

Cultural Factors in High School Student Motivation to Study Less Commonly Taught Languages

Masako Nunn

California State University, San Bernardino

Abstract

Learning less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) such as Japanese can be challenging for American students. Due to the difficulty of learning LCTLs, more effort is required of the learners to become proficient as compared to European languages. Motivation contributes to the learners' academic success. In the socio-cultural perspective, the learners' cultural background mediates their cognitive process. This study examines the motivational differences and similarities among two culturally diverse groups of high school learners of Japanese: Asians excluding Japanese-Americans and non-Asians. One hundred forty two students completed a survey. Factor analysis yielded six factors: integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation (doing activities for enjoyment), self-efficacy (a belief in one's ability to succeed), goal specificity, and goal strategy. The motivational differences were confirmed in intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy. Implications of these findings for LCTL teachers suggest practical steps that can be taken on motivational factors that influence students from different cultural backgrounds.

Introduction

Learning less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) such as Japanese can be challenging for American students. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) reports the length of time to achieve speaking level 3 for English speakers. Spanish and French take 575-600 class hours. German takes longer 750 class hours. East Asian languages (Japanese, Korean and Chinese) and Arabic are significantly more difficult for English speakers. Amazingly, they take 2,200 class hours, nearly 3.5 times more than Spanish and French. It is in large part because of difficulty in learning the writing system. Due to the difficulty of learning LCTLs such as Japanese, East Asian language researchers (e.g., Saito & Samimy, 1996) emphasize the importance of motivation for learners' academic success.

Unlike other East Asian languages, the recent trend of Japanese language learners is culturally diversified. Recent studies have shown that in the United States, 80% of Japanese language learners had non-Japanese language backgrounds (Schmidt, 2005) whereas only 12% of the Korean language learners had non-Korean language backgrounds (Nunn & Hong, 2007). The concept of considering cultural and ethnic background in the pedagogy contributes to a deep understanding of acquisition of second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) (Iyengar & DeVoe, 2003). Socio-cultural researchers (e.g., Iyengar and DeVoe, 2003) claim that cultural and ethnic differences mediate children's motivational beliefs since the diverse backgrounds of immigrants and their varied degree of acculturation impacts their perspective as well as the motivation for learning FL and SL. Analyzing the learners of LCTLs such as those of the Japanese language with culturally diverse backgrounds is essential in providing a comprehensive understanding in student motivation. It is worthwhile for instructors to investigate what motivates Japanese language learners to create learning models and to explore what influences acquisition (Nunn & Hong, 2007). The purpose of this study is to identify the differences and similarities in two culturally and ethnically diverse groups of high school Japanese language learners in the United States.

Literature Review

Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed the classical theory of language learning motivation which entails two constructs: (a) instrumental orientation and (b) integrative orientation. Instrumental orientation involves learning the target language for a practical purpose in order to gain a benefit from acquiring the target language, such as attaining a better job. The student usually has little interest in the target language's culture (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977). Integrative orientation reflects the "individual's willingness and interest in social interaction with members of other groups" (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993, p. 159); therefore, it stems from a desire to be integrated into the community of the target language.

Debate surrounding motivation theory intensified in the 1990s due in large part to two primary components: First, the incentive to learn a language is too complex to explain with a dichotomous

approach; rather, motivational variables must attend to the multifaceted nature of learning a second language (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Secondly, cultural, psychological, and social aspects of language learning need to be considered (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995). In a study of East Asian language learners, Sung and Padilla (1998) found that the integrative and instrumental items belonged to one factor even though they used Gardner's (1985) orientation items. These studies indicate that the integrative-instrumental motivation approach appeared to be inconsistent; therefore, this dichotomous approach was found to be insufficient by some researchers (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Sung & Padilla, 1998).

In line with the above dichotomous motivational model, Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) created the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation theory. According to them, intrinsic motivation "refers to the motivation to engage in an activity because that activity is enjoyable and satisfying to do, whereas extrinsically motivated behaviors are those actions carried to achieve some instrumental end such as earning a reward or avoiding a punishment" (Nakanishi, 2002, p. 2). They hypothesized that when people are free to choose to perform an activity, they are able to rise to the challenge of the situation and by striving to meet these challenges, develop a sense of competence in their ability. As a result, they enjoy and persist at activities that they have chosen. Katz and Assor (2006) reviewed the value of offering choices in the numerous researches (e.g., Iyengar & Lepper, 2000), when they claim that choice can be either motivating or de-motivating depending upon various settings: "Choice is motivation when the options are relevant to the students' interests and goals (autonomy support), are not too numerous or complex (competence support), and are congruent with the values of the students' culture (relatedness support)" (Katz & Assor, 2006, p.1). Iyengar and Devoe (2003) pointed out that the pursuit of personal choice is invariably mediated by culture. Specifically, Iyengar and Lepper (1999) examined Asian and European-American children (ages 7-9) who were asked to either choose an activity for themselves or be told that someone else would choose for them. The results have shown that European-American students demonstrated less intrinsic motivation when choices were made for them by others than when they made their own choices. Conversely, Asian Americans were mainly motivated and performed

best when a member of in-group (e.g., a parent or the class) chose for them and they did significantly worse when they made the choice for themselves. The above literature suggests that self-choice does not cultivate intrinsic motivation for Asian Americans indicating social and cultural factors should be taken into account when analyzing intrinsic motivation.

Wigfield & Eccles (1992) emphasized the importance of self-efficacy stating that “children’s expectancies and values are assumed to have the most direct effect on their performance, persistence, and choice of achievement tasks” (p. 279). Self-efficacy is referred to as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required in attaining designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). Judgments mean rather explicit judgments, such as having specific skills instead of merely a self-recognition of being good in the subject (Schunk, 1991). Self-efficacy also refers to some type of goal (designated tasks) (Bandura, 1986; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). In the academic domain, “students master school-related tasks, but also have outcome expectations about what grades they might receive on the tasks” (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 89). Based on the above literature, students with high self-efficacy are more likely to choose challenging but attainable tasks, use higher order cognitive strategies on tasks, demonstrate more self-regulation, and achieve higher levels of comprehension so that they set higher goals, expend greater effort and persist longer than those with low self-efficacy (Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Schunk, 1991).

In the previous motivational study with a population of Euro-American students (Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Locke & Latham, 1990; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002), self-efficacy was correlated with academic performance. However, Eaton and Dembo (1997) claimed that the theory of self-efficacy might not be applicable to Asian American students and their achievement. Eaton and Dembo (1997) investigated differences in the motivational beliefs of Asian American ($n = 154$) and non-Asian ($n = 372$) ninth graders. Their research has shown that Asian-American students who tend to have lower self-perception than Euro-American students, set even higher goals for themselves and evaluate their performance against more stringent criteria motivating them to expend additional effort to reach their

goals. Unlike past research supporting lower levels of self-efficacy that produce motivational, affective, and cognitive deficits (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1991), low self-efficacy appears to be a driving force assisting Asian American students to develop their academic performance. Again, as shown in the above literature, a cultural difference mediates self-efficacy between Asian and non-Asian students.

In the context of language learning, the belief that their goal can be achieved influences student effort and persistence in learning (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). A learner's belief about his or her own ability to reach the target level of proficiency directly influences the learner's motivational behavior. Students with high self-efficacy set more challenging and higher goals. From a social cognitive perspective, Locke and Latham (1990) defined goals as "something the individual is consciously trying to attain, but the thing being sought is outside the individual" (p. 7). In other words, students with a goal "tend to experience a higher sense of self-efficacy for attaining it and engage in activities they believe will lead to attainment: attend to instruction, rehearse information to be remembered, expend effort, and persist" (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002, p. 176).

Goal setting is closely related to self-efficacy and one of the most important positive influences on personal goal setting (Locke & Latham, 1990; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). As learners observe goal progress, self-efficacy is substantiated, which in turn conveys improving skills (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Locke and Latham (1990) reviewed a number of studies and meta-analyses of over 100 studies with over 7,000 cases showing that proximal goals and specific goals lead to better performance (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). The goal setting theory suggests that individuals who have challenging, proximal, and specific goals will out-perform those with easy, distant, and non-specific ("do my best") goals (Locke & Latham, 1990; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). However, several studies (e.g., Isogai et al., 2003; Gano-Overway & Dua, 2001; Brandt, 2003; Lee et al., 2003) addressed cultural differences in goal orientation. Roebken (2007) examined student goal orientation in relationship with achievement with the sample of 2,309 college students in Northern California. His study indicated that Asian students rated higher in specific academic goals (e.g., grade and test) than Caucasians.

What causes the inconsistency of the above findings? From a socio-cultural perspective, learners' cognitive processes are significantly influenced by the social interaction and cultural milieu (e.g., Rueda & Dembo, 1995). Students' self-efficacy reflects the influence of psychological processes and social-cultural mediation in learning (Oldfather et al., 1999). According to the above literature, in order to investigate the population of various ethnic backgrounds, the socio-cultural component of language learners must be taken into account in motivational studies. Few studies have investigated the differences of culturally different groups in LCTCs. In this study two culturally different groups are investigated to seek out the differences and similarities in motivation: Asian students, excluding Japanese-Americans, and non-Asian students. Japanese-Americans were excluded in the Asian group, since the Japanese language, as a heritage language for Japanese-Americans, is the target language spoken at home to some degree and could mediate Japanese-Americans' motivation (Fishman, 2001; Sung & Padilla, 1998; Valdes, 2001; Wen, 2011). The research question was then posed to seek out the differences and similarities in motivation between Asian students and non-Asian students in two aspects of learning the Japanese language: 1) how are the six measured motivational variables (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) different or similar between Asian students and non-Asian students? 2) how are these two groups different or similar in intercorrelations among the six measured variables?

Methodology

Participants, Instruments, Data Collection, and Data Analysis

There were 142 high school students enrolled in Japanese language classes in the United States (Hawaii, New York, Texas, and California) who participated in this study in 2006. In this study, subjects were divided into the two major ethnic categories in the Japanese program; Asians ($n = 69$), and non-Asians ($n = 73$). Asians consist of Chinese ($n = 31$), Koreans ($n = 27$), Vietnamese ($n = 7$) and Cambodians ($n = 3$). Non-Asians consisted of the following: Caucasians ($n = 3$).

= 46); Hispanic ($n = 17$), African Americans ($n = 7$) and American Indians ($n = 3$).

The self-reported survey consisted of two parts (see Appendix). Part 1 of the survey consisted of questions about students' demographics and language-related backgrounds: gender, ethnicity, school year, course level, length of time studying Japanese, and a language-related question as to whether or not Japanese is spoken at home.

Part 2 of the survey consisted of 40 items regarding motivational information including: integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy. The motivational information questionnaire used a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), except for intrinsic motivation which used a 5-point Likert scale. Since the National Foreign Language Resource Center/Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center conducted a similar survey using a 5-point Likert scale with a high reliability of internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$), the same scale was adopted for this study. The questions of integrative motivation (items 1 to 6), and instrumental motivation (items 7 to 11) were adapted from motivational research at the University of Kansas (e.g., Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994). The University of Kansas validated these motivational orientations in East Asian languages through face-to-face discussions, telephone conversations, and e-mail correspondences. The questions measuring intrinsic motivation (items 12 to 17) were adapted from the National Foreign Language Resource Center/Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa (Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996). These items were created after a series of large-scale studies in undergraduate level foreign language classrooms between spring 1996 and fall 1997. The questions of self-efficacy consisted of 8 items, 18 through 25. Items 18 to 21 were adapted from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and McKeachie (1991). Items 22 through 25 were selected from Malpass' dissertation (1994). Items 26 through 40 were adapted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995). This section consisted of two parts in goal salience: goal specificity (7 items from 26 to 32) and goal strategy (8 items from 33 to 40). The

polarity of reversed-question items (16, 26, 29, 34, 38, and 40) were adjusted appropriately.

The reliability tests indicated an internal consistency between items for each scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of six factors (integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) were: .82, .80, .82, .95, .70, and .74, respectively.

Results

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the six motivational factors of each ethnic group. As in Table 1, self-efficacy revealed the highest mean with goal specificity as the second highest. Integrative motivation is the third highest mean for non-Asians and goal strategy is the third strongest mean for Asians. Both groups show that integrative motivation is higher than instrumental motivation.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Japanese-American, Asian, and Non-Asian Groups

Factors	Asian ($n = 69$)		Non-Asian ($n = 73$)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Integrative	30.40	7.08	31.47	6.14
Instrumental	26.90	5.06	26.60	5.45
Intrinsic	22.93	4.01	24.85	3.97
Self-efficacy	38.93	10.08	43.91	8.70
Goal specificity	33.47	7.65	34.34	7.77
Goal strategy	30.65	7.64	30.79	9.04

Research Question 1: Motivational Differences between Asian and non-Asian Groups

In order to investigate how the two ethnic groups differ on six motivational factors, *t*-test was administered. The result showed that two factors revealed significant differences demonstrating that non-Asians scored higher than Asians: intrinsic motivation, $t = 1.92$, $p < .05$, and self-efficacy $t = 4.98$, $p < .05$.

Research Question 2: Comparison among the Intercorrelations of Measured Motivations between Asian and non-Asian Groups

Pearson product-moment correlations were also used to compare significant inter-correlations between factors of the two ethnic groups in order to answer the second research question: how each measured variable correlates differently in two ethnic groups. Intercorrelations of six measured variables (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, goal specificity, and goal strategy) for the two ethnic groups are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Intercorrelations of Measured Variables for Asian Students ($n = 69$)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Integrative	--	.57**	.67**	.34**	.44**	.17
2. Instrumental		--	.55**	.51**	.45**	.19
3. Intrinsic			--	.58**	.61**	.22
4. Self-efficacy				--	.49**	.08
5. Goal specificity					--	.32*
6. Goal strategy						--

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Intercorrelations of Measured Variables for Non-Asian Students ($n = 73$)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Integrative	--	.37**	.42**	.38**	.47**	.18
2. Instrumental		--	.46**	.39**	.43**	.28*
3. Intrinsic			--	.60**	.55**	.31*
4. Self-efficacy				--	.35*	-.03
5. Goal specificity					--	.53**
6. Goal strategy						--

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Differing correlations were revealed among the two ethnic groups only in association with goal strategy as in Tables 2 & 3. The Asian group showed distinctive differences from the non-Asian groups in regard to goal strategy associated with other measured motivational variables. The non-Asian group showed significant correlations associated with three motivational variables; integrative, instrumental and goal specificity. On the other hand, the Asian students linked with only one motivational variable, i.e., goal specificity (see Table 2) indicating that goal strategy correlates with the measured variables more in non-Asians than Asians. The differences of correlations revealed in instrumental and intrinsic motivations related with goal strategy. As in Tables 2 and 3, non-Asians showed significant correlations in goal strategy related with instrumental and intrinsic motivations, whereas Asians showed no significant correlations with these motivational variables. This indicates that goal strategy has a significantly positive influence on instrumental and intrinsic motivations. Goal specificity associates significantly with goal strategy in both groups. Unexpectedly, goal strategy did not reveal significant correlation with self-efficacy in both groups, which does not accord with the previous study (e.g., Seijts & Latham, 2005).

Overall, the measured motivational variables (integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, self-efficacy and goal specificity) with the exception of goal strategy, revealed positively significant correlations with other measured motivational variables indicating that they are significant contributors for the Japanese language learning for both ethnic groups.

In summary of the findings, it was remarkable that many of the measured variables did not reveal statistically significant differences in the correlations among the two ethnic groups as the socio-cultural researchers had claimed (e.g., Rueda & Dembo, 1995). This could be because the Asian group consisted of American born participants who were in all probability assimilated into the American culture (e.g., Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner & Cain, 2001). The subgroups of the Asian group (1st, 2nd, 3rd generations, etc.) need to be considered since some studies discovered the significant differences of the motivations among the subgroups of Asians (e.g., Rueda & Chen, 2005). However, differences in motivational beliefs were discovered in this study, specifically in intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy.

Goal strategy shows the different correlations with the measured motivational variables in the two ethnic groups. The findings of this investigation still confirm those of other researchers who examined motivational beliefs and cultural differences (e.g., Bernat, 2004).

Discussion

Results of this study show that both Asian and non-Asian students have great confidence in their ability in learning Japanese (e.g., “I am certain I can master the skills being taught in the Japanese class.”), which can be observed in self-efficacy shown from the highest mean (Table 1) among the measured variables in each group. Non-Asians show higher self-confidence than Asians, even though Japanese is categorized as the most difficult language for English speakers and takes longer class hours compared to European languages. This result implies that both groups, especially non-Asians, have confidence in their ability to do well not only in the Japanese class but also in understanding the complex materials presented by the instructor in the course. This is shown in some question items of the survey, such as in items 18-25 (e.g., “I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the reading for this course; I have no doubts about my ability to do well on exams in this class”).

The students of both ethnic groups have specific goals on what they would like to accomplish in the Japanese course displayed in Table 1 where goal specificity revealed the second highest mean for both groups. Both groups also have clear goals and purposes in learning the Japanese language as indicated in the survey items, e.g., “I have specific plans when it comes to learning Japanese; I know what my purpose of studying Japanese is.” Several researchers (e.g., Eaton & Dembo, 1997; Rueda & Chen, 2005) assumed that Asian-Americans set higher goals for their academic achievement due to family pressure, since in general, Asian parents place a greater importance on their children’s education. However, this study did not reveal the significant difference between Asians and non-Asians. The reason might be the fact that Asians are assimilated to the American culture, since Asian students in this study are all American born. However, further research is needed.

As for integrative and instrumental motivations, as some second language acquisition researchers (Cooke & Schmidt, 1991)

claim: “Integrative motivation has often been held to be a superior support for language learning” (p. 472), the students of both ethnic groups indicated that they learn Japanese with more integrative motivation. Instead of intention beneficial to their future careers, the students learn Japanese to be able to better understand and appreciate the art and literature of Japanese culture and to participate in the culture activities of a Japanese group such as the Obon dance (traditional Japanese dance usually held in summer).

In regards to the differences of motivation between two ethnic groups, there are significant differences in self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation between two ethnic groups. First, as for self-efficacy, non-Asian students show much greater confidence in their capability to do well than that of the Asian students, even though the Japanese writing system is far different for non-Asians than Asians. Non-Asian students tend to expect more and do well on the exams and quizzes in the Japanese class. Studies addressing culturally and ethnically mixed samples (e.g., Oettingen et al., 1994) claimed that Asians underestimate their ability while non-Asians overestimate theirs. Similarly, in this study Asians showed much lower self-confidence in learning Japanese than non-Asians in spite of similarities in writing systems, especially for Chinese speakers. .

Secondly, non-Asian students tend to enjoy learning Japanese more than Asian students. Even though learning Japanese is more challenging for non-Asians than Asians due to the distinctive difference in its writing system and grammar, non-Asians indicate that the Japanese class is a challenge that they enjoy. Also, they like using Japanese language outside of class whenever they have a chance, more so than Asians. Also, non-Asian students expressed that they would take a Japanese class even if it is not required. The reason for this difference is out of scope in this study and could be researched in the future.

As for the differences of two ethnic groups among the inter-correlations, unexpectedly, the unique difference was observed only in goal strategy with other measured variables. Goal strategy in this study refers to a study plan or schedule for the Japanese course and to make an effort to follow the plan. For non-Asians, goal strategy relates positively with intrinsic, instrumental motivations and goal specificity. This implies that making a study plan for learning Japa-

nese enables non-Asians to enjoy learning Japanese more, to be more career oriented, and to have a specific goal for accomplishing tasks, tests, and assignments. As for Asians, making a study plan does not correlate with other measured variables as much as for non-Asians. This indicates even though Asians make a study plan in learning Japanese, it does not always lead to enhancement of their instrumental, integrative motivations, enjoyment of learning Japanese, and self-confidence. Goal strategy, such as making a list of the things the students have to do and making a time schedule of their study, correlates with goal specificity in both ethnic groups. The implication is that with specific study plans, tasks, and assignments, the students would be enhanced with their goals or expectations of the course in Japanese.

In sum, not many differences between two groups were observed in intercorrelations among the measured variables except for goal strategy. Goal strategy did not correlate with integrative, instrumental, intrinsic motivations, and self-efficacy in the Asian group indicating that this variable might not be universal across ethnic groups. Since the study of goal setting was administered for American and European students of learning European languages, the theory of goal setting might be applied dominantly for the population of Americans and Europeans. Surprisingly, goal strategy did not significantly correlate with self-efficacy in both groups, which does not accord with the previous research claiming that self-efficacy has a direct influence on the level of the goal set (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Seijts & Latham, 2005). Further research is needed to investigate the reason(s) for this discrepancy.

Implications and Conclusions

First, the results demonstrate that different ethnic groups differ in types of motivational beliefs which explains their behavior regarding Japanese language acquisition. The differences in motivational belief could result from family cultural background values (Uba, 1994), or socio-economic status and perceptions of and responses to schooling (Ogbu, 1995). The genesis of these motivational orientations was beyond the scope of this study but would be an important focus for future research.

Secondly, the following pedagogical implications can be addressed based upon the findings. As the study by Iyengar and Lepper (1999) has shown, self-made choice enhances the non-Asian intrinsic motivation; therefore, the projects (e.g., cultural topic and cultural comparison) where the students can decide on topics and create dialogues, facilitate the learner's freedom within the curriculum framework in the non-Asian dominant class. However, as socio-cultural researchers (e.g., Katz & Assor, 2006) pointed out, self-made choice may not foster intrinsic motivation for Asian students. Asians performed best when a member of the in-group (e.g., the class), did significantly worse when they made the choice for themselves (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999); therefore, the instructors can assign their tasks or choices, or the Asian students can select from the list in the Asian dominant-class, or the instructor needs to balance the self-choice tasks and the instructor-assigned tasks depending upon the ethnically dominant group in the class.

Even though both groups show high self-efficacy, non-Asians have significantly more confidence in their learning Japanese as in the finding of this study and previous researches (e.g. Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). It is important to give positive feedback often to Asian students in order to enhance their confidence. In order for Asians to develop confidence, especially in speaking skill, the instructors might want to have them demonstrate dialogues with their partners or give a speech in front of the class. Working in pairs, Asians and non-Asians can couple up for oral activities.

As shown in the result of this study, the students respond positively to the specific tasks and activities of learning Japanese so that they are more engaged in the classroom activities. It's also important that the tasks are challenging but achievable in order to enhance the students' self-efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1986). The goal setting theory also suggests the specific goals or tasks (Locke & Latham, 1990; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). In order to enhance the purpose of the students' study, the instructors might be very specific on the challenging but achievable tasks on the assignments, upcoming quizzes, tests, and class activities (vocabulary, new sentence patterns, Chinese characters, etc.). The instructor constantly informs the students about upcoming quizzes or tests, etc., via the campus internet (e.g., Moodle and BlackBoard) so that the students are aware of the

specific plan, goal, and task of the course in the on-going pace. In addition, using the backward design developed by Wiggins and McTighe (1998), the instructors can inform specific items to study for the quizzes and tests. The backward design is the instructional approach to design lesson plans to identify desired outcomes and results. The specific and detailed grammar items, idioms, tasks, classroom activities, etc. are designed in each lesson. In addition, the instructors might benefit students by expressing specific goals for classroom activities, explaining the goal of each lesson before class starts; for example, writing the schedule of each lesson on the board (e.g., grammar items) and upcoming quizzes and tests. In this way, the students clearly see the specific goals, assignments, and accomplishments of each lesson. Providing a detailed course schedule with the syllabus is also recommended. A detailed course schedule means not just the dates and the pages of the lessons, but the dates of the quizzes, tests, and assignments that explain the items they need to study or submit so that the students can make a plan in advance.

The report by Modern Language Association (MLA, 2010) shows that the enrollment of the LCTLs grew between 2006 and 2009: Arabic language (up 46.3%), Korean (up 19.1%), Chinese (up 18.2%), and Japanese (up 10.3%). Additionally, more LCTLs were offered for study in 2009, 35 LCTLs more than in 2006. MLA Executive Director Rosemary G. Feal (2010) said that many American students recognize the importance of LCTLs for the future of the United States. In this sense, the motivational research regarding the socio-cultural perspective in learning LCTLs becomes more important than ever in the American melting pot of cultures. However, since research regarding the socio-cultural perspective in second language acquisition is still predominantly for the populations of Europeans or Americans with commonly taught languages (English as second language, Spanish, French and German), LCTLs are a fore-runner in this field. More research is needed in learning the LCTLs in motivational research from a socio-cultural perspective.

Lastly, in light of the socio-cultural perspective, it is quite possible that these differences may apply, not only to the Japanese language learners, but also to other LCTL students within varying motivational paradigms. Instructors of the rapidly increasing numbers of students of LCTLs need to consider these differences in their ped-

agogy when applying motivational constructs to enhance students' impetus in learning.

References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bernat, E. (2004). Investigating Vietnamese ESL learners' beliefs about language learning. *English Australia Journal*, 21, 40–54
- Brandt, D. M. (2003). Differences in goal orientation and competitive attitudes of community college students: An analysis by generation, gender, race/ethnic background, and family life, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (6), 2159A (UMI No. 3093821), Capella University.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 417–448
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuit: Human needs and the self-determination theory of behavior. *Psychology Inquiry*, 11, 227-26
- Eaton, M. J., & Dembo, M. H. (1997). Differences in the motivational beliefs of Asian American and non-Asian students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 433–440
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 5-12.
- Fishman, J. (2001). 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ronard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 81-89). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC: CA, ERIC. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43(2), 157–194.

- Gano-Overway, L.A., & Duda, J.L. (2001). Personal theories of achievement motivation among African and White main stream American athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 32, 335-354.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, Jr. W., Skinner, D., Cain C. (2001). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Isogai, H., Brewer, B.W., Corneius, A.E., Etnier, J. and Tokunaga, M. (2003). A cross-cultural analysis of goal orientation in American and Japanese physical education students. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 334, 80-93.
- Iyengar S., & Lepper, M. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 349-366.
- Iyengar S., & Lepper, M. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 995-1006.
- Iyengar, S., & DeVoe, S. E. (2003). Rethinking the value of choice: Considering cultural mediators of intrinsic motivation. *The Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 49, 129-174.
- Katz, I., & Assor, A. (2006). *When choice motivates and when it does not*. Available:
<http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10648-006-9027-y.pdf#page->
- Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Socio-cultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 108-124
- Lee, B. (2000). *Cross-cultural comparisons of tasks and ego orientations among Anglo-American, African-American, Chinese-American, and Mexican-American high school athletes*. Dissertation, Florida State University.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Malpass, J. R. (1994). *A structural model of self-efficacy, goal orientation, worry, self-regulated learning, and high-stakes mathematics achievement*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Modern Language Association (December, 2010).

- New MLA survey report finds that the study of languages other than English is growing and diversifying at US colleges and universities.*
http://www.mla.org/pdf/2009_enrollment_survey_pr.pdf.
- Nakanishi, T. (2002). Critical literature review on motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(3).
- Nunn, M. M., & Hong, W. Y. (2007). *Ethnic variation in motivational constructs in East Asian Language learning*. Paper presented at the 10th National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOLCTL).
- Oettingen, G., Little, T. D., Lindenberger, U., & Baltes, P.B. (1994). Causality, agency and control beliefs in East versus West Berlin children: A natural experiment on the role of context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 579–95.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1995). Cultural problems in minority education: Their interpretations and consequences—Part one: *Theoretical background*. *The Urban Review*, 27(3), 189-205.
- Oldfather, P., West, J., White, J., & Wilmarth, J. (1999). *Learning through children's eyes: Social constructivism and the desire to learn*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation in a new key. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 121–160). Mānoa, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. (1991). *The motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ)*. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan.
- Roebken, H., (2007). *Multiple goals, satisfaction, and achievement in university undergraduate education*. (Center for Studies in Higher Education No. CSHE. 2.07).
- Rueda, R., & Chen, B. C. (2005). Assessing motivational factors in foreign language learning: Cultural variation in key constructs. *Educational Assessment*, 10(3), 209–229.
- Rueda, R., & Dembo, M. H. (1995). Motivational processes in learning: A comparative analysis of cognitive and socio-

- cultural frameworks. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Culture, motivation and achievement* (Vol. 9, pp. 255–289). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 239–251.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp. 9–70). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schmidt, S. (2005). Nihongokyoiku *shampoo: Taooka suru ga kushuusha e no taioo* [Japanese Language Education Symposium: How to cope with diverse learners]. Sankei Shimbun [Sankei Newspaper].
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 207–231.
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. H. (2005). Learning versus performance: When should each be? *Academy of Management Executive*, 19, 124–131.
- Sung, H., & Padilla, A. (1998). Student motivation, parental attitudes, and involvement in the learning of Asian languages in elementary and secondary schools. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(2), 205–216.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), 505–518.
- Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and personalities. In J. K. Peyton, D.A. Ronard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC: CA, ERIC. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.

- Wen, X. (2011, Fall). Chinese language motivation: A comparative study of heritage and non-heritage earners. *Heritage Language Journal*, 8(3), 41-66.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, 12, 265-310
- Wigfield, A. & Eccles, J. (2002). *The development of achievement motivation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press
- Wiggins, G., and J. McTighe. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Appendix

Part 1: Student Background Information

Please mark X on the appropriate answer.

1. Gender: Male _____ Female _____
2. What is your ethnic membership?
Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ African-American _____
American Indian _____ Japanese-American _____
Other (specify) _____
3. Year at high school: Freshman ____ Sophomore ____
Junior ____ Senior ____
4. Is Japanese a spoken language among your family members such as parent(s), relatives, siblings or grandparents?
Yes _____ No _____
5. What level are you currently enrolled in Japanese?
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
6. How long have you been studying the Japanese language?

Part 2: Motivation to Learn Japanese

Please circle the number that indicates how well you agree with each of the statements below.

Questions from 1 to 11 and from 18 to 40 have a 1 to 7 scale as follows:

-
- 1: strongly disagree 2: moderately disagree 3: slightly disagree
4: neutral (no opinion) 5: slightly agree 6: moderately agree
7: strongly agree
-

Questions from 12 to 17 have a 1 to 5 scale as follows:

- 1= strongly disagree
2= disagree 3 = neutral or no opinion
4 = agree 5= strongly agree

I am taking a Japanese language class because...

1. I will be able to participate in the cultural activities of a Japanese group.
2. I will be able to meet and converse with more people.

3. I will be able to better understand and appreciate the art and literature of the culture.
4. I will be more at ease with native speakers of Japanese.
5. I want to converse with my friends in Japanese.
6. I want to travel to countries where this language is spoken.
7. I think foreign language study is part of a well-rounded education.
8. I will be a more knowledgeable person.
9. I will need the language for my future career.
10. It will be useful someday to get a job.
11. I will get respect from others if I know a foreign language.
12. I really enjoy learning Japanese very much.
13. My Japanese class is a challenge that I enjoy.
14. When Japanese class ends, I often wish that we could continue.
15. I enjoy using Japanese outside of class whenever I have a chance.
16. I don't like language learning.
17. I would take the Japanese class even if it were not required.
18. I am certain I can master the skills being taught in this class.
19. I am confident I can understand the basic concepts taught in this course.
20. I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the reading for this course.
21. I am confident I can understand the most complex material presented by the instructor in this course.
22. Considering the difficulty of this course, the teacher, and my skill, I am confident I can do well.
23. I expect to do very well on most exams in this class.
24. I have no doubts about my capability to do well on exams in this class.
25. Even when the questions are difficult, I know I can succeed in this class.
26. I don't have any specific plans when it comes to learning Japanese.
27. I have a clear idea of how much Japanese I want to learn.
28. I have a specific goal of how much Japanese I want to learn.
29. I do not know what my purpose of studying Japanese is.

30. I often think of what I want to accomplish in my Japanese course.
31. When it comes to learning Japanese, my goals change all the time.
32. I have planned out well what I want to achieve in my Japanese course.
33. When I study Japanese, I often refer to a goal.
34. I rarely take time to think about my Japanese learning plans.
35. I sometimes ask someone for advice on the best way to learn Japanese.
36. To me it is a great advantage when I have a schedule or a plan for this course in a Japanese class.
37. When I study Japanese, I rarely follow a plan.
38. I don't spend much time thinking about my goals to learn Japanese.
39. I often make a list of the things I have to do in my Japanese course.
40. I rarely follow a time schedule when I study Japanese.