Regulatory Processes: A Proposition for Resilient Japanese EFL Students

---

A Research Paper

Presented to

The Graduate School of Letters

Soka University

In Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

18M3251

Darian Castle Lawrence

August 2020

Acknowledgements

This research paper was not created alone and there are those whom have my eternal gratitude for assisting during the development process. Firstly, thank you to Dr. Richmond Stroupe for taking me under his advisement and for being a never-ending source of guidance and council. Thank you to Dr. Steven Morgan and Dr. Paul Horness for assisting in the supervising of this project. Your insights have been invaluable. I thank Soka University as well for providing me this opportunity and the resources which allowed me to explore a topic I felt strongly about. I would also like to thank Suzon Mamet for the myriad of ways she has helped me with the process of writing this research paper.

I also would like to take a moment to thank those who have assisted in helping me grow as a thinker and future educator. I must thank Mr. Nathan Bankert for all the compassion he has shown me and for teaching me how to use my passions to create something I am proud of. I also want to thank Samee Siddiqui, for showing me the path to academia and allowing me to explore my thoughts via vigorous discourse. Next, I wish to thank Dr. Darryl Flaherty for teaching me about the nature of being a post-graduate student and the valuable lessons I've learned because of it. Last, but certainly not least, I need to thank Dr. Patricia Sloane-White. You believed in me even before I believed in myself. You have taught me more than just how to be an academic—you taught me how to be a human being within this field. I dedicate this research paper to you.

Abstract

In the Japanese EFL context, English language learning is convoluted by shifting expectations as students' progress through the school system. What begins as mostly light introductions to the language in elementary school, transforms into a more structural approach in middle school. In high school, students turn their attention toward life altering examinations and English becomes folded into a high stakes game of beating the entrance exams for university. By the time they reach the tertiary level, English for many learners has become associated with pressure and anxiety. Furthermore, current changes in the national English curriculum towards more practical English adds an additional shift in expectations. Yet, contrary to popular narratives, Japanese learners are quite successful. Proficiency rates may be relatively low, but students prove quite capable in enduring the ebb and flow of the system. They are resilient. Still, students often feel as if the type of English they are learning is not consonant with their desire to be proficient. Autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation are regulatory processes that assist in not only increasing proficiency but sustaining long-term learning. Considering English language learning is a mandatory, long term commitment in Japan, promoting regulatory processes may aid students in navigating the learning process. The current research paper will review literature on each of these four regulatory processes, the nature of Japanese TEFL, and formulate a suggestion for how educators can teach students how to maintain their resilience and regulate their learning.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Learning English is a daunting task in any context. In the Japanese context there is currently an issue in which students feel external pressure to both learn English to pass entrance examinations and learn English for practical purposes (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). Students often feel frustrated by the approaches to English language teaching found in their lessons (Tomita & Spada, 2013). Teachers though find they must adhere to ascribed curriculums that are still transitioning towards practical English and away from exam-oriented English (Nakata, 2016). During this transitional phase, old narratives of grammar focused, demotivating lessons continue to affect learners (Kikuchi & Sakai, 2009). However, a push to increase Japanese learners' proficiency by stakeholders in the education system has raised questions as to how to assist in this process. In applied linguistics regulatory processes in language learning are often associated with increased proficiency (Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Holec, 1981). Among those processes are autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Each of these regulatory processes assist in not only increasing proficiency but sustaining long term learning. Research has shown that autonomous language learners often exhibit higher levels of proficiency (Benson, 2007). Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011) stated motivations and their belief in their ability to succeed—known as self-efficacy—contribute to how learners regulate themselves. The opposite is also true. Learners possess the capacity to regulate themselves to a point in which they may become more motivated and gain beliefs in their ability to succeed. There exists a growing amount of literature that proposes regulatory processes such as teaching for motivation, learner autonomy, building self-efficacy, and self-regulation may help circumvent this for learners (Sugita-McEown & Takeuchi, 2014; McEown, Noels, & Saumure, 2014; Mikami, 2012). Besides increased proficiency, there is another reason for teaching regulatory processes in Japan. Despite students' lament on the current state of learning English in Japan, many not only maintain positive views on being able to become proficient in English. Moreover, even though the current education system is arduous, students have been able to adjust and maintain

success. They should be praised for their efforts. Learners in Japan should not be defined by their lack of proficiency but defined by their resilience. Resilience though cannot be taken for granted—there is no guarantee students will continue this success on their own. The onus then is on educators to take advantage of this resilience and look at the role they play in the learning process. Educators can assist in maintaining learner resilience by teaching regulatory processes to students during this transitional phase in Japanese English education. In doing so, students may find what motivates them, increase beliefs in their ability to succeed, and better regulate their learning. Thus, the present research paper seeks to review literature on these regulatory processes and the potential benefits for resilient Japanese learners of English.

Literature Review

In Japan, there exists an ongoing narrative of Japanese learners struggling to gain English language proficiency. Popular media often laments the current state of Japanese TEFL and the lack of the ability for learners to speak English (Japan Times, 2018). Comparing test scores such as the TOEIC (2017, 2018) to other countries suggests that Japanese people do indeed struggle comparatively to become proficient. Learners themselves are frustrated with their perceived lack of English skills and teachers alike have discussed the current situation in Japan using this mode of thought (Gorsuch, 2012; Ryan, 2009; Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). For students, frustration often comes in the form of an unrealized desire to be able to use English practically. For many, the opportunity to do so effectively does not come until after high school. Teachers frustrations come by either lack of preparedness in teaching English communicatively, or being able to teach in a manner that corresponds to their personal beliefs. Though not without some validity, the narrative should account for the eccentricities of the Japanese educational system. The Japanese education system has a long history with English and is currently in a transitional phase (Butler & Iino, 2004). Traditionally speaking, the overall educational system was built for the purpose of creating

successful adults vis-à-vis Japanese societal idiosyncrasies (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005). This purpose is not necessarily always aligned with ongoing English language learning (Hereby, ELL) academic literature and that incongruence is increasingly relevant as the Ministry of Education (Hereby, MEXT) seeks to incorporate a more four skills approach into the curriculum (Hashimoto, 2009). Currently, after eight years of English education, learners and teachers often are negatively affected socially, cognitively, and affectively (Tomita & Spada, 2013). A potential solution to these frustrations is assisting learners in acquiring regulatory processes—specifically teaching for autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. These regulatory processes have been shown to positively affect EFL students (Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Holec, 1981). Providing students with the ability to further direct their own learning may assist in circumventing some of the frustrations experienced while learning English. Teaching those processes effectively, however, may also require a different view from which teachers view learners and how to approach the current situation in Japanese TEFL. Thus, the present research paper seeks to review literature on the theoretical backgrounds of autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation, review the history of Japanese TEFL, contextualize those regulatory processes in Japan, and finally ending with a suggestion on how to enhance the teaching and learning experience through a change in the mindset of educators working in Japan.

Learner Autonomy

Humans have been historically thought of as beings capable of exhibiting qualities of autonomy. Though seemingly simple, defining what being autonomous means is quite quarrelsome. Philosophers have long struggled to put the idea into words, let alone create a definition. Most would agree though that the West became highly concerned with the concept around the late 18th century. Since then, this hard to define but highly coveted thought of autonomy has been applied to different fields of academia, including language learning. The term “learner autonomy” is often traced back to

the work of Henri Holec (1981). Holec first defined learner autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (p. 3). David Little (2007) noted that the initial work of Holec was a part of a much larger framework of the Council of Europe and their goal in promoting individuality among adult learners. The work of Holec spawned a vast amount of research beyond the initial political concerns of the Council of Europe. As research progressed, language learner autonomy began to take theoretical form as an attitude or a capacity in which a learner takes responsibility for their learning in some form (Cotterall, 1995; Dickinson, 1995; Little, 1991). Subsequently, more research in language learner autonomy has led to the development of other theoretical dimensions being applied to autonomy (e.g., Benson, 1997, 2001; Sinclair, 2000). Specifically, the incorporation of constructivists approaches consistent with those of Vygotsky (1978) and Jerome Bruner (1986). Despite the amount of progression, those who study learner autonomy still seek to understand exactly the meaning of being an autonomous language learner and to what degree is a given learner autonomous. The current section of this research paper will traverse a range of literature on language learner autonomy. A brief background on the beginnings of autonomy will be presented, leading into foundational works in the field of SLA, and exploring how these works have advanced into our current understandings.

Understanding the nature of autonomy in SLA requires a brief background on the history of autonomy. Perhaps from a Western perspective, concerns of autonomy can be traced back to antiquity with the ruminations on human rationale by the Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle (Richards, 1981). While works such as *The Republic* by Plato somewhat delved into the concept of human self-rule, the more modern conceptualization of autonomy likely began much later in history. Autonomy or "moral autonomy" in modern philosophy stems from the works of Immanuel Kant, an 18th century German philosopher. Kant theorized humans as rational agents posited humans as not requiring an authority other than ourselves to dictate our morals and as self-governing individuals, we are better suited to controlling ourselves (Schneewind, 1998). Development of autonomous

theories from Kant are beyond the scope of this paper and the history of that narrative are well covered elsewhere (Lindley, 1986). While there is no singular, objective definition philosophically, Christman (2015) offered a useful summarized perspective:

> Put most simply, to be autonomous is to be one's own person, to be directed by considerations, desires, conditions, and characteristics that are not simply imposed externally upon one, but are part of what can somehow be considered one's authentic self. (para. 3)

Autonomy then, from a philosophical standpoint, is concerned with thoughts and circumstances being actualized through your own inclinations.

Kant would contribute to a much larger interest in autonomous learning within Europe (Benson, 2007). As Western societies began to shift towards democratic philosophies politically, there was an increased value in researching the attributes of the individual as an ideal in education. By the 20th century, both social and educational psychology had become a cradle for developing theories on autonomy. Worth emphasizing though is as Benson, Littlewood, and others have mentioned, theories of autonomous learning go beyond Western academic tradition (Littlewood, 1999; Ryan & Deci, 2006; Palfreyman, 2003). Most of the relevant literature prior to the seminal work of Holec (1981) on language learner autonomy though was seen through the lens of Western academic ideals (Schmenk, 2005). Those same philosophies would continue to increase their presence in European education through the 20th century.

One of the organizations concerned with learner autonomy was the Council of Europe (not to be confused with the European Union). The Council of Europe is an international organization founded through the Treaty of London. Their stated mission is as follows:

> The Council of Europe has been created after the Second World War in order to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress. (Statue of the Council of Europe, 1949, para. 1)

As Little (2012) explained, the council began to investigate adult education and the potential benefits that could be had from enhancing educational methodology for the group. By the 1970s, the philosophical beliefs of the council on adult education became more explicit through a set of objectives—the ideal adult education promoted democratic values, equal opportunity, autonomy with respect to the rights of others and personal fulfillment (Janne, 1977). The concern for autonomous learning would also be seen in projects from the council involving language learning. The most famous of which came through the work of Henri Holec (1981).

Learner Autonomy in Second Language Acquisition

Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning by Holec (1981) is both frequently cited and viewed as the impetus for an acceleration in research into autonomous language learning (Benson, 2001, 2007; Dickinson, 1995; Little 2007; Little, Ridley, & Ushioda, 2002). His initial definition of autonomy was "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (p. 3). Autonomy in his view was not something learners were born with. Acquiring autonomy would come through environmental experiences such as purposeful (i.e., goal-oriented) or constructed (e.g., formal learning) processes. The manner in which one could acquire autonomy, as he argued, were numerous. Learners can determine their own goals, evaluate their learning progress, and adjust according to their perceptions. Moreover, according to Holec, an autonomous learner is also capable of choosing what exactly they want to learn and a class that values autonomy should support this. In a language learning classroom that promotes autonomy the teacher has the task of both assisting learners in acquiring language and fostering the transition from assisted learning to self-directed learning. Holec (2009) would continue to develop his theories with later works focusing in on the pedagogical nature of self-directed learning. But as researchers in applied linguistics began to embrace autonomous learning, a rapid expansion in both depth and diversity of frameworks began to surface.

Framing the research of Holec (1981) as a starting point, a few distinct but connected narratives emerge. First is the refinement of and surge in empirical research on his initial theories. The 1990s specifically were characterized by immense popularity in research on autonomy in second language acquisition (Hereby, SLA). The results of which were new, useful formulations of autonomy that more aptly described the autonomous process of language learning. The shift towards a more capacity oriented view of autonomous language learning appears to be one of the hallmarks of research during this time. While Holec did view autonomy as a capacity, his initial thoughts were expounded upon. Researchers began to recognize that language learner autonomy is best thought of as an attitude or a potential, rather than a trait learners' always employ (Dickinson, 1995; Little 1991). Not everyone who can be defined as autonomous necessarily exhibits behavior typical of an autonomous individual.

As Little, Ridley, and Ushioda (2002) astutely noted, autonomy often works in stages where learners may from time to time act independently but may just as well choose to operate co-dependently. This is especially true when new information must be acquired. Human socialization appears to naturally veer towards co-dependence and the process of becoming an autonomous learner often reflects this (Little, 1991; 2004). Scholars have taken this line of thinking further by incorporating the teacher as a facilitator in cultivating an environment that promotes autonomy (Littlewood, 1999; Little, 2001; Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012). Most language learners at some point will have been taught in a formal setting and the teacher will play an important role in helping to facilitate language learning autonomy. Nunan (1995) explained that not all learning environments provide the same opportunity for learners to take charge of their learning. However, as the field of autonomy began to develop, scholarship became increasingly concerned with how to effectively incorporate these theories into actual pedagogy. The result was a growth in the variety of theoretical perspectives attributing to autonomous language learning theory.

New theoretical perspectives saw a rise in prevalence within language learner autonomy literature. Self-determination theory, motivation, and language learning strategies among others saw a significant increase in research (Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Oxford, 1999; Ushioda, 2011). Benson (1996) though made a poignant observation in describing the field as having—at the time—yet to fully realize the full nature autonomy. What had yet to be adequately explored were the different lenses from which autonomy can and should be analyzed through. As Benson concurred, the essence of language learner autonomy still contains political, historical, and cultural considerations. Benson was seemingly not alone in having this thought process as autonomous language learning research began to consider the concept through those lenses (Littlewood, 1999).

The second narrative that grew from the beginnings of research on learner autonomy was one of adding new dimensions to autonomy. One of the earliest questions raised on this issue came from Riley (1988) who introduced the dimension of culture, specifically ethnicity into autonomy. That is, ethnicity plays a potentially important role in how learners understand or are willing to participate in autonomous learning vis-à-vis their own cultural backgrounds. While this position was somewhat contentious, the position touched upon the idea of autonomy as a primarily a Western concept (Benson, 2007; Schmenk, 2005). Riley was not the only one concerned with expanding the lens through which we view autonomy. Benson (1997) offered three different forms of learner autonomy he felt needed to be considered: technical, psychological, and political. In order, each refers to the act of learning beyond the classroom environment, learners' attitudes towards autonomous learning, and the social constructs available to create institutions for fostering autonomous language learning.

Language Learner Autonomy Through Different Lenses

Benson (1997) however was not unique in this sense as others would stress the significance of sociocultural dimensions in autonomous language learning (Bruner, 1990; Oxford, 2003; Palfreyman, 2003). The interest in using a sociocultural lens to explore an area of research is not

exclusive to autonomy. Though, the amount of research is possibly indicative of what Little (2007) saw as a critical misstep in the initial works of Holec and others similar to them. That is, much of what is known about learning autonomy is related to what can be classified as constructivists philosophies. Discovery learning characteristic of constructivists like Bruner (1961) have long advocated for a kind of education that encompasses tenants of autonomous learning. The simplest of which is the ability to direct your own learning, though constructivism does not stop there. Learners bring existing knowledge with them from their sociocultural community into the classroom. In an ideal situation, knowledge is challenged, negotiated, and a learner can achieve autonomy through adequate reflection of this complex pedagogical exercise (Bruner, 1986). Though somewhat reductive, the ties to autonomous language learning is clear. When a critical element is added, knowledge can be seen as inseparable from the sociocultural and political symbolism that surrounds us (Freire, 2000). The concern for understanding autonomy through a sociocultural lens then becomes more apparent.

Autonomous individuals, even when used in the broadest sense, have control over their actions but are, from a sociocultural perspective, undeniably interdependent of their social context (Benson, 2011). This is in stark contrast from a cognitive constructivist construct where autonomy is innate and humans learn to regulate themselves (DeVries, 2000; Piaget, 1952). Autonomy from this perspective is promoted by allowing for choice and opportunity. Collaboration is important but only in the sense that the learner is allowed to use society and others as a reference and a source of information to process and grow personally. In cognitive constructivism, autonomy is innate and hindered by heavy external regulation. Conversely, a sociocultural perspective views society and the classroom as an opportunity for learners to be taught how to become autonomous. The knowledge of what is and how to become autonomous exists within the cultural confines of society. Autonomy can be taught to an individual by their peers and those more knowledgeable than themselves. There is a question as to whether this is true autonomy or heteronomy (Lourenço, 2012). A counterargument to

this is that a Vygotskyian, social constructivist approach regulates learners until they develop into self-regulated and autonomous individuals (Lantolf & Poehner, 2010). Thus, the two frameworks are at odds. The debate on the issue of autonomy, where autonomy comes from, and how to define who is and is not autonomous remains an issue in research. Moreover, the point at which a learner becomes autonomous has been difficult to define.

Language Learner Autonomy and Pedagogy

Scholars have used a variety of frameworks to approach the question of when a learner becomes autonomous. Some approaches choose to shape the answer around actions. A definition from the British Council (n.d.) provides an insight into this type of view. They assert that an autonomous learner exhibits the following qualities: "An autonomous learner will set their own goals, reflect on their progress, and seek opportunities to practise (sic) outside the classroom (para. 2)." In EFL situations however, this definition appears to be contextually problematic, especially if practice is interpreted as separate from simple studying. The level of agency a learner may have in their primary learning environment regarding their access to practice outside of the classroom should be considered. That is, not all EFL situations offer ample opportunity for learners to practice outside of the class. Even in structured pedagogical environments, the stage at which a learner can determine curricular outcomes exist on a spectrum (Nunan, 1995). Not all learning situations grant the opportunity to negotiate the level of agency a student has in dictating their goals or tasks in a course. Not considering a learner autonomous because they are incapable of controlling the pedagogical setting seems curious at best and potentially short-sighted. This then reinforces the idea of context as important in understanding what actions autonomous learners can take.

Little (1995) did add an intriguing aspect to the conversation of autonomy by splitting pedagogical autonomy and communicative autonomy into two. He posited pedagogical autonomy as occurring in students before communicative autonomy, though he does not provide a point at which

the language learner becomes pedagogically autonomous. In adding a multi-stage perspective, he allowed a space for autonomy to be looked at in levels of learner achievement. Sinclair (2000) also believed there were levels to autonomy, positioning complete autonomy as an idealistic goal but also cautioning that this goal can be interpreted differently depending on the culture. A cognitive dimension to the levels of autonomy however can also be added. Littlewood (1996) added that ability, willingness, and stratums of behavior provide a framework for understanding the different thought processes that—in his opinion—are required to reach certain levels of autonomy. There is a cyclical mechanism in which willingness—a combination of motivation and confidence—and ability (knowledge) are interdependent of one another. In his behavioral stratums, as learners' knowledge increases, their willingness to be participatory in structuring their learning is more apparent. This framework of thinking offers a middle ground for autonomous development. When combined with contextual considerations the framework is capable of postulating learner autonomy as a spectrum in which learners progress towards a theoretical ideal that allows for interdependence.

As with the development of autonomous language learning, teaching for autonomy appears equally precarious. Research on teaching for autonomy suggests there may be contextual differences worth considering (Oga-Baldwin & Nakata, 2015). The issue can be further problematized in terms of what type of autonomy is being taught and the role of the teacher in facilitating this process. The former seems dependent upon not only sociocultural aspects but the personal needs of the learner. As discussed previously, there remains questions as to what learner autonomy looks like outside of the Western roots of previous research (Palfreyman, 2003). While autonomy does appear applicable in non-Western contexts, in some contexts such as Japan, there may be specific circumstances that go beyond the common paradigm of the collectivist and individualist dichotomy (Nakata, 2009). In the Japanese example, promoting language learning autonomy may be in concordance with social norms, but there may be systemic restrictions that require more specific approaches to instruction. Providing students with absolute freedom of choice and autonomous opportunities may not be plausible

administratively and students could not be receptive of the teaching style depending on their age and how accustomed they are to freedom of choice.

Regardless of the social context, learners may have their own personal circumstances that require an idiomatic approach to learner autonomy. For adults specifically this case may be more common. Working adults seeking to learn a language may have very specific language learning goals and target levels of proficiency. Teaching with those goals in mind will then dictate the amount of autonomy an instructor may seek to foster (Little, 2009). In other cases, autonomous learning may be a result of necessity, as was the case in an ESP case for policeman in New Zealand where self-access was the chosen method for accommodating the wide range of needs of learners (Basturkmen, 2010). Although perhaps the simplest case of individual student needs is the curious learner. While empirical research on autonomous language learning rarely focuses on a single individual, most scholars would agree that what motivates and drives students as individuals can differ widely, even within the same classroom. Self-determination theory (Hereby, SDT) takes this a step further and asserts all humans have individual needs that require support from teachers to develop their personal autonomy and motivations (Oga-Baldwin & Nakata, 2015, Reeve, 2006). While there are questions as to how applicable SDT is to non-Western societies, the theory does highlight the potential for individual motivations to require specific approaches by the teacher. However, even if tailoring to these motivations are important, tailoring lessons towards autonomy requires the teacher to both believe in and feel as if they can promote autonomous language learning.

Teaching beliefs and their own autonomy have recently seen a rise in interest in SLA research (Benson, 2007; Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012; Phipps & Borg, 2009). Instructors' experiences with autonomy may dictate their beliefs in what they feel is important. Not all teachers believe in promoting autonomy. Even if teachers do believe in promoting autonomy, the extent to which they do can vary widely. This can be for a multitude of reasons. Teachers may not feel comfortable with their ability to create a curriculum that effectively fosters autonomy. If they do believe in autonomy

and their ability to promote autonomous language learning, an instructor may not be able to properly implement autonomous language learning into their curriculum (Nakata, 2011). Teacher autonomy cannot be taken as what Benson (2007) described as a natural "professional attribute" (p. 30). Teacher autonomy is especially relevant in learning environments that are top-down, with prescribed curriculums. Increasing concerns among educators has led to a growth in research on developing methods that reconcile this situation for those who find themselves restricted. Professional development, critical reflection, and further education appear to be potential sources for finding solutions. More research will be required to explore how overcoming such difficulties can contribute to the wider field of autonomous language learning.

The field of autonomy struggles with the question of the overall amount of autonomy learners and teachers display. Considering this, calculating the degrees to which one is autonomous and how they express their autonomy as a unique individual is more contentious. A different approach may be to hypothesize not about degrees and definitions, but tangential benefits. There are certainly benefits to being able to place a set a firm parameter around who is and is not autonomous and how autonomous they are. However, excess hypothesizing on definitions may be pedagogically less useful than focusing on what autonomous individuals do and the various products they produce. Those products range from the cognitive products of thought to tangible achievements autonomous learners and teachers are capable of accomplishing. In short, absolute autonomy is not the ideal in language learning, achieving higher levels of autonomy is. Certainly, from a Western perspective, this is a large part of why autonomy is so highly coveted. There is a perception that becoming autonomous unlocks the potential for high levels of language learning achievement. Current research appears to reflect this notion. Achievement though is relative and thus approaches to teaching for autonomy should be as well. Finding the appropriate balance that fits a given context or learning situation continues to be an active area of research in regulatory processes. Currently autonomy is seen as an essential component of self-regulated learning and teaching for self-regulation. However,

autonomy alone is not enough, and scholars have connected other self-regulatory processes to learner autonomy. The addition of those process into learners' language learning repertoire may have significant impact on their capacity for autonomy. One such addition is language learning motivation.

Motivation

L2 learning motivation is one of the most well researched theoretical constructs in applied linguistics. R.C. Gardner (1985) and his creation of the integrative motive model is one of the most significant works in the field and led to a rapid expansion in the amount of research done on motivation in SLA. His work, while significant at the time, was not without fault. Criticisms of his theories on integrativeness have resulted in a large synthesis of theoretical research in the field. This synthesis has gone through different eras of focus, leading to what may be seen as the socio-dynamic period of L2 motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). This current era has seen the rise in popularity of the L2 Motivational Self System—a framework first constructed by Dörnyei (2005, 2009). The current section of this research paper explores the progression of L2 motivation literature and taking an extensive look at how current research assesses motivated learning behavior among students.

Modern research on motivation can be traced back to what Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) refer to as the "social psychological period" (p. 39). One of the most cited works from this period is from R.C. Gardner (1985) whose research established one of the most well researched frameworks for understanding motivation. However, his work with motivation began much earlier, starting with a study by him and Lambert (1959) on the "comparative importance of linguistic aptitude and certain motivational variables in teaming a second language" in Canada (p. 267). Through their findings, motivation was seen as having substantial impact—either positively or negatively—on intercultural communicative success among the participants. While touched upon briefly in their earlier work, Gardner and Lambert (1972) would later go to develop the concept of integratitveness into their model.

Integrativeness is the degree to which a learner genuinely desires to become closer to another communicative community. Contained in this desire is the want to speak with, adopt characteristics of, or identify with the target group. Integratitveness is also used to describe what Gardner (1985) would later define as orientations. Orientations include both integrative and instrumental orientations and are descriptions of learning outcomes or goals. An integrative orientation is the goal to become closer to the speaking community. Instrumental orientation encompasses pragmatic reasons, such as learning a language to advance in a career or to enter college. While important socio-psychological elements of describing goals, the dichotomy between instrumental and integrative orientations are not actually included in the eventual socio-educational model created by Gardner (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Ushioda, 2011). The justification for this comes from what Gardner (1979) perceived as the difference language learning and other forms of learning. That is, the act of learning a language is the process of integrating yourself into a separate speaking community. This notion would become apparent in the integrative motive model later constructed by Gardner.

While his model of motivation would eventually be modified to include the following factors: integratitveness, attitudes towards the learning situation, and motivation. These factors together would become what is known as the integrative motive. The integrative motive is a description of motivation that includes integrativeness—how receptive a learner is and the level of positive attitudes toward a linguistic group—and motivation which comprises the eagerness to learn a language through positive attitude and resulting behavior (MacIntyre, MacKinnon, & Clement, 2009). The amount of research based on this model has led to an expansion the original model theorized by Gardner. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) referred to the era prior to this evolution as the social-psychological period of motivation research and the next stage as the cognitive-situated period.

The cognitive-situated period of research refers to the influx of educational psychological perspectives of cognition that would influence studies on motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Dörnyei (2005) argued that research during this era was primarily concerned with aligning research on L2 motivation with that of the cognitive theories in psychology at that time. Furthermore, theorists began to suggest a need for more critical analyses of specific learning contexts. Perhaps one of the most important works from this era comes from Crookes and Schmidt (1991) and their call to reinvestigate the current state of L2 motivation research. Their seminal work called into question the inability of prior research to address motivation at both unconscious and conscious levels:

> Relevant limitations to SL research and theory during the past decade have been the emphasis on informal learning as the archetypal SL learning situation, and a corresponding lack of attention to classroom learning; a shortage of long-term studies; and a non-cognitive approach stemming from a tendency to see SL learning as unconscious and therefore difficult to reconcile with the concept of motivation, which is associated primarily with effort, choice, voluntary behavior and other phenomena associated with consciousness. (p. 223)

Though this argument called for a change in focus, previous research was not disregarded as irrelevant. Indeed, other researchers would incorporate educational psychological approaches to motivation into their works during this era (Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner & Tremblay, 1995; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Oxford and Shearin, for example, while not proposing a new model for motivation called for a synthesis of various existing models of motivations to be utilized in understanding how to motivate students in the classroom. This broadening of motivation would later lean into the next stage outlined by Dörnyei and Ushioda—the process-oriented period.

The process-oriented period of motivation research as defined by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) posits motivation as not a static mechanism, but one which changes within the learner over a given course of time. While seemingly obvious to many educators, L2 motivation research had somewhat lacked focus in terms of the temporal nature of students' motivation. The level of motivation, reasons for motivation, and how language learners act on their motivation changes as new experiences challenge their previous thought processes. Dörnyei (1998) would note that while

general psychological research seemed aware of this notion, language learning-oriented research appeared deficient in highlighting the importance of the temporal nature of motivation. This push in adding time as a necessary factor in comprehending motivational processes had inspired other scholars to further research the scale of time vis-à-vis changes in motivation.

Motivation, as with other aspects of human cognition is not static. Reasons for motivation develop and may change over time, and some of the initial frameworks for motivation failed to account for this (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Ushioda, 1996, 2001). New encounters with the target language as well as other new experiences may impact how or the level to which a learner is motivated (Irie & Ryan, 2015). Research suggests events influencing learning behaviors may be critically impact changes to their thought process, motivation, and view of the language (Dörnyei, 2000). An influential study by Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2007) on complex systems in applied linguistics also supported this theory of critical events having impact on the behavior of L2 learners, though both question whether micro-events close in time frame have significant impact. Through the development of process-oriented motivation and the inclusion of previous research, current models of motivation continue to question how to exactly measure what makes a student motivated. Moreover, the impact of motivation on performance and proficiency remains crucial to assessing second-language learners' pedagogical outcomes.

The development of various theoretical models of motivation have been instrumental in understanding the importance of motivation in pedagogical outcomes. Dörnyei (2001) for example identified high motivation as one of the most common qualities successful language learners possess. This of course raises questions as to what defines a learner as highly motivated. However, what current literature appears more concerned with is being able to assess learner motivation holistically and then discussing the unique nature of learners' motivation. This push toward models that can assess motivation holistically has given birth to a new age of research. However, as MacIntyre, Clément, and Conrod (MacIntyre, Clément, & Conrod, 2001) exclaimed, the development of

research done at the theoretical level of motivation has traditionally outpaced that of the empirical evidence. There are several potential reasons for this conundrum. L2 motivation studies are vast and the pace at which theoretical models are reshaped may exceed that of studies that seek to assess them. However, what appears most relevant recently is what Ushioda (2009) described as the need to create models that more closely consider context as dynamic and not a static background that learners are understood within. As such, this push toward a more dynamic view of motivation has increased the amount of empirical research, as well as make way for more robust models for assessing motivation.

Turning theoretical models into instruments for assessment has proven difficult. As previously discussed, one potential reason for this is because the models themselves have been subject to scrutiny. That is, many models proposed previously have failed to account for the plethora of factors that motivation encompasses. As the complex systems approach to linguistics appears to suggest, motivation is complex and difficult to assess for an individual, with a specific learning context, using a generalized model (Pigott, 2011). Given the extensive history of L2 motivation research, creating a model capable of assessing learners more holistically appears to be pertinent in current literature. Some attempts at doing so have involved upgrading previous models to account for new research. Gardner (2000, 2005) updated his most recent framework to include attitudes toward learning situations, as well as language achievement alongside ability and anxiety. However, the terminology used in his theories have been critiqued as confusing or convoluted (Dörnyei, 1994, 2005). A new model then that bridges the gap between previous research and views both learners' motivation and the context through which they learn as fluid was constructed. This model has become known as the "L2 Motivational Self System."

The L2 Motivational Self System

The L2 Motivational Self System (Hereby, L2MSS) is one of the latest and most well researched models for assessing language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). While identity has always been a key component in understanding L2 motivation, the L2MSS was created in attempt to account for change and fluctuation in identity (Aubrey, 2014). The notion of integrativeness was of particular concern to Dörnyei. The initial trigger to construct the L2MSS appears to stem from a large study in Hungary which determined integrativeness—a theory by Gardner (2001)—as a key variable for learner motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). This variable, however, was then identified as actually being beyond integrativeness as a theory. Dörnyei envisioned the construction of a new model, based on the ideal self, as pertinent to creating a more apt framework for L2 motivation.

The creation of the L2MSS was a direct challenge to the relevance of the integrative motive. Specifically, the lack of equivalence in general psychology and inapplicability to a wide range of learning environments (Dörnyei, 2009). Moreover, the rise in globalization, multicultural identities, and world Englishes further undermined integrativeness as a theory. As Dörnyei noted "The language of this global identity is English, and from this perspective it is not at all clear who EFL (English as a foreign language) learners believe the 'owner' of their L2 is" (p. 24). The response then, was the construction of a theoretical system of L2 motivation that was capable of assessing the fluid nature of identity vis-à-vis a globalized English-speaking community, while still being rooted in relevant research on motivation. The result being the L2 Motivational System, which places importance on language learners' image of themselves as speakers of the target language. Dörnyei cited Markus and Nurius (1986) and their theories on possible selves as well as theories by Higgins (1987). From there, three primary components were constructed: the ideal self, ought-to self, and L2 learning experience.

The ideal L2 self is the imagined vision of an L2 speaker which a language learner may strive to identify with. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) noted this component as where much of the previous literature on integrativeness would now fit into. Dörnyei (2009) reanalyzed data from previous research by Csizér and himself (2005) on L2 motivation in Hungary. The result was the expansion of the ideal L2 self from theory into empirical findings. The ideal self component however, was also seen as capable of incorporating attitudes towards members of the L2 community and instrumentality previously theorized by Gardner (2005). The former, Dörnyei argued, was due to a positive correlation between the attractiveness of an L2 speaking community and the ideal L2 self of a learner. Simply put, the more positively learners feel toward speakers of the L2, the more positively they feel about an envisioned L2 self—their ideal L2 self. For instrumentality, Dörnyei (2009) stated, "In our idealised (sic) image of ourselves we naturally want to be professionally successful and therefore instrumental motives that are related to career enhancement are logically linked to the ideal L2 self" (p. 28). However, part of the nature of instrumentality is, as he noted, is also relevant to what has been defined as the ought-to L2 self.

The ought-to L2 self refers to the beliefs learners' possess about which traits they should have in order to avoid adverse outcomes and meet certain expectations (Dörnyei, 2009). A connotation within the ought-to L2 self is avoidance and prevention as opposed to that of promotion in the ideal L2 self. When instrumentality as a motive correlates with a learner seeking to prevent negative outcomes, the ought-to L2 self becomes the relevant construct. Dörnyei has often cited the work of Markus and Nurius (1986) on future selves as assisting in the development of both the ought-to L2 self and the ideal L2 self. While both the ought-to L2 self and the ideal L2 self are described as complementary to one another, the third and final component, the L2 learning experience operates at a different level conceptually.

Upon conception, the L2 learning experience was the least developed of the three components (Dörnyei, 2009, 2019). The L2 learning experience is described as "situated, 'executive'

motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience" (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 86). This component is divided into two sub-components: "attitudes towards the immediate learning environment" and "others' influence" (Ueki & Takeuchi, 2013, pp. 242-243). Attitudes towards the immediate learning environment refer to whether learners enjoy or are content with during experiences in their pedagogical context. Others' influence concerns the impact certain stakeholders—parents, teachers, and peers—have on whether the learner feels pressured or encouraged. The L2 learning experience, along with the previous two constructs, are well developed theoretically and appear to serve as valuable replacements for previous staple constructs in L2 motivation research (Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009). Subsequently, a great deal of empirical work has been conducted to assess the validity of each component and the L2MSS as a whole.

While the development of the L2MSS has been described as a necessary, important step forward in the L2 motivation research, questions concerning validity remain. The primary concern appears to be whether all the components remain valid across all contexts. Current research suggests that some components are powerful contributors to identifying motivated L2 learning behavior in some contexts, but appear irrelevant in others (Aubrey, 2014). In a study by Mostafa Papi (2010), all variables of the system were found as relevant, though the ought-to L2 self appeared to negatively impact student anxiety. Islam, Lamb, and Chambers (2013) found the ideal L2 self to be the strongest predictor of motivated learning behavior but suggested national interest as a potential context specific motivator. They argued that the influence of identity and attitudes toward their own country can play a significant role in why learners choose to study English. In Pakistan specifically, studying English has been subsumed in the quest for national development and democracy. Learning English for nationalist reasons may be a strong predictor for motivated behavior. A contrasting theory is that of Yashima (2009) on international posture Learning English in Japan, in her view, is a matter of being able to relate to the rest of the world. Identity in some form then likely plays a strong role in multiple contexts. Still, other factors have also been cited for their importance. For example, Dörnyei (2019)

saw the L2 learning experience as having often been the strongest predictor of motivated learning. Another study of Japanese high school students by Pigott (2011) found the ought-to L2 self as the most relevant component. This mix of results suggests that a change in pedagogical context is quite important in assessing potential strengths and weaknesses of the L2MSS in being able to predict learning behavior.

The L2MSS appears to be the latest, and most relevant tool in being able to assess motivation. However, as research suggests, the system is not perfect and may require adapting in order to better fit certain pedagogical situations. Thus, motivation as a field in SLA appears to continue to develop as new studies are conducted. What remains consistent is the importance of motivation in understanding how and why learners acquire a second language. Motivation though is not situated in a vacuum. There are other self-regulatory processes that intertwine with motivation. One of those processes is that of self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy

Of the different regulatory processes discussed in this paper, self-efficacy is the least researched in the field of SLA. This is not true however in social cognitive theory and educational psychology where the concept was initially formed. Albert Bandura (1977) is seen as creating the basis for self-efficacy research. He posited self-efficacy as humans' beliefs in their ability to successfully deal with a situation, accomplish a task, or overcome an obstacle. Those who have high self-efficacy are more likely to engage in a given activity and lower self-efficacy leads to being more easily dissuaded from attempting to try. As research has developed new studies have assisted in differentiating self-efficacy from other similar social cognitive concepts (Bandura, 1994; Maddux, 2002). Boosting students' belief in their capabilities has been shown to positively effect overall educational development of students, use of learning strategies, and motivation (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman, 1995). In language learning, similar positive

outcomes cognitively and metacognitively have been strongly associated with high levels of self-efficacy (Stracke, 2016). The current section of the research paper focuses on the roots of self-efficacy in general psychology, applications in general education, and how self-efficacy impacts learners in the field of TESOL.

Self-efficacy as a theoretical construct is often cited as being rooted in the academic field of human psychology. Bandura (1977) is seen one of the first and most influential voices in expanding this theory. Bandura stated: "perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of actions required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). He described self-efficacy—sometimes referred to as perceived self-efficacy—as a mechanism of persistence, used by humans to cope and overcome hardship vis-à-vis a personal belief in their ability to do so (Schunk, 1991). His theories on self-efficacy operate in accordance with general social cognitive theory, which supposes people as being less likely to engage in tasks they lack confidence in and more willing to perform those in which they do feel competent (Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). At the core of the argument for the power self-efficacy is a view of the daily human experience that sees positive outlooks as essential to conquering inevitable struggles:

> "Human well-being and attainments require an optimistic and resilient sense of efficacy. This is because the usual daily realities are strewn with difficulties. They are full of frustrations, conflicts, impediments, adversities, failures, setbacks, and inequities. To succeed, one cannot afford to be a realist. Realists forgo the endeavor, are easily discouraged by failures should they try, or they become cynics about the prospect of effecting personal and social changes" (Bandura, 2008, p. 168).

Successful outcomes are determined by more than our abilities. Our abilities may very well be adequate to accomplish a task, but our perception of our abilities does indeed affect our desires to act upon them. Bandura theorized self-efficacy as not inferring that belief in ability alone is enough for success. Perceived self-efficacy controls what actions are pursued, and which are avoided. This

perception of humans' own abilities is built from various life experiences and helps shape future endeavors.

According to Bandura (1994), the foundation for building self-efficacy is created through four different sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, persuasion, and physical and emotional states. Mastery experiences are major achievements which assist in reinforcing positive attitudes through success. These experiences were seen as the most important of the four sources. Mastery experiences amount to real, tangible memories that later can be reflected upon as a time when an obstacle was overcome. This in turn, further increases efficacious feelings within the individual. Vicarious experiences, as implied, come through social modeling of those besides the self. When an individual identifies with and values another individual who achieves success, a sense that they too are capable of achieving success grows. Similarly, if those same individuals experience failure despite great effort, perceived self-efficacy may lower significantly (Bandura, 2008). Next, social persuasion, sometimes referred to as verbal persuasion, comes through conversations with others. Persuasion unfortunately works both ways—positively and negatively—and has more power when used as a form of dissuasion. That is, hearing you can achieve a goal, while a positive source of self-efficacy, has limits as unrealistic goals can easily result in disappointment. Furthermore, being convinced that you lack certain capabilities is exponentially easier and highly detrimental. Lastly, emotional and physical experiences come in many forms: stress, pain, fatigue, mood, among others. These both affect perceived self-efficacy both positively and negatively, and enhancing self-efficacy often comes in the form of reducing stress levels and properly interpreting the signals their body is sending.

The work of Bandura (1977) has led to an expanded understanding of self-efficacy through further research. As a result, self-efficacy has both been refined as a term and further differentiated from similar concepts. Narrowing the scope of any theoretical concept is a useful undertaking, but because other psychological terms such as will, volition and competency are so closely related to

self-efficacy, doing so has been especially beneficial. Competency, for example, is concerned with the amount or particular set of skills humans have to be a successful at a given task (APA, n.d.). Self-efficacy however is a form of perceived competence. An individual may possess the ability to accomplish an objective, but levels of self-efficacy determine perception as to whether those abilities exist or not. Will is the capacity for humans to choose a course of action despite potential external forces (Maddux, 2002). Self-efficacy differs from will in that forces, both internal and external affect a potential impetus for action. Finally, volition is concerned with course of action but is more associated with a commitment to a decision. Again, the belief within an efficacious individual functions as an impetus that may or may not trigger commitment to a decision. However, perceived self-efficacy does not go as far as to dictate any expectations of outcome (Bandura, 1994). As Maddux explained, self-efficacy is the belief that a behavior can be performed, not what may come of that behavior. Other scholars have also contributed to solidifying initial theories from Bandura by separating self-efficacy from other psychological concepts of the self-belief (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Pajares & Schunk, 2002). Self-efficacy then stands as a singular, unique concept, integral to the much larger theory of understanding human behavior (Schunk, 1991).

Before discussing the role of self-efficacy in second language acquisition, how the concept has been understood in educational psychology will be discussed. As with other regulatory processes a significant amount of empirical research on self-efficacy has been conducted within the wider field of educational psychology. Development of self-efficacy during the early educational period is a part of a larger, notoriously difficult process in attaining the necessary skills for growing autonomous learning skills (Zimmerman, 1995). Autonomous learning being as coveted as they are in Western societies, developing a belief in the ability to succeed becomes more important in those contexts (Benson, 2007). Consequently, those working in Western contexts have hypothesized that increasing students' overall self-efficacy may assist in increasing academic achievement . The results appear to mostly support this hypothesis. Zimmerman and Bandura (1994) conducted a field study on

American students in an advanced English composition course finding that self-efficacy contributed to students' overall ability to regulate their learning. Schunk and Zimmerman (2007) found that modeling or vicarious experiences in particular were important for younger students and was consistent with previous research in the area. While the full scope of this research is beyond the scope of this research paper, by showing these few examples, learners' belief in themselves is seen as both important and an increasingly integral component of Western education.

Self-Efficacy in Language Learning

With the previous foundation in mind, self-efficacy research in the field of SLA will be discussed Self-efficacy is much less studied than other regulatory processes such as motivation and autonomy. Little research exists on only self-efficacy in language learning (Leeming, 2017; Sardegna, Lee, & Kusey, 2018). Those that do exist often look at the construct in concert with motivation, learning strategies, and attitudes toward language learning—especially anxiety. Given how connected all four are in general social cognitive theory, this is not unreasonable. How motivated a student is to learn a language can be indicative of their belief in their ability to do so (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Similarly, anxiety is reflective of the emotional state source for self-efficacy and language learning strategies may be built from previous mastery experiences (Genç, Kuluşaklı, & Aydin, 2016; Pajares, 1997). These studies among others make a case to advocate for more research on self-efficacy. The concept appears to fit well within the broader spectrum of studies on the language learning process, but to there is a significant lack of frameworks that account for or primarily focus on self-efficacy in significant detail. However, as was shown in general psychology, there is benefit in being able to isolate self-efficacy from similar constructs. The few studies that do exist however appear to offer some intriguing preliminary conclusions.

A study by Busse and Walter (2013) of students in the UK who were learning German found that learners' amount of effort and self-efficacy are potentially correlated. The study also found that

along with intrinsic motivation, lack of self-efficacy correlated with a lower amount of effort to learn German. Paul Leeming (2017) found that mastery experiences specifically were effective in regulating the learning of Japanese college students being taught English. Both studies were consistent with an article written by Mills (2014) which examined a wide range of self-efficacy studies in SLA. According to Mills, current literature suggests higher levels of self-efficacy correlates with overall higher performance in foreign language learning. This correlation seems to remain true across all four skills and is consistent with the findings by Bandura (2008) in educational psychology research. Though, the article is careful to note that in some of the studies, the results either seem preliminary or require further validation through replicated results. Furthermore, gender, cultural context, and linguistic outcomes in writing and speaking should be explored in future research. While scholars are currently in the process of developing SLA research on self-efficacy, the lack of an efficacy-oriented SLA model that is both well researched theoretically and empirically, remains potentially problematic.

The lack of an efficacy-oriented framework seems curious considering the extensive work done in educational psychology by Bandura, Zimmerman, and others (Bandura, 1977, 2008; Zimmerman, 1995; Schunk, 1991, 1995). Perceived self-efficacy is closely tied to other regulatory processes as has been discussed in this paper. However, the lack of a more focused framework suggests the influence self-efficacy specifically has on the language learning experience is not as well understood as other related affects. This is not to infer becoming an efficacious individual is seen as unimportant. On the contrary, major theoretical frameworks on motivation, autonomy, and self-regulation do include components referring to self-efficacy (Dörnyei, 2009; Oxford, 1990, 2003). In the case of autonomy, high self-efficacy is seen as a product indicative of the agent learner. An individual Believing in their own capabilities is a key step in establishing motivation to learn a language. In the L2MSS, the construction of the ideal L2 self involves social modeling which is a source of self-efficacy (Dörnyei, 2009). In highlighting these examples, two separate conclusions

become clear. Firstly, these different affects are difficult to and should not be separated entirely from one another. Benson (2007) made a salient point in noting models which seek to completely isolate these factors are problematic in not recognizing the delicate role each has in the entire learning experience. Secondly, when you highlight one regulatory process, the interaction between each is more readily analyzed. Advocating for a more self-efficacy oriented framework does not entail separating self-efficacy from related concepts. A model for self-efficacy in SLA could provide a more focused lens for understanding the specific role of self-efficacy within the much larger scope of language learning.

While more studies are required before any sweeping conclusions can be made, higher levels of self-efficacy may offer direct benefits for English language learners in formal learning situations. Using the sources of self-efficacy proposed by Bandura (2008), a few specific situations can be hypothesized. For mastery experiences, current approaches in ELT offer many opportunities for students to build a portfolio of monumental successes (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). From those mastery experiences, learners may be more interested in participating in newer, more difficult tasks they otherwise would have found overwhelming or impossible to accomplish. This increase in self-efficacy leads to more overall academic achievement and may improve overall proficiency over time. For vicarious experiences, students may more actively seek out language learning opportunities for themselves or look for other learners to model themselves after. This is especially important in the current technological age where the amount of online resources for English language learning is ever increasing (Benson, 2015). Verbal and social persuasion is essential in a language class. Students, especially younger ones, can be easily led to believe they are incapable of learning a language if not given encouragement or are discouraged by an instructor or their peers. Few studies have yet to establish this connection in SLA, but general self-efficacy research suggests negative persuasion should be applicable in SLA (Leeming, 2017). Lastly, emotional and physical states are well established as influencing performance in ELL (Gardner, 2005; Oxford, 1990). The regulation of

those states and educating students about their nature may assist in students being able to control or become more aware of why they feel certain emotions when participating in ELL activities, exams, and otherwise. This form of awareness could become part of metacognitive strategies taught to English language learners, resulting in an increase in self-efficacy.

This section of the current research paper has explored past research on self-efficacy and concludes by proposing more empirical research be done on the specific role of self-efficacy in the field of TESOL. The relevance of becoming an efficacious individual is evident in the culmination of self-efficacy studies vis-à-vis educational. Certainly, one could postulate that these findings are directly applicable to learning English. However, as can be seen in motivation and autonomy, the language learning process is quite distinct and there is value in putting these ideas in context. Learning English is an intercultural experience and a serious, long term commitment. For many, learning English is also not a choice. This process can result in powerful experiences both positive and negative. What self-efficacy may provide is learners' belief in their capacity for success. That belief, while not necessarily indicative of skill level, promotes risk and drive to achieve. Improving those skills and overall competencies is still important, but without an impetus to apply them, competency is inert and the benefit of being competent remains unrealized. Self-efficacy, along with autonomy and motivation, then may not only improve English learning outcomes, but ensure those outcomes become actionable in future learning.

Self-Regulation

Self-regulation integrates what has been previously discussed in learner autonomy, motivation, and self-efficacy, as well as other language learning processes not yet covered in this research paper such as language learning strategies. Self-regulation is an internal force which sustains positive management skills in terms of learning (Zimmerman, 2000). Self-regulation involves creating systematic approaches to learning and this in turn assists in achieving goals more

effectively (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2006). Current research generally accepts these approaches as happening on a metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral level. Each of which are rooted in various types of constructivists theories and information processing. In the field of SLA specifically there is growing debate as to how to categorize self-regulation and the result of this debate has made discussing the idea a convoluted process. This section of the research paper will review the roots of self-regulation, discusses different frameworks researchers utilize in defining the construct, and finally provides thoughts on how the field may move forward and reconcile the debate on self-regulation.

Self-regulation and Constructivism

Foundations of self-regulation in the learning environment can be found in theories of constructivism. Constructivism as an epistemological philosophy has developed over time, leading to the creation of various schools of thought existing under the same umbrella term. The rudiments of constructivism are often tied to theoretical views of Jean Piaget (1952, 1963) on cognitive development (Wadsworth, 1996). Piaget sought initially to create a framework for understanding cognitive development in children. He theorized that humans construct a perception of the world around them, see the differences between what they already know and what they experience, then construct new knowledge based on those discrepancies. This form of constructivism is also referred to as cognitive constructivism.

Cognitive constructivist theories of Piaget (1952) are often used in contrast of the work of Lev Vygotsky (1977), but current literature in the social sciences often refers to theories by Vygotsky on the psychological development of children as social constructivism (Devries, 2000; Kingir, Tas, Gok, & Vural, 2013; Powell & Kalina, 2009). Social constructivism posits knowledge as being constructed primarily through interactions with others. The Zone of Proximal Development (Hereby, ZPD)—the point of learning in which a student is assisted in acquiring new knowledge—is likely the

most influential educational framework to come from Vygotsky (Vygotsky, 2012). The social and cognitive constructivist theories, along with critical constructivism (e.g., Freire), are now seen as being important to the development of the overall constructivist learning environment. While constructivism remains somewhat vague as a term, the constructivist learning environment may be seen as generally one in which a student deliberately constructs knowledge and the process of learning is both deep and meaningful (Gijbels, Segers, & Struyf, 2008; Rikers, van Gog, & Paas, 2008).

While self-regulation is rooted in constructivists theories, multiple distinct notions of the nature of self-regulation exist among those theories. Specifically the cognitive constructivists theories of Piaget and social constructivists theories of Vygotsky view self-regulation differently (Fox & Reconscenste, 2008; Schunk, 2008). For Piaget and those who subscribe to his theories, self-regulation is psychological and begins during infancy. That is, children innately possess the ability to self-regulate. Furthermore, Piaget views self-regulation and autonomy as being hindered by the explicit interference of others. Children build their abilities to regulate by being given opportunities to make their own choices and decide the rules for which they will follow. When others directly try to regulate the behavior of a child, their ability to regulate themselves is inhibited. For Vygotsky and social constructivists, self-regulation is formed through external factors. Self-regulation appears as children are either regulated by others or through schedules, timers, and similar external regulators (DeVries, 2000). Self-regulation then is understood quite differently by both forms of constructivism.

The two sides likely differ due to how they understand the acquisition of knowledge. Piaget (1952) theorized that our knowledge of the world is built through schemata or small units of knowledge. During development, these schemata are used to explain the world. When new information does not challenge or disrupt that understanding, we are in a state of equilibrium and assimilate new knowledge. If current schemata cannot be used to fully grasp new information, equilibrium is broken, and accommodation—the act of reconciling new knowledge with the old—

occurs consequently. Put simply, children grow to understand their world by using their own preexisting knowledge and accommodate for new knowledge that does not fit neatly into their current notions of the world. Vygotsky believed that the theories of Piaget were too focused on the internal processes of development and did not appropriately account for the role of society in cognitive development. He believed that learning happened in social contexts with another more knowledgeable individual (Bruner, 1997). Vygotsky theorized social interaction as the arena in which children understand their world and language—the medium for social interaction—as a vector for which information is absorbed. Moreover, cultural and historical symbols are absorbed through language. New information either overwrites or is added to previous structures and is maintained through both personal growth and social interaction. From this process, a sociocultural understanding of world is formed.

Bruner (1997) noted that neither framework is capable of accommodating for the other in their purest form. In his own words, "The two perspectives grow from different world views that generate different pedagogical strategies, different research paradigms, perhaps even different epistemologies, at least for now" (p. 70). Assuming self-regulation is comprised of the different regulatory processes such as autonomy, self-efficacy, motivation, and metacognitive processes, the two realms of theory should in turn view how learners become self-regulated radically different. For Vygotsky informed sociocultural constructivism, acquisition of self-regulatory behavior requires scaffolding by adults and peers through the ZPD to provide a model for which self-regulation is built (Dan, 2016). For Piaget informed cognitive constructivism, self-regulatory behavior is internally developed by experiences. Modern social cognitive theory has sought to reconcile these factors by recognizing the importance of both internal mental functions and the influence of external sociocultural forces (Bandura, 1986; Martin, 2004; Zimmerman, 2000). Still, both the works of Vygotsky and Piaget continue to influence research on the nature of self-regulation.

Where constructivist philosophy and self-regulation clearly connect then is the attention and stress on self-analysis and awareness of the learning process. Knowledge does not exist in a vacuum, waiting to be deposited (Freire, 2000). A self-regulated learner is capable of interacting with, challenging, and assimilating knowledge on their own or within a classroom environment. However, in discussing self-regulation attention must be brought to the nature of information processing. Philip Winne (1985, 2001) breaks information processing into five different types to form the acronym SMART: searching, monitoring, assembling, rehearsing, and translating. SMART is a set of cognitive processes that humans utilize in storing and recalling information. The act involves "…searching memory, monitoring new information's fit with previously learned information, assembling new links to knowledge, rehearsing knowledge to commit it to memory, and translating knowledge in one form, such as verbal, to another, such as pictorial" (Greene & Azevedo, 2007, p. 354). Winne (2018) explains that though these operations are cognitive in nature, they also exist at the metacognitive level. Where self-regulation learning occurs at what he calls the "third level" in which learners think critically about the products of cognitive and metacognitive processing over a course of time. Winne (2017) describes the process of self-regulation in four phases. The learner analyzes resources and limitations that could affect the learning outcome. In phase two they set goals and plans for the task based on the analysis in phase one. In phase three they engage with the task. In phase four the learner monitors the outcome and chooses whether to make adjustments or not. Furthermore, self-regulated learners plan for the future accordingly based on the products of the process in anticipation of future events. Self-regulated learning then as a theory has basis in both cognitive theory, social constructivism, and research on information processing.

Self-regulation in Language Learning

Next, general implications of self-regulated language learning will be made more explicit. Specifically, traits that are found among learners who exhibit qualities of self-regulation and

potential pedagogical benefits self-regulation has in acquiring a second language. In educational psychology studies, Zimmerman (1986) outlined how a self-regulated learner actively participates in the learning process: metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally. The structure of his outline will be used to explore self-regulation in the language learning process. The first act of participation at the metacognitive level can be best looked at through language learning strategies. Metacognitive strategies are divided into five different sections "(1) preparing and planning for learning, (2) selecting and using learning strategies, (3) monitoring strategy use, (4) orchestrating various strategies, and (5) evaluating strategy use and learning" (Anderson, 2002, p. 2). Example metacognitive strategies include thinking aloud, reflection journals, and monitoring. These metacognitive strategies have proven to be useful tools in promoting greater self-regulation among language learners overall (Oxford, 1990, 2003, 2016).

In terms of motivation, language learners who are more motivated may be more likely to exhibit higher qualities of self-regulation (Kormos & Csizér, 2014). Motivation, as with the other regulatory processes discussed in this paper are closely interrelated concepts (Dörnyei, 2001; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2008). While considerable efforts have been made to distinguish them from one another, Nakata (2010) argues that both are "two sides of the same coin" (Nakata, 2010, p. 2). Indeed, as a learner becomes more motivated to learn a language, attempting to better regulate that process could be a natural next step. This logic cannot be taken too far as the level of motivation does not necessitate any given amount of strategy use or particular regulated behavior. Recent strides in the development of the L2MSS by Dörnyei (2009) however provides an intriguing perspective for differentiating strategy use and motivation. The L2MSS also assists in explaining how behavior—the last prescription for self-regulation by Zimmerman (1986)—fits into the intertwined nature of self-regulation and motivation.

Consider the ideal L2 self component of the L2MSS. The ideal L2 self encompasses a positive oriented vision of how a language learner views themselves in the future. That vision may

best be understood as not in sync with self-regulation but as an impetus for enacting regulated behavior. This notion is further supported by a study of Hungarian language learners by Kormos and Csizér (2014). Kormos and Csizér did not include the ought-to L2 self in their study, as their previous works failed to distinguish the ought-to L2 self from instrumentality (Csizér & Kormos, 2008, 2009). However, for scholars who do recognize the ought-to L2 self (e.g., Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011) a similar study with the ought-to L2 self could prove useful in further separating motivation and self-regulation. This is especially intriguing considering contexts such as Japan where a more prevalent ought-to self seems to have a negative impact on long term motivation (Pigott, 2011). Though there is legitimate potential in such a framework, there is currently a serious debate as to whether self-regulation and language learning strategies differ at all in SLA theory. More specifically, should self-regulation as a term replace what many have in the past referred to as language learning strategies.

Recent research on self-regulation has brought the current literature to a critical junction that will affect the future of the field. A large portion of research on self-regulation in SLA as a standalone concept has been conducted vis-à-vis language learning strategies (Dörnyei, 2005; Oxford, 2016; Ranalli, 2012; Tseng, Dörnyei, & Schmitt, 2006). Rose, Briggs, Boggs, Sergio, and Slavianskia (2018) took this a step further by calling attention to an increasingly louder call to replace the construct of language learning strategies with self-regulation. Dörnyei (2005) was especially critical, arguing that no definition of language learning strategies is satisfactory in distinguishing learning from learning strategy use. While this is an important conversation in current literature, the conflation between the two constructs has created a predicament in which understanding which operational definition scholars are using is now essential. Dörnyei and his colleagues seem to have adopted this new form of self-regulation as language learning strategies. Conversely, Oxford (2016) has worked on a new strategy system that may assist in reestablishing language learning strategies as unique to self-regulation. Rose et al. took particular interest in a new

approach by Teng and Zheng (2016) which reconciled the two constructs. Which direction research will take on the matter of self-regulation and language learning strategies remains unclear. What is certain is that whatever synthesis is eventually made will need to accommodate both self-regulation and language learning strategies as being intimately connected to one another.

Using the accommodating definition of self-regulation from Rose et al. (2018), the concept is multidimensional, incorporating cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, behavioral, and environmental factors. These factors together may improve overall academic achievement in language learning. There does not currently exist a formula capable of quantifying the impact of each construct for a typical self-regulated learner. This leads to a familiar conclusion and a recurrent theme throughout this research paper. There is the question of what quantifies a learner as autonomous, motivated, self-regulated, or seen as having self-efficacy. A recurrent rebuttal has been there is no exact number or quantity that can define whether a learner can be defined as possessing these traits. Consequently, each area of research seeks to qualify these facilities through focused, but holistic forms of analysis. Classifying the pedagogical benefits of self-regulation in SLA necessitates a similar holistic view. More precisely, those other regulatory processes—autonomy, motivation, and self-efficacy—are essential to understanding how learners benefit from self-regulation.

Their interconnectedness is perhaps what makes discussing these qualities in concert so difficult. There is a reciprocal relationship in which they both benefit and can be products of one another. Using autonomy as an example, a learner who is autonomous may more readily perform linguistic tasks, actively participates in the learning process, can adapt to new situations, and reflect on their learning—all of which are pedagogically advantageous (Oxford, 1999). The opposite can also be true as well. Learners who employs metacognitive strategies seek out new learning opportunities and learn how to adapt to new situations. This in turn builds skills that often lead to autonomous behavior (Holec, 1981). This of course, relates to the previous argument on strategies and self-regulation being merged, but the same can also be said of motivation. Motivated learners are

autonomous learners, actively engage in metacognition, but also are willing to engage in behavior they may see as unpleasant but necessary to be regulated (Ushioda, 1996, 2011). Each of these qualities of motivation can also be reinforced by either working to be more well-regulated or autonomous. From this standpoint, each of these regulatory processes mesh with one another and their reciprocity reinforces the idea that neither functions on their own.

In concluding this section on self-regulation, the concept has roots in constructivist, cognitive, and information processing theory and is interrelated with autonomy, motivation, and self-efficacy. Self-regulation in SLA theory has reached an impasse in which finding a common operational definition has become difficult. The field at this moment has not come to an agreement on one term and future studies will ultimately show which direction scholars choose to go in. From reviewing the current literature, one solution may prove valuable. Perhaps the mode of thought should not be combining self-regulation with language learning strategies, but attempting to formulate a framework through a broader lens of these range of qualities. One capable of both discussing self-regulation as a glue that binds each of these regulatory processes together. This raises the question of the usefulness of such a framework. A potential response being there is real value in being able to use a singular term to discuss together theories which research shows as being all interconnected. Though this research paper is incapable of being able to actualize such a framework, in discussing the possibility for such a theory, new approaches to self-regulation may be sought in future research. Thus, with the general literature on autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation having been reviewed, the following sections of this research paper seek to contextualize these theories within Japanese TEFL and formulate conclusions based on their perceived relevance.

Historical ELL Policies in Japan

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology sits atop the chain of diffusion of English education policy. Much modern research about MEXT and their policies has

focused on critiquing those policies vis-à-vis classroom realities (Yoshida, 2003; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). Others have gone further by scrutinizing the dichotomy between real political agenda and flowery rhetoric (Hashimoto, 2000; Hashimoto, 2009). While there is some validity to these critiques, the nature of the ebb and flow of political entities like MEXT should be considered through the lens of history. As Bjork and Tsuneyoshi (2005) have explained, during the late 20th century, Japanese educational reforms were lauded for the types of learners they created. However, the 21st century has brought new challenges for the Ministry of Education. Notions of communicative competence and globalization have resulted in a struggle to adapt quickly enough to the needs of learners in Japan today. This section of the literature review uses a historical lens to analyze complex issues learners face in attempting to attain English language proficiency.

The English language has a complex historical relationship with Japan. Butler and Iino (2004) described the presence of English for educational purposes as being either socially pragmatic or for the purposes of passing entrance exams for college or high school. Though Butler and Iino did well in outlining the complex relationship of the narrative of pragmatism and pedagogy, the presence of English in Japan goes beyond both. English in Japan has become seated within the much larger cultural fabric of Japanese society. Within that fabric, English serves a myriad of functions, but most research would suggest the primary function is that of a view toward the rest of the world—though the purpose of that function has changed over time (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005; Hashimoto, 2000; Hino, 2018). This is not to infer that the cultural impact of English is controllable, but that in history, changing states of Japanese society have often coincided with different portrayals of English.

English of course, is not native to Japan and there are certain stages in which the language began to become engrained in Japanese culture. The event most often traced back to, is the opening of the Japanese borders through the Kanagawa Treaty in 1854. The treaty, as Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson (2006) explained, was uneven and triggered a sequence of events that would lead to unequal trade. The soon to be established Meiji government would then look for opportunities to

advance on the world stage. Though these events were significant, Japanese citizens had been in contact with English before these historical incidents. In 1809 for example, the Edo Shogunate required a few of their interpreters to learn English after a prior incident with a British ship arriving in Nagasaki (Shimizu, 2010). Another famous account is that of John Manjiro—a Japanese fisherman who became shipwrecked and was later rescued by an American whaling ship. He is one of the first known figures in Japan to have become fluent in the English language (Hino, 2018). While his story is historically significant, the cultural rooting of English into Japanese society truly began to accelerate with the turn of the Meiji era.

A significant attribute of the Meiji era was the reconstruction and promotion of Japanese history, identity, and national interest (Doak, 1996; Fujitani, 2004). These efforts led to a surge in nationalism and interest in the West vis-à-vis a now mobilized Japanese society. Although the full nature of Japanese nationalism is beyond the scope of this paper, the ties of English education to national interests during this 40 year period are essential in understanding the evolution of ELL in Japan. As such, English education in the beginning of the Meiji era mostly coincided with Japanese interests in Western cultures and what could be learned from these countries. The government continued this effort of promoting English language learning until the creation of the Meiji constitution in 1889 (Shimizu, 2010). This, along with subsequent victories in the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars would reroute national interests away from looking toward the west and to reinvigorating interest and pride in Japanese society. Interest in English language education decreased drastically during toward the end of the Meiji era as a result.

The beginning of the Taisho era in 1912 saw another shift in perspective on English education that would continue through the beginnings of the Showa era. As in the Meiji era most of these changes appeared to coincide with the national interests of the imperial Japanese government. A protectiveness against western ideals entering the Japanese educational system began to grow; non-Japanese texts and teachers were eventually replaced with Japanese ones (Kitao & Kitao, 1995).

Communicative approaches to English such as the early direct method were stifled by an increase in use of Japanese in the classroom and the use of Japanese textbooks (Friedman, 2016). A series of debates among various influential voices from both politicians and scholars were characterized by those who felt English education was needed at the time and those who sought to lessen or even eliminate the usage of English (Shimizu, 2010; Fujimoto-Adamson, 2006). Eventually, after World War II, the place of English education in society would be revisited through a different lens.

Kubota (1998) argues that while there was an initial post-war attempt to hinder English language education, the influence America had on Japanese reform had significant influence in changing this philosophy. The result being another increase in proliferation of English language education. By 1956, English became a common component of high school entrance examinations (Butler & Iino, 2004). The inclusion of English in entrance exams marked the beginnings of English language education being folded into what is known as examination hell, or a culture of high stakes examinations for entering high school and later, university (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005). Studying the English became pseudo-mandatory as pressure to enter higher levels of education increased. Similarly, as Japan began to blossom economically, interests in English as a communicative tool in business rose. By the 1980s liberalization in education became the impetus for a critical period of change (Duke, 1986). The concept of *kokusaika* or internationalization entered the political vernacular and a slew of government prescriptions through MEXT started to shape English education.

Policies from MEXT since the push toward internationalization continue to be the primary vessel of change in English education. This impact can be seen in the suggestion for positive attitudes toward communication in a foreign language (MEXT, 1989). Some consequent literature though, has been rather critical of how these plans have been constructed. A common narrative is policies and reforms for English are not actually being for internationalization, but for maintaining Japanese identity within a globalized society (Hashimoto, 2000; Hashimoto, 2009). That is, government

initiatives on internationalization are protective in nature, and the propagation of English in Japan is a defensive measure. TEFL in Japan, in this view, is employed as a conduit for communicating Japanese uniqueness to the outer world. As Yoshino (1995) described, *kokusaika* may be a mode of exportation of Japanese culture to the outer world. Though these critical arguments are compelling, they exist among a wider interpretation of how *kokusaika* effected TEFL in Japan in the 1980s and 1990s.

Indeed, as Phillip Seargant (2011) expressed, the reaction of Japan to globalization has certainly impacted approaches to TEFL in the country, but as Roger Goodman (2007) explained, internationalization since the 1980s can be thought of beyond nationalism. The debate centered around those nationalists as well as pragmatists and economists. The creation of the JET Programme can be interpreted as one of the pragmatist products of *kokusaika*, although questions still remain as to how effective the program has been. The economic impact of *kokusaika* vis-à-vis English can be seen in the increased interest and competitiveness of institutions seeking to increase their perceptions of being internationalized. Universities, businesses, and other institutions' economic and political power influenced the interpretations of *kokusaika* through their actions. Universities specifically have seen an increased amount of overseas students, programs conducted in English, and study abroad opportunities for Japanese students since the 1990s. Important to note however is that regardless of if *kokusaika* and the subsequent effect on Japanese TEFL was more about pragmatism or nationalism, a country seeking to maintain national interests is not exactly unique to Japan. As Gottlieb (1994) described, language policies in Japan, as with all countries are shaped around national interests during their inception. Furthermore, changes in Japanese education and curriculum are traditionally slow in pace, making any large shifts in how policies are enacted an equally gradual process. Yoshida (2003) agreed with this notion of a leisurely pace of change regarding the lack of communicative approaches until 1999 (MEXT, 1999). The turn of the century though has seen a much greater rate of change and the amount of exhaustive reform from MEXT.

The 2002 MEXT plan of action marks another critical point in ELL policy change with the often-quoted headline “cultivating Japanese who can communicate using English” (MEXT, 2002). As the title implies, the primary goal in the plan of action was to create reform that would in turn increase communicative proficiency among Japanese learners of English. As with previous policies, the action plan would be subject to much debate, but the level of attention surrounding the action plan appeared to be much larger than usual (Butler & Iino, 2004; Hashimoto, 2009). The amount of attention was likely due to the scope of reform included in the plan. The plan of action called for an increase in proficiency for not only students, but teachers as well. For students, junior high school graduates MEXT noted that they should able to communicate in basic situations including greetings and daily life topics. For high school graduates MEXT explained they should be able to have a normal conversation on daily topics. For teachers the standard for English proficiency was set at a TOEIC 710 or above, an addition of a native speaker teacher who assists in class once a week, and a community representative who is proficient in English. Overall, most of the policies set forth by the plan of action regarding English were organized around the notion of practicality. The call for practical English took form in an increase in the use of communicative activities, more study abroad opportunities, exam reform, and furthering the presence of English in elementary school among others. However, most of the suggestions by MEXT were described as either vague or unreasonable—especially regarding teaching ability (Okuno, 2007). While impactful, a few other policies since then have shaped English education in Japan.

2006 marked a year of great revision to the Basic Act on Education which declares as law, compulsory education to be free throughout Japan (MEXT, 2006). The new revision set four specific objectives regarding the purpose of education in Japan:

> (1) having students acquire wide-ranging knowledge and culture, fostering the value of seeking the truth, and cultivating a rich sensibility and sense of morality as well as building the health of the body;

(2) developing individuals' abilities, cultivating creativity, and fostering a spirit of autonomy and independence by respecting the value of the individual, as well as emphasizing the relationship between one's career and one's everyday life and fostering the value of respect for hard work;

(3) fostering the values of respect for justice, responsibility, equality between men and women, and mutual respect and cooperation, as well as the value of actively participating in building our society and contributing to its development, in the public spirit;

(4) fostering the values of respecting life, caring about nature, and desiring to contribute to the preservation of the environment; and

(5) fostering the value of respect for tradition and culture and love of the country and regions that have nurtured us, as well as the value of respect for other countries and the desire to contribute to world peace and the development of the international community. (paras. 6-10)

These five goals were set as the basis for revisions in education around Japan, including foreign language education (MEXT, 2008a, 2008b). With English now being an academic subject and virtually compulsory, reforms in foreign language education primarily targeted English (Hashimoto, 2009). Within this policy, elementary education became compulsory for the first time, though only in grades 5 and 6. In middle school the development of all four skills was emphasized with much more detail in the types of communicative activities in comparison with the 2002 action plan. Vocabulary sizes were increased to 1200 words, class hours to 140 hours, and specific guidelines on grammatical features were established. Senior high school guidelines found similar increases. Vocabulary requirements were increased to 1800 by the end of high school and English classes were reorganized to better fit all four skills.

Currently, Japan faces a situation in which the aspired outlines from MEXT do not necessarily line up with the actual situations learners face. MEXT (2017) seeks to push

communicative proficiencies of Japanese students at the junior high school level although no increases in overall hours are stated. High school students will be expected to reach the equivalent of CEFR B1 proficiency by 2022 (Nakamura, 2018). The current national exam was set to be abolished in 2020 and replaced with a four skills exam. The start of compulsory English lessons was also lowered from 5th grade to 3rd grade but because of the health crisis surrounding the coronavirus disease 2019 (SARS CoV-2) pandemic, whether these were implemented or not is unclear.

This section has sought to outline the complex relationship Japan has with the English language through a historical lens and in modern policy. English has played multiple roles in Japan throughout history and currently serves as a compulsory language taught to all students in the education system. While scholarship has been critical of how MEXT has handled TEFL in Japan, there are positive outcomes worth noting. Learner proficiency is overall increasing and while policies have been historically unclear, MEXT has done well in attempting to implement more communicative approaches. With each new change in the course study, the outlines for how English should be taught, and lesson guidelines are overall becoming more explicit. The latest goals stated by MEXT are lofty and the SARS CoV-2 pandemic has placed their plausibility into question. Still, there remains a path for ELL in Japan to progress for the better. However, students currently and in the past have been heavily affected by a system that demands much of them. The next section of the current research paper looks at the experience of Japanese learners of English at each stage of education, setting the context for a following discussion on regularly processes among those students.

ELL in Japan at Different Stages of Education

As has been shown through the literature, the EFL journey in Japan has a historical narrative that has led to a plethora of reforms via policies. The education system is characterized by a top-down structure run by the Ministry of Education. However, that structure does not always align perfectly with what EFL literature says should benefit learners. Furthermore, as students transition

from the different educational stages, pedagogical approaches also change. Ultimately, these transitions have significant influence on students' ability to learn English efficiently, and their overall views of English. The following section of this research paper discusses policies in Japanese English education and their impact on students. Current issues in TEFL from each stage of education will be discussed starting from elementary school, moving to middle school, then high school, and finally ending with the tertiary level.

Primary School

As discussed in the previous section, part of the revision to the basic act of education was the implementation of compulsory education at the elementary level for the first time by 2011 (MEXT, 2008a, 2008b). While a step forward towards a more comprehensive English curriculum, the implementation Primary School English (hereby, PSE) since 2011 has been somewhat problematic (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011; Hashimoto, 2011; Machida, 2016; Ng, 2016). The main concerns center around how PSE has been introduced, teacher readiness, and student readiness. Prior till 2020, mandatory PSE was established at the 5th and 6th grade levels and treated as a "foreign language activity" with only once a week at 45 minutes per lesson (Ng, 2016, p. 219). The label of foreign language activity is especially critical, inferring students merely needing to interact with the language, as opposed to a more structured learning activity. Teachers themselves have expressed anxiety in both their proficiency and being able to adequately administer the curriculum (Machida, 2016; Machida & Walsh, 2014). For the students, questions have been raised as to the necessity of English at the elementary level, as well as the inevitable shift between how English is taught in Elementary school as opposed to junior high school (Yoshida, 2012). The following paragraphs will explore the current state of PSE since the revision in 2008 and issues in pedagogy which later impacts students at the middle school level.

The outline of compulsory PSE from MEXT (2008b) was met with skepticism toward how English would be taught. The guidelines presented seemed to infer that English would not be treated similarly to other mandatory school subjects (Tahira, 2012). This treatment of English as separate from other foreign languages was not new, but interestingly reinforced the idea of English as essentially required and not a choice. From a public perspective, some of the narrative was shaped by a concern with student and teacher readiness (Japan Times, 2011). These concerns appear more reflective of the issues the public perceived at the upper levels of education. English has historically been seen as a struggle for students and bringing that struggle down to the lower level raised cause for concern. There were also concerns for English education conflicting with Japanese education (Butler, 2007). MEXT, aware of the multitude of concerns, took care in introducing PSE slowly. Despite careful introductions, initial results suggested a lack of organization in what is being taught at the elementary school level.

Although compulsory PSE has not been implemented for long, early research suggests a lack of organization in both materials, who is teaching them, and how they are being taught. Since being introduced in 2011, there have not been strong mandates as to what materials will be used in PSE (Yamauchi, 2018). One of the course materials, *Eigo Note*, has been subject to much criticism already (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011; Ng, 2016). The book is neither comprehensive and lacking in explicit skills such as reading, vocabulary, and grammar. In a survey conducted by Fennelly and Luxton only 30% of teachers felt confident in using Eigo Note. The results of this survey was likely further impacted by a lack of standardization in teaching qualifications. In some regions, PSE is conducted by an ALT with the homeroom teacher but in others, untrained homeroom teachers have been left to figure out how to conduct English lessons. There has been a strong push for a more unified approach and in 2020 MEXT planned to not only bring English to the 3rd and 4th grade, but to introduce a more robust curriculum (Nakamura, 2018). Whether MEXT has gone forth with this,

given the SARS CoV-2 pandemic, remains to be seen, but the lack of centralization of English at the elementary level has impacted how English is taught at the middle school level.

Junior High School

Unlike PSE, middle school English has essentially been mandatory since English became a subject in high school entrance examinations in the 1950s (Sasaki, 2008). Though attending high school in Japan is not compulsory, a surge in the number of Japanese seeking higher education in the 1960s and 1970s led to an increase in the influence of exam washback on junior high school students. The result being a long-established culture of learning English for what Gardner (1985) described as instrumental purposes. Until around the 1980s this resulted in heavy use of grammar-translation methods that were utilized to pass examinations. English for many students was not a tool for communication but a subject to be conquered to enter high school. A change in culture began to occur in the 1980s and 1990s as MEXT (1989, 1999) began to emphasize English for communicative purposes. The result was a growing concern with these methods and pedagogical changes that could be seen during that time (Browne & Wada, 1998; Yamada, 2010). However, many teachers and middle schools still employed old grammar-translation methods despite recommendations by MEXT. With the rapid changes of course study since 2003, overall, modern junior high school English curriculums have become comparatively more communicative and four skills focused. ELT at this level remains problematic however, and many learners continue to struggle to use English in practical situations.

One of the main issues facing ELT in Japanese junior high schools stems from PSE and the wide range of student proficiency levels (Yoshida, 2012). Some learners entering junior high school may be relatively proficient compared to their peers. This gap in proficiency leaves teachers with the difficult task of attempting to accommodate those students who may be behind. The situation may change once more as PSE becomes more stringent in 2020 (Nakamura, 2018). Another major issue is

the continuing dichotomy between the push for communicative language teaching (CLT) and classroom realities. In a major survey by Benesse (as cited in Sakamoto, 2012), only 35.1% of junior high school teachers reported using communicative approaches frequently although 77% of them supported the use of English for communicative purposes. In another study by Benesse (as cited in Sakamoto, 2012) 57.7% of students reported disliking English studies. Sakamoto (2012) explained that this dissatisfaction coincides with a change in how English is taught as many schools continue to implement grammar and translation-based approaches. Policy wise, ELT at the junior high school level should be moving away from these antiquated methods more quickly. A lack of teacher training, confidence in their overall fluency, and pressure to accommodate for examination expectations has likely slowed the transition.

High School

Studies have shown that the transition from junior high school to high school often results in learners who are less motivated and have less positive outlooks on learning English. Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) conducted a considerably large study of 656 high school students from four different high schools. Their study found high school students—whether considered generally motivated or not—mainly experienced demotivation from learning content and test scores. This study is reflective of the ongoing narrative in the literature that an issue with what is being taught and the pressure of examinations still exists despite the ever-changing course of study. Concerning the former, while current policies encourage high schools to teach English for communicative purposes, those approaches are less evident than desired (Sakamoto, 2012). One obstacle toward bringing policy and practice together teachers, their training, and their beliefs. The desire for communicative English and the teachers qualified and confident enough to administer such a curriculum remain at odds. MEXT however must share responsibility for the communicative log jam at the high school level. Teachers may conduct the lessons, but MEXT sponsored materials—despite their espoused objectives—still

lack the necessary guidance to create a communicative classroom (Michaud, 2015). Perhaps the latest adjustment to the high school curriculum in 2022 will bring about more sufficient materials. As of now though the situation in Japanese high school ELT is in flux, and traditional styles of teaching and learning are clinging on. Newer four skills approaches are becoming more prevalent, but at an unfortunately slow pace.

Tertiary

Japanese TEFL at the university level is pedagogically rich with a variety of curriculum styles and courses offered depending on the university. Established pedagogical theories from the broader field of TESOL such as English as an International Language (Hereby, EIL), English as a Lingua Franca, Content and Language Integrated Learning (Hereby, CLIL), English-medium Instruction (Hereby, EMI), and Content-based Instruction (Hereby, CBI) are all present approaches in Japanese universities throughout Japan (Brown & Bradford, 2017; Suzuki, 2011; Tanaka, 2010). CBI has been taught in Japan since the 1990s and EMI courses specifically are offered in more than a third of Japanese universities (MEXT, 2015). Thus, a diverse and growing group of approaches to teaching English at university exist, but those programs face two major issues regarding incoming students. Instruction in secondary schools and below are not as holistic in teaching English language skills. Students entering the university often have significant gaps in their language abilities, especially orally. Moreover, there remains concern over learner motivation. Learners often feel a new sense of freedom from exams when entering university as they exit the proverbial *shiken jigoku* or examination hell that continues to permeate the Japanese education system (McVeigh, 2002; Ushioda, 2013). From a student perspective, learning English no longer carries the tremendous instrumental weight of passing an exam. The tertiary level of Japanese education then faces the burden of attempting reorient the motivation of now generally demotivated Japanese learners, and further develop their English skills (Dörnyei, 2004).

The journey from elementary school to university English language education can be characterized by the constantly shifting narratives at each stage. In public education, English often begins as a fun learning activity where students make first contact with the language and curriculums are rather loose. Upon entering junior high school, learning becomes formalized. Grammar and vocabulary become heavily focused on in lessons which demotivates learners. High schools feel pressure to both ensure students know how to conquer university exams while attempting to adjust to new policies for communicative English. Universities face the obstacles of trying to now provide these same students a more academically holistic English language learning experience while attempting to re-motivate them. This analysis is very general in that private schools, bilingual schools, and public schools that experiment with different approaches have not been mentioned. These schools are important in that they challenge the notion of what Japanese TEFL can be by adding to an increasingly diverse learning environment. They however remain the exception. The culture of Japanese ELL outlined in this section is especially true for those learners who come from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds and more rural towns. In highlighting the typical context, the structure current structure of Japanese education becomes evident. For those students and teachers who operate within this system regulating their learning is an important step toward a better relationship with ELL.

Regulatory Processes in Japanese TEFL

Until this point, the current research paper has outlined the essential role of regulatory processes in ELL for long term learning prospects. The complex historical function of English in Japanese society and the current state of English pedagogy in Japan has also been explored. In doing so, the role of English as an unavoidable, long term journey for Japanese students can be seen. This journey for many is arduous and too often leaves learners with a negative perspective on their abilities as English language learners. Given this context, Japanese students remain highly effective

at being able to tackle these obstacles. Moreover, many still maintain positive views of English as a skill they wish to acquire. This positivity is worth maintaining and acquiring the skills to regulate their learning may aid in doing so. Autonomy, self-efficacy, motivation, and self-regulation stand as some of the hallmarks of successful language learners. Learners who exhibit these qualities are capable of building proficiency over a long period of time and research has shown that promoting these qualities can have transformative results. The following sections will analyze how each regulatory process is currently understood in Japanese TEFL. Afterwards, a hypothesis for a different manner of viewing Japanese EFL students by instructors—and the potential benefits of doing so—will be presented.

Motivation in the Japanese Context

Motivation is a complex construct in SLA, and there is a growing emphasis on measuring motivation within context (Dörnyei, 2019; Taguchi, 2013; Todaka, 2017). There remains a debate however, as to how focused the scope of a context must become when measuring the motivation of an individual. In Japan there are multiple factors to consider. Motivation can be very specific to each individual and many sociocultural and socioeconomic factors can play a role in changing motivation. However, there are some common threads that exist. Japanese learners appear to be primarily extrinsically motivated. Using the LMSS framework, their motivation mostly stems from their ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Pigott, 2011). That source of motivation appears to be problematic. The goal many learners target does not adequately serve their desire to become proficient at English. This section on motivation then outlines motivation in the Japanese context and discusses some of the implications based on recent literature.

What motivates (or demotivates) learners is influenced by current trajectories within Japanese society (Taguchi, 2013). In terms of TEFL, the dissemination of pedagogical policies from MEXT is the most considerable societal element. Since the course of study changes relatively often,

new research will always be relevant and useful in grasping current motivational factors in Japan. Nobuyuki Honna (2016) identified the desire to be a part of a globalized society, the advent of social media, and seeing English as a necessity as relevant motivators in Japan. His analysis was consistent with studies by Brown (2004) and Suzuki (2011), who both described both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as existing among Japanese learners. Kikuchi and Sakai (2009) though noted that compared to extrinsic motivation, intrinsic appeared less often among Japanese English language learners. Mandatory English courses and high-stake test washback are potential reasons for this imbalance (Brown, 2000; Allen, 2016). Not all motivators are positive and the large number of extrinsic motivators that come from sources not of the students choice create the potential for demotivation. Demotivators can accumulate over time, creating a lasting impact. Understanding their nature in Japanese ELL has become pedagogically important (Falout & Maruyama, 2004; Kikuchi & Sakai, 2009).

Demotivation—while somewhat a newer issue in the field of motivation—is well-studied in the context of Japanese TEFL. Dörnyei (2001) described demotivation as "specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action" (p. 143). Sakai and Kikuchi (2009) found this definition to be problematic as Dörnyei himself later noted in the same article that internal factors such as negative attitudes towards the foreign language and low self-confidence as relevant demotivators. Concerning Japan specifically, Dörnyei (2003) identified Japanese learners' motivation for learning English as tied to passing critical examinations for entering university. Using his L2 Motivational Self System as a framework, Japanese learners' motivations being tied to exams directly relates to the ought-to self component (Dörnyei, 2009). The ought-to self is primarily concerned with pragmatic ideals such as career success or passing an exam to enter university. If a Japanese English learner has succeeded in accomplishing their goal of entering a prestigious university, entering university then is a potential crux for demotivation. Put

simply, after entering university, the ideal ought-to self has been realized. The primary source of motivation is now gone, making demotivation inevitable.

Thus, what motivates one to learn English does not necessarily result in a positive outcome over time. What motivates a student to learn now may possibly contribute to overall demotivation future learning situations. Motivation is not a point in time but a journey that often involves change as time progresses (Pigott, 2019). Japanese ELL changes vastly from primary through tertiary education, and what motivates students naturally should as well. This may help illustrate why the ought-to L2 self is such a high predictor of motivated behavior even though many Japanese college students can be classified as overall demotivated. One culprit for their demotivation is the exam culture prevalent in Japanese TEFL and the overprioritizing of pragmatic goals as opposed to intrinsic goals. Pigott (2011) for example found the ought-to ideal L2 self as the strongest indicator of motivated learning behavior in a study of 275 female high school students. In his view, this pushed learners to be able to conquer the exams but does not help students to learn practical English, creating a loop of frustration. The prevalence of ought-to and ideal L2 self imbalance is a potential point of concern as the somewhat equal balance between the ought-to and ideal L2 selves been theorized as appropriate (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). More importantly, the ideal L2 self is theorized as correlating to more positive outcomes and the ought-to self is correlated with prevention of negative outcomes. In terms of motivated learning behavior, when the ought-to L2 self severely outweighs the ideal L2 self, the outcomes may be potentially negative. This position may seem semantically arbitrary, but as MacIntyre and Mercer (2014) asserted, the orientation towards positivity in the ideal L2 self has potential for optimizing learning behavior. Ought-to L2 self-based motivated learning behavior positions learning English not as moving toward something positive but moving away from something negative.

More research into the imbalance of the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self is required to better theorize the impact on Japanese TEFL. As seen in Islam, Lamb, and Chambers' (2013) study

with Pakistani students, adding other motivators to the construct can assist in better focusing the LMSS within a given context. Due to their universality, separating examination pressures from the rest of the ought-to L2 self construct may provide a more illustrative view of what pragmatic goals motivate Japanese students. What is clear is students' motives for learning English strongly affects their drive—both positively and negatively. While the positive notions of motivation are heavily studied among the literature (e.g. Dörnyei), the potentially for these motivations to potentially turn into a negative in Japanese context highlights the common issues in the education environment. However, changes in the kind of English being taught and the variety of approaches that are becoming increasingly common paints a positive outlook. Changing what motivates students will play an essential role in regulating their learning toward English learning that serves the practical usage students seem to desire.

Learner Autonomy in the Japanese Context

Learner autonomy in SLA began in Western literature. Accounting for this, Pennycook (1989) cautioned not to freely apply learner autonomy universally to any context. While an apt warning, learner autonomy has been validated as applicable when adjusting for the educational context (Cotterall, 1995; Littlewood, 1999). Early attempts at applying autonomy in Japan confirmed the notion that if autonomy is to be taught and promoted, the approach must account for learners' cultural expectations and the native educational environment (Aoki & Smith, 1999; Broner, 2000; Dias, 2000). An increased level of interest in language learner autonomy in the early 2000s coincided with the plan of action from MEXT (2003), and the value of teaching autonomous learning in Japan has since grown (Nakata, 2011). The implications of these findings are discussed in the current section and followed by pedagogical suggestions for autonomous language learning in Japan.

Aoki and Smith (1999) argued that Japanese learners' capacity for autonomy should not be underestimated through culturally essentialist views. They also offered a caveat, noting that a phase

in which learners adjust may be present but overall, Japanese students are as capable of autonomous learning as those from other countries. Current research is consistent with their thoughts in that Japanese students are quite capable of exhibiting qualities of autonomous learning (McEown & Sugita McEown, 2019; Sugita-McEown & Oga-Baldwin, 2019; Tsuda & Nakata, 2012). A recurrent result among these studies has been that learners believe they have the ability to control their own learning. Where this becomes problematic is in whether the circumstances in traditional classrooms allows for the cultivation of autonomous language learning. In public school education, before university, teaching for autonomy remains an obstacle. The top-down nature of the national curriculum makes constructing a course that both adheres to the necessary standards and allows instructors to promote autonomy through lesson plans a difficult task. Teachers must have the capacity to administer such content and have the belief in both the value of and their ability to teach for autonomy (Aoki, 2002). Post-secondary education offers more opportunity to teach for autonomy and some success has been found at this level, but the same problems that affect non-tertiary ELL remain relevant (Stroupe, Rundle, & Tomita, 2016).

Thus, any attempt at cultivating autonomous language learning in Japan faces three primary issues: professional realities in Japan, teachers and their beliefs in autonomous language learning, and teachers' beliefs in their ability to teach autonomy. These three have an intricate relationship and act as a circuit through which autonomous instruction must first go through before reaching learners. In general, those who teach in the field of TESOL may be subject to prescribed curriculums. Those curriculums affect if and how they teach for learner autonomy (Phipps & Borg, 2009). In Japan, as was the case for some of the teachers in a study by Nakata (2014), teachers' feelings toward autonomy are not only subject to their own views and beliefs, but their own reaction to institutional expectations. Aoki (2002) discussed the nature of the latter two by positing them as two different forms of teacher autonomy. The first is their judgement in how to and if they should teach autonomy and second is confidence in their abilities to teach for autonomy.

Once an instructor has an established expectation of what is permitted within their curriculum, the path for autonomous instruction must go through their teaching beliefs. Belief in the benefit of teaching autonomy exists among teachers in Japan though whether they actually exercise these beliefs through their lessons appears to depend on the individual. For example, Stroupe, Rundle and Tomita (2016) conducted a study over the course of an academic year on the autonomous language learning beliefs of 16 teachers at a private university in Japan. The faculty members had varying backgrounds, experiences, and all held post-graduate degrees. The faculty members all agreed on the positive effect learners developing autonomy has on their success. Where instructors differed were their opinions on the nature of autonomy and the desirability of certain methods of teaching for autonomy. However, in the same study, some teachers reflected on and grew a desire to teach for autonomy more explicitly. Some of the teachers experimented in new ways to teach their lessons. This study indicated that instructors' beliefs vary and are subject to change over time, especially if given an impetus. Moreover, instructors' belief in their abilities to execute autonomy building activities and lessons are potential obstacles, but are also subject to change as teachers gain more confidence and reflect on how to approach teaching for autonomy.

Next, Japan specific pedagogical suggestions based on current research will be examined. One of the more important components of developing autonomy are the use of language learning strategies (Gao & Zhang, 2011; Oxford, 2003). The use of language learning strategies by Japanese language learners has been found in multiple studies to be associated with language learners' proficiency (Fewell, 2010; Schmidt & Watanabe, 2001; Tsuda & Nakata, 2013). Moreover, language learning strategies have been highlighted as a component in overall self-regulation and autonomous learning (Nakata, 2014). In employing language learning strategies, a student becomes agent in determining the outcomes of their language use. Proficient strategy use could be reflective of autonomous behavior. This is not a perfect correlation; the teaching of strategies alone does not

necessarily equate to an increase in autonomous behavior (Sinclair, 2000). Language learning strategies do, however, appear to play some role in the degree to which one is an autonomous learner.

Reflection has also a recurrent theme in gauging levels of learner autonomy. David Little (2007) viewed metacognitive and metalinguistic reflection as one of the highest indicators of learner autonomy. Reflective journals are a potential method for instructors to begin a conversation with students on how to direct their learning, what students feel about the content of the course, and renegotiate the direction of a course within reason. Effective teaching already makes use of this relationship implicitly through what Graves (2000) refers to as informal assessment. The difference in a more autonomy focused approach is more actively involving students in assessing the direction of the course. The university level provides more opportunities for such an approach, but professors should be aware that autonomy is a skill. As a skill, Japanese students who come from more typical learning environments may need assistance in negotiating their learning in this manner. Expecting learners who are used to a teacher-centered environment and having goals set for them is pedagogically unreasonable.

In the same vein, examining the degree to which an autonomous learner set their goals should be measured using a contextual lens. Goal setting is a skill as well, and autonomous learning does not constitute the teacher relinquishing the learning process entirely. Monitoring the goals Japanese learners set and evaluating them as valid becomes a key component of the autonomous learning classroom. Circumventing potentially unrealistic goals while still allowing learners to push themselves will both build motivation and self-efficacy among students. This then contributes to the overall regulation mechanism that will allow students to direct their learning outside of the classroom and beyond the course. A potential middle ground may be what Henri Holec (2008) refers to as “co-directed learning” (p. 23). That is, an environment that fosters learner autonomy by allowing students to participate in how their learning is guided. Again, this is dependent upon the three-stage circuit discussed before—curriculum, teacher beliefs, and confidence in their abilities. If a teacher does have

autonomy, believes in language learning autonomy, and has self-efficacy in their abilities, co-directed learning may be a useful tool for Japanese learners.

If students are to eventually transcend the formal learning context and develop into "Japanese who can use English," autonomous language learning should begin with a set of metaphorical and in some cases, literal conversations. The first is between teachers and their institutions. That conversation is passed to the teacher and themselves as they determine the best course of action to teach autonomy to their students. Finally, the teachers begin to negotiate tasks, lessons, and if necessary, the curriculum with learners. The result in theory is the promotion of an education that produces students capable of regulating their learning and proficient in English, some of whom will perchance become teachers themselves and teach what they have learned to future generations of Japanese speakers of English.

Self-Efficacy in the Japanese Context

The sources for self-efficacy first described by Bandura (1977) offers a descriptive procedure for analyzing self-efficacy among Japanese learners. The four sources are mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, persuasion, and physical and emotional states. Bandura described mastery experiences as the most powerful method for learners to build the belief in their own capabilities. There is a key issue in building efficacy through mastery experiences that has little discussion amongst current literature. In order for mastery experiences to effectively build self-efficacy, the task must be challenging, and students must feel accomplished for overcoming the challenge (Mills, 2014). The examination culture in Japan arguably has resulted in the creation of an objective that requires an immense amount of effort but does not serve many learners actual goals for learning English. The result is a lost opportunity for a significant efficacy building mastery experience.

When considering the culture of ELL in Japan, mastery experiences are precarious in comparison to the general notions of the framework. One must consider that exams are some of the

targets toward which their language learning is oriented. While research has long advocated against exam culture in Japan, reality still dictates the importance they have for many students (Brown, 2000; Allen, 2016). Hence students' cognition of their English performance often appertains to passing the entrance exams for either high school or university. This is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, while instrumental motivation is a potentially sufficient driving force for learning, if we consider instrumental motivation under the LMSS framework, there is a potential for long term language learning difficulties. As Dörnyei (2009) stated, an imbalance in ought-to L2 self to ideal L2 self sources of motivation can become an impediment for language learning. In this specific case, Japanese learners' attempts in building confidence in their English ability through succeeding at exams—which distorts the idea of learning English—seems paradoxical.

Students themselves may be conscious of exam culture not assisting in building their English language proficiency. Many Japanese learners lament their lack of ability to communicate in English (Takanashi, 2004). Theoretically, their lament is consistent with what Bandura (1986) referred to as efficacy appraisal or the ability to interpret how the experience contributes to your own abilities. What is contentious is the value of a mastery experience is lost on a test which does not serve goals of being able to use English practically. In short, mastery experiences are important. Challenging mastery experiences are especially valuable and result in significant gains in self-efficacy (Leeming, 2017; Mills, 2014). Exams may challenge students, but the effort students put into exams, does not actually serve their long-term English goals—especially communicatively. Pigott (2011) cites this relationship of students studying to pass exams as detrimental to students attempts at mastering English. The present research paper agrees, taking this a step further by arguing that not only are these exams detrimental towards student goals, but they are a lost opportunity for a potential mastery experience which could build learner self-efficacy in Japan.

The Japan Times (2017) reported that universities will soon be able to choose between the new national exam—which will incorporate all four skills—or other similar exams such as the

TOEFL exam. Exams then are unlikely to relinquish their place as one of the most important goals for language learners. However, a change in culture in how universities perceive student applications and how high schools respond to this change may assist in transferring some of the value of the mastery experience from exams to other projects. American university culture is not without fault, but the holistic view in which universities consider student applications could be a reference for the type of change necessary. For example, instead of relying solely on exams, students may be expected to show their practical English abilities through actual practical applications. There is no evidence universities on the whole have interest in this type or any other different kind of evaluation, but a change.

Vicarious experiences have been cited as the second most useful source for building self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). Whether this is the case in the Japanese context has not been consistently discussed through the literature and there is not a clear consensus on the importance of vicarious experiences in Japan. In two studies by Todaka (2013, 2017), students appeared to be affected by role models in their course work. Having either teaching assistants or juniors to model after appeared to play a role in the ability for students to build confidence in their language abilities. Ueki and Takeuchi (2012) though made an interesting connection the LMSS and the ideal L2 self component. Their findings indicated that the ideal L2 self can be a predictor of self-efficacy. Considering the ideal self as an imagined role model or the cumulation of role models into an ideal, the images that create this imagery could become a source of vicarious experiences. For Japanese ELL students, more models of other Japanese speakers of English may cultivate positive views of and belief in their own English abilities. English as a Lingua Franca theory has highlighted the positive impact of having these types of role models for formulating an identity that does not reject learners' own cultures but celebrates them. To further understand vicarious experiences, the power of role models in Japan, especially *senpai* or seniors, should be an area of future self-efficacy research.

Persuasion in self-efficacy can come from a variety of sources but considering the instructor plays a large role in education in Japan, their role in building self-efficacy becomes a logical connection. Two studies by Todaka (2013, 2017) found persuasion to be relevant among their participants as the teacher and their discussions with students played a role in building their self-efficacy. This may be especially important in PSE where students first contact the language. Currently, that contact has mostly come in the form of less formal learning in most elementary schools (Ng, 2016). However, when the course of study changes in 2020, teachers will need to become much more aware of their teaching styles due to more stringent curriculum requirements (Nakamura, 2018). Until now, many instructors in PSE have had more freedom in what and how they taught. In a more formal learning environment, the role of an PSE teacher in building self-efficacy should be re-examined.

Lastly, emotional and physical states are the final source of self-efficacy. Considering the wealth of literature on anxiety in Japanese ELL, physiological states would seem to be an important factor logically. Students with high self-efficacy are able to theoretically lower their states of anxiety in high pressure situations (Mills, 2014). Similarly, high amounts of anxiety will lower self-efficacy in their abilities. Thus, there exists a ratio in which self-efficacy assists students in overcoming their anxieties or their anxieties will overcome their belief in their abilities. Other physiological states play a factor in Japanese TEFL as well. Jung, Kudo, and Choi (2012) found stress to impact students overall self-efficacy. In their study, instructional design, technology, and collaboration were three stressors. This research suggests that the nature of the tasks and assignments in a course can affect learners physiological states. As the course of study develops and more students experience different forms of learning, attention should be paid attention in how the course design affects their emotional and physical states. If students' experiences are negative, instructors will need to become aware of why they experience these negative states and how to accommodate or circumvent them in the future.

In concluding this section on self-efficacy in Japan, there exists an increasing concern on learners' beliefs in their capabilities and how each source of self-efficacy plays a role in the build of their self-efficacy. Each source connects other aspects of the regulatory processes discussed in the present research paper. The ideal and ought to L2 self affects the role models students choose. Mastery experiences increase the level of belief in students' abilities and promotes autonomy through the choosing new challenges based on their confidence levels. Teachers as sources of persuasion are not only capable of persuading students to try and challenge themselves but can provide outlines for how to approach these challenges in a regulated manner. Lastly, strategy use as a form of self-regulation can provide students with methods for being able to overcome their anxieties and become aware of their overall cognition. Self-efficacy then is a useful component of regulatory processes and beneficial in the context of Japanese TEFL.

Self-Regulation in the Japanese Context

In the general section on self-regulation, the present research paper postulated self-regulation as a unifying term for the interconnected regulatory processes that function as a schema for producing regulated language learning. Hence, through this position the final section on self-regulation will serve as a summary for the importance of autonomy, motivation, and self-efficacy under the umbrella term self-regulation. That said, self-regulation among Japanese learners of English is slowly becoming an essential component in attaining English language proficiency. As McEown and Sugita-McEown (2019) described the situation, "The instructional shift from teaching English as subject matter to teaching subject matter in English is robust and students are now required to attain much higher levels of English compared to the past" (p. 390). Despite this, English for everyday communication is still not necessary in most of Japan, but English learning is mandatory in school. Meaning there are fewer natural opportunities for learners to encounter English and hone their skills. This section chooses the same lens of utilized by McEown and Sugita-McEown

in outlining the self-regulatory needs of Japanese students by adding a social component to the analysis. The analysis will discuss why a sociocultural approach to Japanese TEFL is logical, then look at self-regulation through a widening social lens—starting from the social context closest to ELL in Japan and ending with the wider societal effects on self-regulation.

Self-regulation is conceptually rooted in constructivists theories influenced by the theories of Vygotsky and Piaget. While the theories of both highlight the importance of self-regulation, the two view self-regulation and education differently (DeVries, 2000). In truth, neither the theories of Vygotsky nor Piaget can fully accommodate the form of self-regulation that is most applicable to modern Japanese TEFL. For Vygotsky, his theories were never fully developed in terms of educational implications. Scholarship has of course since taken the roots of his work and expanded upon them, but many focus simply on the ZPD portion. This is problematic because the ZPD does not necessitate how the proximal force (e.g., the instructor) leads the learner. An instructor that operates under authoritarian dogma and an instructor who shares the language learning process can both utilize the ZPD theory, but how they do so is obviously different. For Piaget, while the breadth of his work during his life did contain ruminations on context, his cognitive developmental theories do not comprehensively account for context (Bruner, 1997). Recently developed theories have attempted to account for this gap between Piaget and Vygotsky. Modern self-regulation research relies on social cognitive theories more capable of accommodating for context and cognition (Martin, 2004; Schunk, 2008). However, the sociocultural aspect of self-regulation may be more important for the Japanese TEFL context. The context is particular in that little English encounters and instances of Japanese nationals using English in society existing. Their lack of prevalence is not only detrimental for practice but for the formation of the identity of a language learner.

As Noels (2009) noted, the restructuring of the self through learning and use of the language leads to more intense motivation and consequently regulated behavior. This thought is in line with the positive outcomes associated with a strong ideal L2 self as described by Dörnyei (2005, 2009). In

an ideal situation, English and English-related cultural symbols would be more readily available to assist in integrating the language with students' sense of self. Without these natural opportunities outside the educational environment, providing them through pedagogy is essential. In a more social constructivists approach, learners are offered these cultural symbols and the social context of school acts as a Zone of Proximal Development in which to formulate an L2 identity. English of course does exist outside of the classroom, but the opportunity for students to personally develop their L2 identity and create regulated behavior through personal experiences for most is minimal. Promoting regulatory processes for ELL then requires the active promotion by stakeholders. Still, the question of how to ensure pedagogical approaches are internalized is important. As Schunk (2008) described, "Teaching involves others providing instruction and guidance, but for self-regulation to develop, this external influence must be internalized by learners into their self-regulatory systems" (p. 467). While research is still being conducted in this area, intrinsically motivating tasks that promote self-regulation seem to be the most effective. The results of that research could contribute greatly to research on self-regulation in Japan. Still, self-regulation in Japan will likely rely more on the sociocultural aspect of regulation than the cognitive aspect. Therefore, the following paragraphs will use a sociocultural lens to view self-regulation in Japan

The language learning classroom in Japan is the closest social context to the English language learning process. This becomes particularly important in Japan because most students will not have many learning opportunities outside of a formal learning environment. In some cases, students who attend cram school or private lessons will have multiple opportunities for encountering English, but public school classrooms remain the primary source for English encounters. Unfortunately, this limits the amount of chances for organic ELL experiences. These experiences are important for improving proficiency and the classroom is their greatest chance to learn regulation skills (McEown & Sugita-McEown, 2019). A study by Sugita and Takeuchi (2014), for example, found teachers style of teaching can have a serious positive effect on students becoming more

motivated. However, according to a study by Kikuchi & Sakai (2009) on demotivation, the teacher also has the potential to demotivate students as well. As Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) explained, increased motivation is positively correlated with overall self-regulated behavior. There are a multitude of approaches to increasing student motivation. Goal setting, increasing students awareness of language learning strategies, and informing students of the extrinsic and intrinsic values of English appear to be highly applicable in Japan (Sugita-McEown & Takeuchi, 2014; McEown, Noels, & Saumure, 2014; Mikami, 2012).

The institution students attend is the next closest social context related to their ability to self-regulate. Within the institution, two groups—peers and administrators—have significant effects on students discovering how to regulate their learning. Returning to the Zone of Proximal Development, theoretically students rely not only the teacher, but each other to share and increase their knowledge (Vygotsky, 2012). Ohta (2005) mentioned that even though the ZPD is less studied in modern literature, applications still exist. In the Japanese EFL classroom, the ZPD is applicable and potentially even more relevant due to the lack of external opportunities to speak and practice. However, this applicability may change depending on if the student is an adult and has access to more external resources (Ohta, 2006). In terms of administration, the type of school one attends, or the level of education will highly affect the curriculum that is being taught. This in turn effects teacher autonomy and the types of lessons they can teach to students (Nakata, 2016). Autonomy for some teachers may be negotiable and the results of that negotiation with administrators may positively change the type of activities or tasks that are allowed within the scope of a set curriculum. In universities where there are more types of programs available, students may be afforded a wider variety of courses. Socially speaking, students who can attend universities with more diverse options may find this to their advantage. Those who do not could be comparatively negatively impacted by these limitations.

Lastly, factors outside of classrooms and their institutions will be discussed. For younger students, the most important factor is likely their parents. Parents can be sources of support, stress, and in other ways (e.g., socioeconomically) affect students' ability to acquire English (McEown & Sugita-McEown, 2019). One potential concern with parents in Japan are their capacity to become what Sugita-McEown and Oga-Baldwin (2019) referred to as "external regulation" and "introjected regulation" (p. 4). External regulation refers to any behaviors that are controlled by pressures outside of the student. Introjected regulation is a form of regulation not fully internalized and controls behavior via guilt or shame. Students in Japan may feel the need to study or attend cram schools due to external regulation in which they feel they must comply. Introjected regulation concerns the ego and students may regulate due to the pressures they feel not to fail or disappoint their parents. Parents however can be supportive, positive figures in Japanese ELL as well and stereotypes and generalizations of domineering parents in Japan should be avoided. Beyond the household, the changes of TEFL in Japan, as Ushioda (2013) noted, has serious impact on the learning process in Japan. The shifts from communicative English to English for exams negatively impacts how students regulate their learning and what for. Communicative English for example has different requirements than English for passing an exam and students can and will regulate their learning accordingly. Future studies on self-regulation in Japan will need to not only account for theory in the wider field, but how that theory behaves within the context of Japan.

This section has attempted to emphasize the significance of social factors in self-regulation theory in Japan. While numerous studies have assisted in the development of self-regulation pedagogy, these must ultimately account for contextual allowances. In the case of Japan, there may not always be the space to effectively teach for autonomy or motivate students in accordance to current theories. Furthermore, various stakeholders may have beliefs that conflict with those theories and those stakeholders' beliefs may be constructed by their experiences within Japanese society. Those perspectives should not be immediately dismissed. They allow for an insight into past

happenings within Japanese society and may be instrumental in being able to refocus or encourage those stakeholders towards new perspectives. Of course, while their perspectives matter, the main priority is the language needs of the students. While there exists an often-hyperbolic perspective on the crisis of Japanese ELL, perhaps a shift away from this perspective is necessary. A change in how stakeholders, specifically teachers, view Japanese learners may prove as an insight into the role of those involved in the educational environment. This change in view could assist Japanese English language learners in becoming more proficient. The final section of this research paper uses a positive lens to view Japanese EFL students. Not as poor at English, but incredible learners who are both capable a nd resilient.

Regulatory Processes: A Proposition for Resilient Japanese Learners

Throughout this research paper, autonomy, self-efficacy, motivation, and self-regulation have been consistently linked to one another. These regulatory processes and the plethora of frameworks used to construct them were not created in inertia. Each one has a pull among the other three and vice versa. They have the potential to motivate learners, enhance their belief in their abilities, and allow them to find spaces for which to further their language learning on their own. Despite this, stress in Japanese TEFL is an inevitability. Many students in the public education system will not learn in a manner that supports their goals and desires. Consequently, they will be put under a significant amount of pressure and experience classes that will be potentially demotivating. I return to this quote by Bandura (2008): “Human well-being and attainments require an optimistic and resilient sense of efficacy. This is because the usual daily realities are strewn with difficulties. They are full of frustrations, conflicts, impediments, adversities, failures, setbacks, and inequities” (p. 168). Note the word resilient. Resilience is described as “the capacity to bounce back, to withstand hardship, and to repair yourself” (Wolin & Wolin, 1995, p. 5). Resilience in an academic sense describes the capacity for achieving success and overcoming stress despite external and internal stressors that put one at risk

for failure (Najafzadeh, Ghanizadeh, & Jahedizadeh, 2018). While there exists little literature in combining regulatory processes with resilient behavior, some literature has shown that there is the potential for regulation to allow students to continue to challenge themselves and push through adversity (Partovi & Tafazoli, 2016). Though Japanese learners can be currently seen as resilient, this current state should not be taken for granted. While the changes in the course of study seem to be moving toward a positive curriculum for students, the actual outcomes remain unclear. Current global trends and how the Japanese government treats TEFL are not guaranteed to stay as they are. In short, there is no guarantee students will be able to maintain their resilient state on their own. Therefore, the responsibility of helping them to maintain their resilience is on those stakeholders who directly affect them. By more explicitly teaching for regulation through these processes the resilience for English language learners in Japan can be maintained during this transitional phase in Japanese TEFL. Maintenance starts with an understanding between administrators and teachers that they are both agents in this educational environment. A possible product of that conversation is distributed to students in the form of teaching for autonomy, motivation, building self-efficacy, and overall self-regulation of their language learning. To this point however, literature too often describes students in terms of what they are not capable of doing, when in fact, they have shown through their resilience that within them exists the capacity for achievement. This capacity should be the lens through which we as educators view students. Hypothetically, appending the label of resilient onto learners changes the conversation from what they cannot do, but what we as educators can do for them. This final section discusses how current research on resilience can be applied to Japanese TEFL and the potential implications of such a framework for instructors who help maintain that resilience.

What is resilience?

In educational psychology, research on students who can be described as resilient emerged mostly in the past 30 years as an attempt to move toward a model of wellness as opposed to the

pathology of risk (Henderson & Milstein, 2003). From this, a few models of resiliency have emerged. Richardson, Neiger, Jensen, and Kumpfer (1990) created a model of resiliency that describes the experience of sudden stressors or trauma placing the student in a state of reintegration. Reintegration is a suspended state of being where experienced trauma and the capacity for recovery from that trauma metaphorically meet. The outcome of that meeting depends on the ratio between the two and one reintegrates accordingly. When the trauma is more than the student can handle, they reintegrate with negative affective consequences. With enough protective factors—environmental or individual tools for overcoming adversity—the student can reintegrate without being negatively impacted or potentially build even more resiliency through the experience. Building more resiliency allows for those who experienced stressors to push through more difficult experiences in the future. This process of building resilience and using the outcome to continue past future stressors has become the subject of research via the term grit (Duckworth, Matthews, Kelly, & Peterson, 2007). As Duckworth et al. describes, "We define grit as perseverance and passion for long-term goals. Grit entails working strenuously toward challenges, maintaining effort and interest over years despite failure, adversity, and plateaus in progress" (pp. 1087-1088). Research on grit in the field of TESOL is sparse but the few empirical studies that do exist suggest that grit is indicative of higher achievement and willingness to overcome adversity (Sudina et al., 2020; Teimouri, Plonsky, & Tabandeh, 2020).

Teaching to help maintain resilience and consequently grit appears to be plausible. Henderson and Milstein (1996) further recommend three different approaches to building resiliency and to help lower the risk factors that may impact them. The three options for maintaining resilience are providing care and support, set and communicate high expectations, and provide opportunities for meaningful participation. In Japanese TEFL, these are implementable through both the responsibilities of the teacher and the promotion of the regulatory processes discussed in this paper. For example, providing care and support can come in the form of supporting students' self-efficacy through affective, persuasive, and vicarious means (Todaka, 2013, 2017). Setting and communicating

high expectations can come through goal setting and expectations that allow them to regulate their learning. Providing meaningful participation could be providing materials that motivate students and activities that are relevant to their interests, therefore, circumventing demotivation (Hamada, 2011). The resilience building aspects are as follows: increase prosocial bonding, set clear, consistent boundaries, and teach life skills. For prosocial bonding, creating activities that allow students to utilize the ZPD and bringing in seniors who can serve as vicarious self-efficacy images could effectively increase prosocial bonding. Setting clear and consistent boundaries relies on the teacher to explicitly outline their expectations so students can set their regulatory habits based on those expectations. Lastly, teaching life skills should again, come in the form of using materials that provide opportunities for authentic language use. Thus, the outcome theoretically should be a student that has their resilience maintained and when challenged by stressors, has the proper amount of grit to overcome trauma from the language learning environment.

Resilience among Japanese learners

One of the key indicators that Japanese learners are indeed resilient is the perspective many university students hold regarding English. Much has been written on the demotivation of Japanese learners and given the literature, the case seems to be that in general, Japanese learners are demotivated (Dörnyei, 2001; Kikuchi & Sakai, 2009). Yet, within that same generalization, Japanese learners remain mostly positive about and what is gained from acquiring English. One potential critique is that learners' positivity is more societally ascribed and less internally developed (Ryan, 2009). A potential middle ground however is that demotivation by learners stems from an English learning that they do not view as really learning English. Learners may recognize the type of education they are receiving as not how practical English is acquired. Hence, for some, they may still seek outlets for which to acquire English. In discussing the results of his study however Brown (2004) mentioned that understanding what exactly motivates students is less relevant than finding out

how to encourage them to study and utilize English. The current research paper though aligns more with the thoughts of Fujimi Tanaka (2010) and her survey of student attitudes towards EIL. While Japanese people are diverse in their thoughts and motivations, for many, English has an importance in their lives. Reasons range from career choice to intercultural communication but positing English as generally desirable for the average Japanese student is not unreasonable. For those students, that value in English is beyond a tool for meeting expectations espoused by the school system. Yet, they possess the capacity to endure the hardships of courses that do not always meet their expectations. Through a change in perspective of educators, there exists a space to allow students to maintain that value while also succeeding in their studies.

Why is resiliency the word of choice? Positing Japanese learners as resilient positively orients who Japanese language learners are and their capabilities while highlighting a problematic learning environment without being overly critical. Indeed, Japanese language learners are successful. Graduation rates are relatively high, many students go through the education system and come out having accomplished their goal of passing the entrance exams (MEXT, 2016). Categorizing them as resilient however implies hardship. Many scholars are right in evaluating the flaws of the current education system, but others are perhaps overzealous in their critique. In complex, centralized education systems, transformation is a slow process. Clearly, MEXT through consistent changes in the course of study desires change toward a more comprehensive curriculum akin to those suggested by researchers in applied linguistics. There is of course the argument that their intentions are more insidious than what can interpreted from words alone (Hashimoto, 2009). This is an important topic of discussion amongst scholars, administrators, and politicians. For Japanese students, administrators, and teachers, more pertinent are the consequences within the current learning environment.

For comparison, in the field of TESOL, we are consistently reminded of formulating tasks and lesson plans that fit our goals and objectives (Graves, 2000). The outcome of not doing so is confusion and potential failure to meet those expectations. When educators see this conflict during a

course, most TESOL training instructs the teacher to attempt to reassess, adjust, and construct lessons that allow learners to better reach the goals and objectives. In Japanese TEFL the current goals and objectives outlined are not yet appropriately addressed at the pedagogical level. Again, the system is in a state of transition and has been subject to critique within research (Hashimoto, 2009; Michaud, 2015; Ng, 2016; Sakamoto, 2012). This perspective alone denies the agency of administrators and teachers and our roles in helping to transform the current state of Japanese TEFL. Historically the education system has changed vastly and looks to continue to change toward a more balanced TEFL curriculum. Stakeholders who are cognizant of this penchant for change have the ability and agency to assist students in becoming more proficient as the transition happens. Though he was describing learners specifically, Littlewood (1999) referred to this type of agency as reactive autonomy. In his words, "This is the kind of autonomy which does not create its own direction but once a direction is initiated, enables learners to organize their own resources autonomously in order to reach their goal" (p. 75). Applying his definition to stakeholders, the direction (i.e. curriculum) is set but there exists an amount of autonomy for how teachers and administrators execute that curriculum—provided the espoused goals are met. For administrators, their role should be evaluating the ascribed national curriculum and allowing a certain amount of flexibility for teacher autonomy within those confines. For teachers, their role should be facilitating the curriculum while promoting regulated learning. Hypothetically, the product would be Japanese students who are still able to meet the goals of the coursework but are also more motivated and enthusiastic about learning English. Thus, a general outline for teachers and administrators' roles in maintaining learners' resilience is established. Subsequently, a few suggestions for how those roles may look at the different stages of education will be discussed.

Currently, teachers at the elementary school level have issues in their confidence in being able to teach English and in what should be taught (Ng, 2016). This is especially true of those homeroom teachers who have no previous experiences in teaching English. How teachers handle

these problems is highly dependent on the school they teach at, their confidence, and their training. For those teachers who are untrained, asking them not only to acquire English training skills but to be able to handle the nuances of teaching for regulated learning may be too much of an ask. For those who are TESOL trained, the new MEXT course of study will provide more stringent outlines for the elementary school curriculum in 2020 (Nakamura, 2018). An evaluation of their own beliefs on teaching for autonomy and self-regulation and discussions with their institutions on how to accommodate these beliefs with the new curriculum will be necessary. Students at the PSE level should be encouraged to explore English outside of the classroom theoretically, but due to the limited presence of English outside of the household, this is a major obstacle (Yano, 2011). More research will be required to develop methods to help elementary students begin to regulate their learning at this stage.

In junior high school, learners will be beginning to transition into a more formal learning style. The transition may become less prominent when the TEFL curriculum changes for elementary school but currently, junior high schools will have students whose English proficiency vary widely. One pedagogical suggestion is to be accepting of the learners natural L1 and L2 as intertwined and not separate. While L2 usage in the classroom should be maximized, communicative English is a major difficulty for many Japanese students. Scolding students for using their L1 can be especially demotivating. To quote a student from a study by Kikuchi (2019), “People do not want to talk in English. They want to do it in Japanese. People chat away in Japanese and the teacher scolds us” (p. 166). While educators need to encourage students to use the L2, scolding them for doing what comes natural to them is a poor method of motivating them to speak in English. Instead, L1 usage can be a tool for providing scaffolding while students become more used to speaking English (Moore, 2013). This will require the educator to consider the balance between L1 and L2 and when to allow use of the L1 and the purpose for doing so. The hopeful outcome is to deter demotivation through failure and to build self-efficacy by slowly building students successes with English over time, with more

and more complex opportunities for language use coming later. Self-efficacy building at this stage will be critical as students begin to transition more toward demotivating types of ELL.

The change in the national exam to a four skills test will provide an opportunity for even the most traditional teachers to offer more varied methods for passing examinations. This creates a potential road for increased amounts of teaching for self-regulation among students. However, as noted in previous research, teachers must become more aware of their own beliefs in self-regulation and learner autonomy before creating curriculums that support the constructs (Nakata, 2014). High school instructors will also need to negotiate those beliefs with administrators to ensure they are viable. This is especially true considering the importance of exams. While students may be interested in English as a valuable tool for communication, many are still motivated by extrinsic factors such as examinations (Pigott, 2011). There is room for debate in research as to how to change examination culture, but the current reality for students should not be dismissed. When students do graduate from high school, teachers and administrators at universities though should be more explicit in fostering regulated learning skills. Universities are not as easily subject to changes in educational policies in Japan and are therefore more open to employing curriculums capable of promoting self-regulation, autonomy, build self-efficacy, and motivate students (Stroupe, Rundle, & Tomita, 2016). Moreover, freshmen entering university have in many cases experienced six to nine years of an often stressful, anxiety inducing, and demotivating path for learning English. Encouraging those who are demotivated and are impacted by negative affects to rethink how they approach learning will become a vital cross-section for pedagogy and theory.

Summary

Recognizing the resilience among Japanese English language learners is a change in culture. A rethinking of who Japanese learners are and who they can be. Reversing a culture of learning after 6-9 years of the current style of teaching and learning English in Japan is difficult. Just as difficult is

penetrating the type of texts and curriculums schools use. Centralized education in Japan is a national reality and this will not change soon. What this section has suggested is an awareness and an understanding of what learners will experience. As educators we may not be able to change the texts, but we can change how we discuss ELL and our suggestions to learners. Just as teachers can be a source of demotivation, we have the power to motivate as well. We are also gifted with Japanese students who are responsive and desire to learn English. At risk of being too direct, Japanese learners are extraordinary. This word must be carefully approached in order to avoid othering and evoke essentialist and orientalist imagery of machine-like learners. On the contrary, the hope is to promote imagery of Japanese learners as capable—to move the conversation away from not proficient, not being able to speak, and other negative connotations. Put another way, changing the narrative away from what Japanese learners cannot do to what they can do. To quote Paulo Freire (2000), "Looking at the past must only be a means of understanding more clearly what and who they are so that they can more wisely build the future" (p. 84). In defining students as resilient, the onus is then put on us researchers, administrators, and teachers, to assist learners in rethinking how they learn. To do so within the current system is difficult and this research paper does not contain the proper framework for that change. However, future research should be conducted into the routing of this discussion. Specifically, how do teachers talk about their beliefs in regulated learning to administrators, how do administrators react to these discussions, and in what way do these conclusions then transform the learning for students. The conclusion is hopefully an education that reduces the hardship of our resilient learners so that one day they are just learners.

Educational Implications

The implications of a resilience-based framework are to provide teachers with an opportunity to transform how they view students and what can be done for them in the language learning classroom. The goals are to eventually help students build habits that regulate their learning as well

as provide motivating imagery that promotes their desire to learn. This will in turn, encourage students to regulate themselves as they move through the learning process. To assist in changing the current culture, a few objectives should be outlined for teachers to help them guide students. Thus, recommendations for teaching in the classroom as well as recommendations for professional development will be presented. Not all the recommendations are easily integrated and may take more time than others. Therefore, the recommendations in this section have been categorically divided into classroom and professional recommendations and further subdivided into what can be done immediately, what may take time to implement, and what can be done over a long course of time or in a future curriculum cycle.

Immediate Recommendations for the Classroom

For classroom activities, there are a few immediate changes that can be brought in immediately. First is to change the overall imagery used in classroom materials. All instructors use materials of some sort, whether they are self-made or provided by the institution. Often within those materials are images or examples of speakers who are traditionally defined as native speakers. There is currently a debate in the field of TESOL as to how to shift away from the typical native and non-native paradigm (Tanaka, 2010). For Japanese students, increasing the number of images of speakers like themselves can have a great influence on their resilience and motivation to continue to learn English. When students see someone who is like themselves, they may be more willing to accept that they too can be an English speaker. For this, an instructor can use technology to show students videos of Japanese people who speak English. They can be famous or simply normal people, but essential is ensuring that the speaker shown is confident, no matter what their level. Similarly, for Japanese instructors of English, using themselves or their Japanese colleagues as examples of English speakers can have a powerful effect. Many students look up to teachers and are aware of their habits. Therefore, what a Japanese instructor does as a speaker of English can have significant influence on

their students. Another recommendation is to transform any task or activity that is done alone—and can be done in pairs or groups—into a pair or group activity. The social aspect of the classroom is a strong tool in Japanese TEFL. Considering that students may not have ample opportunity to speak and work on English outside of the classroom, having students interact with one another is perhaps even more crucial in the Japanese context. Furthermore, students learn skills from and utilize each other as scaffolding to push through tasks they may have otherwise struggled with. Scaffolding in this manner builds both confidence and provides opportunities to continue to add to their mastery experiences. Lastly, students should be allowed to take advantage of their technology. This is likely more applicable for university students who are higher level and more mature. Teaching students how to change aspects of their phones and computers into English provides content outside of the course that can accommodate for the lack of outside English encounters. The benefit is small but authentic and as students become used to the act, they gain access to a wider world of English.

Long Term Recommendations for the Classroom

At any level, the teacher should work to provide opportunities for students to interact with speakers of English from outside of the classroom. In university, this can come in the form of coordinating with international students for intercultural activities. This can be formally structured through presentations or sessions where students can talk casually with international students. One such activity could be to place the international students in groups or tables that represent their countries and have the Japanese students rotate every 5-10 minutes to different tables. The opposite can also be done where the Japanese students are in groups and the international students rotate. In high school, *senpai* or seniors, who are proficient speakers can be brought into the class to show their capabilities and share their stories with students. The culture of *senpai* in Japan is strong, and a potentially powerful tool for teachers looking for an impactful lesson. There are also instances in which teachers have coordinated with local colleges and schools and brought older students and

international students to work with younger learners or taken the learners to those schools. The goal in doing this is to motivate and provide more opportunities to use English outside of a typically structured lesson.

Future Recommendations for the Classroom

One pedagogical consideration for the future is to create a pre-assessment plan for next semester with the next batch of students. This plan would outline their goals with the English language for the semester. Goal setting is one of the most effective forms of self-regulation (Zimmerman, 2000). Teachers have the capacity for not only teaching learners how to achieve their goals, but also outlining clear objectives to be able to accomplish those goals. Therefore, giving students objectives based on the curriculum to accomplish goals can not only build self-regulation and autonomy, but overall self-efficacy as well. However, as Bandura (2008) noted, if goals are set too high and students fail, the negative consequences can be dire. Therefore, instructors should provide students with carefully constructed objectives for their goals and negotiate realistic expectations.

A final recommendation is the formulation of a semester long project in which students create a portfolio of themselves using English outside of the classroom in real, practical situations. In preparation for this project, the teacher should identify places where students can use English in a particular pragmatic situation or a situation that requires a certain set of discourse familiarity. The teacher can go even further by coordinating with or contacting an establishment and requesting their permission or simply informing them that you may have students who are attempting to practice their English when they visit. During the initial phases of students building their portfolio, the instructor can either require students to visit the establishment and accomplish a task or only provide them with one or two choices as to where they can accomplish the task. Not all learners are used to having any form of autonomy and this will ease them into the beginnings of the portfolio. The task itself can be

simple, such as buying a product at a store, asking for directions, and other basic situations. The teacher can label the tasks in any way they please, but an interesting word that many Japanese students know—such as "mission"—can bring a flavor and an importance to the tasks that sounds less pedagogical.

Ideally, students would record themselves using either video or voice recording technologies, but in Japan especially, being recorded is not generally well received and can make the situation problematic. Therefore, having students keep a journal of their missions may be the best course of action. As the semester continues, students will execute more complicated, open-ended missions, and given more choice as to which mission they specifically wish to attempt. During the semester, the class can either share their experiences in groups and in some cases, give presentations on what they have experienced. Not all the missions need to be done alone. Especially when first assigning a more complex mission, asking students to attempt the mission together in pairs or groups may give them more confidence and act as a ZPD. Lastly, an important component of this portfolio is lacing the curriculum with exercises that provide students with the linguistic tools to execute their missions. Furthermore, creating well formulated tasks that scaffold for students will provide the opportunity for students to understand the nature of the mission before the real situation.

Before concluding, a few caveats should be mentioned. A project such as this requires the environmental tools to administer. In bigger, urban environments such as Tokyo or Osaka, an instructor may find providing these opportunities for students to be complicated, but not impossible. In less international settings, this type of project may be daunting and implausible. This project may also require permission from administrators to be able to execute. A teacher must have enough autonomy or be able to negotiate what can and cannot be done for both administrative and safety reasons. For instructors who teach at a university with a more international presence, limiting the missions to those inside the campus may prove more negotiable. After the project is administered in a few semesters and further refined, renegotiating the parameters may become possible.

In summary, the end goal of this activity would be to have students gradually become more autonomous by scaffolding via well-constructed tasks, limiting choices initially, and slowly granting students more autonomy in both their choice and how their mission needs to be accomplished. Outlining the different missions and providing exercises to build the necessary skills assists in regulating student learning. Through the various missions, they build mastery experiences from smaller, easier activities, giving them the confidence to attempt the more complex assignments. Motivationally, students have the chance to use English practically which many have not been able to do often. If the exercises, tasks, and missions are well designed, students will eventually become more confident in their abilities and better realize an image of themselves as English language speakers.

Immediate Recommendations for Professional Development

The most immediate task for instructors should be to reflect on their beliefs and their classroom. An instructor should reflect on what they believe about autonomous language learning, self-regulation, and if their current classroom is at the level the teacher wants them to be. The instructor should also consider if their tasks are actually accomplishing the goals and objectives for which they are purposed. One of the negative stressors impacting student resilience is expectations that are in discord with what is being taught (Henderson & Milstein, 2003). Realigning these expectations will help students better understand the goals and objectives of the class and to adjust their study habits accordingly.

Long Term and Future Recommendations for Professional Development

Recommendations that will take longer are PSE teacher training, negotiating with administrators and teaching workshops. For PSE teachers who have little formal training, the expected changes in PSE will result in more stringent, structured curriculums. Currently, the

regulations are quite loose at the PSE level, but as regulations become more stringent, the responsibilities for those less qualified will become overwhelming. If a teacher believes themselves as undertrained, seeking out training in the field of TESOL will be essential to maintaining a classroom that better corresponds to the current trends within research. For ALTs who assist homeroom teachers in PSE, discussing teaching beliefs and attempting to negotiate the pedagogical process with the homeroom teacher is a natural step forward. Not all these conversations will end productively initially. However, expressing a sympathetic position and respecting the homeroom teacher as a teaching partner, should place the groundwork for working better together. For teachers who lack sufficient autonomy, negotiating what can and cannot be done in the classroom with administrators becomes imperative in avoiding frustration as a professional. As is the case in PSE, initial conversations may not bear any fruit, but a sympathetic position that recognizes the expectations administrators are under could lead to productive outcomes. As teachers' supervisors and employers, the administration shares a complicated relationship regarding curriculum. However administrators and teachers share the TEFL experience in Japan. A positive, sympathetic relationship where both parties understand their positions could result in more flexibility in what is allowed within the curriculum. Furthermore, all teachers should rely on their peers both inside and outside their institutions. This can come via workshops and conferences such as JALT, or even forming a habit of discussing current issues and sharing ideas with co-workers. The hope is for those teaching in Japan to learn from what others are currently experiencing in the field. Teachers do not exist alone in Japanese TEFL and do not need to operate as such.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current research paper has outlined different regulatory processes, the current state of TEFL in Japan, and proposed a framework for rethinking the current situation in Japan. However, without further research, this framework cannot become practical. There currently exists a lack of

anthropological research in Japanese TEFL. Teachers in Japan often discuss the specific nature of their situation as both an educator and as a professional via the practicalities and limitations that present themselves. To comprehend these specific situations and what teachers experience within their institutions, a qualitative approach that adapts anthropological theory can provide critical insight into the lives of an educator in Japan. While this could be applicable at any level, the two levels that appear of most concern are at the elementary level and at the high school level. Firstly, both levels represent times in the educational environment where there are critical transitions. In primary school, the instructors seem to lack training and are struggling with the materials. There is a space in research to find out what those instructors feel they can and cannot do and the kind of training that is necessary. In high school, teachers are caught between needing to help students pass exams and helping them to use English practically. To this point, many instructors seem to feel positive about teaching for self-regulation and practical English skills but feel a lack of autonomy and teaching efficacy. Drawing conclusions from the teaching experience holistically—and not just as an educator—could be useful and has not yet been done frequently in current SLA research.

A final recommendation for future research is for a cross-sectional, comparative study for public schools vis-à-vis the teaching of regulatory processes. Throughout the present research paper, generalizations about the public school system have been made. While caveats about socioeconomic status have been mentioned, they were not expanded upon. While the course of study from MEXT is nationally prescribed, not all schools have the same resources. Current research lacks a sufficient amount of comparisons of how teaching for regulatory processes is affected by the socioeconomic realities of an institution. In order to further the focus of suggestions such as the ones found in the present research paper, more research is required in defining how the socioeconomics of a public institution affects the plausibility of what can be taught. Due to the wealth of research on the pressures of examinations for high school students and those teaching them, comparing multiple

different high schools based on their socioeconomic resources could provide a necessary contribution to the field and highlight any potential differences that may present themselves from such a study.

Conclusion

As this paper concludes, the nature of regulatory processes has been discussed extensively. The nature of each process individually is important, but each are connected to one another. When a student is demotivated for example, their ability to self-regulate is at risk of declining. Conversely, if the student is highly motivated, they will often find ways to regulate themselves. When students are more autonomous, they often exhibit qualities of high self-efficacy. When those students lack belief in their ability to succeed, autonomous language learning becomes difficult to attain. Thus, each construct, while individually defined, affects the others. When seeking to increase levels of one construct, the others will to some extent, will be affected as well. Currently, the extent to that affect is not well defined. Yet, how intertwined autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation are is apparent in current research and learners who exhibit these qualities are often characterized by high language learning achievement. Concerning English language learners in Japan, many appear capable of achieving highly regarding the current educational system. However, learners still have unrealized aspirations using English practically. Providing students with activities, lessons, and ultimately curriculums that build those regulatory processes should assist students in realizing those aspirations. Educators in Japan should therefore take more responsibility in teaching for autonomy, motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Educators have a critical role in providing students with the opportunities to accomplish their language learning goals. Currently, those students have been resilient in enduring the type of English language learning that does not satisfy those goals. In order to change this narrative, educators in Japan should attempt to reduce the need for students to be so resilient. Educators can accomplish this by providing learners with the type of English language learning that reduces stress, is enjoyable, and remains challenging. Teaching for autonomy,

increasing motivation, building self-efficacy, and promoting self-regulation facilitates that process. The hope is to create Japanese learners who can utilize English confidently and proficiently in situations that are consonant with their motivations and goals.

References

American Psychological Association (n.d.). *Competence.* APA Dictionary of Psychology. https://dictionary.apa.org/competence

Allen, D. (2016). Investigating washback to the learner from the IELTS test in the Japanese tertiary context. *Language testing in Asia*, *6*(1), 7.

Anderson, N. J. (2002, April). *The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning*. ERIC Digest. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED463659.pdf

Aoki, N. (2002). Aspects of teacher autonomy: Capacity, freedom, and responsibility. In P. Benson & S. Toogood (Eds.), *Learner autonomy: Challenges to research and practice* (pp. 11–124). Authentik.

Aoki, N., & Smith, R. (1999). Learner autonomy in cultural context: The case of Japan. In S. Cotterall D, Crabbe (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (pp. 19-28). Peter Lang.

Aubrey, S. (2014). Development of the L2 motivational self system: English at a university in Japan. *JALT Journal*, *36*(2), 153-174.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (pp. 71-81). Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control.* New York, NY, US: Worth Publishers.

Bandura, A. (2008). An agentic perspective on positive psychology. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Positive psychology: Exploring the best in people* (Vol. 1) (pp. 167-196). Greenwood Publishing Group.

Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benson, P. (1996). Concepts of autonomy in language learning. In R. Pemberton, E. Li, W. Or, & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control. Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 27-34). Hong Kong University Press.

Benson, P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 18-34). Longman.

Benson, P. (2001). *Autonomy in Language Learning.* Longman.

Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language teaching*, *40*(1), 21.

Benson, P. (2011). What's new in autonomy. *The Language Teacher*, *35*(4), 15-18.

Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*. Routledge.

Benson, P. (2015). Commenting to learn: Evidence of language and intercultural learning in comments on YouTube videos. *Language Learning & Technology*, *19*(3), 88-105.

Bjork, C., & Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). Education reform in Japan: Competing visions for the future. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*(8), 619-626.

Bong, M., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: How different are they really? *Educational psychology review*, *15*(1), 1-40.

Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). Learner autonomy: English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *ELT journal*, *12*(7), 1-45.

British Council (n.d.). *Autonomy*. Teaching English. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/autonomy

Bronner, S. (2000). Learner Autonomy Japanese Style: The "Think in English" Approach. *The Language Teacher*, *24*(1), 27-29.

Brown, R. A. (2004). Motivation for learning English among Japanese university students. Information research (Bulletin of the Faculty of Information, Bunkyo University), Vol. 31, 1-12.

Bruner, J. S. (1961). *The act of discovery.* Harvard Educational Review.

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1997). Celebrating divergence: Piaget and Vygotsky. *Human development*, *40*(2), 63-73.

Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2014). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. *the use of English*, 37.

Browne, C. M., & Wada, M. (1998). Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, *11*(1), 97-112.

Busse, V., & Walter, C. (2013). Foreign language learning motivation in higher education: A longitudinal study of motivational changes and their causes. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(2), 435-456.

Butler, Y. G. (2007). How are nonnative-English-speaking teachers perceived by young learners?. *Tesol Quarterly*, *41*(4), 731-755.

Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2004). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 "action plan". *Language Policy*, *4*(1), 25-45.

Cameron, L., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Complex systems and applied linguistics. *International journal of applied linguistics*, *17*(2), 226-239.

Carreira, J. M. (2012). Motivational orientations and psychological needs in EFL learning among elementary school students in Japan. *System*, *40*(2), 191-202.

Carreira, J. M., Ozaki, K., & Maeda, T. (2013). Motivational model of English learning among elementary school students in Japan. *System*, *41*(3), 706-719.

Christman, J. (2015). *Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy.* The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/autonomy-moral/

Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, *23*(2), 195-205.

Council of Europe (1949, May 5). *Statue of the council of Europe*. Council of Europe. https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/001

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language learning*, *41*(4), 469-512.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *The modern language journal*, *89*(1), 19-36.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2008). The relationship of intercultural contact and language learning motivation among Hungarian students of English and German. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *29*(1), 30-48.

Csizér, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.) *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 98-119). Multilingual Matters.

Dan, A. (2016). Supporting and developing self-regulatory behaviours in early childhood in young children with high levels of impulsive behaviour. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, *9*(4), 189-200.

DeVries, R. (2000). Vygotsky, Piaget, and education: A reciprocal assimilation of theories and educational practices. *New ideas in Psychology*, *18*(2-3), 187-213.

Dias, J. (2000). Learner autonomy in Japan: Transforming help yourself from threat to invitation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *13*(1), 49-64.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation a literature review. *System*, *23*(2), 165-174.

Dinsmore, D. L., Alexander, P. A., & Loughlin, S. M. (2008). Focusing the conceptual lens on metacognition, self-regulation, and self-regulated learning. *Educational psychology review*, *20*(4), 391-409.

Doak, K. M. (1996). Race, ethnicity and migration in modern Japan. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 22(1), 77-103.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The modern language journal*, *78*(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language teaching*, *31*(3), 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British journal of educational psychology*, *70*(4), 519-538.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientation, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning, 53*, 3-32. doi:10.1111/1467-9922.53222

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The motivational L2 self-system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self (p. 9-43). Multilingual matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 Learning Experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(1), 19-30. doi:https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language teaching research*, *2*(3), 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation.* Pearson.

Duke, B. (1986) *The Japanese school: Lessons for industrial America.* Praeger.

ETS. (2017). *2017 Report on test takers worldwide.* ETS. https://www.ets.org/s/toeic/pdf/2017-report-on-test-takers-worldwide.pdf

ETS. (2018). *2018 Report on test takers worldwide.* ETS. https://www.ets.org/s/toeic/pdf/2018-report-on-test-takers-worldwide.pdf

Falout, J., & Maruyama, M. (2004). A comparative study of proficiency and learner demotivation. *The Language Teacher*, *28*(8), 3-10.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Fennelly, M., & Luxton, R. (2011). Are they ready? On the verge of compulsory English, elementary school teachers lack confidence. *The Language Teacher*, *35*(2), 19-24.

Fewell, N. (2010). Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: An investigation of Japanese EFL university students. *TESOL Journal*, *2*(1), 159-174.

Fox, E., & Riconscente, M. (2008). Metacognition and self-regulation in James, Piaget, and Vygotsky. *Educational Psychology Review*, *20*(4), 373-389.

Friedman, J. (2016). English education in the era of Meiji Japan. *World Englishes*, *35*(1), 3-17.

Fujimoto-Adamson, N. (2006). Globalization and history of English education in Japan. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3), 259-282.

Fujitani, T. (2004). Inventing, forgetting, remembering. In M. Weiner (Ed.), *Race, ethnicity and culture in modern Japan* (pp. 72-102). Routledge.

Gao, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2011). Joining forces for synergy: Agency and metacognition as interrelated theoretical perspectives on learner autonomy. In G. Murray, X. Gao, & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 25-41). Multilingual Matters.

Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second-language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp. 193-220). Basil Blackwell.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. *Canadian Psychology*, *41*(1), 10.

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 1-20). Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center University of Hawai‘i.

Gardner, R. C. (2005, May 30). *Integrative motivation and second language acquisition* [Conference session]. Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics/Canadian Linguistics Association Joint Plenary Talk, London, Ontario, Canada.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, *13*(4), 266-272.

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

Genç, G., Kuluşaklı, E., & Aydın, S. (2016). Exploring EFL learners' perceived self-efficacy and beliefs on English language learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *41*(2), 53-68.

Gijbels, D., Segers, M., & Struyf, E. (2008). Constructivist learning environments and the (im) possibility to change students' perceptions of assessment demands and approaches to learning. *Instructional Science*, *36*, 431-443.

Goodman, R. (2007). The concept of Kokusaika and Japanese educational reform. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *5*(1), 71-87.

Gorsuch, G. (2012). International Teaching Assistants' Experiences in Educational Cultures and Their Teaching Beliefs. *TESL-EJ*, *16*(1), 1-26.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers.* National Geographic Learning.

Greene, J. A., & Azevedo, R. (2007). A theoretical review of Winne and Hadwin's model of self-regulated learning: New perspectives and directions. *Review of educational research*, *77*(3), 334-372.

Hamada, Y. (2011). Different Demotivators for Japanese Junior High and High School Learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 15-38.

Hashimoto, K. (2000). 'Internationalisation' is 'Japanisation': Japan's foreign language education and national identity. *Journal of intercultural studies*, *21*(1), 39-51.

Hashimoto, K. (2009). Cultivating "Japanese who can use English": Problems and contradictions in government policy. *Asian Studies Review*, *33*(1), 21-42.

Hashimoto, K. (2011). Compulsory 'foreign language activities' in Japanese primary schools. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *12*(2), 167-184.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological review*, *94*(3), 319-340.

Hino, N. (2018). English as an international language for Japan: Historical contexts and future prospects. *Asian Englishes*, *20*(1), 27-40.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* Pergamon.

Holec, H. (2009). Autonomy in language learning: A single pedagogical paradigm or two. In F. Kjisik, P. Voller, N. Aoki, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *Mapping the terrain of learner autonomy: Learning environments, learning communities and identities* (pp. 21-47). Tampere University Press.

Irie, K., & Ryan, S. (2015). Study abroad and the dynamics of change in learner L2 self-concept. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 343-366). Multilingual Matters.

Islam, M., Lamb, M., & Chambers, G. (2013). The L2 motivational self system and national interest: A Pakistani perspective. *System*, *41*(2), 231-244.

Janne, H. (1977). *Organization, content and methods of adult education*. Council of Europe.

Jung, I., Kudo, M., & Choi, S. K. (2012). Stress in Japanese learners engaged in online collaborative learning in English. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *43*(6), 1016-1029.

Kalina, C., & Powell, K. C. (2009). Cognitive and social constructivism: Developing tools for an effective classroom. *Education*, *130*(2), 241-250.

Kikuchi, K. (2019). Motivation and demotivation over two years: A case study of English language learners in Japan. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 157-175.

Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC journal*, *40*(2), 172-191.

Kikuchi, K., & Sakai, H. (2009). Japanese learners' demotivation to study English: A survey study. *JALT journal*, *31*(2), 183-204.

Kingir, S., Tas, Y., Gok, G., & Vural, S. S. (2013). Relationships among constructivist learning environment perceptions, motivational beliefs, self-regulation and science achievement. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, *31*(3), 205-226.

Kitao, K., & Kitao, S. K. (Eds.) (1995). *English teaching: Theory, research and practice*. Eichosha.

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *Tesol quarterly*, *48*(2), 275-299.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL quarterly*, *33*(1), 9-35.

Kumazawa, M. (2011). *Vulnerability and resilience: Working lives and motivation of four novice EFL secondary school teachers in Japan*. Temple University.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language teaching research*, *15*(1), 11-33.

Leeming, P. (2017). A longitudinal investigation into English speaking self-efficacy in a Japanese language classroom. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *2*(1), 12-30.

Lindley, R. (1986). *Autonomy*. Macmillan.

Little, D. (1991) Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems. Authentik.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, *23*(2), 175-181.

Little, D. (2004). Democracy, discourse and learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, *13*(3), 105-126.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(1), 14-29.

Little, D. (2009). Learner autonomy in action: Adult immigrants learning English in Ireland. In F. Kjisik, P. Voller, N. Aoki, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *Mapping the terrain of learner autonomy: Learning environments, learning communities and identities* (pp. 21-47). Tampere University Press.

Little, D. (2012). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, the European Language Portfolio, and language learning in higher education. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 1-21.

Little, D., Ridley, J., & Ushioda, E. (2002). *Towards greater learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom*. Authentik.

Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": An anatomy and a framework. *System*, *24*(4), 427-435.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied linguistics*, *20*(1), 71-94.

Lourenço, O. (2012). Piaget and Vygotsky: Many resemblances, and a crucial difference. *New ideas in psychology*, *30*(3), 281-295.

Machida, T. (2016). Japanese elementary school teachers and English language anxiety. *TESOL Journal*, *7*(1), 40-66.

Machida, T., & Walsh, D. J. (2015). Implementing EFL policy reform in elementary schools in Japan: A case study. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *16*(3), 221-237.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *23*, 369-388.

MacIntyre, P. D., MacKinnon, S. P., & Clément, R. (2009). The baby, the bathwater, and the future of language learning motivation research. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 43-65). Multilingual Matters.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Mercer, S. (2014). Introducing positive psychology to SLA. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 4, 153-172. doi: 10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.2

Maddux, J. E. (2002). Self-efficacy. *Handbook of positive psychology*, 277-287.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American psychologist*, *41*(9), 954.

McCrostie, J. (2017, November 6). *Let's discuss entrance exam reforms*. Japan Times. https://www.japantimes.co.jp/life/2017/11/06/language/lets-discuss-entrance-exam-reforms/

McEown, M. S., Noels, K. A., & Saumure, K. D. (2014). Students' self-determined and integrative orientations and teachers' motivational support in a Japanese as a foreign language context. *System*, *45*, 227-241.

McEown, M. S., & Oga-Baldwin, W. Q. (2019). Self-determination for all language learners: New applications for formal language education. *System*, *86*, 102124.

McEown, K., & Sugita-McEown, M. (2019). Individual, parental and teacher support factors of self-regulation in Japanese students. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *13*(4), 389-401.

McVeigh, B. J. (2002). *Japanese higher education as myth*. ME Sharpe.

Michaud, M. (2015). Oral communication in the Japanese Senior High School: Communicative competence and comparisons of textbooks used for EFL instruction. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, *6*(5), 231-258.

Mikami, Y. (2012). Effects of Goal Setting and Self-Monitoring Instruction on EFL Learners' Goals and Motivation. *ARELE: Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, *23*, 33-44.

Mills, N. (2014). Self-efficacy in second language acquisition. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 6-22). Multilingual Matters.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (1989). *Japanese government policies in education, science, and culture 1989.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpae198901/index.html

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (1999). *Japanese government policies in education, science, and culture 1999.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpae199901/index.html

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2002). *Action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities."* MEXT https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/hpac200201/hpac200201_2_015.html

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2006). *Basic act on education.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/lawandplan/title01/detail01/1373798.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2008a). *The revisions of the course of study for elementary and secondary schools.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/elsec/title02/detail02/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/28/1303755_001.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2008b). *Chapter 4 foreign language activities.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/17/1303755_011.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2015). *Statistical Abstract.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/en/publication/statistics/title02/detail02/1379368.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2016). *Enrollment and advancement rate.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/en/publication/statistics/title01/detail01/1373636.htm#06

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2017). *Chapter 1 General Provisions.* MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2020/02/27/20200227-mxt_kyoiku02-100002604_2.pdf

Moore, P. J. (2013). An emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English-as-a-foreign-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(1), 239-253.

Najafzadeh, M., Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2018). A Dynamic Model of EFL Learners' Personal Best Goals, Resilience, and Language Achievement. *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, *7*(3), 267-296.

Nakamura, K. (2018). Changing role of the English course of study. *PanSIG Journal 2018*, 174-179.

Nakata, Y. (2006) Motivation and Experience in Foreign Language Learning. Bern: Peter Lang.

Nakata, Y. (2009). Towards learner autonomy and teacher autonomy in the Japanese school context. In F. Kjisik, P. Voller, N. Aoki, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *Mapping the terrain of learner autonomy: Learning environments, learning communities and identities* (pp. 21-47). Tampere University Press.

Nakata, Y. (2010). Toward a framework for self-regulated language-learning. *TESL Canada journal*, *27*(2), 1-10.

Nakata, Y. (2011). Teachers' readiness for promoting learner autonomy: A study of Japanese EFL high school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(5), 900-910.

Nakata, Y. (2014). Self-regulation: Why is it important for promoting learner autonomy in the school context? *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 5*(4), 342-356.

Ng, C. L. P. (2016). Primary school English reform in Japan: policies, progress and challenges. *Current issues in language planning*, *17*(2), 215-225.

Nishino, T., & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus classroom realities in Japan. *Tesol Quarterly*, *42*(1), 133-138.

Nosratinia, M., Saveiy, M., & Zaker, A. (2014). EFL learners' self-efficacy, metacognitive awareness, and use of language learning strategies: How are they associated. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(5), 1080-1092.

Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the Gap between Learning and Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 133-158. doi:10.2307/3587808

Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Nakata, Y. (2015). Structure also supports autonomy: Measuring and defining autonomy-supportive teaching in J apanese elementary foreign language classes. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *57*(3), 167-179.

Ohta, A. S. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. *System*, *33*(3), 503-517.

Ohta, A. S. (2006). The zone of proximal development and second language acquisition: Beyond social interaction. *Readings in second language acquisition and second language pedagogy in a Japanese context*, 155-178.

Okuno, H. (2007). A critical discussion on the action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities". *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *4*(4), 133-158.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L., (1999) "Anxiety and the Language Learner: New Insights," In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in Language Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 58-67.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: Concepts and relationships. *International review of applied linguistics in language teaching*, *41*(4), 271-278.

Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The modern language journal*, *78*(1), 12-28.

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In M. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in Motivation and Achievement* (pp. 1-49). JAI Press.

Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. Ecceles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15-31). Academic Press.

Palfreyman, D. (2003). Introduction: Culture and learner autonomy. In D. Palfreyman & R. C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures* (pp. 1-19). Palgrave Macmillan.

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, *38*(3), 467-479.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, *23*(4), 589-618.

Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, *37*(3), 380-390.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.

Piaget, J. (1963). *The origins of intelligence in children.* Norton.

Pigott, J. D. (2011). Self and motivation in compulsory English classes in Japan. In A. Stewart (Ed.), JALT2010 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT.

Pigott, J. D. (2019). Anagnorisis and narrative incorporation: How significant incidents affect language-learning behavior. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 177-198.

Pishghadam, R., & Ghadiri, S. (2011). Symmetrical or asymmetrical scaffolding: Piagetian vs. Vygotskyan views to reading comprehension. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *7*(1), 49-64.

Ranalli, J. (2012). Alternative models of self-regulation and implications for L2 strategy research. *SiSAL Journal*, *3*(4), 357.

Reeve, J. (2006). Teachers as facilitators: What autonomy-supportive teachers do and why their students benefit. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*(3), 225-236.

Richardson, G. E., Neiger, B. L., Jensen, S., & Kumpfer, K. L. (1990). The resiliency model. *Health education*, *21*(6), 33-39.

Richards, D. A. (1981). Rights and autonomy. *Ethics*, *92*(1), 3-20.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Rikers, R. M., Van Gog, T., & Paas, F. (2008). The effects of constructivist learning environments: A commentary. *Instructional Science*, *36*(5-6), 463-467.

Riley, P. (1988). The ethnography of autonomy. In A. Brooks & P. Grundy (Eds.), *Individualisation and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 12-34). MacMillan.

Rose, H., Briggs, J. G., Boggs, J. A., Sergio, L., & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, N. (2018). A systematic review of language learner strategy research in the face of self-regulation. System, *72*, 151-163.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will?. *Journal of personality*, *74*(6), 1557-1586.

Ryan, S. (2009). Ambivalence and commitment, liberation and challenge: Investigating the attitudes of young Japanese people towards the learning of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *30*(5), 405-420.

Sakai, H., & Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, *37*(1), 57-69.

Sakamoto, M. (2012). Moving towards effective English language teaching in Japan: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(4), 409-420.

Sardegna, V. G., Lee, J., & Kusey, C. (2018). Self-efficacy, attitudes, and choice of strategies for English pronunciation learning. *Language Learning*, *68*(1), 83-114.

Sasaki, M. (2008). The 150-year history of English language assessment in Japanese education. *Language Testing*, *25*(1), 63-83.

Schneewind, J. B. (1998). *The invention of autonomy: A history of modern moral philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.

Schmenk, B. (2005). Globalizing learner autonomy. *Tesol Quarterly*, *39*(1), 107-118.

Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.) *Motivation and second language acquisition*, (pp. 313-359). University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational psychologist*, *26*(3-4), 207-231.

Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, *7*(2), 112-137.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 23*, 7-25. doi:10.1080/10573560600837578

Schunk, D. H. (2008). Metacognition, self-regulation, and self-regulated learning: Research recommendations. *Educational psychology review*, *20*(4), 463-467.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.) (2008). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Seargeant, P. (2008). Ideologies of English in Japan: The perspective of policy and pedagogy. *Language Policy, 7*(2), 121-142.

Seargeant, P. (2011). Introduction: English in Japan in the era of globalization. In *English in Japan in the era of globalization* (pp. 1-12). Palgrave Macmillan.

Shimizu, M. (2010). Japanese English Education and Learning: A History of Adapting Foreign Cultures. *Educational Perspectives*, *43*, 5-11.

Shoji, K. (2018, June 18) *Why do the Japanese suck at learning English?* Japan Times. https://www.japantimes.co.jp/life/2018/06/18/language/japanese-suck-learning-english/

Sinclair, B. (2000) Learner autonomy: the next phase. In B. Sinclair, et al. (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 15-23). Longman.

Stracke, E. (2016). Language learning strategies of Indonesian primary school students: In relation to self-efficacy beliefs. *System*, *60*, 1-10.

Stroupe, R., Rundle, C., & Tomita, K. (2016). Developing autonomous learners in Japan: Working with teachers through professional development. In R. Barnard & J. Li (Eds.), *Language learner autonomy: Teachers' beliefs and practices in Asian contexts* (pp. 43-61). Language Education in Asia.

Sudina, E., Vernon, T., Foster, H., Del Villano, H., Hernandez, S., Beck, D., & Plonsky, L. (2020). Development and Initial Validation of the L2-Teacher Grit Scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 0*(0), 1-29.

Sugita-McEown, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2010). What can teachers do to motivate their students? A classroom research on motivational strategy use in the Japanese EFL context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*(1), 21-35.

Sugita-McEown, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2014). Motivational strategies in EFL classrooms: how do teachers impact students' motivation?. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(1), 20-38.

Suzuki, M. (2011). Ideal L2 selves of Japanese English learners at different motivational level [Master's thesis]. Soka University Library.

Taguchi, T. (2013). Motivation, attitudes and selves in the Japanese context: A mixed methods approach. In M. T. Apple, D. Da Silva, & T. Fellner (Eds.), *Language learning motivation in Japan* (pp. 169-188). Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Multilingual Matters.

Tahira, M. (2012). Behind MEXT's new course of study guidelines. *The Language Teacher*, *36*(3), 3-8.

Takanashi, Y. (2004). TEFL and communication styles in Japanese culture. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, *17*(1), 1-14.

Tanaka, F. (2010). A survey-based study of Japanese university student attitudes toward EIL and implications for the future of English education in Japan. *Asian Englishes*, *13*(1), 48-71.

Teimouri, Y., Plonsky, L., & Tabandeh, F. (2020). L2 grit: Passion and perseverance for second-language learning. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820921895

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). A questionnaire-based validation of multidimensional models of self-regulated learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(3), 674-701.

Todaka, Y. (2013). Self-efficacy theory and beyond: Japanese college EFL learners. *Journal of Educational and Social research*, *3*(7), 359.

Todaka, Y. (2017). How to motivate de-motivated Japanese college EFL learners. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, *2*(4), 87-92.

Tomita, Y., & Spada, N. (2013). Form-focused instruction and learner investment in L2 communication. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(3), 591-610.

Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The modern language journal*, *79*(4), 505-518.

Tseng, W. T., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied linguistics*, *27*(1), 78-102.

Tsuda, A., & Nakata, Y. (2013). Exploring self-regulation in language learning: A study of Japanese high school EFL students. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *7*(1), 72-88.

Ueki, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2013). Forming a clearer image of the ideal L2 self: The L2 Motivational Self System and learner autonomy in a Japanese EFL context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *7*(3), 238-252.

Ushioda, E. (1996). Developing a dynamic concept of L2 motivation. In T. Hickey & J. Williams (Eds.), *Language, education and society in a changing world* (pp. 239-245). Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93-125). University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. *215*-228). Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Why autonomy? Insights from motivation theory and research. *Innovation in language learning and teaching*, *5*(2), 221-232.

Ushioda, E. (2013). Foreign language motivation research in Japan: An 'insider'perspective from outside Japan. *Language learning motivation in Japan*, *1*, 14.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2012). *Thought and language*. MIT press.

Wadsworth, B. J. (1996). *Piaget's theory of cognitive and affective development: Foundations of constructivism*. Longman Publishing.

Winne, P. H. (1985). Steps toward promoting cognitive achievements. *The Elementary School Journal*, *85*(5), 673-693.

Winne, P. H. (2001). Self-regulated learning viewed from models of information processing. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 153-189). Routledge.

Winne, P. H. (2017). Learning analytics for self-regulated learning. In C. Lang, G. Siemens, A. Wise, & D. Gašević (Eds.), *Handbook of learning analytics* (pp. 241-249). Solar.

Winne, P. H. (2018). Cognition and metacognition within self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & J. A. Greene (Eds.), *Educational psychology handbook series. Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 36–48). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Wolin, S., & Wolin, S. (1995). Resilience among youth growing up in substance-abusing families. *Pediatric Clinics*, *42*(2), 415-429.

Yamada, M. (2010). English as a multicultural language: implications from a study of Japan's junior high schools' English language textbooks. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(5), 491-506.

Yamauchi, K. (2018). Teaching English at primary school in Japan: Current situation and the issues. *The Asia EFL Journal, 20*(2), 142-155.

Yano, Y. (2011). English as an international language and 'Japanese English'. In P. Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization* (pp. 125-142). Palgrave Macmillan.

Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, *86*(1), 144-163.

Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan: The problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(2), 290-292.

Yoshida, K. (2012). Issues in the transition of English education from elementary schools to secondary schools. In B. Spolsky & Y. Moon (Eds.), *Primary school English-language education in Asia: From policy to practice* (pp. 23-37). Routledge.

Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American educational research journal*, *37*(1), 215-246.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Becoming a self-regulated learner: Which are the key subprocesses. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *11*(4), 307-313.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational psychologist*, *25*(1), 3-17.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. *Self-efficacy in changing societies*, *1*, 202-231.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13–39). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B., & Schunk, D. (2006). Competence and control beliefs: Distinguishing the means and ends. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 349-367). Routledge.