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Abstract

With the change of the social demands, the goals of learning English by Japanese learners have had wide variance. The use of computers made writers easier to change the organization of what they have previously written. The general writers' focus might be given more on the organization than before. The use of faxes eased the interchange of tables, figures, graphs, etc., which in turn provides increased opportunity to discuss over these materials by telephone. These demands might even change the definition of intelligence (e.g. Azuma, 1990), suppose intellingence is defined in terms of social needs. If the output, i.e. the goals of learning English change, then approaches and methods for language teaching should also change.

Learning of language-learning strategies, in this sense, should be focussed on for the reasons of their flexibility, applicability, and efficiency for the changing demands of learners in these circumstances. In this paper, styles of teaching, "learning strategies" were compared in the aim of identifying critical factors in teaching them successfully. Five groups of students majoring in different subjects in two universities were given an questionnaire and the reasons for the increased rate of the use of learning strategies were discussed in terms of the transfer of previous learning experience and students' motivation.
Introduction

As the factors of intelligence are defined in many ways (e.g., Azuma, 1990), language learning is assumed to take place in many ways.

Up to now, the factors of intelligence has usually been discussed only in terms of mathematical and linguistic skills, but now it is beginning to be redefined. The idea of multiple intelligence is replacing the prior definition. Gardner (1983) presented seven different intelligences: linguistic, logical-mathematic, musical, spatial, bodily kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal. As it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss each of the factors of intelligence, it might be wise to discuss why its definition could be broaden. As Azuma (1990) argued the intelligence tend to be defined socially or culturally according to the needs of the community.

The use of computers in academic fields has become common and for students in undergraduate programs mastering of the computer became inevitable. The use of keyboards probably affects the mental processing of language. For example, editing of paragraphs became far easier thanks to the copying or pasting function of word processors. This might lead a writer of a foreign language to care not only about the grammatical correctness but also about the organization of paragraphs or in other words, discourse.

Another example of the change in our mental processing came from the increased demands for the use of a foreign language in oral and written communication. Overseas calls and faxes made real-time communication more available. Sending diagrams, tables, figures and discussing them have become a common style of business. This makes it possible for us to infer the idea of the sender of a message on the basis of the information sent through faxes.

These social needs might affect the ultimate goal of learning a foreign language. The idea of teaching "learning strategies" might fit the idea of corresponding with the changing demands of our society in that teaching "learning strategies" might possibly give more opportunity of intaking (Krashen, 1985) inputs by means of the use of their intelligences in many
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Richards (1990, 42-47) listed six premises on which learning strategy studies are based, by referring to Cohen and Aphek (1980):
1. Some language learners are more successful than others.
2. Some aspects of the learning process are conscious and others are not.
3. Less successful learners can use successful strategies consciously to accelerate learning.
4. Teachers can promote the use of learning strategies.
5. Learners can become the best judges of how they learn most effectively, both in and out of classes.

In defining learning strategies, major studies known are of Richards' (1990), O'Malley's (1990), and Oxford's (1990). Their studies provide the images of learning strategies such as being special ways of processing information that enhance comprehension, learning, or retention of information (O'Malley, 1990, 1). Good language learners seem to be successful as they have a better understanding of and control over their own learning than less successful learners (Richards, 1990, 43). Oxford (1990), by giving examples from Rigney (1978) and Danserau (1985) concludes that it is useful to expand this definition by saying that learning strategies are "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations." He listed "features of learning strategies" that contain all of these ideas:


1. contribute to the main goal, communicative competence
2. allow learners to become more self-directed
3. expand the role of teachers
4. are problem-oriented
5. are specific actions taken by the learner
6. involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive
7. support learning both directly and indirectly
8. are not always observable
9. are often conscious
10. can be taught
11. are flexible
12. are influenced by a variety of factors

As he suggests in this list, though these images of learning strategies seem to suggest the importance of teaching "learning strategies," we should also recognize the innate difficulty of explaining the mental process taking place in the learners' mind (cf. O'Malley, 1990, 2). Richards (1990) suggested the process by introducing Willing that "strategies are essentially methods employed by the person for processing input language information in such a way as to gain control of it, thus enabling the assimilation of that information by the self." Strategies are hence viewed as ways of managing the complex information that the learner is receiving about the target language (44-45). Ellis (1985) also explained the mechanism as it (how learner factors come to influence the rate and success of SLA) has to do with the way they (learners) control the amount of input received by the learner and the way he or she handles this input (124).

For the full understanding of the mechanism, however, we might have to wait for the answer from neurolinguists or psycholinguists. For this reason, the focus of this study is basically on identifying the use of specific items of learning strategies by various students and comparing effects of teaching in two different ways rather than trying to explain the complex mechanisms.

In discussing approaches to teaching "learning strategies," two more things should be kept in mind, which are related to how we should present learning strategies to our students. For this, referring to Richards might help to identify the problem:

In order to present information about learning strategies to students,
strategies need to be operationalized in the form of specific technique (see Fraser and Skibichi 1987). However, there is no consensus yet concerning how to approach the teaching of learning strategies. As with other aspects of language teaching, the issue of whether strategies are best "learned" or "acquired" is a central one. Some researchers advocate a direct approach. This involves explicit training in the use of specific strategies and teaching students to consciously monitor their own strategies. (Richards, 1990, 47)

This study for these reasons focuses on two research questions which are presented in Objectives.

**Objectives**

The primary purposes of this study were: (1) to identify effects of teaching "learning strategies" taught explicitly or implicitly to the varied groups; (2) to examine the use of the good learner strategies by varied groups of students on the bases of the Strategy system proposed by Oxford (1990, 14-22).

**Method**

<A. Subjects>
Dokkyo University (Grade 2)
Major English Law Business Economics
Level 69.4 58.6(64.3) 56.5(60.1) 56.5(60.1)
Study 1 Total 42(11,31) 40(24,16) 29(23,6) 32(27,5)
(Male, Female)
Study 2 43(12,31) 38(23,15) 27(21,6) 23(20,3)
Keisen Ladies College (Grade 1)
Major English
Level 56.1
Study 1 65(0,65)
Study 2 55(0,55)
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* Level shows standard deviation for the entrance examination for each department of the university and the college. (Gokaku Nani Rankingu, 1993)

(B.Procedure)

Study 1

A questionnaire with 76 questions asking the use of each learning strategy was answered either by Yes or No.

Questionnaire Items:

The 76 items were categorized into 14 sections. The choice of the items and the categorization were performed by referring to the Strategy System proposed by Oxford (1990). Oxford proposed six strategies, three were "Direct" and the other three were "Indirect," the two groups of strategies supporting each other. The six strategies were memory, cognitive, compensation under the direct class, metacognitive, affective, and social in the indirect class. The strategies were subdivided as follows:

1. Memory strategies (Creating mental linkages, Applying images and sounds, Reviewing well, Employing action)
2. Cognitive strategies (Practicing, Receiving and sending messages, Analyzing and reasoning, Creating structure for input and output)
3. Compensation strategies (Guessing intelligently, Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing)
4. Metacognitive strategies (Centering your learning, Arranging and planning your learning, Evaluating your learning)
5. Affective strategies (Lowering your anxiety, Encouraging yourself, Taking your emotional temperature)
6. Social strategies (Asking questions, Cooperating with others, Empathizing with others)

According to the proposal by Oxford (1990), 76 questionnaire items were made under the 14 headings (See Appendix). These were as follows:

A. words, idiomatic expressions, and structure learning (Memory strategies): 1. categorizing words, 2. relating unknown to prior knowledge, 3.
putting words in order, 4. putting words into a story 5. having an image of vocabularies, 6. using a map, 7. using key words 8. using phonics, 9. retrieving words, 10. using physical rhythm, sensual image, 11. making cards and lists 12. reordering cards and lists
C. facilitating understanding (Compensation strategies): 18. using skimming and scanning, 19. compensating ability by referring to a script or other information, 20. applying general rules to the unknown, 21. decomposing unknown expressions to smaller units, 22. applying grammatical rules of Japanese, 23. translating, 24. using Japanese words, the ways of thinking, etc.
D. receiving and sending messages (Cognitive strategies): 25. taking notes while listening, 26. drawing charts and pictures while listening, 27. summarizing, 28. emphasizing with markers, underlining
E. inferring in listening and reading (Compensation strategies): 29. resorting to prior knowledge of vocabularies and grammar, 30. inferring meanings from contexts, 31. guessing from situation, 32. guessing from the tone of voice, 33. guessing from gestures, 34. guessing from facial expression, 35. guessing from real world knowledge, 36. guessing from tables and figures, 37. guessing from the topic or the discourse knowledge
F. speaking and writing (Compensation strategies): 38. using Japanese words for unknown words, 39. asking for help from other people, 40. using body language, 41. avoiding topics, 42. Choosing favorite topics, 43. modifying messages, 44. connecting words, 45. circumlocuting
G. concentration on the specific skills (Metacognitive strategies): 46. knowing the purpose of the learning, 47. learning words for specific purposes, 48. learning specific skills, 49. learning listening before speaking
H. planning learning (Metacognitive strategies): 50. getting information about effective learning strategies, 51. making a learning schedule, 52. optimizing physical environment for learning, 53. setting a goal for each learning task, 54. setting a goal for the achievement of ability, 55. trying to understand the meaning of the task, 56. learning for specific purposes,
57. trying to maximize learning opportunity
J. mental control (Affective strategies): 60. trying to relax while learning, 61. having a relaxing strategy, 62. using music for relaxation, 63. trying to enjoy learning
K. motivating (Affective strategies): 64. self-evaluating achievement, 65. putting him/herself into the situation where English is indispensable, 66. self-praising, giving awards to him/herself
L. physical and mental control (Affective strategies): 67. self-monitoring psychological state, 68. checking feelings, attitude, and motivation, 69. recording feelings after learning, 70. discussing feelings with someone else
M. communication (Social strategies): 71. asking for clarification or verification, 72. asking for correction, 73. cooperating with peers, 74. cooperating with proficient users of the target language outside of class
N. understanding cultural difference (social strategies): 75. developing cultural understanding, 76. becoming aware of the thoughts and feelings of others

Study 2

After Study 1, twelve times of classes were given to all the groups. The four groups of D University were taught under the course title of Reading with the teacher's aim of teaching "learning strategy" indirectly. The one group of K University was taught also under the title of Reading but taught learning strategies directly with the aim of the course being explicitly declared. After the three months after the questionnaire was answered in Study 1, the same questionnaire was answered by the same student groups.

The class where learning strategies were explicitly taught (K University) was taught with a text book which had exercises to practice learning strategies.

The text used for this class was "Study Skills in English" (Wallace, 1980). The Syllabus followed the sequence of the chapters presented in the text book.
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Syllabus (Wallus, 1980)

Organizing the studies:

1. Self-assessment of the student's study in terms of college work, private study, and general way of life.

2. Use of timetables

Improving reading efficiency:

3. Reading with a purpose

4. Using the title

5. Reading: Aspects of the reading process and reading efficiency

6. Surveying a book

7. Surveying a chapter using first lines of paragraphs

8. Surveying a chapter using first and last paragraphs

9. Scanning

10. Multiple reading skills (including organization analysis): practice

11. Understanding graphic presentation

12. Making Algorithm
Results

Table 1. Rate of affirmative answer to the questionnaire items (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D-English</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>K-English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>35.9 41.3 35.6 49.6</td>
<td>30.7 34.9</td>
<td>32.0 34.1</td>
<td>40.3 43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5.4 +13.9</td>
<td>+ 4.1</td>
<td>+ 2.0</td>
<td>+ 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>54.3 59.5 50.0 62.6</td>
<td>44.1 44.4</td>
<td>46.2 53.9</td>
<td>53.8 56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5.2 +12.6</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
<td>+ 7.7</td>
<td>+ 2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>41.5 43.5 37.9 54.5</td>
<td>36.9 33.2</td>
<td>32.1 39.7</td>
<td>33.4 42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2.0 +16.7</td>
<td>- 3.6</td>
<td>+ 7.6</td>
<td>+ 8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>45.2 53.5 55.0 57.9</td>
<td>45.7 50.9</td>
<td>43.0 46.7</td>
<td>51.5 63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 8.3 + 2.9</td>
<td>+ 5.2</td>
<td>+ 3.8</td>
<td>+12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>76.2 80.6 65.8 77.5</td>
<td>58.2 76.5</td>
<td>55.2 65.7</td>
<td>72.1 78.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 4.4 +11.7</td>
<td>+18.3</td>
<td>+10.5</td>
<td>+ 6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>74.4 78.5 76.3 78.6</td>
<td>64.5 72.6</td>
<td>59.0 72.8</td>
<td>69.4 76.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 4.1 + 2.4</td>
<td>+ 8.1</td>
<td>+13.8</td>
<td>+ 6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>45.2 64.5 33.1 39.5</td>
<td>32.8 42.3</td>
<td>27.3 37.0</td>
<td>38.8 42.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+19.3 + 6.3</td>
<td>+ 9.6</td>
<td>+ 9.6</td>
<td>+ 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>50.0 48.5 33.8 44.1</td>
<td>27.6 29.8</td>
<td>28.1 33.7</td>
<td>40.8 46.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1.5 +10.3</td>
<td>+ 2.2</td>
<td>+ 5.6</td>
<td>+ 5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>41.7 41.8 28.8 43.4</td>
<td>25.9 28.8</td>
<td>29.7 37.0</td>
<td>33.8 30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0.1 +14.7</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
<td>+ 7.3</td>
<td>- 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>45.8 51.7 40.6 48.7</td>
<td>35.3 41.3</td>
<td>39.1 44.6</td>
<td>35.0 42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5.9 + 8.1</td>
<td>+ 6.0</td>
<td>+ 5.5</td>
<td>+ 7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>42.9 55.0 42.5 58.8</td>
<td>36.8 42.3</td>
<td>40.6 50.7</td>
<td>45.6 52.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+12.1 +16.3</td>
<td>+ 5.5</td>
<td>+10.1</td>
<td>+ 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>34.5 37.2 28.1 30.2</td>
<td>14.7 19.2</td>
<td>27.3 26.1</td>
<td>22.3 29.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2.7 + 2.1</td>
<td>+ 4.6</td>
<td>- 1.3</td>
<td>+ 5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>51.2 58.7 32.5 48.0</td>
<td>30.2 30.8</td>
<td>31.2 33.7</td>
<td>39.6 42.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 7.5 +15.5</td>
<td>+ 0.6</td>
<td>+ 2.5</td>
<td>+ 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>96.3 96.5 82.5 82.9</td>
<td>72.4 78.8</td>
<td>71.9 80.4</td>
<td>52.3 86.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0.2 + 0.4</td>
<td>+ 6.4</td>
<td>+ 8.6</td>
<td>+34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>52.5 57.6 45.9 55.4</td>
<td>39.7 44.7</td>
<td>40.2 46.8</td>
<td>44.9 52.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2. Rate of Strategy Use (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q-items/groups</th>
<th>D-Eng</th>
<th>D-Eng2</th>
<th>2-1</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Law2</th>
<th>2-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory A</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive B,D</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation C,E,F</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive G,H,I</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective J,K,L</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Rate of Attendance (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D-English</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>K-English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Rate of Attendance and Effects of Teaching
Discussion

A: The degree of the effects of teaching differs according to the type of the teaching.

The items (1) Self-assessment of the student's study in terms of college work, private study, and general way of life, and (2) Use of timetable of the syllabus taught at K university are metacognitive strageties.

The item (3) Reading with a purpose (4), Using the title (5) Reading: Aspects of the reading process and reading efficiency (6), Surveying a book (7), Surveying a chapter using first lines of paragraphs (8), Surveying a chapter using first and last paragraphs, and (9) Scanning are compensation strategies. Item (10) Multiple reading skills (including organization analysis): practice (11), Understanding graphic presentation and (12) Making Algorithm are cognitive starategies.

If there are changes in the rate of use of the learning strategies among K university students, we might be able to attribute the results to the explicit teaching of the strategies acrding to the syllabus of Wallace (1990).

The questionnaire items B and D are of cognitive strategies, (See Table. 2.) and the rate of the use of the strategies in Study 1, was 52.65 and 60 in Study 2, which showed 7.35 percent increase in the use of cognitive strategies and was second to the law students' 7.75 percent increase (52.5 in Study 1 and 60.25 in Study 2). The business and the economic students, had 2.75, and 5.7 percent increases respectively.

The questionnaire items C, E, and F are of compensation strategies. The students of K university showed 7.5 percent increase in the rate of the use of the strategies (58.3 in Study 1 and 65.8 in Study 2), following 10.6 of the economics (48.8 and 59.4), 10.2 of the law (60.0 and 70.2) and 7.6 of the business (53.2 and 60.8). The rate of the use of the compensation strategies was the second to the law again.

The items G, H, and I were of metacognitive strategies. The rate of the use of metacognitive strategies by K university students were 40.1 which follows D–English 51.6 and law 42.3.
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The items J, K, and L were of Affective strategies. The rate of the use of affective strategies were 41.2 which follows D-English, 48.0, and law, 45.9.

The items M and N were of social strategies. The rate of the use of social strategies were 64.6 which followed D-English, 77.6 and law, 65.5.

The rate of the increase in the item categorized in the affective and the social strategies were the highest in K-English (affective, 6.9 and social, 18.6).

These results did not show significant difference in the increase of the rate of the use of learning strategies. The increased rate of affective and social strategies in the K-university might not be attributed to the explicit teaching of the learning strategies, because there was no direct teaching of these strategies in the teaching period. It might be attributed to the other reasons.

B: The use of learner strategies by varied groups of students.

(a) The transfer of the learning style might have affected the results of Study 1.

Comparison of Study 2 showed that English major students of Dokkyo university marked the highest rate of the use in the metacognitive, the affective and the social strategies. Their rate of compensation strategies were the second to the law major students. The law major students rated the highest in the memory, the cognitive and the compensation strategies.

These results might be interpreted as follows:

(i) D-English students had metacognitive knowledge (51.6%) such as for: the understanding of the purpose of the learning method they took (questionnaire item G : 46); selecting the appropriate skills to focus their learning on (H47-49); paying attention to effective methods of their learning English, having maximum opportunity to use English, and planning their learning (G: 50-57); evaluating their progress (I: 58-59).

(ii) D-English students had affective strategies (48.9%) for: controlling their psychological state (J: 60-63); motivating themselves (K: 64-66, L: 67-70).

(iii) D-English students had social strategies (77.6%) for: asking help to get supplemental information when they do not understand the communi-
cation (M: 71); taking advantage of group learning and having native friends (M: 71-74); trying to understand feelings of others (N: 75-76).

D-English students entered the university by taking the entrance examination which requires taking two subjects, which were English and composition. Their level of English were the highest (69.4 in their standard deviation as shown in Subject). They had higher motivation for learning English and they had clear purpose and goals of learning English. They had more opportunity to speak with native speakers of English both in their classrooms and outside their classrooms. These might have affected their learning strategies. These might be explained that their attitude for learning English was different from the other students.

They did not show, however, the difference in memory and cognitive strategy use, which might suggest the problem the English major students had. Law major students as compared with English major students seemed to have the strategies that English major students did not have.

(iv) Law major students of Dokkyo university had memory strategies (49.6%) for: acquiring or learning words, phrases, and sentence structures by contextualizing, listing, having images, using sounds and rhythms, rehearsing what they have learned systematically, using kinesthetic movement, and reordering of the list (A: 1-12).

(v) Law major students had cognitive strategies (60.3%) such as: repeating; using phonics; finding rules; relating novel learning items to their prior knowledge; taking naturalistic approach (B: 13-17); taking notes, using tables, figures, matrix, etc.; summarizing, using a marker, underlining (D: 25-28).

(vi) Law major students had compensation strategies (70.2%) for understanding English with their limited knowledge by: skimming; scanning; using graphic information; analyzing novel information into knowledgeable pieces; applying the rules of their native language (C: 18-24); using schematic knowledge; using knowledge of paralinguistic features; using contextual cues (E: 29-3).

These results (iv-v) might be explained in terms of the transfer of learning. The law major students had learning experience with sections of the Japanese Constitution, which might affected the use of memory
strategies. Their learning strategy of law might have been applied to the learning of English. When they were required to process a lot of reading tasks quantity of which they had never experienced—twenty pages were required to read to prepare for the class every week and a test was given every other weeks. They were forced to develop the compensation strategies (vi), which might explain the acquisition process of the compensation strategies.

(b) Motivational factors might have affected the attitudinal difference of the use of the learning strategies (See Table. 3, and Figure. 1.):

Defining learning motivation of the various groups by looking at the attendance rate at the lecture in those six months, D-English counted 89.2%, and the law, 89.1%. These two groups again marked the highest rate. Dealing with the increase in the rate of the use of each strategy, the law major students rated the highest in four categories of strategies: memory, cognitive, compensation, and metacognitive. The role of motivation in relation to learning strategies were discussed in many ways. Gagne (1987), for example said, “Clearly, motivation is of major importance in facilitating people’s learning and should be followed closely by instructional designers.” This explanation of the role of motivation might also make the role of learning strategies clear if “people’s learning is assumed to be a result of the people’s use of learning strategies, which are driven by the force of motivation. O’Malley (1990) described the relationship by categorizing motivation into metacognitive strategies:

Research in metacognitive and cognitive learning strategies suggests that transfer of strategy training to new tasks can be maximized by pairing metacognitive strategies with appropriate cognitive strategies (Brown et al. 1983). Students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to plan their learning, monitor their progress, or review their accomplishments and future learning directions (3-8).

His description is valuable in that he placed the motivation in metacognitive strategy and clarified the relation of motivation and other
strategies. It is possible to explain the developmental stage of the learning of learning strategies by English major students of Dokkyo university, and that of law major students. D-English students used metacognitive, affective and social strategies, but used less of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, which were, in O'Malley terms, "appropriate" strategies. In the case of the law major students, they had appropriate strategies but showed less use of metacognitive, affective and social strategies, which might integrate all the strategies. O'Malley description of the relationship among these strategies thus suggests the further problems for each group of students. As far as motivation plays the central role in the strategies, we as teachers should know how motivation is raised. To this, he also commented as follows:

Motivation is probably the most important characteristic that students bring to a learning task. Motivation or the will to learn, can be considered a component metacognition insofar as it plays a self-regulatory role in learning (Jones et al., 1987). Students who have experienced success in learning have developed confidence in their own ability to learn. They are therefore likely to approach new learning tasks with a higher degree of motivation than students who, because they have not been successful in the past, may have developed a negative attitude toward their ability to learn. Learning strategy instruction would be most valuable for students who may be least motivated to try new strategies, since they may not have confidence that they are able to learn successfully anyway. (161-165)

He explained the importance of successful experience of the use of learning strategies. Ellis (1985) also mentioned this point:

How the learner responds to group dynamics of the learning situation, or to the teacher and course materials, or how he selects study techniques are determined by age, aptitude, cognitive style, motivation and personality. However, those general factors that are open to modification can also be influenced by a successful personal learning
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style.(123-124)

These two suggested the importance of motivation in the use of learning strategies by the students and the mechanism of students’ being motivated, which was “successful personal learning” experience. This might direct how learning strategies should be taught.

Another point that we should focus on in the teaching of learning strategies might be the students centeredness. Students should be able to choose the most appropriate strategy by him/herself according to the task or to their mental and physical state at their final stage of development. To this we might be able to apply the idea of learner-managed-learning in which “the learner must be free to choose whatever approach is most suitable in terms of the requirements of the actual learning experience (Long, 1990, 88-89).”

Grenfell and Harris’s idea (1993) might suggest a standard to what extent teachers should intervene the learning of strategies. They defined the role of a language classroom, as “The prime aim of the language classroom is surely to help learners “let learn”; in other words provide the basic strategies and situations for learners to generate sense and meaning, thus to improve the effective use of ways of managing distinct linguistic knowledge (24).” The twelve classes for each group of the students were given to facilitate this.

Conclusion

Strategies should be taught explicitly or inexplicitly?

In these studies, study 1 and study 2, there were no significant differences in the rate of the increase in the use of learning strategies that might be able to be attributed to the teaching methods. As was shown above, The differences in the rate of the increase in the use of learning strategies might be attributed to the students’ prior learning experience (transfer of learning) and motivation. Two groups that had the highest rates of attendance which was defined as the index of motivation showed the largest increase in the rate of the use of learning strategies. What
should be considered is to identify what strategies are necessary for the specific student in question. If we consider motivation is the most affective factor in the increase rate of the use of learning strategies, the choice of topics, the appropriateness of tasks in terms of the students' interest might be more important than to discuss the issue of comparing the teaching methods.
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