

Study Skills and Strategies within the Academic EFL Context in Japan

Robert H. Taferner

Lancaster University

Tama University, School of Global Studies

Abstract

This cross-sectional study of 43 multi-level 1st-year university students, attempts to determine their perceived study habits, strategies, and language abilities, in order to provide insights into pedagogical approaches needed to adapt to students' learning needs, lesson planning, syllabus, curriculum, and academic English language program design. To better understand the academic needs of these students, they were asked to complete language learning tasks and subsequent surveys regarding their perceived English and Japanese learning skills, strategies and abilities, so as to identify study traits that could be beneficial to their academic studies as per MEXT's recommended policy (2003). Analysis of data revealed that students across all English proficiency levels showed little variation in their study habits and metacognitive strategies in both English and Japanese for listening and reading, whereas they varied somewhat more in their speaking and writing strategies. Using these results and other studies may lead to continued research to develop a study skills inventory for the Japanese academic English context in order to contribute to the advancement of EFL teaching practices within Japan.

学習者のニーズ、教案、シラバス、カリキュラム、及び大学英語プログラムを反映した教授法を考案するため、大学一年生の日本人英語学習者43名を対象に彼らが自らの学習習慣、ストラテジー、語学力をどのようにとらえているかを調査した。学生が大学教育に何を求めているかをより理解するため、彼らの英語と日本語の学習スキルと学習法を調査する語学学習タスクとアンケートを行った。これらの結果は、2003年に文部科学省が発表した言語政策にうたわれている学習スキルの向上につながるはずである。分析の結果から、リスニングとリーディングといった理解に関わるスキルでは、英語と日本語の学習習慣やメタ認知のストラテジーに英語力のレベルで違いが見られなかったが、スピーキングとライティングに関してはバラつきがあることが明らかになった。先行研究とあわせ本研究の結果は、日本においてさらに効果的な英語教育を提供するため、アカデミック・イングリッシュでどのような学習スキルが必要であるかを検討する提案につながるであろう。

Introduction

The primary purpose of the current study is to investigate the learning strategies that 1st-year Japanese university students utilize and to find out to what degree their first language (L1) study skills and strategies are related to their second language (L2) learning skills and strategies within the context of an academic English program designed to teach global studies and prepare students for global governance. It is suggested that since L1 learning experiences may influence L2 learning styles, and that it may be necessary to identify and then explicitly instruct effective learning skills and strategies in both L1 and L2. Insight from these instructions may help learners improve both their Japanese and English communication skills, and should aid the language policy goals officially announced by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (henceforth MEXT) in 2003.

Once students began studying academic content in their first week within the academic English program, it became evident that the majority of them were struggling with the content in both English and Japanese. As students were adapting to the course load, they were using any strategy that could help achieve the goals set by instructors.

Due to the exceptionally high cognitive load for most of the students, it became clear that much of the processing of academic content was done in Japanese. In this environment, an interlanguage emerged leading to questions for individual instructors as to best encourage and develop students academic potential in English. In response to this challenge, this study was initiated to address practical pedagogical issues that could be proposed to ameliorate the situation at hand, and to further make recommendations for future syllabus and curriculum design.

To identify their language learning strategies and language abilities in both Japanese and English, surveys were administered to 43 multi-level 1st-year Japanese university students. Students were asked to complete comprehensive surveys for each of the four skills in English (i.e., listening, reading, speaking, and writing), designed for them to consciously recognize their English language learning strategies and perceived language abilities after administering listening, reading, speaking, and writing tasks over a period of two weeks in their first term. In addition, students completed similar surveys regarding their Japanese reading, writing, and speaking strategies and language abilities. All of the surveys were written in Japanese to ensure comprehension of the instructions and survey statements, utilizing a six-point Likert scale for the participants to indicate their perceptions and attitudes.

Literature Review

Language learning strategies have been investigated by numerous researchers since the 1970s. Notably studies on good language learners (GGLs) of second or foreign languages (e.g. Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975) have often been cited, and more recently attention has been paid to factors influencing strategy usage (Cohen 1998; Griffiths, 2003, 2004, 2007; Oxford, 1990; 1994; Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). It was proposed that GLLs would exhibit an inventory of strategies and

personal behaviors that could facilitate language learners' acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information relating to the target language (Rigney, 1978). Oxford furthered the field with her Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), which classified learning strategies into: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (1990). Many years have passed since the introduction of GLLs and SILL, unfortunately, detailed research into Japanese EFL learners has remain limited (e.g., Mochizuki, 1999; Takeuchi and Wakamoto, 2001) and needs further exploration to determine common learning behaviors and their language proficiency levels to establish which strategies are preferred by Japanese students in academic English settings. In Taferner (2006), modification of Takeuchi's tabulated results (2003, p. 390) revealed that Japanese EFL students learning strategies and their estimated learning stages had some inconsistencies in proficiency level and strategy usage, underscoring the need for specific and more thorough research in this area, and Japanese centric strategy inventory for language learning to be developed.

Some researchers advance that Japanese learners are psychologically hindered in the adaptation of effective language learning strategies due to their passive nature in the classroom (Usuki, 2003). Others forward that students in Confucian cultures have unique learning styles contrary to Western practices, which may be in conflict when engaged in cross-cultural learning and teaching situations (e.g. Littrell, 2006; Wong, 2004). These factors mentioned above should cause some concern as MEXT has been attempting to improve foreign language education in Japan. And more recently, MEXT has recognized a need for the improvement in both Japanese and English academic language skills.

At present, though, due to the lack of sufficient ability, many Japanese are restricted in their exchanges with foreigners and their ideas or opinions are not evaluated appropriately. It is also necessary for Japanese to develop their ability to clearly

express their own opinions in Japanese first in order to learn English (2003, p. 5).

While many academics and language teachers rally to embrace language skill development in the classroom and collaboration between colleagues, many others are resisting change and expect change to come at a slow pace (Kojima, 2008). Nomi (2006) illustrates that urgent reforms must be made to reverse falling academic trends, motivation for learning, and inability to apply knowledge to real life problems. Nonetheless, out of pragmatic necessity, this study will attempt to provide further insight into academic abilities, strategies, and study habits that 1st-year university students possess, and propose new student roles that demand a more active approach in their learning in order to achieve MEXT's ambitious goals.

The present research will address the following questions:

- (1) What academic language skills and learning strategies do 1st-year Japanese university students have in English?
- (2) What academic language skills and learning strategies do 1st-year Japanese university students have in Japanese?
- (3) To what degree are 1st-year university students' L1 and L2 study skills and strategies correlated?

Methodology

Participants

The 43 participants (22 female and 21 male) in this study were selected from 1st-year university students upon entry into university, starting in April 2007. These students, ranging from false-beginner to advanced levels of English—with TOEIC scores between 200 and 870,

have been studying in an academic English program, in Kanagawa, Japan, that provides 12 hours per week of English language instruction dedicated to developing reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills for academic purposes. The students were also attending academic lectures in which they were required to write lecture summaries, opinion and expository essays, read and discuss a wide selection of issues as part of their content-based studies. These lectures were held in a large auditorium, instructing students from all proficiency levels with the same content. These content courses addressed topics suitable for global governance, including: sovereignty, philosophy, psychology, international finance, and identity formation. The materials used in the English skills' classes were primarily selected from international publishers supplying textbooks to Japan, and supplementary tasks designed by instructors to support the lessons in academic content courses.

Data collection and analysis

Quantitative data were collected from surveys eliciting students' learning habits during academic listening, speaking, reading, and writing tasks in English, as well as speaking, reading, and writing tasks in Japanese. Students' responses to the questions on the surveys tried to capture sufficient details about students' perceived knowledge of grammar and vocabulary to complete a task related to a specific language skill (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing); to ascertain language skill related abilities; and to identify common study skills and behaviors. Likert-scale data was reported as frequency responses, standard deviations, and t-test scores for descriptive and statistical analysis.

To create similar conditions for all the surveys, students completed skill specific academic tasks (see Appendix 2 for the pre-survey tasks), in English prior to the English skills and strategies surveys, and in Japanese before the Japanese skills and strategies surveys. The surveys

eliciting English skills were conducted within their English classes, while the reading, writing, and discussion tasks in Japanese were held in research sessions outside of regular class time. The decision to conduct the Japanese sessions outside of class maintained the integrity English usage in the classroom, and also maintained the authenticity of the reading homework they were required to do in Japanese. Unfortunately however, due to the scheduling constraints of these sessions, it resulted in a lower number of participants included in the final study.

The current surveys used in this study evolved over a period of 4 years after conducting numerous pilot surveys in Japanese and subsequent student interviews, resulting in refinements in question type and response options. After students' personal study habits and strategies were tabulated and coded initially using Grounded Theory (Dick, 2005), which is intended to examine the traits of particular participants under study without a preconceived hypothesis. Additional items were then added to the surveys after a thorough review of research on language skill assessment, strategy usage, and language learning (see Buck, 2001; Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001; Cohen, 1998; 2003; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Flowerdew, 1994; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Luoma, 2004; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Read, 2000; Robinson 2001; Sakui & Gaies, 1999; Salehazadeh, 2006; Skehan, 1998; Wenden, 1998). For example, the reading items elicited from students and expanded upon through the literature, resulted in thirteen categories and subcategories, for a total of ninety-eight response items. There is some concern, however, over the large number of items students were required to answer to as it may influence students' cognitive load and ability to respond reliably to all questions. Nonetheless, the potential richness of the empirical data to obtain initial responses to these questions outweighed this concern at the time of this study. Finally, the surveys were professionally verified and revised, trialed once more, then conducted in Japanese to ensure that language comprehension would not interfere with students' responses.

Results

Data representing the participants perceived language learning skills and strategies from surveys were collected and tabulated using frequency and standard deviation for the Likert responses across the range of English language proficiency levels as determined by students' TOEIC scores. T-test scores were used to compare English and Japanese strategies, skills, and abilities for speaking, reading, and writing language skills in order to establish any similarities or differences in strategy usage and the possibility of first language (L1) and second language (L2) transfer. The comparison of Japanese and English listening abilities and strategies was omitted in this study for logistical purposes. Surprisingly, after data analysis, it was found that English language proficiency levels had little impact on the choice of strategy used, thus statements made regarding the participants will be generalized across proficiency levels.

Academic listening abilities and strategies

After completing an academic listening task where students were required to summarize a segment of a videotaped lecture (see Appendix 2a for the listening task), they responded to survey questions regarding their listening strategies, skills, and abilities (see Table 1). The results ranging from disagree to somewhat disagree indicate that students believe that they lacked sufficient grammar and vocabulary knowledge to complete the task successfully.

Table 1

Survey Results for Listening Abilities and Strategies in English

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Part 1: Knowledge		
a. I have enough grammatical knowledge when listening in English.	2.5	0.98
b. I have enough vocabulary to listen in English.	2.4	0.90
Part 2: When listening to questions		

a. I understand questions with no difficulty and without asking for repetition.	2.8	1.19
b. I understand questions, but I might occasionally ask for repetition.	3.8	0.95
c. I have difficulty with some questions, but I generally get the meaning.	3.9	1.00
d. I have difficulty understanding most questions even after repetition.	3.4	1.11
e. I don't understand well at all.	2.5	1.20

Part 3: When listening to instructions

a. I can understand all of the instructions.	2.5	1.24
b. I can understand most of the instructions.	3.0	1.17
c. I can understand enough of the instructions to perform the task, but I cannot understand details.	3.7	1.08
d. I can understand some of the instructions, but not enough to perform the task satisfactorily.	3.7	0.96
e. I can understand a few of the instructions, but not enough to do anything.	3.2	1.15

Part 4: Personal listening strategies

a. I concentrate on what the speaker is saying.	4.7	1.08
b. I consider sentence structure and grammar when listening.	2.8	1.15
c. I translate what I have understood into Japanese when listening.	3.3	1.35
d. I ask the speaker for clarification when listening.	3.2	1.11
e. I listen for gist.	4.0	1.41
f. I guess at meaning when listening.	3.5	1.25

Note. Part 1 Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree - 6 = Strongly Agree; Parts 2 through 4 Likert scale: 1 = Never - 6 = Always. *N* = 43.

However, when listening to instructions, students indicate they mostly understand, but occasionally ask for repetition. When it comes to task instructions, students again appear to have trouble understanding all the details to perform at a satisfactory level without further intervention. In Part 4 of the survey, items a, c, d, e, and f, which address the strategies that students attempt to utilize while listening to the content of a lecture, are of particular interest as they had responses in the sometimes to almost always range. It is obvious that students are struggling with the lecture that is exceedingly difficult with regards to

academic content and linguistic features.

Academic speaking abilities and strategies

Students' academic speaking strategies and perceptions of their speaking abilities in both English and Japanese were deduced through the data presented in Table 2. Generally, students felt that their insufficient grammatical and lexical knowledge made it difficult to conduct the academic speaking tasks in English proficiently (see Appendix 2a for the English speaking task, and Appendix 2c for the Japanese reading, writing and speaking tasks). Academic speaking abilities in Japanese were also rated fair to good (see Part 3: Items b, h, i, and j). Students felt their personal strategy usage in both English and Japanese, see Items in Part 2 a to e, were quite similar as their t-test scores were calculated to be $p > .005$.

Table 2

Survey Results for Speaking Abilities and Strategies in English and Japanese

Item	<i>M</i> Eng.	<i>SD</i> Eng.	<i>M</i> Jpn.	<i>SD</i> Jpn.
Part 1: Knowledge				
a. I have enough grammatical knowledge when writing.	2.2	0.95	--	--
b. I have enough vocabulary to write.	2.2	1.00	3.3	1.46
c. My paragraph writing is appropriate.	2.0	0.93	2.9	1.41
Part 2: Writing abilities	Ave			
a. I can write comprehensible passages for readers.	2.3	1.04	3.3	1.24
b. I can write logically.	2.0	0.84	3.0	1.27
c. I can write passages to convince readers.	2.0	0.87	3.1	1.34
d. I can describe people, things, or events clearly.	2.2	1.05	3.2	1.26
e. I can analyze a given topic and write about it.	2.4	1.09	3.2	1.31
Part 3: Personal writing strategies				
a. I brainstorm my ideas about the topic before writing.	3.7	1.12	4.0	1.14
b. I think of sentence structure before writing.	3.4	1.20	--	--

c. I think of discourse organization before writing.	3.5	1.08	4.0	1.14
d. I choose vocabulary carefully.	3.5	1.26	3.0	1.41
e. I think of grammar carefully.	3.4	1.32	3.4	1.22
f. I revise while writing.	3.1	1.36	3.5	1.22
g. I revise after completing my first draft.	3.1	1.30	3.7	1.19
h. I write while translating from Japanese to English.	3.5	1.49	--	--
i. I try to use idioms when I write.	2.9	1.14	3.2	1.21
j. I try to use fixed expressions when I write.	2.9	1.19	2.8	1.20
k. I try to free-write without thinking about vocabulary, grammar, or passage organization.	3.2	1.44	3.3	1.33

Note. Part 1 Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree - 6 = Strongly Agree; Parts 2 and 3 Likert scale: 1 = Never - 6 = Always. *N* = 43.

Academic reading abilities and strategies

The surveys depicting reading abilities and strategies were the most thorough and complicated of this study, see Table 1 in Appendix 1. Analysis of the items revealed that ninety-one percent of the responses were not significantly different. The mean scores of the items where the responses were significantly different with t-test scores of $p < .005$, are indicated in Table 1 with an asterisk. The items "Do you guess the meaning of a new word from context?" "Do you identify ideas that support the main idea?" And, "I can skip words that may add relatively little to total meaning", signify some development of reading skills necessary for textual interpretation and deductive reasoning required for higher academic learning. The Japanese results, although not highly developed, suggest that these items could be immediately included in lesson planning to hope to transfer existent skills and strategies to the study of English. The results also indicate that students are motivated and have a purpose for reading in English. The results for Japanese responses also reveal a similar outcome with the highest frequency response of almost always as having a purpose for reading. Most other items depict a perceived lack in higher-level language learning skills

and strategies in both L1 and L2.

Academic writing abilities and strategies

In Table 3, Parts 1 and 2 reveal that students' perceived vocabulary knowledge paragraph writing skills are in the poor to fair range, while their writing abilities are in the very poor to poor Likert scale range, for both L1 and L2. Predictably, many of the personal writing strategies utilized in Japanese and English are similar as indicated by t-test scores ($p > .005$) for Part 3: Personal writing strategies.

Table 3

Survey Results for Writing Abilities and Strategies in English and Japanese

Item	<i>M</i> Eng.	<i>SD</i> Eng.	<i>M</i> Jpn.	<i>SD</i> Jpn.
Part 1: Knowledge				
a. I have enough grammatical knowledge when writing.	2.2	0.95	--	--
b. I have enough vocabulary to write.	2.2	1.00	3.3	1.46
c. My paragraph writing is appropriate.	2.0	0.93	2.9	1.41
Part 2: Writing abilities				
a. I can write comprehensible passages for readers.	2.3	1.04	3.3	1.24
b. I can write logically.	2.0	0.84	3.0	1.27
c. I can write passages to convince readers.	2.0	0.87	3.1	1.34
d. I can describe people, things, or events clearly.	2.2	1.05	3.2	1.26
e. I can analyze a given topic and write about it.	2.4	1.09	3.2	1.31
Part 3: Personal writing strategies				
a. I brainstorm my ideas about the topic before writing.	3.7	1.12	4.0	1.14
b. I think of sentence structure before writing.	3.4	1.20	--	--
c. I think of discourse organization before writing.	3.5	1.08	4.0	1.14
d. I choose vocabulary carefully.	3.5	1.26	3.0	1.41
e. I think of grammar carefully.	3.4	1.32	3.4	1.22
f. I revise while writing.	3.1	1.36	3.5	1.22

g. I revise after completing my first draft.	3.1	1.30	3.7	1.19
h. I write while translating from Japanese to English.	3.5	1.49	--	--
i. I try to use idioms when I write.	2.9	1.14	3.2	1.21
j. I try to use fixed expressions when I write.	2.9	1.19	2.8	1.20
k. I try to free-write without thinking about vocabulary, grammar, or passage organization.	3.2	1.44	3.3	1.33

Note. Part 1 Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree - 6 = Strongly Agree; Part 2 Likert scale: 1 = Very poor - 6 = Excellent; Part 3 Likert scale: 1 = Never - 6 = Always. *N* = 43.

Discussion

In this study, the language learning skills and strategies of 1st-year Japanese university students utilized in their academic English program were investigated to determine if their English and Japanese academic learning strategies and proficiency levels were correlated. Survey results indicate that students generally showed consistent language learning strategies in both Japanese and English, indicating that their L1 learning styles may have transferred or have been influenced by their L2 learning strategies and study habits. Further analysis of the survey data reveals that there was little or no correlation found between English language proficiency and their language learning strategies among the four skills. Interestingly, the advanced students in this study appeared not to use the strategies that good language learners use as reported in the previous studies of second or foreign language learners (e.g., Cohen, 1998; Griffiths, 2003; Oxford, 1990; 1994; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). Arguably, this may be due to the nature of the tasks required for students to perform in the institution that this study was undertaken.

Perception of knowledge

Generally the across the four skills, students perceive to have little confidence in their declarative knowledge in English or Japanese to perform tasks assigned to them. This may be a result of the difficulty

of the academic content they are studying. It is also likely that lexical items and new concepts related to the content may need to be further scaffolded according to difficulty to ensure that students are not overwhelmed by the input. Prior to requiring students to have discussions, presentations, or write on academic topics, academic English programs should ensure that students have a basic level of comprehension and competency so as to steadily develop their students' confidence over the period of their studies.

Perceived abilities and language skills

In the language abilities and skills section of the surveys, the majority of students show a clear need for listening, speaking, and writing support in English to function at a basic level during task performance. When completing the pre-survey writing task in Japanese, many students indicated that they lacked procedural writing abilities, which may be attributed to the academic task required of them, in combination with the limited experience they have writing their opinions on difficult topics. Therefore, it may be advantageous to provide students additional instruction in L1 and L2 composition writing in conjunction with their regular studies to reach a minimum stage of L2 writing competency required for their academic studies in English.

Reading, deemed to be the most important skill in academic studies to acquire new knowledge, appears to be very promising pedagogically, according to the survey responses. Over ninety percent of the responses in English and Japanese show a clear correlation, signifying that specific tasks should be designed to accompany academic lectures or tutorials, to encourage the development of students' reading skills for academic purposes.

Personal study skills, strategies and habits

Again students show much promise across all skills in both English

and Japanese. Many of the responses illustrate that students utilize a wide range of skills, strategies and habits with some success to best complete academic exercises required of them. Students indicate that they are engaged in the tasks of varying academic acumen, and are in the early to mid level developmental stages of the critical thinking skills necessary for completing tasks that require more complicated thought processes. Continued effort to provide study skill guidance to students will surely enrich their academic careers.

From these results it is clear that the majority of Japanese students entering university level academic English programs require more extensive academic language learning support to succeed in their content-based classrooms. Current practices are acknowledged to lessen deductive reasoning and critical thinking for the majority of secondary and tertiary level students, and thus, are less likely to perform well in academic English programs. This is important to note as MEXT (2003) also concedes that procedural skill development is important for academic studies to improve, but seems to be hindered by traditional approaches to education (de Bary, 2006; Passin, 1965, p. 160) that encourages classroom practices that emphasize test-driven declarative knowledge which are difficult to overcome (Johnson, 1996), resulting in the possibility cognitive deficits through hardwired behavior (Dörnyei, 2005; Tancredi, 2005). In contrast to MEXT's objectives are UN's Agenda 21 (online) plans for education that includes the necessity to utilize mass media for content in the classroom, implying that an inductive approach to learning that emphasizes rote learning may be suitable for their needs to integrate and unify world knowledge. Additionally, confusion may persist for teachers, as they may be limited in their ability to improve classroom practices due to their students' capabilities, furthermore, pedagogies and content that may be sanctioned due to language policy (Apple, Kenway & Singh, 2005; Edelsky, 2006; Fujimoto-Adamson, 2006; Kubota, 2002), and the effects of deculturation and imperialism (Hashimoto, 2007).

Conclusion

For many years the development of language skills in Japan, both in Japanese and English, have been on the forefront of much debate. While MEXT (2003) promotes policies determined to improve procedural education, a review of results of this study on language perceived abilities, specific skills, knowledge, and strategies, suggest students' study habits remain limited and possibly hardwired. To answer for the lack of perceived language abilities and academic language learning strategies, it is possible that students in this study were accustomed to teacher-centered approaches to instruction and learning throughout secondary school education. It is likely that students receive little feedback on their speaking and writing skills, such that their language learning skills and strategies remain at the level where students are reduced to primarily using memory and compensation strategies to enhance test performance.

Despite the numerous challenges Japanese education faces, movement towards developing the necessary language skills in both Japanese and English may be on-track as deficits in higher-level literacy practices are well known and are being acknowledged by MEXT. And only through gradual modification in academic literacies (Zamel & Spack, 1998) and language policies will achieve the balance between new knowledge, academic rigor, and critical scholarship over time (Ishikida, 2005). Fortunately, we can honestly state that study habits are in transition, as empirical knowledge that this study and other studies provide about the current practices in secondary and tertiary EFL education in Japan, is indeed a step towards improvement. It is hoped that all students and teachers alike, in academic English programs throughout Japan, will struggle with many competing forces to create a higher level of academic success, improving both Japanese and English language skills, not just for the talented, but for all in Japan—as MEXT states as its objective.

Robert Taferner holds a MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching)-TESOL from the School for International Training and is a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Lancaster University, U.K. Robert can be contacted at robert_taferner@yahoo.ca

References

- Apple, M., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Cohen, A. D. (2003). The learner's side of foreign language learning: Where do styles, strategies, and tasks meet? *IRAL*, 4, 279-291.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- de Bary, W. T. (Ed.). (2006). *Sources of Japanese tradition* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dick, B. (2005). Grounded theory: A thumbnail sketch. [On line] Available at <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html>
- Edelsky, C. (2006). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fujimoto-Adamson, N. (2006). Globalization and history of English education in Japan. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(3), Article 13. Retrieved

- August 14, 2008, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Sept_06_nfa.php
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31(3), 367-383.
- Griffiths, C. (2004). Language learning strategies: Theory and research. Occasional Paper No. 1, School of Foundation Studies, Auckland Institute of Studies at St. Helens.
- Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: students' and teachers' perceptions. *ELT Journal*. 61(2), 91-99.
- Hashimoto, K. (2007). Japan's language policy and the "lost decade." In A. B. M. Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts* (pp. 25-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ishikida, M. Y. (2005). *Japanese education in the 21st century*. New York: iUniverse.
- Johnson, K. (1996). *Language teaching & skill learning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kojima, H. (2008, June). Promoting learner and teacher autonomy: Collaborate, autonomous, and reflective approaches to ELT. Paper presented at the JACET JALT Joint Conference 2008.
- Kubota, R. (2002). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13-28). New York: Routledge.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 235-260.
- Littrell, R. F. (2006). Learning styles of students in and from Confucian cultures. In O. S. Heng, G. Apfelthaler, K. Hansen & N. Tapachai (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competencies in higher education and management* (pp. 99 -142). Singapore: Marshall Cavendish Academic.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MEXT (The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and

- Technology). (2003). Action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities." Retrieved May 16, 2008, from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>
- Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese university students. *RELIC, 30*(2), 101-113.
- Nomi, T. (2006). Inequality and Japanese education: Urgent choices. *ZMag*. Retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=9752>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. (1994). *Language learning strategies: An update* [Electronic Version]. Center for Applied Linguistics, Online Resources: Digests. Retrieved March 7, 2008, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/oxford01.html>
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL), *System, 25*(1), 1-23.
- Passin, H. (1965). *Society and education in Japan*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rigney, J. W. (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In H. F. O'Neil (Jr.) (Ed.), *Learning strategies* (pp. 165-205). New York: Academic Press.
- Robinson, P. (2001). *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.
- Sakui, K., & Gaies, S. J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learner's beliefs about language learning. *System, 27*(4), 473-492.
- Salehazadeh, J. (2006). *Academic listening strategies: A guide to understanding lectures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 304-318.
- Taferner, R. H. (2006, November). Reflective teaching journals: A tool for professional development. Okinawa Language Education Fair. Naha, Okinawa.
- Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System*, 31(3), 385-392.
- Takeuchi, O., & Wakamoto, N. (2001). Language learning strategies used by Japanese college learners of English: A synthesis of four empirical studies. *Language Education and Technology*, 38, 21-43.
- Tancredi, L. R. (2005). *Hardwired behavior: What neuroscience reveals about morality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations (Online). Agenda 21: Chapter 36.7 Promoting education, public awareness and training. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development. Retrieved July 17, 2008, from www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/agenda21toc.htm
- Usuki, M. (2003). Learner beliefs about language learning and learner autonomy: A reconsideration. In A. Barfield & M. Nix (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy in Japan 1: Autonomy you ask!* (pp. 11-24). Tokyo: Learner Development Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.
- Wong, J. K.-K. (2004). Are learning styles of Asian international students culturally or contextually based? *International Education Journal*, 4(4), 154-166.
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix 1

Table 1

Survey Results for Reading Abilities and Strategies in English and Japanese

Item	<i>M</i> Eng.	<i>SD</i> Eng.	<i>M</i> Jpn.	<i>SD</i> Jpn.
Part 1: Knowledge				
a. When I read I think my grammatical knowledge is appropriate.	2.3	0.99	--	--
*b. I think my knowledge of organization is appropriate to understand the passage.	2.3	0.96	3.5	1.28
*c. I think my vocabulary knowledge is appropriate to understand the passage.	2.3	1.13	3.2	1.32
Part 2: Purposes for reading				
a. To learn new knowledge.	4.4	1.38	4.7	1.22
b. To deepen my knowledge.	4.2	1.53	4.7	1.27
c. To find knowledge and information to write for an assignment.	4.2	1.36	4.2	1.35
d. To develop my critical thinking skills.	4.2	1.46	4.3	1.17
e. To find knowledge and information for an academic discussion.	3.8	1.33	4.2	1.39
Part 3a: Personal reading strategies 1				
a. Do you specify a purpose for reading?	3.5	1.37	3.6	1.24
b. Do you plan what steps to take when reading?	3.1	1.58	3.3	1.35
c. Do you preview the text?	3.1	1.35	3.4	1.50
d. Do you predict the contents of the text or section of the text from titles?	3.8	1.36	3.8	1.40
e. Do you check your predictions of the text you made about the reading passage?	3.4	1.38	3.6	1.39
f. Do you ask yourself questions about the content and try to answer them while reading?	3.3	1.23	3.5	1.37
g. Do you connect text to background knowledge?	3.7	1.27	3.9	1.25
h. Do you summarize the content of what you have read?	3.0	1.40	2.7	1.15
i. Do you make inferences from what you have read?	3.5	1.25	3.4	1.26
j. Do you connect parts of a text to grasp overall meaning when reading?	3.5	1.26	3.4	1.20
k. Do you read paying attention to text structure?	3.2	1.37	2.9	1.42
l. Do you re-read the text?	3.6	1.35	3.3	1.34
*m. Do you guess the meaning of a new word from the context?	3.5	1.37	4.4	1.18

n. Do you use discourse markers to see relationships in a text?	4.0	1.54	4.0	1.23
o. Do you ask your classmates and/or teacher when you do not understand the content?	4.2	1.46	3.7	1.49
p. Do you critique the text while reading?	3.6	1.38	4.0	1.29
q. Do you reflect on what has been learned from the text?	3.5	1.33	3.9	1.41
r. Do you read to find information you need or you want to know?	3.5	1.35	4.0	1.45
Part 3b: Personal reading strategies 2				
a. I focus on understanding the content when reading.	4.6	1.30	4.8	1.23
b. I try to grasp meaning of a text when reading.	4.4	1.29	4.7	1.15
*c. I read the passage aloud when reading.	3.4	1.43	2.3	1.27
d. I read while guessing the meaning of words.	3.9	1.22	3.7	1.37
e. I read while guessing the meaning of sentences.	4.0	1.31	4.1	1.42
f. I read while focusing on sentence structure and grammar.	3.4	1.22	3.0	1.34
g. I read while underlining important sentences.	3.5	1.49	3.3	1.72
h. I read while underlining important words.	3.4	1.36	3.1	1.67
i. I read while skipping unknown words.	3.5	1.33	3.3	1.35
j. I translate into Japanese when reading.	3.5	1.39	--	--
k. I visualize meaning when reading.	4.1	1.18	4.3	1.28
l. Can you identify the author's purpose for writing the passage?	2.8	1.24	3.5	1.10
Part 4: Academic reading strategies				
1. Reading strategies for densely written texts				
a. While reading, do you break down complex sentences into two or more sentences by deleting conjunctions?	4.1	1.22	3.3	1.34
b. While reading, do you ask who, what, where, when and how questions?	3.7	1.20	3.8	1.46
c. While reading, do you underline unfamiliar words?	3.7	1.58	3.1	1.61
d. While reading, do you identify cohesive elements (e.g. pronouns) and determine what each refers to?	3.4	1.19	3.3	1.50
e. While reading, do you identify the order of the verb, the subject, and the object of each sentence?	3.2	1.25	2.8	1.48
f. While reading, do you identify discourse markers to clarify relationships among text components?	3.7	1.55	3.4	1.42
g. While reading, do you re-read the passage?	3.8	1.30	4.0	1.58
2. Classify information				
a. Do you categorize information?	2.9	1.30	2.8	1.49

b. Do you place information into a graphic organizer?	2.2	1.06	2.3	1.24
3. Identify main idea and details				
*a. Do you identify the main idea of the text?	3.1	1.18	3.5	1.24
b. Do you identify ideas that support the main idea?	3.0	1.17	3.8	1.28
c. Do you remember important events and information described in the text right after finishing reading?	3.2	1.23	3.7	1.29
d. Do you paraphrase information?	3.0	1.40	3.4	1.42
4. Post-reading abilities				
*a. Can you cite or talk about information that you read in discussions or in you writing?	2.9	1.16	3.6	1.10
b. Can you personalize what you read?	3.3	1.23	3.5	1.12
c. Can you recognize cause and effect relations that are explicitly stated in the text?	3.0	1.09	3.6	1.20
d. Can you understand cause and effect relations that are inferred in the text?	2.8	1.10	3.2	1.10
5. Consider the author's point of view				
*a. Can you judge whether the author's point of view is subjective?	2.8	1.17	3.4	1.10
b. Can you identify the author's purpose for writing the passage?	--	--	3.1	1.13
6. Indicate sequence				
a. Do you ascertain chronological sequence?	3.1	1.01	3.7	1.28
b. Do you recognize a sequence of events when they are not explicitly stated?	3.1	1.17	--	--
c. Do you reconstruct the plot? (Can you explain how a writer develops a story line or argument?)	2.8	1.07	3.0	1.13
d. Do you follow the development of arguments?	2.9	1.12	3.2	1.20
Part 5: Rate your comprehension abilities				
a. I can guess the content of a passage from headlines or titles in newspapers, articles, or sections.	3.3	1.45	3.6	1.14
b. I can recognize words or phrases of similar or opposing meaning	3.1	1.08	3.3	1.32
c. I can interpret ideas, actions, events, and relationships (idea, events, and arguments) if they are easy.	3.6	1.40	4.3	1.33
d. I can interpret complex ideas, ideas, actions, events, and relationships	2.6	1.42	2.8	1.26
*e. I can infer meaning from the body of the passage to form my own conclusion.	2.7	1.13	3.5	1.26
f. I can comprehend what I have read from a difficult passage.	2.4	1.24	2.8	1.22
g. I can apply information I have read.	2.9	1.20	3.1	1.07

h. I can analyze what I have read.	3.2	1.43	3.7	1.12
Part 6: CAN statements				
a. I can make my own opinion about the content of a passage.	3.5	1.33	3.6	1.18
b. I can paraphrase information.	2.8	1.08	3.4	1.30
c. I can scan for specific information.	3.0	0.97	3.2	1.22
e. I can skim for general comprehension.	3.1	1.06	3.3	1.29
f. I can distinguish between the main points from supporting details.	2.7	1.10	3.3	1.22
g. I can use an encyclopedia to find information I need to comprehend the content of a passage.	4.3	1.42	3.8	1.21
h. I can empathize with the author of the text.	3.6	1.35	3.7	1.24
i. I can personalize what I read.	3.3	1.43	3.7	1.36
j. I can predict what I read.	3.1	1.15	3.3	1.15
k. I can skip unfamiliar words and guess their meaning from remaining words in a sentence.	3.2	1.21	3.6	1.07
l. I can go back in the text to bring to mind previous context to decode an unfamiliar word.	2.9	1.11	3.4	1.07
m. I can identify the grammatical function (e.g. subject, noun) of an unfamiliar word before guessing its meaning.	3.4	1.26	3.4	1.24
n. I can connect information appearing in illustrations to the content of a passage.	3.7	1.33	4.0	1.15
o. I can read the title and draw inferences from it.	3.4	1.37	3.7	1.12
p. I can use cognates to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.	3.2	1.39	3.7	1.20
q. I can apply common knowledge to decode an unfamiliar word.	3.3	1.22	3.6	1.20
*r. I can skip words that may add relatively little to total meaning.	3.1	1.34	3.9	1.32
Part 7: DO questions				
a. Do you make pre-reading questions before you read a text?	2.7	1.31	3.3	1.30
b. Do you have questions while reading a passage?	2.9	1.19	3.4	1.16
c. Do you read a story from the perspective of authors?	2.9	1.40	3.1	1.28
d. Do you read while locating information?	3.4	1.36	3.9	1.30
e. Do you read to acquire new information?	3.6	1.34	4.0	1.37
f. Do you read to extend your world-view to cultivate your mind?	3.6	1.53	4.1	1.30
g. Do you read while analyzing text?	3.3	1.39	3.3	1.11
h. Do you read for pleasure in your free time?	3.1	1.22	3.5	1.18

i. Do you think you have sufficient and necessary knowledge to understand what you read in English?	2.3	1.29	--	--
j. Do you think you have sufficient cultural background to understand what you read in English?	2.2	1.17	--	--

Note. Part 1 Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree - 6 = Strongly Agree; Parts 2 through 7 Likert scale: 1 = Very poor - 6 = Excellent; Part 3 Likert scale: 1 = Never - 6 = Always. *N* = 43.

Appendix 2a

English Academic Listening and Speaking Tasks

Note-taking task. Watch the lecture and write the most important points you understood in Japanese and/or in English. チャンドラー博士の講義の中で、最も大切だと思うポイントを、日本語か英語、あるいは両方で書きなさい（複数解答化）。

Summary task. Watch the lecture again and summarize the lecture in English and/or Japanese. 講義の内容を、英語か日本語、あるいは両方で要約しなさい。

Discussion—Speaking Task. Discuss the following question—To which do you belong?

Lecture text (this was not given to the students during tasks): “To the question: to what do I belong in my historical present? We usually answer to my family, something like that. My school; I come from this place that place. I come from California, United States. I belong to the group of people that were born or lived in California, United States. Or we can say we belong to my street, my

neighborhood, my town, or my city, my prefecture: Kansai; Kanto; Tohoku. I belong to my country Japan, Brazil, United States. But, what if you belong to more than one? What if your town is a little bit important compared to your region? What if your region is more important than your country? You say you come from Kansai, or Okinawa, or Hokkaido. In American we say "I come from the South," or "New England," or "California." Or if you are born in Brazil, your parents were born in Japan; you are Japanese citizen. To which do you belong: Brazil, Japan, both? What... To which do you belong?"

Appendix 2b

English Academic Reading and Writing Tasks

Please read the following passages and answer the question. 次の文章を読んで質問に答えてください。

Introduction to personalism

Nishida Kitarô (1870-1945) argued that entities take shape in relation to other entities, which becomes the place (場所) of their formation. Such is the case with the 'I' (私) and the 'Thou' (汝). In the Western world an entire philosophical movement with similar concerns developed, mainly throughout the 20th century. This movement was called personalism. Personalist philosophers were wary to stress the importance of the 'person' as a self-determined entity, but which on the other hand was meaningless if not conceived in relation to society. Inter-personal relationships were therefore paramount for personalist philosophers in order to understand the formation of the 'person.'

Emmanuel Mounier (1905-1950)

Mounier (1905-1950) equally tried to understand the nature of personal life within the context of the community. However his personalism has nothing to do with individualism, nor with collectivism. All human beings must awaken to their relationships with other fellows, with their community, and with nature, and this precisely in order to creatively affirm themselves as persons. What are the most important points in the passages?

文章の中で、最も大切なポイントは何ですか。

Appendix 2c

Japanese Academic Reading, Writing and Speaking Tasks

Please read the following passages and answer the question. 次の文章を読んで質問に答えてください。

カントによれば、人間の認識能力には、感性和悟性の二種の認識形式がア
プリオリに備わっており、前者の感性には、純粹直観である空間と時間、
後者の悟性には、因果性などの 12 種の純粹悟性概念（カテゴリー、す
なわち範疇とも称する）が含まれる。純粹悟性概念は時間限定たる図式
(schema)によつてのみ感性和関係する。意識は、その二種の形式（感性和
悟性）に従つてのみ物事を認識する。この認識が物の経験である。他方、
この形式に適合しない理性理念は原理的に人間には認識できないが少なく
とも課題として必要とされる概念とされる。理性推理による理念は、いわ
ば絶対者にまで拡張された純粹悟性概念である。神あるいは超越者がその
代表例であり、これをカントは物自体(*Ding an sich*)と呼ぶ。いわゆる二律
背反においては、定立の側では完全な系列には無制約者が含まれると主張
される。これに対し反定立の側では制約が時間において与えられた系列に
は被制約者のみが含まれると主張される。このような対立の解決は、統制
的ではあつても構成的ではない理念に客觀的實在性を付与する先驗的すり
かえを避けることを必要とする。理念は、与えられた現象の制約系列にお
いて無制約者に到達することを求めるが、しかし到達して停滯することは
許さない規則である。（『純粹理性批判』）

なおプロレゴメナによれば、純粹悟性概念はいわば現象を経験として読み得る
ように文字にあらわすことに役立つもので、もしも物自体に關係させられるべ
きものならば無意義となる。また、経験に先行しこれを可能にする超越論的
(*transzendental*)という概念は、かりに上記の概念の使用が経験を越えるならば超
越的(*transzendent*)と呼ばれ、内在的(*immanent*)すなわち経験内に限られた使用か
ら區別される。

文章の中で、最も大切なポイントは何ですか。

Discussion—Speaking Task

Discuss the main points of the passages above.