Motivational Differences Between Chinese and Japanese Learners of English as a Foreign Language

Bill Teweles
Long Beach (CA) City College

As part of a longitudinal study conducted at Hunan University, China and Okayama University, Japan, questionnaires aimed at tapping attitudes and motivational levels of two groups of 20 freshmen and sophomores at each university (n = 80) were administered. A slight inclination toward "instrumental" indicators was shown by Chinese learners, while a preference for "integrative" indicators was shown by Japanese learners. A follow-up questionnaire showed that the generally positive attitudes toward the target language (English) indicated in the initial survey were not necessarily supported by a commitment to actually use the language, especially on the part of the Japanese respondents. This parallels Benson's (1991) findings. The rather unimpressive correlation between levels of motivation and performance on written tests, especially when compared to the higher correlation shown on a standardized grammar test (Part II of the CELT), also invites caution against overstating the role of motivation when assessing proficiency in writing and related skills.

中国、Hunan大学と、日本の岡山大学において行われた縦断的研究の一部として、各大学の1年生と2年生それぞれ20名、計80名を対象に、アンケート調査が行われた。中国人学習者は、道具的動機づけが若干強く、日本人学習者では統合的動機づけがより好まれることがわかった。動機の強さを測定するための、フォローアップのアンケートでは、一回めのアンケートで多くの学習者によって示された目標言語（英語）に対する肯定的態度が、特に日本人学習者においては、必ずしも目標言語の積極的使用にはつながらないことがわかった。これは、個人的動機が存在しても、学習者が大学の英語教育を経験するうちに、それはやがて道具的動機づけにとってかわられるというBenson (1991)の指摘を裏づけるものである。北京語話者においては、現在進行中の中国の近代化と英語との間に存在する明らかに重要な関係が安定した道具的動機づけを維持するのに役だっている。特に作文の成績と標準化された文法テスト（CELTのPartII）との間のより高い相関と比較した場合、動機のレベルと作文の成績との相関は低く、このことは作文やそれに関連したスキルの能力を評価する際に、動機が果たす役割に重きをおきすぎてはいけないという警告になっている。

A one-year "matched group" study conducted at Hunan University, a large national university in Changsha, Hunan Province, People's Republic of China and Okayama (National) University in Okayama City, Japan revealed a significant difference between the levels of "instrumental" as opposed to "integrative" motivation reported by two groups of freshmen and sophomores at both universities.[1] Based on the first of a pair of attitudinal questionnaires (See Appendix 1), a slight leaning toward "instrumental" motivation was shown by the Mandarin-speaking freshmen and sophomores, with their Japanese-speaking counterparts being more inclined toward "integrative" motivational indicators. Nevertheless, when a follow-up "motivational intensity scale," based on the one designed by Gardner and Lambert (1972), is taken into consideration, a more negative or distant attitude toward English is shown, particularly on the part of the Japanese freshmen and sophomores. This seems to confirm findings by Benson (1991), who in surveying over 300 freshmen in the same region of Japan, found that "personal" motivation was a more appropriate way to gauge interest in and application to the L2 (in this case, English). Further statistical analysis showed a weak-to-moderate correlation between motivation level and proficiency level as shown on a battery of tests taken by all groups of EFL learners. The overall result largely corroborates findings by Oller, Hudson, and Liu (1977) and Chihara and Oller (1978), which showed a stronger positive correlation between attitudes and performance by Chinese students (in an ESL setting) than by a larger group of Japanese adults studying EFL at a private language school. The different directionalities shown in the combined motivational surveys also suggest that the importance of a positive attitude toward the target language (or TL-speaking community) is not as important as the presence of a strong commitment to practice and will to actually use the language in question.

The Study

Subjects

Two groups of 10 freshmen in separate sections of an English class in the Department of Liberal Arts at Hunan University taking English as a departmental requirement were surveyed (n = 20). Of the 20, there were 18 females and two males. A second group of 20 sophomores taking English as a required course in the same department, 13 females and seven males, was also surveyed (n = 20).

Two groups of 10 freshmen taking English as a general graduation requirement in the Department of Liberal Sciences at Okayama Univer-

sity were tested (n = 20). Of these 20, there were 11 females and nine males. A second group of 20 sophomores taking English as a general requirement in the Department of Education at the same school was made up of 18 females and two males (n = 20).

Procedures

Freshmen and sophomores at Hunan and Okayama universitieswho had indicated on a consent agreement that they would participate in a comparative study and be willing to take a series of written tests were asked on the second day of testing to complete a two-part "Attitudinal Questionnaire" (Appendix 1). One purpose of this was to get an indication, via 5-point Likert scale, whether students were "instrumentally" or "integratively" motivated.[2] Eight of the 10 statements (evenly divided between "instrumental" and "integrative"-type assessments of English) on this first questionnaire were drawn from Gardner and Lambert (1972) and were worth a total of 40 points. An additional yes/no question (#7) asked if the student was mainly taking English in order to gain college course credit. A final open question (#10) gave students a chance to elaborate on any of the responses given or offer other personal reasons for learning English. A second questionnaire (Appendix 2) made up of six additional yes/no questions was included as a follow-up to the first questionnaire.

Questions on this "motivational intensity scale," based on a longer version in Gardner and Lambert (1972), were more closely directed to the individual English language learner, and were designed to indicate how "active" or "personally committed" a particular learner was to the target language (i.e. outside the classroom). Worth a single point each, the tally of "yes" and "no" responses on the second questionnaire was also intended as a check on initial assignment of students to a "HIGH" (averaging above 70%) or "LOW" (below the 70% benchmark) motivation level. As the point scales and response mechanisms differ on the two questionnaires, "motivational intensity" will subsequently be referred to as "motivation level" in determining the effects of motivation on the students' overall proficiency scores.

Results and Discussion

A sample question on the first Attitudinal Questionnaire that 52 of the 80 students polled at both universities responded to showed that 30 students at Hunan University, 93.75% of respondents, agreed that English should be required in high school, while 17 (85%) of the Okayama University

students who responded agreed. Given the particular weight of English in determining who gets admitted to universities in both countries, it is not surprising that a solid majority responded favorably on this question. A second question on the first attitudinal questionnaire, which also did not figure in the overall motivational score, asked whether the student was "taking English mainly to gain course credit." Looking at the breakdown of responses given by the 40 students in each of the profiled groups, there was a considerably greater attitudinal difference shown here than for the previous question on the importance of English in the high school curriculum.

Table 1: Question 7 "I am taking English mainly to gain college course credit."

Group	Yes	No	Total	N
Okayama Univ. Sophomores	15	5	75% Yes	$n = 20$
Okayama Univ. Freshmen	12	8	60% Yes	$n = 20$
Hunan Univ. Sophomores	0	20	100% No	$n = 20$
Hunan Univ. Freshmen	0	19*	95% No	$n = 19$

*Note: One freshman at Hunan University did not respond.

It is noteworthy that while 67.5% of the Japanese students responded "negatively" to this question (a "yes" answer indicating that they were mainly taking English to get course credit and might not bother to take it otherwise), all of the Chinese students replied "affirmatively." The unanimity of the Chinese students on this question underlines the positive response they showed on the first (eight question) attitudinal questionnaire. Hunan University students compiled an average of 33.45 instrumental motivation points out of 40, or 83.63%, and an integrative mean score of 32.85 out of 40, or 82.13%. That nearly three-fourths of the Okayama University students indicated having little academic interest in English aside from its satisfying a graduation requirement seems to compromise the generally high mean scores they produced on the first attitudinal questionnaire. On this, Okayama University students averaged 29.95 instrumental motivation points of out of 40, or 74.88%, and had an integrative mean score of 31.65 out of 40, or 79.13%.

In spite of the fact that an abbreviated version of Gardner and Lambert's (1972) Attitude and Motivational Index was used, it is noteworthy, but

not surprising that Japanese students tended to score higher on integrative indicators. Berwick and Ross (1989) and Benson (1991) both elaborated on the considerable decline in "instrumental" interest (particularly in freshman learners of English) once the college entrance examination was in the past. Responses to a "Supplementary Questionnaire" (Appendix 3) taken by a class of 29 juniors at Kyoto University of Foreign Studies in Spring, 1994, also support Benson's view that a more "personal" motivation begins to take hold of the Japanese undergraduate once "instrumental motivation" has run its course. Here, an equally favorable view of English to that held by 23 sophomore respondents at Hunan University in various skill areas was shown. Scores ranged from a high mean score of 4.1724 (on a five-point Likert scale) on pronunciation to a "low" of 3.1724 on vocabulary. While not designed to directly tap into considerations of instrumental and integrative motivation, the questionnaire was able to elicit both positive and negative views toward the target language and culture as well as the following examples of "personal motivation."

Q 1 What topics do you feel comfortable using English to talk about?
"Hobby, friendship, (and) relationship between men and women." "Music, family, myself."

Q 3 What do you like most about English as a second language?
"It's my dream to go abroad and speak with foreigner." "It's more informal than my native language." "I can be another person and freely express myself." "It allows you to communicate with people from countries other than English-speaking countries."

Q 6 What do you like most about English-speaking people?
"Their speech . . . is great, with some jokes which draws the audience within."

Other responses indicated a decidedly mixed attitude toward the subject language and culture.

Q 6 What do you like most about English-speaking people?
"They are friendly and kind."

Q 7 What do you dislike most about them?
"They are insensitive, generally, I think."

As Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 reveal, all eight groups of freshmen and sophomores at Okayama and Hunan Universities showed relatively high levels of motivation (i.e. scored 70 percent or higher on the combined motivational assessments). The motivational assessments below provide

Instrumental and Integrative mean scores for each of the four groups of freshmen and sophomores at both schools.

Table 2: Response of Freshman Groups at Okayama University

Group	High/Low Motivation	Instrumental M	Integrative M
One (n = 10)	8/2	15.3	15.6
Two (n = 10)	6/4	14.0	14.6
Total (n = 20)	—	14.7	15.1

Table 3: Response of Sophomore Groups at Okayama University

Group	High/Low Motivation	Instrumental M	Integrative M
One (n = 10)	7/3	14.5	16.4
Two (n = 10)	9/1	16.0	16.4
Total (n = 20)	—	15.25	16.4

Table 4: Response of Freshman Groups at Hunan University

Group	High/Low Motivation	Instrumental M	Integrative M
One (n = 10)	10/0	17.6	17.3
Two (n = 10)	9/1	16.5	16.1
Total (n = 20)	—	17.05	16.7

Table 5: Response of Sophomore Groups at Hunan University

Group	High/Low Motivation	Instrumental M	Integrative M
One (n = 10)	10/0	17.1	17.0
Two (n = 10)	9/1	15.7	15.3
Total (n = 20)	—	16.4	16.15

Table 6: Motivation (MOT) and Proficiency (PRO) Correlations

Freshmen

Test Type	Test No.	MOT	PRO	MOT	PRO
Mult. Choice	#2	.441	.814	.195	.662
	#5	.421	.791	.177	.626
	#8	.503	.821	.253	.674
Cloze	#3	.350	.698	.122	.488
	#6	.499	.805	.249	.649
	#9	.569	.808	.324	.652
Translation	#4	.308	.679	.095	.462
	#7	.364	.737	.133	.542

Sophomores

Test Type	Test No	MOT	PRO	MOT	PRO
Mult. Choice	#2	.255	.866	.065	.751
	#5	.181	.801	.035	.641
	#8	.279	.848	.078	.719
Cloze	#3	.267	.782	.071	.611
	#6	.316	.624	.100	.389
	#9	.270	.614	.073	.377
Translation	#4	.394	.874	.156	.764
	#7	.356	.825	.127	.680

Due to some expected "glossing" of responses on the questions designed to elicit "instrumental" and "integrative" motivation (i.e. the "approval motive" Oller [1981] noted that often colors self-reported attitudes), a six-point "Motivational Intensity Scale" was given in conjunction with the 40-point attitudinal questionnaire. Freshmen and sophomores at both schools were asked questions which highlighted the extent to which they sought to actively apply the target language. Notably, there were *directional* differences between the response patterns for half of the sophomores and for one-third of the freshmen from both universities on these questions. Responses on this portion of the Attitudinal Questionnaire for the sophomores and freshmen profiled from each school appear in Appendix 4.

That a majority of students at both universities (75% at Okayama and 95% at Hunan) showed "high motivation" was borne out in a 3 x 3 cycle

Table 7: One-factor ANOVA on Motivational Scores for Both Groups

Instrumental Scores for Freshmen

L_1	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*
Japanese	20	14.7	2.203	.493
Mandarin	20	17.05*	2.259	.505

(F-Test 11.095, $*p < .05$)

Instrumental Scores for Sophomores

L_1	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*
Japanese	20	15.25	2.197	.491
Mandarin	20	16.4	2.28	.51

(F-Test 2.637, $p = .1126$)

Integrative Scores for Freshmen

L_1	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*
Japanese	20	15.1	1.944	.435
Mandarin	20	16.7*	2.06	.465

(F-Test 6.317, $*p < .05$)

Integrative Scores for Sophomores

L_1	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*
Japanese	20	16.4	1.903	.426
Mandarin	20	16.15*	2.134	.477

(F-Test .153, $p = .698$)

of testing conducted over the following ten weeks of classes, tests that had no direct bearing on these students' immediate coursework. In the end, however, correlations between motivation level and performance on three types (multiple-choice, cloze, and translation) of tests designed to assess development in interlanguage syntax were not particularly strong—these ranged from lows of .308 and .364 for freshmen on Translation (from Mandarin or Japanese into English) to a high of .503 and .569 for a pair of multiple-choice and cloze tests. For sophomores, correlations ranged from a low of .181 on the second multiple-choice test to a high of .394 on the first translation. Meanwhile, the levels of correlation between scores on a standard grammatical proficiency test (Part II of the CELT), given just prior to the test battery, were considerably higher, ranging from a low of .614 for sophomores on the last multiple-choice test to a high of .874 on the first translation.3

Table 6 shows correlation coefficients for Motivation Level, Proficiency Level, and scores on eight tests (three multiple choice-type, T#2, T#5, and T#8, three cloze-type, T#3, T#6, and T#9, and two translation-type T#4 and T#7) for the combined freshman and sophomore groups at both universities. (StatView 512, 1988, was used to calculate all correlation coefficients.)

Based on an analysis of variance (ANOVA) that was conducted on the two sets of forty instrumental and integrative motivation scores, and that set up the first language (Japanese or Mandarin) of the learner as an "X" variable, the statistical breakdown shown in Table 7 was derived.

Table 8: Two-factor ANOVA on Motivational Score (Y_1) and Motivational Level (Y_2)

Motivation Scores for Freshmen (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	110.063	110.063	5.228	.0282*
Sex (B)	1	8.758	8.758	.416	.523
AB	1	3.756	3.756	.178	.6753
Error	36	757.909	21.053		

AB Incidence Table on Y_1 / Motivation Score

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L_1 Japanese	*n*=11 / M=29.091	*n*=9 / M=31.222	*n*=20 / M=30.05
L_1 Mandarin	*n*=2 / M=34.5	*n*=18 / M=34.944	*n*=20 / M=34.9
Totals	*n*=13 / M=29.923	*n*=27 / M=33.704	*n*=40 / M=32.475

Motivation Level for Freshmen (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	2625.751	2625.751	5.678	.0226*
Gender (B)	1	117.753	117.753	.255	.6169
AB	1	557.165	557.165	1.205	.2796
Error	36	16647.302	462.425		

AB Incidence Table on Y_2 / Motivation Level

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L_1 Japanese	*n*=11 / 42.427%	*n*= 9 / 57.422%	*n*=20 / 49.175%
L_1 Mandarin	*n*= 2 / 75%	*n*=18 / 69.45%	*n*=20 / 70.005%
Totals	*n*=13 / 47.438%	*n*=27 / 65.441%	*n*=40 / 59.59%

Note that while a significant difference is not recorded for both sets of scores at the sophomore level, the Hunan University students scored higher on "instrumental" indicators and the Japanese sophomores scored higher on "integrative" indicators, which is consistent with the results posted by the freshmen groups at both universities.

Table 9: Two-factor ANOVA on Motivational Score (Y_1) and Motivational Level (Y_2)

Motivation Scores for Sophomores (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	30.382	30.382	2.487	.1235
Gender (B)	1	70.195	70.195	5.746	.0218*
AB	1	2.144	2.144	.176	.6777
Error	36	439.791	12.216		

AB Incidence Table on Y_1 / Motivation Score

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L_1 Japanese	n=2 / M=27.5	n=18 / M=31.833	n=20 / M=31.4
L_1 Mandarin	n=7 / M=30.571	n=13 / M=33.615	n=20 / M=32.5
Totals	n=9 / M=29.889	n=27 / M=32.581	n=40 / M=31.975

Motivation Level for Sophomores (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	507.632	507.632	.956	.3347
Gender (B)	1	505.666	505.666	.952	.3356
AB	1	780.268	780.268	1.47	.2333
Error	36	19114.764	530.966		

AB Incidence Table on Y_2 / Motivation Level

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L_1 Japanese	n=2 / 66.66%	n=18 / 44.45%	n=20 / 46.67%
L_1 Mandarin	n=7 / 64.27%	n=13 / 66.66%	n=20 / 65.83%
Totals	n=9 / 64.8%	n=31 / 53.77%	n=40 / 56.25%

In order to assess the interaction between the two assessments devised to determine motivational *score* (via the 40-point "instrumental" and "integrative" attitudinal survey) and *level* (via the 6-point "motivational intensity scale"), a 2-way ANOVA using first language (L_1) and gender of learner as "X" variables shows L_1 to be a significant factor for

freshman respondents at the 95% probability level (*) on both motivational assessments.

Using the same two "X" variables (L1 and gender) to assess sophomore performance on the respective motivational assessments, only learner's gender showed a significant effect on motivational scores. It should be noted that mean scores are directionally higher for the Hunan sophomores throughout, intensity level only being higher for one "group" of two Okayama University males.

A two-factor ANOVA with first language and gender set up as "X" variables, which includes both motivational assessments and proficiency level (the score on Part II of the CELT being set up as a third "Y" variable), yields the following, more decisive result.

Conclusions and Implications

The above results indicate that general verbal ability, as measured by performance on a standard (structure-based) test such as the CELT, shows a consistently higher correlation with performance on a variety of proficiency tests (covering skills in reading comprehension, vocabulary, syntax and writing) than a motivational assessment. These results, which suggest that a standard proficiency test can point to performance on a variety of skill-based tests with nearly 80% accuracy, are, however, decidedly tentative. Sixteen questions and 40 Japanese and Chinese freshmen and sophomores are too limited a sampling to provide an accurate measure of how great a factor attitudes and motivation are in such complex and diverse EFL contexts. Nonetheless, the findings recall those of Chihara and Oller (1978), who also tested groups of adult EFL learners in Japan. Noting the lack of correlation of affective variables and attained proficiency as shown on both standard achievement tests and cloze tests in that research study, particularly when compared with the higher correlations found in a related earlier study that focused on Chinese learners in an ESL setting, Oller's (1981) skepticism about using attitudinal assessments as key indicators of proficiency in a second language is well-founded.

It should also be noted that the battery of tests conducted in this research was primarily designed to assess characteristics of Interlanguage Syntax for speakers of Mandarin and Japanese, and not to comment on the relationship between affective variables and second language proficiency per se. That freshmen and sophomores who were majoring in Liberal Arts and taking English at Hunan University would outscore their Japanese counterparts in the Colleges of Liberal Science and Education at Okayama University was hypothesized a priori due to increased emphasis on En-

Table 10: Two-factor ANOVA on MOT Score (Y_1), MOT Level (Y_2) and PRO Level (Y_3)

Freshmen (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	5352.592	5352.592	47.054	.0001*
Gender (B)	1	14.893	14.893	.131	.7196
AB	1	2.179	2.179	.019	.8907
Error	36	4095.162	113.754		

(*significant at 95% level)

AB Incidence Table on Y_3 / Proficiency Level

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L1 Japanese	n=11 / 55.303	n=9 / 52.981	n=20 / 54.258
L1 Mandarin	n=2 / 86.5	n=18 / 85.463	n=20 / 85.567
Totals	n=13 /60.103	n=27 / 74.636	n=40 / 69.912

Sophomores (n=40)

Source	df	*SS*	*MS*	F-Test	*p* value
L_1	1	2432.068	2432.068	33.101	.0001*
Gender (B)	1	206.557	206.557	2.811	.1023
AB	1	144.021	144.021	1.96	.1701
Error	36	2645.069	73.474		

(*significant at 95% level)

AB Incidence Table on Y_3 / Proficiency Level

Gender	Male	Female	Totals
L1 Japanese	n=2 / 71.0	n=18 / 59.389	n=20 / 60.55
L1 Mandarin	n=7 / 87.429	n=13 / 86.385	n=20 / 86.75
Totals	n=9 / 83.778	n=31 / 70.71	n=40 / 73.65

glish at the former school and other factors such as "transfer of training" and predicted extent of "first language transfer" (Selinker, 1972). For all intents and purposes, though, as the four groups of students were matched

for age and number of years of instruction in English, and had comparably restricted access to the target language, and its speakers, no pre-assumptions were made as to the learners' particular attitudes toward or motivation for learning English.

Motivational and test-taking skill factors aside, the disparity in mean scores can also be partially explained by the different academic emphasis that is placed on English at both universities. While 8 units of English is a general graduation requirement for all liberal arts (and most science) students at Okayama University, English assumes a more specialized role at Hunan University. For example, English courses are often offered in connection with specific occupational needs; i.e., "Business English," along with special classes designed for tour guides and interpreters, future language teachers, etc. Beyond the inevitable Level I/II sequencing that characterizes the Okayama University general foreign language curriculum, Hunan University's foreign language program offers a fairly integrated curriculum that emphasizes all four skills. The long tradition of grammar/translation-based instruction which Scovel (1983), Zhuang (1984), and others have noted as characteristic of foreign language instruction in China is gradually changing. With the opening of its doors to other cultures and purveyors of different ideas about language learning, non-native speaking instructors in China are better able to emphasize communicative aspects of the target language and development in practical skill areas. Japan is also trying to diversify its foreign language methodology, but the heavy dosage of *juken eigo* (English for testing purposes) and associated grammar/translation-centered instruction that most secondary students get during their formative years has made the switch to a more communicative approach difficult.

If the results of the present study may be considered indicative of trends in major Japanese and Chinese cities, then, it is clear that in many respects Hunan University is meeting the "instrumental" designs of its young adult constituency more satisfactorily than Okayama University is meeting the "personal needs" of its student population. Future success in foreign language training in Japan may well depend on retapping the "instrumental motivation" that Gardner and Lambert (1972) noted in their study on ESL in the Philippines and that Fu (1975), Kachru (1977), Shaw (1983), and Young (1987) saw as pivotal in other EFL contexts in Asia. That English is seen in both Japan and China as a critical link to external knowledge and advanced technology, as well as a window onto the modern world of art and science, is well established. This feeling that English is also a necessity for wider communication in today's world is no doubt, too, the closest thing to a consensus that exists between the two cultures vis-a-vis English

language instruction. In this regard, a remark made by a freshman informant from Okayama University on the second attitudinal questionnaire may be considered exemplary:

> *"Genzai no kokusai shakai no naka de hitsuyoo to sarete iru kara."* [English] has become a necessity in today's modern [lit. international] society.

Whether such compelling expressions of interest can be actuated in practice remains to be seen, however. At present, this researcher can only suggest that Japan take a serious look over its shoulder and examine a bit more closely what some other members of the Asian community are doing with English before proceeding further with "language reform" in the next century. Further contrastive assessments and extensive research are clearly in order to determine how China or other Asian neighbors might be instrumental in helping Japan shape a better balanced approach to foreign language learning.

Acknowledgments

Special thanks are owing to Professor Masao Okamoto, who served as my research partner at Okayama University for the duration of this research during the 1993-1994 academic year. It was largely due to his unselfish and competent assistance that a contrastive study of this nature and scale was possible. Professors Chitoshi Motoyama of Kyoto University of Foreign Language Studies and Virginia LoCastro of International Christian University conducted supplementary attitudinal assessments at their schools which were also valuable in appraising strength and type of motivational orientation. I also wish to thank Jack Yohay of Seifu Gakuen, Gipyo Park of the University of Texas at Austin, and the editorial staff of the JALT Journal *for their thorough review of earlier drafts of this article and helpful comments.*

Bill Teweles, currently an instructor in the ESL program at Long Beach (CA) City College, received his doctorate in Foreign Language Education from the University of Texas at Austin. He lectured for four years at Tsukuba University and served as a "foreign expert" from 1993 to 1994 at Hunan University.

Notes

1. Students were matched according to age, level at university, and number of years they had studied English in public school (allowing for up to a year of private instruction). That both Changsha and Okayama are regional capitals

and have relatively few native English-speaking residents was also taken into consideration in selecting freshman and sophomore students from Hunan and Okayama National Universities as participants in the study.

2. Brown (1987) and Macnamara (1973), among others, have questioned the wisdom of trying to bend such a multifaceted concept as motivation into neat binary distinctions. While the two basic types of motivation are fairly straightforward and stem from separate sources (i.e., having to go abroad because the head office is sending you there on business as opposed to heading there because you feel compelled to learn more about the people), it is more difficult to distinguish between them in other areas. For example, if one were to agree with the statement that English is an important tool for intercultural communication, this may reflect both a global view and one that has significant meaning to the individual.
3. Authorization to use CELT for proficiency test purposes granted by McGraw-Hill, Inc.

References

Benson, M. (1991). Attitudes and motivation toward English: A survey of Japanese freshmen. *RELC Journal, 22*(1), 34-48.

Berwick, R. & Ross, S. (1989). Motivation after matriculation: Are Japanese learners of English still alive after exam hell? *JALT Journal, 11*, 193-210.

Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Chihara, T. & Oller, J. W. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning, 28*, 55-68.

Fu, G. S. (1975). A Hong Kong perspective: English language learning and the Chinese student. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Dissertation Series.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kachru, B. (1976). Models of English for the third world. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*, 221-39.

Macnamara, J. (1973). The cognitive strategies of language learning. In J. W. Oller, Jr. & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner* (pp. 57-65). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Oller, J. W. (1981). Research on the measurement of affective variables: Some remaining questions. In R. W. Andersen (Ed.), *New dimensions in second language acquisition research* (pp. 14-27). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Oller, J. W., Hudson, A., & Liu, P. F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A Sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. *Language Learning, 27*, 1-27.

Oller, J. W., & Perkins, K. (1980). *Research in language testing: Testing the tests*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Scovel, T. (1983). The impact of foreign experts, methodology and materials on English language study in China. *Language Learning and Communication, 2*, 83-92.

Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage.* International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10, 209-31.

Shaw, W. D. (1983). Asian student attitudes towards English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 21-33). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

StatView 512, Version SE. (1988). Berkeley, CA: Abacus Concepts.

Wong, S. C. (1988). What we do and don't know about Chinese learners of English: A critical review of selected research. *RELC Journal, 19*(1), 1-20.

Young, R. (1987). The cultural context of TESOL: A review of research into Chinese classrooms. *RELC Journal, 18*(2), 15-28.

Zhuang, J. (1984). *English teaching in China's colleges.* ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 245 565.

(Received January 17, 1996; revised May 8, 1996)

Appendix 1: Attitudinal Questionnaire

CIRCLE ONE of the following words to describe how you feel about each of the following:

EXAMPLE: English should be a required course in high school.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. English is very useful in the workplace or in most job situations these days.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. English helps you make a variety of friends more easily.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. A truly educated person should be able to read or understand written or spoken English.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. English is very useful for helping us to gain knowledge about life in other countries or to better understand life in other countries.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. Knowing at least one foreign language is desirable for social recognition or gaining higher social status.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. English is necessary if one wishes to travel abroad or live in another country.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. I am taking English mainly to gain college course credit.
YES/NO

8. English is important in order to understand Western thought.
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. English is necessary in order for us to become truly "internationally minded" or a "world citizen."
STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. Other personal reason(s) for learning English:

Appendix 2: Motivational Intensity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: CIRCLE "YES" OR "NO" as you feel appropriate in each case.

YES / NO 1. Do you plan to continue learning or to use English after you graduate from college?

YES / NO 2. Do you spend more than the minimum time on most of your English class (homework) assignments?

YES / NO 3. Do you make use of the English language outside of school?

YES / NO 4. Do you ever practice English outside of class; for example, attempt to converse with native speakers of English?

YES / NO 5. Is improving your English important to you aside from getting a good mark in school?

YES / NO 6. If English were not (required as) a school subject, would you take time to learn it?

Appendix 3: Supplementary Questionnaire

Please answer as many of the following questions as you can about using English as a Second (or Foreign) Language

(1) What kinds of topics do you feel comfortable using English to talk about?

_____ _____ _____

(2) What subjects do you prefer NOT to use English to discuss?

(3) What do you like most about English as a second language?

(4) What do you dislike most about English?

(5) Rate the following aspects of English by circling one description for (A) to (F)

(A) The sound system (or pronunciation) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(B) The system of word formation (or morphology) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(C) The broadness of the vocabulary (or word choice) available in English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(D) The grammatical system (or syntactic structure) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(E) The logicality (or semantic sense) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(F) The various cultural aspects of English-speaking peoples

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(6) What do you like most about English-speaking people or their cultures?

(7) What do you dislike most about them?

(8) How would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 (total non-proficiency) to 10 (total proficiency or superfluency) in terms of understanding the English language?

(CIRCLE ONE) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Appendix 4: Responses to Attitudinal Questionaire

Sophomores		Yes	No	No Resp.	Total
Q 1: Do you plan to continue learning or to use English after you graduate from college?					
	Hunan Univ.	18	1	1	90% yes
	Okayama Univ.	14	5	1	70% yes
Q 2: Do you spend more than the minimum time on most of your English class (homework) assignments?					
	Hunan Univ.	6	13	1	65% no
	Okayama Univ.	9	11	0	55% no
Q 3: Do you make use of the English language outside of school?					
	Hunan Univ.	6	13	1	65% *no*
	Okayama Univ.	11	9	0	55% *yes*
Q 4: Do you ever practice English outside of class/attempt to converse with native speakers?					
	Hunan Univ.	10	9	1	50% *yes*
	Okayama Univ.	2	18	0	90% *no*
Q 5: Is improving your English important to you aside from getting a good mark in school?					
	Hunan Univ.	18	1	1	90% yes
	Okayama Univ.	17	3	0	85% yes
Q 6: If English were not a required subject, would you take time to learn it?					
	Hunan Univ.	17	2	1	85% *yes*
	Okayama Univ.	8	11	1	55% *no*
	Total Hunan	75	39	*	65.8% yes
	Total Okayama	61	57		51.7% yes

*Note: Does not include 6 no responses.

Freshmen		Yes	No	No Resp.	Total
Q1	Hunan Univ.	20	0	0	100% yes
	Okayama Univ.	14	6	0	70% yes
Q 2	Hunan Univ.	7	12	1	60% *no*
	Okayama Univ.	13	7	0	65% *yes*
Q3	Hunan Univ.	6	14	0	70% no
	Okayama Univ.	1	19	0	95% no
Q 4	Hunan Univ.	12	8	0	60% *yes*
	Okayama Univ.	2	18	0	90% *no*
Q 5	Hunan Univ.	19	1	0	95% yes
	Okayama Univ.	16	4	0	80% yes
Q 6	Hunan Univ.	19	1	0	95% yes
	Okayama Univ.	13	6	1	65% yes
	Total Hunan	83	36	**	69.75% *yes*
	Total Okayama	59	60		69.75% *yes*

**Note: Does not include 1 no response.

Combined Total				
	Hunan	158	75	67.81%† yes
	Okayama	120	117	50.633%†† yes

†Note: Does not include 7 no responses.
††Note: Does not include 3 no responses.