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Abstract

The aim of this study is to shed light on the complexes of psycho-educational affective mechanism in Foreign Language Learning (FLL) focusing on the 630 Japanese learners with low language proficiency. Three replicated studies exploring foreign language learners’ affective factors related to learning motivation indicated dynamic interrelationships among the factors and their effects on English language proficiency. The analysis of the quantitative data using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) showed that the learners were highly integratively and instrumentally oriented in English learning, but such orientations did not contribute to their language proficiency. On the contrary, ethnocentrism and linguistic self-confidence were revealed to be statistically significant factors affecting proficiency, the former was a negative impact and the latter was a positive impact on the final outcome. In this study, the analysis was multi-dimensionally analyzed and the learners’ high integrativeness and instrumentality were defined as the learners’ surface beliefs derived from the social pressures. It was concluded that the learners were ought to be believed in that way and their underlying beliefs were somewhat different. The surface beliefs were categorized as “desirable motivation” and the underlying beliefs were named as “desired motivation.”
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1. BACKGROUND

Since the 1990s, motivation has been a popular research topic in Second Language Learning (SLL). Both researchers and practicing teachers found that affective factors play important roles in language learning, and the previous theoretical framework, which had been derived from social psychology, was further expanded to include several additional variables. Many of the motivational studies of this period find their origin in the work of Gardner and his associates. Gardner’s 1985 model is still used as a base for further research, and has led to the recognition of various other affective factors (for reviews, see Dörnyei 1998).

However, the previous literature does not sufficiently address three important issues. First, the affective factors which underlie language proficiency and their relationship to each other are far from clear in Foreign Language Learning (FLL). Secondly, the extent to which the prevalent psycho-educational models can be applied to different cultural contexts remains unexplored. Finally, recognition of the cultural beliefs that influence the development of other affective factors in Gardner’s model is still inadequate. Spolsky (1991) proposes that social context is closely relevant to language learning both in determining the attitudes and goals of the learner which lead to motivation. The socio-cultural milieu of second language (SL) learners differs fundamentally from that of foreign language (FL) learners in classroom contexts. The ability of SL learners to function in society is often heavily contingent on attaining some level of proficiency, while the target language may not be essential outside the classroom for FL learners. Much of the previous research related to affective factors has been conducted in multilingual and multicultural contexts like Canada (Further details can be found in Gardner 1980, 1985, 1988; Clément and Gardner 2001), thus, it is natural to question the validity of applying the resulting motivational theory to monolingual and monocultural contexts like Japan within the prevalent theoretical framework or possibly beyond it.

1.1. The Changing Role of English in Japan

The role of English in Japan has rapidly changed since the country opened up to the outside world following the gunboat diplomacy by the US in 1854. During the Meiji period (1868-1912), under the slogan of fukoku kyōhei (enrich the economy and strengthen the military), many young students were sent overseas to Europe and the US to study modern technology. Within the country, 3,000 foreign professionals were temporarily employed as o-yatoi gaikokujin or “hired foreigners” to teach Japanese intellectuals a variety of fields such as technology, engineering, science, and English that is needed to understand these fields (Ohta 1995). English was an essential tool for enlightening Japan, but it was designated as an
enemy language during World War II only to be swiftly rehabilitated to a symbolic language for modernization in the post-war era. However, despite a campaign to promote internationalization since the 1970s, with English continuously showing up as a subject on high school and university entrance examinations, even today very few people in Japan are able to use it as a communication tool.

Thus, the role of English as a foreign language in Japan has changed depending on the needs for the country as part of the rapid globalization process. When English was first introduced to Japan, its function was purely instrumental and it was learned mainly for security purposes. Soon after, English was taught in an effort to acquire technology from the West to modernize and industrialize Japan. However, actual users of English were limited only to “male intellectuals” who were able to attend universities. New concepts of “freedom, democracy, speech, expression, legend and justice” were introduced to the Japanese society along with English in that the egalitarian values are embedded. Intellectual figures such as Kanzô Uchimura, Inazô Nitobe, and Tenshin Okakura were trained by the o-yatoi gaikokujin or 'hired foreigners' with Direct Method and reportedly became quite proficient in English (Hatta 2003). Soon after, the pedagogical climate was changed by the view that Western values learned along with English would corrupt Japanese mind and “Japaneseness,” and following such values blindly would negatively affect Japan to become submissive, eventually taking a secondary role to the Western imperial power (Ohta 1995). Under the national pride, the Direct Method adopted at first was switched to the Translation Method using Japanese language as a means of instruction in the classroom, and subsequently Japanese teachers of English replaced the native English teachers who were initially dominant in number (Takanashi and Ohmura 1975).

As early as the 1890s, when Japan was already an imperial power in East Asia, it campaigned for co-prosperity among Asian countries to protect the region from Western imperialism. When it launched into war against the US and the allies in 1941, the role of English drastically changed from a tool to learn western civilization and technology to the language of the enemy. English was legally banned, including all imported English words, such as the words used for baseball rules, which were awkwardly translated into Japanese (Miller 1967).

---

2 Japan’s globalization may be said to have begun toward the end of the fifteen century, when western globalization began (Befu 2002).
3 The first English dictionary was first edited by the order of the Tokugawa government after a British warship abruptly invaded Nagasaki Harbor in 1808. At the time, Japan had secluded itself from the rest of world – a policy which had been in effect for more than three hundred years.
4 Japanese women suffrage was not granted until 1946, one year after Japan’s defeat in World War II.
5 Uchimura, Nitobe and Okakura were Japanese scholars who contributed to the modernization of Japan and the nation state’s goal was to catch up with the Western countries’ modernization.
At the same time, political propaganda attempting to eradicate Western beliefs and values was common (Dower 1987). For example, one widely circulated picture portrays a woman brushing “individualism, selfishness, luxury, disharmony and aggressiveness” from her hair, symbolized as dandruff (Dower 1987, 269). English was coincided with an ideological vehicle to transmit the Western value system, particularly the American egalitarian values that did not reconcile with the state value of Japan having the emperor as the holy head of the nation.

When Japan admitted the disastrous defeat in 1945, the US occupation army brought American culture along with the English language. Sweets, chewing gum and chocolates, which the US soldiers gave to starving children and “Give me chocolate” became a catchy English phrase for the approach Japanese children adopted toward the conquerors (Dower 1999, 71). Many people of that generation reported that taste of the American chewing gum did much more than just fill their empty stomach. Even as children, they were keenly aware of the gigantic power the chewing gum symbolized, and realized how fragile their own country had been. The “Give me chocolate” children believed the rumors that every American house included a movie theater and a huge refrigerator that was to the size of a Japanese house. Later, the movie theater was found to be a TV set commonly seen at American homes even at that time (Lee 2004). During the occupation period, English was re-introduced along with the Western values. The Western values were interpreted as modern values, for example the concepts of “freedom” and “consumerism” became the fundamental values in the newly established Japan’s democratic social system. At the same, English language functioned as a symbol of the Western power and hopes for the future, as evidenced by the elite status attributed to those who could speak it. Dower (1999) stated that even practical undertakings such as teaching English were carefully wedded to an explicit philosophy of accentuating the positive, spreading even to the popularity of radio programs such as “Come Come English/Kamu Kamu Eigo” (p.173).

The children who asked for sweets from the U.S. occupation army soldiers, the “Give me chocolate” generation revitalized the Japanese economy, and the baby boomers turned the country to the world’s second largest economic power by the late 1970s. During the period of economic growth, Western culture, especially American culture, became the role model for Japanese (Sekiguchi 2002). It was in these circumstances that the “Barbie Doll Syndrome” emerged in Japanese society, in which Barbie dolls with blond, blue eyes with long legs replaced Japanese traditional dolls as young girls’ playmates. The concept of beauty was also changed along with the popularity of Barbie Doll, hattōshin or eight-head figure (a tall, well-proportioned figure having a small head) became a symbol of beauty for young Japanese
women (Lee 2004). Cars, electric appliances, and other merchandise that symbolized modernization were advertised with catchy English phrases by white Caucasian models during the economic development in the 1960s and 1970s (Hagiwara 1998).

However, “acquiring English” for non-social elites followed a different path. English was never much more than one of several subjects on high school and university entrance examinations, and communicative competence was only necessary for international business or politics. The translation method was persistently maintained as evidenced by the two types of English classes still present in Japanese schools: Eigo, taught by Japanese teachers and Eikwaiwa (English conversation) taught by native speakers, now living symbols of internationalization (McConnell 2000). The distinctly divided roles of Eigo and Eikwaiwa have not been successfully integrated (Lee 1989).

When the economic boom of the early 1970s started, internationalizing the country was seen as essential for progress, and since then, English has ostensibly been taught for communicative purposes. However, despite the social pressure on English educators and learners, no significant changes have been observed to date and Japanese test takers’ average TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) score ranked near the bottom of 22nd out of 23 Asian countries (Mainichi Daily News, July 12, 2002) and even almost after 10 years, Japan was ranked the 104th out of 113th in TOEFL iBT (Educational Testing Service 2011).

1.2. Significant Factors in Foreign Language Learning: Ethnocentrism, Linguistic Self-confidence, Language Anxiety

This section reviews major factors affecting motivation in foreign language learning from the previous studies. Dörnyei (1990) argues that the results of motivational studies in SLL contexts are not directly applicable to FLL situations. In his Hungarian context, he found that the instrumentality and need for achievement played an especially significant role for intermediate level learners of English, but the desire to go beyond this level was associated with integrative motives.7 Svanes’s study (1987) presents empirical evidence that there are more significant affective factors than previously acknowledged. Although Svanes’s study was conducted in a SL learning context (Norwegian in Norway), it was found that the motivation variables explained very little of the variance in language proficiency. Svanes concluded that the best predictor of variance in groups of students with differing language

---

6 Those opposing to referring to the low achievement of Japanese using TOEFL as a measurement claim the demographics of the Japanese test takers are different from the ones in other Asian countries (Reedy 2000).

7 Gardner and Lambert (1959) identified two types of motivation from a social-psychological view: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation is the desire to learn a language to integrate oneself into the target culture, and instrumental motivation is the desire to learn the language in order to get a better job or meet a language requirement.
and cultural backgrounds was cultural distance. Members of a cultural minority group may feel it necessary to cling to their own culture and limit their interest in the target language (TL) culture or contact with TL native speakers because it may be viewed as a threat to the individual’s ethnic identity. This study implies that variables such as identity and social-cultural distance should also be expected to exert considerable influence on acquisition in FL learning contexts.

Japanese is considered a highly contextualized language (Hodge 2000) in the sense that non-verbal factors weigh heavily in the communication process and careful listening is considered important (Lee 1998). Heated debates are discouraged to avoid direct confrontations, and “mind reading” or “the art of conveying unspoken messages” is regarded as a subtle skill showing native intelligence to maintain harmony (Barnlund 1975). Such norms influence Japanese learners’ classroom attitude resulting in a reluctance to take initiative in classroom activities. It is conceivable that English teachers from different cultural background might think that those who are not participating actively are poorly motivated. Lee (1998) characterizes such Japanese classroom attitudes by using the Hoyle’s term “tissue rejection” (1970). This phenomenon is often observed when a common classroom management or teaching methods does not work well in a Japanese context because of the difference in cultural norms. Along these same lines, Guiora (1972) claimed that language learning itself is “a profoundly unsettling psychological proposition” because it directly threatens an individual’s self-concept and worldview. Hence, it is possible to argue that language anxiety is related to ethnocentrism.

Little research has been conducted into the effects of social variables such as ethnocentrism and cultural ego. Gudykunst (1991) provides a further expanded definition of ethnocentrism; “Ethnocentrism is a bias to evaluate others negatively using our own standards.” Gardner, Smythe, and Clément (1979) included a scale that measures the level of ethnocentrism in and found that fear of assimilation was negatively related to integrative motivation which implied a threat to ethnic identity. In their study, ethnocentrism was conceptualized as the belief that one’s own cultural community is superior to other cultural groups. The measurement was found to be negatively correlated to an integrative factor and language. In addition, students with high ethnocentrism would have less integrative orientation or willingness to communicate which was newly conceptualized as a significant affective factor (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels 1998).

Noels, Pon, and Clément (1996) tested relationships between interethnic contacts, linguistic self-confidence, and situated ethnic identity variables using path analysis. They found that
greater self-confidence in Chinese was related to less involvement in the Canadian community and greater involvement in the Chinese community. Yashima (2000) used a path analysis to investigate how ethnocentrism affected learners’ intercultural approach tendency, and intercultural friendship orientation in a Japanese context. She found that ethnocentrism was negatively related to the tendency to approach people of other cultures and orientation intercultural friendships. As she suggested, ethnocentrism is a significant variable that should be included in the socio-psychological model in the Japanese context.

Another important psychological construct in motivational studies is learners’ linguistic self-confidence. Linguistic self-confidence was first described by Clément, Gardner, and Smythe (1977) who defined it as self-perceptions of communicative competence or self-assessments of L2 proficiency. They claim that it is a dimension of motivation and also a state that is free of anxiety. Linguistic self-confidence was found to be a significant motivational factor in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situations in which learners do not have direct contact with the L2 community. The concept of self-confidence is closely related to that of language anxiety (MacIntyre 1998; MacIntyre and Gardner 1989; MacIntyre and Gardner 1991a, 1991b), which is defined as a component of self-confidence which emphasizes the positive rather than negative (Gardner, Tremblay, and Masgoret 1997, 354). In other words, learners’ positive attitudes in motivation can be defined as self-confidence, while learners’ negative attitudes can be defined as anxiety.

2. THE ROLE OF INSTRUMENTALITY AND INTEGRATIVENESS

2.1. Pilot Study and Preliminary Study
Before pursuing the principal study, two similar surveys were conducted as a pilot study and the preliminary study. The pilot study focused on 45 Japanese university freshmen, 11 females and 34 males, while 98 females (27%) and 264 males (73%) participated in the preliminary study. The aim of these studies was to explore psycho-educational models at a Japanese cultural context and the effect of attitudinal factors on English proficiency as measured by TOEFL ITP (the Test of English as a Foreign Language, the Intuitional Testing Program)\(^8\). Unfortunately, due to the limit of space in this paper, findings will only be briefly introduced as hereafter (further details can be found in Lee 1998, 2000).

The research method applied for the pilot study was a quantitative inquiry using Path Analysis and the preliminary study was another quantitative inquiry using Structural

---
\(^8\) TOEFL ITP is specially designed for in-service testing conducted by universities or other institutes. It’s commonly used due to the reasonable fee and flexible scheduling, but the scoring system is the same as TOEFL.
Equation Modeling (SEM). The intents of both studies are meant to investigate the interrelationships among the variables and their causal relationships to the final goal that is language proficiency measured by TOEFL ITP. The hypothesized models are present in Figure 1 and 2, in which the rectangles represent measured variables and ovals represent latent variables derived from factor analysis. The direct and indirect effects to the final goal are shown in the schematic representations. The numbers represent regression coefficients and the variances and the covariances of the independent variables in the model (Bentler 1995). The number of parameters needs to be reduced by fixing, constrained by setting the parameter equal to another parameter to make the model just-identified (the details are found in Tabachinick and Fidell 1996, 743). The variables with asterisks are fixed to the value of 1 in order to adjust the hypothesized model to being just-identified. The goodness of the fit for the data was satisfactory and the following fit indices were found for the model: GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) = .906, AGFI (adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) = .859, CFI (Comparative Fit Index) = .902, Chi - square divided by degree of freedom = 3.3, and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) = .08

The results of the pilot study and preliminary studies showed a high degree of integrative and instrumental orientations of Japanese learners with low language proficiency. English was defined an international language and the target culture was not limited to any specific cultures. However, as Honna, Tajima and Minamoto (2000) claims, English is equally regarded as American English by many Japanese learners. Spolsky (1970) explains that one of the most important attitudinal factors is the attitude of the learner to the language and to its speakers. Even though there is a prevalent norm that English is a global language, English was conceptualized as the language of the West represented by the U.S.A. in Japan and the definition of English was applied to these studies.

Interestingly, the effects of the instrumentality and integrativeness on language proficiency were not significant. In other words, even though the participants showed a high level of such orientations, their instrumentality and integrativeness did not affect their language proficiency. Although there were significant interrelationships among the extracted factors observed (See figures 1 and 2), self-confidence was the only factor which showed a significant effect on language proficiency in both studies.

---

9 TOEFL ITP assess only receptive skills, therefore scores should be interpreted accordingly.
10 In Figure 1, the importance of English for entrance examinations was the only factor that didn’t show significant paths to any other affective factors.
Figure 1.
Pilot Study; Path Diagram of Motivational Factors and Proficiency

Source: Lee (1998, 70)
Note: p<.01, N=45, All paths were significant. GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) = .906, AGFI (adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) = .859, CFI (Comparative Fit Index) = .902, Chi - square divided by degree of freedom = 3.3, and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation)= .08, Single arrows indicate regression and lines with arrows at both ends indicate correlations.

(a) Impression (attitude toward English classes, positive impression of English),
(b) Oral Con (attitude toward oral conversation classes taught by native English teachers),
and (c) Preference (to what extent they like English), (d) Importance (instrumentality, importance of English) (e) Confidence (perceived linguistic self-confidence), (f) Entrance examination need (instrumentality, how important English is for university entrance examination), (g) Culture (integrativeness, interest in other cultures in which English is used as an official language), (h) Qualification (instrumentality, interest in passing English skill tests), (i) Needs (instrumentality, need to master English).
Figure 2.

Preliminary Study; the model with standardized weights

(a) Proficiency as measured by TOEFL, ITP, (b) Confidence=extent participants feel confident in using English, (c) Integrative=extent participants are interested in other culture in which English is used, (d) Attitude=extent participants have good impression on English learning, (e) Instrumental=extent participants feel English is useful for their future)

3. THE PRINCIPAL STUDY

The purpose of the principal study was to replicate the pilot and preliminary studies using a larger number of subjects in order to confirm the initial findings: Integrativeness and instrumentality did not significantly affect language proficiency while linguistic confidence was only significant factor in both studies. New constructs of motivation, anxiety and ethnocentrism considered significant in EFL contexts were included in this study. The following research questions were posited;

1. What are the effects of orientations such as integrativeness and instrumentality on English proficiency?
2. If ethnocentrism and anxiety are included, what interrelationships in the hypothesized model are observed?

3. To what extent can the Gardner’s (1985) model and Clément’s (1980) model be applied to this set of data?

3.1. Participants
A questionnaire was administered to six hundred and thirty Japanese university students. Their ages ranged from age 18 to 21 and 174 (28%) of the participants were female and 456 (72%) were male. The participants have been studying English since the first grade of junior high school so that all participants have six year long experience of learning English. The questionnaire was used to investigate the participants’ awareness of English learning. The TOEFL, ITP was used as a language proficiency measure. The TOEFL, ITP is an in-service test promoted by English Testing Service with a reasonable test fee. The TOEFL, ITP is appropriate for students at beginning levels of English study and the pre-TOEFL scores are on the same scale as normal TOEFL scores, but up to a score of 500, thus the TOEFL, ITP provides more discriminating measurements for lower proficiency test takers. The TOEFL, ITP average score of the participants was approximately 368 (SD = 38), thus categorizing them as low proficiency learners.

3.2. Materials
The software program Elias (Elias 2.5 1998) was used to set up an online questionnaire. This software is a popular program that is often used to set up electronic bulletin boards. Students complete the questionnaire in a computer lab during a two week period. Questionnaires were labeled with student names and classes for matching with TOEFL, ITP scores. A total of 38 questions were included (See Appendix 1). The foci for the study were six theory-driven indices and the following details how the question items were designed. Cronbach’s alphas are included to show the reliability of each index. The students answered using a 5-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 2-moderately disagree, 3-neutral, 4-moderately agree, and 5-strongly agree) through the online questionnaire.

3.3. Extracted Factors for Structural Equation Modeling

Integrative Orientation
Five items in integrative orientation were designed by modifying the items used for integrativeness defined in Clément, Gardner, and Smythe (1980). Items included questions

---

11 The rigid hierarchy in postsecondary educational system in Japan results in a situation where university applicants tend to focus on the rank of the university department rather than their own academic interests. Therefore, the participants’ major was not asked in the questionnaire.
such as “I am interested in foreign music and culture.” and “I would like to visit as many foreign countries as possible.” The target culture was meant to be the culture of the countries in which English is spoken (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.81$), but many students equalized English as the language of the U.S.A.

**Instrumental Orientation**

Five items in instrumental orientation were adapted from the instrumentality items used in Clément, Gardner, and Smythe, 1980. Some example items are “English broadens possibilities in my future.” and “English is necessary to get a good job.” A higher score indicates that a student endorses instrumental reasons for studying English (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.81$).

**Ethnocentrism**

Eight items were included in an ethnocentrism index based on the definitions introduced in Hinenoya and Gatbonton (1998); Gardner, Smythe, and Clément (1979). Questions included “Foreigners do not understand Japanese culture.” and “Foreigners do not understand Japanese thinking.” Positive responses to these questions indicate that the respondents feel that Japanese culture and thinking are too distinct or unique to understand by non-Japanese. Questions such as “I think it is absurd to speak English in Japan” signifies similarly that the respondent feels that it is not necessary to master English as long as he/she lives in Japan. A high score on this index indicates a negative attitude toward learning English (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.72$).

**Anxiety**

Seven question items were adapted from anxiety measurements used in MacIntyre and Gardner (1989). Communication anxiety was conceptualized in a similar way to the one in MacIntyre and Gardner and is assessed with statements such as “I tend to be nervous when speaking in front of people.” and “I tend to be nervous when speaking in the classroom.” This scale was designed so that a high score indicates a high level communication anxiety (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$).

**Linguistic Confidence**

Seven questions were adapted from the linguistic confidence measurements used in Clément and Kruidenier (1985), but these questions were modified to fit for an educational context. Statements include “I find listening to English easy.” and “I find reading English easy.” A high score close to 5.0 indicates that students feel confident utilizing English (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.76$).
Motivation Intensity
Six items were adopted from Gardner (1980) to measure the intensity of a student’s motivation to learn English in terms of work done studying English for a class taken in a previous semester. Questions included “How many hours a week did you study English this semester?” and “I think I have studied English hard this semester.” Motivation Intensity was clearly defined as effortful behavior that is shown as true value while learners’ orientations are more likely face value (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.71$).

An Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores of the Indices (The maximum score is 5.0)</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>CR1</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>CR2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNOCENTLISM</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 shows the mean score of each index. The maximum mean score is 5.0 and integrativeness and instrumentality showed a high level with mean scores of 3.8 and 4.03, respectively. Ethnocentrism, linguistic confidence and motivation intensity showed relatively lower average scores of 2.58, 2.22, and 2.78, respectively. Anxiety showed somewhat a mid-range average of 3.20. These results indicate that the participants seemed to have high level of integrativeness and instrumentality in learning English while they showed low level of ethnocentrism, linguistic confidence and motivation intensity.

First, an exploratory factor analysis was used to investigate the structure of the items, following the statistical procedure recommended by Clément and Kruidenier (1985); Dörnyei (1990). The first step was an application of the screen test (Cattell 1966) of eigenvalues plotted against factors. The plot was negatively decreasing and the eigenvalue was highest for the first factor and moderate but decreasing for the next five factors before reaching small values. Six factors were retained after the test (46% variance), and then an orthogonal method with varimax rotation that is commonly used to simplify factors by maximizing the variance of the loadings across variables (Tabachinick and Fidell 1996, 666).
Table 4.

Factor Loadings after Varimax Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Items and Extracted Factors</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2.07 English is essential to be active in society.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Instrumental Orientation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2.10 I would like to acquire some sorts of qualification or certificate in English.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2.08 English broadens possibilities in my future.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2.06 English is essential for personal development.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2.09 English is necessary to get a good job.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.12 Since I live in Japan, a foreign language is not necessary.</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.15 Japan is an economically advanced country so Japanese should be one of the international languages.</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Ethnocentrism)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.14 It will not be very inconvenient even if I can’t speak English.</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6.38 I believe if I study English hard, I will acquire the language.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Motivation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.23 I tend be nervous when asked questions in the classroom.</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.21 I tend to be nervous when speaking in front of people.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.22 I don’t like to talk to strangers.</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.19 I am not good at expressing myself even in Japanese.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.24 I tend to be nervous when speaking English in the classroom.</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.25 I would be nervous if I spoke to foreigners.</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4.20 I can express my own opinions even about difficult topics.</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.29 I find writing English easy. <strong>(Confidence)</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.31 I find understanding English grammar easy.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td><strong>0.70</strong></td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.32 I find reading English easy.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td><strong>0.69</strong></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.28 I find memorizing English vocabulary easy.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.30 I find listening to English easy.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.27 I can write English without worrying about mistakes.</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5.26 I can speak English without worrying about mistakes.</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1.03 I am interested in foreign culture. <strong>(Integrative Orientation)</strong></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td><strong>0.71</strong></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1.04 I would like to make friends with foreigners.</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1.02 I would like to communicate with foreigners.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td><strong>0.65</strong></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1.01 I would like to go overseas in the future.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1.05 I would like to take native speakers' classes.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6.34 How many hours a week did you study English this year?</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0.08</th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>-0.10</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.76</th>
<th>-0.04</th>
<th>0.59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V6.36 How many hours a week did you study for the English listening class this semester?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6.35 How many hours a week did you study for the English reading class this semester?</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6.37 I think I have studied English hard this semester.</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6.33 I studied English very hard at high school.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.16 Foreigners do not understand Japanese culture.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>0.12</th>
<th>-0.14</th>
<th>-0.13</th>
<th>0.72</th>
<th>0.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V3.17 Foreigners do not understand Japanese thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.18 Foreigners do not understand Japanese thinking.</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.13 Foreigners visiting Japan should learn Japanese.</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3.11 I often feel that I am Japanese.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance%</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variance%</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table 4, Factor 1 received strong loadings from nine variables, and the five most prominent ones (The item 7, 10, 8, 6, 9) were the variables in the instrumental index. This factor explained instrumental orientation, which is the desire to learn English to be successful in Japanese society. In addition, three variables in the ethnocentrism index negatively loaded on this factor. The three variables in the ethnocentrism index were the item 12 (Since I live in Japan, English is not necessary), the item 15 (Japan is an economically advanced country so Japanese should be one of the international languages), and the item 14 (It will not be very inconvenient even if I can’t speak English). This factor concerns learners’ immediate need to learn English and is the opposite of ethnocentrism as defined in this study. Therefore, this factor was labeled as instrumental orientation, and is similar to the concept of instrumental motivation defined by Gardner (1985).

The anxiety items clustered together to form the second factor. This factor received high loadings from seven variables such as “I tend to be nervous when asked questions in the classroom” (the item 23) or “I tend to be nervous when speaking in front of people” (the item 21). One variable, “I can express my own opinions even about difficult topics” (the item 20) had a negative loading on this factor. This factor was labeled as communication anxiety, which was defined similarly by MacIntyre and Gardner (1989).

The seven items measuring linguistic confidence were closely clustered on the third factor. Items such as “I find writing English easy” (the item 29) and “I find understanding English grammar easy” (the item 31) represented this factor. This factor is similar to linguistic...
confidence as defined by Clément (1980), so that it is most accurately labeled linguistic confidence.

The five items designed to measure integrative orientation heavily loaded on the fourth factor. The items were “I would like to make as many foreign friends as possible” (the item 3) and “I would like to visit as many foreign countries as possible” (the item 4). In order to distinguish this factor from motivation which was defined effortful behavior, it was labeled integrative orientation, following Gardner’s (1985) conceptual definition.

Five items concerned with motivation intensity heavily loaded on the fifth factor. The items that contributed to this factor were “I studied English very hard at high school,” “How many hours a week did you study English this semester” (the item 35), and “I think I have studied English hard this semester” (the item 37). This factor represents learners’ effort to learn English, which is similar to motivational intensity. It is, therefore, best named motivation intensity.

The sixth factor received high loadings from five items in the ethnocentrism index. The variables included “Foreigners do not understand Japanese culture” (the item 16) and “Foreigners do not understand Japanese thinking” (the item 17). These alienation attitudes are ethnocentric attitudes originally conceptualized by Gardner, Smythe, and Clément (1979).

**Structural Equation Modeling**
AMOS 4.0, which was used for Structural Equation Modeling, SEM (Arbuckle 1995) in this study, uses Maximum Likelihood (ML) as an estimation procedure. SEM gains its robustness by combining multiple regression, path analysis and factor analysis and is a useful methodology for specifying, estimating, and testing hypothesized relationships among a set of substantively meaningful variables (Bentler 1995, ix). The basic information on SEM is introduced to grasp the statistical steps adopted for this study (Detail descriptions of SEM applied to language learning spheres are available in Purpura 1997; Kunnan 1998). Most estimation procedures used for SEM assume that data are normally distributed so univariate and multivariate normality were checked. After screening for outliers and examining the skewness and kurtosis of the measured variables, no signs of univariate and multivariate outliers were identified.

**Specification of Hypothesized Models**
A model was hypothesized based on the following four variants: Gardner and his associates’ socio-psychological model focusing on motivation intensity and orientations (1985); the
self-confidence model of Clément et al (1977); MacIntyre and Gardner’s anxiety model (1989); Noel, Pon, Clément and Kruidenier’s identity model (1996). The three measurement variables represented by rectangles were chosen to represent latent variables represented by ovals. One of the measured variables loading on a latent construct must have its factor loading fixed to 1 and these variables are shown in figure 3 with asterisks. This was done with the third variable (the items 3, 8, 18, 23) for each latent variable, while the other two loadings were free to be estimated (Kunan 1998, 301). A line with one arrow in the figure represents a hypothesized direct relationship between two variables, and a line with arrows at both ends indicates a correlation relationship. The measurement variables chosen for ethnocentrism were somewhat different. Two variables, the items 16 and 17, had the highest loadings on the factor (0.73, 0.72), but when these two variables were included in the model, a default model could not be obtained; therefore, the three other measures of the items 15, 12, and 18 were chosen to represent the ethnocentrism factor.

**The Goodness of Fit Indices**

The fit indices for the hypothesized model showed a fair fit to the data. GFI (Goodness-of-fit) was .953, and AGFI (Adjusted Goodness-of-fit) was 0.937, which indicated satisfactory fit. The Chi - square ratio divided by degrees of freedom was 1.94, and this also indicated a fair fit of the model. The three factors were revealed significant affecting language proficiency; ethnocentrism, motivation intensity and confidence. The regression weights were -.25, .40, and .20, respectively.

Motivation intensity also had a significant, but negative path from ethnocentrism and the parameter estimate was -.21. Confidence had negative paths from ethnocentrism, anxiety and motivation intensity: -.19, -.23, -.12 respectively. The effect of motivation intensity on confidence was negative (-.12).

In addition to the significant causal relationships among the factors, correlational relationships were also found in the model. Integrative orientation was highly and positively correlated with instrumental orientation (.54). Ethnocentrism had a negative correlation with integrative orientation and instrumental orientation, (.51 and -.56 respectively). No significant relationship was found between ethnocentrism and anxiety; but anxiety was negatively correlated with integrative orientation (-.22).

---

12 “Default model” means an initial model ready for model estimation.
13 Goodness-of-fit (GFI) indices are generally formulated to range in value from 0 (no model fit) to 1.0.
14 Weaton, Muthen, Alwin, and Summers (1977) suggest a ratio of less than 5 is an adequate fit while others like Stage (1990) recommend that a ratio of 2.5 or less for the Chi-squared statistic and degrees of freedom ratio is an indication of model fit.
4. DISCUSSION

4.1. The Learners’ Desired Motivation and Desirable Motivation

Perhaps the most notable result of this study is that the effects of the two types of orientation (integrativeness and instrumentality) on language proficiency were not significant. The findings in pilot study and preliminary study were confirmed in this study. The indirect effect of such orientations implied in Gardner’s model (1985) on language proficiency was not found in this study. Even motivation intensity was not affected by these two types of orientations.

In contrast, the results related to confidence and motivation intensity (conceptualized as effortful behavior) supported Gardner’s (1985); Clément, et al’s (1980) models. The negative effect of ethnocentrism on language proficiency was significant, and implying that ethnocentrism must be interpreted as a noteworthy factor in this context. Anxiety was another noteworthy factor and had a negative effect on linguistic confidence. This result supported
Clément, et al’s model that linguistic confidence could be operationally defined as low anxiety and a perception of L2 competence. However, no direct effect from anxiety to language proficiency was found in this study, in contrast to the findings of past studies on anxiety.

This study revealed is a complex nature of the psycho-educational model at a Japanese cultural context. Hofstede (1980) points out that very little consensus have been made among researchers regarding values and beliefs, and construct validity of measurements of values and beliefs is unfortunately low. According to Hofstede’s interpretation, when an individual holds a value, the issue involved has a certain relevance for that person (intensity) and certain outcomes as good and others as bad (direction). In other words, values and beliefs have two aspects to measure. Hofstede takes this step further by distinguishing between values that are the “desired” and “desirable”: what people actually desire versus what they ought to desire. Although the two are not independent, they should not be equated which could lead to a gap between reality and social desirability.

Applying Hofstede’s perspective to the findings of this study, the “intensity” and “direction” of the affective factors focused on in this study should not be equated. The learners had positive perception toward learning English but such high direction is shows as a surface value, which is socially acceptable. English is one of the most crucial subjects in many areas including entrance examinations, job hunting, and students’ future careers. Many students constantly feel social pressure to acquire English, however, the pressure is not seriously affecting their lives. Therefore, Integrative and instrumental orientations are labeled as “desirable motivation” following Hofstede’s (1980) characterization. On the other hand, the motivation intensity factor significantly affected the learners' language proficiency, thus this is interpreted as a value with intensity and can be categorized as a “desired motivation.”

Linguistic confidence is a characteristic of learners who have achieved a certain goal. Learners desire to acquire the language and their desired motivation, which develops self-confidence, is demonstrated in their behavior: successful language performance. Only learners with desired motivation can reach the goal and self-confidence is a product of their value with intensity. Their confident attitude will be beneficial in their further language learning, while learners having only the desirable motivation which does not go along with their behavior will probably not reach their goal. Internationalization and globalization have been buzzwords in English education in Japan for the last two decades. These words were subconsciously integrated in learners' awareness as desirable values that everyone acknowledges, but the present research shows that such awareness (desirable motivation)
does not produce a desirable outcome in language learning. This study shows that motivation intensity (*desired motivation*) is more influential than ethnocentrism affecting language proficiency. Interestingly, the impact of motivation intensity on linguistic confidence was negative. This was interpreted that under the condition that the learners have desired motivation, the harder and the more seriously the learners study, the less they feel confident about their own language competence. Their views toward their own competence become modest and humble which is a reflection of Japanese virtue of emphasizing modesty and humbleness.

4.2. The Dichotomous View of English

An interdisciplinary interpretation of the findings in this study develops the following argument. The dichotomy view which splits the world into two spheres, Japan and the West has been prevalent as cultural nationalism in Japan assuming that the spiritual, moral, and cultural life of the Japanese should not be corrupted by foreign influences no matter how much Japan’s material way of life may be affected by them (Sugimoto 1997, 169). The cultural nationalism develops into the dichotomous view of language; English or Japanese, one way or another, the two languages are weighed against each other. That is, the linguistic nationalist claims that the more Japanese master English, the more they become culturally rootless or lose “Japaneseness” (Fujiwara 2004).

In much of the nationalistic literature of the 1970s, race, language, and culture were defined synonymous, resulting in what one Japanese critic calls a “unitary ethnic nation, intolerant of alien elements, constitutionally unable to accept the existence of different kinds of Japanese” (Nakanishi 1988: 21; McConnell 2000: 15). The definition of Japaneseness by the Japanese is one dimensional, focusing on biological race and a sharing of the same language and culture is still deeply penetrated in Japanese society (Befu 2001). As a conclusion, English that is considered as a tool to transmit the Western values and beliefs, Japanese ethnocentric beliefs and values influence English language learning. Spolsky (2004) argues that a monolingual country usually comes to see its language as threatened from the outside and supranational policies for language rights often appear in order to save the weakened language in the competition with the powerful language. The findings of this study on ethnocentrism are supported by Spolsky’s theory and language policy at each country cannot be detached from any other topics in foreign language learning.

Positive and negative views of Japanese language are frequently heard interchangeably in the midst of globalization, and the distinctiveness of Japanese language in contrast with English is emphasized in the discourse (Kubota 2002). The discourse has been actively developed by
educators and language policy makers, and Japanese learners are keenly aware of the socio-cultural environment surrounding them. Learners feel ambivalent toward learning English and their perceptions swing like a pendulum between their own desired motivation and desirable motivation.

One more point that needs to be discussed is that male students accounted for the majority of the participants in all studies conducted (75% for the pilot study, 73% for the preliminary study, 72% for the principal study). According to Hofstede’s dimension of cultural scales, Japan ranked highest among 38 countries in Masculinity index. Masculinity was defined as “assertiveness and competitiveness” and the findings in this study imply that the hypothesized model might fit better to Japanese men with low English language proficiency. Simon-Maeda (2004) describes the severe gender bias in TEFL in Japan in her narrative inquiry and she discloses female English teachers’ antagonistic positions at their male-dominated work places. At the university and junior college level in Japan, women still make up only 13.5% of full-time faculty positions despite of female students account for the majority students majoring in English literature (Simon-Maeda 2004). Incorporating western beliefs and values along with English might be able to be interpreted as a serious threat to their male chauvinistic national identity and face saving to keep their national pride. As a summary, this study reveals that ethnocentrism plays a negative role in English learning and concludes that the low English proficiency of Japanese is interpreted as the socio-cultural product.
Appendix 1

(Integrative Orientation)
V1.1. I would like to communicate with foreigners in English.
V1.2. I am interested in foreign music and culture.
V1.3. I would like to make as many foreign friends as possible.
V1.4. I would like to visit as many foreign countries as possible.
V1.5. I would like to understand other countries’ values and thought.

(Instrumental Orientation)
V2.6. English is essential for personal development.
V2.7. English is essential to be active in society.
V2.8. English broadens possibilities in my future.
V2.9. English is necessary to get a good job.
V2.10. I would like to acquire some sorts of qualification or certificate in English.

(Ethnocentrism)
V3.11. I often feel that I am Japanese.
V3.12. Since I live in Japan, a foreign language is not necessary.
V3.14. It will not be very inconvenient even if I can’t speak English.
V3.15. Japan is an economically advanced country so Japanese should be one of the international languages.
V3.18. Foreigners do not understand Japanese thinking.

(Anxiety)
V4.19. I am not good at expressing myself even in Japanese.
V4.20. I can express my own opinions even about difficult topics.
V4.21. I tend to be nervous when speaking in front of people.
V4.22. I don’t like to talk to strangers.
V4.23. I tend be nervous when asked questions in the classroom.
V4.24. I tend to be nervous when speaking English in the classroom.
V4.25. I would be nervous if I spoke to foreigners.
(Linguistic Confidence)
V5.26. I can speak English without worrying about mistakes.
V5.27. I can write English without worrying about mistakes.
V5.28. I find memorizing English vocabulary easy.
V5.29. I find writing English easy.
V5.30. I find listening to English easy.
V5.31. I find understanding English grammar easy.
V5.32. I find reading English easy.

(Motivation Intensity)
V6.33. I studied English very hard at high school.
V6.34. How many hours a week did you study English this semester?
V6.35. How many hours a week did you study for the English reading class this semester?
V6.36. How many hours a week did you study for the English listening class this semester?
V6.37. I think I have studied English hard this semester.
V6.38. I believe if I study English hard, I will acquire the language.
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