Placing language learning strategies in a local context: An investigation into the language learning strategies which Japanese teachers of EFL use to improve their own English, and those they teach their students

Thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Education at the University of Leicester

By
Karen Fedderholdt

2003

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

This thesis investigates an area which is not commonly examined: the language learning strategies which Japanese high school teachers of English as a Foreign Language report using to improve their own English and those they report teaching their students. Learning strategies are ways in which learners deal with aspects of learning. In the case of language learning strategies, these focus specifically on the learning of target languages.

Revised versions of Oxford`s (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning 5.1 and 7.0 were combined and sent to 272 Japanese teachers of English. The data was examined to determine to what degree teachers use and teach various strategies and whether these varied according to gender, number of years teaching EFL, which subject their degree was in, and correlations between these. In addition, 24 teachers later took part in unstructured interviews which were subsequently analysed according to interpretative methodology (Erickson 1986).

Oxford`s (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) differentiates language learning strategies into various groups. The findings showed that teachers report using and teaching compensation strategies mostly. However, the findings from the semi-structured interviews are somewhat different in that this data showed that while teachers use compensation strategies themselves, they do not appear to teach these to students. Further, while questionnaire answers indicate that they report using social

strategies as the second least used strategy group, in the interviews they report using social strategies extensively, but they do not appear to teach them to students.

The fact that teachers often teach their students different strategies to the ones they use themselves is also examined, as well as the fact that some teachers tend to teach different strategies according to the academic level of the school. Again these findings are examined in the light of social, educational contexts at different levels in Japan.

Based on the findings in this thesis, suggestions are given for language learning strategy guidance for teachers and learners.

Acknowledgements

Many people have in many ways supported me on the way to completion of this thesis and I am grateful to all of them.

I would like to say how very indebted I am to Dr. Peter Martin for his wise, critical comments and queries in connection with this study, as well as his excellent advice and help for which I cannot thank him enough. Also many warm thanks to Dr. Angela Creese for her expertise_the supportive environment she created and wonderful encouragement she always gave. To Professor Ken Fogelman many thanks also, as well as Dr. Dan Robertson. A special thanks to Julie Thomson for her many efforts and help at a difficult time. Thanks too to Ros Holmes.

I would also like to thank very much the Education Library staff who have been very helpful at all times. I would especially like to thank Suzie Kitchner and Nicky Oram for all their many efforts in tracking down elusive articles and for the speed with which they dealt with my queries and expedited articles to Japan.

I am extremely grateful to Professor Rebecca Oxford for her permission to use her Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) 5.1 and 7.0. I have been encouraged by her very positive comments concerning the adaptions I made to the SILL and my research topics.

In Japan, I would like very much to thank Dr. Yoshiro Takanishi for his constant, invaluable help and encouragement. Also I am very grateful to

Professor Kase for his extensive cooperation. Further, thanks indeed to the many Japanese teachers of English who answered the questionnaire. I am very impressed by the time and trouble they took in order to answer the SILL survey. Extra thanks to the teachers who also took part in the interviews.

In addition, I am appreciative of the flexibility of the office personnel at Toyama University in granting me permission for stationary and photocopying as well as university stamps in connection with the production and sending of the SILL and related pre- and follow up letters.

Many thanks too for the encouragement given me by friends: Dr. Henry Hepburn and Kit-Pui Wong and last but certainly not least, Debra Magit *coach fantastique*. I am grateful to my family who never asked when this would be finished. To my lovely cats, Aqua and Snowflake: I am grateful for your constant company, lying on the table next to the computer, sitting on my lap while I was typing, walking over the keys when I was stuck for ideas, and for your incredible beauty and calm which was balm to my soul throughout this long endeavour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables

Glossary

AET	Assistant English Teacher
ALT	Assistant Language Teacher
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language.
ESP	English for Specific Purposes
CELT	Comprehensive English Language Test
FL _	Foreign Language
FLA	Foreign Language Acquisition
JHS	Junior High School
JTE	Japanese Teacher of English
LL	Language Learning
LLS	Language Learning Strategies
LS	Learning Strategies
LTM	Long Term Memory
MEXT	Ministry for Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
NS	Native Speakers (in this thesis, this will mean of English)
NNS	Non Native Speakers (of English)
RQ	Research Question
SHS	Senior High School
SILL	Strategy Inventory Language Learning
SL	Second Language
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
STM	Short Term Memory
TL	Target Language
TOEFL	Test Of English as a Foreign Language
TOEIC	Test Of English for International Communication

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by explaining the background and context of the study. It then continues by presenting its aims and the research questions. The theoretical framework of the thesis is outlined in the next section. Finally, this chapter provides a brief overview of the structure of the thesis.

1.1 Background of this study

Language Learning Strategies (LLS) are a specific branch of learning strategies (LS) which focus on the learning of target languages (TL), either as foreign languages (FL) or second languages (SL) [1]. As in the case of learner strategies, language learning strategies are problem solving activities which are initiated and effectuated by the learner of her[2] own volition. The importance of LLS is not only that appropriate use can lead to improved language skills, but that they are stepping stones to increased, even complete, learner autonomy or independence which is considered important as it frees the learner from reliance upon a classroom teacher, so she can manage learning endeavours by herself, wherever and at any time.

---

[1] In this study, the terminology "Foreign" and "Second Language" are used in the generally accepted sense. That is, Foreign Languages (FL) are not spoken as the main language in an area, in contrast to a Second Language (SL). That is, a Greek who emigrates to the UK would be learning English as a Second Language (SL), as English is the official language there, while a person studying English in Japan is learning English as a Foreign Language (FL) as Japanese, not English, is spoken in Japan.

[2] In this thesis, "her", "she" will also refer to "he" and "his".

I have for many years been very interested in the issue of guiding people towards acquiring the skills necessary for them to independently manage various situations and solve different types of problems. Erickson (1986) advocates that we look to other institutions other than our usual areas of work for ideas. I have transferred this conviction of the desirability of guiding people towards being able to do as much as possible by themselves, from my experience as a nurse. Although, as a student nurse, I had first thought our nursing tutor quite unkind, when he asked patients to do things themselves that seemed difficult, I soon came to realize that this was an essential part of preparing the patients for life after hospital. Nevertheless, often this approach did not appeal to patients who generally expected nurses to do most things for them as a matter of course. Also, many nurses were unwilling to guide them towards managing by themselves, as it often took much longer, at least in the beginning. At the same time, possibly, they were not comfortable relinquishing a certain amount of power by allowing patients to do things which they as nurses generally did for them.

Although this anecdote reflects a very different world from that of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), I think there are some similarities and its relevance goes beyond being able to manage things physically. In both arenas, the key point is that people need to learn to manage successfully and independently as many challenges as they can. That this often is not actively encouraged, also seems to be the case quite frequently in classrooms, as I discovered upon my career change into teaching. Teachers often do things for

students which their students would be better off doing by themselves. However, in the long run, this is debilitating. Far better to encourage them to find their own learning way.

There are of course many others who stress that focus should be placed on how students manage learning situations. One example is Weinstein and Mayers` (1986) view. They stress that not only "goals concerning the products of learning" (what students should know or be able to do as a result of learning) are of primary importance for teachers, but also "goals concerning the processes of learning: which focus on the techniques and strategies students can use to accomplish learning, that is, on teaching how to learn" (p315). Their second point reflects my own focus and therefore I either incorporate LLS in my teaching of EFL or create specific courses in LLS.

The context in which this research takes place is Japan, where I teach at a national university[3]. The students are either majoring in English in the Faculty of Humanities, or trainee teachers of EFL in the Education Department. In addition, on occasion, I also organize courses for qualified teachers. One of the main problems I found early in my teaching experience here was that students have problems dealing with the processes of their language learning partly because they have a very limited range of LLS and seem not to know how to take responsibility for their learning situation. Therefore, in my classes, I:

1. teach EFL and guide students in the Faculty of Humanities towards

[3] "National universities" have been and will be in the next few years funded by the government. With the exception of very few private universities, they are generally considered more prestigious than private ones.

LLS use

2. teach EFL and guide trainee teachers to use LLS
3. guide qualified Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) to expand their own LLS use
4. guide trainee teachers to help their own future students towards LLS use.
5. guide JTEs to help their own students towards LLS use.
6. provide EFL courses for JTEs to improve their English. (Although language is the main focus in these cases, LLS guidance is incorporated).

While carrying out the above, I stress the importance of LLS needing to be regarded holistically so their wider importance is emphasized: That is, LLS can not only help towards improved language competence, but also they can be stepping stones for learners on the way to becoming autonomous learners in other areas. Learner independence is probably one of the most important survival skills necessary for the 21st century. There will be many changes throughout people's lives and many, if not most, will have to learn new languages as well as other skills. Increasingly we will need to be learners throughout our lives.

If language learners are guided towards awareness and use of appropriate LLS, they will be better equipped for getting the most out of learning situations in as well as outside class, through active, self-directed involvement. Students who have developed good LLS and have become autonomous learners can

create their own learning opportunities wherever they are. Whatever the situation, they can define their own goals, monitor themselves and self-evaluate their own learning. They use strategies in order to improve the internalization, storage and retrieval of the TL. Also they learn to control nervousness and overcome shyness in order to practice the language in question, thus making optimal use of their language learning potential. However, as Wenden (1991) points out, not all learners discover how to do this by themselves.

In order to guide students towards effective ways of learning and to learner autonomy, I concentrate on how to increase LLS awareness and use through orientation sessions, pair and group work, interchanged by explicit teaching of LLS and practice in the oral and written communication classes that I teach. So that participants and I can keep track of their LLS development, students are periodically asked to observe and note LLS use via charts or diaries (Fedderholdt, 1998). These records then provide the focus of discussions in class during which students can exchange thoughts and ideas concerning the LLS which they or others are using.

However, although there generally is enthusiasm for how to improve making the most of one's language learning potential, I am constantly searching for ways to make LLS guidance more effective so that LLS can become a more permanent, ongoing and integral part of their language learning endeavours. It was for this reason that LLS has become the focus of the present study.

1.2 Aims and objectives and objectives of this research

Nyikos and Oxford (1993) emphasize that teachers of FL and SL must "understand the types of strategies learners employ both inside and outside the classroom" (p17). Yet, although much research has been done concerning students` use of LLS and variables such as age, gender, major, motivation, cultural background, there has been little research into which LLS teachers of EFL use themselves when learning English after they have become teachers, and which LLS teachers of EFL guide their students towards using. Therefore, the first area which is explored in the study is:

1. To discover which LLS Japanese senior high school teachers of English report using themselves and to what extent.

The reason for this is to:

a) create suitable LLS courses to help teachers improve their own use of LLS so that they can
    i. better help their pupils in their language learning endeavours.
    ii. improve their own EFL skills.
b) to see - through LLS use - which areas of English teachers have most problems with so English language courses can be tailored to fit their needs.

The second main area which this research explored is:

2. To find out which LLS Japanese senior high school teachers of English report teaching their students and to what extent.

The rationale for this is that:

a) if it is known which LLS JTEs teach and how extensively, then university teachers may better understand how and why students go about LL as they do when they begin to study EFL at tertiary level. In turn, they can better develop effective LLS guidance.
b) Knowledge about which LLS teachers teach can also help provide a foundation upon which to base better teacher training courses for
c) teachers to develop LLS in their students.

Emerging from the two major aims above, a number of research questions have been formulated:

1. What is the overall relationship regarding frequency between the LLS JTEs report using themselves, and those they report teaching students?

2. What is the rank order of the LLS categories which JTEs report using themselves and those they report teaching? Are there any differences

in the order of strategy categories reported used and taught? Are there any significant differences between paired categories?

3. Are there any variations in the LLS reported used by JTEs and those which they report teaching students according to major, gender or number of years teaching EFL?

4. Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS which JTEs report using themselves and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

5. Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS which JTEs report teaching students, and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

1.3 Theoretical framework

This research is based on a combination of positivist and interpretative approaches. A mailed questionnaire survey and unstructured interviews were used to gather data.

In matters related to LLS and learner autonomy, this study is guided by the work of Oxford (1990), of O`Malley and Chamot (1990), Cohen (1990, 1998) and Wenden (1991) in the areas of LLS. To help analyze the interview data and contextualize both quantitative and qualitative findings in a social, educational

Japanese setting, I have drawn upon Erickson (1986).

Rebecca Oxford (1990) has done much work in connection with LL and in this research, I have been especially guided by "Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know" (1990) which makes the concepts of LLS very accessible to teachers through explanations, examples and ways of using LLS in the classroom. Further it contains her Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) Versions 5.1 and 7.0.

It is important to have a theoretical framework for LLS and in this paper, I have drawn upon that of information processing and cognitive theory, especially that proposed by O`Malley and Chamot (1990). They stress the importance of a solid theoretical foundation from which LLS can be investigated, so that, for example, LLS can be described and interventionist LLS teaching programmes tailored to meet the needs of the learners. That they place LLS into information processing and cognitive theory allows them to convincingly argue that LLS are teachable. A detailed discussion of this is provided in Chapter 3.

Regarding categorization of LLS, I have also been influenced by the distinction made by Cohen (1990, 1998) between language use strategies and language learning strategies, especially in the area of compensation strategies and language learning strategies. Another important issue in connection with LLS is that they are essential components to achieve learner autonomy which enables people to tackle lifelong learning confidently. It is one of the primary responsibilities of teachers to ensure that students will be able to learn well on their own when necessary. Therefore, I have drawn upon work by Wenden

(1991) who has been very influential with regard to learner autonomy in language learning.

It is necessary to contextualize the findings in order for them to attain meaning. To achieve this, I have been guided by the work of Erickson (1986). His theories of interpretative analysis advocate the importance of making the "invisible" "visible". This is necessary to create depth of understanding and can be achieved through "documentation of concrete details of practice" (p121). and paying attention to consideration of "local meaning" (p.121). This in turn can be understood more fully by linking together "a setting and its wider environment"(ibid.122). In the case of this study, an incidence of major "visible" overarching systems which are in conflict with each other -and which may influence the way JTEs approach guiding their pupils towards LLS - is focused upon. The conflict in question exists between the Ministry of Education on one hand and the organizers of the "Center Test" which is the first test students must take for entry into university and the second one which is made by the professors at the individual universities. Both have conflicting agendas. Whereas the Ministry of Education's[4] Guidelines (1989) for the teaching of English at secondary schools ostensibly stress communicative competence, the questions of the two university entrance examinations stress accuracy of grammar, vocabulary and translation at sentence level. Using Erickson`s (1986) framework, this thesis attempts to make the "invisible" visible. That is how teachers, on a "local" level attempt to deal with this schism and the problem it causes; especially how they go about the processes of FL

[4]The Ministry of Education became the Ministry of Education ,Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) in 2001.However, throughout this thesis it will be referred to as the Ministry of Education until this time. After this is will be referred to as MEXT.

learning and their own use of LLS to augment their English, as well as development of pupils' use of LLS. The thesis then discusses the problems connected with this.

1.4 Overview of thesis

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 will provide the contextual background for EFL in Japan to which the issues of this research are related. Chapter 3 will present an overview of the shift in the 20th century from teacher centered methodologies to an interest in how learners deal with language learning. Then the literature concerning various aspects connected with LLS and their link to learner autonomy will be discussed. The first part of Chapter 4 will focus on issues related to the two research instruments used in this study and the need for triangulation. In the second part, the methodologies for both the quantitative and qualitative studies will be described. After this, Chapter 5 will present and discuss the findings from the survey questionnaire. Following this, Chapter 6 will present and discuss the findings from the unstructured interviews. Finally, in Chapter 7 the conclusions of this study will be found. Also the limitations of the study will be shown, and ideas for the planning of teacher training courses in LLS given, as well as suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

EFL EDUCATION AT SECONDARY AND TERTIARY LEVEL IN JAPAN

This chapter will supplement some of the issues referred to in Chapter 1 in connection with EFL in Japan and to which there will be frequent references throughout this study. They include: the focus on written texts, further information regarding the university entrance examinations, the role of universities, English at tertiary level, teacher examinations, the schism between universities and the Ministry of Education and foreign assistant language teachers (ALTs).

2.1 Focus on written texts

As will be noted in Chapters 5 and 6, there are many references to written English made by the JTEs. It might seem curious in an era of intense focus on communicative use of foreign languages and stress on speaking and listening comprehension that so much focus is put on written English as well as translation in Japan. One reason reason is that there is a long established tradition in Japan, when learning a FL, to focus on the written word, and this is still influential according to Torikai (2000). Originally, FL studies were undertaken to understand foreign cultures and to learn about scientific and technological developments in France, Germany, China, Holland and English speaking countries through reading. Japan was very isolated for centuries and

until very recently, there were extremely few foreigners in the country.

Consequently, grammar-translation methods (not limited to Japan by any means) were the most used ways of learning languages. In addition, Torikai (ibid) claims that even now in Japan the written word is valued more highly than the spoken. Therefore, it is difficult to break this emphasis on reading and writing. Changes are occurring, although slowly. Universities are traditionally unwelcoming towards change and do not often incorporate it into their scheme of things. As an example, she cites one university which in 1997 changed its English programme for the first time in 125 years from grammar-translation of literary topics to more actual use of English.

2.2 Japanese university examinations

As noted in section 1.3, to gain admission to university, students first take the "Center Test" ,which is a national examination. The examination is the same for all who sit it, despite what they may plan to study in the future . Students are tested in a variety of subjects including English. Therefore, all students in Japan study English for at least 6 years at secondary school. Depending on their score from the Center Test, they can then sit the entrance examinations created by each university. These also always include an English section. A high "Center Test" score means students can try for higher level universities. The "Center Test" does not have a listening component although it is recommended that it should include one in the future. The most recent date said to have been set is 2006. A survey from The Ministry of Education,

Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2000) showed that only 43 out of 99 national universities, from where most JTEs at prefectural SHS graduate, include a listening component, while a mere 45 out of 216 private universities contain a listening section. Teachers at private high schools usually graduate from private universities. No universities include a speaking component. Therefore, most students eliminate speaking/listening classes after the first compulsory year at senior high school (SHS) and opt for those which concentrate on the minutiae of grammar and translation upon which the examinations to tertiary education focus (Brown 1995, Brown and Yamashita, 1995). In these classes Japanese is the dominant language used to explain the various topics being taught. So, as Murphey and Sasaki (1998) claim: "the entrance exam syndrome among SHS (senior high school) teachers is such that they use English less, the closer their students get to the exams." (p5). They point out that this decrease in use of English both by students and teachers as students advance through the school system "is an anomaly that probably only happens in certain Asian countries, and it confounds the expectations of those who equate more advanced language courses with more contact with L2" (ibid.p22). Consequently, teachers feel pressurized by students, parents and schools to prime students to pass these vital examinations and therefore they concentrate on grammar-translation and vocabulary (Watanabe 1992, Shimizu et al. 1995, Miller 1995) at the expense of oral/aural practice. This narrow focus also limits teachers with regard to the selection of LLS they can potentially teach students, and prevents students from developing a varied range of LLS themselves.

2.3 The role of universities

There will be references to JTEs problems with English in Chapters 5 and 6. There are several reasons for these, one which has been presented in section 2.1 and 2.2 Another is the role of universities in Japan. This is rather different from that of many other countries. They are openly recognized as places where students can relax for a few years (Kelly, 1993). In contrast to primary and secondary institutions, at university students can take part voluntarily in social activities, have fun, do part time jobs and, importantly, work on creating the personal links with other students which will be important to them socially and politically in their futures. In addition, it is more important which university one attends than what one does there. Further, it is difficult not to graduate. Kelly (1993) refers to Woronoff who describes how if students do fail important examinations, others are created so that they can pass. Or, simply, in some cases, teachers are asked to change a "fail" to a "pass". As a result, there is often not much willingness by students to take the academic aspects of tertiary education seriously and this too may cause some of the problems JTEs have when they embark upon their teaching careers. They may not have paid much attention to academic matters, including the learning of English.

2.4 English at university

Very little seems to be done by university authorities to ensure that future JTEs have subject competency upon graduation. Even students majoring in English

and those who plan to be EFL teachers in the Education department are presented with much the same situation that they experienced at SHS. That is, there is very little focus on the development of the use of English. The situation at the university from which the majority of the subjects in this study graduated is typical of many other universities. Second and third year students are offered only 90 minutes of oral English a week, 12 or 13 times per semester. This equals 48 to 52 hours annually. These classes are not compulsory. That is, students from the Education department and Faculty of Humanities can graduate with English as their major without having any credits in oral English. Significantly, only written communication is compulsory (for 2nd year students) which reflects what Torikai (2000) claims in Section 2.2 above, although it is not compulsory for 3rd year students. As for 4th year students, these are invited to take oral and writing classes, but generally in their 4th year they do not come to the university much as they are writing their graduation theses. The other classes are held by Japanese "professors" (the term is used differently from in the UK: almost all are professors by time they retire) and these reflect to a great degree the situation in SHS. That is, classes are held in Japanese and the tradition of "yakudoku" persists. This is a process involving 3 steps: word to word translation of foreign texts, a reordering of words, and finally a recoding into Japanese syntax which Hino (in Law, 1995) claims "introduces marked distortions and inefficiencies (not only in reading) if language learning is to be viewed in communicative terms" (p214). Gorsuch (1998) also claims "yakudoku" results in emphasis on linguistic forms and the resulting translation into Japanese, rather than the English text itself and its meaning. As for writing in English, this consists of translating single sentences

from Japanese into English (LoCastro, 1996). Christensen, (1989) describes the type of lesson which still takes place; a professor chooses an annotated text and over one or two semesters will have students read and translate the work "making sure that every word is translated, and generally avoiding deviations from what is printed in the text" (ibid.p41). Grammatical points are discussed at length. However, as Guest (1998) points out, this is quite different from spoken grammar. As a result, as JTEs have little experience of spoken grammar, they continue "the faulty practice of teaching written forms as if they were 'conversational'" (ibid.p43-44) and when they in turn become teachers, the vicious circle continues. In addition, as the grammar-translation method focuses on text at word or sentence levels, students usually do not become practiced in reading texts across sentences or paragraphs. Consequently, they are not taught to consider texts in their entirety. Thus they often do not realize the importance of cohesion and coherence and that it is essential both at paragraph level and beyond (Fedderholdt, 2001).

2.5 The examinations to qualify as a JTE

As for those who wish to become teachers of EFL at prefectural SHS, their problems are further compounded as they have to pass the prefectural teachers' examination which is independent of the university but which resembles the university entrance examinations. Although these examinations are more likely to include a cloze listening test in English, there will in most prefectures not be a speaking section included in the first round of examinations. For example, in Toyama prefecture, only those who pass the

first round are invited to an interview, during which they speak Japanese and some English. This interview lasts approximately 30 minutes and may be a group interview with several candidates. Therefore, would be JTEs continue to focus on grammar translation. LoCastro (1996) comments upon this and how this results in JTEs not having communicative competence as the prefectural teachers' examinations rather than testing English is "more likely to test knowledge of concepts related to what is called 'moral education' rather than language teaching" (p42). This means that the majority of JTEs do not have the oral/aural skills necessary to conduct EFL classes in English. Also they have had limited opportunities to develop and use LLS. When they begin teaching in SHS, the circle continues, most of the time is used explaining texts or grammar in Japanese and students answer in Japanese. Further, as described in 2.3, the nature of the university entrance examinations encourages this way of teaching.

2.6 The schism between universities and the Ministry of Education

It is necessary to look at the schism between the 'local' and 'non-local' - the universities and the government. In its recommendations of 1989, the Ministry suggested that suggested that teaching at high school should focus on communicative competence with special emphasis on speaking and listening skills. This was, on paper, a great new step towards meeting the wishes of students and JTEs. However, the recommendations indicated in the Ministry of Education's (1989) guidelines have still not been fulfilled even now in 2003. This is mainly due to the washback effect of the university entrance

examinations. It seems that universities have the upper hand in that they have not changed their entrance examinations to accommodate the guidelines. For example, listening sections were recommended for inclusion in the university entrance examinations, but as indicated in section 2.2, this has not been effectuated by the majority of national universities, including ones in Toyama, and only by few private ones. That may be due to a variety of reasons. One is that the majority of professors who devise the entrance examinations are are not trained in TEFL or applied linguistics and have no knowledge of testing. Possibly they feel grammar-translation skills are more valuable than communicative ones. Or, it may be because many of the professors have low oral/aural skills and little communicative competence themselves. The examinations are in most cases not piloted (Murphey 2000) and are created according to Brown (interviewed by Leonard, 1998) "by people who say they don't know what they are doing" (p2). The same reasons may apply at prefectural level, in that the examinations which graduates must take to become certified teachers also do not reflect the government's suggestions for focussing on use of English and competence in oral/aural skills. LoCastro (1996) and Lamie (2000) point out, the Ministry of Education did not ensure that all factors were changed suitably when they put forward in 1989 their recommendations for a focus on communicative competence in both junior and senior high schools. There were no measures to effectuate change in the examinations for entrance to university which would result in a change of EFL focus in secondary schools. Nor were universities required to ensure that JTEs would be competent in oral/aural skills as well as their being trained in the theory and pedagogy of teaching foreign languages communicatively or about

how to help students learn effectively.

2.7 Assistant language teachers

In an attempt to remedy SHS students' lack of exposure to English, a large number of English native speakers have been invited to Japan since 1989 in order to become Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). These are graduates (in any subject) who come and, ideally, team teach with JTEs to introduce students to spoken English. However, classes are large, often over 40 students, and as mentioned above, students are not obliged to take these classes in their second and third year of SHS when they are studying intensively for the university entrance examinations. As university entrances examinations do not usually have a listening component and never a speaking one, most students do not want to use time on conversation classes. However, the ALTs seem to bring unexpected advantages with them for the JTEs as will be seen in Chapter 6.

2.8 Research concerning JTEs

There does not seem to have been any research which looks at how JTEs manage to overcome their limited English skills due to the lack of rounded and effective English programmes at high schools and universities. It has not been examined whether they have the language learning strategy competence necessary to improve their English. Proficiency in all areas of English is something they have to succeed in on their own, and for this it is necessary to have a wide variety of LLS and to be a self-directed learner. The lack of

attention to these areas is in contrast to the plethora of work regarding various other aspects of teaching. This includes for example training of JTEs regarding teaching pedagogy (Yonesawa 1999, Lamie 2000), of various methodologies, for example grammar-translation versus communicative methodologies (Christensen 1989, Gorsuch 1998), team-teaching (Wada and Cominos 1994, Shimaoka and Yasuhiro 1990, Tajino and Walker 1998, Pattimore 1999) and Japanese EFL teachers' limited use of English in the classroom (Murphey and Purcell 2000, Sasaki 2000). This study hopes to add another area to this list by examining which language learning strategies JTEs use and those they teach their students. Possession of an extensive range of language learning strategies and the ability to use them appropriately for the task at hand can lead to self-directed or autonomous learning. These skills are always important. Not least when the educational systems in situ are lacking.

CHAPTER THREE

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

It is only in recent decades that language learner strategies have been highlighted in connection with the learning of foreign or second languages as the emphasis on teacher fronted methodologies has receded. Therefore this chapter begins by charting the change in focus from teacher centered methodologies to emphasis on the learner. After this, seminal investigations which looked at how learners deal with language learning processes are presented. One of the observations stemming from these was that language learners use various language learning strategies. Therefore the chapter continues by giving an overview of a variety of definitions of these to clarify what language learning strategies are thought to be. However, my belief is that LLS need to be seen, not only as a means towards TL success, but also as important stepping stones in the development of learner independence. Consequently, this concept will be discussed in some detail. The chapter then returns to the topic of LLS and places them within a theoretical framework, before going on to the categorizations of LLS. Following this, the chapter discusses research into LLS. As will be noticed, with the exception of one paper (Robbins 1998), there will be no research presented which is directly connected with the topic of this study; which LLS do JTEs of English use themselves and which ones do they teach their students. These appear to be little explored areas as yet. Nevertheless, research carried out on LLS related topics will be

discussed as these will indicate how LLS can be useful. The review of the research will be divided into two main groups: research connected with non-Japanese subjects and research which focuses on Japanese subjects. Some criticisms of LLS will follow in order to create a more rounded picture. As noted in Chapter 1, one of the aims of this thesis is also to create better LLS training courses for JTEs. Therefore, the final section of this chapter considers various aspects of teacher training in connection with LLS.

3.1 The shift from teacher to student centered methodologies

Teachers of foreign languages have constantly searched for better ways of improving target language instruction. Celce-Murcia (1991) notes that there were principally nine approaches to FL teaching in the 20th century: the grammar-translation, direct, reading, situational, cognitive, comprehension-based and communicative approaches as well as audio-lingualism. In addition to these, there were a variety of others, for example: Silent Way, Silent Method, Total Physical Response, Community Learning, Suggestopedia and Neuro-linguistic Programming. So many that Prator (1991) points that a "striking feature of the history of language instruction" is "the great diversity of the methodologies that have been propounded" (p.11). Typically, departures from "the" method of the day were frowned upon. Nevertheless, even strict adherence to the different methods did not bring about the hoped for success in language learning (Scherer and Wertheimer, 1964).

However, in recent decades much attention has been directed towards

language learners. Instead of teachers and methodologies being regarded as the pivotal factors in determining language learning success, it is now often the student who is given prominence. Ervin-Tripp (1970 in Rubin and Thompson, 1982) posited that "any learning model which predicts language learning on the basis of input without regard to the selective processing by the learner will not work, except for trivial problems" (p14). This point of view gradually gained credence in the following decades, and Nyikos and Oxford (1993) point out that there is "the recognition that learning begins with the learner" (p11).

3.2 Focus on how language learners deal with their language learning processes

In the 1970`s people such as Stern (1975), Rubin (1975) and Naiman et al (1978) began to show an increasing interest in learners, to see what and how they managed their TL learning. As this created a foundation for further investigations, their findings will be presented in some detail below. It will be noted that they often refer, as do a number of researchers subsequently, to "good" or "poor" language learners. However, these labels fail to indicate that no learner is entirely "good" or "poor". I feel Weinstein and Hume`s (1998) term "strategic" learner (of learners in general) is more appropriate. However, as much of the literature on LLS uses the terms "good" and "poor" language learners, they will be used in this thesis to avoid confusion.

3.3 The "good" language learner

Stern (1975) and Rubin (1975) were two of the first who looked at what language learners did when trying to learn a TL. Stern (1975) suggested that the "good" learner had the following qualities:

- A personal learning style or positive learning strategies
- A tolerant and out going approach to the target language and empathy with its speakers
- Technical know-how about how to tackle a language
- Strategies of experimentation and planning with the object of developing the new language into an ordered system, and revising this system progressively
- Constantly searching for meaning
- Willingness to practice
- Willingness to use the language in real communication
- Self-monitoring and critical sensitivity to language use
- Able to develop the second language more and more as a separate reference system and learn to think in it. (p311)

Rubin's (1975) list of attributes of the "good" learner was similar, but there were four different points. The "good" learner:

- Was willing to guess
- Had a strong drive to communicate
- Was often not inhibited
- Focused on communication. (p47)

The work produced by Stern (1975) and Rubin (1975) at this point was based on observations and assumptions. Stern (1975) states clearly that he based his list of beliefs concerning good language learners on theoretical arguments and the results of his "own experience as a language teacher" (p311). Rubin`s (1975) attributes of the good learner were based on her own observations, conversations and from observations by teachers, but not on direct questioning of learners themselves.

In contrast, the study by Naiman et al (1978) on learners of French involved students themselves and included questionnaires, interviews, classroom observations, language proficiency measures and tests for field dependence/independence. Their findings stress active participation in the learning process, the realization that language is a system and that learning goals consist of being able to organize new language input appropriately. Using the target language as a means of communication was considered essential as was the fact that learners evaluated their own language learning. In contrast to the previous two studies, Naiman et al. (1978), also showed that effective learners took their feelings into account and attempted to control negative self-image regarding language learning.

Later, Rubin (Rubin and Thompson, 1987) and Stern (1983) published revised versions of the "good" learner based on observations and interviews with learners. The findings were similar to their first suggestions: the successful learner was, above all, active, rich in initiative regarding how to go about

improving TL proficiency, willing to experiment, self-evaluate and self-monitor, able to concentrate on overcoming negative feelings about language learning capabilities and nervousness as well as shyness regarding authentic language use. Notably, however, Rubin's (1975) original contention that "good" learners were not "inhibited" was omitted from her new list. As Oxford (1994) claims, many learners are in fact inhibited, but use affective strategies to overcome this. Affective strategies help cope with shyness and nervousness when using the TL. If a learner masters these strategies, she is empowered to be able to use language communicatively, which is in accordance with the claims of Naiman et al (1978). Recognition that social/affective competence is not necessarily an inherent part of a learner's psychological make-up is important, for this allows for the belief that it can be developed through guidance and training of social/affective strategies.

Another important factor in connection with learning was pointed out by Stevick (1989), who examined seven successful language learners. The importance of his investigation was that it showed how differently individual learners go about mastering a new language. This too is a crucial issue and would seem to argue the case for learners being taught a wide repertoire of LLS to help them choose the ones that they feel suit them best. At the same time, they may need encouragement to go beyond those they automatically feel most comfortable with due to learning styles and personality type.

3.4 The "poor" language learner

In contrast, the "poor" language learner has not (yet) found effective strategies to help her learn languages. She has a limited range of LLS, or uses them inappropriately for the task in hand (Abraham and Vann 1987, Vann and Abraham 1990, Porte 1993, O`Malley and Chamot 1990).

However, according to Cook (1991), and Ellis and Sinclair (1989) "poor" language learners can become "good" language learners, if they are guided towards appropriate use of various LLS. O`Malley and Chamot (1990) put LLS into an information processing and cognitive theoretical framework to support their claim that LLS are teachable and learnable. Teachers can help students towards a realization that they can be active themselves in working to overcome language learning problems by cultivating strategies that are helpful to them. Learners can be guided towards taking responsibility for grappling actively themselves with difficulties in the TL by using various strategies from the different LLS categories. This is one of the aspects of LLS which is particularly encouraging. However, to enable the teacher to carry out effective guidance, in addition to knowledge and belief in actual LLS, she must also be cognizant of the local and overarching cultures, as well as students` past language learning experiences, problems and goals. It is also useful, if she has insight into the LLS which other teachers are likely to have taught students.

3.5 What are language learning strategies?

As will be seen in the following discussion, it is not possible to present a universally agreed upon definition of LLS. The ones given below, are those by the most notable authorities in the field. After some preliminary discussion of these definitions, I will present a synthesis which I find useful for work with LLS.

Oxford (1990) traces the meaning of strategy back to its Greek origins as "strategia" meaning the "art of war". That is, its management. Also she defines "tactics" as originally meaning the ways "to achieve the success of strategies" (p7). Nowadays, she adds, the two terms are often used interchangeably for "planning, competition, conscious manipulation, and movement towards a goal" (p7). As for "strategy" in its modern non-military guise, it means "a plan, step or conscious action towards achievement of an objective" (p8). As "learning strategies", Oxford sees them as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, more transferable to new situations" (p8).

However, there are many more definitions, and this complicates discussions of LLS. This situation has, in fact, changed little from 1978 when Naiman, Fröhlich and Todesco agreed that "a consensus of the term is lacking", while Bialystok (1983, in Wenden and Rubin, 1987) states "there is little consensus in the literature concerning either the definition or the identification of language learning strategies" (p7). Twelve years later McDonough (1995) finds, after

presenting various explanations and definitions, that "the concept of psychological strategy is a very difficult one to pin down in a clear fashion that can be accepted by a majority of workers in the field" (p6). Different researchers use different criteria for defining and classifying LLS. It is difficult to sort out and separate them from the various taxonomies and categorizations and come up with a clear-cut, universally accepted definition. They overlap and are enmeshed in each other. The following sections will present a variety of definitions to illustrate how the issue of grappling with defining strategies has been dealt with over the years.

Weinstein and Mayer (1986) see LS as "behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning and are intended to influence the learner's encoding process. Thus the goal of any particular learning strategy may be to affect the learner's motivational or affective state, or the way in which the learner selects, acquires or organizes or integrates new knowledge" (p135).

Wenden (1987) sees LLS as the "language learning behaviours which learners actually engage in to learn and regulate the learning of a second language" (p.6) and adds that they are "problem oriented" (p.7). Rubin (1994) sees learning strategies as "mental steps or operations which learners actually engage in to learn and regulate learning of a second language" (p2).

My conviction is that the most important points concerning LLS are that they are actions chosen by learners as manifestations of active involvement in the learning process and which they consciously use with the intention of learning

the TL successfully in the areas which they have planned. Another feature which I feel is an essential component of successful learner strategy use is that they empower the learner. That is, by using them, learners feel in more control, know better how to go about learning, what to do, where to look for information or whom to ask when they are having problems. This in turn can lead to learner autonomy which I consider a very important and desirable outcome of learning strategy use. Therefore the following section, (3.6.) will examine the concept of the autonomous learner.

3.6 The autonomous learner

Dickinson (1978) differentiated between the autonomous learner and the self-directed learner. According to his views, learners can pass through to the latter stage to achieve autonomy. Not all may reach this stage, yet they may still be self-directed learners who take responsibility for their own learning situation. That is, although they may not achieve complete mastery in learner autonomy, they will be better learners than those who expect teachers to take responsibility for their learning.

Wenden (1991) for her part, claims that a person on the way to learner autonomy "has acquired the strategies and knowledge to take some, (if not yet all) responsibility for her language learning and is willing and confident to do so" (p163).

Thus both Dickinson (1979) and Wenden (1991) seem to imply that there is a

learning curve involved in developing learner independence. The learner needs to move from one stage to another. It is possible for this to occur without teacher involvement, but many learners may need guidance to first become aware of LLS and then to develop their use of these in order to progress along the path to learner autonomy. Teachers need to be prepared to help learners with this. However, both learners and teachers may first need to consider a change of perception concerning the roles of students and teachers in order to create a suitable environment to bring about the necessary shifts in personal attitudes which are essential for the development of LLS and creation of learner autonomy.

The advantages of being a self-directed and, ideally, an autonomous, independent learner are that people can become competent in dealing independently with learning situations. Once the learner reaches this stage she is liberated, she is no longer dependent on teachers. This is an advantage even at a young age. Often teachers do not "inspire" students, their methodologies may be considered poor or the topics which they present not interesting. Classes may be too large, as in the case of Japan where there may well be over 40 students at both junior and senior high school level, or over 50, in for, example, "English conversation" classes at universities. Further, the level may be too high or too low, lessons move too quickly or too slowly. Focus may be on the wrong things for a particular learner. Thus having the learning strategies which can help one progress despite these difficulties is a powerful advantage.

Furthermore, these skills can be essential after formal education has ended. Nowadays people often have to improve their qualifications, including languages, in connection with their jobs. Having developed learning strategies and learner independence empowers them to do this.

With regard to teachers, this does not mean that they become redundant. Rather they too need to adapt (and may need guidance to enable them to do this) in order to become facilitators, consultants and advisers able to encourage learners to "make use" of teachers, in their quest to achieve the goals they have set.

Weinstein and Mayer (1986) go so far as to claim that "it must be a democracy's major priority" (p124) to ensure that learners learn how to assume responsibility for their learning, and the goal of learner autonomy is nurtured by teachers. This can be linked to Crabbe`s (1993) contention that learner autonomy is essential for ideological reasons. He claims that it is vital that people are aware of what they are being taught and do "not become a victim (even an unwitting one) of choices made by social institutions" (p447). This can be avoided, if learners are taught first how to decide what they want to learn, and know how to learn well and independently. In addition, he argues that psychologically it is beneficial to be in control of one's learning and be active in the learning process rather than a recipient. This makes learning more personal and thus "more meaningful, more permanent, more focused on the processes and schemata of the individual" (ibid.p448). This in turn may increase motivation, which often results in the learner being more successful.

A third major point made by Crabbe (1994) is that it makes sense economically that learners can independently manage their learning and reach their goals. Societies, in general, do not have the money to provide enough personal instruction for people. However, this must not result in their members becoming less educated. To avoid this, people must be guided towards becoming effective learners who realize that the responsibility for their education lies with themselves.

There is a further reason why I believe LLS should be taught in order to create learner independence/learner autonomy. This is to enable them to learn in spite of an education system which does not cater to what individuals want from a language learning situation. This is a pertinent factor in the case of Japan, where this study takes place. As will be seen in Chapter 6, JTEs express their disappointment with various aspects of EFL education in Japan. Their comments mirror those of other teachers, students and the general public. Therefore, if people are guided towards ways of being able to learn, to take charge of their learning in order to receive results, they can become independent of educational systems. Consequently, teachers should focus on creating self-directed and autonomous learners. As claimed in this thesis, one way of bringing this about is by ensuring learners are aware of an extended variety of actions in the form of learning strategies that they can draw upon to take charge of the various stages of their learning processes.

3.7 Language learning strategies in an information processing/cognitive framework

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) emphasize the necessity of there being a theoretical structure within which to place LLS in order to be able to understand better how they can work and in order to create more effective programmes regarding teaching them. Their framework is based on information processing and cognitive theory.

Information processing is described by Sharwood Smith (1994) as "a concept used in artificial intelligence and cognitive psychology allowing the uses of terms such as 'input' and 'output'. The learner may be seen as processing device which takes certain input, transforms it, and produces output" (p200). According to Mayer (1988), new information first passes through sensory memory and then to short term memory (STM) (or working memory as it is sometimes called) from where, if it has been processed, it may subsequently be stored in long term memory (LTM) or if not attended to, forgotten. Further, the information can be stored in isolated "nodes" or interconnected ones. The hypothesis is that learning strategies can influence the amount and quality of information stored. The information processing model, claims Mayer, (1988) consists of 4 stages: attention, rehearsal, encoding, retrieval. New stimuli first pass into sensory memory and then into short term memory depending on how much attention is paid to it. Next, in the 'encoding' phase, information passes from STM to LTM. Once in LTM, in order to be used, it has to be transferred back into STM via retrieval processes.

O`Malley and Chamot, especially, build upon McLaughlin`s (1987) and Anderson`s (1983, 1985) information processing theory and cognitive theory to explain memory and second language acquisition (SLA). They used Anderson's (1983, 1985) three stage process in which it is described how a person can move from a declarative knowledge of rules to an automatic procedularized state. The three stages, according to Anderson (1983,1985) are: cognition, transformation and execution. Declarative knowledge is thought to build upon what a person already knows and therefore is more easily assimilated as it can be built upon, while procedural knowledge takes longer to be established.

Thus an important aspect of cognitive theory and information processing as an explanation of learning, including foreign and second language learning, is that it sees learning as an active event, a constructionist process in which learners are participants. It allows for both simple and complex tasks. Cognitive theory deals with developing the individual's problem solving skills and has been a model for instruction in general education for some time. It developed especially through the 1980`s and 1990`s and incorporates developments in information processing "in a continuing commitment to understanding how the human mind works" (Mayer, 1996:159). Skilled learners can do the following well: select and organize informational input, connect it to what they already know, remember what they find useful, use this information as needed and reflect on the outcomes of their learning efforts. They will also find ways of solving their LL problems by looking in reference

books, for example, or ask others for help. They will deal with various concerns related to nervousness when using the TL. That there are different issues in language learning is reflected in the way LLS are grouped according to categories. These will be discussed in the following sections.

3.8. Categorizations of language learning strategies

There are, of course, many different types of LLS as the learning process involves many aspects. Often they are categorized according to certain areas which reflect aspects such as overall management of learning, actions to carry out learning, how cooperation with others can help deal with a learning problem, as well as how to deal with one's emotions in connection with language learning.

In the same way that LLS have been defined differently by a number of people, as discussed in 3.5, so has the categorization of them. Stern (1992) groups strategies into the following main areas: `management and planning` which correspond to metacognitive and cognitive strategies, while those he terms `communicative-experiential` and `interpersonal` ones are similar to social and affective strategies. Wenden (1991) and O`Malley and Chamot (1990) group LLS into metacognitive, cognitive and social-affective strategies.

Sometimes researchers change their categorizations of LLS as research has developed, as in the case of Oxford who in 1986 divided LLS into 'primary' and 'support' strategies, but then later in 1990 presented a new taxonomy

consisting of 'direct' and 'indirect' strategies. These were divided yet again into memory, cognitive and compensation strategies in the direct category, and metacognitive, affective and social strategies in the indirect one. These are the ones which appear in her Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (1990) known as the 'SILL'. These six groups will be presented in Sections 3.8.1 to 3.8.6 but not in the same order as presented in the SILL. Instead the discussion will begin with metacognitive strategies. This group, I would argue, contain some of the most fundamental LLS, in that successful use of these lays the foundation for creating a good learning environment in which to use other LLS. The metacognitive strategies which I am thinking of in relation to the above are those concerned with goal setting, self-monitoring and self-evaluation, as these involve TL learning on a long-term basis and create a foundation upon which other strategy use can be based. Further, compensation strategies will be discussed together with communicative strategies as these often consist of the same strategies, but are not always viewed as LLS.

3.8.1. Metacognitive strategies

Weinstein and Mayer (1986), discussing learning strategies in general, emphasize that it is important that learners have metacognitive awareness so that they are conscious of which cognitive strategies they use. In connection with language learning strategies, Wenden (1983, 1986) stresses the importance of metacognitive strategies in language learning. In her work, she defines them as dealing with "person knowledge, strategic knowledge and task knowledge" (1991:34). This she bases on the theories of Flavell (1979) who

advocated strongly the necessity for children and adults to have well developed metacognitive strategies to deal not only with education but with life in general. Rubin (in Rubin and Thompson, 1987) points to the relevance of "Person knowledge", which she claims consists of "what learners know about themselves as learners" (p36). That is, how they see themselves as learners, whether they have a positive or negative self-image, whether they feel it is necessary to have an aptitude for languages in order to achieve competence in the TL, whether they are aware of what their cognitive style and range comprises, what kind of learning style they favour, if they feel their age influences their ability to succeed, to mention just some of the aspects.

O`Malley and Chamot (1990) posit that "metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring the learning task, and evaluating how well one has learned" (p137). Oxford's (1990) definition is similar: "planning, evaluating and arranging one's own learning" (p11). Cohen (1998) follows this pattern and divides metacognitive strategies into pre-planning/pre-assessment, on-line planning/assessment and post-evaluation of not only language use but also learning.

These definitions stress that it is important to know how one deals with learning, and is aware of what one`s strengths and weaknesses are. Also they emphasize the relevance of being clear why one is learning a language and issues such as whether one approves of the cultures where the language is spoken. Metacognitive strategies also include the 'business' of learning and include general, overall planning including goal setting, time-management,

self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

I consider it important that goal setting, monitoring and self-evaluation need to be emphasized when guiding students towards their use. In the case of goal-setting, for example, learners have to know whether the goals they are working towards are those which have been set for them, or whether they are self-chosen ones and what the differences are. They need to be able to recognize what their various goals consist of, and be able to break them down into their various components to create manageable goals in the form of smaller and more manageable sub-goals and, possibly, even smaller mini-goals. They need to know how to link these together to reach their overall goal. Metacognitive strategies also include being able to choose suitable learning materials oneself, knowing where to find information, to be able to pinpoint problems and formulate relevant questions to, for example, one's teacher where there is one available. Self-monitoring involves being cognizant of which ways of learning are personally helpful, and being able to articulate these for oneself. It further involves checking that one is aware of how much one has understood, and how much one has learnt within certain time frames. Self-evaluation means being able to know by oneself whether one is being successful or not, what could be done better, differently and how. Other metacognitive strategies which are important, but do not appear to be in the literature of LLS, are being able to ask questions and time-management. Students often need guidance in how to have the confidence to ask questions and how to formulate 'good' questions that facilitate appropriate answers. They also need to be able to recognize what they have not grasped from

explanations following answers to questions and to be able to persist until the matter is made clear. Another important metacognitive strategy is, as noted, that of time-management. Learners may need guidance in how to set up frameworks and deadlines by which they intend to have accomplished various goals.

Research into metacognitive strategies has been carried out, for example, by Carrel et al. (1989), and Carrel (1998) who found that in connection with reading, training in metacognitive strategies improved students' reading. In addition, Cresswell (2000) found improvement in writing after metacognitive training. Brown and Perry (1991) and Oxford (1993) found that good use of metacognitive LLS distinguished effective learners from less effective ones. Separate areas within metacognitive LLS have also been investigated. For example, to what extent students can set their own appropriate goals. Griffee (1994), Andersen and Vandergriff (1997) and Oxford and Green (1996) found, as did Fedderholdt (1998), that students often set unrealistic goals, and often lacked knowledge concerning which cognitive strategies to utilize in order to achieve their objectives. Students needed guidance in order to define realistic goals in order to achieve these.

3.8.2 Cognitive strategies

Wenden (1991) defines cognitive strategies as "mental steps or operations that learners use to process both linguistic and sociolinguistic content" (p19). O`Malley and Chamot (1990) claim that they "involve interacting with the

material to be learned, manipulating the material mentally or physically, or applying specific techniques to a learning task" (p138). Cohen (1998) gives a succinct, helpful definition. According to him, they consist of "identification, grouping, retention and storage of language material, as well as language use strategies of retrieval, rehearsal, and comprehension or production of words, phrases or other elements of the second language" (p7). Oxford (1990) emphasizes manipulation and transformation of the TL. Grenfell and Harris (1999) define cognitive strategies as mental engagements with language materials or tasks in order to develop understanding and hence learning .

There are a number of cognitive strategies. Memory strategies are generally subsumed under cognitive strategies (although this is not the case in the SILL). Cognitive memory strategies include strategies such as grouping words according to semantic areas or different grammatical forms or words. Other memory strategies consist of key method techniques, repetition and practice. Further cognitive strategies involve using resources such as dictionaries, grammar books, online sources or taking notes, writing summaries, paraphrasing. Cognitive strategies involve grappling, and manipulating language so as to change problems into solutions and add new information to one's store of FL knowledge. They enable learners to remember and be able to retrieve and use the language they have worked with.

3.8.3.Compensation/communicative strategies

There are some problems in connection with compensation and

communication strategies as, although they have different names, they often comprise the same strategies. Nevertheless, there are differences of opinion regarding their function.

Tarone (1980) distinguishes between communicative strategies and learning strategies. She contends that the former are "descriptive of the learner's *pattern of use* of what they know as they try to communicate with speakers of the target language" (p285, emphasis in the original). However, she points out that these do not necessarily lead to learning. A key characteristic of communication strategies is that they are interactional involving "joint negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer". Faerch and Kasper (1983) consider communication strategies as involving conscious problem solving efforts which first require a planning process. They suggest that the learner scans the linguistic knowledge available to her, either in her first language or other languages in order to achieve a particular communicative goal. There can be a wholehearted effort to get meaning across, in which case "achievement" strategies will be used, or a decision made to abandon one's goal, or to strive for a lesser one.

Examples of communication strategies are attempts by the language learner to make up for missing linguistic knowledge by creating neologisms, using circumlocution, miming, guessing, reverting to another language and using words from there to fill in gaps in TL communication. These are similar to those which Oxford (1990) describes and categorizes as compensation strategies in the SILL.

There appear to be two problems with regard to communication or compensation strategies. The first is that Bialystok and Kellerman (1986) question the necessity of learners being trained with regard to compensation strategies. They posit that communication strategies transfer easily across languages and therefore there is no need to teach them, and cite a study by Faerch and Kasper (1985, in Bialystok and Kellerman 1986) which shows that despite training, subjects showed no improvement in their communication strategy methods. Bialystok (1990) notes that communication strategies are a "dynamic interaction of the components of language processing that balance each other in their level of involvement to meet task demands" (p318) and argues that if we can manage these in our mother tongue, they will automatically be used in the TL providing the language base is there. Therefore it may not be necessary to use time in a busy class schedule on teaching this type of strategy.

3.8.4. Memory strategies

Memory strategies are intended to help internalize new input for retrieval when necessary. In the case of words they can involve organizing words that are related to each other either by meaning or overarching concepts. Visualization can also be used, as mnemonic techniques, writing words on cards and carrying them around to check from time to time. Repeated practice also facilitates internalization. New items or grammar points can be used when speaking to someone or writing either for class work or privately for email.

Noting them when reading or listening to something also gives practice which aids acquisition. Practice and performance of items that one wants to learn are also important methods useful for consolidating material.

3.8.5 Social Strategies

Social and affective strategies are often grouped together, as by O`Malley and Chamot (1990), who contend that "social and affective strategies involve interacting with another person to assist a learning task" (p139). However, here they will be discussed separately in accordance with the structure of the SILL.

Examples of social strategies given by Oxford (1990) are interacting, co-operating and helping others in the target language in a variety of situations both in and outside class. In addition, social strategies can also help with negative affective situations in that use of the TL with other learners, or users of the TL, can help develop the realization that communication in the TL is "do-able". Once the learner realizes this, stress levels may be lessened and, as a result, negative affective situations which hinder language learning may be eliminated. Consequently, if the learner feels less anxiety and tenseness in language learning situations, learning can be improved as the "affective filter" (Krashen, 1987) is lowered making the learner more receptive to input.

3.8.6. Affective strategies

According to Scovel (1991) "affect" can be seen as "the emotions of pleasure

and displeasure which surround a task such as second language learning" (p16). Affective strategies are ways of dealing with negative emotions such as anxiety in connection with the target language. A learner can pay attention to how she feels when she has to use the TL, by taking what Oxford (1990) describes as taking one's "emotional temperature" (p.17). Mostly this may be in connection with speaking, but is not limited to this. The learner can try to pinpoint why she is nervous or tense and then decide to alter this situation by re-framing the situation, by positive self-talk, breathing deeply or promising herself a reward for dealing appropriately with a TL situation which caused her anxiety. Other strategies are to talk with others who have the same problem and give each other tasks to carry out in the TL to practice confronting and overcoming fears.

3.9 Techniques, tactics, or procedures

As seen in the above sections 3.8.1-3.8.6., it is not easy to provide clear-cut and unequivocal definitions of LLS. A further source of difficulty in connection with LLS is that different terms may be used by different authors. Sometimes they are used interchangeably. However, there may be differences between them. Stern (1992) defines learning strategies as consisting of "intentional directions" and techniques as "activities or procedures", which seems to indicate a two-tier system suggesting that the learner for example, decides to memorize something. Then she decides how to go about it. What Stern here refers to as "intentional directions" could be considered metacognitive strategies and the "activities and procedures" could be LLS such as memory or

cognitive strategies.

Seliger (1984, cited in Ellis 1994) considers strategies as "basic abstract categories of processing by which information perceived in the outside word is organized and categorized into cognitive structures as part of a conceptual network" (pp.531-532). However, he describes tactics as "variable and idiosyncratic learning activities, which learners use to organize a learning situation, respond to the learning environment, or cope with input and output demands" (ibid.p531-532). Faerch and Kasper (1983) differentiate between "strategy" and "process". Ellis (1994) objects to this, claiming there is no clear-cut consensus as to which are strategies and processes. Cohen (1998) proposes a solution to the problem of various labels and suggests that "a solution to the problem would be to refer to all of these simply as strategies, while still acknowledging that there is a continuum from the broadest categories to the most specific or low-level" (p10). At the same time, it must be remembered that Cohen himself differentiates between "language learning strategies" and strategies for language use. This dichotomy is also upheld by Sharwood Smith (1994) and McDonough (1995). The argument here is that some strategies merely allow for the accomplishment of a language problem without necessarily leading to learning. This, I think, is a very important. Many strategies need to be used in combination with others. Using LLS does not cut out the "work" factor involved in language learning. They can only help learners deal with language learning problems more efficiently.

3.10 Are LLS effective if used singly?

Another point concerning compensation/communicative strategies is that some researchers query whether these can be described as LLS if used singly. McDonough (1995) and Cohen (1990, 1998) question this. In fact, Cohen (1998) extends this question beyond compensation strategies. He claims that for LLS to be effective they need to consist of language learning strategies and language use strategies and together and only in this way can they "constitute the steps or actions selected by learners either to improve the learning of a second language, the use of it, or both" (p5). That is, conscious efforts must be made to remember, for subsequent retrieval, the language material that was encountered or used. If this is not the case, material will be lost and the strategies will not have contributed to any language learning, and are thus not language learning strategies.

Cohen's (1998) distinction between language learning strategies and language use strategies is, I feel, a very relevant distinction. Not all strategies named "language learning strategies" do lead to learning. This is especially noticeable with compensation/communicative strategies. Guessing the meaning of something, miming, and creating neologisms may be used merely to manage a transitory situation without the user being in the least interested in augmenting her TL skills. An instance of this may be where the speaker can manage what she wants and needs in daily life and does not wish to invest more time in the TL. Cases of this can be seen with expatriates who are staying in a country for a limited time. They may use compensation strategies every

day, without their TL improving.

Another pertinent point is, as Cohen (1998) claims, that distinctions between metacognitive, cognitive, social and affective strategies are not always clear-cut. Strategies may overlap or be used together, or "the same category may function at different levels of abstraction" (p12). The fact that different strategies do not belong unequivocally to one particular group must be taken into account when considering research results. Nevertheless, a chosen set of categorizations, such as those found in the SILL, can provide a preliminary framework.

3.11 Research into LLS

This section examines research in connection with LLS. There are three sub-sections. The first deals with research which looks at the LLS which teachers use themselves or teach their students. However, as there appear to be only two research studies on this topic, and as only one has proved available, this section will be short. The second section examines LLS and non-Japanese informants, while the third discusses LLS and Japanese.

3.11.1 Research into LLS which teachers use themselves and teach students

As noted in the previous section, there seems to be little research into whether and which LLS teachers use themselves to learn FLs. Nor whether

they teach students LLS, apart from in research projects where LLS are being taught in order to see whether students subsequently use them, and if and how they may help. By this I mean that there do not seem to have been studies which focus on FL/SL teachers themselves in ordinary classrooms and whether they teach LLS as part of their own teaching philosophy.

I have been able to find reference to one which deals with the LLS which teachers use. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find locate it despite extensive library and web-based search. This is a paper entitled: "Second Language Learning Strategies Utilized by Some Members of Language Departments at Four Institues" presented by E. Davis and H. Abas at Sulawesi, Indonesia: Summer School of Linguistics 1992.

Regarding which LLS teachers guide students towards using, Robbins presented a study at the JALT Conference in 1998. She had interviewed fourteen teachers teaching English in Japan in order to establish whether they taught their students LLS. Seven were western teachers of English and seven were JTEs. The data showed that both groups taught a limited number of LLS although the western teachers taught LLS to students slightly more than the JTEs did. JTEs did not appear to teach metacognitive strategies such as self-monitoring or self-evaluation. Only one western teacher and one JTE asked students to think about learner independence. Robbins points out that the LLS used mostly (predicting and inferencing) were the ones which often appear in textbooks.

3.11.2 LLS and non-Japanese

Research has been carried out in a variety of areas on LLS. The areas which will be presented below examine LLS and listening, reading, speaking, vocabulary and writing.

LLS and listening

This section will look at LLS and listening. Early research by O'Malley et al (1985) found that strategy training was useful in improving students' listening to some degree. Later, O'Malley et al (1989) found that three particular groups of strategies were used by more proficient students: self-monitoring, use of background knowledge to create meaning, and guessing from context. They further used 'top-down' skills such as, for example, listening for main ideas before listening again (if possible) and listening for specific points. They were able to follow both anaphoric and cataphoric references. Less competent listeners used 'bottom-up' ones such as focusing on single sentences and single words within these, translating word-for-word. Murphy (1989) investigated the listening strategies of ESL learners and found that good listeners used recall, guessing, asking questions and metacognitive strategies such as self-monitoring while trying to comprehend aural texts. Teng (1998) in a study of 51 first year university students found that effective listeners (as measured by 20 multiple-choice questions) overall used more LLS than less effective listeners. Also the study revealed that students mostly used compensation strategies, while affective strategies were used least. In addition

to compensation strategies paying attention and translating were used most. Goh's (1997) diary studies showed that although learners had metacognitive awareness, it was still necessary to stress metacognitive strategies when teaching listening. Flowerdew and Miller (1992) studied the strategies of HK Chinese attempting to understand lectures in English and found they used mostly metacognitive strategies in the form of pre/post-reading, and efforts to focus on the speaker. They also used social strategies such as peer/tutor help and cognitive strategies such as underlining and note-taking.

In the above discussion, it can be seen how metacognitive strategies play an important role with regard to improving listening comprehension. Also important was top-down processing in contrast to bottom-up processing and guessing. Japanese language learners seldom have experience of using these strategies. An interesting feature in the above discussion is the fact that effective listeners - in the studies of Chinese - use translating as a strategy to increase listening comprehension. This is not included in western taxonomies of LLS, but it may nevertheless play a helpful role in the case of students from certain cultures.

LLS and reading

Barnett (1989), Carrell et al. (1989), and Carrel (1989) investigated the use of metacognitive strategies in reading. In particular, they investigated the use of metacognitive strategies of organization. They found that proficiency and the use of a limited number of strategies were linked, but not that proficient

readers used more strategies. The strategies which the better readers used were top-down strategies compared to the poorer readers who mainly use several bottom-up ones, such as translating words one by one within sentences, and not realizing the importance of anaphoric and cataphoric connections. Their results also showed that effectiveness of training was related to learning styles. A later investigation by Carrell (1998) examined the question whether reading strategies were influenced by language problems or reading problems. Examination of the strategies by American students of Spanish and Spanish students of English showed that the English speakers felt that knowledge of Spanish was important in their reading endeavours. On the other hand, Spanish speakers thought that their reading in English was influenced by whether they were good readers of Spanish. Carrell (ibid) thought this might be due to the fact that the latter were learning English as a SL while the former were learning Spanish as a FL. Casanave (1988), Cohen (1990, 1994), Cohen and Hosenfeld (1981), and Hosenfeld (1984) looked at the differences in strategy use by 'good' and 'poor' readers. After isolating the 'good' strategies, they attempted to train the 'poor' readers in these strategies. However, the results of the training were mixed results, only increasing reading competence in the case of a few readers. Possibly this could be due to the way the strategy training was carried out, and not that the strategies were not 'good' after all.

LLS and oral skills

There have been few studies carried out on LLS and oral skills. This is an area

which needs further in-depth research. However, in a study of 520 adults studying a variety of languages, Oxford and Ehrman (1995) found that there was a small but significant relationship between cognitive strategy use and speaking proficiency. However, limitations of this study include the fact that speaking tasks were rather artificial and seemed to involve tasks that resulted in monologues. Lam and Wong (2000) conducted training in clarification strategies in group discussions with mixed findings. Namely that although at the end of training, students used more interactive strategies, but also that there were more incidents of ineffective strategies used.

However, there is an area which has not been explored yet: that of voice chatting on the Internet. As this becomes more accessible and students become more familiar with its uses, no doubt a great deal of research will be done regarding the use of LLS in oral use of EFL.

LLS and vocabulary

The learning of vocabulary is a basic, essential requirement for being able to manage any area in the TL. This sub-section reports on vocabulary LLS in a variety of countries.

Cohen et al. (1995) studied the LLS of university learners of Norwegian and French in the US and found that instruction in LLS improved learners' performance in vocabulary building. Medani (1988) carried out research with 300 Sudanese EFL learners to find out more about their vocabulary learning

strategies. In general, he found that although both good learners and under-achievers shared several macro-strategies (using reference books, memorization, note-taking), the better learners also used macro-strategies but within these had a more varied and extensive use of micro-strategies. That is, a more proficient learner would not only use the dictionary - as the less proficient learner - but also several of the following micro-strategies, such as use of not only a bi-lingual dictionary but also a monolingual one for looking up derivations, word classes, and examples of use in addition to simply looking up meaning (ibid.). Brown and Perry (1991) examined three learning strategies for vocabulary acquisition: the key-word method, the semantic processing method and combined keyword-semantic method. Out of these, the combined keyword-semantic method was most effective. Cohen and Aphek (1980, 1981) studied the effect of learning words in context and found that once learners had moved beyond elementary learning, words in context were remembered better. Sanaoui's (1995) findings showed learners who used structured approaches which included self-initiated activities, listened frequently to recordings of a high number of vocabulary items and created opportunities to use new items were more successful at increasing their vocabulary. Oxford and Crookall (1989) and Scarcella and Oxford (1994) found that metacognitive strategies were of importance in vocabulary learning. Kojic-Sabo and Lightbown (1999) investigated the LLS of ESL and EFL students. They too found that for both groups in addition to successful learners using structured strategies, learner initiative and independence plus time were crucial factors leading to achievement. Tinkham (1989) investigated the strategy of rote-learning and found that Japanese not only had a greater

acceptance of rote-learning for vocabulary than American students, but also achieved better results. Also, as will be seen in the following section, for some tasks rote-learning has, in fact, been seen to be more successful than otherwise thought.

Ellis and Beaton (1993) examined a comparison of keyword method for vocabulary learning and rote-repetition. Their study was with 47 subjects who were native speakers of English learning German as a FL. Their findings reflected those of Pressley, Levin, Hall, Miller and Berry (1980) which suggested that the keyword method for remembering was better when used for recognizing words in texts. However, they found that for instances were learners were required to use words, the keyword method was less effective than rote-repetition. Ellis and Beaton (1993) point out that rote repetition has been out of fashion for decades. Nevertheless, in their study it was shown to be effective. This shows that, as in all matters, care must be taken not to be judgmental simply because a method is for example, 'unfashionable'. Also care must be taken to avoid holding up certain cultural (usually anglo-American) ideals in language learning . This is stressed by Brooks, (1996) and Cortazzi and Jin (1999), who argue for the importance of culture as a pivotal factor on which to base LLS training. They caution against the disapproval by western teachers of traditional methods such as rote memorization which have their roots and logic in Confucianism.

Japanese students use rote-learning LLS, often to the exclusion of other LLS. Therefore, although rote-learning has its value, it is also shown in the above

discussion that other strategies also help to increase vocabulary. Consequently, it would seem beneficial for JTEs to extend students LLS also in connection with vocabulary.

LLS and writing

Cresswell (2000) conducted training in self-monitoring in writing with advanced level students and found that as a result, students developed a more responsible attitude to writing. They became more willing to solve problems themselves regarding language problems but also overall organization. For tasks such as summarizing, Kirkland and Saunders (1991) recommend that, in academic settings especially, metacognitive awareness is necessary in order to manage the extensive cognitive load involved in the complex skill of summarizing. Cohen and Brooks-Carson (2001) conducted an investigation on learners of French. Students were asked to write two 20 minute compositions: an essay directly in French and then an essay in their native language, which they then translated into French. This was in order to ascertain whether there were differences between writing done directly in the TL or translated from the native language into the TL. Although there were no significant differences regarding accuracy of grammar, two thirds of the essays which were written directly in French had better use of colloquial expressions. Cohesiveness was also better. Nevertheless, an important, interesting point was that in follow-up interviews, the writers revealed that they were thinking most of the time in their L1 even when they were writing directly in the TL. However, there are many aspects to be considered when teaching writing strategies such as

students' proficiency, how close languages are to each other (non-Indo European languages or Indo-European, for example) and what the criteria are for evaluation.

3.11.3 LLS and Japanese Learners of English

Several studies have been carried out in various areas regarding Japanese and LLS.

Hirose and Sasaki (1994) found that competent writers at university used metacognitive strategies such as planning, organization and revision (self-monitoring). In addition, they seemed to be confident about writing and are described as independent, self-directed learners in that they also self-initiated writing in contrast with the less efficient writers. Taka-Yoshi (1993) found that training students not to rely totally on teachers' corrections could develop students' self-monitoring and self-correcting strategies.

What is termed 'writing' in Japan is most often grammar-translation of isolated sentences. This means that students find issues such as cohesion and coherence in text difficult (Fedderholdt 2001). They also have difficulties in creating pre-writing outlines which depict the overall structure of what they are going to write. Organization of texts is difficult for them at both paragraph and text level.

Takanashi (1999) investigated the learning strategies and styles of Japanese

students studying EFL and compared them with British students studying Japanese. He found that Japanese students especially used compensation strategies. Tamada (1996) investigated the LLS of Japanese students studying English in Britain. He found that the respondents were greatly influenced by the LLS they had been taught at secondary school in that none of the respondents used LLS which they had not been taught by their teachers during high school in Japan.

Concerning listening and LLS, Fujiwara (1990) asked students to describe in diaries the effects of listening training tasks which had been devised on the basis of "good" listening strategies. She found that students gradually reported changes in attitudes towards listening and listening proficiency. In addition, her study showed that strategies which had been especially effective were the ones which learners had described themselves. Fedderholdt (2002) found that university students who were asked to consider their past listening strategy background and then were introduced to a variety of listening strategies, including practice, said they felt they had more confidence regarding tackling listening problems after the course. She also found (2001) that students who had received concentrated 'shadowing' practice felt that their listening competence had improved, while some felt that it had helped in areas of pronunciation. Examples of shadowing include listening to an aural text in the TL and repeating what one hears, or thinks one hears, as quickly as possible after it is heard. Another form is to repeat the last part of an utterance made by one's conversation partner.

Regarding English in general, Mochizuki (1991) investigated 157 Japanese university students and found they used compensation strategies most, with affective ones least. Further, more proficient students used cognitive and metacognitive LLS more frequently than those who were less proficient. In addition, memory strategies were not used as often as expected. Kimura (1999) found that Japanese students who had been overseas used a greater variety of compensation strategies and that they had higher scores on all parts of the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). However, it seems difficult to assess whether it is the compensation strategies alone which helped improve scores. Takauchi (1993) also looked at the scores of 78 Japanese university students' CELT and their use of LLS. He found that use of 4 SILL items seemed to be indicators of low scores in 58% of the variance in scores. However, the strategies which predicted negatively included asking questions in English and trying to find as many ways as possible to use English and writing down feelings in a language learning diary. This is surprising because use of a TL is generally considered an advantageous way of improving it. Possibly the strategies they used were not the ones useful for the CELT. Takeuchi (1993) himself thought it might be because of cultural issues. Those that indicated higher scores included writing notes, messages, letters or reports in English, not translating word for word, dividing words into parts to find meaning, and paying attention when someone is speaking.

Murphey (1998) used videos of his students in conversation. The students then watched the video in order to assess their performance. Murphey (1998) found that this method was rather successful in developing especially the meta-

cognitive strategy of self-evaluation. Usuki (1995) argues for a need for to cultivate learner autonomy via an increase of metacognitive strategies so as to help students have more control over their learning

In contrast to the 1000 words recommended by the Ministry of Education (1989) which Japanese students should have learnt upon completion of junior high school, no number is recommended for SHS students (Goold, Madelyb and Carter 1993:3). However, two Japanese professors, one of whom has worked for the Ministry of Education for several years, claim that 5,000-6,000 words or more are the norm in senior high school in order to enter a reputable university (personal communication). This means that large amounts of vocabulary have to be learnt.

Regarding memory strategies, Tinkham (1989), as mentioned in 3.11.1, investigated the strategies of rote-learning for vocabulary. This strategy has come under much criticism in the last few decades. However, he found that Japanese not only had a greater acceptance of rote-learning for vocabulary than American student but also seemed to enjoy this way, and did better on word tests than Americans. As already noted, care must be taken in not casting aside potentially useful strategies/methods simply because they are "unfashionable". Further, it is important for FL or SL teachers to be culturally sensitive and not try to force students from various cultures to behave in ways that go against their own culture. An example of this is exhorting students to be "active" in ways that inappropriate in their own culture, as in the case of Japanese, they are often reluctant to reveal opinions as this is generally not

something one does in Japanese society.

In this section various studies of Japanese and LLS have been presented. The present study supplements these by exploring in greater depth the areas already mentioned.

3.12 Inappropriate uses of LLS

In the sub-sections of 3.11 an overview was given of research which showed that certain LLS have been connected with various degrees of success in language learning. However, as Erickson (1986) reminds us, disconfirming evidence is also necessary. Therefore, a discussion of studies of learners who use LLS but are not successful follow.

In an early report, Abraham and Vann (1987) studied two Spanish male learners of ESL. One was successful in his attempts, the other one less so. They found that the former used LLS more often than his counterpart and had a greater repertoire of LLS. However, later, Vann and Abraham (1990) studied two unsuccessful female Arab speaking language learners. They found that although these women were active in their language learning attempts, and used similar LLS to effective language learners, they, in contrast to the successful learners, often applied LLS to tasks for which they were unsuitable. Consequently, they were not successful in managing various LL tasks. In conclusion Vann and Abraham (1990) stress the necessity of learners being competent at matching LLS and tasks appropriately.

Porte (1988) found, in a study of fifteen unsuccessful language learners, that they in fact used many LLS, but used them inappropriately. However, at the same time, he emphasizes the necessity of recognizing that different individuals may use different LLS from each other and still be successful at the same task. He also warns against exhorting students to "critically copy 'model' learning strategies" (ibid.p170). ('Model' strategies are those which are recommended in the literature these days, such as guessing from context rather than checking a dictionary, or if dictionaries are used, it is very common for TL-TL dictionaries to be recommended and the use of TL-mother language dictionaries discouraged.) Instead, he recommends that learners should be encouraged to examine their strategies more closely, question them, and with the teacher work towards finding more useful ones they are happy to use.

Pearson (1988) presents examples of both a 'good' and 'poor' learner. She investigated 12 Japanese employees on site in Singapore and Malaysia and discusses especially two: one in Malaysia as well as one in Singapore. The one in Malaysia learnt to speak Malay well because he spent time with Malaysians both socially as well as at work. He asked them questions about language problems he could not understand and made constant use of new language which he learnt. In contrast, the subject in Singapore made no attempt to learn Mandarin or improve on the English he had learnt at school in Japan. When forced into situations where Mandarin or English were used, he reported making no attempts to guess or work out meanings, general rules, or pick up new words or expressions.

Pearson (1988), suggests that his lack of effort could be due to personality factors or having low confidence in his language learning abilities. It could also be that he simply had no idea that he could learn languages successfully by himself, without a teacher. Possibly, if he had become proficient in LLS and guided towards learner autonomy at school, he would have dealt with his language learning situation better.

In the above, it has been argued that LLS are potentially useful, but learners need not only to know about LLS but be able to use them appropriately. Teachers can play an important role in not only teaching LLS but also cultivating learners' interest in them as well the motivation to develop and use them.

As has been demonstrated in the previous sections, the overall view presented has been that, despite problems that may occur with choice of LLS and appropriate use, LLS are nevertheless considered helpful in language learning and in developing learner autonomy. However, not all are convinced of the usefulness of LLS. Therefore, in the following section, there will be a discussion of some criticisms of LLS.

3.13 Criticisms of LLS

Some researchers are not convinced of the usefulness of LLS. For example, Towell and Hawkins (1994) are sceptical about LLS which in their view are only

"tangential to the acquisition process" (p.48). However, they seem to focus mainly on cognitive strategies and do not discuss metacognitive or socio-affective strategies, which weakens their argument. Rees-Miller (1993) criticizes learner training for producing only limited success. Like McDonough (1995), she questions whether it is worth spending time on learner strategy training and suggests it would be more useful to concentrate on language work itself. Further, she criticizes the rather crusading nature of LLS proponents. She points out that several strategies which they often disapprove of, such as using dictionaries, reading aloud, and following grammar book rules are, in fact, used effectively by many successful learners. Further, she argues that LLS supporters often claim that 'active' extrovert learners are more successful than quiet, more introverted ones a point with which she disagrees. She suggests that more culturally defined models should be developed and applied, and criteria such as 'active' used with caution. In connection with adults, she warns teachers not to appear patronizing, and that it should be realized that not all adults may want to 'act out words' or play games. Rees-Miller (1993) also argues that teachers should not be overzealous in promoting certain LLS or certain aspects of language learning. An example of this is that nowadays speaking and listening skills are considered by many teachers to be more useful than reading and writing. However, a number of learners may actually prefer these skills. Field (1998) also criticizes learner training in LLS and is against the fact that it simply focuses on "a set of uniform procedures" (p116). Their points concerning dogmatism in connection with which activities should be used in order to foster LLS learning, and some teachers' focus on some skills over others are relevant, but the suggestion that

limited success of LLS training should be a reason not to teach them does not seem wise. Rather more focus should be placed on teachers learning how to better be able to guide students towards appropriate use of LLS.

Benson (1995) also worries about over-enthusiasm for LLS learner training, which he feels may be 'learner moulding' in disguise. He warns against attempting an "ideological construction of the learner". He claims that if this is not successful, the learner may feel that she is either a 'poor' language learner or not even a language learner at all! (p.48). I too feel that there is a tendency in EFL (and no doubt other professions, but which does not make it better!) towards conformity to the prevalent ideology supported by those who claim to know what is best way to learn, and that teachers should question these continually. There has often been pressure, at least implicitly, if not explicitly, to jump on the particular bandwagon going round at a particular time. Retrospectively, we have realized that no one way is actually best. Therefore proponents of LLS should be cautious not to fall into this trap. An open mind is necessary to re-assess LLS frequently.

Ridgeway (2000) also comments on the value of LLS. He criticizes the lack of consensus of the definitions and the fact that there has been no elucidation of whether strategies are conscious or unconscious. He further argues that strategy-based approaches possibly detract from the value of practice. He is cautious about the work done by LLS proponents and wonders if it is not simply differences in level and motivation which makes some learners more successful than others.

Gu (1996) is sceptical about almost all areas concerning LLS and is critical of what he terms "the marketing of LLS". He wants "a more prudent, honest, and disinterested marketing strategy backed up by more empirical findings that go well beyond strategy-counting questionnaire results and one or two weeks' experimentation on a few isolated test-tube strategies" (p26).

Despite these criticisms, I feel that introducing, augmenting and practicing LLS are useful additions which teachers can introduce in their teaching to aid students with their language learning processes. However, I agree that many points should be changed and improved with reference to cultural differences, that western ideas about learners should not be taken for granted, that LLS literature could do well to be less prescriptive and judgmental. Nevertheless, I also believe through my many years experience of LLS guidance to students that there are successes. That students sometimes are empowered by use of LLS and enjoy the process towards learner independence. It seems to me that instead of discarding LLS training, we should instead continue to find out more about them to improve transmission about them as well as training in them.

3.14 Can LLS use be taught?

One of the issues which is relevant in connection with helping learners develop LLS is whether in fact others can influence learners to develop and use them. Connected to this is whether learning strategies are conscious or unconscious. This is a matter of contention. Oxford (1990) claims that some strategies can

become so autonomous as to become unconscious. Nyikos (1996) contends that "developing strategies leads to routines that are eventually 'forgotten' as awareness shifts away from consciously remembering vocabulary and socioculturally appropriate application of language structures" (p111). Nevertheless, they are still amenable to inspection if attention is drawn to them. Then the user again becomes aware of them and they can be re-appraised. The importance of LLS being conscious at various levels is important as accessibility allows for introspection and change for example through LLS training/awareness raising.

Cohen (1998) reiterates his 1990 position that LS "are learning processes which are consciously selected by the learner" (p4). He stresses the importance of choice being deliberate or conscious, and claims this "is what gives a strategy its special character" (ibid.p4). Cohen (1994) finds Schmidt's (in Cohen, 1994) idea useful: language learning strategies are either within the learner's focal attention or peripheral attention and can be described. If this is not the case and they cannot be described, then they can be described as processes (ibid.p11). Ellis (1994) suggests that LS are "conscious or at least potentially conscious actions which learners employ intentionally" (p532). To me an important point is that decisions can be made as to whether to use LLS or not. They seem to to be very 'hands on' practical ways of dealing with the language learning process. Learners can decide themselves whether, for example, to set themselves a goal, or a time frame, and to check whether they are adhering to it and how well they are doing. To do this they can also decide, if they are aware of them, which cognitive, affective and social strategies they

need to avail themselves of. However, often they need to have guidance first of all to realize that they can be empowered to do this, and next that there are some ways that are more preferable than others to achieve a good outcome. Of course, focus only on LLS in isolation is not enough. As noted in this study, local contexts and overarching planning systems also need to be taken into consideration. And, as Oxford and Nyikos (1989) stress, factors such as gender, personality,and learning styles to, name a few variables, also need to be considered.

3.15 Creating learner responsibility

McLaughlin (1990) contends that teachers "need to make strategies and metacognitive skills available to learners" (173). Often learners are not aware that they would manage their learning better by taking an active part in their learning processes. They are often not taught to take responsibility for their learning situation, and are accustomed to rely overly on their teachers. Consequently, students are often victims of "learned helplessness" (Wenden 1991, p57) and convinced that a teacher is necessary for their learning to take place. The objectives of their learning are usually to pass examinations set by the authorities. These function as the evaluating systems by which they are judged. Along the way, teachers monitor students by checking their responses in class, and their homework and periodically test them on the way to the final exams. Further, their comprehension is checked constantly by teachers. Weinstein and Rogers (1985, in Wenden 1991) claim that, as a result, students are poor at monitoring themselves whether they have understood something

or not. Teachers habitually watch out for blank or puzzled expressions and re-explain, or repeat what they have said without letting students digest input and then formulate their own questions regarding comprehension problems. Thus "teachers are very often much more active in the learning process than are students" and "while this may result in very effective teaching strategies, these teaching behaviours do not necessarily help the students gain independence by developing effective comprehension-monitoring strategies of their own" (Weinstein and Rogers, 1985, cited in Wenden 1991, p13). Wenden (1991) claims that when learners "enter into an educational activity as adults they expect to be treated like children" and "this expectation, based on early socialization, is so strong that they often put pressure on teachers to behave towards them in this way" (p55-56).

Instead of encouraging learning dialogue between themselves and students, teachers often simply exhort students to 'work hard', or 'make' them do so by threatening them with tests, instead of helping them towards self-directed learning via guidance in learning strategies. Oxford (1990) claims that "strategy training helps guide learners to become more conscious of strategy use and more adept at appropriate strategies" (p12). Good language strategy use helps towards becoming a "successful" language learner which according to Wenden (1991) is someone who has "learned how to learn", who has "acquired the learning strategies, the knowledge about learning, and the attitudes that enable them to use these skills and knowledge confidently, flexibly and appropriately" (p15). Weinstein and Hume (1998) claim that "most students do not think much about how they learn new things" and the ways

they have of learning are based, they claim, on arbitrary factors such as trial and error, comments about learning they have heard from others, and often not very useful (ibid.p12-13).

Cohen (1998) stresses that learners must be given the 'tools' to take charge of their learning. He claims that "when strategy learning is included in the instructional package, students can learn how to learn a foreign language while they are learning the language content" (p66). The tools to enable language learning and language use should enable students to self-diagnose their own strengths and weaknesses in LL, become more aware of what helps them to learn the target language most efficiently, develop a broad range of problem-solving skills, experiment with both familiar and unfamiliar learning tasks, make decisions about how to approach a language task, monitor and self-evaluate their performance, and transfer successful strategies to learning contexts. The results of this are that learners can optimalize their learning potential, improve their TL, and feel empowered to learn more.

3.16 The importance of changes in teacher and student attitudes with regard to their roles as teachers and learners

Without changes in attitudes and roles by both students and teachers, strategy training will not succeed (Wenden,1998). Ellis (1992) contends that teachers often view teaching as a "commitment to some method or implementation of decisions embodied in a syllabus or lesson plan" when instead teaching "should be conceptualized as the interactive events that transpire when a

lesson takes place" (p147). Chamot (1994) argues that teachers must realize that learning is a mentally active process, and students must be mentally engaged, the teaching-learning processs is interactive and should not be a transmission model which the teacher as knower and the student as a passive receiver of knowledge. This may seem to be stating the obvious, but there still exists the attitude that students are "empty bottles into which knowledge must be poured". A first step necessary in order for both learners and teachers to successfully incorporate LLS in their learning and teaching situations is that both groups must accept changes in their attitudes and roles.

Teachers must assume new functions as facilitators, helpers and advisers willing to guide learners to accustom themselves to taking on increasing responsibility for their learning situation, and think about language learning holistically. However, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) argue that it may not be easy to convince teachers that strategy guidance is essential. These may be reluctant to relinquish their role as teacher, or worry about not living up to their responsibilities, if they suggest that students develop ways of learning by themselves. Indeed, they may feel that it is *they* as teachers who are the reason why students are successful. They may unwilling to entertain the notion that it is students themselves who have been able to deal with and process what they have learned in class rather than some skill stemming from the teacher.

The traditional role which the teacher has to relinquish is one which is often likened to that of a "parent, instructor, director, manager, judge, leader, evaluator, controller, and even doctor who must 'cure' the ignorance of

students" (Oxford,1990 p10). To develop students' responsibility for their own learning, teachers should become "partners in the learning process" (Cohen, 1998 p97) or as Oxford (1990) suggests: "facilitator, helper, guide, adviser, coordinator, idea person, diagnostician, and co-communicator" (p10). A new commitment must be added to teachers' ideology, that of "identifying students' learning strategies, conducting training on learner strategies, and of helping students become more independent" (ibid.p10). However, there has been little research into whether teachers themselves are necessarily good users of LLS themselves and whether they pass them on to their students. Oxford (1996) claims that not only students, but also their teachers "are largely unaware of the potential of affective and social strategies" (pxi), while Tamada (1996) claims that students often do not use strategies unless they have been taught them by teachers. Consequently, this study aims to focus on these two issues: which LLS teachers use themselves and to which extent, and which LLS they teach their students.

Regarding the role of diagnostician mentioned above, Cohen (1998) argues that it involves being able to discover not only which learning strategies students are using, but also that the teacher should serve as a "catalyst" to enable students themselves to find out which strategies they are using.

However, one problem might be, as Nyikos (1996) illustrates, that although teachers may be aware of LLS, they may not be willing to teach them. She found that teachers could be grouped as: "resisters, middle-grounders and assimilators" (p.109). There were two main changes regarding acceptance of

LLS. One on a conscious level and another in practice. More than one third of her sample found the shift problematic. She suggests that these were once teacher dependent students who expected teachers to take responsibility for supplying them with knowledge. As a result she advises that teacher training programmes in LLS teaching should include procedural knowledge on how to teach LLS. This should enable teachers not only to understand better the problems that new language learners may have, but also to help them tackle them. For this LLS need to be a conscious part of the language process both for teachers and students. This includes not only teaching students a wide range of LS but also guiding them to use those which do not immediately fit in with their language learning style. Only sticking with strategies that comfortably can be accommodated within one's learning style can cause useful strategies to be excluded and this can inhibit learning.

Important also is that teachers direct students towards use of metacognitive strategies such as deciding macro goals (general goals such as wanting to be able to speak with native speakers) and micro goals (smaller goals which are part of the macro goal and which help learners see more clearly what they need to work on, create a process, and can help maintain enthusiasm by resulting in a feeling of achievement when each micro goal is reached). Students must monitor and evaluate themselves as well as use a variety of cognitive strategies for processing, storing, retrieving and using information. They should be helped towards practicing social and affective strategies also. This process may be a long-term gradual one which involves teacher-student co-operation, dialogue and cultivation of learner independence.

Nyikos (1996) points out that the difficulties experienced by both students learning how to use LLS and teachers attempting to teach them in their language classes are similar. For both, a conceptual change in their perception of their roles is required. She stresses that it is essential that teachers have awareness of LLS for "without such awareness, it is impossible for teachers to assist their students overtly in improving their strategy use" (p109). O'Malley and Chamot (1990) also suggest that teachers often do not have the techniques and understanding to train students in LLS. And Rubin (1994) in an opening address to a TESOL colloquium points out that it is "sometimes easier to get learners to use strategies than it is to get teachers to understand how they work" (p2). Awareness of this by teacher trainers would thus also seem very relevant. The more is known about teachers and their use of LLS, as this research attempts to find out, the better LLS courses can be arranged to help teachers guide their students towards LLS and self-directed learning. Realization by trainers that teachers' own LLS may be limited is helpful when planning courses for the teaching of LLS, for if teachers themselves are placed in 'novice' positions during such courses, unfamiliarity with LLS and its concepts may lead to unwillingness, even resistance to LLS.

3.17 Language learning strategy training

As one of the purposes of this study is to know more about the use and teaching of LLS by JTEs in order to design better LLS training courses, some research in this area will be presented. However, first a note about the term

"training".

The expression "learner training" is, as Benson (1995) points out, sometimes criticized for its "lockstep implications" (p3). However, as it is often used in the literature, "training" will be used in this thesis interchangeably with 'development' or 'instruction'. In my view, these three terms are to be understood as 'nurturing' and 'cultivation' of ways for learning that are appropriate and helpful to the individual and can help her/him make optimal use of their learning potential.

Research has been carried out into various areas of LLS training to students. However, a pivotal point is that for LLS instruction to be successful, both teachers as well as their students need to be positively oriented towards the concept of LLS and be willing to engage in them. Therefore, it is worthwhile to first implement an LLS awareness programme before embarking on actual LLS training. This can be helpful in creating a positive attitude towards, and use of, LLS, especially with regard to cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Flaitz and Feyten (1996) found awareness raising in connection with LLS to be effective. Fedderholdt (1998) found that as time progressed and students became more familiar with the hitherto unknown concept of LLS, students were more willing to experiment and use LLS. Thus, opening students' minds to different ways of dealing with language learning can be profitable.

That teachers are interested in LLS is also important. Nowadays there are a number of EFL textbooks which include LLS hints or suggestions incorporated

in the learners' coursebooks. Examples of these are the *Tapestry* series edited by Oxford (1991 onward), The *Atlas* Series by Nunan (1995), and *English Firsthand 1 and 2* (1999) by Helgesen, Brown and Mandeville. Some of these I have used in my classes. However, it is questionable if learners pay attention to these unless their teachers introduce LLS and refer to their benefits as well as guiding students towards using them to such an extent and in such a manner that students can experience beneficial use of them.

Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary and Robbins (1996) instead of presenting teachers with curricula which included LLS to teach, first trained teachers themselves in LLS. In the first phase, they were given an extensive range of definitions of LLS to facilitate understanding of the concepts of strategies, followed by training in how to help students use various strategies both alone and in combination with other strategies. The teachers were also taught how to help learners evaluate the strategies. In the second phase, teachers were given suggestions for modelling as well as for practicing and evaluating strategies to help them make the training of students successful. Teachers responded well to this holistic approach to training in LLS before going on to teach them to their students. Nyikos' (1996) study involved teachers who were to teach LLS in junior, senior and community colleges. In her study, attempts were made to increase teachers' awareness, focus their attention and intent to teach LLS and augment metacognitive control (p109). She too stresses the need for teachers to know about their own strategies in addition to learning how to be able to teach them to students.

With regard to the teaching of LLS to learners, Chamot (1993) investigated LLS training to high school and college students studying Japanese, Russian and Spanish as FLs. Students were taught a variety of cognitive strategies, and findings showed that students responded better to training when the language teacher herself had been involved to a large extent in developing the LLS course she was teaching, rather than teaching one designed by others. This stresses the necessity for teachers to be active in not only in the teaching of LLS but also to be active in the creation of LLS courses.

As with teachers, learners too have been shown to benefit from being familiarized with LLS before actual instruction in them is carried out. Yang (1992) implemented an LLS awareness raising programme in Taiwan via informal learner instruction and group work. She found that group discussions were especially useful in increasing students' LLS awareness and use, especially regarding cognitive and memory strategies. Flaitz and Feyten (1996) also conducted awareness raising with students studying Spanish, with good effect.

As for the teaching of LLS, Robbins and Dadour (1996) examined the effects of LLS training on students in Egypt and Japan. In this study, Dadour found statistically significant gains in oral ability after strategy instruction of Egyptian learners. Robbins (1994) reports on Problem-Solving Process Model LLS instruction among university students in Japan, after which some students claimed their oral skills had been improved. O'Malley et al. (1985) claim that strategy training can be implemented successfully with speaking and listening

tasks and can facilitate learning.

A further issue in the debate concerning how to best guide learners towards LLS use is whether to teach LLS to students as an integrated part of a language lesson or separately for later inclusion in language classes. The rationale for integrating strategy training in foreign language classes is that if LLS are presented in connection with the tasks students are working on solving, then their usefulness is illustrated immediately. Some, however, such as Derry and Murphey (1986), claim that students will acquire LS more profitably if they only have these to concentrate on rather than having to think about language points as well. In both cases, it is argued, students will realize that strategies can be used in connection with a variety of learning situations.

Cohen (1998) recommends that LLS instruction takes place explicitly. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) suggest that LLS training should be direct as well as embedded, so that students are not only clear about which strategies they are being introduced to but also why. This "metacognitive knowledge will facilitate transfer of the strategies to new tasks and will assist students towards autonomous use of the strategies" (p.184). Wenden (1991) suggests that strategy training be informed, include training in self-regulation, be contextualized, interactive and based on a diagnosis of learners' entering ability. Oxford (1990) devotes several chapters of her seminal book to LLS training. McLaughlin (1990) emphasises that in language learning teachers "need to do more than provide 'comprehensible input'" they should also teach language learning strategies .

Derry (1984, in O'Malley and Chamot 1990) suggests an alternative way: the "incidental learning model". In this case, learners have separate LS sessions followed by content classes in which to make use of the strategies to which they have been introduced.

As with everything, there are detractors. Regarding training in LLS, McDonough (1995) contends that "it is not clear that what differentiates good and poor learners is choice of strategy; it may simply be the range and amount of strategies". He also adds that if a strategy "works", it cannot be known if the strategy would be successful in different individuals with different cultural backgrounds, problems and proficiency levels. On the bases of these uncertainties, he questions whether the "risk involved time-wise is worthwhile, when the pay-off is not secure" (p81). This seems to be an unhelpful attitude. It is not a question of whether one set of strategies for one particular task suits each learner. Instead a wide repertoire should be made available to learners and advice given so that they are able to select suitable ones for them and the tasks they are dealing with at particular moments. Opportunities for increasing self-evaluation and self-monitoring capabilities so students can check whether they are effective or not should also be made available.

This chapter has attempted to give an overview of various issues connected to LLS in order to lay the foundation for the present study. The chapter began by giving a brief overview of the evolution from the concept of teachers being able to produce efficient TL speakers by using the 'correct' methodology to the

realization that learners may learn more profitably, if they know about LLS and how to use them appropriately. The chapter then continued by presenting different definitions of what LLS are considered to be, including my own interpretation of what LLS are. The discussion of the framework for LLS by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) followed, in order to provide a theoretical foundation for this study. The relevance of LLS in helping learners become self-directed or, ideally, autonomus learners was emphasized in order to place LLS in a wider, more encompassing perspective. As there are a number of categories into which LLS can be divided, these were presented and discussed. Strategies which are often not considered as being LLS such as communication and compensation strategies were also dealt with so as to increase understanding of LLS. After this there was a review of research into LLS and non-Japanese, followed by emphasis on LLS and Japanese learners of English. Finally, as the findings of this study should provide better LLS training for JTE's, some issues regarding the training of teachers to teach LLS were examined. Having endeavoured to provide a comprehensive introduction to LLS, the next chapter, Chapter 4, will present the research design for this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As indicated in section 1.3. this research was carried out using two research instruments: a questionnaire survey to collect quantitative data and unstructured interviews to gather data that was analysed so as to provide qualitative data. This chapter will first present the design of the quantitative study. It will remind the reader of the research questions presented in 1.2. Then it will look at the questionnaire survey as research instrument and discuss Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (1990), known as the "SILL". After this, the methodology of the various stages involved in preparing and adapting the SILL for this study will be explained. This will be followed by descriptions of the steps involved in sending out and retrieving the questionnaire. In the final part of the chapter, the design and methodology of the second research instrument, unstructured interviews with a number of JTEs will be explained.

4.1 Research questions

First of all, the quantitative data was examined to determine the overall relationship regarding frequency between the LLS JTEs use themselves and those they teach students (RQ1). I was interested in knowing about this, although it may seem a very simple question, because the answers would give a useful general indication as to whether JTEs a) consider LLS more relevant

for their own EFL learning compared to that of their students, equally important, or less so or b) find them easier to use themselves than teach them. This is a useful point of departure for further explorations into LLS use and teaching, and helpful information when creating LLS training courses for both teachers and learners. Whatever the results of the first research question, my previous experiences with JTEs made me think that teachers would use different categories of LLS in their efforts to learn EFL from those they teach students, as a reflection of their different reasons for learning English. Teachers often express a desire to speak and comprehend English better, while their students want to learn grammar and vocabulary to pass the all-important university entrance examinations. Therefore, the second research question examines the order of the LLS categories which teachers use themselves compared with those they teach students.

Gender differences in connection with the use and teaching of LLS are also examined, as well as the use and teaching of LLS by JTEs according to number of years teaching and subject major. Of special interest was whether younger teachers would use/teach different strategies from teachers with more teaching experience, because, until the beginning of the 1990's, students had virtually no opportunities for speaking or listening comprehension as these were not taught. This in turn meant that JTEs were quite unpractised in these skills after becoming teachers, even less than they are today. RQ3 is concerned with these variables.

Finally, it is important for teacher training to know which LLS are used and

taught more than others. Therefore, the final two questions supplement RQ2 and focus on the rank order within the various strategy categories. In both cases the use and teaching of the LLS in each category are considered in relation to the Japanese EFL context and their relevance within it is discussed. Consequently, the research questions are as follows:

1. What is the overall relationship regarding frequency between the LLS JTEs report using themselves, and those they report teaching students?

2. What is the rank order of the LLS categories which JTEs report using themselves and those they report teaching? Are there any differences in the order of strategy categories reported used and taught? Are there any significant differences between paired categories?

3. Are there any variations in the LLS reported used by JTEs and those they report teaching students according to major, gender or number of years teaching EFL?

4. Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS which JTEs report using themselves and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

5. Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS which

JTEs report teaching students, and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

4.2 The survey questionnaire as research instrument

In order to obtain information from a large number of JTEs effectively and economically about teachers' own use of LLS and those which they teach their students, a mailed survey questionnaire was the first instrument used in this research. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the questionnaire utilized was the SILL. This asks the respondents to reply according to fixed scales and can, therefore, be placed within the quantitative, positivist, normative paradigm of research methodology which results in objective and deductive quantitative data. This kind of survey is not only helpful for obtaining information from a large number of respondents, but can also help put order on otherwise confusing amounts of facts. Although some such as Popper (1974, in Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989) opine that surveys cannot be accorded scientific status or considered "real research" as the results are not testable and falsifiable, this ignores the fact that the results of statistical analysis can generate hypotheses for later examination as well as for collecting data for descriptive purposes.

The findings of the SILL survey questionnaire were examined within the context of the Japanese system of EFL. Thus the SILL in this study functions as an "analytical relational type of survey" which through the yielded results

attempts to explain "why and what goes with what" (Oppenheim 1992, p23). However, Borg and Gall (1989), amongst others, point out that even if surveys may help identify possible cause and effect, only carefully controlled experiments can decide whether relationships between variables are causal. Despite this, both the descriptive and analytical functions of the survey in this study provided useful information in connection with the research questions as the SILL is designed to yield information concerning the degree of use of LLS. The SILL will be described more fully in Section 4.3 which follows.

4.3 The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

In the following discussion, Oxford's (1990) SILL , which was referred to briefly in 1.3. and 4.2., will be explained in more detail.

The SILL was developed from an earlier 121-item version (Oxford, 1986) as a tool to evaluate the progress of learners at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California and Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria, Virginia (Oxford 1990). Two versions of the SILL were produced. Both are highly structured survey instruments. The SILL 7.0 (50 items) is for non-native speakers (NNS), while the SILL 5.1. (80 items) is for English speakers learning a FL. However, the SILL 5.1. is also used for speakers of other languages learning English (Mochizuki, 1991). Both have been used by researchers in many parts of the world as well as being used by learners themselves to check their LLS use. The items which appear in the SILL are based on Oxford's own strategy systems as well as those by O'Malley, Chamot

and Rubin. Responses are according to a Likert scale from 1 to 5, the values of which can be seen below:

1 =never or almost never true of me

2 = generally not true of me

3 = somewhat true of me

4 = generally true of me

5 = always true of me.

4.4 Adapting the SILL

Step 1: Interviews to assess suitability of the SILL

One of the first practical steps in this research was to assess whether the SILL would be useful in the context of Japanese EFL high school teachers. Therefore 12 JTEs were interviewed at 8 senior high schools (SHS) in Toyama prefecture[5]. The visits had been organized through the Dean of the Education Department at the university where I teach. The interviews took place at the various SHS and each interview lasted 45-60 minutes.

With the permission of the interviewees, and under guarantees of complete confidentiality, the interviews were taped. The interviews were conducted in English and the style was informal. First, in order to create a relaxed atmosphere, the teachers were asked to simply talk in general about their EFL classes and issues in connection with teaching EFL in Japan. Invariably, this would, at some point or other, lead to problems teachers felt they had with their own and their students' English. This created opportunities to ask how

[5] Japan is divided into 9 political regions, which are divided into 47 smaller divisions: 4 comprise Tokyo,Hokkaido, Osaka and Kyoto. The remaining 43 are called "ken" which is translated into English as "prefecture" (Strauss, Taylor and Wheeler, 1991).

they dealt with improving their English, and how they helped their students do so. Direct questions about LLS were not asked as they might be not be familiar with the terminology. However, a variety of SILL items were turned into questions, and the teachers asked, for example, "Do you practice the sounds of English?", "If you don't know the meaning of a word, what do you do?" . Or, "Do you teach your students to imitate the way native speakers talk?" , "Do you teach your students to put new words in sentences, so they can remember them?"

I also wanted to explore whether the SILL needed to be made more up to date by asking them whether they used the Internet as a LLS tool to improve their English. The Internet is a useful facility for improving reading, as countless texts in English both for NS and NNS are readily on hand. Also there are several reference sites for learners of English where teachers and learners can find answers to various language problems. In addition, the Internet can be used for practicing writing skills through key-pal contacts (Fedderholdt 2000), or oral communication via voice-mail. Students too can be encouraged to use these opportunities for LL, and therefore I added questions concerning these points to the preliminary version of the SILL I was adapting.

Further, it was necessary to attempt to assess whether there were any cultural, social or educational issues which needed to be taken into consideration. Some teachers voiced concerns about the changes which they had heard may take place in connection with English at high schools in the future. These changes would make effective more of the Ministry of Education's (1989) guidelines,

which suggested that students should be taught how to be able to communicate in English.. A further change is thought to be brought about in 2006 when it is recommended that the Center Test for university should include a listening component. Although this date is tentative and it has already been changed once from 2002, this will necessitate, at some point, that teachers themselves will have to improve their own listening skills in English.

Each interview was listened to twice and salient points in connection with whether the SILL would be a suitable instrument for the purposes of this research were noted. After close examination of these, I decided that it was, and prepared an adapted version to pilot. This will be described in Step 2.

Step 2: Preparing the piloted version of the adapted SILL

Section 1 Biodata

Using the information from the interviews described above in *Step 1*, I set about preparing an adapted version of the SILL. This adapted version, which was to be piloted, consisted of 3 sections. The first asked teachers questions about their age, number of years teaching EFL, gender and which subject they had majored in at university. Also they were asked for their names and addresses, so that I could contact them again, if they did not respond to the questionnaire. This did not affect the confidentiality and anonymity that was promised them at the beginning of the SILL and in the pre-questionnaire letter which they received some days before the actual questionnaire. I guaranteed

them that their names would only be known to *me,* no one but I would see their questionnaires, and their names would not be mentioned in any connection, at any point. However, I was aware how difficult it is to ensure a good response rate, so I wanted to be able to have the possibility to gather as many questionnaires as possible through repeated attempts, if necessary.

Section 2 JTEs own use of LLS

The purpose of the second section was to find out which LLS JTEs use to improve their own English. During the pre-survey interviews, most of the teachers clearly indicated that they used LLS more themselves than they taught them. I therefore decided to base this section on the longer version of the SILL, the SILL 5.1, in order to get a more comprehensive picture of the LLS they used. However, some changes were made to make it more culturally appropriate, more up to date and more specific for JTEs.

For example, an item changed to fit in with the cultural context was in connection with the fact that all English films in Japan are subtitled in Japanese. This can make attempts at listening problematic as it is very difficult to avoid reading the subtitles. This resulted in the SILL item:

- I watch tv programmes or movies in English

being supplemented with the following item:

- I watch tv progammes or movies in English with the subtitles covered

up.

However, I also wanted to retain the original item (I watch tv programmes or films) as I wanted to see which of these two strategies they used most. The former simply is a macro LLS which may or may not involve listening to English to varying degrees (the viewers can read the Japanese subtitles) while, in the latter, the viewer needs to focus on actual listening of English.

Where necessary "Japanese" was added to make the statements clear. Below is the original item:

- I am cautious about transferring words or concepts directly into English.

This was changed to:

- I am cautious about transferring words or concepts directly from Japanese into English.

Three new items were added to include new LLS made possible through the Internet:

- I access the Internet and read about various topics in English
- I write to a key-pal (computer pen-pal) in English.
- I talk in English with others on the Internet

For listening, the following was added:

- I listen to tapes or radio programmes in English.

The category "Affective strategies" was omitted in the section concerned with teachers' own use of LLS, as it was thought that statements such as: "I make encouraging statements to myself, so that I will continue to try hard and do my best in language learning" and "I talk to someone I trust about my attitudes and feelings concerning the language process" might seem offensive to EFL teachers. I thought it might be so because it seems to imply that they have difficulties with their English which might antagonize them so that they would not reply to the questionnaire. It is common knowledge that JTEs do have problems, but I did not want to be the one to bring this up and possibly cause them to loose face. I felt it should come from them. Also statements such as "I arrange my schedule to study and practice English consistently, not just when there is pressure of a test" were also excluded as they seem inappropriate as teachers do not have to sit further tests in EFL.

The remaining five of the categories were retained: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social LLS.

Section 3 LLS which JTEs teach

The third and final part of the questionnaire was to find out which LLS JTEs guide their students towards using. As the teachers had seemed unfamiliar- during the pre-survey interviews with the concept of teaching students LLS

and did not seem to do it much, I thought it would be sufficient to adapt the shorter SILL 7.0. This would also have the advantage of keeping the questionnaire as short as possible. As it was to consist of two parts, it was going to be quite lengthy, and I was worried about the length putting teachers off answering it.

The items in this section were also changed to include the word "Japanese" .

All items were also changed to include " I teach my students to....", as in the following example:

- I teach my students to review their English often.

The affective category was included in the section looking at which LLS teachers teach their students. Japanese students have a reputation for being shy and nervous of using English and several teachers referred to this in the pre-piloting interviews. Therefore it seemed relevant to include this category to see how teachers' help students overcome affective problems.

The adapted SILL was sent out to 20 JTEs to pilot it. These were different from the JTE's in the preliminary interviews. Again the Dean of the Education Department at Toyama University was helpful in establishing contacts for me. After all the questionnaires were returned by the 20 JTEs who piloted them, they were checked for problems with the statements. There was only one main one, which concernined the statement about the use of voice-mail which some

of the teachers did not understand. I discussed this with the teachers concerned and although they then understood, they said that this facility was not available for them or students. This item was therefore eliminated from the final version mailed to the subjects. Consequently, the SILL was not changed much in its core structure. A copy of the final version of the adapted SILL is in Appendix 3. However, by the end of the study, I realised there are a number of limitations of the SILL which became apparent the more I worked with it throughout this research. In the final chapter, I discuss what I consider to be some of the potential limitations of the SILL. It is unfortunate however, I feel, that there are any limitations, as Professor Oxford was very encouraging and positive in her comments about my adaptions and research topic. In an email communication she had written to me: "I think these adaptations are wonderful. I do want to see the results as soon as you have them.I would like to consider doing a similar study over here. What do you think?" (Appendix 1)[7]

4.5 Reliability and validity of adapted SILL

To estimate the internal-consistency reliability of the adapted SILL, Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated with each strategy category used as an item. Reliability of the adapted SILL regarding teachers' reported use of LLS was .79, while reliability regarding the LLS which teachers report teaching students was .87, with exclusion of the affective strategy category. These results show that the adapted SILL in the present study was highly reliable.

[7] In this thesis the appendices are numbered and presented in the order they were used in the research.

In this research, content validity was based on considered selection of items based on research on learning strategies. Content validity was checked by two university teachers of EFL in Japan. These agreed on the content validity of the revised questionnaire. They both agreed that the statements would all be understood as being statements concerning language learning strategies, methods or techniques for solving various problems connected with the learning of EFL.

4.6 Carrying out the questionnaire survey

This section will describe in detail the respondents and processes involved in connection with sending out the questionnaire and the efforts made to increase response rates.

The subjects

The entire sample of JTEs (302) at all prefectural SHS (47) were sent the questionnaire. There are different types of SHS in Japan. Some are run by the prefecture, some are private. The prefectural SHS were chosen as all teachers at these have to pass the same prefectural examination to get a teachers` "license" as they are called in English in Japan. This license is not necessary for teachers at private SHS. In addition, JTEs at prefectural SHS will in most cases have graduated from national universities. These are run by the government as opposed to the more numerous private ones, and are more uniform regarding educational standards. Therefore, the subjects at prefectural SHS would basically have the same educational background.

I was fortunate in that the Dean of the department, could supply me with a list of all the names of all the JTEs at SHS in the prefecture, as well as their school and home addresses, so that I could send them the questionnaires.

Data collection procedures

Browne and Wada (1999) had a 19% return of their questionnaire from JTEs in their study. I hoped to get a higher return rate. Consequently, several steps were involving pre- and post-survey mailing to ensure as many replies as possible. These will be detailed in the following:

First, pre-survey letters were sent in advance as these can help increase return rates (Oppenheim, 1992). These informed the subjects that they would receive a questionnaire about language learning strategies the following Friday. Included in this letter was an explanation of LLS (See Appendix 2).
As promised, the JTEs received the survey on the Friday before one of the two monthly full weekends that the teachers have off. This, in theory, would give them more time to answer the adapted SILL than on a regular weekday. However, the fact is that many of them spend Saturday and/or Sunday participating in various activities with students. Included with the questionnaire was another copy of what LLS are, and a stamped addressed envelope to facilitate return.

Despite this, only 24% of the questionnaires were returned. This was

disappointing, and the long process of attempting to increase the response rate began.

Post-survey contact

First the returned questionnaires were checked according to the published list of teachers. This was unproblematic as all had written their names in the actual questionnaire and the vast majority had also supplied their names and addresses on the back of the envelopes. In addition, I had written a number on the back of each questionnaire corresponding to each name on the list of teachers' names from the handbook. It is necessary to stress that the purpose of this was not secretly to monitor the names of those who replied as this knowledge was irrelevant, but for the following reasons:

1. The number on the back of the questionnaire made it simple and quick to see who had responded. This information was necessary in order to send reminders to those who had not responded.
2. The procedure was that the number on the questionnaires was checked with the list of JTEs names/addresses. If two numbers corresponded, no attention whatever was paid to who the respondent was whether or not their name was on the questionnaire. Only if there was a number on the list without questionnaire with a matching number was it noted who this was and a reminder sent to them, asking them to return the questionnaire (See Appendix 4) within 7 days.

The promise written on the questionnaires guaranteeing confidentiality, that

no one's name would be revealed at any point before, during or after the study and that no one but I would see the questionnaires, has been fulfilled totally at all stages of this research.

The result of sending reminders was that a further 17% of the surveys were returned. However, this was still less than hoped for, so more efforts were made. It has been suggested that it can sometimes be helpful to ring potential respondents to encourage them to return the questionnaire. Therefore I began doing this. It was very time consuming, but of more concern was the fact that telephoning felt intrusive. Consequently, I did not continue ringing all those I had planned to. Nevertheless, as a result of the calls carried out, a further 9% of the questionnaires were obtained. As a last attempt, another copy of the questionnaire was sent out with a short letter (See appendix 5) and another stamped addressed envelope. Finally, three months after the pre-survey letter had been posted, 62% of the questionnaires had been returned.

In order to provide a more balanced view and fulfil the requirements of triangulation in research, the questionnaires were supplemented by unstructured interviews.

4.7. The necessity of triangulation

As Denzin and Lincoln (1994) claim, there is a gradual coming together between quantitative, hypo-deductive, objective research methodologies and qualitative, subjective, interpretative ones so that the necessity for

triangulation is nowadays mostly taken to be a prerequisite for valid research results. Denzin (1990) refers to the work of Fiske (1959) and argues for the need for multiple research strategies, or triangulation, and claims that more than one method of investigation is necessary to provide a fuller, valid explanation of the complexity of human behaviour. This requirement is echoed by many. Jick (1983) stresses that whichever methods are used, the point is to improve validity and thus: "In all the various triangulations one basic assumption is buried. The effectiveness of triangulation rests on one premise that the weakness in each method will be compensated by the counter-balancing strengths of another" (p138) and that although "each method has its assets and liabilities, triangulation purports to exploit the assets and neutralize, rather than compound, the liabilities" (ibid.p138).

The results from two instruments will often differ to some degree. Miles and Huberman (1994) point out that "in the disorderly world of empirical research (....) independent measures will never converge" (p267). However, this need not be a disadvantage, for, as Robson (1993) claims: "Both correspondences and discrepancies are of value" (p383). Jick (1983) is of the same opinion and notes that differences constitute a useful challenge: "When different measures yield dissimilar results, they demand that the researcher reconciles the differences somehow" (p142) and that this "divergence can often turn out to be an opportunity for enriching the explanation" (ibid.p143). In this research, there were some areas where the data from one instrument contradicted data from the other research instrument, but this did not necessarily invalidate the findings. Instead, it pinpointed areas which needed further explanations, if the

reasons for the divergences could not be explained.

4.8 "Objectivity" and "subjectivity"

Another issue which needs to be discussed in connection with quantitative and qualitative research methods is "objectivity" and "subjectivity". They are often placed in juxtaposition to one another and carry with them connotations that objectivity, which is considered the hallmark of quantitative research, is somehow nearer "truth" or "reality" than something that is subjectively based and derived from methodology inspired by research in the natural sciences. However, Popper (in Phillips, 1990) comments that it is naïve to think "objective" means "reality in its raw unadulterated form" (p.20). He adds that "neither subjectivity or objectivity has an exclusive stranglehold on truth" (ibid.p24). However, by examining an issue from different angles by using research instruments which yield objective data a from a survey like the SILL and comparing this with data from unstructured interviews which allow for respondents to bring up matters which are not included in the SILL, a more all round picture may be formed.

"Reality" and "truth" are themselves fraught with difficulties. Any attempts at presenting them, even through the most stringent of research methods, can only capture part of their essence, and only apply to a limited, transient point in time. Nowadays, there is a realization that there is not an absolute truth somewhere, but that we can only reach approximations. However, that we may only be able to reach an incomplete picture of reality and truth does not render

research futile. Rather it means that researchers must work even more intensely to find answers to various questions. To achieve this, the researcher must be alert to discovering and eradicating errors that distort truth (Popper in Phillips, 1990:21). It is essential that research takes place responsibly. Methodologies and data must be rendered open to scrutiny so they can be evaluated, revised, any errors found and be taken into account. I have worked to fulfil this requirement in this research regarding both the quantitative and qualitative investigations. This in turn allows not only me to discover my own errors, but also enables others to do so. In the following sections, the work involved in connection with the interview data will be explained in detail so it too can be made open to scrutiny.

4.9 The design and methodology of the qualitative study

As mentioned, in this study, the function of the interviews was to provide more insights to add to the findings of the mailed questionnaire. As the survey responses were answered according to Likert scales, they needed to be supplemented by face-to-face meetings in which researcher and respondents could talk. Talk is the way through which most of our fact-finding takes place in life. This has been exploited especially, in interviews at the unstructured end of the continuum. However, when talk is used as a research tool in a research methodology, there will be limitations, especially if there is a perceived imbalance of power, which there is likely to be in interviews when there is a difference in language, status, age, gender and race, for example. However, the imbalance need not necessarily be tipped in favour of the interviewer. As

pointed out by Nakane (1986), Japan is characterised by "in-groups" and those who are not members of the "in" group. As a foreigner, interviewing as I did at JTEs schools in their common rooms, I would have been seen as an "outsider".

In the sub-sections below, the subjects, interview procedure and data analysis methodology are discussed.

4.10. The subjects

The subjects were taken from the JTEs who had been sent the adapted SILL. That is: Japanese teachers of EFL at senior high schools in Toyama prefecture. Again it was the Dean of the Education Department who contacted some JTEs, who in turn introduced me to other teachers. I had not interviewed these teachers previously. 19 of the 24 interviewed had returned the SILL questionnaires.

There were 24 interviewees. 12 were female, 12 male. 20 had degrees from the national university in the prefecture where I work, and the remainder outside it, but in Japan. As in the case of the respondents in the questionnaire survey, most had BAs in Education or were "English" or "American" majors. These are the terms used in Japan. Those who studied American English have focused on the US, while the former have studied issues related to Britain. One had a degree in Sanskrit and one in German. That is to say that none had degrees in TEFL. There were no MAs. At the prefectural national university which the majority had attended, education and English/American majors had the same

shared "written communication in English" classes and the same number - though not shared - of "oral communication" classes. None of the interviewees had been students in my classes in which LLS guidance is prevalent.

4.11. Interview procedure

The unstructured interviews lasted not less than one hour each and were held in English at the teachers' schools. As Cohen and Manion (1996) note, "unstructured" does not mean that this kind of interview is a "casual affair" (p273) compared with structured or semi-structured interviews. The overarching purpose was to find out about LLS use/teaching by JTEs and issues related thereto at SHS. Information regarding LLS was obtained through questions on the learning and teaching of EFL. The questions developed through interaction between the interviewee and interviewer. With the exception of one case, all interviews were on a one-to-one basis. The exception was once when two teachers wished to be interviewed together. These two were given numbers 8 and 9 respectively.

With the interviewees' permission, all the interviews were taped and informed consent was obtained so that - under conditions of anonymity - the data could be used in research which might be made public.

The basic principle that created the basis for the interviews was, as Mischler (1986) advocates, one that was intended to give equal power to both interviewee and interviewer in partnership. However, unfortunately, theory and

practice do not always align, and scrutiny of the transcribed data reveals that this ideal was not completely realized at all times. On some occasions, the interviewer lapsed into a more interrogative role, changing topic, and pursuing her own line of thought. Nevertheless, despite this, the interviews were relaxed and in the main, interviewees could explain and elaborate the topic upon which they had embarked to the extent to which they desired.

4.12. Data analysis methodology

The approach to the analysis of the data was an *interpretative* approach as defined by Erickson (1986). This is an umbrella term to include participant observational studies, ethnography, phenomenological, constructivist and case studies. However, a main feature is that it avoids the quantitative/qualitative schism which is not always viable as qualitative data can be quantified. Most importantly, the term is intended to mean approaches which revolve around "a central research interest in human meaning in social life and its elucidation and exposition by the researcher" (Erickson 1986, p.78). Thus a prominent task is to link the way individuals deal with their reality in face of the "local" and "non-local" (ibid.p.105) context in which events take place. Findings are not the basis of "mechanistic causal linkages between the outside realities and the realities of social relations face to face" (ibid. p106). In the case of this research, this meant linking themes connected to the LLS which teachers use and teach to other aspects of their past and present experiences of English as students and later teachers through embedding these in the wider educational and social context of Japan.

The tapes were transcribed in their entirety. (As the transcripts amount to almost 200 pages, they have not been included. However, they can be seen upon demand). Each transcript was read several times and various themes isolated. Then transcripts were read again for confirming evidence that matched the already found themes. Some themes were discarded if there was not enough "evidence" to support them, or if they on closer reflection seemed too peripheral to the central issues. This sifting and sorting was repeated many times until a core group of topics with several examples of teachers' comments to support them remained. Care was also taken to search for disconfirming evidence, as Erickson (1986) recommends, in order to create a balanced picture.

4.13. Summary

This chapter first discussed the research design and methodology involved in order to obtain the quantitative data for this research. The research questions were re-introduced, and it was indicated why it would be helpful to obtain data in order to cast light on these via a survey questionnaire. There was special focus on Oxford`s (1990) SILL and how it was adapted for this study. Then, the methodology was described in detail. Finally it was noted that 62% of the sample returned the questionnaires. An overview of triangulation was given to explain the necessity of using two different research instruments. Next the design and methodology of the unstructured interviews carried out to supplement the quantitative findings was presented. In the following Chapter 5

and Chapter 6, the analyses of the data resulting from both instruments will be presented.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

This chapter examines the data from the survey questionnaire. Statistical analysis was performed in order to yield information concerning the research questions listed in 1.2. and 4.1. First, the differences and similarities between JTEs' use and teaching of the various LLS will be presented and then the correlations between various variables. Then many of the individual LLS reported used and taught by JTE's will be examined according to their rank order within the various LLS categories and discussed with reference to a Japanese context.

5.1. Differences and similarities between JTEs' reported use and teaching of LLS

In this section, differences and similarities between reported usage and teaching of LLS according to the various categories, and correlations between variables such as gender, years of teaching experience and major will be examined.

5.1.Research Question 1: *What is the overall relationship regarding frequency between the LLS JTEs report using themselves, and those they report teaching their students?*

To first obtain a general overview, a basic point of departure was to discover to what extent teachers use LLS compared to the extent they teach them to students.

Table 5.1.1 JTEs reported use/teaching of LLS and variations in strategy category preference between JTEs' own reported use and teaching of LLS

Strategy categories	N	LLS JTEs use			LLS JTEs teach			t- value
		M	SD	n	M	SD	n	
Memory	170	2.63	0.54	13	2.81	0.54	9	-4.36***
Cognitive	170	3.12	0.47	25	3.11	0.58	12	.28
Compensation	169	3.61	0.49	8	3.15	0.72	4	8.38***
Metacognitive	170	3.14	0.60	11	2.76	0.71	10	7.33***
Social	170	2.70	0.65	10	3.07	0.68	7	-7.72***
Total	170	3.01	0.40	67	2.96	0.54	42	1.72

Note: ***:p<.001, **p.<.01

N: Number of subjects

n: Number of strategy items in questionnaire

As can be seen in Table 5.1. above, the findings showed that, overall, teachers reported using LLS only slightly more themselves (mean =3.01) than they reported teaching to students (mean = 2.96), but the difference did not reach significance. Their use and teaching of LLS was "medium" in that the approximate mean for each LLS was around 3 (the Likert scale was from 1 to 5). A point to remember, however, is that a mean can neutralize possible significant differences between individuals and groups of individuals.

That teachers tend to use LLS rather more than teaching them might be attributed to the fact that many JTEs feel their EFL skills are poor, and therefore they urgently need to augment them after graduating from university and

becoming teachers, especially in connection with oral/aural skills. In contrast, they may consider it necessary to limit the LLS they teach to those areas which their pupils need for passing the university entrance examinations. These include reading, vocabulary and grammar. Very rarely is there a listening test to take, and never speaking test. As there are fewer skills which they concentrate on, this might be the reason why they report teaching LLS slightly less than using them.

Research Question 2: *What is the rank order of the LLS categories which JTEs report using themselves and those they report teaching? Are there any differences in the order of strategy categories reported used and taught? Are there any significant differences between paired categories?*

Table 5.1.2 Order of LLS category preferences which JTEs report using and teaching

Teachers' own use of LLS	Compensation strategies Mean 3.61	meta-cognitive strategies Mean 3.14	cognitive strategies Mean 3.12	social strategies Mean 2.70	memory strategies Mean 2.63
Teachers' teaching of LLS	Compensation strategies Mean 3.15	cognitive strategies Mean 3.11	social strategies Mean 3.07	memory strategies Mean 2.81	meta-cognitive strategies Mean 2.76

In Table 5.1.2. above, the rank order of the strategy categories which JTEs report using and teaching are contrasted. The table shows there are

differences in the order of the LLS categories which JTEs prefer using compared to the those they teach. The order of teachers' preferences for LLS use were: compensation strategies (mean = 3.61), metacognitive strategies (mean = 3.14), cognitive strategies (mean 3.12), social strategies (mean = 2.70) and memory strategies (mean = 2.63).

With respect to LLS they teach their students, the order of preference was compensation strategies (mean = 3.15), cognitive strategies (mean = 3.11), social strategies (mean = 3.07), memory strategies (mean = 2.81), and metacognitive strategies (mean = 2.76).

In Table 5.1.1., the results of t-tests for each paired strategy use show that there were significant differences in mean scores on four out of five strategy categories. JTEs tend to use two learning categories more than they teach them. These are compensation strategies (mean 3.61 for JTEs own use and 3.15 for those they teach students) and metacognitive strategies (mean 3.14 for JTEs own use and 2.76 for those they teach students). However, reverse patterns were shown with regard to social strategies and memory strategies. JTEs teach social strategies more (mean 3.07) than they use them themselves (mean 2.70). They also teach memory strategies more (mean 2.81) than they use them themselves (mean 2.63).

The results indicate that compensation strategies are the most preferred LLS used by teachers both when learning English themselves (mean 3.61) and when teaching LLS to students (mean 3.15). In contrast, memory strategies ranked

5th as used by teachers (mean 2.63), and 4th as taught to students (mean 2.81). Regarding students especially, this is somewhat surprising in a Japanese context where success in school and examinations involves the accumulation of facts for which memorization is essential. That compensation strategies are taught most is also unexpected in that there are very few opportunities for speaking or listening practice, which are the main areas for use of compensation strategies, in SHS.

There are further differences regarding metacognitive, cognitive and social strategies. Out of the five categories shared, teachers report using metacognitive strategies as the second preferred strategy group, while these rank fifth regarding strategies reported taught to students. Cognitive strategies are the third most used category used by teachers. In contrast, cognitive LLS are the second most taught strategies. There is also a difference can be seen regarding social strategies. The data shows that these are the fourth most used group, while it is the third most taught.

That teachers report using compensation strategies most is understandable because they are less confined by the restraints which apply to students. The latter need to have accurate knowledge of grammar and translation skills in order to pass the many tests they continually have throughout SHS in order to prepare them for the university entrance examinations and therefore usually drop oral communication classes. Consequently, it is surprising that JTE's also report teaching them most frequently. Teachers however can, for example, afford to be more experimental in their own approach to EFL learning as they

are not facing constant examinations upon which their futures depend. Therefore, they can allow themselves to guess or approximate meaning when using English. There is less risk involved for them, if they, for instance, attempt to create neologisms or transfer words from Japanese to English. They can avoid grammatical difficulties or awkward subjects which they cannot handle by circumlocution or avoidance as well as use other compensation strategies which are often denied students due to the nature of the tasks they are set and the confines within which they learn English.

Regarding metacognitive strategies, which JTEs report using more than teaching, this may be explained by the fact that they are not limited regarding their goals for EFL in the way that their pupils are. There is little genuine freedom of choice in the high school system in Japan, if students wish to continue their education at universities. Although they are offered conversation classes in their second and third year of SHS, few students avail themselves of this opportunity, as it is seen as risky in that it allows them less time for the study of what really matters: grammar and vocabulary. In contrast, teachers can choose to focus on the skills of their choice to the extent they wish.

Social strategies were shown to be taught to students significantly more (mean 3.07) than used by teachers (mean 2.70), as were memory strategies (mean 2.81 and 2.63 respectively). However, even though JTEs teach memory strategies more than they use them themselves, they nevertheless only rank 4th out of the various categories. This is rather surprising in an educational system which relies very heavily on memory skills. Surprizing too it is that

teachers report teaching social strategies more than they use them themselves. Many pupils do not have conversation classes in their final years of SHS. Further, although JTEs may have little contact with ALTs if there is not one permanently at their school, it would seem that they have more opportunities for contact with them than their pupils. JTEs are supposed to cooperate with the assistant language teachers (ALTs) in lesson preparation and as team teachers in connection with the classes for all students. Through these meetings there are likely be to opportunities for compensation strategy use. By contrast, their students often only have one lesson a week of oral communication and maybe only in their first year at SHS. Further, there are few opportunities outside school for the vast majority of students in Toyama prefecture to meet English speaking foreigners. Even at university level, most of the students have not had and do not have contact with speakers of English, and only a tiny percentage of them have ever been overseas.

JTEs, of course, are aware of the fact that their pupils have few opportunities either authentic or otherwise to use social strategies. It can therefore be asked why these are reported taught more than teachers use them themselves. One reason may be that they are thinking of future situations students might find themselves in. Another reason may simply be that social strategies seem logical ways of improving a TL, despite the fact that students do not actually have opportunities to effectuate them.

Research Question 3: Are there any variations in the LLS reported used by JTEs and those they report teaching students according to major, gender and

number of years teaching EFL?

Variations according to major

There were no variations according to major. Most of the JTEs were English and American and Education majors. There were 3 who had French as their major, 2 who had German, and a JTE who is also a Buddhist priest had graduated from university in Sanskrit. There were no TEFL majors. That there was no difference of LLS use and teaching despite major is not surprising as those who were English, American and Education majors would often have shared many of the same courses if they were planning to become EFL teachers. That is, Education department students come to the Faculty of Humanities lectures and English and American majors go to lectures in the Education department if their career objectives are the same. The situation in Japan is that most of the students who graduate from the Education Department do not want to become teachers at all, but the education department is often the easiest one to get into.

Variations according to gender

Table 5.1.3 Variation by gender

Strategy categories	Female		Male		
	(n=84)		(n=85)		t-value
	M	SD	M	SD	
Compensation strategies used by JTEs	3.70	0.44	3.52	0.54	2.41*
Social strategies taught by JTEs	3.18	0.62	2.94	0.71	2.32*

Note: * $p<.05$

Regarding variations according to gender, only two strategy categories were shown to have significant differences between which LLS female and male JTES used. Female JTEs used compensation strategies more (mean=3.70) compared with male JTEs (mean=3.52). Compensation strategies often are linked to social strategies and Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Ehrman and Oxford (1989), Oxford (1993) report that females use these more than men. This may reflect that women are said to be more willing to make overt efforts to create meaning and understanding in social interaction than men (Tannen, 1986).

There were no differences in the teaching of compensation strategies by females or males.

However, regarding teaching of strategies, females reported teaching social strategies (mean 3.18) more than men (mean 2.94). This may be linked to the above findings that female JTEs use compensation strategies more than men. Social strategies are closely linked to compensation strategies and this may explain why female JTEs teach them more than their male counterparts.

Variations according to number of years teaching

Table 5.1.4 Correlations between number of years teaching and strategy preference

Years of Experience	Memory LLS taught	metacognitive LLS taught	total
Experience (more than 20 years) (N=61)	.28**	.19**	n.s.
Experience (more than 20 years) (N=61)	.24**	.23**	.16*

Note 1:**: p<.01, *:p<05. Experiences:years of teaching experience

Only with regard to the teaching of memory and metacognitive LLS to students were there any significant correlations between these and number of years teaching. Teachers who have more than 25 years teaching experience tend to teach memory and metacognitve strategies rather than the strategies belonging to the cognitive, social, affective and compensation categories. Teaching of memory strategies could be explained by the fact that until 1989 communicative goals for EFL were almost non-existent. Therefore JTEs who began teaching before this time, would have had little or no need and few opportunities to hone speaking or listening skills. Consequently, they would have little practice in social and affective strategies and would be unlikely to teach them. As for their teaching memory and metacognitive strategies, this could be because they may tend to focus on accuracy regarding vocabulary, grammar and translation due to their past experience. As for cognitive strategies such as summarizing, skimming for the main idea or scanning for key points of interest the same issues would apply. There are few opportunities for these as most teaching takes place at sentence level. As for metacognitive strategies, more experienced teachers may through their years

of teaching have acquired a more holistic view of learning in connection with planning, self-monitoring, self-evaluation. More research needs to be done in this area, to see whether, why and how teachers may change with regard to teaching of LLS as they acquire more experience.

5.2 The LLS which JTEs report using themselves: examination of the rank order of LLS according to category

So far the differences between JTEs' use and teaching of the various LLS categories and correlations between variables have been discussed. However, for the purposes of this study it is also important to look at the individual strategies according to rank order and, in particular, discuss the relevance of their position to Japanese contexts. Therefore in the following section, the data from RQs 4 and 5 will be presented. This shows the rank order of the individual strategies within each category, and a number of the LLS will be examined with reference to the educational contexts in Japan both at governmental level as well as local ones. It is important to link the LLS with context in order to obtain as much benefit as possible from the findings. Not only may understanding be increased, but also new questions which need to be examined may arise.

First, the LLS which JTEs report using themselves to augment their own English will be discussed followed by those they report teaching their students. In both cases the LLS will be discussed according to the rank order of the category preferences.

RQ4. Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS JTEs report using themselves and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

As noted in the discussion of RQ2 above, the order of the various categories teachers report using most to least was: Compensation - metacognitive - cognitive - social - memory strategies. In this section, the LLS within each category will be presented first according to rank order in the various tables.Then the significance of the ranking of individual strategies within a Japanese context will be discussed. The ranking in relation to each strategy is important because whereas it may be appropriate in some contexts to use a particular LLS frequently or less so, in other language contexts it may not be.

5.2.1 Compensation strategy use reported by JTEs

Table 5.2.1 Rank order of compensation strategies reported used by JTEs

Rank no.	Q no	Description of strategy	Mean	SD
1	44	When I cannot think of the correct expression to say or write, I find a different way to express an idea	4.32	.711
2	39	When I do not understand all the words I read or hear, I guess the general meaning	4.27	.869
3	41	In a conversation, I anticipate what the other person is going to say, based on what has been said so far	3.86	.997
4	42	If I am speaking and cannot think of the right expression, I use gestures or switch back to Japanese momentarily	3.67	1.08
5	40	I read without looking up every unfamiliar word	3.55	1.10
6	43	I ask another person to tell me the word, if I cannot think of it in a conversation	3.27	1.09
7	45	I make up new words, if I cannot think of the right ones	2.87	.979
8	46	I direct the conversation to the topics for which I know the words	2.86	1.17

As can be seen in Table 5.2.1, 5 of the 8 LLS in this category are directly linked to speaking.However, the two most used compensation strategies may also be used in written English or reading, as well as in connection with speaking. Although it may well be that JTEs were thinking of their use mainly in connection with oral communication, it could also reflect the fact that English is learnt as a FL here and that in rural areas such as Toyama, there are limited opportunities for speaking English with NNS of Japanese. If it is the case that JTEs use compensation strategies mostly in connection with reading/writing rather than in speaking situations, it could be that JTEs do not consider practicing English with other Japanese a useful way of improving English. This is useful to know when planning training courses in LLS. For teachers to set

aside some time weekly to discuss a topic in English could be a useful supplement to aid JTEs improve their oral/aural skills. A possible reluctance to practice with other Japanese may mean that JTEs feel that there is no benefit to be had by this, or even that they may learn "wrong" English. Nevertheless, it can have a number of benefits. Training courses can help JTEs towards use of various LLS to help them profit by speaking English with colleagues and other Japanese. Even though there may be a risk of hearing incorrect English from one another, there are benefits in that it not only gives practice in speaking English but also makes the speaker realize which situations she can manage, and which ones she needs to find out how to manage. Once this is realized, she can find ways of dealing with these problems so that she can succeed in future, similar situations.

The fact that teachers in the study use compensation strategies most may also reflect the claims by Bialystok and Kellerman (1986) and Bialystok (1990) that compensation strategies transfer automatically from learners' own language to the TL. A further consideration to be taken into account if compensation strategies do transfer to the TL is that it may be a waste of time to teach them. Another issue to bear in mind when preparing training courses are Cohen's (1990, 1998), and McDonough's (1995) claims that compensation strategies on their own do not necessarily lead to learning in that their first function is to solve a temporary communication problem, as was noted in 3.8.3 once this is done, new material may well be forgotten. Therefore, if compensation strategies are to be included in LLS training courses, the focus may need to be on teaching compensation strategies in connection with other LLS.

5.2.2 Metacognitve strategy use reported by JTEs

Metacognitive strategies are reported by JTEs as being the second most used LLS. This in contrast to their being the second least taught strategies to students.

Table 5.2.2 Rank order of metacognitive strategies reported used by JTEs

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	48	When someone is speaking in English, I try to concentrate on what the person is saying and put unrelated topics out of my mind	3.80	.840
2	54	I learn from my mistakes in English	3.70	.890
3	47	I preview a text to get a general idea of what it is about, how it is organized, and how it relates to what I already know	3.40	1.09
4	51	I identify the purpose of a language activity for instance in a listening task, whether to listen for the general idea, or for specific facts	3.23	.941
5	53	I try to notice my language errors and find the reasons for them	3.22	1.07
6	52	I take responsibility for finding opportunities to practice English	3.17	.995
7	55	If I am not so good at aspects of English, I evaluate the progress I have made in this area	3.04	.926
8	49	I decide in advance to pay special attention to specific language aspects: for example, I focus on the way native speakers pronounce certain sounds	2.96	.965
9	50	I plan my goals for how proficient I want to be	2.85	1.19
10	57	I find out to be a good language learner by reading books and articles or talking about how to learn	2.68	1.05
11	56	I plan a time-schedule for learning English	2.56	1

In the case of metacognitive strategies, it is difficult to explain why the various strategies are chosen more than others, or whether some are more valuable

than others in a Japanese context. However, there may be some factors which might help to explain why some are used more than others. For example, in the case of the most used metacognitive strategy: "When someone is speaking English, I try to concentrate on what the person is saying and put other things out of my mind" a possibility could be that this is necessary due to the fact that JTEs feel they have poor comprehension skills and that in order to understand what they hear, they do have to focus very intently on what is being said. This strategy is quite task focused as compared to a metacognitive strategy such as "If I am not so good at aspects of English, I evaluate the progress I have made in this area" which ranks 7th out of 11. This strategy is a more encompassing one in that it involves a conscious action to first decide what problems there are, whether to do something about them or not, take action and finally check how well one has done. Thus it is a more superordinate strategy than concentrating on what is being said. The structure of Japanese education is very rigid, and therefore, as students, JTEs were not required to plan or organize their learning for themselves. This may be reflected in JTEs' choice of metacognitive strategies. This is as in the case of item no. 9 also which involves planning and goal-setting. Goals have always been set for them in their EFL learning history and this may hinder them in using this LLS.

The second least-used metacognitive strategy is "I find out about how to be a good language learner by reading books or articles, or by talking about how to learn". This may be influenced by the fact that at the national university where the vast majority of JTEs are from, first or second language acquisition theory

is not a part of the curriculum for would be language teachers. Another reason may be that JTEs are in recent years realizing that grammar-translation is only one of many teaching methods and are exploring other ways of teaching. They may not yet have reached the stage described in 3.1. in which the movement away from teaching to learning methodologies is described.

5.2.3 Cognitive strategy use reported by JTEs

Cognitive strategies were the third most used strategy category and will be presented and discussed in this section.

Table 5.2.3 Rank order of cognitive strategies reported used by JTEs

Rank no	Q No	Descripition of strategy	Mean	SD
1	28	I use reference materials such as glossaries or dictionaries to help me with English	4.07	.926
2	34	I try to understand what I hear or read without translating it word-for-word into Japanese	3.86	.941
3	15	I read a text several times until I understand it	3.73	1.00
4	26	I skim a reading passage first to get the main idea, then I go back and read it more carefully	3.65	1.19
5	32	I find the meaning of a word by dividing it into parts I understand	3.61	.951
6	17	I practice the sounds of English	3.54	1.08
7	30	I listen to tapes in English	3.46	1.16
8	36	I look for patterns in English	3.43	.990
9	18	I use idioms in English	3.42	1.09
10	14	I watch tv programmes and/or videos in English	3.40	1.00
11	35	I am cautious about transferring words or concepts directly from Japanese into English	3.31	1.14
12	19	I use familiar words in new combinations to make new sentences	3.30	1.01
13	31	I apply general rules to new situations when using English	3.27	1.05
14	24	I read for pleasure in English	3.23	1.11
15	37	I develop my own understanding of how English works, even if I sometimes have to revise my understanding based on new information	3.19	1.03

16	27	I seek specific details in what I see or hear	3.16	1.13
17	16	I revise what I write in English in order to improve my writing	3.08	1.17
18	33	I look for similarities in the Japanese and English language	2.97	.963
19	22	I try to think in English	2.88	1.02
20	20	I initiate conversations in English	2.83	1.06
21	23	I attend and participate in events where English is spoken	2.78	1.17
22	21	I watch tv programmes, videos in English with the Japanese subtitles covered up	2.72	1.20
23	25	I write personal notes, messages or reports in English	2.54	I.17
24	29	I make summaries in English of new language materials	2.26	1.02
25	38	I access the Internet for various activities in English	1.56	1.09

It seems significant that, as can be seen above, the first five cognitive LLS reported used are to do with augmenting understanding as opposed to language production in English. Nos. 3 and 4 involve reading directly, and nos. 2 and 5 may be used for both reading and listening comprehension, while the most reported, no. 1, may be for all skills but most likely for use with reading or checking heard vocabulary.

A reason why the most used cognitive strategies are those for reading comprehension may be that JTEs prepare reading materials for their pupils to read or translate in class. It could also reflect the fact that there are few chances to practice oral English. Further, it could possibly be that they have developed a habit for reading in EFL as a result of the focus on written texts in secondary and tertiary education. In addition, written texts are readily available both as hard copies or on the Internet. Despite the fact that listening opportunities are also at hand in the form of tapes, videos, films, television, a cogntive strategy involving listening first appears as no. 7. Thus it seems

teachers may consider reading easier or, more important. However, as "I read for pleasure in English" ranks as low as no. 14, it could also be, as already mentioned, because texts in English need to be prepared for classes .

The cognitive LLS connected with oral aspects of EFL appear as no.6 and again as no. 9 and no. 10. However, no.6 focuses on pronunciation, not creative oral production skills as in, for example, a conversation. Further, no. 9 may include written as well as oral skills. The first cognitive strategy solely for oral communication appears as no.20. This may be because JTEs are not in the habit of speaking English, either as a result of lack of opportunities while at school or university, or on account of the paucity of English speakers in Toyama Prefecture as well as a reluctance to speak English with other Japanese. No. 21, " I attend and participate in events where English is spoken", may be the monthly JTE meetings where JTEs discuss teaching issues and where English is sometimes spoken.

Regarding aural practice, listening to tapes ranks as number 7, although "watching tv or videos in English with the Japanese subtitles covered up" does not appear till no. 22. "I watch tv programmes and/or videos in English" features as no. 10, but the problem with this strategy is that foreign films in Japan invariably have sub-titles in Japanese unless the viewer is using DVD, which are still not widely used, and chooses not to have the subtitles shown. The reason may be that tapes are easier to have on, for instance, in the car or while doing the housework. (However, playing tapes while doing something else does not mean they are necessarily listened to). It may also be because

teachers simply have not thought about covering subtitles in order to create listening oppotunities. Or, possibly it could be because having to concentrate on listening - which is often a very undeveloped skill in Japan (Fedderholdt 2002) would detract from the enjoyment of watching a film or video.

The LLS which concerned use of computers for LLS were of special interest to me. However, "I access the Internet for various texts to read or find out about various topics in English" was the least used cognitive strategy. It might be that many JTEs do not have computers at home, although the number of people who do has increased in recent years.

5.2.4 Social strategy use reported by JTEs

Table 5.2.4 Rank order of social strategies reported used by JTEs

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	58	If I do not understand, I ask the speaker to slow down, repeat or clarify what was said	4.08	.768
2	63	I try to learn about the cultures of the various places where English is spoken	3.72	1.15
3	61	I have a regular speaking partner	3.14	1.45
4	65	I travel overseas and use my English	3.00	.53
5	67	I ask other people to verify that I have understood or said something correctly	2.81	.961
6	60	I work with other people to practice, review or share information	2.61	1.13
7	59	I ask other people to correct pronunciation	2.50	1.11
8	66	I invite English speakers to come stay with me	2.15	1.21
9	64	I write to a key-pal (computer "pen-pal") in English	2.00	1.34
10	62	I belong to groups where English is spoken	1.66	1.06

The JTEs did not report favouring the social strategy category which ranked 4th out of the 5 categories. It could be, as noted in 5.2.1, that this is because there are not many foreigners in Toyama. In an FL environment, lack of use of social strategies may simply be due to the fact that it is not feasible to find TL

speaking foreigners. This might also be a reason why "I invite English speakers to my home" is ranked eight out of ten. Yet, this may also be due to cultural reasons. Japanese are often reluctant to invite people other than family to their homes, preferring to entertain in restaurants.

Nevertheless, the third most frequently reported social strategy is "I have a regular English speaking partner". (Regarding the use of "partner" here, it is unlikely that JTEs would have interpreted this as meaning anyone other than a friend or colleague in this statement). In this case, they may be referring to the ALT. Not all schools have a permanent ALT who is at the school everyday, however, and this may also be a reason why social strategies are ranked so low. Social strategies are determined by how easily situations with other people can be created.

Sometimes answers to the survey questionnaire are puzzling. This is the case with the strategy "I travel overseas and use my English" being reported as the 4th most used social LLS out of 10. This is worrying because JTEs have notoriously few days off annually. Even their weekends are often spent at school participating in extra curricular events such as mountain climbing, sporting events, musical clubs, and gardening with students. Possibly, the questionnaire statement is the problem in that it may have been interpreted to mean "When I go overseas, I use my English" or even have been interpreted hypothetically "If I were to go overseas, I would use my English".

As with the cognitive strategy involving the Internet in 5.2.3, a social strategy which was of special interest was "I write to a key-pal (computer pen friend) in English" . However, this was the second least used strategy. However, as more and more people have access to computers and come online, this kind of LLS involving computer use may well increase. I believe the Internet can be very helpful in language learning. Learners can not only find a wealth of material in the TL, they can also find a number of sites where they can practice various skills in English as well as a rich source of cultural knowledge (Fedderholdt, 2000). Practice in English can also take place with others using English as a FL, as in the case of key-pals, "chat"-rooms, or voicemail. The Internet is ideal for supplementing formal language instruction, as well as fostering independent learning and developing learner autonomy. However, often learners do not have the LLS necessary to benefit from this, and therefore attention needs to be paid to these in training courses.

5.2.5 Memory strategy use reported by JTEs

Table 5.2.5 Rank order of memory strategies reported used by JTEs

Rank no	Q no	Description of strategy	Mean	SD
1	1	I create associations between new material and what I already know	3.59	1.0
2	6	I visualize the spelling of a new word in my mind	3.10	1.0
3	7	I use a combinations of sounds and images to remember a new word	3.07	1.0
4	12	I review often	3.05	1.0
5	3	I place the new word in a group with other words that are similar in some way	2.98	.98
6	13	I go back to refresh my memory of things I learned earlier	2.94	.98
7	2	I put a new word in a sentence so I can remember it	2.91	.97
8	4	I associate the sound of a new word with a sound of a familiar word	2.86	1.0
9	9	I remember where a new word is located on a page, or where I first saw or heard it	2.55	1.1

10	5	I use rhyming to remember a word	2.30	1.1
11	8	I list all the words I know that are related to the new word and draw lines to show relationships	2.17	1.0
12	11	I physically act out a word	1.97	1.0
13	10	I use flashcards	1.89	.97

Out of the five categories of strategies which teachers were asked to report on, memory strategies were those they used least. However, the most reported memory strategy is "I create associations between new material and what I already know", which is a higher level, more encompassing memorization technique than rote-memorization, which is thought to be the most widely used memory strategy in Japan.

Possibly it is the type of English that they want to learn which influences the type of strategies JTES use most. In the interview data, which will be presented in the following chapter, it will be seen how teachers stress that the skills they are most interested in are speaking and listening skills. The other strategy categories such as social or cognitive strategies in conjunction with compensation strategies serve these goals better.

5.3 The LLS which JTEs report teaching students: examination of the rank order of LLS according to category

RQ5 Within each LLS category, what is the rank order of each LLS which JTEs report teaching their students, and what is the relevance of the ranking of the individual strategies within a Japanese context?

In this section the LLS which JTEs report teaching students will be discussed according to rank order within each category. The categories themselves will be ranked according to the extent which JTEs teach them.

5.3.1 Compensation strategies which JTEs report teaching students

As noted in 5.1. teachers use compensation strategies most. It is also the category which they teach most to their students (JTEs' own use of compensation strategies = 3.61. Compensation strategies which they teach students = 3.15.).

Table 5.3.1 Rank order of compensation strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	90	I teach my students to guess words they don't know	3.80	1.05
2	92	I teach my students to use other words or phrases in English, when they cannot think of the words they want	3.64	.99
3	89	I teach my students to use gestures if they cannot think of a word in English	2.90	1.51
4	91	I teach my students to make up new words, if they do not know the right ones in English	2.24	1.09

The compensation strategy which was reported most was "I teach my students to guess words in English they don't know". That this strategy is reported as being taught most, is possibly not surprising as it can be used for both listening and reading. However, it does seem somewhat unexpected, seen in a Japanese SHS context, that the second most frequent is: "I teach my students to use another word or phrase in English when they cannot think of the one they want". As has already been mentioned in Section 2.2, at SHS most teachers' and students' focus is on passing the university entrance university

examinations which do not have a speaking component and seldom have a listening comprehension requirement, and translation is from English to Japanese, in addition to which, as also noted in Section 2.2, Japanese teachers speak predominantly Japanese when teaching EFL. The 3rd and 4th most taught were "I teach my students to use gestures, if they cannot think of the word in English" and "I teach my students to make up new words, if they do not know the right ones in English". However, it is difficult to assess why these are reported taught so much because there are no speaking components in the university entrance exams (or any other English exams). Many students do not take oral communication in their second and/or third year of SHS as they do not want to "waste" time on classes not honing them for the university entrance exams. The backwash effect of the university entrance examinations is reiterated throughout this thesis. To go to the best university possible is crucial in Japanese society. Even in the first year of SHS there are far fewer oral communication classes than grammar translation ones. The ratio of oral communication classes to grammar-translation ones is generally reported by students to be approximately 1 to 4 or 5. Therefore, that teachers claim to teach compensation strategies the most, raises the question: when do they do this? There does not seem much time to teach students these so often. Further, why teach students these strategies at SHS level if they have few opportunities to practice oral/aural communication either in class with their Japanese teachers for as explained earlier -in Chapter 2 and above in this section- Japanese teachers teach English in Japanese. Nor do students have opportunities out of class with NNS or NS of English. There are few foreigners with whom to speak English outside the major cities in Japan. Therefore

teachers cannot be counting on students to be able to practice English and use strategies such as creating neologisms or gesturing to create meaning outside class. A possible answer to this is revealed in the data from the interviews in Chapter 6. Some teachers report that at SHS where students are not expected to go to university teachers do include oral communication in their classes. Therefore, it may be these teachers who exhort students to use compensation strategies. Further research is necessary to clarify this point.

5.3.2 Cognitive strategies which JTEs report teaching students

The second most frequent group of LLS reported taught to students were cognitive strategies. The rank order of these can be seen in Table 5.3.2 below.

Table 5.3.2 Rank order of cognitive strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	78	I teach my students to practice the sounds of English	3.85	.899
2	77	I teach my students to say or write new English words several times	3.80	1.04
3	83	I teach my students to first skim a passage in English and then go over reading it more slowly and carefully	3.66	1.14
4	85	I teach my students to find the meanings of words by dividing them into parts they understand	3.62	1.09
5	88	I teach my students to listen to tapes	3.53	1.10
6	86	I teach my students not to translate word for word from English into Japanese	3.27	1.08
7	84	I teach my students to look for words in Japanese that are English (for example "ski", "elevator")	2.90	1.17
8	81	I teach my students to use dictionaries	2.85	1.09
9	79	I teach my students to watch tv programmes in English or go to films in English	2.74	1.17
10	82	I teach my students to write paragraphs or essays that are not translations of Japanese	2.72	1.15
11	87	I teach my students to write summaries of information that they hear or read in English	2.46	1.09
12	80	I teach my students to cover up the sub-titles when they watch tv programmes or videos in English	2.06	1.02

The cognitive strategy which teachers report teaching students most is "I teach my students to practice the sounds of English". This would seem to imply that JTEs regard pronunciation as a very important feature of language learning. However, there are some problems with this. First of all it is doubtful whether this is such an important strategy to warrant being taught most. Secondly, it needs to be examined what teachers focus on when they teach this strategy; whether they ask students to focus on individual sounds or words. In my experience, students have been taught words in isolation and non-contracted forms such as "I will not go swimming today" instead of "I won't go swimming today". The ensuing problem with this is that it causes extensive problems in connection with listening. Students do not understand contracted forms when listening to English. Further, they are not aware of the often vast changes which take place sound-wise when words are spoken in connected discourse. Another problem is that pronuniction is often practiced with "katakana" one of the Japanese alphabets, being used as an aid to practice English pronunciation. This gives rise to a number of problems which can take a long time to unlearn. "Katakana" only comprises 5 vowel sounds in contrast to the 20 of RP English ("RP", is merely used here as an example of English pronunciation as it is well known to a number of EFL teachers, and not because it should necessarily be used as a standard by which to teach English pronunciation) and a limited number of its consonant sounds. Further, when English words are taught singly, they are often extended by Japanese by another syllable as in the case of "and" and "but" becoming "ando" and "buto", "MacDonalds" as "Makudonarado". This also requires considerable unlearning later.

The next most taught LLS "I teach my students to say or write new English words several times" focuses on rote memorization of vocabulary which, although a mainstay of Japanese learning methods would probably benefit from being used in conjuction with other memory strategies. In contrast No.3 "I teach my students to skim a passage in English and then go over it again reading more slowly and carefully" emphasizes global reading skills. That this is taught as the 3rd most frequent is unexpected as university students, at least, seem to have great difficulty in wrenching themselves from word focus reading and using the dictionary whenever an unknown word is encountered. The following most taught strategy is also surprising: "I teach my students to find the meanings of English words by dividing them into parts they understand" which is concerned with obtaining more specific meaning. Possibly teachers teach these but students do not feel comfortable with them, or teachers do not check that students are effectuating them appropriately because students do not appear to use these strategies either. A cognitive strategy for listening is reported taught as no. 5 "I teach my students to listen to tapes". As mentioned earlier, there are not many opportunities available for listening in SHS. Possibly JTEs encourage students to listen to tapes at home in order to compensate for this.

Two of the least taught strategies "I teach my students to write paragraphs or essays in English that are not translations of Japanese" (no.10) and "I teach my students to write English summaries of information they hear or read in English" (no.11) reflect the fact that students generally do not write much in

English, except for translations of sentences, and these are mostly from English to Japanese.

5.3.3 Social strategies which JTEs report teaching students

The category, social strategies was third after compensation and cognitive strategies.

Table 5.3.3 Rank order of social strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of strategy	Mean	SD
1	108	I teach my students to ask someone to slow down or say it again, if they do not understand something in English.	3.82	1.02
2	113	I teach my students about the cultures of English speakers	3.72	.954
3	111	I ask my students to ask for help from English speakers	3.20	1.07
4	112	I teach my students to ask questions in English	3.15	1.10
5	110	I teach my students to speak English with other students	2.95	1.19
6	109	I teach my students to ask English speakers to correct them when they talk in English.	2.90	1.12
7	114	I teach my students to get a key-pal and write to this key-pal in English	1.90	.972

As can be seen from the social strategies listed in Table 5.3.3 above, six of the seven involve interactive use of English. Five of them through asking questions, for clarification, repetition or other use of spoken English.

There can be little doubt that teaching students to practice spoken English (which also provides listening comprehension opportunities) and the various LLS for doing so is beneficial. However, it is a little problematic that emphasis is given to these in this survey. The situation is similar to that discussed in

5.3.1 in connection with compensation strategies. That is, when do teachers have the opportunity to carry this teaching out? Further, why would they teach strategies which their pupils have very few opportunities to use? As mentioned earlier, SHS students have few classes in which English is spoken even if there is a permanent ALT at the school, and the opportunities for practicing outside school are negligible. It can be speculated that possibly teachers teach them for later use.

5.3.4 Memory strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Although it is often said that the most prevalent way of learning in Japan is through memorizing facts, this was not the strategy group which was reported as being taught the most in this research. Teachers did not prioritize memory strategies but compensation, cognitve and social ones. Possibly this is because rote-learning is a wide-spread and well-used strategy for memorizing the vast amounts of facts in all subjects which students need to remember for various subjects.

Table 5.3.4 Rank order of memory strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	68	I teach my students to think about relationships between what they already know and new things they learn in English	4.11	.859
2	74	I teach my students to review English lessons often	3.56	1.03
3	69	I teach my students to use new English words in a sentence so they can remember them	3.47	1.00
4	70	I teach my students to connect the sound of an English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word	2.94	1.10
5	76	I teach my students to remember a word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word may be used	2.63	1.11

6	75	I teach my students to remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on a page, board or sign	2.45	1.22
7	71	I teach my students to use rhymes to remember new English words	2.31	1.12
8	73	I teach my students to physically act out words	2.20	1.00
9	72	I teach my students to use flashcards to remember new words	1.58	.825

Within the memory category, the most taught memory strategy is "I teach my students to think of relationships between what they already know and new things they learn in English". This is interesting in that this strategy does not suggest repetitive memorization specifically, but rather more creative lateral and vertical linkage to connect the "old" and the "new". This placing of new matter in a scaffolding or web of previous learnt knowledge is a more holistic approach than simply writing down words or expressions over and over again for memorization of unconnected items. Also, connecting pieces of information to join with new knowledge requires that the individual makes choices regarding what is to be memorized with what. Thus the memorization process becomes more personalized which may increase the likelihood of it being remembered.

The second memory strategy reported taught was "I teach my students to review English often". ("Review" is the term used in Japan to mean "revise". It is also the American term for "revise"). This strategy also implies a more encompassing view of memorization. One that implies that it should become an integral part of LL, rather than simply being carried out prior to tests.

In contrast, the remaining strategies in this memory category place more

emphasis on the memorization of individual words. Nevertheless, it was seen that more holistic memory strategies were reported as being taught more. This is, however, in contrast to the findings from the interview data, as will be seen in Chapter 6.

5.3.5 Metacognitive strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Table 5.3.5 Rank order of metacognitive strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of category	Mean	SD
1	94	I teach my students to pay attention when someone is speaking in English	3.74	1.03
2	95	I teach my students how to become better learners of English	3.30	1.10
3	102	I teach my students to find as many ways as possible to use their English	3.20	1.11
4	93	I teach my students to read as much as possible in English	3.12	1.66
5	98	I teach my students to check by themselves how well they are managing various tasks in English	3.06	1.06
6	99	I teach my students to have clear goals for improving their English	2.97	1.13
7	96	I teach my students to plan their schedules so that they have enough time to study English	2.87	.970
8	100	I teach my students to think about the progress they are making in English	2.80	.965
9	97	I teach my students to look for people with whom they can talk English	2.70	1.20
10	101	I teach my students to write down what they do to learn English in a language learning diary	2.65	1.10

Metacognitive strategies were the second least taught category and the most taught strategy out of these was rather a task-focussed one: "I teach my students to pay attention when someone is speaking in English". More global ones such as managing own learning endeavours and self-monitoring, goal setting, time-management and self-evaluation were taught as the sixth, seventh and eight LLS out of ten, respectively.

Possibly, the reason for task-focussed metacognitive strategies being reported

as the most taught is that the teaching of EFL (and other subjects) in SHS is almost entirely dominated by one-way knowledge transmission from teacher to students. Information loading is a priority. Further, the classroom activities and goals for learning as well as texts are preset by teachers. Pupils are tested frequently. Consequently, JTEs may feel that there is no neeed to guide students towards more holistic LLS in the form of goal setting, self-monitoring and self-evaluation. In addition, JTEs themselves have little leeway in that they too are controlled by the school curriculum, which is indirectly controlled by the requirements of the university entrance examinations.

Although there are very few foreigners in Toyama, it is possible for students to find some English learning programmes on the radio or television. Metacognitive strategies such as looking for people with whom to speak English can be adapted to finding opportunities for listening to English and practising listening comprehension. Metacognitive competence also includes adapting one's environment to suit one's goals. It would benefit learners if teachers guided their students towards being able to re-frame limitations and create learning opportunites. For example, instead of pupils thinking "I can't learn to speak English, there is no one to speak with" it would be more beneficial to them, if they are able to exhibit metacognitive expertise by reframing to "There are an abundance of English listening opportunities to be had in my daily life. Which strategies can I use to profit from these?"

5.3.6 Affective strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Table 5.3.6 Rank order of affective strategies which JTEs report teaching

Rank no	Q no	Description of strategy	Mean	SD
1	103	I teach my students to relax and not feel afraid of using English	3.98	.991
2	104	I teach my students to speak English even when they are afraid of making a mistake	3.61	1.06
3	106	I teach my students to give themselves a reward when they do well in English	2.50	1.20
4	105	I teach my students to notice when they are tense or nervous when they are studying English	2.18	.979
5	107	I teach my students to talk to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English	1.86	.912

The affective strategy category was the least taught of all the categories, although many JTEs complain about their own and students' shyness and how this prevents them from using English. A possible reason why JTEs have not taught affective strategies may be because, as explained in Chapter 2, most EFL classes are conducted in Japanese. Further, the classes are teacher fronted and there are generally over 40 students in each class. Students have to stand up when answering which means that 39 other students can, potentially, be looking at them and that is hardly conducive to a student being able to feel relaxed. In addition, there is much focus on giving the correct answer as the weekly, semester and annual SHS tests mimic components of the university entrance examinations in which the answers are fixed. In cases like this, it can be that teachers feel that affective LLS are not enough in themselves to lower stress levels and therefore not worthwhile teaching. It can also be that these are considered personal issues which students have to deal with themselves. Whatever the reason, affective strategies are well worth focussing on with regard to Japanese students, who are mostly extremely reluctant to speak in

English. Many months are spent at university in attempts to make students relax and gain sufficient confidence to speak English. That affective LLS are important for students would be well worth emphasizing in LLS training courses for teachers.

5.4 Summary

This chapter dealt the statistical analysis of the data in relation to the research questions and found that there were differences in the rank order of the categories between the LLS teachers teach students and those they use themselves. It was also found that female JTEs used compensation and social strategies more frequently than male JTEs. In addition, teachers with more teaching experience were inclined to teach memory and metacognitve strategies to students more than less experienced teachers.

After this the descriptive sections were presented. First. there was a presentation of the various LLS which teachers report using themselves. Then the ones they teach their students were discussed. In both cases they were discussed with reference to the local and general contexts as recommended by Erickson (1986), in this case the educational contexts of Japan.

It was noted that in both sections there were some puzzles as to why certain LLS were taught/used or not taught/used given the circumstances which students and teachers find themselves. Some suggestions for possible solutions were made with reference to findings from the interview data. This

will be examined more closely in the following chapter. Then in Chapter 7, the various issues will be brought together.

CHAPTER SIX

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE INTERVIEWS

The previous chapter dealt with the quantitative aspect of this research. This one will present the findings from the qualitative study, the objective of which was to provide information which could supplement the findings of the quantitative data in various ways. The design and methodology including information regarding the subjects, interview procedures and data analysis methods is presented in Chapter 4. In the present chapter, the various themes isolated from the interview transcripts linked to JTEs' use and teaching of LLS will be examined. In addition, pertinent issues which relate to LLS in this study will be presented. For example, it is shown how teachers' concerns about their levels of En

glish and those of their students are caused by the schism between what the government claims it wants senior high school students to achieve (communicative competence in EFL) and the decisions by the universities which thwart these directives. Further it discusses how JTEs are affected by the limited training they receive at university and why they feel a strong need to improve their English after graduation. As will be demonstrated, it is in their endeavours to increase their English skills that LLS play a role.

Further, in connection with these efforts, the importance of the assistant language teachers (ALTs)[8] in providing opportunities for JTEs to use social, affective and compensation strategies to improve their EFL is revealed.

[8] These are also sometimes known as Assistant English Teachers (AETs)

The chapter moves on to present information regarding the LLS which JTEs say they teach their students. In addition to talking about these, teachers also brought up other points related to LLS. A topic of special interest which emerged in the interviews concerned their view of the relationship between subject knowledge and transmission of this to students, and the role of motivation. Further, teachers' comments seemed to indicate that different English skills and LLS are taught according to the different levels of SHS. Here too, I will connect JTEs' comments to the culture of education in Japan in order to set them into perspective.

6.1 Overview of the main findings of the interviews

The three main areas which I will discuss in detail in this chapter are:

- JTEs' thoughts about their own levels of English and experiences as learners of English at university.
- JTEs' own use of LLS.
- The LLS which JTEs teach their pupils.

6.1.1 JTEs' thoughts about their own levels of English

This section reveals teachers' personal, or in Erickson's (1986) terms "local" information regarding their perception of their English skills, and what they feel are the reasons for them not being as high as they would like them to be.

These two issues are important as they reveal insights into Japanese EFL education and this in turn can be linked to teachers' own use of LLS in their EFL learning as well as their teaching of it.

LoCastro (1996) claims that "Japanese English language teaching (ELT) has a negative reputation for producing less than competent speakers of foreign languages" (p.42). The teachers seemed very aware of this and in the interviews over 50% of them made comments to this effect *unsolicited*. This suggests the seriousness of the problem for them, and emphasizes their unhappiness with the situation. I had not intended to bring up this subject myself as it seemed inappropriate to question teachers about their levels of subject competence. However, they made many references to the limitations of their English skills very openly, as can be seen in the following[9]

> T5. My English is not good. I can't remember the correct words. I don't have vocabulary

> T7. There are many foreigners who speak good English, and when I see them, I feel very embarrassed and depressed.

> T8. Japanese English education is notorious. We can't speak and we can't listen.

> T9. I feel I have a long way to go about English. I mean, this is

[9] I have corrected some problems of syntax and grammar in JTE's statements

not where I want to be.

T11.We should speak fluently, but Japanese teachers are not so good at speaking English.

T15.Writing. I cannot write in English.

T16.I am ashamed to say that my reading is not good.

T18.I cannot read rapidly, so I am not good at catching the outline of reading.

T20. I can speak only poor English.

T.21.Speaking is my weakest point.

T.22.Vocabulary. My vocabulary is poor.

T23. I haven't mastered it yet, vocabulary.

Teachers reveal problems in all language skills including vocabulary despite having had as other Japanese at least 6 years of EFL at SHS and have spent 4 years at university.

6.1.2 JTEs' comments regarding English at university

Although the teaching of EFL at university in many ways reflects that of senior high school, teachers only complained about their university English experiences. Possibly this is because they had expected university EFL to be a departure from that of secondary education. They comment:

> T4. I didn't feel so good after finishing university. At that time I couldn't say anything in English. When I went on my honeymoon to Hawai'i, I could say only a few phrases, just like a junior high school student.

> T7. At university, classes in which you could use English were few. I was often confused.

> T9. There were not many classes which let students speak English. I had just one conversation class a week.

> T18. At university I read many books but I had only one conversation class per week, so I think it's my weakest point.

> T19. When I began teaching, I was afraid of talking on the phone in English or with the ALTs.

> T20. When I became a teacher I found it necessary to improve my speaking and listening ability.

To make up for the few classes which are held in English, some students go to conversation schools. Ironically, these are considered more useful than university classes as there are fewer participants and generally there are more hours per course. Therefore it is not unexpected that a teacher comments:

T22. The conversation school was better than university.

I shall attempt to link the comments above to the wider context which can help explain the problems which JTEs mention. The teachers' views are not isolated ones. In a study about JTEs' use of English (Murphey and Purcell, 2000), two professors explained why they thought teachers did not use English: "teachers are weak in speaking ability" and that in order to do things "spontaneously" in English during their teaching, they have to put "much effort" into preparation. Further, 3 out of the 22 SHS teachers in their study also made comments about their English, saying: "I don't have confidence of teaching only in English", "speaking English correctly is beyond my ability" and "teaching in English is beyond my power" (p58-60). Students are often not happy with JTEs' English (Murphey, Deacon and Murakami 2000). Sasaki (2000) claims that students complain that "the English used by JTEs is not perfect" and that many JTEs themselves are of the same opinion (p62). McKay (2000) investigated problems of 5 Japanese participating in an MA TESOL programme in the US, and found that two of them who had 5 years EFL teaching experience at high school in Japan and one who had just become a certified JTE cited difficulties related to their lack of English as one of their major problems. Also they criticized their

English learning experiences at school and university. Teachers do not limit their dissatisfaction to complaints only however. As will be seen in this chapter, the JTEs interviewed make efforts to improve their EFL competence. To do this they may use a variety of LLS.

6.2 JTEs' own use of LLS for various skills

As illustrated above in 6.1.1., JTEs especially realize their English abilities are lacking once they begin their EFL teaching careers and comment upon why they think this is the case. In the following subsections, examples of the LLS they use are given. These indicate how and to what degree JTEs engage in various types of LLS in their personal "local" efforts to improve their English.

All of the teachers said they had accelerated their efforts to learn English upon graduation. The interviews showed that they were especially concerned with listening, vocabulary and speaking.

6.2.1 LLS for listening

Listening strategies feature prominently in the interviews. A popular method is listening to English programmes for learners, on radio especially but also on television. Another way is listening to audiotapes. However, this seems to take place mostly while driving to and from work. As paying attention to safety is the top priority while driving, it can be imagined that full attention is not on the listening task as they admit:

T10: Uhm after a while, I just play it like background music.

T23:I listen to tapes in the car.

Interviewer: Do you think you really listen?

T23:Mmmm, maybe half. It's easy to fade away, to think about something else.

Although listening to tapes is an often recommended LLS, its functioning as a successful strategy depends very much on the way it is used. That is, whether attention is being paid, unknown words checked later and strategies used to remember them. This is not always the case:

> T20: I enjoy listening to news in English from 7.25 to 7.45 when I drive to work.
>
> Interviewer: If you are listening and there is something you don't understand, what do you do?
>
> T20: Nothing! I don't care! (Laughs).

Often teachers know of ways that can help improve their English but do not do it (for understandable reasons):

> T22. I think it's good to listen to radio English every day, but I don't.
>
> Interviewer: Mmmm
>
> T22: No time, no energy.

Two teachers used a somewhat different approach to listening. One listened to a television programme which is in English and Japanese and used the facility to listen to both languages at the same time. He also watched news in Japanese and then tried to find the same news on CNN. This was helpful because:

> T19: Then I already have the concept and can understand English better.

The other teacher watched videos. His method for watching videos was quite painstaking:

> T9: I watch vidoes in English.
>
> Interviewer: Yes?
>
> T9: I see two times. First I watch, then I cover the writing (This is the subtitles in Japanese), and see how much I understand of the language after getting the story.
>
> Interviewer: How do you find that?
>
> T9. Very helpful.

In addition, two other teachers explained how they "shadow". This is a not very well known technique outside the training of simultaneous translators (Dollerup and Loddegaard, 1992). There are several ways to do this. The ones mentioned by the JTEs involved repeating what they heard on a tape a split

second after the speaker has said a word or a few words. Sometimes it is known as "echoing". Usually it is not mentioned as a LLS and does not appear in the SILL. However, Murphey (2001) has conducted research on this method as a LLS, as has Fedderholdt (2001). I was surprised to hear of shadowing being used and queried it. The two JTEs said that there is one JTE in Toyama prefecture who is particularly interested in this strategy and had given a talk about it.

6.2.2 LLS for vocabulary

Another area teachers expressed interest in was vocabulary. However, they did not indicate the use of a wide range of LLS in connection with remembering new items.

> T24: Vocabulary is my weakest point. Vocabulary. My vocabulary is poor.
>
> Interviewer: Really? What do you do to increase your vocabulary?
>
> T24: Read sometimes.
>
> Interviewer: I see. During the last weeks how many words do you remember?
>
> T24: Words? I don't remember words. Maybe one or two.

> T2: I need to improve my vocabulary.
>
> Interviewer: Oh? How do you do this?

T2: Excuse me?

Interviewer: How do you remember new vocabulary?

T2: Remember? I don't try to remember. (Laughs heartily).

T23: Yes, there are so many words I don't know. If I don't know meaning, I read two or three times, so I use the dictionary.

Interviewer: Uhuh. So how do you try to remember a word and its meaning?

T23: I don't try to remember.

Interviewer: You don't try to remember?

T23: That's because there are so many new words.

Interviewer: Well true. But supposing, I mean yesterday, did you meet any new words?

T23: Yes, and today.

Interviewer: Right but do you think you forgot all of them?

T23: Not all of them, but....

Interviewer: No. So how did you remember them?

T23: How do I remember?

Interviewer: Yes.

T23: Just read many times.

Interviewer: Well, supposing you had to remember them because you had to teach them to students?

T23: Well (long pause) well, I write them down. Read them.

Interviewer: Suppose you had a word like "cup". Would you connect it to a word like "saucer"?

T23. No.

The teacher in the example below uses the same technique of writing down new words. Possibly many teachers are satisfied with this method, but it could also be that JTEs are generally not aware of the various methods which exist to help retain words effectively. If this is the case, then they are not able to teach a variety of strategies to their pupils.

Interviewer: What is your weakest point, do you think?

T17: Maybe vocabulary

Interviewer: Really? What do you do to increase it?

T17. I try to, but I can't!

Interviewer: Well, supposing you had 10 words you had to remember by Monday?

T17: By Monday? Well..... maybe.....I'd try to read and write.

Despite teachers voicing concerns about their vocabulary, this may be on a more abstract, wishful level, something they would like to improve under different circumstances in which they have more time, for example. Possibly this is because it is, in reality, not necessary for them to make efforts as it is extremely unlikely that they are going to be challenged by students asking them unexpected vocabulary questions. And although they may encounter problems in interaction with ALTs, they can circumvent this by using compensation strategies which are the LLS most reported used by teachers as shown in Section 5.2.

Possibly, teachers have not been able to find any LLS which are helpful. However, one had heard about a strategy which interested her:

> T7: I heard that one teacher who was a really fluent speaker of English, she recorded the words she didn't know with the meanings into a tape, and listened to it again and again until she remembered them. I want to do that too.

Nevertheless, the final words in her statement suggest she has not effectuated this new LLS.

All in all, it seems that teachers use, and possibly know about, very few learning strategies for remembering new items. This may also explain why JTEs suggest a very limited number of strategies to their students, as will be seen in Sections 6.3.1-6.3.7.

6.2.3 LLS for oral skills

In order to improve oral/aural English, eleven of the teachers had attended conversation clubs or schools, or gone to "chat meetings" where they had used a variety of socio-affective strategies. A teacher explains:

> T16: When I became a teacher, in the first year I found the necessity (laughs) to improve my English speaking and listening, so I attended

the English chat meetings. I often attended such classes after 5pm.

Several teachers had done likewise. Six of them had attended for six or seven years. Three had gone abroad for some weeks or a few months. However, as they advance within the system, teachers describe how they have less time to attend meetings where English is spoken and fewer opportunities to go overseas although they still feel a need to be better at English.

A significant advantage exists in having access to an ALT. The interviews revealed that the ALT plays such an important role in JTEs' efforts to improve English that this will be dealt with separately below.

6.2.4 How ALTs provide opportunities for JTEs to use a variety of LLS

Assistant language teachers (ALTs) were introduced in Section 2.7. A constant theme throughout the interviews was how useful JTEs found ALTs (or as they are sometimes call them: AETs) as they provide opportunities for JTEs to use a variety of LLS when communicating with them and this in turn helps them improve their English.

ALTs were introduced by the Japanese Ministry of Education to secondary schools in the late 1980's. They are recruited from English speaking countries and have to have a first degree in any subject. Teaching experience is not required. Their main function is to help "the development of students' communicative skills, particularly those of listening and speaking, and the

cultivation of their international understanding" (Wada and Cominos 1994, p9). This was to be effectuated through team teaching with JTEs. However, as will be seen in the following, AETs appear to play another important role. They are frequently helpful as a resource for JTEs to help them improve their English.

Below, JTEs show how they use a variety of especially social and cognitive strategies to achieve improvements in their EFL skills.

> T8: I can ask her the meaning of some slang, or some expressions or some examples so I can remember:
>
> T20: I ask her again and again.
>
> T24: I ask the AET about the meaning.

ALTs provide speaking and listening opportunities:

> T4: I listen to what the AET is saying to students and repeat it silently to myself.
>
> T7: I copy what the AET says and then check later in the Japanese dictionary.
>
> T8: I have chances to talk with the ALT.

T9: They have given me lots of chances to talk in English

T12: I can practice not just reading or.... but the listening of the sounds of English

T14: They use slang and some expressions or some examples so I can remember and use and practice

T17: We have ALT so I speak better, so I speak a lot better.

T18: Planning the lessons together is a good opportunity to talk to the AET.

T19:The presence of the AET is helpful. We teach once a week. The textbook is not helpful, so we have to make original worksheets together, so we have to talk together. It has taken time, but it has improved my English.

T21: The AETs have been helpful. They have given me lots of chances to talk in English.

T23: We have lunch together and talk together maybe for one hour total a day. This is a big help for my English.

The above comments are quite numerous, but they are the only ones in which

the JTEs express anything positive about their experiences regarding EFL. As noted in Section 6.1.2, when JTEs talk about their EFL education they are quite negative. No one during the interviews expressed anything positive about their 10 years of EFL education at secondary school or university. In connection with ALTs, the teachers indicate how appreciative they are of the opportunities to learn up-to-date communicative EFL which they seem to have thirsted for. ALTs help compensate where both secondary and tertiary education failed to provide adequate opportunities for speaking/listening comprehension practice.

Access to the ALT is often dependent upon arbitrary conditions, however:

> T8: Fortunately I am sitting in front of her, so I can talk to her anytime I want.
>
> Her colleague comments:
>
> T9: Yes, she is lucky because she and the ALT are facing!

Finally, one very articulate JTE sums up his experience with ALTs:

> T24: One of the very important factors is the existence of the foreign teachers at the school. That is the important and very big factor, because you know of course my job is teaching English, but when I teach English together with foreign teachers I have to talk and we have to plan or make some syllabus, so through that I can

unconsciously, I can become aware of what language is, or how to communicate or something like that. There was a big difference before the period I taught with a foreign teacher and afterwards. Very significantly.

Thus the ALTs can be a great help in the development of JTEs' English. However not all schools have their own ALT but have to share ALTs who come infrequently or for "one shot" visits per semester. Thus not all teachers have access to an ALT. Even minor differences within a school can determine how much or little English practice can be had, as indicated by the teachers below (These are the same two teachers who were interviewed together):

T8: Yes, I can talk to her anytime I want. Every day about two or three hours. (This is because her desk is in front of the ALTs)

Interviewer: Really? Is she here every day, all day?

T8: Yea

Interviewer: So you can speak with her about 15 hours a week! How about you?

T9: (Laughing) Only about 10 minutes maybe. (This teacher's desk was at the other end of the rather large teachers' office).

If JTEs do not have access to an ALT, it can be difficult to practice English, for as mentioned earlier, there are not many native speakers of English, although there are a number of Chinese and Russians. However, as these are part of the factory work-force, they speak Japanese. Further, it is unlikely that JTEs would

encounter them. Out of the 24 teachers interviewed, only 14 had regular access to an ALT. Only two of the latter had contact with other native speakers. It can be imagined that those who do not have the possibility to communicate regularly to an ALT can have difficulty in increasing speaking and listening comprehension skills especially, and this can create problems for their pupils.

This section has shown how, although JTEs express interest in increasing competency in EFL, they sometimes do not develop their skills optimally. Although issues such as busy professional and personal lives may be a reason for this, it could also be because teachers do not have a sufficient range of LLS to make use of their LL potential fully.

Further, although ALTs are considered a great resource for improving English through a number of LLS, there are not always ALTs available for all JTEs to avail themselves of the possibilities they provide. Therefore, more focus should be put on providing an effective training in EFL for potential English teachers before they graduate.

6.3 LLS which JTEs report teaching their students

This section presents and discusses the findings in the interview data related to the LLS which teachers report teaching their students. Each section focuses on a main language skill and the LLS taught for this. However, it is difficult to keep each section hermetic and different themes connected with the topic of teaching LLS, which appeared in the interviews, will re-occur across various

sections. These include teachers' beliefs about their role in students' learning attempts as well as JTEs' view of the role of motivation. An interesting separate issue which emerged from the interviews is teachers' beliefs and strategy teaching in connection with low-level students.

6.3.1 LLS for listening which JTEs report teaching students

Listening is not a high priority subject as most university entrance examinations do not have a listening component. This may explain the fact that teachers do not seem to teach students LLS to cope with listening, as illustrated through teachers' comments below:

Interviewer: Do your students have listening practice?

T20: Yes, third year students.

Interviewer: Mmm

T20: Students listen to the tape.

Interviewer: Tape?

T20: Text book, the tape of the textbook.

Interviewer: How do they work with the tape?

T20: The tape is played two or three times. They have comprehension questions in the book.

Interviewer: Apart from re-playing the tape, what do you do?

T20: Explain.

Interviewer: In Japanese or English?

T20: In Japanese. Maybe English.

T4: They listen to a tape or the ALT speaks.

Interviewer: Yes.

T4: And I'll ask some questions.

Interviewer: In English?

T4. Mmmm

Interviewer: And they reply in English?

T4: Mmmm, maybe in Japanese.

In the excerpts above there are several main points to be noted: one is that listening is taught separately, not as an integrated skill as in, for example, a conversation or through the JTE speaking English in class when giving instructions or explanations, so as to provide listening opportunities. Secondly, listening practice seems to consist of listening to tapes. The teachers do not mention pre-listening or post-listening activities, which may suggest that they are not familiar with them. Thirdly, if students seem to have problems or the teacher anticipates these, they are explained in Japanese predominantly. In the second example, it can be seen that the ALT seems to have a tape like function as what the ALT says is depersonalized in that the ALT "speaks" but the teacher asks the questions. These may or may not be in English. At any rate, the students answer in Japanese. These methods do not provide any genuine reasons for listening. The listening experience is rendered completely inauthentic, which in turn is not conducive to students' cultivating a desire to know what is being said and devise their own LLS to do so, in the absence of teacher guidance.

When teachers are asked directly what advice students are given to help them with their listening, no advice is given apart from that their pupils can listen to conversation programmes.

T1: I never give them special advice. Just listen.

Interviewer: Do you give them any advice how to listen?

19: No

Interviewer: How do you advise your students to improve their listening?

T20: Mmmmm (then silence).

Interviewer: What would you tell your students to do to help them with their listening?

T20: Listening..... (laughs) ...sometimes.....listening? Listen to English conversation programmes.

Interviewer: Do you give them any tips about how to listen?

T20: No advice.

It can be seen that JTEs do not seem to help their pupils with the many difficult problems that are involved in obtaining meaning from spoken texts in English. The advice given for listening is very unspecific both in cases where the listening takes place in class as well as outside class. Teachers usually do not focus on teaching listening for, as mentioned previously, most university

examinations do not have a listening component, so it is not a skill teachers or students generally want to use time on. This may also explain why teachers are surprised at the thought of their pupils wanting to practice listening outside class, and why they do not have very good advice to give them.

Another reason for giving little advice regarding listening LLS may be because as teachers themselves are products of the same system, their listening skills are low.

One teacher, however, although not providing any specific LLS to help specifically with listening problems, does consider students' probable anxiety in connection with listening and suggests:

> T5: At home? Let me think.... First listen to music. I think it's important students feel it doesn't scare you. You can enjoy listening to English songs. Then..... if you do more at home, listen to the radio, the programme of the radio.

The lowering of stress which pupils are likely to feel is an important affective LLS which teachers often feel can be overcome through students listening to songs. However, affective strategies need to be bolstered by effective LLS to help LL accomplish the tasks in hand. Otherwise, stress levels are likely to increase. A further point is that possibly even more strategies are needed for listening to songs than spoken discourse. Although there is much repetition in songs, there is also much distortion of pronunciation. Teacher guidance is no

doubt needed to aid learners find songs with suitable lyrics for their level as well as them being pronounced in a well articulated way.

Nevertheless, the combination of students having few communicative classes and teachers having little experience of how to teach listening comprehension strategies as well as often having poor listening comprehension skills themselves results in their students having very low levels of aural comprehension on entering university and few LLS enabling them to improve (Fedderholdt 2002).

6.3.2 LLS for speaking which JTEs report teaching students

As there is no oral component in the examinations for universities, speaking is considered even less important than developing listening comprehension skills as can be seen below:

> Interviewer: How much speaking practice do your students get?
>
> T1: No speaking.
>
> Interviewer: Ah.
>
> T1: Yeah, some students think English learning should be translation practice only.
>
> Interviewer: Why do they think that?
>
> T1: You know, I ask some of the students why they emphasize that translation in my class. They said, some of them said, that er in an examination most of the questions consist of

translation from English to Japanese. Then they need translation from my lesson. We just translate English sentences into Japanese.

Most students opt not to take conversation classes during the two years prior to the university entrance examinations. In addition, a number of teachers leave the conversation classes entirely to the ALTs, although JTEs are supposed to team teach with them.

T19: I don't teach speaking. I'm too tired. I let the ALT teach speaking.

Interviewer: How often are conversation classes?

T19: Once a week, one hour. But most 2nd and 3rd year students don't take her class because of examinations.

Interviewer: Do you have oral communication classes?

T14: Yes.

Interviewer: So what do you do in your oral communication class?

T14: We English teachers at our school ask ALT please teach alone.

The teacher goes on to explain why:

T14: The other teachers, social science teachers don't teach so many classes so they can relax!

Interviewer: Oh, so why do English teachers have to work so hard?

T14: Ah, because English is in the university entrance examinations.

The teacher below has been overseas where she experienced classes quite different from those in Japan. She is impressed by the students at a high school:

T9: I went to Germany. All English classes in English. No German. So students speak English very fluently. But if I do so here, students will hardly understand me.

Interviewer: Hmmm.

T9: For example, they read a textbook. I ask them in English about why, what, where. But they worry about, they worry about they cannot translate into Japanese and they could not get good marks in English.

Interviewer: Hmmmm

T9: Because English examination translation is necessary for students.

Interviewer: Mmmmm

T9: Because university examinations many translations, many translations.

Interviewer: I see.

The examples above indicate why oral/aural English is not prioritized and why students do not want to study this. This disregard for these skills is in conflict

with the government's overt agenda which wants SHS to improve communicative competence. Further, it results in students finding classes with western teachers who tend to focus on communicative skills problematic. However, the washback effect of the university entrance examination dominates the kind of English taught at SHS. Browne and Wada (1998) stress that JTEs are under enormous pressure to get as many as possible of their pupils through these examinations which focus on discrete-point tests (Brown and Yamashita, 1995). A result of the use of Japanese as a medium for teaching English leaves students with little communicative competence and an unwillingness to leave the comfort zone of Japanese. Therefore, the following situation is not uncommon.

> T18: Some students want Japanese when the ALT and I proceed the class in English. So I have to proceed the class in Japanese.

Teachers taught very few LLS to enable their pupils to improve spoken English probably because of the situation described above. Those they did bring up were social strategies, and these will be discussed below.

6.3.3 Social strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Social strategies involve interacting or collaborating with others in connection with use of the TL. The trend in Japan is that SHS only have oral English in their first year for one lesson weekly. Therefore, students cannot get many chances to practice social strategies.

There was occasion to ask nine teachers: "If a student asked you how she/he could improve her/his spoken English, what would you suggest?" Eight out of these said that they would suggest that their students spoke to foreigners while one suggested speaking with the ALT. This seems to suggest the following: that JTEs do not seem to take responsibility themselves for teaching spoken English (probably because of the reasons given in 6.3.2). It further seems to indicate that there are no chances for social strategies to be used in their classes. As was also noted in 2.2 and 6.3.2, classes are held in Japanese predominantly. Their answers also appear to show that the teachers give unrealistic advice for, with the exception of the ALT who may or may not be full time at the school (but certainly not available more than a limited time), there are extremely few opportunities for students to meet foreigners outside. JTEs know that there are very few foreigners in Toyama, let alone NS of English. Therefore, the possibliltiy of this advice being carried out is highly unlikely.

In fact, teachers admitted this. Asked if they thought students knew any foreigners, the answer was "no". Then asked that if there were any, would students talk to them, the answer was also "no". When asked "Why not?" the answers were that students are too shy or nervous and because their English levels are too low.

The data from the questionnaire showed that the most taught LLS were compensation strategies. However, in the discussion of this in section 5.2.6, the point was made that this was surprising because students have so few oral

conversation classes and other EFL classes are taught in Japanese, as well as there being few opportunities for them to practice English outside of class. Consequently it is puzzling as to when and why JTEs would want to focus so much on these strategies. The same applies to social strategies.

6.3.4 LLS for reading which JTEs report teaching students

In the interviews, JTEs indicate that the dictionary is an important tool for reading, and the teaching of how to use it as an LLS is one upon which considerable energy is spent.

> T4: All teacher spend much time teaching the first graders to consult dictionaries. We make them buy the same the same dictionary. Students spend one month or more learning how to use the dictionary.
>
> Interviewer: Which kind of dictionary is it?
>
> T4: Uh?
>
> Interviewer: Which kind of dictionary is it?
>
> T4. Ah. English-Japanese/Japanese-English

This was a popular method for teaching reading.

> Interviewer: How do you advise students to read English?
>
> T13:I think we teachers teach basic techniques in class by reading textbooks with them

Interviewer: I see. So they have their text, their books are open. What do you suggest to help them read?

T13:Ah, first we tell them to buy a dictionary.

Interviewer: English-English, English-Japanese?

T13:English-Japanese,and we teach them how to use a dictionary.

Interviewer: Uhuh.

T13: After that they can look up words they don't know how by themselves.

T22: They have to learn to use the dictionary. We don't have to memorize all of the English words, but if we know how to find the meaning, how to use a dictionary, students can understand every sentence in the future. If they don't know how to use a dictionary, they will be at a loss.

Interviewer: But supposing the students find that the dictionary doesn't help, do you have any suggestions for what they could do?

T16: Hmmm

Interviewer: For example

T16: At home?

Interviewer: Well anywhere.

T16: Hmm. If they are enough motivated, motivated no problem.

In the above examples, it is seen that teachers have great faith in the English-Japanese/Japanese-English dictionary. Except in one case, they did not mention teaching inferencing from context or guessing for meaning even when probed and examples of inferencing given. Nor did they apparently teach skimming and scanning, which some referred to as "skip-reading". Several times the reason for not doing this was that students' level was too low. In fact, they seem to rely on the dictionary to the extent that no more strategy guidance in connection with reading processes was needed. It appeared that once they had learnt how to use a dictionary, they were on their own. As T13 and T16 say respectively: "After that they can look up words they don't know by themselves" and "if they are enough motivated, motivated enough, no problem".

One teacher was an exception, but was not cultivating LLS:

> T11: I do not particularly force them to open the dictionary at all. If you come up with a difficult word, ask me! I'm being paid for that, yea, so for that purpose please use me.
>
> Interviewer: In English?
>
> T11: Japanese.

The teachers seem to rely on the dictionary to solve students reading problems. However, this may be because by "reading" is really meant translating, as this teacher points out:

T4: In our senior high, we just translate in the reading class these sentences, then finished. We just translate English sentences into Japanese. I would like to do other things. I want them to think about the things, but students and teachers have to move on to the next English lesson.

As the translation takes place at sentence level and there is no thought given to deeper meaning, inferencing may not be possible. Therefore, teachers may not teach it.

The limited LLS which JTEs teach their pupils results in great problems in connection with reading as well as writing at university. Students have severe difficulties grasping the concepts of texts being entities and little idea of cohesion or coherence (Fedderholdt 2000).

6.3.5 Memory strategies which JTEs report teaching students

JTEs want students to memorize large amounts of vocabulary, as it is an important feature of the university entrance examinations to be able to recognize vocabulary in addition to grammatical constructions. Few strategies are taught to help students with this endeavour, although they often have vast numbers of vocabulary items to memorize:

Interviewer: Right. How many words do your students learn per week?

T14: Mmm. It depends on the students.

Interviewer: How many do you give them?

T14. My students now? Per week?

Interviewer: Mm

T14:Er..

Interviewer: Ten?

T14: No. More. Ten or twenty times more.

Interviewer: Ha, ha, ha. What a *hundred?*

T14: Maybe more.

Interviewer: A hundred and twenty?

T14: Mmm. Maybe from a hundred and fifty to two hundred.

Interviewer: Per *week?*

T14: Yes.

Interviewer: Is this normal?

T14: Yes. It is quite normal at my school.

Despite these vast numbers, LLS advice for memorizing these may be quite skimpy:

Interviewer: Supposing someone asks for advice how to learn them?

T14: Then I just say pronounce, spell, write them as many times as you can.

Interviewer: All right. When you say that you tell them to

memorize words do you give them suggestions how to memorize?

T9: Just the Japanese way. Sometimes I tell them it is the good way to write words many times.

Maybe there is a belief similar to this teacher's:

Interviewer: How do you suggest they learn vocabulary?

T16: Ah (laughs) high school level students can learn very quickly even if they don't make sentences, they can memorize them.

The secret for successful memorization appears to be repetition:

Interviewer: How?

T16: If they repeat.

Interviewer: If they repeat?

T16: The meaning and the pronunciation.

Or a firm favourite:

T3: Now I am teaching second grade students, so I tell them to write each word twenty times. So they have to write twenty times a hundred words.

(These students, as they were in a less academic high school, were more fortunate than T14's, and only had to learn a hundred words per month).

Three teachers, however, did advise students to learn words in phrases or sentences to help them remember better. Another teacher created funny stories to help students remember words better. This is not a LLS for although students may indeed remember the stories and some words better, it is more a teaching strategy than a learning strategy carried out by learners. However, if students created their own, it might be a better LLS as personalized efforts are often more memorable. Nevertheless, the basic impression is that LLS were limited to learning words by heart in isolation, out of context. Although there may be merits to writing out words a multitude of times to remember them, it does not mean that students can use these words relevantly or actively outside test situations. Indeed, a characteristic of university students is that despite the thousands of words they have been trained in at SHS, they display an extremely limited knowledge of vocabulary in oral and written communication classes. This is not only limited to active use of vocabulary but also with regard to passive vocabulary, as demonstrated when attempting to read texts in connection with oral and written tasks.

6.3.6 Metacognitive strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Teachers did not seem to teach metacognitive LLS to students.

> Interviewer: Do you ever ask them to set goals?
>
> T16: I think er ....that's what I lack.
>
> Interviewer: Righto.
>
> T16: Recently I never ask.

Interviewer: OK. Do you ever ask students to make a weekly plan for when they will study English?

T16: No. We just encourage students to learn language by threatening to give them a test!

Interviewer: Let's see, regarding your students; do you ever ask your students to plan their studying?

T20: (Silence)

Interviewer: Do you ever talk to them about goals?

T20: Goals?

Interviewer: Well, for example, many students say they want to speak English fluently with foreigners, but that is an enormous goal, so do you suggest they have smaller goals, for example (*Here I give several examples of small goals as well as LLS for this including social and affective strategies)*

T20: In the high school situation like us, the textbook is the goal they should cover in one year.

These examples suggest that thinking about their personal reasons for wanting to learn English are not important. Goals are external factors which one may not want to meet voluntarily and therefore tests are given, or students should simply adhere to the goal established by the book.

Nor do self-monitoring strategies seem to be taught:

Interviewer: Do you teach students to for example check themselves? For example, do you say to your students once a week to ask themselves: What have I learnt this week?

T17: You mean summarize?

Interviewer: Well, Friday evening ask themselves: What did I learn this week?

T17: (Laughs) I see. No.

The same applies to self-evaluation:

Interviewer: In which way is students' work corrected?

T19: I put a line underneath, and give them the correct answer.

Interviewer: You give them the correct answer?

T19: On another sheet.

Interviewer: Do you ever ask them to find the correct answer themselves?

T24: Themselves? (Surprised).

Interviewer: Yes.

T24: I have never done such a thing. I think it's a very good idea, but in high school, in Japanese high school, Japanese students have so many things to learn, so they should learn very quickly, so in daily life we choose the easy way.

However, it might be that although it seems a quick and easy method when teachers correct and provide answers, it might be more effective and fruitful, if

some time were spent on metacognitive strategies to help students obtain a clearer overview of their EFL learning, learn to take responsibility and control over it through goal-setting, time-management, self-monitoring and evaluation. Several teachers seemed to find metacognitive strategies very novel and not considered previously. A number indicated they found them a good idea.

6.3.7 Affective strategies which JTEs report teaching students

Affective strategies were least taught, possibly because as there is very little speaking and listening practice, teachers do not get any opportunity to teach them, nor feel they are very necessary, possibly. However, the teacher below empathizes with pupils:

> T8: We sometimes forget how the students are not so good at learning English so there must be a great gap between the teachers and the feelings of the students.
> Interviewer: Yes
> T8: So, ah, I think it's very necessary for us to put ourselves in the students' situation.

Another teacher attempted to relax students even though they had to be tested:

> T18: I am doing a three word vocabulary quiz every time, so the

students seem to be enjoying it because it is very easy just to remember three words, so they can get confidence to remember.

Teachers did not advise students regarding affective strategies such as "I try to relax whenever I use English" or "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake", possibly because of the few opportunities students have for these to be relevant. Also a number of teachers seem to leave conversation classes solely to the ALT. However, these are not trained to be teachers and may not know about LLS or how to give guidance in them. Nevertheless, JTEs could teach affective strategies in connection with grammar and vocabulary by encouraging students to use affective strategies such as: "I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English".

6.4 The responsibility for learning lies with students

A motif running through the interviews seems to be that teachers tend to consider it students' own duty to deal with their learning themselves rather than teachers guiding them towards LLS to do so. Comments such as the following run through the interviews:

T19: We let them find their own way.

T17: I never give them special advice. Just listen.

T20: No advice

Instead of advising pupils how to go about learning, teachers seem indicate that they feel motivation will solve learning problems:

> Interviewer: Who is responsible for learning a language, the teacher or the student?
> T21: If a student's really motivated to learn English, they will succeed.

> T14: I think teachers can help, but other than that, it depends on how much the student is motivated.

In addition, advice is very limited:

> T19: At my school, uh, teachers usually just ask students to memorize idioms and words and read English, as much English as possible. That will do the trick.
> Interviewer: Mmmm
> T19: After 3 years students get very efficient.

The theme seems to be that "learning is students' responsibility" and that there thus is a schism between teaching and learning. The teacher teaches, while the learner somehow, independent of the teachers, must learn. However, not all students can manage this, and need help to learn and guidance to use appropriate LLS for various tasks which suit their individuality.

6.5 Different skills and LLS taught according to level of students

A surprising finding in the interview data was that teachers at lower level SHS seemed to emphasize speaking more than at the more academic high schools from where students are expected to enter university:

> T15: My school is a technological high school, so the level of the students is very low, so if I teach lots of grammar, they refuse, so I always teach them short sentences, easy ones and lots of practice to speak. But in other schools, some high level schools, they um learn lots of grammars. I try to make English interesting, some activity or game or something like that.

> T7: I want my students to enjoy English. If they want grammar, it's ok. If they want conversation, it's ok. You know I said my school level is low, so it's difficult to have an aim.

> T14: This is a low level high school and the students are not interested in English.
> Interviewer: Mmmm
> T14: So I always think how I can get them interested.
> Interviewer: How do you do that?
> T14: They do pair work.
> Interviewer: In English?

T14: Yes, these students can now speak English.

Possibly teachers and students are willing to be more "experimental" in these schools because both they and the students have less to lose. Students will not be trying to go to university, or if they are they will be focusing on low level private ones or sports ones which practically anyone who has graduated from SHS can enter.

However, regarding LLS guidance, the fact that they are considered low-level students works against them:

T2: No. I don't teach skip reading. To tell the truth, the students of this school do not have such a high level.

Interviewer: Do you teach skimming and scanning?

T7: Skip reading?

Interviewer: Yes.

T7: No! (Very emphatically).

Interviewer: Oh.

T7: My students level of learning, average level of learning has not reached that level. That way of reading for them is too difficult.

Interviewer: Do you ever ask your students to correct their own writing?

T16: (No response).

Interviewer: For example, instead of you giving them the correct answers when you check their papers, do you ask them to find their own mistakes or their partner's?

T16: That is not possible. This school's students are very low level.

Statements such as these suggest that at least some teachers seem to feel that teaching even basic LLS is out of the question with low-level students. However, an argument could be made that precisely these students need help with learning how to learn and make good use of appropriate LLS. Rather than withholding LLS, teachers should intensify teaching them, so that pupils could be helped towards better learning. This in turn might promote an interest in learning and desire to learn English.

6.6 Summary

In this chapter, the focus has been on what JTEs say about their EFL skills, and their use and teaching of LLS in their own voices. They express dissatisfaction with their EFL education and have strong desires to improve their English. However, they seem to be hindered by various factors, such as simply being very busy. They also seem to have a very limited knowledge and use of appropriate LLS which could help them make optimal use of the time they do have to spend on increasing their English. Nor do JTEs seem to teach their students LLS in order to help them manage their EFL learning. In the interviews, it seems JTEs report teaching LLS to students much less than they use them themselves as well as what they report in the questionnaire survey. A

further problem is that compensation strategies are reported as the ones most taught in the questionnaire. In addition to the fact that these may not be the most appropriate, it is remarkable that teachers report doing this as their students have very few opportunities to practice oral/aural English. An exception to this, seemed to be in the case of students at lower-level SHS who appear to have more opportunities to make use of them. This is an unexpected though nevertheless interesting finding which the interviews were able to reveal. A further point of interest is the role of the ALTs. These are intended to improve students' EFL. However, teachers' comments showed how they provide opportunities for JTEs to use a variety of LLS in their interaction with them, and how those JTEs in frequent contact with ALTs have been able to improve their English. However, teachers did not mention the ALTs in connection with their students.

As noted earlier in this section, JTEs do not much mention teaching LLS. One reason may be that they seemed to feel that academic students should be motivated enough to manage learning problems on their own, while in the case of non-academic students, their low-levels of English were seen to preclude LLS training. Another reason can also be that JTEs themselves have narrow experience or insights into the role of LLS and therefore do not guide students towards them. This may also be connected with the finding that there seems to be some indication that teachers do not actually feel responsible for helping students with learning, but that they consider their job is done once the transmission of the information they have selected for students is effectuated. Nor do the EFL textbooks used at high schools include LLS guidance.

It seems to me that not being expert users of LLS and not teaching these to students results in a loss of opportunities with regard to EFL learning. My conviction is that were people educated to know how to deal with the input directed at them, they would profit from it better. If they were able to formulate for themselves which goals they want to achieve and what they need in order to do so, they would be able to critically assess the information made available to them. If it were not appropriate for their needs, they should have the strategies to ask for or find what they need by themselves. If they were taught how to assess themselves rather than being dependent on tests to tell them, this would also be more useful for life-long learning. In addition, they should be able to recognize which cognitive LLS can help them solve the problems they are confronted with and whether they need further LLS and in which combination they need to use them. Also, in order to work with others or overcome possible fears and anxieties in connection with the learning process. Therefore, social and affective strategies ought to be taught. These are some of the issues I will discuss in the final chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN OF LLS COURSES FOR JTEs AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter connects pivotal points of the study. First of all, it brings together the various findings which demonstrate how the research questions have been addressed. It discusses the findings of the survey and interview data regarding JTEs' own use and teaching of LLS. Then supplementary findings of interest connected to the use and teaching of LLS will be examined. After this, limitations of the study will be presented. Next, implications for the design of LLS courses for teachers will be discussed. Finally, there will be suggestions for further research.

7.1 Findings

The survey questionnaire data revealed that JTEs reported medium use of LLS as well as teaching of LLS. The average per strategy was around 3 out of a scale 1-5. However, teachers reported using LLS themselves slightly more than teaching them, although this was not significant. In both cases, compensation strategies were the most popular (mean 3.61 for JTEs' own use, mean 3.15 for compensation strategies taught). Next JTEs used metacognitive strategies most (mean 3.14), then cognitive LLS (mean 3.12). The least used groups of LLS were social strategies (mean 2.70) and memory strategies (mean 2.63). In contrast, the second most taught group was cognitive strategies (mean 3.11),

followed by social strategies (mean 3.07), then memory (mean 2.81) and metacognitive strategies (mean 2.76). In addition, teachers were asked in the questionnaire to which extent they teach affective strategies. These they reported teaching least (mean 2.68).

In the above findings there are some surprises and these will be commented upon. One is that JTEs report compensation and social strategies as being the most and third most taught LLS. This is unexpected because, as noted in Sections 2.2, 5.2.6. and 6.3.2, many, if not most, students spend their senior high school years concentrating on acquiring the grammar, vocabulary and translation skills necessary to pass the university entrance examinations. And, as also noted, very little English is spoken in these classes so that compensation and social strategies do not seem needed. Further, as pointed out in Sections 5.2.6 and 6.3.2, most students do not take oral communication classes in the final two of their three years at senior high school. Consequently, it is difficult to see when, and why, compensation and social skills are taught. Further research is necessary to clarify whether JTEs really do focus on teaching compensation strategies more than other LLS. Also there are further problems in connection with the teaching of compensation strategies. This will be discussed more fully in section 7.5.

In contrast, social skills were the second least LLS reported used by JTEs, although they generally have more opportunities than their students to use social strategies with the ALTs.

Possibly it could have been imagined that memory strategies would be taught frequently by JTEs, as passing the exams successfully is dependent upon knowing a vast number of words, expressions and grammar points. Nevertheless, memory strategies ranked fourth out of the six groups which JTEs could teach. Possibly, this is because the teachers believe students, through many years experience of memorizing, are adept at this.

Regarding variations according to gender, only two strategy categories showed significant differences between the LLS female and male JTEs used. Female teachers used compensation and social strategies more themselves but only taught social strategies more than male JTEs.

With regard to teaching experience, the data indicated that teachers who have more than 25 years experience teach memory and metacognitve strategies more than those with less experience. This is in contrast to the overall findings of the survey data. It is rather difficult to explain why this is so, but until the late 1980's there were far fewer universities in Japan, so in order to enter one, students had to focus to a very high degree on memorization to be successful in the university entrance examinations. Consequently, these teachers would be very familiar with memory strategies and as they had had success with them, likely to be inclined to teach them to students.

Teachers who have taught more might also have a more encompassing view of learning. This may result in their recognizing the value of metacognitive strategies and therefore this may be why they teach them more. Nevertheless,

both memory and metacognitive strategies were overall two of the three least taught strategies.

Some of the findings within the individual strategy groups reflect the EFL situation in Japan. Two examples will be given: In the metacognitive strategy group (metacognitive strategies were the second most used group of LLS) the most used strategy reported was "When someone is speaking in English, I try to concentrate on what the person is saying and put unrelated topics out of my mind". This could be symptomatic of the fact that JTEs are often poor at aural comprehension, and therefore have to focus intensely when listening to spoken English. That JTEs have passed through an educational system which values accuracy may be mirrored in the fact that the most used cognitive strategy used is "I use reference materials such as glossaries or dictionaries to help me with English". Thus examination of the individual strategies used and taught and placing these within the Japanese EFL context is also important, partly in order to understand teachers and students better, but also to be able to taylor LLS courses.

Some other salient points in the metacognitive group in addition to the example given above is that in general JTEs seem to use less the more over-arching strategies such as self-evaluating and goal-setting compared to more task based ones. Also, in the case of cognitive strategies, the 5 strategies used most are for aiding understanding rather than language production.

Regarding the LLS which JTEs teach students, of the cognitive strategy group,

the most taught LLS is teaching "students to practice the sounds of English" and to "say or write new English words several times". These are very task-bound strategies strategies and seem to reflect the situation in Japan, which necessitates accumulating knowledge.

The data from the interviews revealed a number of differences from the findings of the survey. With regard to the extent of JTEs' own use of LLS, there seemed to be less discrepancy between what they reported in the survey and what they indicated in the interviews as compared with what they reported regarding teaching students. In the surveys, JTEs reported teaching students LLS far more than they indicated in the interviews. However, in contrast to the survey data, the interviews revealed JTEs' extensive use of social strategies in connection with ALTs especially. This is to be expected as they may have one permanently at their school, or at least have a working relationship with one. Teachers reported being very interested in improving oral/aural skills which fits in with frequent social skill use.

A salient point - as noted in the previous paragraph - is that JTEs indicated in the interviews that taught LLS far less than they reported in the questionnaire. Furthermore, the range of LLS was very narrow. Some reported not teaching any LLS in connection with various skills. One of the two LLS which JTEs seem to teach quite intensively was how to use English-Japanese/Japanese-English dictionaries. This is in contrast to the most reported compensation strategy: "I teach my students to guess words they don't know" and the fact that using dictionaries ranked 8th out of the cognitive strategies taught. The second LLS

which JTEs encouraged students to use was to write down words many times to remember them.

References to other strategies taught were mostly limited to recommending students to listen to songs or tapes, but not which strategies to use when listening in order to derive meaning and accomplish learning. The LLS mentioned taught were very few indeed.

Possibly, although it would require more research using different instruments in order to verify the following, it could be thought that the reasons between the survey and interview data could be one, a combination or all of the following:

- That JTEs inadvertently became victims of the "halo" effect and overemphasized in the questionnaire the frequency that they use and teach LLS
- There could have been lack of precision regarding accuracy due to time constraints
- Misunderstandings of the formulations of the LLS
- that teachers teach some LLS not for immediate use, but with a view to future idealized situations in which students have possibilities for speaking English.
- Possibly JTEs answered the questionnaire more from the point of view of view of what they feel are good strategies to use or teach, rather than what they actually do.

When the local EFL context within which JTEs work is taken into consideration, it would seem that the data in the interview reflects a more accurate picture. It also reflects my personal experience from teacher training courses I have organized, informal discussions with JTEs, knowledge of the EFL situation in Japan, as well as observations and surveys done on students regarding LLS both published and unpublished (Fedderholdt 1998, 2000, 2001). It seems that although JTEs do use some LLS, their overall use and indeed awareness of them seems limited, especially in connection with their relevance for their students.

7.2 Special findings

During the interviews, some issues which were not revealed in the survey, due to the nature of the instrument and the statements presented, were brought up. This reiterates the importance of triangulation of methods in research and the fact that surveys need to take into consideration, possibly to an extent more than normally recognised, the cultural context of a particular situation.

The first most interesting topic which the data from the interviews yielded was how JTEs could use a variety of LLS in connection with the ALTs. These provide JTEs with the possibility of speaking English with NS and give them opportunities to use LLS. The vast majority of JTEs do not have an opportunity to do this otherwise. Their previous experience of EFL at secondary school and university did not include many opportunities for authentic, relevant use of

oral/aural English and this excluded chances to use a variety of LLS. In contrast, with ALTs JTEs can use social, compensation, cognitive and metacognitve strategies to make their interaction with ALTs learning ones. In fact, encounters with ALTs seemed to be the most positive learning experience JTEs have in connection with their own EFL learning and from which they felt they have benefited well.

However, it has been noted that not all SHS have ALTs. Apart from that, the fact that JTEs indicate that ALTs have helped them improve their English levels says something about the sorry state of EFL education in Japan. Although Sick (1996) points out that regarding ALTs "there seems to be no official guidelines specifying how they should be used" (p200) surely it should not be to train the teachers they have come to assist. The responsibility for ensuring good English skills for JTEs must lie elsewhere. Nevertheless, the fact is that many JTEs testify that their English has improved through LLS and contact with ALTs.

With regard to students, the fact that JTEs taught few LLS and did not appear to be very interested in doing so seems to suggest that they are possibly not aware that a number of students may need help in order to make the most of their learning potential. Several teachers indicated that learning issues could be solved by giving tests which would make students focus on the items to be learnt. Others claimed that as long as students were motivated, they would manage to learn well. However, some students may not be motivated simply because they are not able to learn well and therefore often do not succeed in

various tasks. If they were guided towards LLS which could help them cope better, their motivation may be increased and this in turn may improve performance. JTEs did not mention this way of looking at the situation, however.

Another interesting point which was found in the interview data was that there possibly exists a difference in EFL skill focus depending on the academic level of the various schools. Comments made by teachers at less academic SHS seemed to suggest that if students were not expected to go to any kind of university, teachers were not limited by the demand for grammar-translation skills. Therefore, they indicated that they could instead focus rather more on speaking skills. This leads to the observation below in 7.3.

7.3 The differences between the government's guidelines and practice at local levels at SHS and universities

The implicit message in the discussion in the previous sub-section seems to be that grammar and written work in the form of translation are seen to be more important than speaking/listening skills. In most societies, not least in Japan, going to university, and being able to create good careers, is considered admirable and enhances a person's status. Therefore, doing well in subjects which are needed to create the entry into this world are those which are most important. In Japan, in the area of EFL this means developing the ability to deal competently with discrete points of grammar and vocabulary questions and

being able to translate various sentences in a passage into Japanese, because it is these skills in which the universities test would-be-students.

Students who attend SHS from where they are not expected to go to into tertiary education do not feel obliged to concentrate on these areas exclusively. This could explain the tendency for their teachers to feel less restrained, and therefore, that they can concentrate more on English for communicative competence instead.

It thus appears that it is at non-academic SHS where the ministerial guidelines issued in 1989 advocating focus on communicative skills are being carried out. These recommendations (first discussed in Section 2.6) included ones for a more communicatively oriented approach in the teaching of EFL in order to help Japanese be able to speak and understand English. As it is now, however, those who will show Japan's public face to the world are continuing with the traditional emphasis on learning about language instead of being able to use it appropriately as a means of communication. This inability to express themselves or understand what is being said to them may give rise to problems such as those which Hau (2002) discusses in a recent newspaper article about the English skills of Japanese. This, he claims, contributes to continuing economic stagnation in Japan, and situations such as the recent one in China in which the Japanese deputy consul in Shanghai caused an embarrassing international incident when he handed back a letter from would-be asylum seekers because he did not understand English (ibid). As a result the

Chinese police forced the asylum seekers out of the embassy grounds and incarcerated them.

This kind of situation may well continue to happen for as yet no thoroughgoing changes have been made in the examination system despite the Ministry of Education's directives of 1989. The lack of action in this area gives rise to speculation as to whether the government is whole-hearted in its claims that it wants Japanese to become functional in English. In the following section, I will present possible reasons why the guidelines of 1989 have not been heeded. My discussion is based on the work by Erickson (1986) which, as noted in 1.3., provides one of the frameworks for this thesis.

Erickson (1986) claims "there may be universal principals of organization by which people collectively foster or inhibit the accomplishment of stated goals" (p135). In the case of English in Japan, it seems to be that Japanese are prevented rather than helped to become competent English speakers, but what the reason is for this is difficult to discern. Can the contradictions within EFL education be because Japan is still uncertain with regard to its attitude to the West, embracing yet rejecting? That English is seen as a symbol of "oreigness" of which history has shown Japan to be wary? Or simply that educators have not realized the advantages of scanning the global village for other ways of teaching and testing foreign languages? Do people who control the education system fail to recognize or accept the necessity of sweeping reforms and changes to be effectuated rapidly in Japanese EFL education? Whatever reasons there are, it is difficult to imagine how recent proposals will bring

about great improvements in the communicative skills of the Japanese. As demonstrated, the guidelines of 1989 have had little impact and people do not have the resources in the form of for example, LLS, with which to overcome the hurdles preventing them becoming competent in English in the areas they wish. New proposals continue to be made. One of these , a proposal made by MEXT (2000) seems helpful at first. It advocates that attempts at improving English proficiency should be made by beginning EFL earlier in Japan. The government wants children at primary school to experience English. However, it is looking for retired teachers and others to volunteer for these classes. It is well known in Japan, that the older teachers of EFL are, the less communicative competence they generally have. Secondly why should such an important project be left in the hands of volunteers? It seems that a project which is not worth paying for cannot be valued very highly. This may indicate that the government is not fully supportive of its own plans. With regard to the proposal, Hau (2002)- referring to this MEXT (2002) proposal - claims that the ministry has "again failed to address what is generally agreed to be the real problem - English teachers who do not know the language they teach" (5). As has been seen in this study, even teachers themselves are dissatisfied with their English levels.

A more recent proposal by MEXT entitled "Japanese with English abilities" (2002) calls for creating competent speakers of English. This seems to make attempts to reflect the ideas of 1989. However, it does not include the necessary urgent overhaul of the entrance examinations which are the major reason for communicative competence not being taught. Instead it only

recommends that the Center Test should have a listening component as soon as possible (this has already been delayed from 2002) or that examinations such as TOEFL or TOIEC should be used instead of the present examinations. However, the TOEFL focuses on academic English and the TOIEC on business English. It also suggests that future JTEs should have English language abilities equal to a TOEFL score of 550 or a TOIEC one of 730. If this becomes what is required of JTEs, the problems noted above will result: teachers are not likely to become communicatively competent in daily life situations. Nor would this be required, if their pupils are to sit TOEIC or TOEFL examinations. Teaching towards these or fulfilling the TOIEC or TOEFL requirements would not help cultivate communicative competence as there are no speaking components in these tests in their present state. Even if these two examinations do include a speaking component at some point, their focus is on English for Specific Purposes (ESP). This will result in the same situation as hitherto. Communicative skills for a variety general social and daily interactions will not be prioritised.

In addition, the plan uses vague language such as recommending education boards, when employing new JTEs, to "urge the consideration of English-language abilities in teachers' assessments" (2002;p5). The new "strategic plan" (2002) reveals that JTEs will receive further training, but this is extremely limited. Only 2,000 annually will be able to receive 4-weeks training and not all of this time will involve learning of English. Currently, there are 60,000 high school teachers, so it will take decades before all teachers experience this

training. Added to which is the question as to whether any substantial benefit can be achieved in four weeks.

The dual-system whereby JTEs cannot -or are possibly even not expected to - speak English will continue as a new measure by MEXT (2002) is that 300 foreign teachers are to be appointed as regular teachers at high schools. This is to increase to a 1000 within 3 years. In addition the proposal recommends that the number of ALTs be increased by circa 3.000 from the present 8.400 to 11.500 in 2003. In no proposals are there any suggestions for emphasizing students situation and how to enable them to cope efficiently with their learning endeavours. As long as there are no clear, unequivocal goals for the improvement of the language skills for JTEs or students, Japanese who wish to be able to communicate efficiently and appropriately will have to find their own way in order to be competent in English. One of the ways of doing this will be by developing good LLS and becoming independent, preferably autonomous learners. However, the concept of life-long learning and the necessity to cultivate people who have been guided towards efficient LLS and learner independence is not mentioned at all.

7.4 Limitations of this study

The research carried out in this study could have been improved in various ways. Especially I feel that it would have been helpful, had it been possible, to interview more teachers for longer and more than once.

It would have been useful to have been able to supplement the survey and interviews with observations of EFL classes at SHS. This, however, was impossible as because of teaching duties at university.

In addition, it would have been fruitful to have been able to obtain more in depth information from JTEs about their LLS. It would have been very useful to have had supplementary questions about various strategies. Statements such as "I watch television programmes, videos and films in English". This does not say much about how the viewer works with the video, for example, to create meaning. An in-depth questionnaire would ask questions such as "Do you rewind, if you don't understand something?", "Do you have a dictionary on hand when viewing a film?","Do you make notes concerning vocabulary or expressions while you are watching?","Do you summarize the content of the film?" "Do you talk about the film in English later to a friend?" "Do you review new words you discovered in the film?" "Will you do anything to check if you remember any of these words next week?" to mention just a few possibilities. In my view, this lack of more in-depth probing is a main defect of the SILL. It would also be helpful to have a questionnaire which examined how LLS were taught in combinations. Here I am thinking of the problems which Cohen (1990, 1998) and McDonough (1995) point to concerning the fact that compensation strategies are in fact not necessarily more than language *use* strategies, if not specifically used by the learner as language *learning* strategies. Often this would mean using them in combination with other LLS. However, compensation strategies appear as one of the LLS categories in Oxford's (1990) SILL.

Another puzzling point in the SILL is the way in which some LLS are allocated to a particular category. A case in point is "I say or write new English words several times" which would seem to be a memory strategy, yet it features in the cognitive category. In addition, the SILL could be improved, if it were more culture specific. For example, in countries such as Japan, it might be more useful to focus on LLS which can be used in connection with the skills students have to focus on such as grammar, translation, and vocabulary. It seems to me now that the SILL is too superficial and imprecise an instrument which can only be used for preliminary questions on LLS.

7.5. LLS training courses for JTEs: some considerations

One of the objectives of this research is to be able to create LLS courses for teachers based on the findings. Athough the limitations of lenght of this study will not allow for a very in-depth presentation of the design of LLS courses, based on the findings of this study, the following will discuss a number of areas which I think LLS courses for JTEs need to especially encompass.

First of all, the Japanese context of EFL education both for students and the training of JTEs needs to be borne in mind. This includes knowing that would-be JTEs have only a modicum of grounding in the theories of FL teaching and learn only little about methodologies. And, as demonstrated in Chapter 2 and through teachers' own comments in Chapter 6, subject knowledge of English is generally quite low. Practical experience is gained through only 2 weeks on-

site practice in a school. Once employed, new teachers have apprentice-like status and are guided by older teachers. However, these teachers are themselves products of the same EFL education and university programmes. Japan is still very insular and very few JTEs have been overseas to study or to attend EFL conferences. This means innovation is unusual. Therefore, in the introductory stage of LLS courses, a good idea might be for teachers to explore what is done overseas with regard to LLS and autonomous learning in a wide variety of countries where English is taught as a foreign language. They would be asked to investigate via the Internet various projects taking place in Asia such as in Hong Kong and in Europe:for example in Ireland, France, Denmark, Sweden and Finland in order to widen their perspective and understanding of LLS and learner independence. It is important to cultivate a receptive attitude towards LLS and their importance for learner autonomy. Teachers also need to be encouraged to realize that despite the rigid ramifications in Japan: little choice in textbooks, a large number of students in each class and the limitations dictated by examinations, students can still benefit from learning how to learn via LLS use. It is important for JTEs to realize that teaching students how to learn is essential. It cannot be left to whether their motivation is high or not as some teachers indicated in the interviews.

With regard to the teaching of actual strategies, there are especially two main areas which need special attention within a Japanese context. The first concerns metacognitive strategies. The data from the survey showed that JTEs

taught metacognitive strategies as the second least category, and the interviews showed a similar lack of interest in teaching them. Yet the metacognitive strategies involving goal setting, time management, self-monitoring and evaluation as well as problem solving are extremely important.

As for goal-setting, for example, teachers need to be able to advise students how to not only decide goals, but also refine them. After deciding superordinate goals, these goals then need to be broken down into sub-goals and possibly, even smaller, micro-goals. This serves a two-fold purpose: students learn how to recognize which parts constitute a goal, and also how to make these of manageable size that do not invite defeat. An important feature is also to learn not only to work in a linear fashion towards a goal, but also laterally to maintain learning of previously accomplished goals. Also LLS for time-management should be taught, so that students can decide upon dead-lines for accomplishing tasks and adhering to them.

Concerning self-monitoring and self-evaluation, teachers should for example encourage their pupils to self-correct. In Japan, writing mostly involves translation. However, the same principles apply as for writing. That is, students (and JTEs) should regard translation efforts as processes and realise that a finished product cannot be completed optimally in one sitting. The next step involves re-reading, reflecting and the creation of an improved version. Instead of handing back fully corrected copies to students, teachers should wean students away from their dependency on them. This means, for example, only indicating that a number of mistakes have been made without identifying

them, or identifying them but not providing correct answers. Teachers in the interviews corrected students' inaccuracies, but this does not help learners achieve learner independence or autonomy. Instead, teachers can help students more profitably by leading them to self-correction strategies and grade on self-correction rather than the first version handed in. While they work on a project, students should learn LLS which help them avail themselves of a variety of resources, for example, on the Internet and through use of various reference books. JTEs need to encourage learners to use social strategies to work together to find solutions to problems, both with classmates and on an international level with keypals. For example, other NNS EFL learners in similar situations, or indeed NSs. Together they could discuss language issues which would involve use of English to solve problems in English. Students should also be taught to self-evaluate the final version of their work by giving themselves a grade before the teacher does, and further learn how to self-evaluate their progress by checking each draft or assignment with previous ones.

In contrast to metacognitive strategies, teachers reported using and teaching compensation strategies most. However, there are various problems concerning this group and these need to be considered in the preparation of training courses. Cohen (1998) and McDonough (1995) posit that compensation strategies are not necessarily LLS. They argue that compensation strategies such as reverting back to one's own language or creating a neologism to attempt to solve a language problem only keeps interaction going. Likewise, in the case of asking for clarification, repetition and for

someone to speak more slowly. Once the difficulty has been overcome, the new insight can be forgotten completely. Therefore, Cohen stresses that compensation strategies should be thought of as language "use" strategies as explained in section 3.8.3. For learners to achieve any lasting effect through their use, they need to be combined with LLS focusing on language "learning".

Another important point to be taken into consideration in connection with compensation strategies is that Bialystok (1981) claims that it is in fact not necessary to teach learners these as language learners carry them over from first language experiences. Therefore, if focus is spent on compensation strategies in isolation after providing students with the various expressions in English (For example, "Would you please repeat that?" or "What does that mean?"), time may be being wasted. Because of this and Cohen's (1998) and McDonough's (1995) claims, JTEs should be guided towards using compensation strategies in conjunction with other strategies so as to render them beneficial.

However, not only compenstion strategies need to be combined with other strategies in order for learning to take place. Cognitive, memory, social and affective strategies and combinations of these are central for LLS to be effective. Further for LLS training to be successful, courses need to be linked to situations which JTEs and learners find themselves in. There seems little point in stressing LLS for situations which are unlikely to crop up. LLS are not esoteric abstractions but practical ways of doing things to improve learning. Several of the LLS which are often recommended by teachers in the data, for

example "Speak with NS of the TL" or "Watch tv programmes, films or videos in English" as discussed in Chapter 6 are either very unrealistic or very superficial strategies. In the first case, JTEs know it is extremely unlikely that their students know any foreigners in Toyama, or would have the courage to speak to them if they did. Advising students to watch films etc in English is not very helpful. Teachers need to help learners uncover and employ a number of more specific strategies which make these general strategies successful. In the case of the latter, a number of connected strategies can be suggested as in Section 7.4. above, while students can be encouraged to think about how they can get speaking practice although there are no foreigners. This can be accomplished via "voicemail" or live "chatrooms" where students can speak in English with other NNS or NS of English. Several LLS can be used in connection with this. I shall give an example devised by one of my students recently (Fedderholdt, 2003) and which other students could use with good effect. This student had "voicemail" sessions with young people in various parts of the world in English twice a week. During these she taped what she said. After this she replayed the tapes and transcribed what she had said and checked her language output. Then she worked on improving various aspects. For example, she noted where she had repeated the same words or expressions frequently and then learnt other ones as substitutes and in the next meeting made a conscious effort to use these. She noted where she was at a loss for words or could not express something grammatically and then found out how to overcome these problems. Another relevant point here is that it is not always teachers who have all the answers. Students too can devise their own excellent LLS.

This has been a brief example of basing teacher training courses on some of the findings from this research. It is important that these are tailored, taking the local as well as non-local issues into consideration in order for them to be effective and benefit both teachers and students.

7.6 Suggestions for further research

Although the background and qualifications of teachers in Japan is very uniform, it would be interesting to explore the differences between the teachers in the various prefectures and what can be learnt from them. To achieve this, it would be helpful if research could be carried out to learn about different teacher training programmes at various universities and a comparison of prefectural examinations for would-be-teachers undertaken. This information could then be examined with reference to data regarding JTE's use and teaching of LLS to see if variations in education and teacher-training between prefectures resulted in differences in LLS use and teaching.

Inter-prefectural studies would also allow for comparions between teachers who majored in TEFL with those who are British or American majors to examine how this affects LLS use/teaching.

Another area of interest would be a long term project to see whether LLS training has a "maturation" effect. That is, whether LL who have been taught LLS at some point, but who might have stopped using them, are able to

retrieve these strategies later in situations where LL is more urgent. Research does not seem to have been done in this area. A problem with LLS training is that some research findings suggest that after the cessation of LLS training, learners often revert to former learning practices. However, it would be useful to see whether this rejection is permanent. This would necessitate investigating learners who have received LLS training and compare their LLS use during and upon finishing the course and, for example, one month later, then three months later and then again at intervals for a number of years. It is perhaps the case that learners draw upon earlier LLS training at later times in their lives. This would further argue for the importance of LLS training.

This chapter completes this research which was carried out to investigate JTEs' use and teaching of LLS in order to be able to create better LLS training courses for JTEs and in turn LLS guidance to students. Proficiency in LLS can help to achieve learner independence or autonomy which is essential for people to cope with new learning situations which inevitably will crop up during their lives and which they will need to tackle successfully. It is hoped that other teacher trainers may find this research helpful in this regard. The findings also may help teachers at universities to understand better how students go about FL learning as through this research they will be able to find some information concerning which LLS their students have been guided towards using prior to coming to university.

Also it has provided further relevant information through teachers' comments related to various issues connected to EFL at SHS concerning students and the

way JTEs look upon them. Knowing more about students can also help towards being able to devise better LLS programmes for them. This is important so that they can achieve learner independence to help them cope with the many learning situations they will find themselves in throughout their lives.

Appendix 1: Acceptance by Professor Oxford regarding adaptions made to SILL. Copy of email from Professor Oxford/ secretary.

Dr. O.
Is it OK for Karen Fedderholdt to make these adaptions to the SILL? Let me know and I will write back to her.
Thanks
Kara

Kara,
Pls forward to Karen

Karen

I think these adaptations are wonderful. I do want to see the results as soon as you have them.

I would like to consider doing a similar study over here. What do you think?

Rebecca O.

Appendix 2: Pre-survey letter

Karen Fedderholdt
Faculty of Humanities
Toyama University

Dear Colleague,

My name is Karen Fedderholdt and I teach English as a Foreign Language at Toyama University. I would like to ask you and all your colleagues at senior high schools in Toyama Prefecture to answer a questionnaire which I will send to you next week. In it you will be asked about which Language Learning Strategies (LLS) you use when you are working on increasing your skills in English, and also which language learning strategies you teach your students to use to help them learn English.

Language learning strategies are methods, or techniques or tactics which you use to help you learn English. Some examples are to: write personal notes, or summaries in English, to listen for new words when listening to tapes and make a note of them, to practice speaking English with a partner.

You will receive the questionnaire next Friday and I would be very grateful, if you would return it within 10 days. There will be a stamped addressed envelope included for your convenience.

I look very much forward to receiving your questionnaire. If you have any problems or questions concerning it, please contact me on the telephone number or email address below.

Thank you.

Karen Fedderholdt
Tel: 076-445-6236
Email: Karen@hmt.toyama-u.ac.jp

Appendix 3. Cover letter for SILL and final version of the adapted SILL Questionnaire sent to JTEs

Karen Fedderholdt
Toyama University
Faculty of Humanities

Dear Colleague,

I hope you are fine. With this letter I am sending you the survey questionnaire which I promised you last week. As I wrote earlier, the questionnaire is about which Language Learning Strategies (LLS) you use when you are working on increasing your English skills and which language learning strategies you teach your students to help them learn English.

Language learning strategies are the "tricks", tactics, or techniques which you use to make your learning of English more effective. Some examples are to: make sentences with new items of vocabulary you have learnt, to listen to tapes in English, to review often.

All Japanese teachers of English as a Foreign Language at prefectural senior high schools in Toyama Prefecture are being sent this questionnaire. I hope to as many as possible will be sent back to me - including yours! I will be very happy if you would please return your answers within 10 days. Thank you.

If you have any problems concerning language learning strategies or this questionnaire, please contact me on the telephone number or email address supplied below.

Regards,

Karen Fedderholdt
Tel: 076-445- 6232 Email: Karen@hmt.toyama-u.ac.jp

A Questionnaire about Language Learning Strategies

SILL - adapted by Karen Fedderholdt

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. Please answer all the statements according to what you really do. Do not answer what you think the answer should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers. No one will see you answers except me!

There are three sections to this questionnaire: A, B and C. The first part asks you some information about you:

A

1.What is your name?

2. Gender?

3. What is your major?

4. How long have you been teaching English?

5. What is your age? Please circle one:

20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69

B

This section asks you about what YOU do when you learn English. Read each one of the statements. For example:

I review often_____

Then decide whether you do this:

1. Never or almost never true of me. (This means that the statement is very rarely true of you.)

2. Generally not true of me. (This means that the statement is true less than half the time)

3. Somewhat true of me. (This means that the statement is true about half the time)

4. Generally true of me. (This means the statement is true more than half the time)

Always or almost always true of me. (This means the statement is true of you almost always).

Decide how often you review: 1,2,3,4 or 5 and then write the appropriate number on the line.

1. I create associations between new material and what I already know_____
2. I put a new word in a sentence so I can remember it_____
3. I place a new word in a group with other words that are similar in some way_____
4. I associate the sound of a new word with other words that are similar in some way_____
5. I use rhyming to remember new English words _____
6. I visualize the spelling of a new word in my mind_____
7. I use a combination of sounds and images to remember the new word_____
8. I list all the words I know that are related to the new word and draw lines to show relationships_____
9. I remember where the new word is located on a page, or where I first saw or heard it_____
10. I use flashcards to write down new words and memorize them_____
11. I physically act out a new word _____
12. I review often_____
13. I go back to refresh my memory of things learnt much earlier
14. I watch tv programmes and/or videos in English_____
15. I read a text several times until I understand it_____
16. I revise what I write in English in order to improve my writing____
17. I practice the sound of English_____
18. I use idioms in English_____
19. I use familiar words in new combinations to make new sentences_____

20. I initiate conversations in English_____
21. I watch tv programmes and/or videos in English with the sub-titles covered up____
22. I try to think in English_____
23. I attend and participate in events where English is spoken____-
24. I read for pleasure in English
25. I write personal notes, messages, reports or letters in English_____
26. I skim a reading passage first to get the main idea, then I go back and read it more carefully_____
27. I seek specific details in what I see or hear_____
28. I use reference materials such as glossaries or dictionaries to help me use English_____
29. I make summaries of new language material_____
30. I listen to tapes in English_____
31. I apply general rules to new situations using English_____
32. I find the meaning of a word by dividing the word into parts I understand_____
33. I look for similarities between the Japanese and English languages____
34. I try to understand what I hear or read without translating it word for word into Japanese_____
35. I am cautious about transferring words or concepts directly from Japanese into English_____
36. I look for patterns in English_____
37. I develop my own understanding of English, even if I sometimes have to revise my understanding based on new information_____
38. I access the Internet for various activities in English_____
39. When I do not understand all the words I read or hear, I guess the general meaning by using any clue I can find, for example, clues from the context or situations_____
40. I read without looking up every unfamiliar word_____
41. In a conversation, I anticipate what the other person is going to say, based on what has been said so far_____
42. If I am speaking and cannot think of the right expression, I use gestures or switch back to Japanese momentarily_____

43. I ask another person to tell me the word if I cannot think of it in a conversation_____
44. When I cannot think of the correct expression to say or write, I find a different way to express an idea: for example I use a synonym or describe the idea_____
45. I make up new words if I cannot think of the right ones_____
46. I direct the conversation to the topics for which I know the words_____
47. I preview a text to get a general idea of what it is about, how it is organized, and how it relates to what I already now_____
48. When someone is speaking in English, I try to concentrate on what the person is saying and put unrelated topics out of my mind_____
49. I decide in advance to pay attention to specific language aspects: for example, I focus on the way native speakers pronounce certain sounds_____
50. I plan my goals for how proficient I want to become_____
51. I identify the purpose of a language activity, for instance in a listening activity, I decide whether to listen for general ideas or specific facts____
52. I take responsibility for finding opportunities to practice English____
53. I try to notice any errors I make in English and find out the reasons for them_____
54. I learn from my mistakes in English_____
55. If I am not so good at some aspects of English, I evaluate the progress I have made in this area_____
56. I plan a time-schedule for learning English_____
57. I find out how to be a good language learner by reading books/articles about how to learn_____
58. If I do not understand, I ask the speaker to slow down, repeat or clarify what was said_____
59. I ask other people to correct my pronunciation_____
60. I work with others to practice, review, or share information_____
61. I have a regular English speaking partner_____
62. I belong to interest groups where English is spoken____
63. I try to learn about the cultures of places where English is spoken_____
64. I write to a key-pal (computer pen pal) in English_____

65. I travel overseas and use my English_____

66. I invite English speakers to come and stay with me_____

67. I ask other people, if I have understood something correctly_____

Now please continue to Section C, which is about which strategies or ways or techniques you recommend your students to use to learn English. Please continue answering as above.

68. I teach my students to think of relationships between what they already know and new things they learn in English_____

69. I teach my students to use new English words in a sentence so they can remember them_____

70. I teach my students to connect the sound of an English word and an image or picture of the word to help them remember the word_____

71. I teach my students to use rhymes to remember new words____

72. I teach my students to use flashcards to remember new words____

73. I teach my students to physically act out new words_____

74. I teach my students to review English lessons often_____

75. I teach my students to remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on a page, board or sign_____

76. I teach my students to remember a word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word may be used_____

77. I teach my students to say or write a new word several times_____

78. I teach my students to practice the sounds of English_____

79. I teach my students to watch tv programmes in English or go to films spoken in English_____

80. I teach my students to cover up the Japanese sub-titles when they watch programmes on tv or videos_____

81. I teach my students to use dictionaries_____

82. I teach my students to write paragraphs or essays that are not translations of Japanese_____

83. I teach my students to first skim (go over quickly) a passage in English

and then go over again reading it more slowly and carefully_____

84.I teach my students to look for words in Japanese which are English (For example "ski", "elevator", "door")_____

85.I teach my students to find the meanings of English words by dividing them into parts they understand_____

86.I teach my students not to translate word for word from Japanese into English_____

87.I teach my students to write summaries of information that they hear or read in English_____

88.I teach my students to listen to tapes_____

89.I teach my students to use gestures if they cannot think of a word in English_____

90.I teach my students to guess words they don't know_____

91.I teach my students to make up new words, if they do not know the right ones in English_____

92.I teach my students to use other words or phrases in English, when they cannot think of the words they want_____

93.I teach my students to read as much as possible in English_____

94.I teach my students to pay attention when someone is speaking in English_____

95.I teach my students how to become better learners of English_____

96.I teach my students to plan their schedules so they have enough time to study English_____

97.I teach my students to look for people with whom they can talk in English_____

98.I teach my students to check by themselves how well they are managing various tasks in English_____

99.I teach my students to have clear goals for improving their English skills_____

100.I teach my students to think about the progress they are making in learning English_____

101.I teach my students to write down what they do to learn English in a language learning diary_____

102. I teach my students to find as many ways as possible to use their

English_____

103.I teach my students to relax and not feel afraid of using English____

104.I teach my students to speak English even when they are afraid of making mistakes_____

105.I teach my students to notice when they are tense or nervous when they are studying English_____

106.I teach my students to give themselves a reward or treat when they do well in English_____

107.I teach my students to talk to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English_____

108.I teach my students to ask someone to slow down or say it again, if they do not understand something in English_____

109.I teach my students to ask English speakers to correct them when they talk in English _____

110.I teach my student to speak English with other students_____

111.I teach my students to ask for help from other English speakers_____

112.I teach my students to ask questions in English_____

113.I teach my students about the cultures of English speakers_____

114.I teach my students to get a key-pal and write to this key-pal in English_____

Thank you very much indeed for answering this questionnaire!

This questionnaire was adapted from Oxford's (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) 5.0. and 7.1 by Karen Fedderholdt*

Appendix 4: post-survey reminder (postcard)

Dear Colleague
I hope you are fine and not
too busy to answer the
questionnaire about language
learning strategies which I sent
you some time ago. Please do
return it. I would appreciate it
very much indeed. If you have
any problems or need a new
questionnaire, please
contact me.
Karen Fedderhodlt
Tel.076-445-6232
Email:Karen@hmt.toyama-u.ac.jp

Appendix 5: Final reminder sent to JTEs

Karen Fedderholdt
Toyama University
Faculty of Humanities

Dear Colleague,

I do hope you are well and enjoying life. I wonder if you remember that some time ago, I sent you a questionnaire asking you which Language Learning Strategies (LLS) you use to help you improve your English as efficiently as possible and which language learning strategies you teach your students? I do not seem to have received your questionnaire yet, so I would like to send you another copy, in case you cannot find the original. There is also another stampted addressed envelope. Please do try to find the time to answer the questionnaire and send it to me as quickly as possible. Your answers are important!

Thank you.

Karen Fedderholdt
Telephone: 076-445-6232
Email:Karen@hmt.toyama-u.ac.jp

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, R.G. and Vann, R.J. (1987). "Strategies of two language learners: A case study". In A. L. Wenden and J.Rubin (eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp.85-102). Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall.

Andersen, L. and Vandergriff, L. (1997). "The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study". Foreign Language Annals 30 (3), 387-409.

Anderson, J.R. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition.* Cambridge, Mass.:Harvard University Press.

Anderson, J.R. (1985). *Cognitive Psychology and its Implications,* 2nd Ed. New York:Freeman.

Anderson, N.J. (1991). "Individual Differences in Strategy Use in Second Language Reading and Testing" Modern Language Journal 75, 460-472.

Barnett , M.A. (1989). "Reading through Context: How Real and Perceived Strategy Use Affects L2 Comprehension". Modern language Learning 73 (2), 150-162.

Benson, Phil. (1995) "A Critical View of Learner Training". Learner Training 2 (2), 2-6.

Bialystok, Ellen (1990). *Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second-Language Use* Mass:Blackwell.

Bialystok, Ellen and Kellerman, E. (1986). "Language Strategies in the Classroom". RELC Conference, Singapore, 160-175.

Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational Research : An Introduction* (4th ed.). White Plains,New York: Longman.

Brooks, Adrianne A.R. (1997). "Learning Strategies as Learning Inhibitors for Chinese Speakers". Paper presented at TESOL, Orlando, USA.

Brown, J.D. (1995). "English language entrance examinations at Japanese universities". The Language Teacher 19 (11), 7-11.

Brown, J.D. and Yamashita, S.O.(1995). "English language entrance examinations at Japanese universities: What do we know about them?" JALT Journal 17, (1), 7-30.

Brown, Thomas S. and Perry Jr., Fred L. (1991). "A Comparison of Three Learning Strategies for ESL Vocabulary Acquisition" .TESOL Quarterly 25 (4), 655-670.

Browne, J. and Wada, M. (1999). "Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory study in Language, Culture and Communication". Language, Culture and Curriculum 11 (1), 97-112.

Carrel, P.L., Pharis, G and Liberto, J.C. (1989). "Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading". TESOL Quarterly 2 (4), 647-666.

Carrell, P.L. (1989). "Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading". The Modern Language Learner 73 (2), 121-134.

Carrell, P. L. (1998). "Can Reading Strategies Be Successfully Taught?" Language Teacher Online 12 (22), 2-4.

Casanave, C.P. (1988). "Comprehension Monitoring in ESL Reading: A Neglected Essential" . TESOL Quarterly 22 (3), 283-302.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). "Language Teaching Approaches: An Overview". In M.Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp.3-10). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Chamot, U.A. (1993). "Student responses to learner instruction in the foreign language classroom". Foreign Language Annals 26 (3), 308-321.

Chamot, U.A. (1994). "A Model for Learner Strategy Instruction in the Foreign Language Classroom". In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics.* (pp.323-336) Washington DC:Georgetown University Press.

Chamot, A.U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P.B., & Robbins, J. (1996). "Methods for teaching learning strategies in the foreign language classroom and assessment of language skills for instruction". In R.L. Oxford (ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp.175-188).Manoa: Honolulu:U. of Hawaii Press.

Christensen, T. (1989). "Grammatical Overkill?" English Today , 20, 38-44.

Cohen, Andrew D. (1990). *Language Learning:Insights for Learners, Teachers and Researchers.* Boston, Massachusetts:Heinle and Heinle.

Cohen, Andrew D. (1994). *Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom* (2nd

ed). Boston: Newbury House, Heinle and Heinle.

Cohen, Andrew D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language.* Reading, MA:Addison Wesley Longman.

Cohen, Andrew D. and Aphek, E. (1980). "Retention of second-language vocabulary over time: Investigating the role of mnemonic associations". System, 3 (2), 443-452.

Cohen, Andrew D. and Aphek, E. (1981). "Easifying second language learning". Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3 (2), 221-236.

Cohen, Andrew D. and Brooks-Carson A. (2001). "Research on Direct versus Translated Writing Processes: Students' Strategies and their Results". The Modern Language Journal, 85 (2) 169-188.

Cohen, Andrew D. and Hosenfeld, C. (1981). "Some Uses of Mentalistic Data in Second Language Research". Language Learning, 31 (2), 285-313.

Cohen, Andrew D., Weaver, S.J. and Tao, Y-L. (1995). "The Impact of Strategy Instruction on Speaking a Foreign Language". Research Report: The Center for Advanced Research in Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota , 2-53.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1996). *Research Methods in Education* (4th Ed.). London: Routledge.

Cook,V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching.* London: Edward Arnold.

Cortazzi, M. and Jin, L. (1999). "Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China" .In Hywel Coleman (ed.) *Society and the classroom* (pp.169-206). UK:CUP.

Crabbe, D. (1993). "Fostering Autonomy from Within the Classroom: The

Teacher's Responsibility". System, 21 (4), 33-34.

Cresswell, A. (2000). "Self-monitoring in students writing: developing learner responsibility". ELT Journal, 54 (3), 235-244.

Davis, E. and Abas, H. (1992). "Second Language Learning Strategies Utilized by Some Members of Language Departments at Four Institutions - Sulawesi, Indonesia". Presented at Sulawesi, Indonesia: Summer School of Linguistics.

Denzin, N. (1990). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues.* Beverley Hills: Sage.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Derry, S.J. and Murphy, D. A. (1986). "Designing Systems That Train Learning Ability: From Theory to Practice". Review of Educational Research , 56 (1), 1-39.

Dickinson, L. (1979). "Autonomy, self-directed learning and individualisation".. System, 7 (3), 31-32.

Dollerup, C. and Loddegaard, A. (1992). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience.* London:John Benjamins.

Eisner, E.W. and Peskhin, A. (1990). *Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Erhman and Oxford (1989). "Effects of Sex Differences,Career Choice and Psychological Type on Adults' Language Learning Strategies". Modern Language Journal ,73 (1), 1-13.

Ellis, Nick and Beaton, Alan. (1993). "Factors Affecting the Learning of Foreign Language Vocabulary: Imagery Keyword Mediators and Phonological Short-

term Memory". The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 46A (3), 533-538.

Ellis, R. (1992). *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy.*Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, Frederick (1986). "Qualitative Methods in Research on Teaching". In Merlin C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook in Research in Teaching* (pp.119-161), NY:Macmillan.

Faerch, C. and Kasper G (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication.* London:Longman.

Fedderholdt, Karen (1998). "Using Learner Diaries to Develop Language Learning Strategies" . The Language Teacher 19 (4), 2-45.

Fedderholdt, Karen (2000). "An email exchange project between NNS of English". ELT Journal 55 (3), 273-280.

Fedderholdt, Karen (2001). "Using Lautamatti's 'Topical Subject Analysis' to check for cohesion and coherence in EFL email writing". Unpublished Ed.D. Coursework Assignment, University of Leicester, UK.

Fedderholdt, Karen (2001). "Shadowing to improve listening". Paper presented at TESOLArabia, Dubai, UAE.

Fedderholdt, Karen (2002). "Investigating listening skills in a cultural context: an exploration of Japanese students of English". Unpublished Ed D Coursework Assignment, University of Leicester, UK.

Fedderholdt, Karen (2003). "Letting Students Choose Their Own Homework".

TESOL Arabia Learner Independence Special Interest Group Newsletter 3 (1), 3-4.

Field, John (1999). "Skills and strategies: towards a new methodology for listening" .ELT Journal, 52 (2), 110-118.

Flaitz, J. and Feyten, C. (1996). "Two successes in raising general awareness of language learning strategies".In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Strategies Around the World: Cross Cultural Perspectives* (pp.211-226). National Foreign Language Resource Center: University of Hawaii Press.

Flavell, John H. (1979). "Metacognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive-Developmental Inquiry". American Psychological Association, 34 (10), 906-11.

Flowerdew, John and Miller, Lindsey (1992). "Student Perceptions, Problems and Strategies in Second Language Lecture Comprehension" .RELC Journal, 23 (2), 60-80.

Fujiwara, Barbara. (1990). "Learner Training in Listening Strategies". JALT Journal, 12 (2), 203-218.

Goh, Christine (1997). "Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners". ELT Journal, 51 (4), 361-370.

Goold, R., Madely C. and Carter, N. (1993). "The New Mombusho Guidelines". The Language Teacher, 12 (6), 3-5.

Gorsuch, G.J. (1998). "Yakudoku EFL Instruction in Two Japanese High School Classrooms: An Exploratory Study". JALT Journal, 20 (1),12-19.

Grenfell, M. and Harris, V. (1999). *Learning Modern Languages: Modern Languages and Learning Strategies in Teaching and Practice.* London:Routledge.

Griffee, Dale T. (1994). "Can Students Set Their Own Goals and Objectives? A Preliminary Report". In K. Adams (ed.), *Student Language Learning Beliefs* (pp180-201). NY:Heinle and Heinle.

Gu, Peter Yongqi (1996). "Robin Hood of SLA: What Has the Learner Strategy Researcher Taught Us?". Asian Journal of English Language Teaching 6, 1-29.

Guest, Michael (1998). "Spoken Grammar: Easing the Transitions". The Language Teacher ,22 (6), 42-46.

Hau, Boon Lai (2002). "Japanese up against English brick wall" The Daily Yomiuri July 23, p5.

Helgesen, M., Brown, S., and Mandeville, T. (1999). *English Firsthand 1 and 2.* Singapore: Longman.

Hirose, K. and Sasaki, M. (1994). "Explanatory Variables for Japanese Students Expository Writing in English: An Exploratory Study". Journal of Language Writing, 3 (3),203-228.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the Teacher* (2nd Ed.) London: Routledge.

Hosenfeld, C. (1984). "Case studies of ninth graders". In J.C. Alderson and A.S. Urhquart (eds.), *Reading in a Foreign Language* (pp.231-244), London:Longman.

Jick, T.D. (1983). "Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action" . Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, pp.602-611.

Kelly, C. (1993). "The Hidden Role of the University". In P. Wadden (ed.) *A Handbook for Teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*, (pp.172-192), New York: OUP.

Kimura, M. (1999). "A Cross-Sectional Study of Japanese College Students' English Proficiency and Their Strategies for Foreign Language Learning Mainly Focusing on the Difference between General Students and Returnees". Paper presented at AILA, Tokyo.

Kirkland, Margaret R. and Saunders, Mary Ann P. (1991). "Maximising Student Performance in Summary Writing: Managing Cognitive Load". TESOL Quarterly, 25 (1), 105-123.

Kojic-Sabo, I. and Lightbown, P. (1999). "Students' Approaches to Vocabulary Learning and Their Relationship to Success". The Modern Language Journal, 83 (2), 176-192.

Lam, W. and Wong, J. (2000). "The effects of strategy training on developing discussion skills in an ESL classroom". ELT Journal,54 (3), 245-255.

Lamie, Judith M. (2000). "Teachers of English in Japan: Professional Development and Training at a Crossroads". JALT Journal ,22 (1), 27-45.

Law, G. (1995). "Ideologies of English Language Education in Japan". JALT Journal, 17 (2), 213-224.

Leonard, Todd Jay (1997). "Evaluating Student Teachers' Teaching Practice". The Language Teacher ,21, (6), 12-15.

Leonard, T.J. (1998). "Japanese University Entrance Examinations: An interview with Dr. J.D.Brown". The Language Teacher, 22 (4), 8-11.

LoCastro, Virginia (1996). "English Language Education in Japan". In Hywel Coleman (ed.), *Society and the Language Classroom* (pp.32-51). Cambridge:CUP.

Mayer, R.E. (1988). "Learning Strategies:an overview". In C.E. Weinstein, E.T. Goetz and P.A. Alexander (eds.), *Learning and Study Strategies* (pp.11-22), New York:Academic Press.

McDonough, S.H. (1995). *Strategy and Skill in Learning a Foreign Language* London:Edward Arnold.

McKay, Sandra (2000). "An Investigation of Five Japanese English Teachers' Reflections of Their US MA TESOL Practicum Experience". JALT Journal, 22 (1), 46-68.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

McLaughlin, B. (1990). "The relationship between first and second languages". In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins and M. Swain (eds.), *The Development of Second Language Proficiency* (pp.47-78). Cambridge: CUP.

Medani, Osman Ahmed (1988). "Vocabulary learning strategies". In Paul M. Meara (ed.), *Beyond Words* (pp.52-66). Cambridge:CUP.

Miles,M.B., and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis.* Beverley Hills: Sage

Miller, T. (1995). "Japanese Learners' Reactions to Communicative English Lessons". JALT Journal, 17 (2), 32-52.

Ministry of Education (1989). *Guidelines for the Study in the Senior High School - Foreign Languages/ English Language.* Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2000) "Survey on Listening Comprehension in University Entrance Examinations". Tokyo: MEXT.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2002). "Developing a strategic plan to cultivate 'Japanese With English Abilities' - Plan to improve English and Japanese abilities" .Tokyo: MEXT.

Mischler, E.G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narration.* Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.

Mochizuki, A. (1999). "Language learning strategies used by Japanese university students". RELC Journal 30 (2),101-113.

Murphey, T. (1998). "In and Between People: Facilitating Metacognition and Identity Construction".The Language Teacher , 24 (4), 5-8.

Murphey, T. (2000). "What can you do to change the entrance exam system? Dare ask some embarrassing questions". in T. Murphey (ed.), *The Medium IS the Message: Japanese Teachers' Use of English in the Classroom* 3rd. revised ed. (pp.14-19). Japan: South Mountain Press.

Murphey, T. (2001). "Exploring Conversational Shadowing" Language Teaching Research , V (5), 128-155.

Murphey, T., Deacon, B. and Murakami, K. (2000). "An Analysis of JTEs Classroom English and Students' Impressions". In T. Murphey (ed.), *The Medium IS the Message: Japanese Teachers' Use of English in the Classroom* 3rd. revised ed. (pp.52-55). Japan: South Mountain Press.

Murphey, T. and Purcell W. (2000). "A Survey of JTEs Use of English in Class". In T. Murphey (ed.), *The Medium IS the Message: Japanese Teachers' Use of English in the Classroom* 3rd. revised ed.(pp.56-60). Japan: South Mountain Press.

Murphey T. and Sasaki, T. (1998). "Japanese English Teachers' Increasing Use of English". The Language Teacher, 22 (10), 21-26.

Murphy, John, M. (1989). "Listening in Second Language: Hermeneutics and Inner Speech". TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL du Canada, 6 (2), 13-21.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M. and Todesco, A. (1978). "The good language learner". TESL Talk 6, 68-75.

Nakane, C. (1986). *Japanese Society*. LA: University of California Press.

Nunan, David. (1995). *Atlas; Learning-Centered Communication.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle, Int. Thompson Publications.

Nyikos, M. (1996). "The Conceptual Shift to Learner-Centered Classrooms: Increasing Teacher and Student Awareness". In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Crosscultural Perspectives* (pp.117-131). Manoa: University of Hawaii.

Nyikos, M and Oxford R.L. (1993). "A Factor Analytic Study of Language Learning Strategy Use: Interpretations from Information Processing Theory and Social Psychology". Modern Language Journal, 7 (1), 11-22.

O`Malley, J.M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge:CUP.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Küpper, L., and Russo, R.P. (1985). "Learning Strategies Used by Beginning and Intermediate ESL Students". Language Learning, 35 (1), 21-46.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Russo, A.P. and Küpper, L. (1989). "Listening Comprehension Strategies in Second Language Acquisition". Applied Linguistics, 10 (4), 419-437.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire Design; Interviewing and Attitude Measurement.* London: Pinter Publications.

Oxford, Rebecca L. (1986). "Development and Psychometric Testing of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning" Army Research Institute Technical Report 728 Alexandria, VA: Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Oxford, Rebecca L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should know* Mass:Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, Rebecca (Series Editor) *Tapestry Series* . (This series includes a variety of ESL books first published in the early 1990s and which continue to be published. They focus on the 4 language skills and incorporating language learning strategies). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, Rebecca L. (1993). "Instructional Implications of Gender Differences in Language Learning Styles and Strategies". Applied Language, 4 (1&2), 65-94.

Oxford, Rebecca L. (1993). "Research on Second Language Learning Strategies". Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13, 175-187.

Oxford, Rebecca L. (1994). "Language Learning Strategies: An Update". ERIC Educantional Reproduction Service No. ED376707.

Oxford, Rebecca L.(ed.) (1996) *Learning Strategies Around the World:Cross Cultural Perspectives.* Technical Report 11. Honolulu:Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center: University of Hawaii.

Oxford, Rebecca, L. and Crookall, D. (1989). "Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings and instructional issues". Modern Language Journal, 73 (4), 404-419.

Oxford, Rebecca, L. and Ehrman, M.E. (1995). "Adults' Language Learning

Strategies in an Intensive Foreign Language Program in the United States". System, 23 (3), 359-386.

Oxford, Rebecca L. and Green, J.M. (1996). "Language Learning Histories: Learners and Teachers Helping Each Other Understand Learning Styles". TESOL Journal, 6 (1), 20-23.

Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (1988). "Vive la difference? Reflections on Sex Differences in Use of Language Learning Strategies". Foreign Language Annals , 21 (4), 321-329.

Pattimore, Roger (1999). "JTEs View Team Teaching with AETs favourably". The School House, 3, 1-4.

Pearson, E. (1988). "Learner strategies and learner interviews". ELT Journal, 42 (3), 173-178.

Phillips, D.C. (1990). "Subjectivitiy and Objectivity: An objective inquiry". In E. Eisner and A. Peskhin (Eds.), *Qualitative Inquiry in Education,* (pp.19-37). NY:Teachers College Press.

Porte, Graeme. (1988). "Poor language learners and their strategies for dealing with new vocabulary". ELT Journal, 42 (3), 167-172.

Prator, C.H. (1991) ."Cornerstones of Method and Names for the Profession". In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language,* (pp.11-22). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Pressley, M., Levin, J.R., Hall J.W., Miller, G.E. and Berry, J.K. (1980). "The Keyword Method and Foreign Word Acquisition". The American Psychology Association, 6 (2), 163-173.

Rees-Miller, Janie. (1993). "A Critical Appraisal of Learner Training: Theoretical Bases and Teacher Implications". TESOL Quarterly, 27 (4), 670-68.

Ridgeway, T. (2000). "I beg your pardon?". ELT Journal, 54 (2), 179-185.

Robbins, Jill, (1994), "How can LLS instruction improve oral communication skills of Japanese students?". In K. Kitao (ed.), *Culture and Communication* (pp.21-28). Kyoto:Yamaguchi-shoten.

Robbins, Jill. (1998). "Approaches To Learner Autonomy". Paper presented at JALT Conference, Omiya, Japan.

Robbins, Jill and Dadour, E.S. (1996). "University-Level strategy instruction to improve speaking ability in Egypt and Japan". In R. Oxford (ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives,* (pp.48-61). Manoa: University of Hawaii.

Robson, C. (1993). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practioner-Researchers.* Oxford,UK:Blackwell.

Rubin, J. (1975). "What 'the good language learner' can teach us". TESOL Quarterly, 9 (1), 41-51.

Rubin, J. (1994). "Components of a teacher education curriculum for learner strategies". Transcript of a colloquium held at the annual meeting of TESOL, Baltimore, USA. Washington, DC: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED376701.

Rubin, J. and Thompson, I. (1987). *How to be a More Successful Language Learner* . Boston, Mass: Heinle and Heinle.

Sanaoui, Razika (1995). "Adult Learners' Approaches to Learning Vocabulary in Second Languages". The Modern Language Journal, 79 (1), 15-28.

Sasaki, T. (2000). "A Commentary on a "Survey of JTEs Use of English in Class". In T. Murphey (ed.), *The Medium IS the Message: Japanese teachers of English using English in the classroom* (pp.21-27). Japan: South Mountain Press.

Scarcella, R. C. and Oxford, R. (1994). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual and the Classroom.* NY: Heinle and Heinle.

Scherer, P. and Wertheimer, S. (1964). *A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Learning.* NY:McGraw.

Scovel, Thomas (1991). "The Effect of Affect on Foreign Language Learning: A Review of the Anxiety Research". In E.K. Horwitz and D.J. Young (eds.), *Language Anxiety: From Research to Classroom Implications* (pp.61-81) NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sharwood Smith, Michael (1994). *Second Language Learning:Theoretical Foundations.* New York:Longman.

Shimaoka, T. and Yasuhiro K. (1990). *Team Teaching in English Classrooms - An Intercultural Approach* . Tokyo: Kairyudo.

Shimizu , T. et al.(1995). "Curriculum and Evaluation". Proceedings of the JALT International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning. Nagoya, Japan.

Sick, J. (1996). "Assistant Language Teachers in Junior High Schools: Do Programs Stressing Their Inclusion Produce Better Listeners". JALT Journal, 18 (2), 18-24.

Stern, H.H. (1975). "What can we learn from 'the good language learner'?". Canadian Modern Language Review ,31 (2), 304-18.

Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Oxford:OUP.

Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford:OUP.

Stevick, Earl W. (1989). *Success with Foreign Languages: Seven Who Achieved It and What Worked For Them.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Strauss, R., Taylor, C., and Wheeler, T. (1991). *Japan - A Travel Survival Kit.* Sydney: Lonely Planet.

Tajino, A. and Walker, L. (1998). "Perspectives on Team Teaching by Students and Teachers: Exploring Foundations for Team Learning". Language, Culture and Curriculum, 7 (1), 113-131.

Taka-Yoshi, Makino. (1993). "Learner self-correction in EFL written corrections" .ELT Journal, 47 (4), 337-441.

Takanashi, Y. (1999). "Learning Strategies and Styles of British and Japanese University Students in Relation to Their Cultural Beliefs". Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: University of Leicester.

Takeuchi, O. (1993). "Language learning strategies and their relationship to achievement in English as a foreign language" Language Laboratory, 30, 17-34.

Tamada, Y.(1996), "Japanese learners' language learning strategies: The relationship between learners' personal factors and their choice of language learning strategies". Unpublished Master's Thesis: Lancaster University.

Tannen, D. (1986). *That's Not What I Meant!* NY:Morrow.

Tarone, E. (1980). "Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy". Tesol Quarterly , 15 (3), 285-295.

Teng, Huei-Chun (1998). "A Study of EFL Listening Comprehension Strategies". Washington, DC: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED422745.

Tinkham, Thomas (1989). "Rote Learning, Attitudes, and Abilities: A Comparison of Japanese and American Students". TESOL Quarterly, 24 (4), 695-698.

Torikai, Kumiko (2000). "English Language Education in Japan: Past, Present and Future" . The Language Teacher Online, 10 (7), 1-3.

Towell, R. and Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to Language Acquisition*:.New York: Multilingual Matters.

Usuki, M. (1991). "The usefulness of learning diaries in learner diaries in learner training" . translated by T.H. Parry Learning Learning, 2 (3), 14-15.

Vann, R.J. and Abraham, R.J. (1990). "Strategies of Unsuccessful Learners". TESOL Quarterly, 24 (2), 177-198.

Wada, M. and Cominos, A. (1994). *Studies in Team Teaching.* Tokyo :Kenkyusha.

Watanabe, Y. (1992). "Washback effects of college entrance examinations on language". JACET Bulletin, 23, 175-194.

Weinstein, C.M.and Hume, L.M. (1998). *Strategies for Lifelong Learning.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Weinstein, C.M. and Mayer, R.F. (1986). "The Teaching of Learning Strategies". In Merlin C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook in Research in Teaching* (pp.119-161). NY:Macmillan.

Wenden, Anita (1983). "Literature Review: the Process of Intervention". Language Learning ,33 (1), 103-121.

Wenden, Anita (1986). "What do Second Language Learners Know about their Language Learning? A Second Look at Retrospective Accounts". Applied Linguistics, 7 (2), 186-201.

Wenden, Anita (1987) "Conceptual Background and Utility". In Anita Wenden and Joan Rubin (eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp.3-13). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Wenden, Anita (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy.* Hemel Hempstead :Prentice Hall International.

Wenden, Anita (1998). "Metacognitive knowledge and language learning". Applied Linguistics , 19 (4), 515-537.

Yang, N.D. (1996). *Second Language Learning Beliefs about Language Learning and Their Use of Language Learning Strategies:A Study of College Students of English in Taiwan.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation University of Texas, Austin.

Yonesawa, Suzanne. (1999). "The Pre-service Training of Japanese Teachers of English". The Language Teacher, 23 (11), 8-11.