of the function.
In foreign language learning situations, memorization could play a part in performing communication as well as achievement in academic language learning. Each individual would possess dissimilar and unique way of process for retaining linguistic elements on a par with mathematical works that deal with logics of shape, quantity and arrangement. When it comes to language proficiency, rote memorization could have a substantial effect even in communicative use. The learner may retain language contents once before without exposure to the context and could make up or further their semantic understanding through later experience in the linguistic cultural community. The author has had ample tangible experience with this in his third language, Thai, real-life situations and daily communication during his work as a language teacher in Thailand. Thai linguistic elements he had retained by himself in advance and also from daily interactions with native speakers were reviewed over again and again in communication settings to understand more aspects of the linguistic elements in the semantic contexts, which are the different patterns of the sequences of natural language use. That is to say, the memorized language elements were observed in multiple dimensions in the surrounding circumstances. At the same time, being in the linguistic cultural community of Thailand, the author also came to grips with numerous occasions in which he had to surmise meanings and intent of some linguistic elements. That is, learning another language is the exploration of myriad challenges in which leaners may be occasionally required to draw an inference on linguistic elements in order to carry on learning. In such situations, learners would need to make the most of the process of inductive learning to make sense of the rules governing the structure of the target language. Over and above that, motivated learners would always strive to catch up with the missed contents to come out even and moreover, to enhance understanding and appreciation because they are excited about the discovery of the target linguistic culture.

Motivation should most likely perform the prime role in language learning as the decisive factor in view of the fact that it is the driving force, which orients learners toward their objective. In the matter of foreign language learning, there seems to be some affect and some attitudes that may contribute to the acquisition. Therefore, there would be differing sorts of motivation. One of the author’s former teachers from Finland made one
of her immediate goals learning Japanese language and culture happen earlier in her life. She first got an inspiration from *tanka*, a genre of classical Japanese poetry, when she was in high school. Thereafter, she became more and more interested in the culture as she studied Japanese art history, as well as also from meeting people from Japan on her trip across Europe. In reaching her objective, she discovered that it was her desire to achieve the goal that whipped her up and to find a way to move more deeply with the linguistic cultural community, not to mention the effort she expended toward achieving it. It was a “Cultural Activities Visa” that brought her to Japan to study the art there, including *suibokuga*, Japanese ink painting, at an atelier. She lived in Osaka, Japan for four years (from 1978 to 1979 and again from 1981 to 1984) and while working, one of her main social goals was to meet the people and experience their way of life and the culture.

The residence permit also allowed her to work certain amount of time. She then experienced Japanese work culture from working at NOVA for three years. (NOVA was one of the largest private for-profit English language schools in Japan). To understand Japanese culture and language, it would be more effective to learn within the linguistic cultural community due to its highly context-sensitive nature of the language. For instance, the honorific expressions that are unique to Japanese do not often have clear counterparts in English or other languages. Japanese culture is characterized by its hierarchy system in which human relationships are expressed by honorific language and Japanese-style non-verbal communication. It is firmly emphasized and enforced in work environments and conformity and success in using it is considered a high level of social and communicative competence in Japanese culture. Above and beyond that, Japanese is a context-dependent language in which the subject of the sentence is often left out. That is, it could be hard for learners to infer the subject from the context when the learners’ first language requires the subject clearly stated such as is common in English sentences, especially when the L2 learner learns outside of the Japanese linguistic cultural community. This hands-on experience greatly influenced and helped her learning and understanding of Japanese culture and society. In the context of the actual situation, she experienced natural language concepts and the dynamics of Japanese work culture.
She then became even more devoted to the culture and still continues to study, for instance, by engaging in activities such as attending Japanese Language Teachers Short-term Training (by The Japan Foundation Japanese-Language Institute) in Urawa, Japan, as well as reading Japanese texts. These ongoing activities show her regular efforts to stay involved in the materials and remain interested in serious issues. She then took up her career as a Japanese teacher and taught Japanese language and culture at University of Jyväskylä in Finland for six years. Overall, she has been teaching at the University of Eastern Finland over 20 years. She still visits Japan every year for both private and formal purposes as a guest teacher at two different universities, while gaining new experience, collecting materials for teaching and research as well as practicing her personal hobby, iaidō, a Japanese martial art. She will retire and end her career as a Japanese teacher someday, even so, she is sure that she will continue to learn Japanese language and culture while enjoying the effort further down the road. This example of a L2 student actively maintaining studies in the L2 is an excellent example of motivation after formal immersion in the target culture ends. It also shows how important it is to never stop pursuing (or acquiring) the target language and maintaining such motivation over time, even after not being inside the linguistic cultural community, regardless of what the target language is.

There are international students, such as that Finnish person, who show excellent command of Japanese language and impress the native speakers with their fluency in grammar, pronunciation and cultural knowledge. Most of them appear to be affectionately devoted to Japanese culture. As is often the case, many of them are besotted with Japanese subculture. For instance, those who are infatuated with Japanese cartoons often learn the language by watching it with a Japanese soundtrack as well as backing it up with self-study educational materials. Motivated learners who are successful in making a strong effort tend to enjoy the endeavor, that is to say, they are apt to exert a substantial amount of effort and get involved in activities and settings for communication, which provide exposure to the linguistic culture one way or another purely out of affinity, desire and passion. Many of those learners stumble across the culture that fascinates them as if it were their calling, and become devoted in pursuing, something which appears to be
reminiscent of a child’s natural desire to learn his/her mother culture. Moreover, those L2 learners seem willing to learn the language and the culture no matter how far the physical and cultural distances from their own cultures are. In other words, they do not seem to limit their learning due to a boundary especially by taking advantage of the ever-developing technology in this digital age. Therefore, they are likely to continue to pursue learning the target language and culture even further throughout life, no matter the time or setting.

The present research strives to analyze Japanese university undergraduate students’ awareness and attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language and is interested in where their orientations toward learning it emanate from, what kind of cultural influences they have had both in formal and informal settings, as well as how they perceive learning English as their L2 in light of their future career and personal learning. Their devoted Japanese teachers might have made it interesting and exciting to encounter different people, cultures and languages, or their Assistant Language Teachers, called ALTs (as coined by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology), who are foreign native speakers of English, might have provided inspiring exposure and hands-on linguistic cultural experience. They could have done this through Foreign Language Activities in elementary, junior and/or senior high school classes. Educational settings such as these should be the environment where students gain cultural awareness and encouragement to actively develop cultural competence throughout life. However, such an ideal situation unfortunately does not occur as often as it should.

The author had manifold cultural stimuli, which he thinks initially oriented him to cultural exploration when he was in the lower grades of elementary school. His homeroom teacher was a culturally aware person and brought so many visitors from different cultures to class for students to have cultural experiences, traditional performances from the visitors’ home countries, or even just to interact and play together in the school yard. She gave students used postage stamps from her personal friends she corresponded with as reward stickers in class. Those postage stamps were from various countries including Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Belgium, East and West Germany, to name just a few. In
summer vacation in 1990, she sent the author a summer greeting card from Germany, which on back side showed photo of her standing in front of a portion of the demolished Berlin Wall. She spoke Esperanto with some of the visitors she brought to the school. She taught us what Esperanto is in a way the eight-year-olds were able to understand. What is more, she used to bring up topics on current international matters accordingly such as the Gulf War in the morning and afternoon homeroom meetings. The author considers it was the yielding of non-linguistic outcomes that facilitated his favorable attitude toward learning both language and culture and strongly believes this influence enriched his life course and made him embrace and immerse himself deeply in cultural discovery.

On the flip side, there might be some cultural factor that is having a dampening effect, which results in lower English language proficiency and slack cultural literacy of Japanese people. In this globalized era of newer trends, there may be even more chances to encounter and initiate cultural exploration in the immediate circumstances. Nowadays, there are more availabilities and options for Japanese students to study abroad than previous decades, as well as opportunities to meet people of various cultural backgrounds within Japan. That is, it would be possible for an L2 community in close proximity to provide motivation in Japanese students to learn communicative English within their realm of possibility. The present research specifically investigates Japanese undergraduate students in Hiroshima where the conditions differ from other cities in Japan, which brings to the point that students in Hiroshima might have expectations that are at variance with other areas of the country. Under any and all circumstances, the Japanese government and businesses have been advocating an emphasis on globalization and showing some concern about it, which might be the source of pressure on the younger members of society on the grounds that it is the norm to match their attitudes, beliefs and behaviors with others in Japanese society, which has been done by decree in the nation to keep with westernization of Japan since around 1870. At this time, it should be a question of understanding what it means to be internationalized and facilitating a reasonable measure to realize some effect.

Japanese students today are prone to mystification and demotivation for which the governing methods of English learning is responsible, and that is proving to be inefficient
and wearisome. It generally imposes students monotonous repetition tasks such as contents of vocabulary matrix and grammar exercises that do not come with much cultural or communicative contexts. Nevertheless, English is one of the core academic subjects in the Japanese education system in which grades in the subject are taken into account to a great degree in the overall academic grades. Therefore, it could be the source of anxiety for Japanese students. Under the one-size-fits-all system, they are compelled to achieve sufficient performance on the standardized periodic school tests and senior high school entrance exams of English as a school subject to succeed academically. All of this is done in order to meet the ultimate goal of academic achievement, starting with the matriculation examination (in Japan, the Center Examination). One’s academic history has significant lifelong consequences due to the fact that the name of the university, that is, the ranking or reputation of the institution, on one’s CV matters much more in Japanese culture than in western culture when job hunting and choosing a career path. It is often seen as more vital than such personal skills as computer literacy, foreign language proficiency or research achievements while in the school.

The general circumstances in Japan seem to fall into a swinging predicament for both students and teachers, as well as personnel who have been urged to work toward kokusaika (discussed earlier in this paper, under “Motivation in Asian Contexts”). The authorities in Japan have been advocating the importance of becoming able to speak English without tangible and down-to-earth policies and procedures that appear to be realizable and galvanizing. Such a condition appears to be forging an environment where students are involved in effort just to attain instrumental objectives of academic performance and employability in the Japanese system. It might be misleading those who are eager at heart to pursue learning the language and culture for communicative purposes and cultural study. As a consequence, their enthusiasm and potential might be jeopardized, parenthetically, they might be at a loss or wasted. The low proficiency and confidence in English among common Japanese people may be attributed to the perfunctory system and misleading conceptualizations about the linguistic culture which are likely to translate into increased apprehension.
Notwithstanding that L2 acquisition and proficiency would come under the sway of the cultural milieu and all four of its variables (mentioned earlier) could have effects in formal language learning contexts, such as motivation and situational anxiety would play a more critical role in informal learning contexts (Gardner, Lalonde & Pierson, 1983). It is a challenge to take up a different language and culture, thus it would require proper and sufficient motivation and adequate effort, in that it is natural or probable to feel uneasy when getting into it or along the way. In such situations, individuals could have language anxiety which is “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening and learning” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p.284). It is mental blockage caused by “the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” that is specifically against learning a foreign language, and “behavioral responses of the anxious foreign language learner are essentially the same as for any specific anxiety” (Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, 1986, pp.125-126).

It gives an indication that anxiety mostly hinges on the two basic skills of foreign language learning, listening and speaking, which appear to be dismal in English language education in Japan. Japanese students are more used to respond to drills and delivering prepared speeches than presenting an idea and communicating with a collocutor or audience. Japanese schools encourage students to work on recitation and incentivize them to participate in recitation contests widely held throughout the country, which seem to primarily require rote memorization of the script, gestures and facial expressions rather than own personality, originality and improvisation that would nurture self-identity, social skill and creativity as well as English language skill for expressing and sharing ideas and opinions. It is one of the traits of Japanese education that teaching is by rote and repetition in almost every effect as contrasted with teaching to think critically, to think outside the box and to express oneself. To put it another way, it does not encourage students to go far and beyond in order to explore and gain new perspectives, but rather, stick to Japanese convention, which seems to be making it backbreaking for Japanese learners to acquire L2, given that language learning is “a profoundly unsettling psychological proposition”
(Guiora, 1983, p.8) insomuch as it may destabilize the belief and self-concept imprinted through the long course of the Japanese education system.

L2 acquisition would not rely only on exceptional intellectual ability, so, by way of explanation, there would not be any prerequisites like any difficult techniques which only one out of hundreds of people has a grasp of. It is not exclusive for certain geniuses or entitled individuals, if imagined, nor available in an only major systematic manner, but rather depends on exploration with learner autonomy, or, to rephrase it, a desire to achieve the goal, having a favorable attitude and sufficient effort. Active and successful L2 learners would not hesitate to make mistakes in their endeavor, and they still try to figure it out even when they are inefficient in linguistic elements just like infants pick up how to walk and communicate even when they seemingly can’t. It could be hypothesized that one of the factors which put Finland among the best English speakers in the world is that most of the random ordinary Finnish people would deal with you in English, for instance, when asked for directions on the street, regardless of his or her proficiency level, unlike Japanese people. Gregarious attitude and spontaneous conversational interaction are substantive in L2 settings (Savignon, 2018).

In spite of the outstanding English language performance of Finnish people (and other Scandinavians), the author at times hears them revealing that they are more or less nervous when they communicate in English. For all that, when compared, the vast majority of Japanese people appear to hesitate or back off in intercultural situations presuming they are not capable anyway. The present research is interested in unthreading what holds Japanese people back. Horwitz et al. (1986) classified foreign language anxiety into three related performance anxieties considering the fact that it would involve performance assessment in academic and social contexts:

- communication apprehension: a type of shyness characterized by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people;
- test anxiety: a type of performance anxiety and distress in fear of failure in testing situations; and
fear of negative evaluation: which is “apprehension about other’s evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (Watson & Friend, 1969, p.449).

Horwitz et al. (1986, p.127) enumerated manifestations of communication apprehension as follows: it is “difficulty in speaking in dyads or groups (oral communication anxiety) or in public (“stage fright”), or in listening to or learning a spoken language (receiver anxiety)” and points out it could be attributed to the feeling that it is difficult to understand and make oneself understood because the language element capable of handling is limited or less than own first language especially when performance is monitored or evaluated.

In terms of test-anxiety, as mentioned earlier, the condition is overwhelming and jarring for Japanese students being under the fatiguing pressure in the so called “examination hell”, that is to say, antithetical. Performance evaluation is constant and ongoing in Japanese education. Moreover, one’s ultimate academic achievement could be the main life-course determining factor in Japanese society. In essence, English language education in Japan generally lacks communicative and linguistic cultural elements while requiring students to achieve English language performance, which is a great paradox in the Japanese system. Test-anxiety is specific to the academic testing situations on the one hand. Fear of negative evaluation, on the other hand, is similar but may occur in any evaluative or social situations such as speaking in foreign language class or job interviews, etc. (Horwitz et al., 1986). In the Japanese context, it could play a strong adverse role on the grounds that it is the social behavioral code to be concerned with and how one is perceived by others. In other words, individuals are expected to behave and perform only to the expected degree.

Horwitz et al. (1986, p.128) regard “foreign language anxiety as a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process.” Learners explore the language and culture where their own possessed knowledge and common sense do not matter much, but instead, go beyond their own concept of values to encounter and learn
outside the own range on condition “individual communication attempts will be evaluated
according to uncertain or even unknown linguistic and socio-cultural standards” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.128) in which L2 communication come with risk-taking, thus it could be
troublesome. Under the condition that “the language learner’s self-esteem is vulnerable to
the awareness that the range of communicative choices and authenticity is restricted”
(Horwitz et al., 1986, p.128) due to the imperfect command of the language and
understanding of the culture, it is a great journey to cast about for, which would conflict
with one’s own self-concept.

3.1.2.3 Second Language Acquisition Contexts & Outcomes

The SEM demonstrates that the four classes of individual difference serve as
variables, or as nuts and bolts, that influence L2 learning performance of individuals. The
watershed is made between the different contexts, formal and informal, in keeping with
the differing prime objectives. Formal contexts entail instruction and aims to evaluate
learners according to their performance. It takes place in academic settings, (language
classrooms), in the general run of things, nonetheless, “any situation in which the
individual receives training, explanations or drills would be characterized as a formal
context” (Gardner, 1985, p.148). By way of alternative, informal contexts do not
necessarily involve instruction as per the fact that it includes such activities in the L2 as
listening to the music, watching movies, reading, communicating (Gardner, 1985), or any
activity the learner pursues in the target language.

The four individual differences would contribute to L2 acquisition in different
ways in each context. All four individual difference variables have an effect on the
learning process in formal contexts in which instruction is the main part, on the other hand,
motivation and/or anxiety would exert predominant influence on acquiring the L2 in
informal contexts, where instruction is incidental inasmuch as learners typically get
involved in the situation voluntarily although their level of intelligence and aptitude would
still have influence since they are contingent upon the learners (Gardner, 1985). This
association was depicted in Figure 1 (see p.5) by dotted lines, meaning they play
secondary roles, connecting intelligence and aptitude with informal contexts. According
to Gardner (1985, p.148), the assumption is “the base rate of association for the four classes of individual difference variables with second language proficiency is a constant.”

However, Gardner (1985) pointed out that this assumption is not within reason because it does not consider the interactivity of the context on individual differences giving two illustrative situations:

- A situation where the language material is so poorly presented that, regardless of a student’s aptitude, motivation, or anxiety, the major determinant of whether the material is learned would be the student’s level of intelligence.
- A situation which is made so interesting that motivation for the entire class is high. Under these conditions, individual differences in motivation would be virtually non-existent, and individual differences in proficiency would be related more highly to the other three attributes (Gardner, 1985, pp.148-149).

The situation of the first example laconically describes the aspect of English language education in a Japanese context in words. As mentioned throughout this treatise, the language materials in Japan and how they are presented in the instructions generally do not regard linguistic cultural dimension neither sufficiently nor in a suitable manner. That is to say, it does not place much emphasis and value on linguistic cultural elements. By way of explanation, then, language aptitude and favorable attitude in communicative English would not be fully advantageous for success in the Japanese system, which emphasizes success mostly on the standardized tests with such questions as spelling quizzes, sentence shuffle and fill-in-the-blank questions, in that rote memorization could be more expedient. That is, intelligence, “the capacity to acquire capacity”, would play a primary role in patterned learning to get through the Japanese system on account of the fact that the instruction and the language learning materials used in schools there are generally more mathematical in structure but undynamic, as opposed to being linguistic or cultural. In fact, students learn English as a school subject in a uniform manner that focuses on training for multiple choice questions and rote memorization of grammar, which does not show concern for culture and communication competently. For all of these reasons, the language learning materials in Japanese contexts appear to be systemic and overly numerical in most cases.
The author observed situations of the latter time and again when he was teaching English to Thai children, where the lesson focused substantially on communication and activities in a group, which heightened motivation as a whole. The school in this case was the largest private school in the region. It had freedom and autonomy in management, and had the largest number of foreign teachers (from many different cultures) including native-English speakers of L1 (as well as L2 speakers of English) to enhance diversity and teach students the significance of English as an L2. The prime job description of the foreign teachers was to present the materials in order to generate interest among the students mostly through communicative group activities. Therefore, the foreign teachers were constantly evaluated based on that standard by the supervisors, and an annual seminar was held at the beginning of school year having a guest instructor from Oxford University Press Thailand to update teaching methods. The school was stepping up English language education through various kinds of efforts schoolwide. All in all, the whole school was maintaining this stirring environment, which motivated students to be involved in such activities to learn English although it was not certain that group activities were particularly contributing to self-motivation, which should be essential for students’ ongoing learning after formal language education ends.

The author was engaged in the second and third-grade Intensive English Program (IEP), which lessons were taught only in English while vocabulary and grammar were taught by their Thai teachers. The whole system was well-organized and motivation in the entire school was high. The students were highly motivated as a group to participate in the activities, most students always raised their hands to speak or perform in front of the class, so the author had to make sure to give every student an opportunity to perform in front of the class more than one time in every 50-minute lesson. In doing so, students showed variance in their performance that appeared to be due to individual differences in intelligence, language aptitude and situational anxiety rather than individual motivation, since the sense of the group atmosphere was already framed. That is, group motivation was existent and playing the dominant role for driving the students. In particular, it was noteworthy that each student displayed some difference that appeared to be ascribed to
phonetic coding ability and grammatical sensitivity, not to mention that young children are often naturally brilliant language learners.

One of the author’s outstanding students at the time had developed a remarkable capacity to manage the function of lexical elements in English. The ambience of the situation was making her emphatically motivated to demonstrate her ability in front of the class all the time. Above and beyond that, on an open house day, she demonstrated this ability by translating between the author, her teacher at the time, and her mother, who wanted to know how she had been doing in class. For being a child who had only been in her home culture, she did make a few minor errors, even so, she performed with a more than adequate and comprehensible interpretation. This eight-year-old student acquired the capability to convey the semantic meaning and handle syntactic patterning of sentences, as well as the tone and intent of the original message. Her natural ability shined in such formal language training situations where motivation for the entire class was already substantial. But for all that, she will still need to cultivate more of her individual interest and self-motivation on her own when she goes off by herself as a L2 English speaker, where the common sense she acquired through the formal education does not have as much consequence to the global L2 community.

On the other hand, this uplifting situation also revealed a different state of students with situational anxiety in the language learning class. One of the students was showing relatively strong apprehension in the class and hesitated or refused to speak up at the beginning of the semester. The author was, therefore, emboldening her to perform tasks in the formal language training while adjusting pressure on her so she would not turn back. Specifically, the author did not demand any immediate response when she hesitated in the class, but got back to her after calling on everyone else. This methodological approach got her into orbit and she gradually overcame her struggle and soaked up the positive atmosphere in each lesson toward mid-semester and started to appreciate learning by actively participating. This also seemed to be due to encouragement from both her peers and teachers. In her case, situational anxiety was affecting her performance more highly
than other things in the formal language training, whereas the collective motivation was not initially exerting a beneficial effect for her.

By any measure, her abilities were nowhere near the bottom of the class, but more than the average level of the class as manifested by others during the lesson, in which the author normally split his lesson into distinct time frames to target specific skills and manage the attention spans of such young students. Under this condition, it turned out that she was only blocked by the psychological barrier to perform communication skills tasks and activities in the group setting of the language learning situation where the motivation for the entire class was so high. The two basic language skills, speaking and listening, have turned out to be the central area of language learning anxiety found by the counselors who have been engaged in clinical studies on foreign language students in university classes and at the Learning Skills Center (LSC) at the University of Texas (Horwitz et al., 1986). The reports from the LSC revealed that the anxious learners are predisposed to “freeze” in a role-play situation, in which the Thai student was turning away from during such activities as dialogue exercise in the group language learning situation of high level of collective motivation.

As for informal language experience, one matter for concern is that motivation, and occasionally anxiety would exert a predominant effect in informal language situations. In fact, students today will be out in the global L2 community, where people of different perspectives dynamically interact, and that includes occasions of informal settings after formal education ends. That is, students like her would need to become more self-motivated to effectively perform L2 learning and proficiently engage in actual situations of cross-cultural communication. Therefore, L2 education should essentially intend to improve skills in the target language as well as enhance cross-cultural understanding in which the instructions and training provides linguistic cultural inspiration and self-confidence for making sufficient effort so that they carry on and achieve as successfully motivated lifelong language learners. Accordingly, it is important to be engaged in formal L2 training, in which students practice by putting communication with the target language into action with various tasks and activities that focus on different grammar points and
situations, and also to see and track progress to be better prepared for L2 communication in any situation in the ever-diversifying global society.

Gardner (1985) asserted, last but not least, that the language contexts “are not homogenous, and the nature of the context, like the nature of the cultural milieu, can influence the role played by individual difference variables in language acquisition” (p.149). In the Japanese context, it would be smart for a student to make the most of his/her intelligence to achieve the goals of English class. It is deplorable that the formal educational system does not encourage and facilitate enough linguistic and cultural competence, but instead, imposes materials that are generally useless for students’ lifelong English learning. On the contrary (as noted earlier), the Thai school the author taught at had a comforting atmosphere for group activities. Group motivation should be beneficial in many aspects of L2 learning to a significant degree, however, individual motivation may not play out substantially in such a situation where motivation for the entire group is high. As a matter of fact, individual motivation of the Thai students was a concern among the foreign teachers and often brought up in the meetings. In a case like this, more focus on individual learning would be desired since each student still has different interests, disposition and pace for learning. Such a situation, which is made so interesting that motivation for the entire group is high, could be beneficial in accommodating successful learning in a group, on the other hand, it would be also important for learners to have individual motivation to continue learning voluntarily, moreover, to explore and encounter different people and culture in the global community of great diversity today.

The two outcomes in the target language, linguistic and non-linguistic, derive from the learning experience, and they could often come out differentially depending on experiences in the contexts. Gardner (1985) enumerated instances of outcomes as follows, “linguistic outcomes refer to second language proficiency – vocabulary knowledge, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, etc. Non-linguistic outcomes, on the other hand, refer to attitudes, values, etc.” (p.149). One of the author’s aforementioned former students in Thailand, the eight-year-old student who was an interpreter for her mother, exhibited her growth on many occasions, which were different forms of linguistic and non-linguistic
outcomes that seemed to be attributed to both formal language training and her informal language experience with foreign teachers in the school and her private American tutor teaching her non-formal lessons. She showed assumed values and attitudes toward the English linguistic culture and L2 community by behaving and communicating actively with particular interest in and outside the class. These outcomes have significant implications for succeeding in L2 learning experiences, however, “they themselves are influenced by prior cognitive (intelligence and language aptitude) and affective (motivation and situational anxiety) characteristics” (Gardner, 1985, p.149). That is to say, learners produce outcomes through the “dynamic interplay” of experience and their prior cognitive and affective characteristics. The next section describes and discusses the construct of motivation that seems to cast a significant and powerful influence on acquiring an L2.

3.1.3 Motivation: Instrumental and Integrative Orientation

It is fairly common knowledge that motivation is needed to achieve success in language learning. However, few realize the process that leads to achieving a goal, the concept of motivation, and the relationship between those two. According to Gardner (1985, pp.10, 50), motivation is about the goal and “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language.” He also pointed out that effort by itself does not denote motivation considering that effort could be made without motivation, that is, such factors as compulsiveness, social pressures or reward might produce such effort. For instance, Japanese high school students strive to study English as a required subject because they are constantly under the pressure of courses and exams that can strongly affect their future. As for university students, who are technically done with the systematic academic competition, they may make some effort on the standardized English language proficiency tests (such as TOEIC) to be competitive in the job market. By the same token, “the desire to learn the language, or favourable attitudes toward learning the language, do not reflect motivation in and of themselves” (Gardner, 1985, p.11).
As a case in point, many education administrations in non-English speaking societies including Japan undertake an agenda to promote ESL / EFL education through various measures. Nonetheless, few schools in Japan seem to be successful in accommodating proper methods through which students could cultivate their leaning and attain the goal of linguistic cultural intent, befitting attitudes and adequate efforts that are essential to acquire the target language. It is an all-too-common consequence that activities are mostly focused on enjoying learning, which seem to be merely an escape from the mandatory materials that are uninspiring and unproductive both culturally and linguistically, and fail to associate students’ desire and attitude with concomitant efforts. In essence, students are not presented with ideas and significance of learning the language with possible linguistic cultural goals and/or an intention of ongoing pursuit of knowledge and experience in the target culture. That is, under the current Japanese system, it is unlikely that Japanese students in general are genuinely motivated to be proficient in English and competent in the linguistic culture despite the promotional statements of the education authorities. When it comes to acquiring proficiency and cultural competence, the policies in Japan are incongruous with the objectives. At the end of the day, the stance of the authorities and their concern for students’ future is not likely to be anything much more than words on paper. This present research analyzes university students in Hiroshima who have English as a foreign language as part of their requirement to understand how different they are from university students of other majors (and in larger metropolitan areas of Japan) that do not require English.

According to Gardner and Lambert (1959, p.267), “achievement in a second language is dependent upon essentially the same type of motivation that is apparently necessary for the child to learn his first language.” That is, learners who acquire the target language adapt “certain behavior patterns” of the linguistic cultural group, and attitudes toward the target linguistic cultural group sustains the motivation. Fundamentally, Gardner and Lambert note, attitude as a motivational construct entails an intention to acquire the language with different ideas and objectives, and to pursue the objectives with differing intensity of force (1959). Gardner and Lambert (1959, p.267) posited the two motivation orientations according to their purposes:
• **Integrative**: the aim of the language learning effort is to learn more about the target linguistic cultural group, or to “meet more and different people.”

• **Instrumental**: the aim of the language learning effort is “the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement.”

Although L2 learning orientation is classified into these two distinct concepts, *integrative* orientation may be the essential factor on the grounds that the mutual objective is principally to learn the language, which is inextricable with the culture. To put it another way, it is inevitable, more or less, for *instrumentally* oriented learners to go through linguistic cultural elements in some way. The present research analyzes how *integratively* and/or *instrumentally* Japanese university students, who have passed through the formalistic compulsory and upper secondary education, are oriented for their English learning in Hiroshima.

*Integratively* oriented learners are determined to immerse themselves in learning the target language and culture, and are sincerely interested in the people and their way of life. They are willing to actively interact with members of the linguistic cultural community for the sake of “social-emotional purposes” (see Gardner, 1985, p.11). Alongside that, *instrumental* orientation embraces the acquisition of the language for utilitarian benefit such as for academic achievement and advantage or requirement in job opportunities. In that spirit, the idea does not necessarily concern “social-emotional contact” with the people from the linguistic culture (Gardner, 1985, p.11). Gardner (1985, p.11) further asserts “the integrative and instrumental orientations represent ultimate goals for achieving the more immediate goal of learning the second language.” That is, learners may make different sorts of effort that translates to achieving their goals. The amount of effort expended by the learner, or the learner would be willing to expend, acts as the barometer to assess motivational intensity in the L2 research field (Gardner, 1985).

Gardner and Lambert (1959) also found that the maximum predictor of success in L2 acquisition could be obtained from motivational intensity and purpose for learning the L2, in which the scale was designed to measure intensity of motivation with regards to workload, opportunities made use of to improve speaking and reading the target language,
willingness to study or use the language in the future, emphasis on knowledge of the language, and so on. In this study, the factor analysis indicated that achievement ratings, orientation index, attitude scale and motivational intensity scale had high loadings on the second factor. Methodically, in accordance with the result that the achievement ratings were loaded to a considerable degree, the other variables ought to be attributed to the success in L2 acquisition. Furthermore, it was integrative orientation that appeared in the second factor as well as positive attitudes about the target cultural group and motivational intensity, that is to say, the factor turned out to be integrative motivation. Besides, the study demonstrated in the analysis that the correlation between the orientation index and achievement ratings in the L2 signifies that integratively oriented students perform more successfully in general in acquisition of the L2 than instrumentally oriented students, integratively oriented students are also found to possess more favorable attitudes towards members of the target linguistic cultural community and are more strongly motivated in acquiring the language (Gardner & Lambert, 1959).

![Figure 2: Schematic Representation of the Concept of Motivation as it relates to L2 Acquisition (adapted from Gardner, 1985, in a study on French as the L2)](image)

Gardner (1985) described the mechanism of motivational construct in which the four elements play out in L2 acquisition, so desire and attitude constituents would influence on motivational intensity, and also pointed out that it is more viable than other situational variables, such influences as mentioned earlier in this section of the chapter,
could also affect. As stated earlier, the goal denotes the ultimate aim for pursuit of L2 learning, technically speaking, the goal is the reasons for learning the L2 rather than the goal of learning itself (Gardner, 1985). For example, it could be a goal for the learner to live and pursue a career in the linguistic cultural community and to have a liaison with the people in the culture, not the learning achievement itself that is rather a waypoint. The types of reasons would be considered as ‘orientations’ once reasons are classified in certain way, that is, “orientation refers to a class of reasons for learning a second language”, whereas “motivation refers to a complex of three characteristics which may or may not be related to any particular orientation” (Gardner, 1985, p.54). By way explanation, it might be the case that some individuals possess integrative orientation, however, are not integratively motivated to make an effort in learning the L2. The present research assesses conscious cognitive judgment on the part of Japanese university students in Hiroshima who have differing degrees of chance to obtain exposure to the linguistic culture of English and the L2 community than students in the other parts of the country do.

The SEM Model studied in this paper does not delineate attitude as one of the variables on the grounds that it underlies motivation, that is, attitude plays a substantial role in shaping motivation, not in making an achievement directly (Gardner, 1985). In essence, the construct of motivation could be feasibly taken based on an “attitudinal foundation that sustains the motivation” considering that acquiring an L2 involves a “long and arduous” effort (Gardner, 1985, p.149). As a matter of fact, the significance of learning a second language and culture would certainly assume more importance as a result of a dynamic blend of commerce, culture and people in the global system. Under such circumstances, impractical and meaningless training of language and culture should become obsolete in this culturally diverse and boundless age. Yet, present-day Japanese society still seems to remain arid and unininitiated in taking a larger role in interacting with and leading the international community. This author believes it is due to the low level of awareness and readiness among the people as well as the authorities. Open willingness to learn other cultures must be reconsidered in society, and educational institutions must take the lead for the young generations who will forge the future. The author strives to
illuminate the momentousness and potentials of learning English as a second/foreign language for Japanese university students in response to the ongoing and ever-increasing transformation of the global system.
4 Theoretical Framework: *Lifelong Learning*

Learning has always been an inherent feature of human life activity and naturally inscribed in human biographies (Nuissl & Przybylska, 2016). After decades of striving for improved education in postmodern society, *lifelong learning* has become widely researched. *Lifelong learning* recognizes “the fact that learning is an inevitable human activity from birth to old age, and that provision of lifelong educational opportunities is essential for the realization of human potential” (UNESCO, 2009). The literal interpretation of *lifelong learning* would be of “learning that continues from the cradle to the grave, and indeed, some educators have embraced the concept to justify the importance of providing instruction and courses long after formal education” (Kirby, Knapper, Lamon & Egnatoff, 2010). It does not only mean *lifelong learning* in schooling, but autonomy, motivation and self-determination are also very important. It is meant to assist in the attainment of greater achievement and appreciate the significance of learning in the life course.

Moreover, in a fast-paced and unforeseeable society, it will be paramount to keep learning as a life course in parallel with broadening one’s own perspective by developing an open mind and intercultural communicative competency in as much as diversification continues to speed up and make society still more multifaceted. Necessity to deal with such cosmopolitan situations in normal life in Japan will, sooner or later, come in due course and become a matter of common practice. In that case, Japanese students today ought to realize and visualize the shifting circumstance by taking advantage of learning opportunities and technology that are way more advanced and abundant than previous decades.

With today’s ever-broadening and advanced technology, opportunities which would give both instrumental and integrative motivation to learn English as an L2 for Japanese university students (cf. Chapman & Shinya, 2019), especially those who will be active in the workforce after they finish their studies, are limitless. Learning is no longer passive. Learners actively choose learning contents, which means motivated learners have
access to immense amounts of sources and possibilities. Learning is not only confined to formal education. It may take place in various settings including the workplace, and even with someone from thousands of miles away, and that may give learners culturally boundless experiences which could lead to integrative ideas. The latest technology enhances and makes it easier and faster to learn different languages and cultures which also helps learners to learn effectively and continue. It enables individuals to obtain broader insight to lead meaningful lives.

Kirby et al. says (2010) “An inclination towards lifelong learning is likely to be due to a combination of early-established traits and later-occurring situational factors. If we are serious about fostering lifelong learning, we need to establish what those traits and situational factors are” (p.301). Knapper and Cropley (2000) have discussed just how lifelong learning might be achieved, especially in the context of tertiary education. It is what we learn in school and “an even more important task is to equip students with the generic ability to guide their own learning throughout their lives” ( Kirby et al., 2010) and many situations they will encounter after formal education. Knapper and Cropley (2000) describe effective lifelong learners as being able to: 1) set goals, 2) apply appropriate knowledge and skills, 3) engage in self-direction and self-evaluation, 4) locate required information, and 5) adapt their learning strategies to different conditions.

The body of research on lifelong learning is so large that researchers must focus on specific areas in order to do meaningful research. The research done by OECD (2005) demonstrated the importance of adult learning. It affirms public and private benefits, that is, more employability and increased productivity as well as individual well-being and fulfillment. It is difficult to set out controlled empirical research on lifelong learning ( Kirby et al., 2010, p.291-302), but, since lifelong learning has an enormous body of research, research can take small, focused steps such as finding correlations between what motivates students to continue learning. Specifically, this paper focuses on one population: Japanese university students striving to learn English as their L2. To do that, it will briefly review Social Learning Theory, discuss the unique population of Japanese students, then discuss results from a 16-item survey on attitudes toward lifelong learning.
4.1 Social Learning Theory

In response to the increasing necessity for learning in the context of the rapid social changes on a global scale that calls for faster and continuous applications, learning should be reconsidered in order to effectively adjust to the era in which social situations unpredictably transform without cessation. Bandura postulated “in the social learning system, new patterns of behavior can be acquired through direct experience or by observing the behavior of others” (1971, p.3). According to Wielkiewicz and Turkowski (2010), students who had study abroad experience scored higher than those who did not (based on data from a 16-item lifelong learning scale). That indicates that such experience could be a causal factor for motivation to be a successful lifelong learner (see p.123). Cross-cultural experience outside one’s own society would entail firsthand interactive communication that takes place primarily in English between L1, L2 and L3 speakers in which non-native speakers may have to respond by trial and error, as well as observing multiple situational aspects in the linguistic cultural community or the L2 community. Japanese L2 students should undergo such learning efforts while struggling to acquire successful modes of behavior by discarding ineffective ones and keeping up with continuous learning shifts.

Learning is inherently due to “rewarding and punishing consequences” that act toward efforts made to deal with different situations (Bandura, 1971). Contentment as a consequence should be of one’s own accord and gained through the process of effort with appreciation, that is, a basic characteristic of effort is autonomy in determination. Therefore, the prime cause of action is intrinsic to the learner. One’s life course, otherwise, might become grueling without any effort that involves meaningful exploratory activities, which could be similar to that of a language student without integrative motivation experiencing the entire learning situation as somewhat punishing. That, then, becomes a consequence of lack of reinforcement from the driving force that derives from sense of affinity toward the linguistic cultural community and the L2 community as well as learning activities (Gardner, 2010, p.80). Human behavior is given incentive and motivation that arises “from within by various needs, drives, impulses, and instincts” (Bandura, 1986). Various habitual functions beneath the stratum of consciousness,
therefore, may well be the causes of behavior, which could be attributed to inner forces that are responsible for action (Bandura & Walters, 1977). As a consequence, fulfillment is gained by undertaking relevant efforts for one’s own aspiration with willingness and actualization by succeeding in selecting practical effects, which would serve as an informative function as attested to by the framework of social learning theory (Bandura, 1971).

Such functioning is even more essential today with greater reason since individuals are occasioned to identify enlightening gratification, which fits in with the significance in one’s own life, to fulfill their life course in a society of abundance and complexity. Often, individuals would need to perform learning activities on the basis of feedback that is based on various values and interests in the interconnected society, brought about by even more diversified and way-out information and communication technology. In consequence, the unprecedented technical innovation forges ahead with communication culture, which is characterized by far intricate patterns of global community where conventional approaches and methods are no longer relevant in many instances. In that event, self-governed motivation, driven by underlying factors that should function in favor of lifelong learning by providing instinctive inspiration, would play an elemental role to unconstrainedly develop thoughts or hypotheses for effectively responding to mutable circumstances of the era. Individuals ought to recognize the significance of learning that is supposed to be driven by inner forces and one’s own motives. That is, individuals would need to act on account of autonomy to form agency for reinforcing response capabilities and determination for meaningful effect.

Reinforcement operations, in which cognitive events are selectively substantiated or refuted by differential consequences, are done to cause effective courses of action (Bandura, 1971). Cognitive events transpire as an effect in the system of cognitive trajectory, which is a “dynamical and nonlinear path” that seamless cognitive ecosystem brings into being as it achieves a given cognitive result (Steffensen, Vallée-Tourangeau & Vallée-Tourangeau, 2016). There are phase transitions along the trajectory in which a given formation of transition points compose an ‘event’, which is in accordance with
“changes in the layout of affordances of the animal-environment system” (Chemero, 2000, p.39). By way of explanation, the cognitive ecosystem is metamorphosed from agent and environment that are the factors involved in “action-perception dynamics”, which constitute “contingent spatio-temporal trajectory” by means of interactivity that involves “far-from-equilibrium homeostasis (i.e., the ability to maintain a steady state in a dynamic context) through regulating the organism-environment relation” (Steffensen et al, 2016, p.81). As a direct consequence of immeasurably dynamical progressing conditions, individuals are having an increased need for responding to capricious changes and new arrangements in society by perceiving a vast array of environmental events and competently reinforcing capacity for producing significant effects for one’s own life course in the ever-shifting circumstance. Hence, it is fundamental and indispensable to carry on lifelong effort for oneself recognizing inestimably and developing potential utility of learning. Consequently, pattern and necessity of reinforcement will grow as the global society goes through shifts across the ages.

Human beings possess the faculty to envisage, deduce and hypothesize as to consequences of events on the grounds of prior experiences. In other words, it may be “incentive-motivational” to reinforce one’s own competence for thinking about events which are not within the immediate environment to produce desired outcomes that are rewarding to one’s own life (Bandura, 1971, p.3). That is, future consequences may become an influential factor as current motivators in a like manner as actual consequences, which could be realized by human cognitive skills that afford the competency for both “insightful and foresightful behavior” (Bandura, 1971, p.3). That is to say, the capability to conceive future consequences in thought supply learners with one “cognitively based source of motivation”, thus, a plethora of human behavior could be initiated and maintained over a prolonged period of time, which inducements are ingrained in cognitive activities (Bandura, 1977, p.161). This should be particularly true for efforts to continuously learn English as an L2. To be specific, it would be substantive to have cognitive motivation for original understanding of the target linguistic culture and L2 culture, carrying out self-regulated reinforcing tasks and long-range planning in order to
yield significant spatiotemporal effects through life stages by contemplating lifelong language and culture learning pursuits.

It would take a great deal of mental effort over a course of a long period of time for such L2 learners as Japanese university students to carry on learning and acquire practical English to a certain degree of proficiency. In such an endeavor, it would be foundational for them to work on cognitive skills and motivation for abstract thinking and reasoning, as well as forethought. Such intellectual functioning would be integral for L2 learners to absorb information to make associative and empathetic connections and adapt themselves to the linguistic culture and the L2 culture as part of the effective acquisition process. Moreover, forethought enhances adequate and efficient learning in the long run, thus, affording learners a sense of self-composure as an L2 speaker from a broader standpoint by discerning a bigger picture of L2 self in various cross-cultural settings. That is, Japanese university students have to forge an identity as L2 speakers in the global community for reinforcement of cross-cultural competency for the common and ineluctable future consequences, both globally and domestically, in which Japan turns into a far more linguistically and culturally boundless society where people of different backgrounds are involved in each aspect of social activity.

The scope of social interaction continues to grow more complex, larger in scale, and faster to an astronomically increasing extent, by which the future circumstances hold unlimited potential that mutates by interconnectedness. As a matter of course, further possibilities keep opening up for any arrangement, which gives rise to interminable multifariousness that encompasses each individual and society. Under those circumstances, individuals are necessitated to be aware of momentousness and meteoric social expansion, complexities and advancement. That is, the extensive breakthrough transformation is imposing the demands to evolve fittingly and prolifically through the agency of cognition that involves acts of perception, interpretation, reasoning and thought, which encourages visionary and longstanding self-directed motivation for lifelong learning. Thence, in the course of personal and social evolution, far more multiform resources will be ubiquitous, which make it feasible to create a new value and a possibility
by means of the dynamical and continuous interactions in the shifting global community over space and time. Therefore, individuals have to discover knowledge and meaning by way of cognition coupled with potential utility of unconditional interconnectivity in the light of polymorphous prospects and significance for the individual and society.
5 Research Questions

Given these discussions on motivational theory, English as an L2, and lifelong learning, this research wants to learn about Japanese learners, and, therefore, ask the following research questions.

1. Are EFL/ESL undergraduate Japanese students more integratively or more instrumentally motivated to study English as a foreign language?
2. How does the lifelong learning scale score correlate with the L2 motivation scale?
3. Which factors of lifelong learning explain Japanese EFL students continued motivation?
6 Methodology

This area explains the methodology used to empirically answer the previously stated research questions. The present research employed two different measurement scales to answer those questions. The descriptions such as demographics and technical information are also given here. The purpose and the conditions of the survey was explained at the top and the bottom of the questionnaire. The questionnaire for the present research was translated and cross-translated into Japanese by two bi-lingual speakers (for a copy of the Japanese-language survey, see the Appendix 1).

6.1 Subjects

Focusing on Japan, this research collected data from a total of 130 students at 4-year universities (private and public) in and near the Hiroshima City area, Western Japan (A group of subjects over 100+ is generally considered sufficient for a statistical survey). The students are in Bachelor Degree programs that have English as a foreign language as part of their requirement. The sample consisted of 45 first-year students, 30 sophomores, 30 juniors and 25 seniors. There were 62 men and 68 women. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 23, with a mean of 19.6 years old. Participation was solicited anonymously via Microsoft Forms with no incentives offered for taking part.

The geography was chosen due to the fact that is the author’s hometown. The author is interested to unearth the motivating factors in EFL/ESL and lifelong English language learning of university students in Hiroshima assuming that the results would differ to a certain degree from other metropolitan parts of Japan (such as Tokyo, or other large metropolitan areas) which has higher levels of English language proficiency than other parts of the country.
6.2 Measure on L2 Motivating Factors

The instrument used to measure motivating factors is the questionnaire adapted from Gardner’s English-language version of *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery*, the AMTB (Zanghar, 2012). The AMTB was translated and used in Gardner’s research in different countries such as Brazil, Croatia, Poland, Romania, Spain (Catalonia) and Japan (Gardner, 2004). The questionnaire asks 14 questions that seek the students’ motivating reasons to study English. Seven of the questions investigate *instrumental motivation*, and the other seven focus on *integrative motivation* (see all 14 below). Answers are Likert-scales with 5 answer options: *strongly disagree, moderately disagree, neutral (neither), moderately agree and strongly agree*.

The questionnaire includes questions that were changed or developed for use on researches in different contexts which investigated undergraduate students or young adults including a Libyan population (see Zanghar, 2012). Gardner (2010, p. 108) affirmed that the intended function of the AMTB was to measure “the major affective individual difference variables identified by the Socio-Educational Model of second language acquisition”, and pointed out the benefit and liability:

Prior to the development of the AMTB, researchers interested in assessing affective variables associated with second language acquisition often wrote items they felt were applicable and then used these items in their research. The advantage of this approach is that researchers are able to use items they feel are most meaningful in their context. The disadvantage of this approach from a scientific perspective is that there is very little continuity from one study or researcher to another… Such discrepancies appear to have been responsible for some disagreements in the literature concerning the validity of the socio-educational model. We have found that if the scales from the AMTB are used in the research as they were designed to be used, the results are very consistent.

Many researchers drew on published motivation scales including the AMTB to set instruments for their own research. The items in the present questionnaire were examined when they were translated and cross-translated into Japanese by two people fluent in both
Japanese and English, and then tested in a pilot study by Chapman and Shinya (2019) to make sure of the quality of translation and the appropriateness to the social and educational context of Japan.

The following seven items are those representing the students’ instrumental motivation:

1. Studying English is important because I will need it for my future career.
2. Studying English is important because it will make me more knowledgeable and educated.
3. Studying English is important because it will be useful in getting a good job with a good salary.
4. Studying English is important because I will need to use it on my overseas trips.
5. Studying English is important because I need it for technology uses and the Internet. (Not Gardner’s, this was developed for use on research in a Libyan population)
6. Studying English is important because other people will respect me more if I know English.
7. Studying English is important because I will be able to read newspapers, magazines, and books published in English. (Changed from the original for use on research in a Libyan population. Original read: I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages See Zanghar, 2012.)

The following seven items are those representing the students’ integrative motivation:

1. Studying English is important because it will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak English.
2. Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
3. Studying English is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate English-language art and literature. (Not on Gardner’s original survey. This was developed for use on research in an Iranian population. See Vaezi, 2008)
4. Studying English is important because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups. (Not on Gardner’s original survey. This was developed for use on research in an Iranian population, noted above)

5. Studying English is important because it will help me make many friends from many parts of the world. (Changed from the original: *I wish I could have many native English-speaking friends.*)

6. Studying English is important because it will allow me to learn about the culture and social life of English-speaking people. (Changed from the original for use on research in a Libyan population (noted above). Original read: *Studying English is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate the English way of life.*)

7. I study English because it is enjoyable. (Changed from the original for use on research in a Libyan population (noted above). Original read: *I really enjoy learning English. / I enjoy the activities of our English class much more than those of my other classes.*)

### 6.3 Measure on Lifelong Learning

The instrument employed here to collect data on lifelong learning is a 16-item scale. In a previous study conducted on 575 college students by Wielkiewicz and Meuwissen (2014), that scale showed excellent reliability, validity and correlation with college grade point averages (GPA). The researchers demonstrated that the items were normally distributed and measures a homogenous construct. The version used here is a revised version (based on work by Wielkiewicz, Prom and Loos, 2005), and “measures the extent to which the person reports positive behaviors and attitudes associated with learning, curiosity and critical thinking” (Wielkiewicz & Meuwissen, 2014). The earlier version was more academically oriented and included questions such as students’ interest in their classes. Later, the scale was modified so that it could be applicable in a wider range of contexts. The 16 scale items are given in the Appendix 2.

The 16 scale items are given below. Participants were asked to answer with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to +5 (*always or daily*).
The following 16 items measure the students’ attitude toward *Lifelong Learning*:

1. I enjoy intellectual challenges.
2. I read for the sake of new learning.
3. I converse with others about new things I have learned.
4. I like to analyze problems and issues in depth.
5. I see myself as a lifelong learner.
6. My regular activities involve reading.
7. My regular activities involve writing.
8. I am a self-motivated learner.
9. I browse libraries or bookstores for interesting books or magazines.
10. I make interesting contributions to discussions in my class, at work, or with friends.
11. My activities involve critical thinking.
12. I read for pleasure or entertainment.
13. I am curious about many things.
15. I like to learn new things.
16. I do a lot of reading that is not required for my classes or job.

### 6.4 Mode of Survey and Data Quality

The data collection was conducted online. Microsoft Forms was employed for creating the online survey to collect data. The link to the web survey was sent to each participant’s personal university email account so they could fill it out with ease and comfort on their computers, smartphones or any mobile device, which is likely to minimize the effort and time and possibly avoid suboptimal responses while increasing data quality. Although little research has been done on probing the impact of survey fatigue that could significantly influence the responses (Porter, Whitcomb & Weitzer, 2004), this research was, in fact, concerned with avoiding such experience which participants might go through. Accordingly, the order of the questions was arranged randomly so that participants do not work on questions of the same concept in succession. This can also prevent them from tiredness caused by repetition. Besides that, the participants are enrolled in English as a foreign/second language classes, so the survey
topic should not have caused any fatigue, let alone those that are less relevant to the
participants, since learning English would be the matter of most concern for them, in
addition to their lifelong learning agenda (Porter et al., 2004).

The questionnaire included two trap questions, also known as instructional
manipulation checks, as a data quality measure to detect respondents who did not pay
close attention to the questions. The first one is a Captcha, or Completely Automated
Public Turing test to tell Computers and Humans Apart. A picture Captcha-like question
was incorporated and placed prior to the 30 substance questions, asking participants to
select the answer option that matches the content of the picture. Besides its function as a
data quality measure, it was also a diversion by levity. The second one is a worded
question that asked participants to choose the answer option which is false in the real sense,
in order to weed out negligent respondents. It was included as question 31 and placed after
the main substance questions. It was placed there because research has suggested working
on a trap question beforehand might affect how the participants react to the main questions
that follow (Hauser & Schwarz, 2015). In essence, the survey considered the difficulty
level and number of the trap questions, as well as the locations in the questionnaire to
avoid confusion and unnecessary pressure on the participants which might potentially
cause adverse effects and discourage even attentive respondents (Liu & Wronski, 2018).
In other words, the trap questions aimed to identify satisficing behavior of the participants
and raise data accuracy for better understanding Japanese university students.
7 Results

This section shows the statistical analysis of the data collected using the scales explained in the previous section. The data was analyzed with SPSS version 25. The present research compared the proportion of age in the sample to the expected proportion in the general population. The obtained values confirm that there is no partiality according to age in passing the trap question. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between age and performance in the trap question. The relation between these variables was insignificant, $X^2(5, N = 196) = 3.963, p = .555$. The disposition of age according to answers for the trap question did not show any strong tendency in any specific age group (see Table 4).

### Table 4: Chi-Square Test Results of Trap Question by Subjects’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years old)</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present research also compared the proportion of gender in the sample to the expected proportion in the population. The obtained values confirmed that there is no disproportion in gender of the population in passing the trap question. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between gender and the performance in the trap question. The relation between these variables was insignificant, \( \chi^2(1, N = 196) = .084, p = .772 \). The gender difference according to answers for the trap question did not show any strong tendency for either gender (see Table 5).

**Table 5: Chi-Square Test Results of Trap Question by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count 62.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count 82.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count 145.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 \text{(1, N = 196)} = .084, p = .772 \]

The present research compared proportions from the sample obtained to the expected proportion in the population. The obtained values confirmed that there is no preference in the chosen population. The participants would have been chosen equally often even if they were chosen randomly. The test aimed to determine either of these hypotheses:

- The participants are chosen randomly,
- The participants are not chosen randomly.

A one-way Chi-Square Test (chi-square goodness of fit test) was conducted to determine if the pattern of participants’ scholastic years show preferences. There was not a statistically significant association in the pattern of participants’ scholastic years. \( \chi^2(3, N = 130) = 6.92, p = .074 \). The participants were chosen randomly without preference and the sizes of groups vary to some extent, but the variation is not significant (see Table 6).
Table 6: One-Way Chi-Square Test Results of Proportion by Scholastic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholastic Year</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present research also compared the proportion of gender in the sample to the expected proportion in the population. The obtained values confirmed that there is no preference in gender of the chosen population. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between gender and the pattern of participants’ scholastic year. The relation between these variables was insignificant, $X^2(3, N = 130) = 5.44$, $p = .142$. The participants were chosen randomly regardless of gender and the proportion is in balance (see Table 7).

Table 7: Chi-Square Test Results of Proportion in the Participants by Gender and Scholastic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholastic Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 5.441

Asymp. Sig .142
Now, the discussion will focus on three different research areas: *instrumental* motivation, *integrative* motivation and attitudes toward *lifelong learning*. Let’s begin with the reliability analyses. The questionnaire consists of three different sorts of questions: *instrumental* motivation, *integrative* motivation and *lifelong learning*. In order to understand whether the questions were internally consistent, Cronbach’s alpha was run for the three kinds of questions.

The first reliability analysis was carried out on the scale of *instrumental* motivation (comprised of seven items). Cronbach’s alpha showed the questionnaire had acceptable reliability, $\alpha = 0.749$. All items appeared to be worthy of retention, resulting in a decrease in the alpha if deleted. As such, deleting any of the items would not have significantly increased the alpha level (see Table 8).

**Table 8: Results of Cronbach’s Alpha for Items on Instrumental Motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst 1</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cases (Total) | 130 |

The second reliability analysis was carried out on the scale of *integrative* motivation (comprised of seven items). Cronbach’s alpha showed the questionnaire to reach good reliability, $\alpha = 0.839$. Most items appeared to be worthy of retention, resulting in a decrease in the alpha if deleted. The one exception was item 7, which increases the alpha to $\alpha = 0.869$. As such, removal of this item could be considered, however, it would not significantly increase the alpha level (see Table 9).
Table 9: Results of Cronbach's Alpha for Items on *Integrative* Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.839</td>
<td>Intg 1: .821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 2: .809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 3: .813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 4: .805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 5: .809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 6: .789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intg 7: .869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases (Total)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third reliability analysis was carried out on the scale of *lifelong learning* (comprised of 16 items). Cronbach’s alpha showed the questionnaire to have good reliability, α = 0.873. Most items appeared to be worthy of retention, resulting in a decrease in the alpha if deleted. The one exception to this was item 3, which increases the alpha to α = 0.875. As such, removal of this item could be considered, however, it would not significantly increase the alpha level (see Table 10).

Table 10: Results of Cronbach’s Alpha for Items on *Lifelong Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.873</td>
<td>LL 1: .865</td>
<td>LL 9: .871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 2: .860</td>
<td>LL 10: .872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 3: .875</td>
<td>LL 11: .869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 4: .866</td>
<td>LL 12: .861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 5: .868</td>
<td>LL 13: .871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 6: .859</td>
<td>LL 14: .863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 7: .869</td>
<td>LL 15: .868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 8: .862</td>
<td>LL 16: .857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases (Total)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the two motivating factors for learning English as a foreign language, instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. There was no significant difference between instrumental motivation (M = 3.93, SD = .55) and integrative motivation (M = 3.91, SD = .63), t (129) = 4.78, p = .634 (see Table 11).

Table 11: Results of Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3.9319</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.55492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>3.9143</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.62904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean of each motivation turned out to be very close to each other and both of them are high (more than 3.9 out of 5-point Likert scale). The standard deviation values are ‘.55’ and ‘.62’. The participants showed homogeneity of variance on the 5-point Likert scale by selecting high points on the question items. To sum up, Japanese university students possess similar levels of both instrumental and integrative motivation.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning. It first examined correlations for all participants. Instrumental motivation was positively and strongly related to integrative motivation, r (128) = .76, p < .001. Lifelong learning was positively but weakly related to instrumental motivation, r (128) = .32, p < .001, and integrative motivation, r (128) = .35, p < .001. A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 12. These findings indicated that integrative motivation explains slightly more of the variability in lifelong learning than does instrumental motivation. The effect size for integrative motivation ($r^2 = 12$) indicated that the level of integrative motivation accounted for 12% of the variability in lifelong learning.
Table 12: Correlations for All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Integrative</th>
<th>Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for males. Instrumental motivation was positively and strongly related to integrative motivation, $r (60) = .74, p < .001$. Lifelong learning was positively but weakly related to instrumental motivation, $r (60) = .31, p = .014$, and integrative motivation, $r (60) = .39, p = .002$. A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 13. These findings indicated that integrative motivation explains slightly more of the variability in lifelong learning than does instrumental motivation for males. The effect size for integrative motivation ($r^2 = 15$) indicated that the level of integrative motivation accounted for 15% of the variability in lifelong learning.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for females. Instrumental motivation was positively and strongly related to integrative motivation, $r (66) = .78, p < .001$. Lifelong learning was positively but weakly related to instrumental motivation, $r (66) = .33, p = .006$, and integrative motivation, $r (66) = .31, p = .01$. A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 13. These findings indicated that instrumental motivation explains slightly more of the variability in lifelong learning than does integrative motivation for females. The effect size for instrumental motivation ($r^2 = 11$) indicated that the level of instrumental motivation accounted for 11% of the variability in lifelong learning.
Table 13: Correlations for Male and Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Integrative</th>
<th>Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level.
Note. * Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for first-year through fourth-year students. For first-year students, the relationship between instrumental and integrative was positive and very strong, $r$ (43) = .82, $p < .001$. Lifelong learning was positively but moderately related to instrumental motivation, $r$ (43) = .42, $p = .004$, and integrative motivation, $r$ (43) = .49, $p = .001$. A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 14. These findings indicated that integrative motivation explains more of the variability in lifelong learning than does instrumental motivation for first-year students. The effect size for integrative motivation ($r^2 = 24$) indicated that the level of integrative motivation accounted for 24% of the variability in lifelong learning.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for second-year students. The relationship between instrumental motivation and integrative motivation was positive and strong, $r$ (28) = .78, $p < .001$. Lifelong learning was positively weakly related to instrumental motivation, $r$ (28) = .37, $p = .047$, and integrative motivation, $r$ (28) = .34, $p = .067$. A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 14. These findings indicated that instrumental motivation explains slightly more of the variability in lifelong learning than does Integrative motivation for second-year students. The effect size for instrumental motivation ($r^2 = 18$) indicated that the level of instrumental motivation accounted for 18% of the variability in lifelong learning.
A Pearson product-moment correlation was also conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for third-year students. The relationship between instrumental motivation and integrative motivation was positive and strong, \( r (28) = .71, p < .001 \). Lifelong learning was positively weakly related to instrumental motivation, \( r (28) = .12, p = .524 \), and integrative motivation, \( r (28) = .099, p = .60 \). A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 14. These findings indicated that instrumental motivation explains slightly more of the variability in lifelong learning than does integrative motivation for third-year students. The effect size for instrumental motivation \((r^2 = 1.4)\) indicated that the level of instrumental motivation accounted for 1.4% of the variability in lifelong learning.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between instrumental motivation, integrative motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning for fourth-year students. The relationship between instrumental and integrative was positive and strong, \( r (23) = .70, p < .001 \). Lifelong learning was positively but weakly related to instrumental motivation, \( r (23) = .24, p = .239 \), and integrative motivation, \( r (23) = .36, p = .080 \). A complete list of correlations is presented in Table 14. These findings indicated that integrative motivation explains more of the variability in lifelong learning than does instrumental motivation for fourth-year students. The effect size for integrative motivation \((r^2 = 13)\) indicated that the level of integrative motivation accounted for 13% of the variability in lifelong learning.

Table 14: Correlations by Scholastic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Intg</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level.

Note. * Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level.
8 Discussion

This area will discuss the results of the data and their implications. The strong positive correlation and similar means of the two types of motivation could be explained in connection with the previous studies (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner & Smythe, 1975) and the analysis done by Gardner (2001). He observed relationships between the measures of motivation (i.e. Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn the Language, and/or Attitudes Towards Learning the Language) with the measures for orientations (classifications of reasons to study the target language). In the present research, the participants showed a comparable degree of motivation on the motivation measure. This is in line with the remarks of the previous studies about orientations that show "generally speaking, scores on Integrative Orientation tended to correlate significantly, and appreciably with scores on Instrumental Orientation. And this is to be expected.” Gardner (2001) pointed out it is certainly reasonable that individuals who have integrative reasons for learning the target language to also endorse instrumental reasons. In contrast, those who do not have instrumental reasons would presumably not possess integrative reasons either. Therefore, the data collected in this study, as well as the previous research conducted on a different population of Japanese students in Hiroshima (Chapman & Shinya, 2019) and Libyan EFL undergraduate students (Zanghar, 2012) demonstrated similar results, and appear to support the assumption. That is, it can be concluded that Japanese students would make English learning efforts, which derive from both instrumental and integrative motivation that are comprised of the two orientations as well as the other constituents of motivation.

This thesis strived to deal with a deeper understanding on association between the two types of ESL motivation and attitudes toward lifelong learning in Japanese EFL university students. For the participants as a whole, a higher level of association between attitudes towards lifelong learning and integrative motivation (rather than with instrumental motivation) was demonstrated. Studying another culture could profoundly influence one’s system of beliefs, values and principles which might pose skepticism toward one’s own culture and may lead individuals to examine their own culture by
comparing and contrasting it with another culture (Wielkiewicz & Turkowski, 2010). What is noteworthy is that Wielkiewicz and Meuwissen (2014) observed participants with study abroad experience had higher scores on the scale than those who did not. Consequently, knowing the other culture may give individuals the capacity to accept a differing sense of values and alternative forms of perception which equips them with wider perspectives, rather than relying on parochial thoughts and acts. That is, a new perspective gained from cross-cultural education, which usually requires L2 learning, could operate as an extra lens for perceiving things and provide inspiration for learning across one’s lifespan. International experience may be a causal factor in motivation to be a lifelong learner (Wielkiewicz & Meuwissen, 2014).

The results according to the categorization of participants showed the two types of motivation are correlated with lifelong learning differently and provide further detailed insights. The results of the gender difference contradict some traditional gender roles in Japanese society. Female students showed a stronger association between lifelong learning and instrumental motivation, which is characterized by pragmatic and self-sufficient attitude, than integrative motivation. To the contrary, male students displayed a stronger association between lifelong learning and integrative motivation, which concerns communicative relationship and affinity, than instrumental motivation. Female students scored higher on such questions of instrumental motivation as item numbers one and two. The average score of the item number one, which states the importance of English learning for future career, by females was 4.22 compared to the males’ 4.11. A larger difference was observed between the average scores for the item number two, which is about the importance of studying English to obtain more knowledge and become educated. Females marked 4.36 on average whereas males scored 4.18. The results may be the reflection of movement in gender role consciousness in the current Japanese society that is appearing in L2 learning.

The different grouping of participants by scholastic year manifested the results, which should be taken into account to understand Japanese EFL undergraduate students
concerning their phases of academic life. Japanese university students go through different stages throughout their academic life, including introductory studies for transition into university level education, developing linguistic cultural knowledge and cross-cultural communication skills, as well as planning their life course after graduation. In the data, the first- and fourth-year students showed more association between attitudes toward lifelong learning and integrative motivation while the second- and third-year students did the other way around. The largest effect size demonstrated by the first-year students may be attributed to their stronger interest and curiosity in the linguistic culture and L2 learning, which are supposed to be one of the biggest reasons for hoping to be enrolled at the university in the first place. However, as discussed earlier in this treatise, Japanese students are, in general, blessed with little opportunity for linguistic cultural experience and effective L2 learning during the formal education, which most likely fails to provide integrative motivation that could be associated with lifelong learning. One possible implication of this is that those are the students who have been successfully motivated integratively by certain factors in the formal and informal settings and are, therefore, determined to pursue L2 learning.

In contrast, the second- and third-year students are likely to be more devoted to study for their specialized field and other academic work, which may include English language proficiency tests, ESL teaching qualification and overseas programs. These would make them occupied and more concerned about pragmatic aspects. Thus, there is a possibility that the higher level of association between lifelong learning and instrumental motivation could be enhanced by these factors during the intermediary phase of university years. However, what is particularly noticeable is that the third-year students demonstrated the weakest effect size for associations with both types of motivation. This may be the indication of their academic burnout caused by fatigue and pressure about their future. On the other hand, the fourth-year students demonstrated stronger association with integrative motivation by the effect size that is larger than the effect size of the second-year students, although they are in the final phase during which they would be more concerned in a matter-of-fact way about their future careers than the other groups of
younger students. According to Wielkiewicz and Meuwissen (2014), scores on the *lifelong learning* scale are related to experiences of completing four years of university education. The first three years of study and intercultural experience might have given them a better understanding of the nature of L2 learning. The data appears to indicate tangible factors, which could derive from their academic lives that may vary corresponding to scholastic years in association with their motivation in L2 learning and perspectives on *lifelong learning*.

The present research elucidated factors of *lifelong learning* that explain Japanese students’ continued motivation for learning English. Wielkiewicz and Meuwissen (2014) found that the 16-item *lifelong learning* scale positively associated with college GPA, Conscientiousness and the Intellect/Imagination scales of the mini-IPIP (Donnellan, Oswald, Baird & Lucas, 2006). In that study, the *lifelong learning* scale showed modest correlation with Conscientiousness, which is characterized by scrupulousness and attentiveness that would be related to the aspects of *instrumentality* for L2 learning. *Instrumentally* motivated students would study English with pragmatic intention in a more organized manner. Therefore, the evidence from the present research suggests that females and second- and third-year students are inclined to put together plan and more motivated to learn English for utilitarian purpose.

In contrast, males, first- and fourth-year students turned out to be more *integratively* motivated to study English, which indicates association with open-mindedness that contribute to intellect and imagination. Data by Wielkiewicz and Meuwissen (2014) showed the *lifelong learning* scale has a strong, positive correlation with Intellect/Imagination (also called Openness to Experience). Students with *integrative* motivation would possess interests in English linguistic culture and exploring different cultures. Gardner proposed that L2 learning motivation derives from *integrativeness*, which is based on openness to other cultures and the language community (2010, p.174). All in all, the similar means of the two types of motivation and comparative correlations by each group suggest Japanese university EFL students are aware of the importance of professional development and learning needs emerging from the demands of the rapid
shifts in society. Moreover, the higher level of correlation between lifelong learning and integrative motivation for all participants indicates Japanese EFL university students consider the significance of understanding for the linguistic and L2 culture as well as longstanding motivation.

There are two major limitations in this study that could be addressed in future research. First, the survey data of the present research could be subject to biases since it was collected at only two universities. Hiroshima is one of the cities in which the local universities are actively expanding their ESL/EFL and intercultural understanding programs with distinct curriculums and more developments coupled with overseas programs to teach students by providing trainings and experience. In addition, the schools facilitate an environment of L2 communities where students speak English with varied numbers of foreign teachers and international students from various backgrounds. Therefore, each university attracts students who are looking to learn with varying degrees of motivation. Secondly, the scope of the present research is confined to motivation in ESL learning. There would be more factors that would be attributed to successful lifelong L2 learning including the others entailed in the SEM: Intelligence, Language Aptitude, Situational Anxiety, as well as experience in university education and study abroad. Therefore, further research is needed to establish associations with these factors as well as other possible ones. Moreover, future studies should take into account of having larger samples from more different universities in Hiroshima with longitudinal approaches for assessing changes to illustrate the tendency in the region across time.

It is suggested that lifelong learning behavior would be enhanced by positive attitudes in continued engagement as well as intercultural experience. Hence, universities in Japan ought to facilitate more effective L2 and cross-cultural learning to substantially increase the emphasis on lifelong learning with a tangible curriculum coupled with more opportunities to join overseas programs. It would accommodate confidence, which is essential on the grounds that “The stronger the belief in their capabilities, the greater and more persistent are their efforts” (Bandura, 1989, p.1176). It is hoped that the new
generation of Japanese university students, who enter the workforce and forge the future of society, will gain broader insight and motivation through *lifelong learning*, and continue to develop personally and professionally even after completion of their university degrees to better respond to new global situations. As the nature of this work evolves, the new circumstances with changing societal needs will compel individuals to foster flexibility and act sensibly by scratching beneath the surface (American Psychological Association, 2007, p.21).
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Appendix 1: Japanese-Language Survey
Used to Measure Integrative and Instrumental Motivation Factors and Attitudes Toward Lifelong Learning in University EFL Student

英語を学ぶ目的・動機のアンケート調査
このアンケートは皆さんが英語を外国語として、または第二言語として学ぶわけ、実際どういった理由でやる気になるのか、またそれに加えて、学ぶこと自体・学び続けることについての意識を調査するためのデータを収集するものです。日本の英語教育・異文化教育がより実用的で効果が上がるものへ発展していくことに貢献するために研究しています。

a と b は当てはまるものにマル、c は記入して下さい。

a. 学年：1年生  2年生  3年生  4年生
b. 性別：男  女
c. 年齢：________ 巻

Part A

① 就職してから必要になるので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
② 英語を話す人と接する際に気持ちに余裕ができるので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
③ 自分は知性的なことに取り組むのが好きだ  1 2 3 4 5
④ いろいろな知識や教養が身につくので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑤ より多くの多様な人々と出会い、話すことができるようになるので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑥ 本や新聞等を読んで新しいことを学んでいる  1 2 3 4 5
⑦ 収入のよい仕事に就くのに役立つため英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑧ 英語の美術や文学がより深く理解でき、面白さを味わうことができるようになるので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑨ 人との会話で自分が新しく知ったことや学んだことについて話す  1 2 3 4 5
⑩ 海外に行った時に必要なので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑪ 異文化の人たちの集まりや活動に気軽に参加できるので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑫ 問題や課題は深く掘り下げて各要素・側面について考えたい  1 2 3 4 5
⑬ インターネット等の最新技術を使うのに必要なため英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
⑭ たくさんのいろいろな国の人たちと友達になるのに役立つので英語の勉強は重要だ  1 2 3 4 5
Part B

1. 自分は生涯学び続けると思う
2. 英語がわければ周りから尊敬されるので英語の勉強は重要だ
3. 英語圏の人々の日常の関わり合いや文化について知ることができるので

英語の勉強は重要だ
4. 本を読む習慣がある
5. 英語がわければ英語の新聞、雑誌、本が読めるようになるので
6. 英語を勉強する理由としては楽しいからだ
7. 日常的に文章を書く
8. 自分は自発的に学ぶ人だ
9. 興味深い本や雑誌を求めて図書館や本屋へ見に行く
10. 授業・仕事で、または友達との話し合いで自分は興味深い意見や

考えを提供して貢献する
11. 与えられた情報や物事をそのまま鵜呑みにするのではなく、

批判的な視点も持って論理的・客観的・合理的に考えることを実践している
12. 楽しみや気晴らしに読書をする
13. 自分は好奇心が強く、たくさんのことに興味がある
14. 自分は学習において関心の範囲が広く、それらを追求することを実践している
15. 新しいことを学ぶことが好きだ
16. 授業・仕事で必須とされていなくても本や資料をたくさん読む

ご協力感謝いたします
いただいた回答は研究に役立てさせていただきます
Appendix 2: English-Language Survey

Used to Measure Integrative and Instrumental Motivation Factors and Attitudes Toward Lifelong Learning in University EFL Student

(Note: Only the Japanese-version was used. English is given here for non-Japanese researchers.)

Questionnaire Survey about Motivation for Learning English

This survey is for a research project about students’ reasons for learning English as a foreign/second language, as well as their views on continuing to learn (lifelong learning). This research wants to contribute to English language and intercultural education in Japan, with the hope that students develop and become more competent in their command of English.

a. Scholastic year: 1st-year 2nd-year 3rd-year 4th-year

b. Gender: Male Female

c. Age _________ years old

Part A 1 Never 2 Rarely 3 Sometimes 4 Often 5 Always / Daily

1. Studying English is important because I will need it for my future career.

2. Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

3. I enjoy intellectual challenges.

4. Studying English is important because it will make me more knowledgeable and educated.

5. Studying English is important because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

6. I read for the sake of new learning.

7. Studying English is important because it will be useful in getting a good job with a good salary.

8. Studying English is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate English-language art and literature.

9. I converse with others about new things I have learned.

10. Studying English is important because I will need to use it on my overseas trips.
11. Studying English is important because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups. 1 2 3 4 5

12. I like to analyze problems and issues in depth. 1 2 3 4 5

13. Studying English is important because I need it for technology uses and the Internet. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Studying English is important because it will help me make many friends from many parts of the world. 1 2 3 4 5

**Part B**  

1. I see myself as a lifelong learner. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Studying English is important because other people will respect me more if I know English. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Studying English is important because it will allow me to learn about the culture and social life of English-speaking people. 1 2 3 4 5

4. My regular activities involve reading. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Studying English is important because I will be able to read newspapers, magazines, and books published in English. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I study English because it is enjoyable. 1 2 3 4 5

7. My regular activities involve writing. 1 2 3 4 5

8. I am a self-motivated learner. 1 2 3 4 5

9. I browse libraries or bookstores for interesting books or magazines. 1 2 3 4 5

10. I make interesting contributions to discussions in my class, at work, or with friends. 1 2 3 4 5

11. My activities involve critical thinking. 1 2 3 4 5

12. I read for pleasure or entertainment. 1 2 3 4 5

13. I am curious about many things. 1 2 3 4 5

14. I pursue a wide range of learning interests. 1 2 3 4 5

15. I like to learn new things. 1 2 3 4 5

16. I do a lot of reading that is not required for my classes or job. 1 2 3 4 5

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH**

*Your responses are anonymous and very much appreciated as part of this research*