Training Japanese university English learners for greater autonomy

Paul A. Lyddon
University of Aizu

Reference data:
Lyddon, P. A. (2011). Training Japanese university English learners for greater autonomy. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

To acquire sufficient English proficiency for academic and professional purposes, most Japanese high school graduates would need a far greater number of study hours than university language programs can typically provide. Consequently, they should be autonomous and self-directed in their language learning if they hope to attain an advanced level. This paper provides an evaluation of a 15-week content-based university elective course designed specifically to promote this type of learner autonomy. Following a detailed description of the course goals, structure, and implementation, the learner outcomes are analyzed and discussed. Finally, suggestions are made for improving this specific training model and adapting it to other university settings.

現在、日本国内の大学が英語教育に割ける時間は、理想をはるかに下回るもので、授業を介するだけでは、上級レベルの英語が習得できるとは言い難い。そのため、その学習目標を達成するには大学生の自主的かつ自律的な学習を促進する必要が求められる。　本稿では、学生の自律学習の促進を目的に作られた、15週間に及ぶコンテンツベースの選択科目について、多方面からの分析を試みる。まず、コースの到達目標、構造、実行方法を論じた後、学生の自律学習に対する考え方および理解度に変化が見られたかを検討する。最後に、これらの分析を元に、このトレーニングモデルにおける改善策を検討、また、他大学への応用の可能性を示唆する。

Since the mid-1990s, Japanese universities have shown a growing movement toward replacing generic English courses with ones targeting specific disciplines (Anthony, 1998; Hajime, Yamauchi, Noguchi, & Sasajima, 2010). To effectively use a language for academic and professional purposes, however, students generally need a level of proficiency equivalent to a B2 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001). In terms of TOEIC scores, this level corresponds to a 400 in listening, 385 in reading, 160 in speaking, and 150 in writing (Tannenbaum & Wylie, 2007). Yet first-year university students in Japan respectively average only 228 and 184 in listening and reading (Educational Testing Service, 2010b) and 84.1 and 94.3 in speaking and writing (Educational Testing Service, 2010a). Thus, on the basis of these numbers, they would need an estimated 1,000 additional study hours to reach the given targets (Prolingua Executive Language Services, 2000), whereas most university learners receive only a fraction of this amount of time in class. As such, if they hope to ever attain such an advanced level of English, clearly they will have to supplement their in-class instruction with other learning opportunities, but to do this they first need to be autonomous in this regard.

Benson (2011) defines learner autonomy as "the *capacity* to take control of one's own learning" (p. 58, emphasis added). Thus, in keeping with this definition, being autonomous does not mean teaching oneself, nor does it even necessarily entail a change in behavior (though most teachers might hope for one). Holliday (2003) goes so far as to argue that everyone is autonomous in his or her own way but that learner autonomy is often invisible to teachers, who may be blinded by their own professional agendas. Granted, learner autonomy is much more clearly evident in extracurricular learning, which ordinarily involves little or no formal instruction (e.g., learning to play a new video game or use the latest smartphone application). As Oxford (2003) points out, however, autonomy requires a sense of agency. In other words, learners must feel that their actions can effectively help them realize their goals or intentions. Moreover, this feeling may be lost in cases of perceived disconnect between the classroom and the outside world.

Ideally, the domain of learner autonomy should encompass all learning decisions, including objectives, scope and sequence, methods and techniques, locations and schedules, and outcome evaluations (Holec, 1981). However, students do not become autonomous in their academic endeavors simply because the teacher turns the responsibility for learning over to them. To illustrate this, in her study of high-achieving Japanese university English learners, Usuki (2007) found that while all of them expressed awareness of personal responsibility for their own learning, greater sustained language growth was shown by those who had clear long-term goals as well as metacognitive awareness of their motivation and strategies for and the means of achieving them. Moreover, although Smith (2003) describes the successful implementation of a nearly ideal, "strong" version of pedagogy for autonomy in a Japanese tertiary setting, many university instructors such as myself must submit a detailed syllabus including a clear evaluation scheme for every course well in advance of student registration and, therefore, are not at liberty to negotiate these items after the start of classes.

Thus, it was with these ideas and constraints in mind that I developed the learner training course described below. The main purpose of this paper is to reflect on and evaluate the overall efficacy of the course as a whole while suggesting ways of improving this specific model and possibly adapting it to other university settings. Additionally, however, I hope to provide sufficient details of the course context, goals, structure, and implementation so that tertiary-level language educators at other institutions will have a means of comparison with their own situations by which to draw their own particular insights and conclusions.

Learner training course description

General background

The school where I teach is a small, predominantly male prefectural university in southern Tohoku, devoted entirely to computer science and engineering. All students there must write and orally defend a research thesis in English as one of their graduation requirements, ideally at the end of their fourth year. When they arrive, most of these students would be classified as CEFR A1 (beginner) in speaking and A2 (elementary) in listening, reading, and writing. In their first two years of enrollment, they complete a standard programmatic sequence in listening and reading (both skills in one course, 90 minutes per week for four 15-week semesters) and another in speaking and writing (both skills in one course, 90 minutes per week for three 15-week semesters). Additionally, they must take a minimum of five advanced English elective hours, or three courses, which are only available to those in their third year or above. However, after teaching thesis writing and presentation to second-semester seniors in Fall 2009 and finding most of them far from adequately prepared for the monumental task they faced, I discovered that the majority did very little English study out-

side the 225 contact hours they received in their classes. While a lack of motivation could not be ruled out in some cases, another plausible explanation for these students' insufficient efforts was an inability to concretely imagine the gap in their skill level and the time commitment necessary to close it.

As such, the course I developed for the following spring was a 90-minute-per-week, 15-week, 2-credit English elective, organized around Scharle & Szabó's (2000) four major themes of motivation, learning strategies, community building, and self-monitoring. Moreover, in accordance with this same model, I divided my instruction into three separate phases designed to raise learner awareness and promote changes in attitudes and greater acceptance of learning responsibility. The maximum class size was then set at 30 seats, for which 27 students (25 males, 2 females) enrolled, including 11 third-year students, 14 fourth-year students, 1 fifth-year student, and 1 sixth-year student. Like most Japanese university learners, they had all completed six years of compulsory English education in junior high and high school. Since high school graduation, they had also satisfied my university's basic seven-course requirement (157.5 instructional hours) in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, although a few students in their fourth year and above had taken up to an additional 45 lesson hours in electives. Two students had spent three weeks auditing computer science courses at a partner school in the United States in the spring one year prior, but otherwise merely a few others had been outside Japan for as long as one week, and then only on family vacations. Moreover, not one was enrolled in private English classes. Although their English had certainly improved since their arrival at university, the majority would still be characterized as A2 (elementary) in all skills. In other words, they could communicate "in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 74). Below is a week-by-week description of the content and activities of the learner training course they took.

Preliminary lessons

Week 1: Introductory lecture

I began the first class by giving the learners the final exam question, which was "How have you become a more autonomous learner over the course of this semester?" For their eventual response I then asked them to prepare both a full-page reflective essay and a 2-3 minute oral explanation. The phrasing of the question was designed to allow for changes in awareness and attitudes without assuming modifications of observable behavior. In other words, it was aimed at eliciting evidence of increased capacity for control, whether or not that capacity was actually exercised. I had hoped that providing the students with the exam question at the beginning of the course would facilitate the making of connections with each lesson, although that aim was only partly achieved. The objectives of the first lesson were to define learner autonomy and explain its importance and to discuss the characteristics of autonomous learners. As a precursor to the lesson on motivation in Week 3, for homework, I assigned the students to write an essay of at least one half-page on either a past English class they liked or one they did not.

Week 2: Background assessment

In the second week, the lesson theme was the influence of learner beliefs and attitudes on learning behaviors. As a basis for discussion, the learners completed a modified version of Horwitz's (1987) Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) as well as an in-house locus-of-control measure (see Appendix 1). For homework, I gave them the LinguaFolio Self-Assessment Grid (National Council of State Supervisors for Languages, 2011) and asked them to download and complete the Checklists that accompany it. The Assessment Grid provides global descriptions of novice, intermediate, and advanced ability (with three sub-levels each) in listening, read-

ing, person-to-person communication, spoken production, and written production, approximately corresponding to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. The Checklists contain "can-do" statements of specific abilities exemplifying each proficiency level. The purpose of these assignments was to provide the learners with a clearer idea of their current abilities so they could begin to set clear goals.

Phase 1: Raising awareness

Week 3: Motivation

The first of the three phase cycles began in Week 3, when the theme was motivation. To raise awareness in this regard, the lesson focused on the constituent factors of Dörnyei's three-level framework of L2 motivation (as discussed in Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2010, pp. 51-53), with a 20-item anonymous in-house motivation survey (see Appendix 2) providing a springboard for class discussion. Interestingly, the majority of students indicated that they enjoyed studying English, they would study it even if it were not required, and they thought English would help them find a better job. On the other hand, they also signaled that they often thought other students spoke English better than they did and that they would rather say nothing in class than make a mistake.

For homework, the learners were asked to download and complete the LinguaFolio Passport (a summary of language study history and a summary of the checklist results from the previous week) as well as take at least one of several recommended, publicly available online language assessments and write a brief summary of the reasons for their choice of instrument. The purpose of these assignments was to encourage the learners to begin keeping records of their work as well as to help them notice any potential discrepancies with their self-evaluations.

Week 4: Learner strategies

In the fourth week, the lesson objective was to raise learners' awareness of their own strategy use and of the different categories of strategies conceptualized by Oxford (1990). The main activity that week was the completion and discussion of a Japanese version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Iwasaki, 2006). For homework, the students were asked to complete the LinguaFolio Biography (a journal of language learning experiences, including strategy use) as well as try out a new strategy and write a brief summary of their experience.

Week 5: Community building

The fifth lesson centered on the importance of community building and on ways to achieve it. The students first played a board game to get to know their classmates better face-to-face, then explored the online community of *How to Learn any Language* (Micheloud, 2009). Their homework was to download and complete the LinguaFolio Dossier (a list of language learning artifacts) as well as post entries to two separate Moodle forums, one for recommending a language learning strategy and the other for suggesting a resource.

Week 6: Self-monitoring

The sixth lesson focused on the meaning and importance of self-monitoring. As a demonstration of self-monitoring, I showed the students a split-page note-taking technique, whereby I had them fold a sheet of notebook paper lengthwise, making factual notes on the left side and recording personal reflections on the right. Their homework was to download an in-house learning log that had been presented in class (see Appendix 3) and to record their English study activities for the next week. The purpose of this assignment was to sensitize them to the amount

of study they actually did so that later they could realistically evaluate its adequacy for attaining their goals.

Phase 2: Changing attitudes

Week 7: Motivation (revisited)

In the seventh lesson, I revisited motivation, but my focus now shifted from raising awareness to changing attitudes. Specifically, the main points were 1) the importance of setting goals that are easy enough to achieve but challenging enough to have value, and 2) the need to determine learning objectives, find and choose learning materials, set a realistic timeframe, set concrete tasks, and log progress. The homework was to download an in-house short-term goal progress log that had been presented in class (see Appendix 4) and to set and monitor a language learning goal to achieve by the end of the month.

Week 8: Learner strategies (revisited)

Beginning in the eighth week, the instruction on learner autonomy per se became decidedly less didactic as I now encouraged the learners to apply their knowledge of the subject to a practical goal, namely the mastery of grammatical voice, or expression of the relationship of the subject to the verb, a difficult but essential feature of the type of academic writing they would eventually need to do for their graduation thesis. The teacher-fronted portion of the lesson consisted only of a live demonstration of a computerized module on the grammatical concept of agency, or the quality of being able to cause or initiate an event. The students were then assigned to download and run the agency tutorial on their own, to re-write a passage from the tutorial in the passive voice, and to post a Moodle forum entry on a personal strategy for learning grammatical passivization.

Week 9: Community building (revisited)

In the ninth week, the learners were presented with another computerized module, this time related to the concept of animacy, or the degree to which an entity is capable of conscious action. Their assignment was then to download and run the animacy tutorial on their own as well as read and reply to at least three of their classmates' strategies for learning passivization from the previous week's Moodle forum.

Week 10: Self-monitoring (revisited)

In Week 10, the learners saw one final computerized module, this time on transitivity, or the association between a verb and a direct object. For their assignment, they were then asked to download and run the transitivity tutorial, taking notes according to the split-page technique demonstrated in class in Week 6: on the left side of a clean sheet of paper, writing the most important details; then, on the right, after every fifth screen or so, writing reflections such as connections with previous knowledge and experiences, a summary of understanding, and remaining questions.

Phase 3: Transferring roles

Weeks 11-14: Motivation, learner strategies, community building, self-monitoring (as appropriate)

For the remaining third of the course, the use of the lesson time was largely turned over to the students. In Week 11, I began the class with a user survey to obtain feedback on the online modules on grammatical voice, after which I presented the learners with a long-term goal planning model. Their assignment was, by the end of the course, to create a plan for achieving their long-term language learning goals as well as write the reflective essay that had been announced on the first day of class. During

this four-week period, the learners then worked individually or in groups to develop their learning plans, consulting with me as necessary.

Week 15: Oral interviews

In the final week, the learners submitted their learning plans and essays and then sat for their interview, in which they orally explained how they had become more autonomous over the course of the semester.

Learner outcomes

Oral interview findings

The oral interviews were recorded and then transcribed and coded by me for examples of each of the four themes on which the course had focused. Single and multiple references to the same theme were counted equally as one token for each interview as some students telegraphically listed a great number of strategies whereas others went into more detail on just a few. Furthermore, the themes of motivation, community building, and self-monitoring even seem to lend themselves more to a single invocation followed by elaboration. In short, my main interest was whether each theme was mentioned at all by each student.

The results showed an overwhelming amount of relative attention to strategies (12 interviews, or 92.3%). Motivation was mentioned slightly less than half as often (5 interviews, or 38.5%), and community building and self-monitoring only appeared in one interview each (7.7%). Unfortunately, many students struggled to talk even for two minutes, and the thoughts they tried to express were not always easy to interpret. However, I felt this exercise was necessary even if difficult for their speaking proficiency level as my experience had taught me that without some other means of accountability I might otherwise find myself marking largely machine-translated essays in the end. While I have had students in the past who presented thoroughly planned speeches, any translation has at least always appeared to be their own.

Written statements

As expected, the content of the reflective essays corresponded closely to the oral interviews, with strategies once again represented 92.3% of the time. One additional student mentioned motivation, bringing its total to 46.2%, and two others discussed self-monitoring, bringing that total to 23.1%. However, community building was still only referenced by the one student who talked about it in his interview. While the language use is still far from target-like, I think the following unedited excerpts of five representative papers give a rich picture of the type of learner development I witnessed. (The accompanying author names are pseudonyms.)

> When professor gave an idea that planning of study, I thought It was useful to doing my translation problem in seminar. Dividing a book in small section or more smaller part of a few pages, setting work per hour or day or week, and making final goal, these planning kept my motivation…. Recording study also made me feel sense of accomplishment the work. Recently I reached my goal. — Daisuke

> I think that abilities grow by used in life…. I think necessary this sense I learning of English. Then, I joined web interesting community by English for myself. I peeped at the open source community of Google by way of experiment. Motivation rose naturally because information on interested topic in me entered. Moreover, I joined forum.

That was very interesting because that is not exist information in Japan. —Ryōta

I have to know my current English skills by myself, but it's hard to measure them exactly by myself. Communications with [two international students who joined my lab this semester] is a one of the indicator to know them. I therefore easily made myself to use English and got motivation continuously. In this case, to become more autonomous or not was whether making the most of the English speaking environment or not. —Shōhei

I've think motivation. My plan was so vague in many case. All of this case I never finished what I've started. This course teach me that I'll have a higher motivation if I fix any clearly short-goals. I just have to take it one step at a time. —Takahiro

First of all, I checked my English study time per week in class. As a result, I noticed that my English study time is not enough to be able to speak, read, hear, and write English…. About hearing and writing, I thought that if we want to continue learning English long time, we must make the connection between study and hobby. So I watched American animation to learn hearing and writing. —Kazuki

Although the first four of these statements come from students who had also explicitly mentioned motivation in their interview, here even the one from Kazuki, who had not, refers to it implicitly in the conditional statement, "if we want to continue learning English long time". Moreover, it is clear from these examples that strategy use can be as important to motivation as it is to actual language learning itself.

Discussion

Overall course evaluation

On one hand, by the end of the course, all students who completed it reported new strategy use and/or independent study activities (e.g., pleasure reading of journal articles or web pages in English, participation in online English-using communities, listening to Anglophone music). Moreover, the majority explicitly expressed awareness of the need for greater language learning autonomy and showed a change in attitude toward their roles as learners.

On the other hand, although all four themes of strategy use, motivation, community building, and self-monitoring shared equal time in the instruction, the latter two were much less frequently mentioned by the learners in their final oral interviews and written essays. While the themes of strategy use and motivation may somehow have been more salient or comprehensible to the learners or perhaps simply easier for them to articulate, another possibility is that many learners just did not value community building and self-monitoring as highly or even at all. Thus, more work will need to be done to determine whether learners are indeed conscious of such preferences or whether my current pedagogical approach is merely ineffective in conveying the full multi-faceted view of autonomy intended.

Unfortunately, of the 27 who enrolled in the course, only 13 actually finished, 12 earning credit. Thus, it is possible that only those who were the most autonomous to begin with pursued the course until the end. In fact, it is true that those scoring on the external end of the locus-of-control scale had a higher tendency to disenroll themselves. Another predictor of course attrition, however, was the self-assessment grids, especially the listening, where the mode rating for students who continued was Intermediate Low, as opposed to Novice High for those who withdrew. It also bears mentioning that 8 of the 12 students who successfully

completed the course were scheduled to graduate at the end of the year and, hence, might have had a stronger sense of needing credit. In any case, ironically, a course in learner autonomy many not appeal to those who stand to benefit most, and the results obtained above may not apply to them.

It must also be remembered that learner autonomy is really a *capacity* to take control of one's own learning and not necessarily a change in behavior. As such, with no follow-up after the end of the course, it is impossible even to determine whether it truly had a short-term effect on the study habits of the few who were exposed to it.

As the purpose of this study was to determine whether offering the described course on learner autonomy had any merit whatsoever, I would conclude that that objective was indeed met and that the answer is affirmative, at least in my own particular setting. As Benson (2011) rightly notes, however, general research questions such as whether a learner training course is effective in fostering autonomy are really too broad to provide definitive answers. Thus, specific elements of the learning context will need to be explicitly considered in future to make the findings replicable.

Limitations of the described training model

Though the learner training course presented above showed some qualified signs of success, a few additional limitations need bearing in mind. The first of these is the late stage of implementation, namely as a course for third-year students, who have less than half the time to make up the difference between their classroom instruction hours and the study hours needed to reach their proficiency goals if they hope to use their language ability to help their job search prospects.

Another weakness is that a great deal of time was spent communicating the pedagogical rationale and course goals because the majority of the instruction was conducted in English. One way of devoting less time to lecture and more to application might be to provide native language explanations of some of the key concepts (e.g., self-monitoring) and the assessment instruments (e.g., the motivation survey) when the teaching of metacognitive language is not one of the course goals.

A further limitation is that only one section of the course is currently offered, once a year. In concrete terms, in the current situation, even in a larger classroom, at a maximum only 50 students out of a possible 250 in any given graduating class, or 20%, would ever have the opportunity to take advantage of it. Unfortunately, because of bureaucratic and political constraints, neither lobbying for an additional required course nor persuading a meaningful number of colleagues to give up their own chosen electives would be an easy task.

In short, training university students in learner autonomy by means of a third-year elective class is clearly not a panacea for helping them all reach an advanced level of English proficiency before graduation. However, one might also argue that for those lacking the ability to institute programmatic change, empowering even a few is preferable to none at all.

Possibilities for improvement and wider application

Unfortunately, many instructors do not even have the luxury of dedicating an entire course to learner autonomy. In either case, one option would be to create online modules, making the course available to all students from the start of their first year. The online course could be introduced during freshman orientation or as part of a single lesson in a communication skills class. One drawback to this approach is that students may need an incentive to get started and continue their efforts, and it may be difficult at some institutions to award formal course credit and/or find personnel willing to mentor these students on top of

their normal course load. In an optimal situation, however, once these issues are resolved, offering an elective course of the type described here would provide teachers and learners both with a checkpoint at which to assess the efficacy of the program.

Alternatively, and perhaps ideally, rather than (or in addition to) offering a dedicated training course, instructors could foster some degree of learner autonomy in all their classes, such as by allowing choices of activities and assignments and encouraging reflection on them. Other possibilities range from having them hand out materials and collect papers to letting them decide classroom procedures and evaluate their own and other students' performance (cf. Scharle & Szabó, 2000, p. 101, for a list of further examples).

Conclusion

In light of the number of study hours most Japanese learners entering university would still need in order to reach an advanced level of English proficiency by the time they leave school, it is clear that much of their learning will have to take place outside the classroom for them to be successful. Before they can act on this challenge, however, first they must have the capacity to take control of their language learning in all respects. The training course described in this paper is simply one attempt to address this issue, but I hope that others who are similarly interested in the topic of learner autonomy will gain insights from my work and contribute their own ideas and solutions to the discussion as well.

Bio data

Paul Lyddon is an assistant professor in the Center for Language Research at the University of Aizu. His main interests are computer-assisted language learning, intercultural communication, learner autonomy, motivation, and assessment. <palyddon@u-aizu.ac.jp>

References

Anthony, L. (1998). Defining English for specific purposes and the role of the ESP practitioner. In T. Orr (Ed.), *Center for Language Research 1997 Annual Review* (pp. 115-120). Aizuwakamatsu: University of Aizu.

Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy (2nd ed.)*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/Framework_EN.pdf>

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2010). *Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.)*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Educational Testing Service. (2010a). *TOEIC speaking and writing tests data and analysis 2009: Number of examinees and average scores in FY2009*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from <http://www.toeic.or.jp/toeic_en/pdf/data/TOEIC_SW_DAA2009.pdf>

Educational Testing Service. (2010b). *TOEIC test data and analysis 2009: Number of examinees and average scores in FY2009*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from <http://www.toeic.or.jp/toeic_en/pdf/data/TOEIC_DAA2009.pdf>

Hajime, T., Yamauchi, H., Noguchi, J., & Sasajima, S. (Eds.). (2010). *21-seiki no ESP—Atarashii ESP no riron no kōchiku to jissen*. [ESP in the 21st Century: ESP theory and application today]. Tokyo: Taishūkan.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Holliday, A. (2003). Social autonomy: Addressing the dangers of culturism in TESOL. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 110-126). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Horwitz, E.K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-129). New York: Prentice Hall.

Iwasaki, A. (2006). Gakushū sutoratejī no kenkyū: Gakushūsha no shūjukudo to gakushū sutairu to no kanrensei no kōsatsu—EFL joshi daigakusei o taishō toshite— [Learning strategy research: On the link between the language proficiency and learning styles of female university EFL learners]. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Bulletin*. Retrieved from <http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki26/iwasaki.pdf>

Micheloud, F. (2009). *How to learn any language: The website about teaching yourself languages*. Retrieved from <http://how-to-learn-any-language.com>

National Council of State Supervisors for Languages. (2011). *LinguaFolio*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncssfl.org/LinguaFolio/index.php?linguafolio_index>

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R.L. (2003). Toward a more systematic model of L2 learner autonomy. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 75-91). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prolingua Executive Language Services. (2000). *TOEIC info*. Retrieved from <http://www.prolingua.co.jp/toeic_e.html>

Scharle, Á. & Szabó, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, R.C. (2003). Pedagogy for autonomy as (becoming-) appropriate methodology. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 129-146). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tannenbaum, R.J., & Wylie, E.C. (2007). *Mapping the TOEIC and TOEIC Bridge tests on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Usuki, M. (2007). *Autonomy in language learning: Japanese students' exploratory analysis*. Nagoya: Sankeisha.

Appendix 1

Language Learning Locus of Control Survey

Directions: For each statement below, circle the number of the response (1-5) that best matches your personal feelings:

1- とてもそう思う
2- そう思う
3- どちらともいえない
4- あまりそう思わない
5- 全くそう思わない

1) 子供の頃に覚えたり、長く外国に住んだりしたような経験がないと、英語がとても上手になる可能性は少ない。
1 2 3 4 5

2) 英語の試験の結果が良かったときは、試験が簡単だった、または採点が甘かったからだ。
1 2 3 4 5

3) 私の英語が上手になるかどうかは、自分次第だ。
1 2 3 4 5

4) 英語が上手になるためには、英語がとても好きでなければならない。
1 2 3 4 5

5) 英語が上手になるためには、私は充分に勉強する時間がない。
1 2 3 4 5

6) 今私より英語が上手な人は、今後も私より上手だろう。

1 2 3 4 5

7) なぜ私の英語力が足りないかと言うと、前の教師があまりよくなかったからだ。

1 2 3 4 5

8) 私の性格は英語が上手になるのに向いていない。

1 2 3 4 5

9) 英語が上手になる人の多くは、もともと語学の才能があるので一所懸命英語の勉強をしなくても良い。

1 2 3 4 5

10) いくら一所懸命努力しても、絶対に私の英語は上手にならないだろう。

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix 2

English Learning Motivation Survey

Directions: For each statement below, circle the letter of the response (A-D) that best matches your personal feelings.

1. For me personally, learning English has little practical benefit.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

2. I am satisfied with my current level of English.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

3. I can never imagine myself using English for anything important.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

4. I enjoy studying English.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

5. I like to prepare the material for each English lesson before I go to class.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

6. I look for opportunities to use my English outside of class.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

7. I want to learn as much English as possible, even if I won't be tested on it.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

8. I often feel that other students speak English better than I do.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

9. I wouldn't do my English homework if the instructor didn't collect it.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

10. In English class, I'd rather say nothing than take a chance of making a mistake.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

11. I'd be interested in participating in English research studies outside of class.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

12. I'd like to try living in an English-speaking country someday.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

13 I'd rather spend my time on subjects other than English.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

14. I'd study English even if it weren't required.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

15. I'm more interested in foreign cultures than in the English language.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

16. Learning English is a waste of time.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

17. Learning English makes me feel successful.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

18. Learning English well will help me get a better job in the future.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

19. Native English speakers' attitudes make me not want to learn English.
   A) Strongly agree B) Agree
   C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

20. When I make mistakes in English, I often don't understand why.

A) Strongly agree B) Agree
C) Disagree D) Strongly disagree

Appendix 3

Weekly Learning Log

Date	Activity	Time on Task
	Summary: _____ **Reflection:** _____ **Language Notes:**	
	Summary: _____ **Reflection:** _____ **Language Notes:**	
	Summary: _____ **Reflection:** _____ **Language Notes:**	
	Summary: _____ **Reflection:** _____ **Language Notes:**	
	Summary: _____ **Reflection:** _____ **Language Notes:**	

Appendix 4

Short-Term Goal Progress Log

- **Goal:** _____
- **Rationale:** _____
- **Timeframe:** _____ to _____

Date	Min. Spent	Task(s)	Comments