

Title	Students' beliefs about Indonesian language learning : BALLI in Japan
Sub Title	インドネシア語学習に関する日本人学生の見方：日本におけるBALLI
Author	Santoso, Petrus Ari(Nonaka, Yō) 野中, 葉
Publisher	慶應義塾大学湘南藤沢学会
Publication year	2020
Jtitle	Keio SFC journal Vol.19, No.2 (2019.) ,p.154- 174
JaLC DOI	10.14991/003.00190002-0154
Abstract	Most studies about learning beliefs and learning strategies, which affect learners' target language achievement, are concerned with English as a foreign language. Only a few studies have been conducted to examine students' beliefs about learning Indonesian as a foreign language. Using Horwitz's Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), this study explored the learning beliefs of Japanese students who are learning the Indonesian language as a foreign language in Japan. A total of 268 students from universities across Japan who have Indonesian as a major or elective course have participated in the study. The statistical analysis of the collected data combines descriptive and multivariate techniques like factor analysis. The findings of the study are relevant to improve the practice of Indonesian language teaching and learning for Japanese students.
Notes	特集 多言語多文化共生社会に向けた挑戦 招待論文
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=0402-1902-0154

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the Keio Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

[招待論文]

Students' Beliefs about Indonesian Language Learning

BALLI in Japan

インドネシア語学習に関する日本人学生の見方
日本における BALLI

Petrus Ari Santoso

Visiting Lecturer, Faculty of Policy Management, Keio University

ペトルス アリ サントーソ

慶應義塾大学総合政策学部訪問講師 (招聘)

Yo Nonaka

Associate Professor, Faculty of Policy Management, Keio University

野中 葉

慶應義塾大学総合政策学部准教授

Abstract: Most studies about learning beliefs and learning strategies, which affect learners' target language achievement, are concerned with English as a foreign language. Only a few studies have been conducted to examine students' beliefs about learning Indonesian as a foreign language. Using Horwitz's Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), this study explored the learning beliefs of Japanese students who are learning the Indonesian language as a foreign language in Japan. A total of 268 students from universities across Japan who have Indonesian as a major or elective course have participated in the study. The statistical analysis of the collected data combines descriptive and multivariate techniques like factor analysis. The findings of the study are relevant to improve the practice of Indonesian language teaching and learning for Japanese students.

外国語習得の成果に影響を与える学習者のビリーフと学習ストラテジーに関する研究は、これまで主に、外国語としての英語教育を対象に実施されており、外国語としてのインドネシア語学習における学生たちのビリーフに関する研究は、ほとんど行われてこなかった。本研究では、Horwitzが開発したBALLIを用いて、日本の大学でインドネシア語を学ぶ大学生268人を対象に、彼らの学習ビリーフを検証した。データの分析には、記述分析の他、因子分析などの多変量解析の手法を用いた。本研究の結果は、インドネシア語を学ぶ日本人学生の特徴を明らかにし、日本におけるインドネシア語教育や学習の向上に寄与するものとなった。

Keywords: Indonesian language learning, students' beliefs, BALLI

インドネシア語学、インドネシア語学習に関する学生の見方、BALLI

1 Introduction

1.1 Indonesian language learning in Japan

The history of Indonesian language teaching in Japan started in 1908. According to Kudo (2006), the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS) was the first high education institution that opened the Indonesian language as a foreign language course. Following TUFS, in 1922, Osaka University of Foreign studies also opened Malaysian language education which aimed to train people engaged in overseas trade. In 1925, Tenri University also started to offer similar training. Now there are more than 20 universities across Japan that offer the Indonesian language as a major or an elective course.

The Indonesian language uses the Roman alphabet in its writing system. The spelling in Indonesian is quite regular with some exceptions to its rules. Indonesian has no tones, and also no tone markers as well as accents. Although Indonesian has no relationship with the Japanese language, it is considered easier to read when it is compared to English. In the Indonesian sentence, it is common to find the subject first and followed by the predicate. The non-existence of tenses makes the Indonesian language even more attractive to learn.

Although the Indonesian language is one of the less taught languages in Japan, the number of learners appears to be increased. The number of students who took the Indonesian language proficiency test is also increasing year by year. According to HIPUBI (Himpunan Penyelenggara Ujian Bahasa Indonesia), an institution that holds an Indonesian proficiency test in Japan, in 2015 there were 2,715 test participants and increased by 7 % (2,908) in 2016 then by 11.2 % (3,236) in 2017. These numbers are quite significant.

1.2 Indonesian language learning in Shonan Fujisawa Campus

The Indonesian language is one of the foreign languages that are offered in the Shonan Fujisawa Campus (SFC). Indonesian classes are Basic, Intensive and Skill. Basic is divided into Basic one and Basic two (each has two credits) while intensive class also has Intensive one and two with four credits. Basic and Intensive classes are offered as an elective course. Students have to pass Basic one in order to enroll Basic two. It is also the same with intensive classes. In addition, students are also encouraged to take the immersion program in Indonesia during summer and spring break. For those who have passed Basic one and Intensive one can take 海外研修 B (Overseas Language Training) which is worth two credits while for those who have passed Intensive two are eligible to take Intensive three. Intensive three is four credits immersion program in Indonesia.

Every semester, many students take the Indonesian language for their foreign language. In the spring semester, approximately more than 100 students took Indonesian classes from basic to skill classes while in the fall semester, there were fewer. This fact caught our attention as an Indonesian language teacher in Japan. We would like to know how students see the Indonesian language as a foreign language in Japan. The students' belief about Indonesian language learning can be very beneficial for Indonesian language teachers and curriculum developers in creating a suitable curriculum that fulfills their needs.

1.3 Language learning beliefs

Learner beliefs about second language acquisition (SLA) have been considered an essential factor influencing the learning process and outcomes (Ellis, 2008).

According to Victori and Lockhart (1995, p. 224), beliefs about language learning refer to:

'general assumptions that students hold about themselves as learners, about factors influencing language learning, and about the nature of language learning and teaching.'

Horwitz (1988) mentioned that previous language learning experiences influencing students' beliefs on language learning. She also added that students' beliefs also have essential influence to language learning's commitment, motivation, and goal. While Wenden (1987) assured that student has personal understanding of language learning which relates to value and commitment, Cotteral (1999), in her study on key variables in language learning and how students believe about them, distributed 90 items of questionnaire that emphasized on learner autonomy to 131 learners of English for Academic Purposes in New Zealand. She found that the role of teacher, the role of feedback, sense of self-efficacy, essential strategies, dimensions of strategies-related behavior, and the nature of language learning influence learner autonomy significantly.

As mentioned earlier, the pioneering work of Horwitz (1988) has started extensive research on language learners' and language teachers' beliefs. She developed a 34-statement questionnaire based on teacher-generated list of beliefs that students might have or experience in foreign language learning.

She inspired other researchers to devote their time to defining and assessing beliefs in almost three decades in different contexts and settings. Inspired by Horwitz, Bacon and Finnemann (1990) researched beliefs of Spanish language learners. Using students' self-report data and factor analysis, they identified students' beliefs about language learning and their relationship to authentic learning material. They suggested that the teacher should take students' affective needs and general language learning strategies into high considerations when using authentic input in teaching.

Kern (1995) surveyed students of learning French and their teachers to compare their view of language learning. He underlined that teachers' beliefs were one of the critical factors that affect students' beliefs about language learning.

Mori (1999) concentrated on Japanese learners in the United States; Sakui and Gaies (1999) reported on a study of the beliefs about language learning of almost 1300 Japanese university learners of English; Diab (2006) compared the learning beliefs of English and French students in Lebanon; Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) looked at the nature of students' beliefs who learned Russian language in Malaysia.

Epstein (1990) claims that learning beliefs cannot be separated from self-concept and identity, self-efficacy, personality, and other individual differences. Therefore, learning beliefs are something that is not absolute or dynamic. Learning beliefs can change throughout the process of learning itself as Tanaka and Ellis (2003) reported in their research. They examined changes in the Japanese students' beliefs on learning English during the study abroad. Ellis (2008) also claimed that beliefs can change over time and how their beliefs relate to learners' developing proficiency. The research on the changes in learners' beliefs continues to invite more researchers. Peng (2011) investigated the changes of one first-year college student's beliefs about English teaching and learning since his enrollment.

1.4 BALLI--Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory

Horwitz (1988) developed BALLI – Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory which consists of a 34-item questionnaire to explore students', teachers', and pre-service teachers' beliefs. BALLI is also used to assess students' opinions on a variety of issues and concerns related to language learning. BALLI was developed based on free-recall protocols of foreign language and ESL teachers with different cultural backgrounds, students (both foreign language and ESL) focus groups, and new beliefs supplied by teacher educators from a variety of culture groups. BALLI employed a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'.

BALLI has five categories. The first one is the *Difficulty of language learning*. This category addresses both the general difficulty of learning a second language and perceptions of the difficulty of specific target languages. BALLI items number 3, 4, 6, 14, 24, and 28 concern about this first category. The next group of items concern about *Foreign Language Aptitude*. Items number 1, 2, 10, 15, 22, 29, 32, 33, and 34 address the issue of foreign language aptitude or individual achievement in language learning. The third one is about *The Nature of Language Learning* is embedded in items number 5, 8, 11, 16, 20, 25, 26, and 28. This group discusses the role of social contact and language immersion in language achievement, learners' view on the

difference of language learning and other types of learning, learners' conception of the focus of the language learning task. This group also addresses the learners' perceptions of structural differences between English and the target language. The fourth group is about *Learning and communication strategies* that are embedded in items 7, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, and 21. The last group is about *Motivations and Expectations*. These items are 23, 27, 30, and 31, which concern the desires and opportunities the students associate with the learning of their target language.

1.5 BALLI + (plus)

Although Horwitz's 34-item questionnaire is considered appropriate to address language learning beliefs, quite a few studies have also added additional questions or used different methods to analyze the data. One of the early studies in the 90s was done by Yang (1992), who added one open-ended question to the 34-statement of BALLI. In this study, she used four categories for the group. They are the *Existence of self-efficacy and positive expectation of learning outcome*, *High value of learning English*, *Endorsement of foreign language aptitude*, *Priority to formal and structured study*. Different from Yang, Park (1995) only used 27-statement of BALLI with ten additional statements to 338 Korean students learning English as a foreign language in Korean universities. He identified four categories from the study. They are *Motivation and formal English*, *Self-efficacy and social interaction*, *Learning spoken English*, and *Foreign language aptitude*. In a similar context, Truitt (1995) employed 34-statement of BALLI with an open-ended question to 204 learning English at Korean university. Five categories appeared from factor analysis such as (1) *value and nature of learning English*, (2) *self-efficacy/confidence in speaking*, (3) *the importance of correctness/formal learning*, (4) *ease of learning English*, (5) *motivation*.

In recent years, BALLI was also used to study language learner beliefs of different languages in Japan (Riley, 2006), in Malaysia (Nikitina and Furuoka, 2006), in the Philippines (Sioson, 2011), in Thailand (Fujiwara, 2011), and Malaysia (Peng and Hui, 2012). Of all the mentioned studies, Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) was the

most interesting. They employed BALLI to find the nature of language learners' beliefs in Malaysia which is a multilingual setting. The participants were 107 students learning the Russian language. In addition, this study also proved that BALLI is a suitable tool. They used statistical analysis and employed factor analysis for this purpose.

Most studies related to both learning beliefs and learning strategies affecting learners' target language achievement, were related to English as foreign language. However, none (or only a few) attempts have been made to examine Japanese university students' beliefs about Indonesian language learning. Therefore, in order to give more insights into this field, we explored Japanese students' beliefs on learning Indonesian as a foreign language. Using Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) as a comparison, this study employed Horwitz's BALLI (1988) intending to investigate beliefs about Indonesian language learning held by Japanese higher institutions.

The research questions are as follows:

RQ 1: What are the common factors or categories that appear from the finding on students' Indonesian language learning beliefs?

RQ 2: How Japanese students see the Indonesian language?

RQ 3: What are Japanese students' beliefs about learning Indonesian language?

2 Research Method

2.1 Participants

The Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) was administered at 8 private universities that have an Indonesian language course as a major or elective course. A total of 268 students responded to the survey. 136 (50.75%) of the respondents were male, and 132 (49.25%) were female. 166 (61.94%) of them are in the first year, 82 (30.60%) are in the second year, and 19 (7.09%) are in the third year, and one is in the fourth year. The age of respondents ranged from 18 to 28 years, with the average age is 20 years old. Regarding their linguistic background, 264 students or almost all of them listed the Japanese language as their mother tongue.

2.2 Instruments

This study used the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) developed by Horwitz (1988) to access the beliefs about learning a foreign language. The BALLI contains 34 items and assesses students' beliefs in five major areas: 1. Difficulty of language learning; 2. Foreign language aptitude; 3. The nature of language learning; 4. Learning and communication strategies; and 5. Motivations and expectations.

The 34-statement BALLI uses a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from answers indicating 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree.'

The 34-statement BALLI was translated into Japanese with the goal to find the beliefs among the Japanese students. The structure of the instrument was carefully retained, and no significant changes were made to the design of the original BALLI. Only minor modifications were done in order to reflect the study's context with a focus on Indonesian language students at Japanese universities. Therefore, the words "English language" in BALLI statements no. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 27, 28, 31 were changed to "Indonesian language" and the word "Americans" in no. 30 and 33 was changed to "Japanese".

2.3 Procedure

The 34-statement BALLI (Horwitz, 1988) was distributed in classes in 7 universities in Japan. With the help of the Indonesian language program coordinator from each university, the survey was done in the class for 10 to 15 minutes. All the survey was done manually by using print-outs. Due to time limitations and also some of the universities' policies, the class teacher administered the survey. After completing the questionnaires, they returned the forms to the researcher directly.

2.4 Data Analysis

Factor analysis was carried out in this study. It aims to examine how interrelated several variables are to one another. In other words, factor analysis helps to justify the classifications. Justification whether factor analysis is an appropriate tool to use

was also done using the data.

Table 1: KMO

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy
KMO = 0.673

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is 0.673, which in KMO score is considered *mediocre*. KMO considers 0 – 1 is a good idea to do factor analysis. However, in this case the questions are not very much related.

Table 2: Bartlett’s test

Bartlett test of sphericity

Chi-square = 1584.920
Degrees of freedom = 561
p-value = 0.000
H0: variables are not intercorrelated

Bartlett’s test of sphericity also shows that factor analysis is an appropriate tool to use. If p-value ≤ 1%, ≤ 5 %, ≤ 10%, then H0 is rejected, which means an alternative hypothesis is that variables are correlated.

To decide how many factors that are accountable for this study, we referred to the suggested eigenvalue above 1 (Guttman-Kaiser rule). We also kept the factors which in total, account for about 70-80% of the variant. Using the mentioned rules, these are the following four factors (factor 1 – 4).

Table 3: Total variance

Factor	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor1	2.94407	0.25950	0.2874	0.2874
Factor2	2.68458	1.19287	0.2621	0.5495
Factor3	1.49171	0.48919	0.1456	0.6951
Factor4	1.00252	0.15005	0.0979	0.7929

Factor5	0.85247	0.16835	0.0832	0.8761
Factor6	0.68412	0.05841	0.0668	0.9429
Factor7	0.62571	0.06280	0.0611	1.0040
Factor8	0.56291	0.09912	0.0549	1.0590
Factor9	0.46379	0.07417	0.0453	1.1042
Factor10	0.38963	0.03084	0.0380	1.1423
Factor11	0.35878	0.08819	0.0350	1.1773
Factor12	0.27059	0.04195	0.0264	1.2037
Factor13	0.22864	0.05016	0.0223	1.2260
Factor14	0.17848	0.01674	0.0174	1.2434
Factor15	0.16174	0.02638	0.0158	1.2592
Factor16	0.13536	0.03181	0.0132	1.2725
Factor17	0.10356	0.03925	0.0101	1.2826
Factor18	0.06430	0.05725	0.0063	1.2888
Factor19	0.00706	0.02654	0.0007	1.2895
Factor20	-0.01949	0.01913	-0.0019	1.2876
Factor21	-0.03862	0.03039	-0.0038	1.2839
Factor22	-0.06900	0.03896	-0.0067	1.2771
Factor23	-0.10797	0.03620	-0.0105	1.2666
Factor24	-0.14417	0.01096	-0.0141	1.2525
Factor25	-0.15512	0.02910	-0.0151	1.2374
Factor26	-0.18423	0.00882	-0.0180	1.2194
Factor27	-0.19305	0.01565	-0.0188	1.2005
Factor28	-0.20870	0.03337	-0.0204	1.1802
Factor29	-0.24207	0.01255	-0.0236	1.1565
Factor30	-0.25462	0.03510	-0.0249	1.1317
Factor31	-0.28972	0.03328	-0.0283	1.1034
Factor32	-0.32300	0.02293	-0.0315	1.0719
Factor33	-0.34593	0.04432	-0.0338	1.0381
Factor34	-0.39025		-0.0381	1.0000

LR test: independent vs. saturated: $\chi^2(561) = 1591.91$ Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.0000$

In order to have a clear interpretation of the results, we apply factor rotation. Factor rotation helps to assign high loading variables to groups variables. In this

study, a loading of 0.3 and above was considered as higher loading. Table 4 shows rotated factor loadings and unique variances.

Compared to previous studies, the categories created are different. Horwitz created categories based on the teachers' recommendations, while Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) used statistical procedures and showed different variables. As mentioned before, Horwitz grouped the 34-item statements into five themes. There are 'Difficulty of language learning' (item number 3, 4, 6, 14, 24, and 28), 'Foreign language aptitude' (item number 1, 2, 10, 15, 22, 29, 32, 33, and 34), 'The nature of language learning' (item number 5, 8, 11, 16, 20, 25, 26, and 28) 'Learning and communication strategies' (item number 7, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, and 21), and the last factor is 'Motivations and expectations' (item number 23, 27, 30, and 31). Under each theme, items are grouped based on language teachers' and linguists' discussions.

Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) identified different variables and grouped them as follows. Factor 1 (Motivation) has items number 23, 27, 30, and 31. Factor 2 (Aptitude) has items number 22 and 29. Factor 3 (Strategy) has items number 9 and 13. Factor 4 (Ease of learning) has items number 28 and 33.

Although using a similar framework, the identified categories in this study are different. It is because of the different contexts and target language. The identified high loading variables are as follows.

Table 4: Rotated factor loadings (pattern matrix) and unique variances

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Uniqueness
q1					0.8900
q2					0.9133
q3			0.4233		0.7702
q4	0.3237		-0.3448		0.7547
q5				0.3357	0.8373
q6		0.4005			0.7502
q7					0.8877
q8		0.5407			0.6801
q9	0.6064				0.5811

q10		0.4672		0.6876
q11				0.8795
q12		0.5787		0.6355
q13			0.4590	0.7051
q14				0.8818
q15	0.3160		-0.3043	0.7535
q16	0.3306			0.8410
q17		0.5441		0.6364
q18				0.8135
q19			0.3054	0.8019
q20	0.4725		0.4163	0.5958
q21		0.5755		0.6322
q22				0.8168
q23			0.3628	0.7725
q24				0.9234
q25				0.9669
q26	0.6344			0.5885
q27		0.3365	0.3236	0.7800
q28			0.3626	0.8447
q29	0.5019			0.7071
q30				0.8701
q31		0.6621		0.5112
q32	0.4856			0.6862
q33	0.4485			0.7752
q34			0.4623	0.7062

(blanks represent abs (loading) <.3)

3 Interpretation of factors

3.1 Factor 1

General view about language learning

Table 5 shows items that are identified (item 26, 9, 29, 32, 20, 33, 16, 4, and 15). The highest loading factor is item 26 (0.6344), which says that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from the foreign language itself. The

dominant items after number 26 are number 9 (0.6064), 29 (0.5019), 32 (0.4856), 20 (0.4725), and 33 (0.4485).

Table 5: Factor 1
General view about language learning

26. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from the foreign language itself
9. You should not say anything in Indonesian until you can say it properly
29. People who are good at math and science are not good at learning a foreign language
32. People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent
20. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules
33. Japanese are good at learning foreign languages
16. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words
4. Indonesian language: 1) a very difficult language, 2) a difficult language, 3) a language of medium difficulty, 4) an easy language, 5) a very easy language
15. I have foreign language aptitude

According to tabulation, here are an explanation of how the participants believe in the above items. 44% of the participants, which composition of 37% disagree and 7% strongly believe that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from the foreign language itself. In addition, 80% or the majority of the participants disagree that one should not say anything in Indonesian until he or she can say it correctly.

They also think that it is not necessary for people who are good at math and science are not good at learning a foreign language. Moreover, 32% of the participants believe that people who speak more than one language well are very intelligent while 39% neither agree nor disagree. 32% of the total participant believes that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning many grammar rules. Almost 50% of the respondents also believe that the Japanese are good at learning foreign languages with the idea of learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of

learning a lot of new vocabulary words. For item number 4, 44% of them believe that Indonesian is a medium-difficult language, and 15.4% believe that the Indonesian language is difficult while only 2.6% believe that it is a very difficult language. However, 66% of the respondents are not confident in their potential to learn foreign language.

3.2 Factor 2

Language learning motivation

The second group of items is shown in table 6. Item number 31 has the highest loading factor, which is 0.6621. The next are number 12 (0.5787), number 21 (0.5755), number 17 (0.5441), number 8 (0.5407), number 6 (0.4005) and number 27 (0.3365).

**Table 6: Factor 2
Language learning motivation**

31. I would like to learn this language so that I can get to know its speakers better
12. If I heard someone speaking in the language I am trying to learn, I would go up to them so that I could practice speaking
21. It is important to practice in the language laboratory
17. It is important to repeat and practice a lot
8. It is necessary to know a foreign culture in order to speak a foreign language
6. I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak this language very well
27. If I learn to speak this language very well, it will help me get a good job

In this group, 70 % of the respondents would like to learn this language so that they can get to know its speakers better. Also, almost 80 % convey their interest in meeting and practicing to speak the Indonesian language when they heard someone speaking in the Indonesian language. Besides that, almost 70% also believe that it is essential to practice in the language laboratory. Moreover, 94% think that it is important to repeat and practice a lot. In addition, they also think that it is necessary to know a foreign culture in order to speak a foreign language. 59% of them believe

that they will ultimately learn to speak the Indonesian language very well. Half of the total number of respondents believe that if they learn to speak the Indonesian language very well, it will help them to get a good job.

3.3 Factor 3

Idiosyncrasy in language learning

In this group, item number 10 with loading factor 0.4672 is the highest. It says that it is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one. The next number consecutively as follows: number 34 (0.4623), number 13 (0.4590), number 3 (0.4233), number 23 (0.3628), and number 27 (0.3236).

Table 7: Factor 3
Idiosyncrasy in language learning

10. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one
34. Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language
13. It is o.k. to guess if you don't know a word in a foreign language
3. Some languages are easier to learn than others
23. If I get to speak this language very well, I will have many opportunities to use it
27. If I learn to speak this language very well, it will help me get a good job

40% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree with the statement about how easy for someone who already speaks foreign language to learn another one. Half of the total respondents also agree that everyone can learn to speak a foreign language. Moreover, more than 50% agree that it is all right to guess if one does not know a word in a foreign language. However, more than 75% agree that some languages are easier to learn than others. Besides, 57% agree that if one gets to speak the language very well, one will have many opportunities to use it. Moreover, 69% also believe that the language that they speak well will help them to get a good job.

3.4 Factor 4

Strategy of language learning

The last factor identified has only 4 item numbers. The following are the item numbers in consecutive order. Number 20 (0.4163), item number 28 (0.3626), item number 5 (0.3357) and item number 19 (0.3054).

**Table 8: Factor 4
Strategy of language learning**

20. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules
28. It is easier to read and write in Indonesian than to speak and understand it
5. In order to speak Indonesian well, it is important for me to learn grammar
19. If you are allowed to make mistakes, in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on

41% of the participants neither agree nor disagree that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning many grammar rules. 48% agree that it is easier to read and write in Indonesian than to speak and understand it. 73% agree that in order to speak Indonesian well, it is essential for them to learn grammar. They also believe in accuracy since 54% agree that it will be hard to get rid of mistakes if they are allowed to make them in the beginning.

4 Discussion and conclusion

According to the statistically result, each factor consists of mixed items. The grouping of items in each factor does not resemble or correspond to Horwitz's study.

The table below gives an illustration on the finding of Horwitz (1988), Nikitina and Furuoka (2006) and the current study.

Table 9: BALLI themes and factors across studies

Author					
Horwitz (1988)	Language difficulty (theme 1) 3 4 6 14 24 28	FL aptitude (theme 2) 1 2 10 15 22 29 32 33 34	Nature of learning (theme 3) 5 8 11 16 20 25 26 28	Learning strategy (theme 4) 7 9 12 13 17 18 19 21	Motivation (theme 5) 23 27 30 31
Nikitina and Furuoka (2006)	Ease of learning (factor 4) 28 33	Aptitude (factor 2) 22 29	-----	Strategy (factor 3) 9 13	Motivation (factor 1) 23 27 30 31
Current study	Idiosyncrasy in language learning (factor 3) 10, 34, 13, 3, 23, and 27	Strategy of language learning (factor 4) 20, 28, 5, and 19	General view about language learning (factor 1) 26, 9, 29, 32, 20, 33, 16, 4, and 15	Language learning motivation (factor 2) 31, 12, 21, 17, 8, 6, and 27	-----

Similar to Nikitina and Furuoka (2006), this study affirms that the validity of Horwitz's choice of themes is supported by the tenacity of particular students' beliefs as reported in different studies. The difference between the current findings and previous research is that 'motivation' did not appear to be a significant factor. BALLI items that represent students' motivations and expectations on the Indonesian language are 23, 27, and 31. Although 39% of the participants agreed that if they got to speak the Indonesian language well, they would have many opportunities to use it, they neither agreed nor disagreed with the Indonesian language would help them to get a good job. The motivation to get to know the speaker of the Indonesian language better was not significantly appeared. A low score on motivation might be caused by the fact that the Indonesian language is a minor foreign language taught in universities where the survey was done.

RQ 1: What are the common factors or categories that appear from the finding on

students' Indonesian language learning beliefs?

The first factor is described as a general view about language learning with item number 26 as the highest loading variable. It says that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from the foreign language itself. It represents how students come to have beliefs of proper and expected learning tasks in foreign language learning. Most of the class activities are a matter of learning many grammar rules. Therefore, the target language is rarely seen as a communication tool but as a language that is needed to be understood grammatically. Less opportunity to use the target language is communication context also influenced students' belief in language learning practices. Students are accustomed to a heavily guided learning environment when mistakes are less expected. Vocabulary learning is done by memorizing the meaning and how it is pronounced in katakana. One is expected to say the word correctly before using it in the sentence. Item number 9 describes this belief.

It is also believed that everyone has a different ability to learning a foreign language. Someone who is good at math and science is considered a less good language learner compared to the student who studies social science. Besides, society's view of bilingual or multilingual is considered knowledgeable people. Therefore, a student who is not bilingual or multilingual might not succeed in learning a foreign language. However, it is surprising to find item number 33, which says that 'Japanese are good at learning foreign languages' also has a quite high variable loading number in this factor. The belief about having foreign language aptitude is also refreshing to find after listing quite pessimistic beliefs.

Items that are grouped in the second factor tell us about students' language learning motivations. The first item that appears in this group is the aim to learn the language. Students would like to get to know the speakers of Indonesian better. It also represents a positive attitude towards Indonesian native speakers or people who speak Indonesian. Students have social aims in learning a foreign language.

The next group of items is idiosyncrasy in language learning. This third factor describes students' tendency in language learning. It is believed that it is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one. However,

students also believe that everyone is able to learn to speak a foreign language. It is fascinating to find there is confidence in using the target language, although one has not mastered it. This confidence motivates them to learn more, and they also believe that being able to speak a foreign language will benefit them when they look for a job.

The last factor is about strategy for language learning. Students believe that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning many grammar rules. Students' previous foreign language learning styles might also influence students' learning strategies. They believe that in order to speak a foreign language, mastering grammar is necessary. Therefore, it is easier to read and write in Indonesian than to speak and understand it. It is because they might have few opportunities to use the target language orally. It seems that they also believe that mistakes should not be allowed in learning.


RQ 2: How Japanese students see the Indonesian language?

43.9% of the students consider the Indonesian language as a language with medium difficulty; 15.4 % of the students choose the Indonesian language is a difficult language while only 5.6% refer the Indonesian language is a very easy language. Indonesia language uses the Roman alphabet, which makes Indonesian language learners easier to learn. The Indonesian language also has regular spelling which few exceptions, has no tones, and therefore no tone makers and no accents. Comparing to English, Indonesian is considered easy since it does not have tenses and inflectional forms.

RQ 3: What are Japanese students' beliefs about learning the Indonesian language?

The present study is unique from previous studies since it was done in Japan and about how Japanese students view the Indonesian language as their second foreign language. The identified factors also can represent how Japanese students see foreign language learning.

Table 10: Summary of results

Factor 1. General view about language learning	General view
Factor 2. Language learning motivation	
Factor 3. Idiosyncrasy in language learning	
Factor 4. Strategy of language learning	
	Individual view

In a wider scope, this study has identified General views about language learning, Language learning motivation, Idiosyncrasy in language learning, and Strategy of language learning. The factors identified above have described the uniqueness of Japanese students in learning the Indonesian language. By using the result of the study, I hope that teachers of Indonesian as a foreign language can overcome the challenges of integrating suitable teaching methods and materials to match learners' needs.

References

- Bacon, S.M. and Finnemann, M.D. (1990) "A study of attitudes, motives and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input", *Modern Language Journal*. 74(4), pp. 459–473.
- Cotterall, S. (1999) "Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them?" *System*. 27(4), pp. 493-513.
- Diab, R.L. (2006) "University students' beliefs about learning English and French in Lebanon", *System*. 34(1), pp. 80-96.
- Ellis, R. (2008) "Learner beliefs dan language learning", *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*. 10 (4), 7-25. http://asian-efl-journal.com/December_2008_EBook.pdf#page=7
- Epstein, S. (1990) Cognitive-experiential self-theory. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 165-192). NY: Guilford.
- Fujiwara, T. (2011) "Language learning beliefs of Thai EFL university students: dimensional structure and cultural variations", *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 8(1), pp. 87-107.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1988) "The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students", *Modern Language Journal*. 72(3), pp. 283–294.
- Kern, R.G. (1995) "Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning", *Foreign language Annals*. 28(1), pp. 71-92.
- Kudo, N. (2006) "Indonesia and Japan viewed from the history of exchange", Sunaoka, K., and Ikeda, M., *Language and Culture in Asia*. Seibundo.
- Mori, Y. (1999) "Epistemological beliefs and language learning beliefs: What do language learners believe about their learning?" *Language learning*. 49(3), pp. 377-415.
- Nikitina, L. and Furuoka, F. (2006) "Re-examining Horwitz's beliefs about language learning

- inventory (BALLI) in the Malaysian context”, *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching*. 3(2), pp. 209-219.
- Park, G.P. (1995) “Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea”, *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 56(06).
- Peng, C.F. and Hui, C.J. (2012) “Beliefs about ESL learning among secondary school students in Terengganu, Malaysia”, *International Journal of Research in Economics & Social Sciences*. 2(2), pp. 44-63.
- Peng, J-E. (2011) “Changes in language learning beliefs during a transition to tertiary study: The mediation of classroom affordances”, *System*. 39(3), pp. 314-324.
- Riley, P.A. (2006) The beliefs of first year Japanese university students towards the learning of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Queensland, Australia.
- Sakui, K. and Gaies, S.J. (1999) “Investigating Japanese learners’ beliefs about language learning”, *System*. 27(4), pp. 473-492.
- Sioson, I.C. (2011) “Language learning strategies, beliefs, and anxiety in the academic speaking task”, *Philippine ESL Journal*. 7, pp. 3-27.
- Tanaka, K. and Ellis, R. (2003) “Study abroad, language proficiency, and learner beliefs about language learning”, *JALT Journal*. 25(1), pp. 63-85.
- Truitt, S. N. (1995) “Beliefs about language learning: A study of Korean university students learning English”, *Texas papers in Foreign language Education*. 2(1), pp. 1-14.
- Victori, M. and Lockhart, W. (1995) “Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning”, *System*. 23(2), pp. 223-234.
- Wenden, A. L. (1987) Conceptual background and utility. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*, pp. 3-13. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yang, N. D. (1992) “Second language learners’ beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies”, *A study of college students of English in Taiwan. Dissertation Abstracts International*. 53(08).

[受付日 2019. 9. 30]