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Abstract

This study aimed to discover how willing Japanese university students actively work towards acquiring English as a second (L2) or foreign language, and what motivates them to do so. This research focused on two factors in L2 learning: instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. Those concepts are from the Socio-Educational Model of L2 motivation and it entails the theoretical concepts of integrative orientation compared to instrumental orientation of L2 motivation. A 14-item survey was used to collect data from 100 students at 4-year universities (private and public) in Hiroshima City. The measurement asked seven questions for each of the two motivation factors. Results show little difference between the two types of motivation in Japanese students.

Introduction

In today’s globalized and diversified society, English is more than just a hobby or an elective course in school. 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. In Japan, where the second author is from, English is studied 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). There are problems, however, when applying general socio-educational L2 motivational theories to Japan. There are researchers who argue that “the traditional view of integrative motivation in the socio-educational model does not apply to English as a foreign language (EFL) within such contexts because there is no ‘target culture’ for English [in Japan] and, therefore, no target language community with which to integrate. The concept is seen as a particular misfit for learners in Asian contexts where English is perceived more as an ‘international language’ used by essentially anybody not part of the first language (L1) community” (Apple, Da Silva & Fellner, 2016). In other words, applying L2 motivational theories to Japan is problematic.

Research by Gardner (2010, p. 174), strenuously pointed out that an 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 as having elements of both individual (affective) and social (context) variables. In fact, many recent studies which utilize the “L2 possible selves” concept (e.g. You et al., 2006) 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 long-term motivation needed to acquire a 2L, which is a demanding task (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p.12) for average Japanese learners. Language learning is such a complex scenario as a lifelong and life-wide task. It develops through personal experience, social interaction and reflection, thus enhancing intercultural competence and strategic skills for internationalization and globalization (Hildén & Kantelinen, 2012, pp.161-162, 165). This research wants to know to what extent Japanese university students are motivated to continue learning EFL/ESL.

As one of the richest nations in Asia with a long history of ESL, Japan has no shortage of research on English language motivation (cf. Apple, Falout & Hill, 2013; Moritani & Manning, 2017; Yashima, 2002, 2009; Taguchi, et al, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Kojima, et al, 2010; Olah, 2006). Reviewing literature on motivation, Irie (2003) summarizes a wide body of Japan-based research that finds positive attitudes toward L2 communities but “without a desire to assimilate into them.” This paper aims to learn more about what motivates Japanese students. This is vital to L2 learning since “motivation is one of the most influential factors to determine success or failure in second language learning” (Shirai, 2012; cited in Moritani & Manning, 2017).

The topic of this study, as the first in a longer study by the authors, centers on how Japanese EFL/ESL undergraduate students are motivated to study English as their L2. It will begin with a brief review of popular approaches to L2 motivation, focusing on a Japanese population and their unique motivation factors, which may differ from Western populations. It will end with a survey of Japanese university students by asking one simple question: is their motivation integrative or instrumental? Let’s begin with looking at some popular approaches to studying motivation in L2 learning.

**Motivation in English as an L2: A Theoretical Framework**

Based on recent research on L2 motivation (cf. Apple, Da Silva & Fellner, 2016), the following four theories are being reviewed: the Socio-Educational Model, Attribution Theory, Self-Determination Theory and the L2 Motivational Self-System. As explained by Apple, et al (2016), however, those four L2 motivation theories “do not fully explain the complex dynamic that most Asian-based teachers and researchers face” (p. 230). In other words, the majority of research of motivation theory in ESL has been done in Western populations. In those cases, cultural contexts and their inherently different attributes for success in language learning vary widely from Asian contexts (such as Japan) and their reasons for L2 success.

**The Socio-Educational Model**

The “Socio-Educational Model” entails the theoretical concepts of integrative compared to instrumental orientation of L2 motivation. Lambert defines ‘integrative orientation’ as, “a sincere and personal interest in the people and culture represented by the other language group” (1974, p. 98). That is, it is a motivation “to learn a second language because of positive feelings toward the community that speaks that language” (see Gardner, 1985, pp. 82-83). On the other hand, ‘instrumental orientation’ is about practicality and what reasons people decide to take up learning, such as for a broader choice of careers. It is an ‘instrumental’ outlook, reflecting the practical value and advantages of learning a new language” (Lambert, et al, 1973, p. 13). These orientations (integrative and
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instrumental) are significant to the present research to bring to light the motivating factors of current Japanese university students for EFL learning that would differ from those in the second authors' generation. That author was studying EFL in the Department of Language and Culture at a university in Hiroshima, Japan from 2001 to 2004. The present research is expected to reveal if university EFL students of the current generation are more integratively or more instrumentally motivated.

Attribution Theory

As one of the best known theories focusing on the perceived causes of one’s success or failure, Attribution Theory is widespread. Weiner (1974) focused his Attribution Theory on achievement when striving to attain something. In this research, Attribution Theory will be used as the theoretical background on the achievement (level of success) of English as the L2. The perceived causes of success or failure are known as causal attributions. Weiner’s model of causal attributions describes three different dimensions: locus, stability and control.

Locus involves two poles, internal and external. Examples of internal poles are ability and effort, whereas external poles are difficulty of a task and the “luck of the draw”. Stability is concerned with whether causes alter as time goes by or not. For example, ability could be classified as stable, and effort may be classified as unstable. Control contrasts two different causes from one another: causes if the person has control, such as skill and efficacy, from causes he or she does not have control over, such as aptitude, other’s actions and luck. In later research, Weiner (2000) postulated that attributions spring from self-perceptions, and as a result, may influence a person’s expectations, emotions, values and views about self-competence. Such self-perceptions, in turn, influence their motivation. Differences in attributions have been reported for individuals depending on performance success or failure (e.g. Carr & Borkowski, 1989; Kristner, Osborne & LeVerrier, 1988), and it has been suggested that attributions may also differ by culture, with some cultures attributing their success more to internal, personal factors (self-enhancement bias) and other cultures attributing failures to internal, personal factors (self-depreciation bias) (Kitayama & Uchida, 2003).

It is the potential differences in cultures and how they attribute success or failure that this current paper wants to improve on. Asian cultures tend to contribute personal success to external factors, such as giving credit and appreciation to a teacher for their success (a self-depreciation bias; “Thanks to my teacher I could succeed.”). Whereas Western cultures tend to attribute success to internal factors (“I studied so hard, so I earned my high score,” a self-enhancement bias). Such cultural differences in attributions led this paper to apply this theory toward Japanese university students (the unique challenges and circumstances of a Japanese population is discussed later). Next, let’s look at the Self-Determination Theory.

Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory (hereinafter SDT) by Deci and Ryan (2000; also see Vansteenkiste, Ryan & Deci, 2008) involves the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs that are innate and universal for individuals across most, if not all, cultures when discussing and researching motivation:

- Autonomy (a personal endorsement of one’s action deriving from self, experiencing a sense of volition and psychological freedom);
- Competence (self-confidence in the ability to complete activities, feeling effective); and
Relatedness (a positive interpersonal relationship with others, feeling loved and cared for).

When these needs are satisfied by the individual’s “social milieu,” the individual becomes more motivated to act and shows greater positive outcomes in the education setting (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2002). However, offering people extrinsic rewards for behavior that is intrinsically motivated undermines the intrinsic motivation as they grow less interested in it. When intrinsically motivated behavior becomes controlled by external rewards, it undermines their autonomy (Deci, 1971). For example, students who study English just because they get a competitive edge for job hunting, common in Japan, may determine that scores on job tests improve their social status (employment), and cause people to have less intrinsic motivation to act because the motivation was “forced” upon them by society. The pure interest in English language learning should work good for the student to keep learning, however the advantage, that is, employment or promotion the student gets, which is the extrinsic reward, may hinder the original intrinsic motivation.

Similarly, many Japanese take specified standardized tests to enter a university. That improvement in their social milieu via acceptance to a good and/or prestigious university was the intrinsic motivation, but when it is controlled by external rewards, it can actually decrease motivation. For another example, once learners are employed a company often demands its employees get high scores on the specified standardized English tests for promotion, which is a reward controlled externally and, by default, takes away from autonomy, self-determination and motivation.

Situations that give autonomy as opposed to taking it away also have a link to motivation. Studies looking at choice have found that increasing a participant’s options and choices increases their intrinsic motivation (Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith, & Deci, 1978). For example, in Japan, most teachers impose exams on students for which students are told to cover certain pages. Then, students are to work on simple memorization of the material. Moreover, students are assigned to turn in their work (such as spelling practice) in their notebooks. Those methods would not likely provide students with freedom in their choice of learning which, in turn, leads to depriving them of attaining autonomy. Although autonomy is a task characteristic, task meaningfulness is disposed to contribute to feelings of psychological freedom, and people might also experience autonomy satisfaction when they turn to others and even when they follow others’ requests.

Deci (1971) found that giving people unexpected positive feedback on a task increases people’s intrinsic motivation to do it, meaning that this was because the positive feedback was fulfilling people’s need for competence. In fact, giving positive feedback on a task aided only to increasing people’s intrinsic motivation while decreasing extrinsic motivation for the task. The desire for competence is defined as individuals’ inherent appetite to feel effective in interacting with the environment (Deci & Ryan, 2000; White, 1959). Competence satisfaction allows individuals to adapt to complex and changing environments, whereas competence frustration can result in helplessness and a lack of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Competence satisfaction concerns general, affective experience of effectiveness which derives from mastering a task (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, Soenens & Lens, 2010). The need for relatedness is satisfied when people experience a sense of communion and develop close and intimate relationships with others (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It is inherent human psychological propensity to seek connection to others, for example, to be included in a group, to be cared for and care for, be loved and love (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The assumption that individuals have the natural tendency to integrate themselves in the social matrix and benefit from being cared for is equally
emphasized in developmental approaches such as Attachment Theory (Bowlby, 1969). Lastly, let’s look the L2 Motivational Self-System.

The L2 Motivational Self-System

The L2 Motivational Self-System aims to extend the existing conceptualizations of L2 motivation using psychological theories of the self. These theories of the self were possible selves presented by Markus and Nurius (1986) and ought selves researched by Higgins (1987). Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) contemplated that the process of identification theorized to ground integrativeness could be better explained as an internal process of identification within the individual’s self-concept, rather than identification with an external reference group. Dörnyei (2005) established this contemplation further by employing the psychological theory of ‘possible selves’. That concept includes the following three main types of ‘self’: 1) what we would like to become; 2) what we could become; and 3) what we are afraid of becoming. While the ideal self refers to the attributes one would like to possess, the ought self refers to the attributes one believes one ought to possess according to a general sense of obligations and responsibilities, which can differ from one’s desires and aspirations (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009). The L2 motivational self-system consists of three dimensions: the Ideal L2 self, the Ought-to self and the L2 Learning experience. Let’s look at each of these briefly.

The Ideal L2 Self

The Ideal L2 self is the “L2-specific facet of one’s ‘ideal self’” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 29). It is the ideal image a learner wants to have as a result of learning. For example, if one wants to become a fluent L2 speaker who interacts with international friends, the image that this person would create of oneself as a fluent speaker might act as a powerful motivator, since it would reduce the discrepancy between the actual and the ideal self (Papi, 2010). This dimension is related to ‘integrative’ and ‘instrumental’ motives. According to Dörnyei, the Ideal L2 self is a “vivid and real image: one can see, hear and feel one’s ideal self” (Dörnyei et. al., 2006, p. 92). Therefore, it would be the level of a native speaker that learners may seek to realize themselves.

The Ought-to L2 self

The Ought-to L2 self “concerns the attributes that one believes one ought to possess to meet expectations and avoid possible negative outcomes” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009: 29). Motivating factors could be obligations, responsibilities and perceived duties in the learner’s life. One example is found here in Japan at the online shopping company Rakuten, where all employees are required to use English in the office at all times. This dimension is related to extrinsic motivational factors because the obligation or expectation came from an outside source, such as the company, not from the learner.

The L2 Learning Experience

The L2 learning experience concerns “situated, executive motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009, p. 29). Situation-specific motives such as the curriculum, the L2 teacher, the peer group and the teaching materials can have a strong influence on motivated behavior (Papi, 2010). Dörnyei and Ushioda contend “a basic hypothesis is that if proficiency in the target language is part and parcel of one’s ideal or ought-to self, this will serve as a powerful motivator to learn the language because of our psychological desire to reduce the discrepancy between our current and possible future selves” (2009, p.4).
L2 Motivation in Asian Contexts: A Focus on Japan

Japan is one of the most monolingual countries in the world. Average Japanese people are often unfamiliar with intercultural relationships, especially outside big metropolitan areas such as Tokyo or Osaka. However, Japanese people are increasingly exposed to English speaking opportunities, now more than ever. A huge increase in visitors to Japan has brought non-Japanese speakers much closer to them. This will only increase in the near future when Tokyo host the 2020 Olympic Games. In formal education also, Japanese have seen many changes. One of the biggest was when the government made English education a requirement from elementary school (until recently it was not required until junior high school). The Ministry of Education (MEXT, 2019) states its reasons for such changes 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 the Tokyo Olympics, 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 and ethnicities co-exist and compete, therefore, each citizen will have more situations in which the communication is done in a foreign language in various social and working settings (MEXT, 2019, translated from Japanese by the second author.)

In short, no matter how homogenous, English is becoming hard to avoid in Japan. In any case, whether in a metropolitan area or not, Japanese people inevitably have some reactions to those English language opportunities. That is, they often find either instrumental motivation or integrative motivation to use English, or both. Still, average Japanese people are not obliged in their daily life to be able to communicate in English with people from different cultural backgrounds. Nevertheless, more universities are sending students on overseas programs with a focus on English, and after graduation from university, more and more businesses are asking job-seeking university students to possess English ability as one of the requirements or advantages. In short, English is becoming a staple in many Japanese lives.

There are nonetheless university students who have less integrative orientation, however, due to their character, lack of confidence in English (or any L2), and they are unlikely to pursue interaction with non-Japanese speakers. An additional factor is “the use of English in daily life for ‘decorative’ or ‘design’ rather than functional purposes” (see Ikeshima, 2005, p. 185; Blair, 1997). That is, it is for Japanese consumption, not for English speakers per se, and many Japanese, especially young people see it as a way of appearing ’smart, sophisticated and modern’” (Blair, 1997; Dougill, 1987), or just plain “cool”. Indeed, it is claimed that in such decorative English “there is often no attempt to try to get it right, nor do the vast majority of the Japanese population . . . ever attempt to read the English design element in question . . . There is therefore less emphasis on spell checking and grammatical accuracy” (Melin & Rey, 2005, p.13-25). Those factors may appear in the results of this present research. When it comes to the meaning of the English words, most Japanese are disinterested or could be even annoyed. The researchers assume that it is probably because they only want English to be something “decorative” or some kind of “cool fashion,” not practical or academic. Similarly, they may think people are trying to appear smart, sophisticated and modern when they speak English in the presence of other English speakers. This is a common scenario among Japanese people. In the case of Japanese
university students, the young generation who will play a greater role in the future, they encounter and interact with people from various cultural backgrounds much more in this increasingly globalized society. It is for this reason that this research aims to uncover how willing Japanese university students actively work towards acquiring English and what motivates them to do so.

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 reinforcing feedback (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Gardner and Lambert further contend, “a process similar to social identification ‘extended to a whole ethnolinguistic community’ may sustain the long-term motivation needed to master a second language” (p.12). Many people learn English as their L2 for different reasons and causes. It is quite a bit of work to continue once formal education ends. There may be diverse reasonings and motivations among successfully motivated learners, just like there will be different attributes for perceived success. Integrative orientation would be one of the motivating factors that contributes for learners to continue learning. “It was our hunch that an integrative orientation would sustain better the long-term motivation needed for the very demanding task of second-language learning, and here we had in mind students in North American contexts studying the popular European languages” (Lambert, 1974, p. 13).

In research on Japanese populations and the L2 Motivational Self-System approach, Apple, Falout and Hill (2013) noted that ought-to L2 self was a more influential factor for their learning behavior than was the ideal L2 self. Moritani and Manning (2017) focused on various psychological variables such as the ought-to L2 self, the ideal L2 self, international posture, confidence in the L2, anxiety and cultural interest, among others in Japanese students in rural Japan, and found their motivation toward English to be more instrumentally oriented.

Much other research has been done on Japanese populations. Yashima (2002, 2009) looked at the motivation to study English in Japan and created a construct called “international posture.” It is defined as “a tendency to relate oneself to the international community rather than with any specific L2 group” (2009, p. 145). The main characteristics of this concept are very integrative and are described as an “interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness to go overseas to stay or work, readiness to interact with intercultural partners, and, one hopes, openness or a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures” (2002, p. 57). In her work it was found that this international posture had a direct impact on students’ willingness to communicate in English. The concept of being willing is central to motivation: since willingness to communicate is a minimum condition for achieving an aspired level of communicative competence in the L2, increasing such willingness is widely believed to be a natural goal of L2 learning (cf. MacIntyre, et al, 1998; cited in Moritani & Manning, 2017). Yashima (2002; 2009) also noted that enhancing international posture in students increases their willingness to communicate and later explained that a students’ imagined international community helped students create their ideal selves, a central concept in the L2 motivational self-system.

Ryan (2009) noted two “basic templates” when it comes to English as an L2 in Japan: the “one-size-fits-all model of second language education” promoted by the enormous ESL industry, and the other being a “notion of Japanese exceptionalism prevalent within the Japanese education system” (p. 120). Whether that dichotomy holds true is debatable, but what motivates English learners in Japan is one of many unanswered questions. This paper wants to learn why Japanese students are motivated! What drives them to go for English? What keeps them going once they start? As confirmed by Kimura,
Nakata and Okumura (2001), “little research has been conducted to identify the various motivational components characterizing different learning contexts in Japan” (p. 51).

Research Question

Given these discussions on motivational theory and English as an L2, this paper wants to learn about Japanese learners L2 motivation. Japan is unique for many reasons. As an island country, its isolation from the rest of the world for most of its history allowed a culture like no other to develop. Yet, in the area of English as an L2, Japan is also unique: it “leads the world when it comes to academic research on ‘demotivation’ in language learning” (Ushioda, 2015, p. 14). Nakata (2006) adds that “there is a general consensus that the educational system has resulted in Japanese learners with weak English communication ability and low motivation to learn the language” (p. 166). Why do Japanese communicate so poorly? Why is an understanding of what motivates them so elusive? This paper will focus on one simple research question: Are EFL/ESL undergraduate Japanese students more integratively or more instrumentally motivated to study English as their L2?

Methodology

This area explains the methodology used to answer the research question, including the subjects, the measuring instruments and the analysis.

Subjects

This research collected data from 100 students (52 males and 48 females) at two 4-year universities (private and public) in Hiroshima City, Western Japan. The participants were aged 18 to 23, and the mean age was 19.43 years old (SD=1.12). The geography was chosen due to the fact that is the second author’s hometown, yet both authors (based in Hiroshima) were interested in unearthing the motivating factors in EFL/ESL students in that smaller city, assuming that the results would differ from large metropolitan parts of Japan (such as Tokyo) which has higher levels of English language proficiency. The students were all in Bachelor’s Degree programs that have English as a requirement.

Measure Used to Study L2 Motivating Factors

The data-collection instrument used to measure motivating factors was adapted from Gardner’s English-language version of Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB, cited in Gardner, 2004). The original AMTB contained five sections and was translated and used in Gardner’s research in different countries, including Japan. This current project only used the section focusing on motivation (and was translated and cross-translated into Japanese by two bi-lingual speakers). It asks 14 questions about students’ motivation to study English (for a copy of the Japanese-language survey, see the Appendix).

The first 7 questions investigate instrumental motivation, and the second 7 focus on integrative motivation. Likert-scales with 5 answers were utilized; strongly disagree, moderately disagree, neutral (neither), moderately agree and strongly agree. Those 14 questions are as follows:

Items that measure 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 created 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.

The seven items used to measure 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 art and literature.
4. Studying English is important because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.
5. Studying English is important because it will help me make many friends from many parts of the world.
6. Studying English is important because it will allow me to learn about the culture and social life of English-speaking people.
7. I study English because it is enjoyable.

Results

The data was analyzed with SPSS version 19. Cronbach’s alpha was also used to establish the internal consistency reliability of the scales. Also, since most research on motivation theory in ESL/EFL has been conducted in Western populations, where cultural contexts and the attributes for success in language learning considerably differ, the present research sets out a paired samples t-test to compare the two kinds of motivation to find out which one Japanese university students were driven to learn English.

The first step was to make sure that all survey questions were measuring the same concept. Therefore, a Cronbach’s alpha was done to estimate the internal consistency reliability. Cronbach’s Alpha for *Instrumental motivation* was “.872”; for *Integrative* it was “.883” which are both considered “Good” according to the commonly accepted standard for internal consistency. A paired samples T-test was also done to see how much each type of motivation contributed to the overall motivation of the subjects. The research conducted T-tests to confirm that any difference found in the data might exist only as a coincidence of the sample, rather than resulting from a difference in the overall population. The calculation works out the differences between the two variables, *instrumental* and *integrative* (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>4.0657</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.67996</td>
<td>.06800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>4.1314</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.74485</td>
<td>.07449</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 4.0 out of a 5-point Likert scale). The standard deviation values are ‘.679’ and ‘.74’. The participants showed homogeneity of variance on the 5-point Likert scale by selecting high points on the question items. To sum up, Japanese students possess similar levels of both instrumental and integrative motivation for learning English with only slightly higher levels of integrative motivation (see Table 2). The mean difference between the two motivations is 0.04, t value is 1.48 and p value 0.14. Therefore, the difference between the two L2 motivations is statistically insignificant (with the p value greater than 0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.0427</td>
<td>-.15356 to .02213</td>
<td>-1.484</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, to see if the score on instrumental motivation correlates to the score on integrative motivation, a Pearson correlation coefficient was done. As seen in Table 3.1, there is high positive correlation between the two types of L2 motivation in the Japanese university students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Total</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>.811**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender Differences in Motivating Factors**

The authors were also interested to see how the scores on instrumental and integrative motivation are associated with each other according to sex. To compare, the research did Pearson correlation coefficients for male and female participants separately (see Table 3.2). The Pearson Correlation is ‘.737’ for males, which is a high positive correlation. The correlation for females is ‘.875’ which is an even higher positive correlation. All in all, both sexes show strong correlation in their L2 motivations, though female students showed marginally higher correlations than male students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inst. Mean</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.737**</td>
<td>.875**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intg. Mean</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.737**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intg. Mean | Pearson Correlation | .875** | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |                     |   |   |
| N           |                     | 52| 48   | 52     |
Discussion

This paper sought to learn if there were any significant differences in types of motivation in ESL students in a population of Japanese university students. It focused on the concepts of instrumental and integrative motivation proposed by Gardner (cf. Gardner 2004; 2010). Data from this project show virtually no differences between instrumental and integrative motivation factors. T-tests show that Japanese students possess similar levels of both instrumental and integrative motivation for learning English with slightly higher levels of integrative motivation. As for any gender differences, both males and females show strong correlations to both motivation factors, but females showed slightly higher (.875) than did males (.737). This indicates that females in Japan may have slightly stronger motivation than males in their English as L2 studies.

Previous research had found Japanese interest in both types of motivation (Kimura, Nakata & Okumura, 2001) but that research studied components of motivational factors (such as extrinsic vs. intrinsic along with instrumental and integrative), so the constructs in that work were not as clearly defined as those in the present research. Other research on motivation had suggested that for most learners in Japan, English has a clearly defined instrumental function, yet the problem is that it is often “stripped of any communicative function, as content for a series of examinations that have profound consequences for future academic or career prospects” (cf. Ryan, 2009, p.125). So, research on instrumental and integrative motivational factors in Japanese populations has been varied in its results.

One of the many reasons for this paper was to learn more specifically if Japanese are motivated to study English due to the unique characteristics and pressures of ESL in required class in formal education (instrumental motivation), or if they are seriously and personally invested in it (integrative). Sadly, the data bore no insight into this question. English is huge in Japan, both in and out of formal education. The problem is that being in Japan, people here may have, no matter what the level of motivation, little, if any, chance to use English. Following the main concern of Ryan (2009), this paper was heavily interested in “understanding those learners who make ‘extraordinary efforts to learn a language that holds out little immediate prospect of material reward and offers scarce opportunity to establish direct contact with its speakers” (p. 121). The second author in particular has extensive interest in this as he, himself, is an ESL scholar.

It was noted earlier that Japan is big on research “when it comes to academic research on ‘demotivation’ in language learning” (Ushioda, 2015, p. 14). Research by Moritani and Manning (2017) adds to that, finding in a longitudinal study that students’ “overall motivation to learn English diminished while their attitudes toward English learning and willingness to communicate showed no change” over time (p. 49). No matter how strong personal factors affect one’s ability to maintain motivation, such as one’s personality and competence, language-learning motivation varies over the course of the study period (Kojima, Ozeki & Hiromori, 2010). Given such changes in motivation over time, it is vital that educators understand the students’ motivation (what drives them?). This paper set out to do just that. Once educators learn specifically what motivates their students, as well as their motivational status (are they keeping up with it?), we must never stop aiding them in their goals. We must set timely and necessary “educational interventions” to increase this motivation (Moritani & Manning, 2017) while in formal education settings. Yet off campus, the encouragement from educators must not stop. As suggested by the same researchers:

While focusing on English as a means to an end may be easier to immediately envision for
students, it might not sustain their motivation far beyond job hunting. Self-enhancement programs and strategies to improve their willingness to communicate [emphasis added by the authors] should also be implemented to equip students with more communicative English ability applicable in international settings, in which they see themselves. Helping them get further involved in international events will also set them on a course to continue being active and prepare them for lifelong learning (Moritani & Manning, 2017, p. 51).

This research is a first step by the authors in a longer research project that examines not only ESL motivation factors, but also the correlation between ESL/EFL motivation and lifelong learning in Japanese university students. The next step will look at the relationship (if any) between integrative and instrumental motivation to learn English in Japan, and what maintains their lifelong learning.
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Appendix：Japanese-Language Survey Used to Measure Integrative and Instrumental Motivation Factors in University ESL Students

英語を学ぶ動機・目的についてのアンケート調査

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動機を調査する研究のためのデータ収集を目的としたものです。日本の英語教育・異文化教育がより効果的なものに発展することを目的として研究しています。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>質問</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>就職してから必要になるので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>いろんな知識や教養が身につくので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>海外に行った時に必要なので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>インターネット等の最新技術を使うために必要なため英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>英語が分かれば周りから尊敬されるので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>英語が分かれば英語の新聞、雑誌、本が読めるようになるので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>より多くの多様な人々と出会える、話すことができるようになるので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>英語の文学や美術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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>異文化の人たちの集まり・活動に気軽に参加できるので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>いろんな国のの人たちと友好関係を築くのに役立つので英語の勉強は重要だ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>英語を勉強する理由としては楽しいからだ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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