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Abstract:
This research study examines teaching beliefs of English-language instructors in Japan, and how their pedagogy is influenced by those beliefs. An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) research design was used. Seven English-language instructors employed full-time in universities in Tokyo prefecture of Japan participated in this study. Social Cognitive Theory was used as the theoretical framework. It was observed that each instructor’s beliefs interacted in a complex manner within the higher education system in Japan, which impacted instructors’ teaching practices. This study demonstrated that language instructors’ self-efficacy (LTSE) beliefs are intrinsically related to their pedagogy. It revealed a complex relationship between what instructors think and what they may do in class. Findings of this study suggest that English Language instructors’ beliefs are key to their decision-making. In addition, the findings will provide valuable implications for ways to better understand the impact that personal beliefs of instructors have on curriculum and learning. Finally, it has implications for professional education programs for teachers and brings attention to potential research directions for scholars.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The growing body of research in education identifies the important role that instructors’ thinking plays in the way they teach which may be derived from their own experiences as language learners. Instructors’ choices and decision processes are deeply rooted in their beliefs and, thus, support this claim (Harrison, & Lakin, 2018; Shieh & Reynolds, 2021; Thompson, 2020; Yada & Ghaleb, 2021; Yuan, Chen, & Peng, 2020). The term “belief” is difficult to define, as it is often hard to find a consensus regarding the meaning of the concept. From a general perspective, every instructor holds his/her own beliefs regarding what, how, and why he/she teaches. It is worthwhile to assess how those beliefs play a role in instruction. Research has contained “beliefs about self, context and environment, content or knowledge, specific practices, teaching approach, and students” (Harrison & Lakin, 2018, p. 86). Hence, the way the instructors approach their pedagogy and comprehend their instruction is clarified through beliefs which they may have acquired through their lived experiences. Various studies have given convincing proof that instructors’ efficacy beliefs are strong predictors of teaching behavior, decisions to continue in challenging environment, and of their dedication to the teaching profession (Hasnain & Halder, 2021; Hoang & Wyatt, 2020; Lee, Chen, & Wang, 2017; Polat et al., 2019; Thompson et al., 2022; Graham, 2022; Wyatt, 2021). Language instructors’ self-efficacy beliefs have been defined as instructors’ beliefs in their abilities to support learning in different ways (Wyatt, 2018a, 2018b). There is increasing body of research investigating the relationship between LTSE beliefs and pedagogy (Eghtesadi & Jeddi, 2019; Faez, Karas, & Uchihara, 2019; Graham, 2022; McGarrigle, Beamish, & Hay, 2021; Vattøy, 2020). Furthermore, instructors’ expertise in the target language along with effective techniques, suggests that instructors’ beliefs and perceptions regarding different aspects that involve the learning process might influence classroom practice. Nevertheless, given the same curriculum and teaching hours, teachers tend to design their lessons, including teaching materials, teaching techniques, and time allocation to different activities in accordance with their beliefs concerning the language learning process (Vaisman & Kahn-Horwitz, 2020; Wyatt & Dikilitaş, 2021).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research in language education has shown instructors beliefs as “complex, situated, and dynamic, which are (re)shaped by their histories and situated socio-cultural contexts” and yet those beliefs may be “transformed” by various interactions, including professional and social interactions (Yuan, Chen, & Peng, 2020, p.3). LTSE beliefs may have various sources. Personal experiences being successful or unsuccessful in previous tasks influence LTSE beliefs, as do experiences of watching or listening to others. LTSE beliefs might change over time as parts of the task or context change, and can be generalized throughout tasks (Wyatt, 2021). Beliefs fluctuate in strength and kind; the easiness with which an instructor can change his/her beliefs is related to the strength of the beliefs. Stronger beliefs are those that are essential to an individual’s identity (Sandholtz, 2011; Wyatt, 2018a), perhaps because
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they were formed through early experiences (Thomas, 2014). The more closely a given belief is functionally connected or in communication with other beliefs, the more implications, and consequences it has for other beliefs and, therefore, the more central the belief (Korkmazgil & Seferoğlu, 2021; Mellati & Khademi, 2015; Wach & Monroy, 2020; Wyatt, 2018b; Xie & Zhang, 2022). Even the most effective pedagogy may not be implemented in a classroom if instructors do not trust in its efficacy. In a quantitative research done by Eghtesadi and Jeddi (2019), their study indicated that while instructors’ self-efficacy and critical thinking are considerably connected with their pedagogical achievement, out of the two, self-efficacy is the most meaningful and thus the superior forecaster of instructors’ pedagogical accomplishment. This outcome in the finding is aligned with and can be maintained by the study that has demonstrated the effect of instructor efficacy on their devotion, keenness in instruction, and resolution. Furthermore, the regression model they employed revealed that among the parts of self-efficacy, efficacy for instructional approaches is the principal predictor of educators’ satisfaction in instruction.

In a study by Gallagher & Haan (2018), the researchers investigated instructors’ beliefs on implementing linguistically responsive instruction (LRI). The study explored the reflections that stemmed from prior experiences, focusing on participating faculty members’ beliefs about multilingual students. The investigation focused on faculty beliefs about (a) multilingual students and their language proficiency, (b) faculty’s own instructional practices and linguistically responsive instruction, and (c) contextual factors. They found that participants had generally viewed multilingual students as deficient and their language proficiency as inadequate. The authors collected survey data from faculty and evaluated written comments provided by participants. They found constructs of teacher beliefs (or dispositions, norms, attitudes, and orientations) and teacher knowledge are intertwined in various situations. The study noted that beliefs are an integral part of preparation for linguistically responsive teaching because they are related to instructors’ likelihood of enacting their knowledge and skills. Their tendencies are for individuals to act in a particular manner under circumstances, founded on their beliefs. A persistent theme throughout the open-ended comment data was that international multilingual students were lacking in terms of their work ethic and academic skills. The written responses of the participants also displayed low self-efficacy in implementing some aspects of LRI due to lack of assessment procedures, cultural knowledge, and lack of time.

In Harris (2016), instructors’ beliefs about task-based language teaching (TBLT) in Japan were explored through an online survey. The aim of the study was to enquire into what special considerations practicing teachers have made when implementing TBLT in Japanese classrooms. It was found that instructors’ beliefs are connected to socio-cultural and contextual factors. Teachers explained that it was widely believed TBLT conflicts with teacher-centered culture and felt that students may prefer teacher-centered learning. Teachers believed students are apathetic to TBLT and they are fearful of negative evaluation and of making mistakes. Teachers also were found to
feel that TBLT approach is not useful for exam preparation, which is a focus in learning situations in Japan. As a result of these predetermined ideas, teachers were reluctant to use TBLT. According to the study, it could be concluded that even as many teachers implemented TBLT in their classes, they were reluctant based on their personal beliefs and notions about unsuitability of TBLT for learning environment. The research question in this study is as follows: How do language instructors’ self-efficacy (LTSE) beliefs influence their pedagogy? This question addressed LTSE beliefs and the resulting impact on instruction.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

The literature examined shows the value of instructors’ beliefs in their decision-making. The current study is based on Social-Cognitive Theory’s (SCT) assumption that there may be an alignment between instructors’ confidence in their ability to carry out a certain teaching practice, and their beliefs in the efficacy of the practice. The review also elucidates that instructors’ beliefs are subject to change. Namely, SCT suggests that self-efficacy beliefs determine behavioral strength (Bandura, 2012). Acknowledging, SCT, which articulates that self-efficacy is the key to determining whether an individual can successfully shape their experience in the way they prefer. Self-efficacy comprises beliefs regarding one’s capacities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations (Bandura, 1995). It represents an individual’s perceived competence, and conviction that he or she can execute the action required to reach a goal, and an optimistic assessment of one’s likelihood of success (Bandura, 2012).

Thus, LTSE beliefs may assist them in attaching meanings to their related abilities, or lack of abilities, and their opinions and evaluations of their past, present, and future abilities. Utilizing self-efficacy beliefs allows the research question to encompass both the formation of English-language university instructors’ pedagogical beliefs and the way these beliefs change over time. When deciding whether a teaching practice will bring about an expected outcome in implementation of teaching strategies, it is based upon their teaching beliefs. Therefore, as SCT suggests that individuals hold beliefs about their ability to make things happen through their own actions, Instructors are steered by their beliefs which have developed through lived experience through their environment, and behavioral factors (Bandura, 1977, 1995, 2001, 2006). It is important to acknowledge that beliefs and values of teachers are indispensable in the influencing of all facets of instructional methods (Harrison and Lakin, 2018). While various research studies have shown the changing nature of instructors’ belief formation and development, several have indicated a “potential gap between instructors’ beliefs and practice, which can impact negatively on their classroom teaching and continuing development” (Yuan, Chen, & Peng, 2020, p.3).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Among the existing research studies that have been conducted on faculty members’ beliefs about teaching, learning, survey has been the most widely utilized method to
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explore instructors’ beliefs (Harrison & Lakin, 2018). However, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) suited the current study through a series of interviews to find out the teaching efficacy of higher-education English language faculty, including the process by which instructors’ self-efficacy beliefs influenced their teaching choices. The research topic is best examined as a process over time because it is not just one or two incidents or specific lessons that have shaped instructors’ self-efficacy beliefs. The participants were assured of their anonymity as part of the research process and informed that participation was voluntary and that they were free to withdraw from the study at any point prior to data analysis. Acknowledging the IPA approach, however, has its shortcomings. The sample size poses limitations in terms of generalizability and the current study understands these limitations. A small sample size was chosen of seven participants which allowed the researcher to privilege each participant’s individual account of experiences and then to make comparisons across cases. It has been noted that a large sample size could become a hindrance to a rich and in-depth descriptive and interpretative account of each participant (Smith, & Nizza, 2021). The fellowship that was built with the participants allowed frank and open sharing of their experiences in detail, and the researcher was then in a good position to understand their lived experiences.

3.1. Data Collection

Semi-structured, one-on-one, face-to-face interviews were conducted with the seven participants in this study. These interviews were followed by 30–45-minute member-checking interviews conducted after the data analysis process. Each interview took place in the participants’ own office at the university or in a private conference room of their choice to offer a secured environment. Each semi-structured interview lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. Possible threat to credibility was the fact that this researcher has known the participants as colleagues, which could impose preconceived ideas on the interpretation. This was mitigated by the researcher’s clarification of bias at the onset of the study and bracketing in both the interviews and analysis.

3.2. Validity

Interview data was analyzed in several steps in accordance with Smith & Nizza, (2021). The four criteria used to assess the validity of the research included: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was ensured through an accurate description of the subjectively formed lived experiences of the participants. A possible risk to credibility could be if participants offered preferred social responses to realize social acceptance because sharing prejudicial instructional practices could make them feel ineffectual as educators. To inspire candid sharing, the participants’ privacy and the confidentiality of their interview data were ensured in the informed consent procedure. Probing and reiterative questioning were employed in the interviews to circumvent preferred social answers. One other danger to credibility was that the researcher had known the participants, which might have compelled predetermined notions on the interpretations. This was lessened by the researcher’s
explanation of bias at the commencement of the study and bracketing in the interviews and subsequent analyses. To assure reflexivity, a reflective field journal of observations was kept which included the following: moods, feelings, thoughts, issues, and difficulties during the entire process (Smith et al., 2013). To summate, the limits of the size of the study (seven participants) were addressed. A certain assumption was made by choosing IPA study that it would be descriptive and interpretative. Common themes obtained were characteristic of this population being researched. Still, to assist the comprehension, demographic data of every participant were specified, and a thick description was created to explain individually participant’s lived experiences. A selected narration was also provided from the interviews (Smith & Nizza, 2021). Recognizing the confines of the study because of the details stated above, it is essential to reaffirm them. First, the study is limited to seven English language instructors in universities in Greater Tokyo area, and it would be ill-advised to oversimplify by assuming this to be true for other educational institutions. Second, the data which were gathered from interviews to study instructors’ self-perceptions and practices in the could have a bias as the questioner knew the participants as co-workers. Third, classroom teaching observations to assess practices were not conducted in this study. Finally, as this researcher did not collect documents connected to the taught courses of the participants, it would be useful in collecting curriculum related material from each participant to understand the meanings of instructors’ motivation, if any, through curriculum materials. Comprehensive as they may be, relying solely on interview data, may not provide a complete picture without examining documented teaching pedagogy.

The issue of dependability in a qualitative study can occur because of the everchanging characteristics of the experiences being examined. Nevertheless, the researcher described IPA’s idiographic quality and specified that the research results would not represent a single definitive version but fairly a reliable one (Smith & Nizza, 2021). Dependability was confirmed through the establishment of supportive analyses with suitable word for word extracts from the complete interview transcriptions. Numerous outlooks were investigated, even if only one experience was reviewed, to show a thorough and multilayered explanation of that occurrence (Reid, et al., 2005). A code-record method was employed, in accordance with which the researcher waited two weeks after the first coding activity before re-coding the unchanged data and inspecting for constancy. To restate, accepting unavoidability of the researcher’s biases, this researcher lessened bias by concentrating on confirmability in the study to guarantee impartiality. This researcher explained biases in steering this study from the start, for example the choice of IPA, the interpretivist paradigm, and a comprehensive working description. Furthermore, continuing reflective analyses was done using a field journal to attain validation of the findings.

3.3. Protection of Human Subjects

This researcher was trained through the National Institute of Health’s (NIH) online training called “Protecting Human Research Subjects.” To guarantee the participants’
voluntary involvement, an informed consent form was created, by adjusting the Institutional Review Board (IRB) consent template for social or behavioral studies. All participants were assured that the data would only be used for intents of the study and in professional engagements and that pseudonyms would be used while viewing the data. The participants could gain access to their transcripts two weeks after the interview for member checking. They were given seven days to confirm the accuracy of the transcripts during which they could also withdraw any uneasy statement that they sensed should not be disclosed. To safeguard fair procedure and outcome in the selection of participants, the selection was based only on the instructors’ relevant experience in relation to the research queries. It should be stated that the researcher was not in any position of authority relative to any participant and handled them professionally.

4. FINDINGS

In this section, the findings that resulted from the transcripts of the interviews and subsequent analyses of the interviews are reported. The findings are supported by quotations from the transcripts. This section will end with a review of the findings, which were established in conformity with an IPA idiographic research framework.

Participants

Table: 1 provides demographic information about the seven participants in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Maki</th>
<th>Josh</th>
<th>Kenta</th>
<th>Yasu</th>
<th>Saori</th>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th>Sean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Themes

Two superordinate themes and three sub-themes emerged from the interviews and the analysis of the transcripts. The superordinate and corresponding sub-themes are:

1. Influence of primary beliefs informs instructors’ pedagogical choices.
   a) Instructors maintained that they viewed their perceptions of their teaching abilities through peer reviews and student feedback system.
   b) Instructors highlighted their autonomy in the curricular decision-making to be of great importance in putting innovation into practice.

2. Instructors identified students as their motivational drivers for instructional strategy
   a) Instructors’ affirmed student satisfaction as a motivation for their implementation of change.
Table: 2 provides the recurrence of each theme across the seven participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Themes</th>
<th>Maki</th>
<th>Josh</th>
<th>Kenta</th>
<th>Yasu</th>
<th>Saori</th>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th>Sean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Influence of primary beliefs informs pedagogical choices</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Perceptions of teaching abilities through peer reviews and feedback</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Autonomy in curricular decision-making</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Motivation as a driver of instruction</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Motivation from student achievement</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agree = SA  
Partially Agree = PA  
Disagree = DA

4.2. The Emergence of Themes

The participants’ maintained they viewed their perceptions of their teaching abilities through peer reviews and student feedback system. Josh had developed a sense of his teaching through feedback from peers and students. He pointed out that his lessons were appreciated because he focused on critical thinking, and according to him, students in Japan for a variety of reasons, one being the system which encourages harmony, are weak in critical thinking. Through course evaluations and personal comments, he acknowledged that the needs of the students were being met. But the lesson plans provided by his department did not give this opportunity, so Josh worked by adding personal touches to them, to cater to the students’ needs. This exchange with Josh revealed the importance he placed on autonomy and the lengths to which he went to try to tailor those lesson plans to his students’ satisfaction. Another participant, Maki was of the view that her improvement in teaching is the direct result of feedback from students and colleagues alike. Student feedback was very valuable in her opinion because they were the receivers of her practice and recognizes their input to be vital and equally, peer feedback provided comparative advice.

Instructors highlighted their autonomy in the curricular decision-making. The participants expressed their satisfaction with the amount of autonomy granted to them; however, there was a discrepancy regarding the level of adherence to the course structure. Josh indicated overall satisfaction but felt that following the strict course curriculum and using the materials set by their program interfered with his gaining autonomy in his teaching. He claimed that he was given lesson plans every day by the course coordinator and he was not allowed to customize the curriculum designed. He was not satisfied because the plans were deductive instead of inductive and did not

---
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engage with the students’ ideas or challenge them to express their ideas. Josh would have preferred more of an inductive exchange with students. Striving to innovate and instituting his own teaching practices without violating the department’s program, Josh considered this constraint a barrier to his creativity. Even then, he admitted that he tried to adjust the lesson plans without changing their core objectives. Another participant found it difficult to use the materials set by the program coordinators, while three participants appeared to be satisfied. All the participants, however, were satisfied by the clear goals set and delivery of the course material prior to the start of the course.

While describing his program, Maki noted that she was given independence in choosing course material by the language department. She added that an enormous amount of preparation was involved in her courses. Throughout her career, she had seldom been asked to modify her curriculum, but she recalled that at a university in Tokyo, where she had worked, the program was rigidly structured. That program had numerous personnel issues, and a very high turnover of instructors. In Saori’s case, empowerment had a different meaning as she felt that autonomy did not only mean freedom to choose the curriculum and redesign it or tweak it; it also meant being treated as a relevant stakeholder. That meant being given a voice in the management and decision-making process. She thought that the pace it was happening was not fast enough. It would be more productive if instructors were taken into confidence and provided with the overall goals of the program and given the bigger picture or vision. In her discussion about autonomy, she expressed that autonomy included better facilities and training opportunities. She expressed a strong belief in providing faculty development opportunities to not only full-time faculty, which are usual, but adjunct faculty, both to this end as well as for empowerment and better coordination and integration of the program objectives. When Yasu was asked about the departmental guidelines on curriculum, he pointed out that autonomy was desirable to allow teachers to modify teaching practices because instructors often felt the need to be independent to be creative. Even though few participants liked the idea of a uniform curriculum that everyone could agree on, it seemed more of an organizational goal than a teaching one. Rachel shared Josh’s appreciation for autonomy, noting that when the curriculum was well-designed, she had no objection to it if she were given the freedom to choose the textbooks and change or adapt the lessons as it fit her students’ language level. She felt this to be a reasonable expectation. However, she observed that whenever anyone had tried to alter the course plan or requested a change in study material, it was not well-received by the department curriculum organizing committee.

The motivation theme emerged out of the forces that drove the participants, and their influencers. Certain factors that stood out were students as the motivating influencers and the internal and external elements which drove the participants. Responding to questions about their motivation, participants reflected deeply on the factors that motivated them. These responses provided information about their teaching beliefs. One primary motivation driver identified was student satisfaction, and others being
either internal (intrinsic) or external (extrinsic) forces affecting their decision-making. They were asked no direct questions having to do with students; however, the participants kept on bringing student needs and satisfaction into their answers. They also alluded to internal and external forces at work in forming their teaching beliefs. Instructors affirmed student satisfaction as a motivation for their implementation of change. This sub-theme explores how the participants in their individual ways brought to light the different aspects of student satisfaction as part of their own motivation. The participants seemed eager to engage in discussion about student satisfaction, and they all appeared to show enthusiasm while identifying their students’ learning endeavors. Generally, the students had similar backgrounds, even though they belonged to different universities. Their university entrance examination results did not qualify them to attend top tier universities in Japan; however, the English competence of these students was not considered by the participants as lower than those students enrolled in any other Japanese university. Although the participants noticed academic deficiencies in their students, all participants expressed positive feelings toward them. While discussing the students, Kenta, believed that helping students achieve their goals was a very rewarding experience for him. He described moments while working with students when they were struggling to get a concept; and he managed to convey the concept to them was very satisfying experience. Those moments, he noted, perhaps did not come often, but when they occurred, were thrilling. He further pointed out that the learning needs of his students in English take precedence over his concerns about his own research, which demanded a sizable portion of his time. Kenta mentioned the unique challenges the Japanese university students face. He explained that at the Japanese high school level, students have very limited or no task-based English lessons, as they were mostly given grammar translation reading lessons from teachers. Therefore, university instructors need to train them not only in critical thinking, but task-based language focusing on all four skills. He emphasized Japanese students’ lack of critical thinking preparation at the high school level posed a hindrance to their creativity in language acquisition. The students needed him to be a source of motivation; and consequently, he needed to innovate and develop effective pedagogy.

Among the seven participants, Saori spent the most time during the interview in discussing what kept students interested in the lesson during the whole 90-minute or 100-minute classes. She expressed dissatisfaction with the class time and size of the classes by noting that it was difficult to keep young people interested in such a long class. She added that paying attention for that long was not an easy task. Thus, she must keep the subject interesting by providing a variety of tasks to be accomplished within that time, lecturing briefly, then moving on to reading, writing, discussion, and group activities. Maki’s description also revealed that she believed student satisfaction could be achieved through a more personal, better student-instructor ratio, and possibly through decreasing the length of classes. She pointed out that in her classes it was important that students are relaxed enough to do the tasks that are required. She paid attention not only to their academic success but also catering to their emotional
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wellbeing. When Sean was asked about teaching as a fulfilling occupation, he immediately talked about his past and present university students. He had assisted his current and past students in their career choices. The students came to him to get advice on study abroad programs, career choices, and selection of a graduate school. Even though he was under no obligation to help these students, he loved doing it. In reference to generating ideas, Sean got ideas from his present and former students through formal and informal ways in improving his teaching to innovate and develop his curriculum and admitted that students were the driving force for his innovation and strategies in the classroom. His formal and informal interaction with students revealed his motivation as he tried to create high satisfaction level for them. When asked about her students, Rachel stressed she remembers their names and talks to them long after the class is finished to help them understand and to be able to establish a connection with them. She admitted that her students had a busy schedule, and that English language was not a priority for them in some cases. To keep them engaged, she asked them questions when she noticed their attention drifting. She was aware of their club activities, commitments, part-time jobs, and other courses they were enrolled in. This information allowed her to understand that her students were people whose wellbeing, both physical and mental, needed her focus. In a similar manner, all participants identified student needs and ways to improve their students’ English-language ability in this global environment. They viewed that information gained from checked assignments was not enough to gauge the level of understanding about academic English courses the students were taking and the level of challenges they were facing. Comparably, Rachel expressed that she notices body language of her students and knows when to change the pace of the lesson or rearrange the task activities. She sometimes did this by reassuring her students that the goal was nearly achieved, and by giving them encouragement through positive formative feedback. These non-academic strategies emphasized her objective to make the students feel special and keep them motivated by creating short-term goals for them. Rachel noted that her students were not motivated to take any extra step beyond their required coursework, however, on a positive note, English courses were probably the only 100-minute classes at the university, they did not sleep through in class. Kenta pointed out that the structure of the class was unlikely to change anytime soon because there were many administrative, parental and faculty considerations, and concerns involved in the decision-making. Even then, he concluded, it was difficult to understand the logic for 100-minute class period, given the research which showed diminishing returns on learning after 40 or 50 minutes. To summarize, the participants perceived their students as one of the primary motivation forces that drove their work. Their outlook on the curriculum was based on how the students’ learning needs would be met by it. Throughout the interviews, their students were repeatedly brought up, even though they were not asked a question directly related to students. The instructors made clear that learning occurred not only in the classroom and through curriculum, but also through the way interaction took
place outside the classroom. They relayed a sense of accomplishment when their students understood a concept or put forth an argument that reflected critical thinking. Regardless of the variety of courses the participants had been teaching in English in Japan, they worked to keep their curriculum dynamic and their lessons meaningful and interesting. The instructors in this study were motivated to develop instructional strategies in response to their Japanese higher-education students’ characteristics, learning challenges, and their own autonomy. The narratives of the participants’ responses showed a clear goal for student satisfaction through a variety of methods, such as adapting content, adjusting to the students’ interests, and tailoring the content carefully to interact in class, as well as purposeful encounters outside the class. This finding was reinforced by the participants’ narrative of arresting and lucid descriptions during the length of the interviewing process.

5. DISCUSSION

Teachers do not always activate their beliefs in their classroom practices. In one study it was observed that after taking part in a professional development program, the instructors started believing in the importance of integrating various activities in the classrooms; but factors such as, institutional authority, precluded them from putting their beliefs into practice. There was a consistency between instructors’ beliefs and practice, and beliefs had a noticeable influence on instructors’ practice (Karim et al., 2020). Similarly, Bokiev & Ismail (2021) examined instructors’ beliefs and practices regarding the use of music and songs in language instruction. It was found that the teachers held positive beliefs about music and songs as a teaching technique and recognized their psychological and pedagogical benefits for language learning. The findings suggested that the instructors’ early language learning experiences, teacher education, previous teaching experiences and personal interest in music had considerable impact on the formation of their beliefs. Moreover, Eghtesadi & Jeddi (2018) showed a positive correlation between teacher self-efficacy and pedagogical success. The result of their study indicated that although instructors’ self-efficacy and critical thinking are significantly correlated with their pedagogical success, of the two, only self-efficacy is the significant and therefore the better predictor of instructors’ pedagogical success. Their findings implied that if instructors want to regard themselves as successful and efficient teachers, they need to invest more on expanding their self-efficacy skills and particularly their efficacy for instructional strategies.

In Gracia-Ponce & Tagg (2020), the potential importance of beliefs in affecting teaching practices, and the interplay between instructors’ beliefs and speaking practice indicate pedagogical beliefs in communicative language teaching combined with beliefs about locally situated needs and other perceived immediate demands. This created the teaching practices, which in turn shaped the classroom interactional features during practice. The instructors’ beliefs could be seen as conflicting in the sense that their recognition of locally situated needs and other perceived demands appeared to contrast with their assertions that they adopt a communicative approach while practicing speaking activities. In general, the interactional and perceptual data
suggested a complex picture of the instructors who do not simply avoid communicative teaching practices but modify them in line with real-world constraints and their intersecting beliefs. Consequently, the negative prior experience as learners informed teachers about what not to do in their own practice. The intention of the instructors was to be different in their own practice. Their recollections of negative learning experiences as learners meant that they were missing an important aspect of teacher development. Negative experiences as learners led to intentions to be different from their models of teaching and influenced their beliefs about English education and chosen teaching practices (Moodie, 2016). Comparably, Kartchava et al. (2020) found that instructors’ beliefs appear to have been shaped by their language learning experiences. The findings of the study suggest that pre-service language teachers carry beliefs about pedagogy and its different types from their own learning into their teaching. The limited knowledge they possess about providing feedback, however, prevents them from reconciling their beliefs with classroom practices. Equally, Thompson & Woodman (2019) discovered that content knowledge is a key skill influencing teacher beliefs and practice, while perceptions of language capability have been shown to indirectly influence teaching practice through teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Perceived capability is a stronger influence upon behavior than actual ability, and a minimum standard level of perceived capability may be required for self-efficacy beliefs to influence practice. As teacher efficacy beliefs primarily develop through attributions of past personal proficiency, findings indicate that teacher development should underscore contextualized practice prospects. Their findings suggest that teacher efficacy beliefs appear to reflect underlying beliefs and are influenced by the social and cultural context. Correspondingly, Boudouaia et al., (2022) in their research on teachers’ beliefs about the concept of learner autonomy found instructors’ beliefs are central because they influence their real classroom practices as they reflect their beliefs about what forms good teaching. Instructors appeared to share similar conceptions about learner autonomy. Contrarily, the findings of Shi, Delahunty, & Gao (2019) show what teachers did in classroom teaching was not fully consistent with their stated strong beliefs in pedagogy. This was particularly evident into what extent the teachers followed the instructional plan and instructors’ performance of designed interaction activities. The findings underlined that teachers expressed strong beliefs were not consistent with their teaching practice.

In this study, the participants provided their approaches and beliefs regarding foreign-language teaching that grew out of those personal experiences. The participants emphasized their belief in creating critical thinking abilities in their students. They believed their personal stories had formed their initial pedagogical choices. As some of the participants noted, their earlier teaching ideas had very much to do with how they were taught but also not taught. Similarly, this research also showed that participants were willing to adjust and adapt their knowledge-based beliefs. The centerpiece of the participants’ narrative is that beliefs do change. Although beliefs are not readily changed, this does not mean that they never change. One participant maintained that beliefs changed, not through argument or reason, but rather through a
conversion process. The participants attributed the changes to several factors, such as influence of colleagues, feedback from instructional supervisors and students’ evaluations, class observations of other instructors, and results from past practice. In addition, the participants perceived their own abilities through the eyes of their peers, students, evaluations, feedbacks, and own philosophy. Consequently, with nuance, they all pivoted towards the idea that attitude had been shaped by the influence of myriad of actors, foremost among them being their personal role models, influence of peers and education philosophies, and it appeared that core beliefs played an important role in developing their teaching style and pedagogy.

6. CONCLUSION

This study sought to gain an in-depth understanding of LTSE beliefs. Consequently, it provides information for faculty members and their institutions about the alignment between instructors’ pedagogical beliefs, and practice. The participants could harness motivation through their own life experiences and adopt similar practices to develop teaching that they believed would produce outcomes of their choice. However, they also avoided using strategies that they had experienced if those had resulted in negative connotations for them. Participants had some influence exerted from departmental curricular lesson planning. However, the influence exerted was not consequential and the participants were able to adapt the lesson to suit their class, to fulfill expectations, and satisfy student needs. Because of their strong statements concerning lesson planning and independence to achieve those goals, instructor autonomy played a substantial role in their pursuit of pedagogical innovation. All the participants maintained identical view on the construction of knowledge as a dynamic process that required the active engagement of the students as the instructor created an effective learning environment. As the results of this study indicate, personal beliefs are central to instructors’ decision-making processes. In addition, student satisfaction played an important role in instruction as instructors tried to integrate what the students desired in learning and what motivated them, which in turn motivated the instructors to develop pedagogical strategies. Despite the consequence and importance of instructors’ beliefs, relatively few studies have investigated the instructors’ beliefs that would provide insight into understanding instructor cognition or their implicit beliefs. Even though the scholarship on positive and negative motivation for instructors is available, the extant literature has not narrowed down on how instructors apportion meaning to each when performing the practice of teaching. Accordingly, this research will advance the understanding of how instructors’ self-efficacy beliefs influenced their interpretations of motivational factors.

However, there are limitations to this study. First, the study is limited to seven English instructors in private universities in Japan, and therefore it would be unwise to generalize to other research environments. Second, the data collected were from interviews which were conducted to explore instructors own self-perceptions and practice in the classroom. Third, there were no observations conducted of classroom practice. Added research would be helpful in comprehending the meanings of
instructors’ motivation through curriculum materials, classroom observations, and recorded teaching pedagogy, rather than relying solely on interview data, comprehensive as it may be. In conclusion, instructors may have LTSE beliefs that interrelate with personal beliefs, and these personal and professional beliefs possibly might not continually be compatible, and yet they may be the basis for action in the instruction. Consequently, if instructor education or professional development programs are to be successful at exploring the importance of beliefs and possible alteration of those beliefs, it must incentivize them to make their pre-existing personal beliefs explicit; it must also explore the adequacy of those beliefs; and it must provide instructors extended opportunities to evaluate, elaborate, and integrate new information into their existing belief systems. Findings from the study suggest that any professional development program would be wise to address faculty LTSE beliefs, and their role in instruction.
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