達成目標志向性が学習方略の選択に及ぼす影響：高校生の英語学習を中心に

The Influence of Achievement Goal Orientations on Learners' Choice of Strategies: English Learners in Japanese High Schools

中山　晃 NAKAYAMA, Akira
● 国際基督教大学大学院教育学研究科
　Graduate school of Education, International Christian University

吉田　広毅 YOSHIDA, Hiroki
● 常葉学園大学
　Tokohagakuen University

ABSTRACT

　目標理論では，生徒が抱く達成目標の違いが実際の学習行動に影響を与えるという．本研究では，外国語として英語を学ぶ日本の高校生を被験者とし，学校及び家庭学習としての英語学習に焦点を当て，目標志向性を測定する目標達成傾向尺度と言語学習方略尺度を用いて，高校生の英語学習における目標志向性の違いが学習方略の選択に及ぼす影響を調査した．一連の調査から，遂行目標（「現実志向 "reality-oriented"」及び「評価志向 "evaluation-oriented"」）よりも学習目標（「理解志向 "understanding-oriented"」）に高い得点を示した生徒は，想定した 6 つの学習方略（記憶方略・認知方略・補償方略・メタ認知方略・情意方略・社会的方略）のすべてを柔軟に使用しているという結果を得た．こうした結果をもとに，言語学習における達成目標志向性と学習方略との関係を考察する．

Introduction

Instead of analyzing language data derived from tests of modern linguistic theories, non-linguistic factors such as age, gender, personality, attitude, and motivation have been studied from an interdisciplinary perspective in the field of second language acquisition research (SLA). Since these individual factors have a close relationship with external and contextual variables, the researchers have cited relevant theories depending on when and where language learning takes place and who learns the target language.

As for motivation, which is the primary focus of this paper, various types of motivation in language learning have been categorized within social psychological frameworks. So far, the main purpose of such studies has been to identify what kinds of motivation the learners have. However, it seems insufficient for language teachers with a practical orientation that researchers simply concentrate on classifying language-learning motivations in psychological terms. For them, motivational studies should aim at examining how different types of motivation can enhance actual behavior patterns with a view to providing practical and educational implications for both teachers and students. In this paper, we review the results of the previous motivational studies to: (1) clarify the major points; (2) introduce goal theory as one of the explanatory theories in order to discern the relationship between learners' types of goal orientations and learning behaviors; and (3) discuss the results of the present study in terms of goal theory.

Review of Literature

Motivational Studies in Japan

After several researchers in the early 1990s (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1990, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994) pointed out some shortcomings and limitations of the Gardner's social psychological framework (i.e., instrumental and integrative motivation, see, Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Gardner 1985), motivational studies based on new concepts and rooted in other areas of psychology have been published (Dörnyei, 1994). Much attention has been paid in particular to studies on learner motivation in the language classroom from an educational psychological perspective and this tendency can be seen quite clearly in motivational studies conducted in Japan (e.g., Kimura, Nakata, & Okumura, 2001; Nakayama, 2001; Yashima, 2000). So far, the study of language learner motivation has focused on situations where learners are expected to develop communicative competence both socially and in daily life in a target language (e.g., second language, or L2), in Canada. In Japan, students typically study English as a foreign language (EFL) in a classroom, where they lack exposure to English and do not always realize the necessity for acquiring it. Several Japanese researchers (Kamiyama, 1984; Konishi, 1996; Kubo, 1997) have pointed out repeatedly the difference between the L2 and EFL situations. In order to meet the demands of this motivational research paradigm, researchers should specify clearly which aspects they are addressing and where the language learning is taking place.

Motivational study in the 1990s concentrated not only on introducing educational psychological views but also on seeking

explanations for outcomes of specific language tasks and behaviors rather than pursuing general tendencies in social contexts (Kimura, Nakata, & Okumura, 2001). With regard to the relationship between motivational patterns and strategy choices, Horino and Ichikawa (1997) examined the influence of motivation of high school EFL learners in Japan on strategy choices and found that learners' strong attachment to the contents of what they learned was needed for them to use an organization strategy. Concerning the possibility of cognitive interventions with language learners, Kubo (1999) examined the relationships among learning motivation, cognitive appraisal, learning behavior, and performance in Japanese university students by using an orientation-appraisal model. She found that having teachers present a learning strategy with clarification of the goals of the learning content might facilitate a favorable change in the learning strategies students use. By examining the relationship between motivational patterns and behaviors, teachers might be helped to better understand learners' behavior patterns and changes.

Moreover, these two studies conducted in Japanese high schools and universities seem to be based on the assumption that studying a foreign language as a school subject is the same as learning other school subjects such as mathematics, world history, biology, etc. This assumption is related to the notion of the difference between L2 and EFL learning. As mentioned above, since learners in EFL situations lack both an exposure to English and a sense of the necessity of acquiring it, English class for them might be a matter of learning vocabulary and the rules of grammar in order to pass college entrance examinations. Thus, foreign language learning in

Japan might be characterized as one instance of a more general learning process.

Achievement Goal Orientations

Language teachers may know from experience that students who are highly motivated do not always get good grades on English tests or any other kind of language proficiency test. This is probably due to the fact that several important factors can intervene between learner motivation and language proficiency, including learner beliefs, anxiety, motivational patterns, learning strategies, ability, and so forth. Presumably, motivational factors have their impact on behavior patterns rather than language proficiency, itself. With regard to this relationship, goal theory[1] might provide a plausible explanation.

"It has long been known that factors other than ability influence whether children seek or avoid challenges, whether they persist or withdraw in the face of difficulty, and whether they use and develop their skills effectively" (Dweck, 1986, p.1040). In particular, motivational processes influence not only learners' persistence in learning the target language but also their acquisition, transfer, and use of knowledge and skills. Despite this, education related conceptions of motivation have been neglected for a long time. Researching motivational processes from a social-cognitive perspective, Dweck (1986) proposed a model of achievement goal orientations showing how the particular goals children pursue in cognitive tasks shape their reactions toward success and failure and influence the quality of their cognitive performance. Dweck also argued that this approach has important implications for practice and the design of interventions to

change maladaptive motivational processes. According to Dweck, achievement goal orientations can be divided into two different orientations: learning goal (LG) and performance goal (PG). The former refers to the orientation to increase competence and understand something new and the latter to the orientation to gain positive judgment, or to avoid negative judgment of their competence. Concerning each behavior pattern, several researchers (Ames, 1984; Elliot & Dweck, 1985; Leggett, 1986) reported that children with learning goals tend to use obstacles as a cue to increase their effort or to analyze and vary their strategies while children with performance goals are likely to reach negative outcomes in terms of their ability and attribute errors and failure to a lack of ability, and this tends to result in a defensive withdrawal of effort or debilitation in the face of obstacles.

Regarding confidence in present ability, the role of self-efficacy is reflected in Dweck's model in contrast to the preceding model of goal theory expanded by Nicholl (1984). That is, it is considered that task choice is affected by the degree of self-assessment of ability in Dweck's model. Several studies (Bandura & Dweck, 1985; Elliott & Dweck, 1985) reported that performance goals work against the pursuit of challenge by requiring that children's perceptions of their ability be high before the children will desire a challenging task. That is, if the goal is not to obtain a favorable judgment of ability, they will choose tasks that conceal their ability or protect it from negative evaluation. On the other hand, learning goals make it easier for children to choose challenging tasks that foster learning even if they assess their present ability as low. That is, children with learning

goals chose challenging tasks regardless of whether they believe themselves to have high or low ability. In short, children with a learning goal are willing to risk displays of ignorance in order to acquire skills and knowledge while performance goals appear to promote defensive strategies that can interfere with challenge seeking (Dweck, 1986).

Target Issues and Research Question

Although Dweck's model accounts for the tendency to use learning behavior patterns consistent with the various types of students' orientations, the concrete strategies they use are not identified, let alone the strategies the language learners use. For language teachers dealing with practical issues, understanding the relationship between students' motivational patterns and strategy choice might help them to intervene cognitively with their students. As such, empirical studies on the relationship between motivational patterns and language learning strategies are necessary. Focusing on EFL learners in Japanese high schools, the present study investigates the influence of achievement goal orientations on learners' choice of strategies. Thus, our research question for our exploratory study is, "Do differences in students' achievement goal orientations affect their use of language learning strategies ?"

Method

Participants
A total of 295 Japanese high school students in a general course in high schools located in Hyogo and Hiroshima participated in our self-report survey. Students in technical courses who wanted to get a job

after graduation and students who had experiences in English speaking countries for a period greater than one year were excluded from subsequent analyses because (1) they may have held specific beliefs or orientations toward English learning and/or (2) they did not meet our sampling criteria (i.e., the statistical population for our study was Japanese students who study English as a foreign language in a public or private high school in Japan). The analyses reported below are based on a total of 284 students enrolled in a general course and who were learning English as a foreign language. Characteristics of the survey respondents are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 *Characteristics of the Survey Respondents (n=284)*

Characteristics	Percent
Age	16 to 17 (age range)
Gender	
Female	61.2%
Male	38.7%
Missing	0.1%
Year in school	
1st grade	28.3%
2nd grade	71.7%
3rd grade	0.0%
English Proficiency Test (STEP)	
Pre-1st Grade	0.0%
2nd Grade	0.03%
Pre-2nd Grade	2.2%
3rd Grade	61.2%
None + 4th Grade	36.57%

Procedure

The participants were asked to respond to two different self-report questionnaires after the class period. First, they completed a questionnaire containing items to measure achievement goal orientations. Second, they completed a questionnaire consisting of items designed to measure language-learning strategy. Administration of these questionnaires took about 20 minutes. We asked the teachers to inform the students that their

participation was voluntary, that their responses would be used only for this study, and that their personal information would be kept confidential.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study consisted of two independent existing questionnaires. To measure subjects' achievement goal orientations, we adopted the Mokuhyo Tassei Keikou Shakudo (MTKS) developed by Hayamizu, Ito and Yoshizaki (1989), which is written in Japanese and was originally designed to measure Japanese students' goal orientations in accordance with the basic tenets of goal theory. This scale consisted of 26 items arranged in random order (see Table 2). The participants rated the extent to which the descriptions corresponded with their own reasons for achievement goal, adopting a 5-point scale ranging from 1="*Does not correspond at all*" to 5="*Corresponds exactly.*" A high score indicated strong agreement with the subject's achievement goal orientations.

Second, with a view to identifying subjects' preferences for using learning strategies, we adopted Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). We had a bilingual colleague translate the SILL from English to Japanese and then had it back-translated to English to confirm that the Japanese version of the scale was equivalent to the original English version. This scale consisted of 43 items on concrete language learning strategies divided into six sections as follows: memory strategies (7 items), cognitive strategies (9 items), compensation strategies (6 items), metacognitive strategies (9 items), affective strategies (6 items), and social strategies (6 items). The participants

rated the extent to which the descriptions corresponded with their use of language learning strategies, using a 5-point scale that ranged from 1="*Do not use at all*" to 5="*Use it always.*" A high score indicated strong agreement with their preferred learning strategy use.

Analyses and Results

Overview of Analyses

The results are presented in the following three sections. Reported first are descriptive statistics and results of the factor analysis of the MTKS seen in Tables 2 and Table 3. Second, descriptive statistics for the SILL are shown in Table 5. Third, the results of the partial correlation analysis between MTKS and SILL are reported in Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics and Factor Analysis of MTKS

Descriptive statistics for the MTKS are shown in Table 2. The alpha level for all statistical decisions was set at .05. Concerning the factor construction in MTKS, since previous studies (Hayamizu, 1987; Hayamizu, Ito, & Yoshizaki, 1989) found three factors in achievement goal orientations despite Dweck's goal theory proposed only two types of achievement goal orientations, the data were examined using the principal factor method (PFM) for exploratory factor extraction and the factors were rotated by the Kaiser Varimax method on assumption that three factors might be identified. By taking

Table 2 *Descriptive Statistics of MTKS (n=284)*

Item	Statement	M	SD
1	I learn because I can develop my mind.	3.42	1.24
2	I learn because I want to get a good report.	3.79	1.18
3	I learn because I find it interesting to solve problems.	2.56	1.24
4	I learn because I want to be praised by my parents and teachers.	2.50	1.25
5	I learn because what I study now might be useful for the next study in the future.	3.21	1.27
6	I learn because I want to show off academic might.	2.80	1.24
7	I learn because I enjoy gaining ability.	3.26	1.18
8	I learn because I want to be noticed by my parents and teachers.	2.56	1.23
9	I learn because I enjoy challenging difficult things.	2.32	1.21
10	I learn because I can be proud of obtaining a good grade.	2.71	1.35
11	I learn because I don't want to fail the entrance examination.	3.50	1.39
12	I learn because I feel pleasure of mastery.	3.18	1.24
13	I learn because I don't want to be scolded.	2.43	1.35
14	I learn because I enjoy getting to know that I can do it.	3.13	1.26
15	I learn because I don't want to be made a fool of by my peers.	2.38	1.21
16	I learn because I enjoy overcoming stumbling blocks and failure.	2.31	1.15
17	I learn because I want to enter a good school.	3.27	1.37
18	I learn because I enjoy finding new means of problem-solving.	2.39	1.21
19	I learn because I want attention from my peers.	2.01	1.16
20	I learn because I can see something new.	2.87	1.28
21	I learn because I want to get good marks in the exams	3.84	1.18
22	I learn because if I study hard, I can develop my mind.	3.30	1.20
23	I learn because I wish to get better grades than my peers.	2.86	1.30
24	I learn because I am pleased when I can work out difficult problems.	3.07	1.34
25	I learn because I am pleased when I get better scores than my rivals.	2.74	1.41
26	I learn because I like using my brains.	2.01	1.17

Source: Hayamizu, Ito & Yoshizaki (1989).
Notes: This is our English translation of the Japanese version used.

the decreasing rate of the scree plot and the cumulative proportion into account, three factors were identified in our study. As shown in Table 3, like earlier studies (Hayamizu, 1987; Hayamizu, Ito, & Yoshizaki, 1989), each item was assigned conceptually to one of three factors: "understanding-oriented (F1: Q12, Q20, Q3, Q18, Q14, Q9, Q16, Q26, Q24)", "reality-oriented (F2: Q21, Q2, Q11, Q7, Q17,)", and "evaluation-oriented (F3: Q15, Q23, Q25, Q10, Q19, Q13, Q8, Q4)." The understanding-oriented motivation refers to that learners study for self-fulfillment, as represented in Q12 "I learn because I feel pleasure of mastery." The reality-oriented motivation refers to that learners study for getting rewards, for getting works, and for the development of the mind, as represented in Q21 "I learn because I want to get good marks in the exam." The evaluation-oriented motivation refers to that learners study in order to get approvals and avoid refusal from their teachers, parents, and peers, as represented in Q15 "I learn because I don't want to be a fool of by my peers." 45% of the total variance is explained by these three factors. Although the factor analysis indicated that F1, F2, and F3 were independent of each other, the correlation coefficient among F1, F2, and F3 was of moderate strength (see, Table 4), which suggests that it may be impossible to study the effects of each orientation separately. In order to examine the research question, we

Table 3 *Results of Factor Analysis of MTKS (Principal Factor Method with Varimax Rotation)*

Item		Factor Loadings			
No.	Statements	F1	F2	F3	h²
Q12	I learn because I feel pleasure of mastery.	0.73	0.36	0.06	0.67
Q20	I learn because I can see something new.	0.69	0.24	0.07	0.54
Q3	I learn because I find it interesting to solve problems.	0.68	0.19	0.08	0.51
Q18	I learn because I enjoy finding new means of problem-solving.	0.67	0.02	0.22	0.50
Q14	I learn because I enjoy getting to know that I can do it.	0.64	0.36	0.05	0.54
Q9	I learn because I enjoy challenging difficult things.	0.63	-0.03	0.30	0.48
Q16	I learn because I enjoy overcoming stumbling blocks and failure.	0.63	-0.05	0.31	0.49
Q26	I learn because I like using my brains.	0.59	-0.14	0.27	0.44
Q24	I learn because I am pleased when I can work out difficult problems.	0.56	0.37	0.16	0.48
Q6	I learn because I want to show off academic might.	0.40	0.29	0.31	0.34
Q21	I learn because I want to get good marks in the exams.	-0.05	0.67	0.16	0.47
Q2	I learn because I want to get a good report.	-0.10	0.60	0.16	0.40
Q11	I learn because I don't want to fail the entrance examination.	0.15	0.60	0.20	0.42
Q22	I learn because if I study hard, I can develop my mind.	0.46	0.59	0.09	0.57
Q7	I learn because I enjoy gaining ability.	0.38	0.55	0.14	0.47
Q1	I learn because I can develop my mind.	0.44	0.55	-0.08	0.50
Q17	I learn because I want to enter a good school.	0.13	0.54	0.31	0.40
Q5	I learn because what I study now might be useful for the next study in the future.	0.40	0.43	-0.07	0.35
Q15	I learn because I don't want to be made a fool of by my peers.	0.09	0.06	0.68	0.47
Q23	I learn because I wish to get better grades than my peers.	0.21	0.37	0.65	0.61
Q25	I learn because I am pleased when I get better scores than my rivals.	0.30	0.22	0.64	0.55
Q10	I learn because I can be proud of obtaining a good grade.	0.05	0.22	0.64	0.46
Q19	I learn because I want attention from my peers.	0.32	-0.03	0.61	0.48
Q13	I learn because I don't want to be scolded.	-0.02	0.01	0.57	0.32
Q8	I learn because I want to be noticed by my parents and teachers.	0.24	0.30	0.49	0.39
Q4	I learn because I want to be praised by my parents and teachers.	0.21	0.34	0.43	0.34
	Proportion	0.19	0.14	0.13	
	Cum. Proportion	0.19	0.33	0.47	

Table 4 *Correlation Coefficient among Three Factors*

	Factor 1 (Understanding-oriented)	Factor 2 (Reality-oriented)	Factor 3 (Evaluation-oriented)
Factor 1	—		
Factor 2	0.513**	—	
Factor 3	0.475**	0.451**	—

$**p < .01$

need to control the independent predictive power of F1, F2, and F3 over each strategy.

Descriptive Statistics of SILL

Descriptive statistics for the SILL data were first calculated for each item and then for the items grouped into the six categories. The alpha level for all statistical decisions was set at .05. Table 5 shows the items themselves with their original groupings, and the mean and standard deviation for each item. Although Oxford (1990) introduced the SILL as a generalized inventory, Robson and Midorikawa (2001) reported two problems with the factor construction of SILL. One is that despite the high degree of reliability of the SILL as a whole, it still consists of six independent subsections in its factor construction. The other is that the results of factor analysis do not confirm Oxford's six strategy categories even when attempting to force the analysis into a six-factor solution (Robson et al., 2001). In our study, Cronbach's alpha (α), which indicates the internal consistency of the scales, was relatively high for each of the subsections (Table 5), but this might be the result of the number of items. The more items the subcategories have, the higher the degree of reliability the scales are likely to exhibit (Bachman, 1990). Moreover, we also found that the exploratory factor analysis did not show six different factors in the SILL (although we did not provide the results of

factor analysis due to limitations of space). Thus, it would seem safer to limit the SILL to one grand language learning strategy instead of trying to break it into theorized groups (Robson et al., 2001). Though the SILL has a problem with its factor construction, the original groupings were adopted for the sake of convenience. We could not perform statistical comparisons among the six original groupings because we could not assume that the factors were statistically independent from one another.

Partial Correlation Analysis

In order to answer our research question, we used the partial correlation coefficient formula. In this formula, we can treat more than three different kinds of variables at one time and calculate the correlation between two of them, while eliminating the effect of other latent variables during the process of statistical computation. In our study, the variables are F1, F2, F3 and each strategy. As mentioned above, since F1, F2, and F3 unexpectedly correlated with each other at statistical significant level, we had to control two of the predictors respectively, and calculated the partial correlation coefficient (r_p) among each orientation (factor) and the six strategies. Table 6 shows the results of this analysis for each orientation and the six different learning strategies. The results showed that F1 correlates with all six strategies at the .01 level, F2 correlates with

Table 5 *Descriptive Statistics of SILL*

Item	Statements	M	SD
Memory Strategy (a =0.92)			
1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	2.23	0.95
2	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	1.89	0.93
3	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	2.83	1.23
4	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	2.15	1.15
5	I physically act out new English words.	2.83	1.36
6	I review English lessons often.	1.70	0.99
7	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.35	1.22
Cognitive Strategy (a =0.81)			
8	I try to talk like native English speakers.	1.71	0.94
9	I practice the sounds of English.	2.48	1.18
10	I use the English words I know in different ways.	2.10	1.04
11	I start conversations in English.	1.70	0.96
12	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	1.36	0.80
13	I try to find patterns in English.	2.49	1.21
14	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2.34	1.08
15	I try not to translate word-for-word.	2.14	1.01
16	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	1.86	0.99
Compensation Strategy (a =0.78)			
17	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	2.79	1.18
18	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.01	1.35
19	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.15	1.23
20	I read English without looking up every new word.	2.71	1.29
21	I try to guess what the order person will say next in English.	1.72	0.92
22	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.20	1.23
Metacognitive Strategy (a =0.89)			
23	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	1.97	1.08
24	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2.35	1.20
25	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	2.54	1.31
26	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	2.65	1.30
27	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1.92	1.05
28	I look for people I can talk to in English.	1.46	0.88
29	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1.77	1.00
30	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1.94	1.07
31	I think about my progress in learning English.	2.44	1.25
Affective Strategy (a =0.88)			
32	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	2.24	1.11
33	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	1.76	0.93
34	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.43	1.36
35	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.55	1.28
36	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1.15	0.53
37	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	1.57	0.89
Social Strategy (a =0.80)			
38	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.41	1.11
39	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.06	0.93
40	I practice English with other students.	2.57	1.36
41	I ask for help from English speakers.	2.46	1.28
42	I ask questions in English.	1.63	0.53
43	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	2.07	0.89

Source: Oxford (1990).

Table 6 *Result of Partial Correlation Coefficient*

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Understanding-oriented	0.35**	0.37**	0.20**	0.34**	0.28**	0.33**
Reality-oriented	0.09	0.14*	0.09	0.26*	0.05	0.15**
Evaluation-oriented	0.02	-0.08	0.02	-0.10	0.09	-0.02

*p< .05, **p< .01

Cognitive strategy (p< .05), Metacognitive strategy (p< .05), and Social strategy (p< .01), and F3 does not. In this analysis, we did not carry out statistical comparisons of the differences in each strategy because they are not independent from one another. According to the results, our research questions can be answered as follows. Compared to students who rated high on F3, students who rate high on F1 use all types of strategies evenly all around.

Discussion

Regarding achievement goal orientations, unlike the dichotomous categorization proposed by Dweck, three different goal orientations (F1, F2, and F3) were found in our study. However, these three factors are similar to the results of Hayamaizu et al (1989). According to Hayamizu et al (1989), F1 "understanding-oriented" can be identified as LG and the other two factors (F2 "reality-oriented" and F3 "evaluation-oriented") can be identified as PG, and PCM analysis in our study led the almost same result as Hayamizu et al (1989). In addition, recent goal theory proposes a trichotomous categorization of goal orientation designated as "mastery-goal", "performance-approach", or "performance-avoid" (Church, Elliot, & Gable, 2001). Each type of goal orientation has a close conceptual match with the results of both Hayamazi, et al. (1989) and the present study. Therefore, the three factors

identified in the present study and that of Hayamizu, et al. (1989) might be characterized as students' general tendency. However, the modest correlation among them might indicate that the students have these three orientations simultaneously but to different degrees. We could theorize in our study that three types of goal orientation exist, and we could not make a rigid boundary among the subjects in terms of achievement goal orientations. This finding may be limited to the present study, but it suggests that students who are mastery-oriented and have a high attachment to the contents of what is learned may tend to have praise and reward orientations. This might be related to self-efficacy or students' confidence in their present ability, which is reflected in Dweck's model of goal theory. Since the participants in the present study were from middle level high schools and the proportion of students preparing for university entrance examinations was relatively high, their goal orientations were dispersed to some degree.

With regard to the relationship between achievement goal orientations and strategy choices, the results of the partial correlation analysis suggest that learners' achievement goal orientations can influence their use of learning strategies. In particular, high rating scores in F1 "understanding-oriented" have a closer relation with all types of strategies used than high rating scores in F2 "reality-oriented" and F3 "evaluation-oriented." As Dweck (1986) argued, those who show

mastery-oriented type of behavior (i.e., learning goal) are characterized by the tendencies to seek challenge and to persevere in their efforts. From this point of view, their types of achievement goal orientation might affect language learners' flexibility in choosing or using strategies. That is, mastery-oriented students may be willing to try any kind of learning strategy in order to accomplish their goal and they may be flexible enough to modify or change their strategy depending on the requirements of the target tasks. Concerning reality-oriented students, they tended to limit their choice of strategy to the cognitive, meta-cognitive, or social domains in the present study. As this type of students rated high on questions such as "I learn because I want to get good marks in the exams", "I learn because I enjoy gaining ability", and so forth, they study English just for utilitarian purposes. This is a very really realistic, compared to students who exhibited high scores on evaluation-oriented items and were studying English just to avoid negative evaluations from others. Moreover, these psychological constructions are not only limited to English language learning but apply to general learning, so called school subjects, such as mathematics, history and so forth.

However, it is impossible to say definitely that those who use all types of strategies always show mastery-oriented type of behaviors. Can it be said that the student who uses a single or a particular strategy, which is his favorite and effective way of learning, does not seek challenge and does not persevere in the face of obstacles ? This is also beyond our research design framework and scope.

Achievement goal orientations might be considered to take the form of learners' beliefs about learning. That is, whether learners, for their own sake, use effective ways of learning a target issue depends on what they think about learning it. As mentioned above, those who use only one strategy, or persist in using a particular strategy, have a belief that, as language learners, they should do so. There might be a reciprocal relationship between orientations and beliefs, and this relationship may make it hard to grasp the blueprint of the motivational construct.

Implications for Further Research

Teachers with practical concerns need to keep in mind that the choice and use of learning strategies by students might be influenced by achievement goal orientations or beliefs about language learning, although flexibility and persistence in using certain strategies cannot always be defined in terms of types of orientation and beliefs. We need another empirical study to explore the relationship between individual issues and strategy choices. Both strategy investment and clarification of learning goals and language learning beliefs must be considered in the course of the foreign language education.

For both researchers and teachers, it is important to investigate the influence of teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching on students' goals and beliefs toward language learning. Particularly in the EFL context, students are likely to view their language teachers as experts in language learning matters, and, presumably, teachers convey through their classroom practices many of their own assumptions about

language learning.

Along with learners' beliefs, achievement goal orientations play an important role in choosing learning strategies. However, the present study does not provide any information on types of learners' beliefs as one of the factors to affect language learning, nor does it offer a detailed psychological model of the relationship between learners' beliefs and their choice of learning strategies. As such, future research topics should include: (1) identifying learners' beliefs and enumerating the strategies they use; (2) the development of new scales to measure these phenomena over and above the SILL; and (3) clarifying the relationship between these variables by way of path diagrams.

Notes

1. In goal theory, individual behaviors are thought to be rational and economic so as to achieve certain goals. In terms of goal theory, motivation is a series of information processing stages leading toward the goals. Thus, the goals an individual sets influence the strategy choice, methodology, and process toward the goals, and, consequently, the actions and behaviors are driven or maintained.

References

Ames, C. (1984). Achievement attributions and self-instructions under competitive and individualistic goal structures. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 478-487.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bandura, M., & Dweck, C. S. (1985). Self-conceptions and motivation: Conceptions of intelligence, choice of achievement goals, and patterns of cognition, affect, and behavior. Manuscript submitted for publication. Cited in Dweck, C. S. (1986, pp.1042).

Church, M., Elliot, A., & Gable, L. (2001). Perceptions of Classroom Environment, Achievement Goals, and Achievement Outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93* (1), 43-54.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41* (1), 469-512.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning, 40* (1), 45-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78* (iii), 273-284.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41,* 1040-1048.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95* (2), 256-273.

Elliot, E., & Dweck, C. S. (1985). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. Manuscript submitted for publication. Cited in Dweck, C. S. (1986, pp.1042).

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

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

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

Hayamizu, T., Ito, A., & Yoshizaki, K. (1989). Chuugakusei no tassei mokuhyou keikou [Junior High School Students' tendencies of achievement goals]. *Bulletin of Division of Education of Nagoya University, 36,* 55-72.

Horino, M., & Ichikawa, S. (1997). Learning motives and strategies in high school students' English learning. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 45,* 140-147.

Kamiyama, M. (1984). Gaikokugo gakushu niokeru jyouiteki yoin no yakuwari nikansuru jisshouteki kenkyu [An empirical study on the role of affective factors in foreign language learning]. *Language Laboratory, 21,* 23-40.

Konishi, M. (1996). Dainigengo shutoku niokeru gakushushayoin. In SLA Kenkyukai (Eds.), Dainigengo shutokukenkyu ni otoduku Saishin

no Eigo kyoiku (pp.127-146). Tokyo: Taishukan.

Kubo, N. (1999). Orientation-appraisal model for Japanese university students' learning of English: Relation among learning motive, cognitive appraisal, learning behavior, and performance. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 47,* 511-520.

Leggett, E. (1986, April). Individual differences in effort-ability inference rules: Implications for causal judgments. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, New York. Cited in C. S. Dweck (1986, pp.1042).

Nakata, Y., Kimura, Y., & Okumura, T. (2001). Language learning motivation of EFL learners in Japan - A cross-sectional analysis of various learning milieus. *JALT Journal, 23* (1), 47-68.

Nakayama, A. (2001). The influence of self-assessment on learner motivation in the English class, *Educational Studies, 43,* 219-234.

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Conceptions of ability and achievement motivation. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education (Vol. 1).* New York: Academic Press, pp.39-73.

Oxford, R, L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House / Harper & Row Publishers.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 78* (iii), 12-28.

Robson, G., & Midorikawa, H. (2001). How reliable and valid is the Japanese version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. *JALT Journal, 21* (2), 202-226.

Yashima, T. (2000). Orientations and motivation in foreign language learning: A study of Japanese college students, *JACET Bulletin, 31,* 121-133.

Acknowledgements