Chapter IV Findings and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data findings of the present study and conducts its analysis. As explained in Chapter 3 ‘Research Methodology’, the study was divided into the following components in order to achieve the objectives of the present study:

1. An initial survey of JFL was designed and conducted in order to achieve objective one, i.e., ‘To investigate the JFL learners’ beliefs about and readiness for autonomous learning’.

2. Training in Conversation, a programme for training in direct and indirect strategies was designed and conducted in order to achieve objective two and three, i.e., ‘To develop a programme for training in ‘Japanese Conversation and the Learning Strategies’ and ‘To test the effectiveness of the programme in ‘Japanese conversation and learning strategies’

3. Training in Reading, a programme for training in direct and indirect strategies was designed and conducted in order to achieve objective three and four, i.e., ‘To develop a programme for training in ‘Japanese Reading and the Learning Strategies’ and ‘To test the effectiveness of the programme in ‘Japanese reading and learning strategies’.

The present chapter deals with the above three components and their respective findings separately. The findings are compiled and the discussion is carried out for each part of the study.

4.2 Beliefs and Readiness Survey for Autonomous Learning

The initial survey to find out the beliefs and readiness of Japanese learners for autonomous learning received a valid response from a total of 167 learners from across India.
4.2.1 Findings of the Survey on Readiness for and Beliefs on Autonomous Learning

The complete tables of the collected data through the paper and online questionnaire survey are given in Annexure. In total, 167 learners responded to the questionnaire, out of which 137 learners responded to an online survey whereas 30 learners responded to the paper survey.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Fig. 4.1** Responses of JFL learners to the survey on readiness and beliefs (Reading)

4.2.2 Analysis of the Findings

Statements 3 and 4 check whether the learner is willing and ready to take up autonomous learning at least going by theory.

Statement 3: I should become more independent in my studies as I progress in my The Japanese language studies. 92% agree to this statement and only 8% disagree.
Statement 4: If I come across certain difficulty in Japanese, I should try to find the solution by myself. As many as 73.34% are positive about the situation where they handle their own problems, however, 26.67% disagree.

On this background, it is interesting to check their responses to two other questions and check them against their actual preferences. Answers to questions 8 and 5 give us what the learner would prefer to do practically, against the agreement to the theory and will also indicate the preferred level of dependence on the teacher.

Statement 8: ‘If I come across certain difficulty in Japanese, I should immediately approach the teacher to find a solution.’ As per the above data, as large as 67.79% agree to the statement.

Statement 10: ‘I will feel more comfortable if the teacher is always beside me to correct and support even in advanced level studies.’ The count is 75% in total with the learners who agree and strongly agree. This shows dependence on the teacher to a large extent, and a result of influence of traditional teaching-learning pattern which is followed in most of the classes.

There were a few statements checking on the beliefs on the learning process that is traditionally done and is supposed to be done by the teacher only. Statements seven and eight try to find what the learners believe themselves to be capable or incapable of. It checks their beliefs on their capacity for planning, evaluating and monitoring their own learning which form the base of Learner Autonomy and connect theory to practical implementation.

Statement 7: It is possible for me to plan my own learning and monitor it. 76% agree to the statement.
Statement 5: I can evaluate my own learning and level. Approximately 57% agree/strongly agree to the statement. It shows that though the learners feel that they are capable of planning and monitoring their own learning, much lesser learners think themselves to be capable of their own evaluation. Alternatively, they are not ready for such an activity.

Response to statement no.1 also shows strong affiliation to a teacher-centric classroom that the learners have experienced till date. Approximately 75% agree or strongly agree to the statement ‘Teacher should always be the controller of the class’. However, for 2nd statement, only 18% strongly agree/agree saying that ‘Teacher is the only source of knowledge learners should depend on’ and as many as 60% disagree and 12% strongly disagree with the statement. They acknowledge that there are other sources of knowledge apart from the teacher.

Statement 6 and 9 check the learners’ readiness to adopt peer-review, which can be considered a social strategy or more importantly, interdependence. Peer learning can be interpreted as a manifestation of a social learning environment and the social aspect of learner autonomy.

We can see openness to Peer-review through the fact that 84% of the learners believe that error correction by friends will not affect their relationship. As many as 83% believe that peers can assess their performance and give feedback. The tremendous positive response can be seen as a significant sign of readiness for peer review and peer learning.

In addition to the responses to the survey, a few learners responded with an additional comment along with the questionnaire.

An excerpt from a learner’s spontaneous response is as following.
“…. I strongly believe in Guru-Shishya Parampara. So whatever teacher says is the ultimate word for me. So, I believe that Teacher always has to be there even when the student achieves higher levels. Nowadays, people probably don't believe in such a relationship. I thought of writing something in addition as the answers had to be chosen from 4 options. So I wanted to clear my thoughts on why I chose those options.”

The above statement throws light on how attached and probably dependent some learners are. Though we can see the genuineness in the feelings, we can say that ‘Guru Shishya Parampara’ from our culture is comprehended or interpreted as ‘having the teacher always beside oneself’ as the respondent claims to believe in. The learner is comfortable if the teacher is always there to guide.

4.2.3 Conclusion of the Findings and analysis

The first objective of ‘investigating the JFL learners’ beliefs about and readiness for autonomous learning’ was achieved. To conclude the analysis of the findings, the data collected supports that the JFL learners today can be said to be aware of the following:

1. The teacher is not the only source of knowledge they can depend on

2. There are new resources and possibilities of learning

3. They can positively take the help of peers and

4. They should aim for self-directed learning

The learners wish to get independent as they progress in their studies, however perhaps do not know the steps necessary for self-directed learning. Secondly, they are in a very strong grip of old beliefs about teaching-learning and a teacher-centric classroom.
The findings show that though the learners avoid speaking are afraid of in front of the whole class because they are afraid of making mistakes, they are in favour of small group tasks and peer feedback. The ground for working on peer learning and Learner Autonomy is not as hostile as it was predicted before the study. *This approach was judged to be positive for modifying the learners’ role partially and was interpreted as readiness for autonomous learning. The probability of success of the peer learning activities through small groups was judged to be high.* On this basis, the two strategy training models were developed.

### 4.3 Training in Conversation and the Learning Strategies

Before designing the training course for conversation and learning strategies, the needs and beliefs survey related to speaking skills was conducted. Based on the findings, a pilot study was conducted. Further, based on the observations made during the pilot study, the final training was designed and implemented. The following sections give the findings of all the above steps undertaken for the study.

#### 4.3.1 Analysis of the Data collected before the Training

A beliefs survey regarding the language skills (particularly speaking) and grammar centric teaching was conducted. 45 respondents who were interested in conversation skills training answered in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Cannot say</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite experiencing a grammar and vocabulary based class till date, 60% of the learners do not seem to attach the highest importance to grammar. 96% of the respondents think that ‘a language class should mainly involve communication practice’ and 87% of them think that ‘Communicating correctly should be considered more important than native-like accent and intonation’. The most positive result of the survey is that 100% of the respondents thought that ‘Speaking skills can be developed through practice’, which conveyed the positive frame of mind the learners had for conversation class and practice.

The next question of the questionnaire was about the elements in Japanese which the learners find most difficult. They were asked to rank 1 for the easiest and 7 for the most difficult. a) Kanji b) Grammar c) Vocabulary d) Listening e) Conversation f) Reading g) Writing. 30 learners rated conversation as ‘Difficult’ or ‘Most difficult’. 31 learners have rated own
conversation skills as ‘poor’ and seven have rated it as ‘average’ remaining two evaluate own conversation skills as ‘above average’ or ‘good’. It confirmed the need for the training developed as a part of the study.

Some more questions on peer learning and affective factors were asked. The learners are not as apprehensive of the error correction before classmates as it was predicted before the study. As high as 82% do not find it embarrassing. However, 45% of the learners agree that they avoid speaking in front of the class because they are afraid of making mistakes. This psychological aspect was taken into consideration while designing the programme and was taken care of by focusing on small group tasks.

**Table 4.2 Responses to the questions on peer review and the related affective factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My friends are like me, so they will be able to tell me why I am making a particular mistake.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not want my friends to know about my mistakes.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is embarrassing to get corrected by the teacher in front of the whole class.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is embarrassing to get corrected within a small group in a class.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I try to avoid speaking in a class because I am afraid of making mistakes.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above figures show that the learners do not hesitate to let their friends know about their mistakes and let them correct him/her.

### 4.3.2 Findings of the Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted for the conversation training which brought about the modifications in the product to be developed. The observations by the researcher and the feedback from learners were as the following.

1. A 90 minutes session per week was insufficient for practice. The frequency or the time per session needed to be increased.

2. The existing teaching material and the newly created material was useful to give a considerable coverage of Japanese language skills and strategies. However, it required a different sequence to make learners more comfortable with the functional approach of the class.

3. Cartoons seemed to have a good retention effect, learners (L5,L7,L10) specifically stated so.

4. In the pilot study, the reviews were mainly oral and note-taking had no specific guideline. Initially students were vague in self-review, gradually they got more precise and specific. This could be assisted through guiding questions in review sheets.

5. There was a need to keep regular track of students self-review.

6. In the main study, self-review sheets should be filed and kept at an accessible place for students/ given back to them after copying the content for research purpose.
7. Because of the lack of proper record, there was no measure to prove the change caused because of self-review and peer review.

8. No language medium was forced for expression in the pilot study. Initially most of the students preferred writing in English, then gradually shifted to Japanese on their own. It can be seen as a positive trend. However it is arguable whether all can express correctly in Japanese with their current proficiency and the correct meaning is conveyed.

9. There was a need to introduce ‘recording of conversation practice and group interaction’ as a learning strategy. Students gave very positive feedback on the method of recording on mobile phones.

10. There was a need to provide some way to note down peer feedback right at the time of conversation/role-play. It needed to be checked whether writing will affect the spontaneity of oral communication.

11. There were a few students who used to learn the material well, practised it in sessions with a particular focus, though they could not recollect/apply it wholly at the end. Frequent access to written feedback and more practice could be the answer.

12. As overall feedback towards the course, the students gave very positive comments regarding the practice among themselves and other group activities such as games.

The review forms, the teaching materials, and sequencing were refined after the above observations and findings.
4.3.3 Data collected in the Pre-test

A pre-test was administered before the main study, i.e. experiment of the long-term training model of ‘Japanese Conversation and learning strategies’. Observations of the Oral pre-test performance were as follows:

The learners were generally weak in conversation as they themselves had expressed and therefore had registered for the training. The following areas were found to be commonly weak among learners:

1. **Choice of the discourse**: Learners not aware of the variety of discourse and their standard norms. In Japanese society, the discourse in fact plays a pivotal role in successfully completing a communication goal with a language function.

2. **Choice of relevant and correct expressions**: The expressions matching with the purpose of conversation were not used.

3. **Intonation**: Intonation needs to be as per the role and conversation content, which was lacking in the pre-test performance. Learners seemed not exposed to this important aspect of communication. The lack of awareness of intonation was evident also in the loud reading of conversation text.

4. **Choice of honorific language** was not suitable as per the status of the conversation partner, the formality of the situation and content. Though learners seemed to be aware of levels of politeness and the relevant honorific forms of verbs and expressions, they could not use the language.
5. **Smoothness in conversation** lacked significantly which can be the result of insufficient practice.

Based on the pretest results, a training programme of 12 sessions was designed to train the learners in conversational skills. The training programme was conducted in sessions of two clock hours once per week for 12 weeks. Therefore, the teaching materials and methods could be improvised during the course as per the need of the learners.

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected during the training programme to achieve the 3rd objective of the study namely ‘To test the effectiveness of the Programme in Japanese conversation and indirect strategies. As stated in the chapter on research methodology(3.6.3), in order to specify the term ‘effectiveness’ of the programme, two hypotheses of the experimentation were as the following:

1. There will be a sign of progress in the performance of the learners (conversation skills and strategies) and usage of strategies after the special training is imparted for a certain period.

2. Learners will be able to understand the goals, monitor and evaluate their own performance as a result of training in peer-review and self-review.

The above hypotheses were checked against the quantitative as well as qualitative data collected during the experiment.
4.3.4 Analysis of the Quantitative data: Comparison of the Pre-test and the Post-test scores

From the quantitative data of pre-test and post-test scores, it is proved that the training in direct strategies like Communication and compensation strategies as well as indirect strategies such as social and meta-cognitive strategies have resulted in significant improvement of the conversational skills of the learners. Both the tests were evaluated by a native teacher of Japanese and one Indian teacher. The conversational skills seem to be improved specially in the areas found to be weak in the pretest. The detailed account of the pre-test and post-test scores in each category of questions is given in Annexure. Below is the difference in grand total and t-test score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Pre-test score</th>
<th>Post-test score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 t-Test (Paired Two Sample for Means) for Conversation Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.769231</td>
<td>22.86923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>23.028974</td>
<td>36.83564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.9788938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>-17.3198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.7822876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.1788128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:

Hypothesized Mean difference '0' implies that there was no difference in scores due to training. Since the p-value is less than 0.05 hence the null hypothesis of zero difference can be rejected. The gap between the pre-test and post-test scores a mean difference of 8.1 points, which is considerably high. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the experimentation that “there will be a sign of progress in the performance of the learners (conversation skills and strategies) and usage of strategies after the special training is imparted for a certain period” is proved.

The comparison between the pre-test and post-test for each assessment criteria is given below.

1. The activity of Reading Aloud a piece of conversation
As seen in the graph above, there is a certain growth in the performance of the learners except for L4 and L10, where they show no change. However, no learners show any fall in the score.

2. The next section is Interview, where the learners were asked to introduce themselves, and answer related questions posed by the tester. Later, they were asked to describe and explain certain concepts or procedure to a Japanese native speaker. The learners were expected to make factual statements and also provide details of the content. They were supposed to make a point in their description that would help the Japanese person know Indian culture better. We can see from the graph below that most of the learners could do much better in their post-test than the pre-test, with the exception of L13.
3. They were asked to explain a certain issue and state their opinion. Here, it is necessary to back up their opinion with enough reasoning and at the same time, assert their opinion gently (Japanese communication style does not assert too aggressively). Only four learners have shown considerable improvement here, whereas eight learners do not show any change. This is perhaps due to the least exposure to such argumentative situations in reality as well as in the classroom settings. Secondly, while explaining an issue, the learners seemed to lack the background knowledge of the subject (e.g., social problems in India).

4. The language-related errors (grammar and vocabulary) committed during the interview in the post-test seem to have reduced compared to that of the pre-test.
5. The role-play, which is the third component of the test involved 3 points for the assessment of the correct usage of discourse namely; 1. Starting the conversation, 2. Developing the conversation and making a request, 3. Ending the conversation.

**Fig. 4.5 Errors in grammar/Vocabulary**

The 3 graphs show that there is a good improvement seen in ‘opening’ and ‘developing the conversation’, but a few learners (L2, 4, 10) still did the closing abruptly, without much thought to the formality, and hence the post-test results were same as the pre-test.

**Fig. 4.6 Role play: Beginning correctly and developing the conversation**
6. The usage of formal and polite language has improved in most of the learners.

7. The words of encouragement was a matter of great interest since it was introduced in training. The learners strongly expressed that the correct usage of あいづち (Japanese words for encouraging the counterpart in a conversation) boosted their fluency and the conversation sounded more natural. The learners’ interest is reflected even in the performance, showing better use of あいづち in post-test compared to the pre-test.
8. The intonation of the learners during the role-play which had an influence of their first language (Marathi) was improved to a great extent in 6 learners whereas, it was not improved in 7 leaners. This can be the result of:

1. The pressure felt by learners due to the Information gap created in role-plays
2. More attention given to the content of the conversation and completing the task
3. Counterpart of the conversation was the evaluator who was a senior teacher

Fig. 4.10 Role play: Correctness in Intonation
Though various criteria of the assessment of the oral proficiency show a mixed result, the overall performance of the learners can be said as improved as proved by the t-Test (Paired Two Sample for Means) shown in table 4.4 at the beginning of this section.
4.3.5 Analysis of the Findings through Qualitative Data

The focus of the study was the training of social strategies (‘group work’ and ‘peer-review’) as well as the meta-cognitive learning strategies (‘self-monitoring’ and ‘self-review’). Qualitative data was collected through the Peer review and self-review forms for this purpose.

The responses to the forms provided qualitative data for the study as well as guided for further improvisation of the course.

4.3.5.1 Grasping the Goals of the Training Session

The learners seemed unable to answer the question “What was your goal for today’s conversation (pair work/group work)? Try to be specific.” It was for the first time that the learners were made to think about the objective of the teaching content and class activities.

The responses to the questions were vague such as “to speak fluently/ group work/ pair work”.

Therefore, a new element as ‘Today’s wrappers’ (which can be any 3 ideas/ Key terms) was introduced at the end of each session, which enabled learners to have a quick review/summary of the whole session. Some learners began identifying the main expressions and language functions as wrappers.

By the end of session 4, the variety of wrappers given by learners were conversation strategies/ language functions /key expressions:

1. Request for repeating the inaudible speech, asking meaning of a word/phrase, confirming the content that was heard (L718)

2. Asking meaning, confirming the content, asking to repeat (L13)

18 L1 ~L13: Numbering given to the learners for the study of Conversation Training
3. すみませんが、〜はどんな意味ですか、もういちどお願いします、電話は少し遠いようなんですが、... (Key expressions given by L2)

This offered an insight into how the learners perceive the objective and content of the class which significantly influences the retention too.

4.5.3.2 Categories of Peer Review and Self-review

Learners’ comments from the self-review and peer-review data were compiled session wise and were analysed with qualitative analysis of coding. The categories for the Learners’ comments and the frequency measurement of the comments were as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. no.</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Group Work-pair work as a learning method</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>self-monitoring and self-review as a learning method</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vocabulary and expressions</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Formal/informal language, polite language, Taiguu hyougen</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accent and intonation, pronunciation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Positive/negative emotions (Affective factors)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Altogether new category, different from the mentioned above.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*Areas for own improvement not directly related to the conversation (e.g. Kanji)</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Practice by Reading/Revising (in next week’s plan)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Practice with friends/in a group (in next week’s plan)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.1 Content Analysis of the Peer review and Self-review sheets

The following can be said after analysing the qualitative data collected through the peer review and self-review sheets.

1. As we can see in the above table, the most frequent feedback category is ‘Vocabulary and expressions’ with 97 entries. The learners’ feedback includes comments on vocabulary and expressions consistently throughout the training programme. The focus on newly learnt vocabulary and expressions can be seen as many new expressions were introduced from the functional (pragmatic) point of view but needed no grammatical explanation. Here, a note should be taken that such feedback occurred despite the fact that the newly introduced expressions had no new grammar items.

2. The entry of ‘formal/informal language, polite language’ is second on the list that appears in peer feedback and self-review forms, with 72 entries in total. Though the learners have thoroughly gone through the table of honorific and polite forms of various verbs, it is most of the times presented as grammar explanation and hence remains at the level of ‘language information’ without rising to the level of actual ‘language use/performance’. The classes have been severely lacking the opportunities to practice ‘language use’. The entries appeared in review forms as soon as a formal conversation over the telephone was introduced in the 4th session. The polite language has maintained the significance in the learners’ reviews throughout the training programme post 4th session.

3. The comments on ‘Intonation and pronunciation’ appear in a large number i.e. 29 in a single session, when its importance was focused in the 4th session (9th May) and there are 10 in the 5th session. However, the number dwindles later, with only 6 and 4 entries in the 6th and 7th session. Furthermore, there is as less as 1 comment on this aspect. It shows
that though the comments include feedback on recently covered aspects of Japanese conversation, the learners still need to be trained to include all relevant aspects of previous sessions.

4. Grammar related comments are 16 in all, and they appear in the reviews of only 2 sessions, when the topics handled were ‘Asking once again, asking/providing the meaning/explanation, asking for rephrasing’ (9th May) and ‘Using colloquial language with friends/in an informal situation’ (26th May). In other sessions, the learners have focused more on other aspects of conversation. It shows that given the opportunity and exposure, there will be less preoccupation with grammar while communicating orally and thereby being less anxious about making errors in one’s conversation.

5. Students are still to come in terms with ‘group study/practice’ as a learning strategy outside the classroom because of the heavy influence of individualistic and competitive environment experienced so far. As against only 25 entries mentioning ‘practice with friends’ as a plan, almost double entries, i.e. 48 entries have ‘read/ revise the materials given during sessions at home’ which can be seen as a solitary effort.

6. Only a couple of initial forms asked a question about whether the learners enjoyed the conversation with friends. However, even in later sessions, the comments in review forms reflected related to learners’ affective factors such as confidence, enjoying the conversation or feeling less anxious about Japanese conversation seem to appear spontaneously, as there was no such guideline given in the questions of the review forms. Such comments have particularly appeared in self-review forms, which can be seen as an affective strategy (a type of indirect strategy) namely ‘Taking emotional temperature’ by ‘discussing your feelings with someone’.
7. There are as many as 29 comments about ‘Fluency in conversation’, and there seems to be deep concern about this aspect. Some comments express a sense of achievement such as ‘Flow of the sentences, conversation speed was good’ or ‘My fluency in speaking was good’. There are also entries seeing fluency as an area of improvement ‘I will improve myself in the proper flow of the conversation’. This category too, like the one mentioned in the 6th point above, was not touched upon in guidelines of the review forms.

8. Here, a special note should be taken that, the comments on positive emotions and fluency have started appearing from 6th session onward.

4.3.1.2 Analysis of the Free Writing in Self-review Form

The second last session (11th session) had no guidelines or questions in review forms to check the variety in categories of the self-review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments on Japanese communication style</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying hurdles in conversation/ learning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting on own previous performance and finding drawbacks in the light</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of recent practice/newly learnt material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation/ self-review of performance (how good/effective it was)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affective aspect/ strategy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering a new way of learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive comment on Peer learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewing learning content/ new input/ practice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning future action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the comments reflected the learners’ response for a change in affective aspect, counting up to 10. They include comments such as:

- “My confidence level has raised. Now I can speak in Japanese though not so fluently, certainly more fluently than before.” (L3 session 8)

- “Today's session was very interesting. The flow that was missing from the conversation, was present today as we could fill up the gaps in-between the conversation using Aizuchi. There was much more participation from my side.” (L8 session 8)

Second in the list are comments on the ‘Japanese communication style’, which can be seen as progress towards feedback on content and socio-linguistic aspect of conversation (here, role-plays) from the earlier focus on mere form or presentation.

It should be noted that when there was no guideline in the form of questions, in all of the 44 comments, there was no mention of a specific grammar and only 2 comments with a mention of newly learnt vocabulary. The focus seems to be more on observations about Japanese language, its usage and one’s own learning and learning methods. Seven comments that reflect on the comparison with one’s previous and latest performance. Here, when asked to think and reflect freely, the learners on their own have observed the change and tried to measure their improvement. This also can be called as a natural but unprompted result of all the sessions till that point of time. It can be seen as a partial achievement of the training.
4.3.1.3 Analysis of Peer Learning Evident in the Qualitative Data

The regular activity of peer review ensured confirmed feedback to all the performances of learners within the group. The interdependence resulted into more constructive feedback given to each other. As a response to whether the activity of self-review and peer-review within groups was helpful, there was an average evaluation of 4.5 marks on a 5 point scale of Usefulness.

The results of peer learning are evident in the whole qualitative data, which is put forth below.

A. New learning of Content and Strategies from Peers

There was a change in the variety of categories of peer-feedback and also an improvement in terms of precision of the comments. By the 10th session, learners began to come up spontaneously with comments not only on newly learnt expressions, but other aspects like intonation, Aizuchi, Flow of conversation (discourse) and most interestingly, body language or content of the conversation such as “convincing reason should be given for declining an invitation”, which was not touched upon in the training course.

As a response to what they learnt that day from peers, the responses had a variety.

1. New vocabulary/expressions learnt: L9 reported of learning “Phrases like いろいろことがあって…”(session 5)

2. Way of effective communication: L4 reported of learning “How not to (sound) rude while conversing with others” or L1 reported that she learnt about “Adding interesting points to
grab the counterpart’s attention” reported by L1. Whereas “Using different preface (前置き) before making a request” was reported by L10.

3. It seems that inputs on communication strategies are common. “How to refuse or delay responding to the request.” Was reported by L4 as a learning from a peer in session 7.

4. There were inputs on background knowledge, particularly on socio-cultural aspects. L8 reports that she got “information about Japan which L7 had experienced during her stay in Japan” (session 7).

B. Learners identified some new ways of learning

There are instances where even comparatively proficient learners report of being introduced to a new way of learning by peers in the group. One good example is of L6, who is in fact a proficient learner reports that he learnt about ‘Imagination of new situations (similar to the practice in class and trying to use learnt discourse and expressions)’ as a learning strategy because it was introduced by a peer (session 9).

C. Sharing experiences and making observations together

Learners positively explored peer-review, which is evident in comments as further. “Our lecture (session) was interesting in (because of) group (activities). We discussed our experience and we learnt new words from each other.” (L13) Or “During our conversation, as we used to speak continuously and didn’t take any pause, the opposite person didn’t get a chance to use Aizuchi. We also noticed that we use very less Aizuchi expressions as compared to Japanese people” (L6).
D. Motivation and interest retained through peer learning

Apart from the above comments reported in section C above, learners have particularly reported positive approach towards group activities.

1. L4: loved answering in a group, it helped a lot to find mistakes
2. L11: It is always better to do it in a group as it reduces the hesitation in you.
3. L12: Working in group is certainly better for improving conversation skills. It also helps to come up with new ideas.

4.3.1.4 Specific Trends in Self-review Forms

A. Identifying and Evaluating a New Learning Strategy

After a new Learning strategy for reviewing own performance was introduced in session 8, there was a special mention of it in the self-review sheets though not guided by any question.

1. L11: “Recording our own conversation is a very good idea for practice. This will surely help to improve”.
2. L13: “It was really great to record the conversation and realise mistakes on our own, recording again for improvement and doing afresh”.
3. L7: “While listening to our recorded conversation, we realised that we don’t give (take) a pause while speaking, and the person in front doesn't get a chance to insert Aizuchi (and to respond in the Japanese way). Recording is a good way to improve our conversation.”
B. Learners shifted from generalized comments to more specific feedback to oneself and peers

Initially learners usually commented in a generalized statement. E.g. L3 said “I need much more practice” (session 1) or L1 saying “Conversation is a must, I want to improve”, or “our conversation was good” or “I enjoyed the talk” (around session 2). However, the comments gradually were more focused which is evident in comments such as “I need to improve the usage of polite language” or by session 5: “I need to put in a lot of effort to improve my intonation.” “Giving short responses every now and then in a conversation was very new to me. I have never been doing this while speaking in other languages.”(L 6, after session 8 which dealt with Aizuchi).

On the other hand, a learner like L4 was very much aware of her own performance level since the beginning. She commented after pre-test, “I was unable to recollect the correct words, verbs, and connectivities (L4 meant conjunctions giving an impression of a smooth flow). Even though I knew all these very well at the time of writing”.

C. Comments shifted gradually from first language / English to Japanese as a medium of expression

A few learners after gaining confidence, gradually switched over to Japanese for comments and opinions, though they were not instructed to do so. It can be taken as a positive sign. Although there is a debate over whether the writing in the target language can be a reliable data because it may not allow full expression of oneself, and there are bound to be some flaws in grammar and vocabulary, we cannot deny that the expression is genuine as learners have given feedback to their peers and to their own self with lot of consistency and honesty.
1. Self-review: 会話を自然に続く(続ける)のはためしました。(L9 who is a proficient learner, Session 5)

2. Interestingly, a few weaker learners also resorted to the Japanese language for expressing themselves.

3. L11: My role for today’s conversation: 私は日本語の学生ですが、日本人はたずねてレシピを教えています(I was a Japanese language student, and the Japanese visitor was teaching a recipe to me) (a weak student comments though she has missed to mention that she had to request the Japanese visitor to teach her the recipe). Same learner in the same, 10th session commented on what was difficult for her: 場面によって反応をするのは難しいいでした. (It was quite difficult to respond as per the situation. Although her response has a grammar error, she has attempted to express in Japanese).

4. L2, an average learner commented on what was difficult (session 10): 適当な言葉を覚えるのと場面によって返事すること (Responding with appropriate expressions suitable for the situation)

D. Deeper thought given to “What went wrong?”

It was observed that the learners on their own started thinking deeper on reasons for poor performance. It can be seen as the first step toward problem solving and self-improvisation. L9, a proficient learner, comments on session 5 saying “Had not practiced well so, it was a bit difficult to continue the conversation.” L4 comments on the same session saying “In
above-said points, there were a few points I could not express properly. Perhaps because of vocabulary”. L11, a weak learner says “I can't remember quickly while talking”, while L3 gives an affective aspect as a reason by saying “I found it a bit difficult to refuse a request”.

E. Observations on conversation style and smoothness

L8 observes, “Today's session was an interesting one. The flow that was missing from the conversation, was present today as we could fill up the gaps in-between the conversation using Aizuchi.”

Very frank and clear in her opinion, L11 is in fact weak in Japanese but still is capable of observing Japanese communication, which was an unpredicted outcome. “Learnt some new words for Aizuchi. I am of a clear opinion that Aizuchi was very interesting but it interrupted the flow of conversation.” (Session 8). It shows the growth in a weak learner who is now not preoccupied with her errors in vocabulary /grammar, but observes a difference between the communication styles of her culture and another culture from an independent perspective and evaluates it.

F. Learners tried to apply the content of the past sessions

The categories in comments appearing in the review forms increase in every session and at the same time retain the earlier categories. L5 says “it was difficult to remember appropriate expressions at the right time. I forgot aizuchi” (taught 3 weeks before).
G. Affective factors

Confidence level was reported to be considerably high. Each learner has reported a boost in self-confidence. L13, with a poor pre-test score, says “I used good language and I could speak very well than all previous lectures” (Session 6). L2 reports by the end of session 8, “My confidence level has raised. Now, I can speak in Japanese though not so fluently, definitely more fluently than before.”

H. Planning for further learning became more concrete in nature:

When asked for the plan for the next week, till the next session, most of the learners planned to “Practice what is taught” or “Revise the class work”. However, gradually, the plan became more concrete evident in comments such as “Will practice with my friends”, or L18, who was evaluated by the evaluators as very low in speaking skills, and had a poor score, said that she (needed to) correct and study informal and polite language more.

By the end of the last session, the learners were asked what they had thought about their conversation practice thereafter. They were asked whether they had any particular points and specific action items for own improvement. The responses were positive and the examples are given below:

“I will improve my conversation with a proper flow … and improve my grammar, vocabulary, and intonation. I am currently trying hard for that.” L11.

“Using the content taught in this course in daily conversation will help a lot as I can feel my confidence building up while speaking Japanese with friends and colleagues.” L8, a working person.
4.3.1.5 Transition in Ratings Given to Oneself

The self-assessment can be seen as a manifestation of self-evaluation in quantitative measures. The learners were given the evaluation criteria in self-review forms. However they were not trained in assessment, that is to say the marking standards. Therefore the marking does not match with the one done by the actual evaluators. The marks in the self-assessment section is completely a learner’s perception of his/her own performance. There are certain patterns seen in the self-assessment of learners.

A. Pattern 1: Low – High –Low (higher compared to pre-test)

Some proficient learners rated themselves low in the pre-session conversation (the pre-test). As the sessions progressed, the rating slowly seems to trend upwards, but again travels downwards to stop higher compared to the beginning.

The case of L5: L5 is a senior professional and likes to revise his Japanese skills every time he gets a chance. L5 gave himself 56% in the pre-session conversation, which raised up to 65% in the middle and towards the end it settled at 60%.

L7 is very proficient in the Japanese language getting highest marks from the evaluator. She has rated herself 67% in the beginning, then gives herself 65% around the middle of the training programme and again comes up to 70%. This learner seems to have a fairly good idea of her own flaws and is very critical towards herself. She is able to find specific areas to improve which is evident even in the comments in the initial sessions e.g. “I need to improve on intonation”
B. Pattern 2: High – Very low- High (lower than pre-test)

In some cases, comparatively less proficient learners, the rating is high in the beginning, low around the middle of the total period of 12 sessions. By the end of the sessions the self-rating trend seems to go slightly up.

Case of L2: 80% in the pre-session conversation, 66% around middle and towards the end, has settled at 68% by the end of the sessions. The comments may help to understand the reason.

Various reasons can be thought of for these trends among learners. In earlier 2 patterns, L5 is very critical to himself though he is approximately at the same level compared to L2 if we refer to the evaluation by the evaluator (native speaker). L2 has overestimated her performance in the beginning, then she shows some objectivity and strictness in the self-evaluation. Therefore, their self-rating shows the vast difference of approximately 20% and it comes down to 8% in the self-evaluation at end of the sessions.

C. Pattern 3: High- Higher- Low (lower than pre-test) rating

The case of Learner L1: Sum of marks brings 66 % in the pre-session conversation whereas it raises to 74% in the middle of the sessions and settles at 51% by the end of the sessions. In post-test she has given 60% to herself. L1 is had hardly spoken in Japanese before the training. However, given the opportunity, she has participated very positively. During the middle phase of the course this learner says she “I read the material carefully (given in earlier sessions)”. She thoroughly prepares herself and makes it a point to execute the plan she has for the week. She remarks, “My confidence level has gone up.” However, towards
the end of the 13 sessions, she is very critical and gives herself lesser marks, as less as 60% which are lesser than those in the beginning. She comments, “Practice for improving speaking skills is required. I will revise the syllabus and will speak with friends”. She has set a specific goal for herself.

This shows that as per the maturity or development of a learner on the meta-cognitive level, learners differ in self-assessment. We cannot observe a common tendency or make any generalised statement on the trend. It is very learner specific. However, we can say that the learners can be guided and self-evaluation technique can be taught in a classroom which can be developed to a certain level.

4.3.6 Characteristics of Indian JFL Learners in Comparison with the Studies Reported in Earlier Literature

The studies reported in the earlier literature show that the learners are more motivated due to peer-learning, and felt less anxious and got a different perspective because of peer-feedback. Indian learners have shown similar trend during the present study. They did not report or show any hesitation or resistance for peer feedback and could attempt more without feeling anxious. Moreover, they have shown keen interest in correcting their peers in a variety of categories, many times going beyond the areas suggested by the review form. Secondly, some earlier studies had reported that learners respect and respond to a teacher’s feedback more than a peer’s feedback and hence very few percentage of peer feedback influenced their writing. On the contrary, the Indian JFL learners in this study seem to incorporate peer feedback more positively in their next performance.
All the above analysis of qualitative data, we can infer that if trained, learners are able to:

- Understand the learning goals
- Monitor their own performance
- Give effective feedback to peers for improvement
- Evaluate their own and their peers’ performance qualitatively

Therefore, the second hypothesis namely ‘Learners will be able to understand the goals, monitor and evaluate their own performance as a result of training in peer-review and ‘self-review’ is proved.

4.3.7 Conclusion of the Findings and Analysis

A training programme in Japanese conversation was developed as per the Learners’ needs and its effectiveness was proven through the quantitative and qualitative data. The learners positively participated in the small group tasks. When trained, they showed comprehensiveness and depth in peer-feedback as well as self-evaluation. In this way, the second and the third objective, i.e. ‘To develop a programme for training in ‘Japanese Conversation and the Learning Strategies’ and ‘To test the effectiveness of the programme in ‘Japanese Conversation and the Learning Strategies’ were achieved successfully. Moreover, the attempt to implement the principles of Autonomy through the use of direct, social and meta-cognitive strategies were proved to be successful on the basis of the qualitative data.

4.4 Training in Reading and the Learning Strategies

The ‘Training in Reading and the Learning Strategies’ was an intensive training as against the Training in ‘Conversation and Learning Strategies’ reported earlier. However, the same
scientific method for product development was followed. Before designing the training course, the needs and beliefs survey related to reading skills was conducted. Based on the findings of the survey and observations made during the pilot study, the final training was designed and implemented. The following sections give the findings of all the above steps undertaken for the study.

4.4.1 Findings and Discussion on the Questionnaire Survey on Reading

There were 163 valid responses from major cities across the country to the survey on reading needs and current status of reading activities, skills and strategies. The distribution of the first language of the respondents is as the following.

![First Language of Respondents](image)

**Fig. 4.11 First Language of Respondents**

When asked about the ‘difficulty in reading’ in First language, English and Japanese, the following responses were collected.
Specific to Reading Japanese, it appears that more than 48% of learners have expressed that they find reading “Difficult”, 47% find it average and 2% “Very Difficult”. It shows that the learners are not much comfortable with reading texts in Japanese. Whereas the learners finding English average and difficult are approximately 55% and 6% respectively. It should be noted that, learners who are not so comfortable with reading in their first language (average, difficult and very difficult) are as many as 28%.

The most common objective behind learning Japanese is to ‘use Japanese in future for a career’ (80%). In line with the above response, the type of text the learners want to be able to read the most is Business communication with 41%. However, 23% want to be able to read Novels and 19% want to read a newspaper. Technical literature comes later with only 8%. 

Fig. 4.12 Difficulty in Reading (across languages)
When asked about the general purpose for reading Japanese text, 125 learners read in order to improve vocabulary, 98 read to enjoy the language while others aim JLPT preparation or preparation for a higher level. 42 read mainly “to be able to answer the questions”.

However, as shown in the graph below, the actual text types read by learners are limited.
It is evident that most frequently (every day/alternate days) read text type (in classroom or as homework) is textbook (85 learners) and JLPT related reading comprehension (62 learners). The percentage of learners reading applied Japanese in real life, i.e. novels, newspapers magazines is negligible. Comparatively, number of learners reading social media and internet sites is more significant.

It is not certain as to what kind of activity is involved when learners say that they read Japanese on websites. However, when investigated further on ‘Do you use a smartphone while reading’, and for what purpose, as many as 82% read no other material but only online dictionaries.

**Fig. 4.15 The current reading variety pattern**

It is evident that most frequently (every day/alternate days) read text type (in classroom or as homework) is textbook (85 learners) and JLPT related reading comprehension (62 learners). The percentage of learners reading applied Japanese in real life, i.e. novels, newspapers magazines is negligible. Comparatively, number of learners reading social media and internet sites is more significant.

It is not certain as to what kind of activity is involved when learners say that they read Japanese on websites. However, when investigated further on ‘Do you use a smartphone while reading’, and for what purpose, as many as 82% read no other material but only online dictionaries.
Fig. 4.16 Response on the type of reading on Smartphone

The above finding shows that though there are ample of newly available resources, the learners are not utilising them.

Further, questions on certain factors were put forth that may be proposed as ‘Reasons for difficulty in reading’. The responses to the 13 such factors are as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed reasons for difficulty</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unknown Kanji</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unknown Vocabulary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unknown Grammar Pattern</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grasping long sentences with clauses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grasping word boundaries and meaningful chunks of words/phrases</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Grasping scope of referents like 「これ」, 「それ」 and 「あれ」</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Length of the reading passage</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Difficulty to differentiate between quotations and the author’s opinion</em></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Structure of the passage</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Determining the writer’s perspective</em></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Not having the background knowledge of the topic</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Less interest in the content</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Not able to find the out central idea of the Text</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the data, a general trend is seen that the learners are mainly concerned with the micro level understanding of the text. Micro-level understanding deals with the comprehension of vocabulary, Kanji characters and grammar patterns. Among these 3, highest score as a factor making a text difficult is given to ‘Unknown Kanji’ as it is ‘Strongly agreed’ by approximately 80 learners and ‘agreed’ by 78 learners. ‘Unknown vocabulary’ and ‘unknown grammar pattern’ are on 2nd and 3rd position as each of them is of concern for 71% and 68% of learners respectively.
Fig. 4.17 Graphical representation of learners’ opinion on reasons for difficulty

The reasons proposed further rise to the level of sentences and connections between sentences as well paragraphs and the flow of the text as a whole.

1. ‘Grasping word boundaries and meaningful chunks of words/phrases\(^\text{19}\)’ is seen as a challenge by more than 100 learners (68%).

2. ‘Grasping scope of referents like 「これ」, 「それ」 which is necessary to grasp the connection between sentences is seen as the reason for difficulty only by 28%.

3. ‘Structure of the passage’ is felt as one reason for difficulty only by 48%. Whereas,

\(^{19}\) Japanese sentences are said to have a tendency of being very long with many interwoven clauses. Additionally, the text runs continuously without any space between words.
4. ‘Difficulty to differentiate between quotations and the author’s opinion’ is seen as a reason by as many as 78% and a closely related ‘Determining the writer’s perspective’ (in an argumentative text) is found difficult by as many as 62%.

5. ‘Inability to grasp the central idea of the text’ which is said to be the essential factor for reading comprehension, is thought as the reason for difficulty by as less as 9%.

6. ‘Not having background knowledge of the topic’ looks as a reason to as many as 56% and ‘Less interest in content’ makes the text difficult for 50% of the learners.

All the above responses can be directly related to the responses to the next question. In the light of the difficulty faced while reading, the learners were asked about the class activities related to reading. The difficulty in reading can be a result of the nature of class activities conducted in classrooms.

![Reading Activities in a Classroom](image)

**Fig. 4.18 The current Reading Activities in a Classroom**
The responses essentially show the ‘grammar and Kanji-vocabulary oriented’ nature of training conducted in a regular Indian classroom.

1. ‘Read passage silently and solve the questions individually’ is the most frequent activity with 55% of learners participating ‘Often’ and 29% participating ‘sometimes’. This fact entails that there is no collaborative activity or give and take among the learners. The teacher may be checking the answers after all the learners solve it individually and explain whenever such a need is felt by the teacher or raised by a learner. The activity of silently reading the text and answering the questions while checking does not give any opportunity to have various views on the passage regarding the content, the answers or sharing the background knowledge.

2. ‘Read passage or new words as homework’ is on 2nd rank with 48% involved in such activity ‘Often’ and 42% doing so ‘Sometimes’. It implies that the learners are never given a chance to guess and predict the meaning from the context which is required in case of unseen passage of reading or reading in real life.

3. ‘Reading the passage and solving True/False (O and X in Japanese) questions’ is on 3rd rank with 47% doing ‘Often’ and 36% doing it ‘Sometimes’. Unless there is a discussion on why the statement is True/False, there is a possibility of correctness by chance.

4. ‘Writing summary of the passage is ‘Not much’ or ‘Never’ done by 75%. ‘Discussing various ways of reading like rapid reading/ scanning a specific detail’ is done ‘Often’ by only 17% and ‘Sometimes’ by 36%. This has direct relation with the inability to identify the central idea of the text. The activity of writing summary captures the essence of each paragraph and the whole text and confirms the understanding of key points.
5. ‘Reading the passage and answering the subjective /descriptive questions’ is ‘Never’ or ‘Not much’ done by 80% of the learners. ‘Formulation of subjective answers in exact words’ ensures correct expression and use of the language. Both these activities need to be given more time.

6. Discussion on the topic of the text is mostly conducted after reading and solving questions, which can be briefly taken in the beginning as a pre-task and facilitate a better understanding for the learners without the prior knowledge of the topic.

The learners were also asked about their reading behaviours in general which involve a few reading strategies.

![Fig. 4.19 Response on Predicting content while reading](chart)

When asked about their usual habit while reading, whether they predict content while reading, approximately 72% responded positively (36% predict frequently and 36% predict sometimes) whereas 28% respond negatively. However, the response goes against the finding of the next question.
When asked about what they do when they ‘come across an unknown word’, 66% of learners say that they stop and look up in a dictionary. 31% would guess meaning from the context. Keeping in view the future application of reading skills in various professions, where learners may not be preferred to or have time to refer to any dictionary, such a training of prediction and inference needs to be incorporated in the classrooms if it is not spontaneously done so by learners.

36% ‘Always’ and 36% ‘Frequently’ guess the content while reading. However, the learners may be guessing the content up to certain extent only through the Kanji and vocabulary. It is also evident from the response to the next question.
Against the question ‘Do you pay attention to any particular types of words to guess the structure/flow of the content written ahead?’ 48% have not responded at all and only 30% responded positively, whereas 22% have said they do not pay attention to any particular word.

Further, in the positive responses, the variety of the linguistic clues used by the learners are minimal. Out of 163 respondents, only 27 could name 1 or 2 such clues, which perhaps they have heard about or discovered on their own. The following are some examples.

- ‘If the same word is used many times, then it gives me a hint... but for N2 above reading passages it’s difficult’ (finding a keyword)
- ‘Yes, while reading I pay close attention to the starting word of paragraph. And also kore, sore ,are, shikashi etc.’ (Conjunctions ; demonstrative used as referent)
- Yes, for e.g., expressions like 要するには、付きましては、etc. are used by the author to attract attention of the reader to the crux of the passage (Finding central idea of the text)
- でも that means something contradictory is coming ahead. (Conjunction used as a hint)
- To the tense of the verb (To guess the chronological order within the sentences of a story/passage)
- Other responses predominantly cover ‘Kanji’ as a clue to support some guess regarding content and a few ‘grammar patterns’ for guessing the content that follows.
4.4.2 Cross-checking Survey Findings with the Findings of the Diagnostic Test

It was found necessary to check the actual performance of the learners against the beliefs seen in the survey. A reading test for approximately 40 learners was conducted. The comparison between the learners’ perception of difficulty in reading and the actual reading test performance is carried out. The learners were used to solving and scored better in:

1. Understanding the connections between sentences through referents
2. Sentences with complex grammar forms of passive and causative

On the other hand, the learners were found weaker in certain areas which were perceived by them as the reasons for difficulty in reading:

1. Differentiate between the writer’s perspective, someone else’s opinion and statements of facts.
2. Understand the main structure of the sentence when it has long clauses (modifying nouns of the sentence)

However, the learners did not perceive the following factors as reasons for difficulty but have scored less in questions dealing with them.

1. Prediction of content based on conjunctions
2. Getting the central idea of the text (Precision in noting the topic and purpose of a formal mail)

The survey conducted before the test showed that the learners are preoccupied with bottom-up style of reading and want to able to decode every Kanji and grammar pattern. While they
were aware of their inability in some areas, the test results show factors which they have not been identified as weak areas and are in fact necessary for understanding of the text as a whole.

### 4.4.3 Findings of the Pilot Study

The study of the Training in Reading and Learning Strategies was conducted based on the following observations in the pilot study:

1. Amongst the identified strategies, the learners seemed to be weaker in certain referents, conjunctions, getting the central idea of the text and differentiating between the author’s opinion and someone else’s opinion/facts.

2. There was very less exposure to skills training such as scanning and skimming, inference and predicting the content based on linguistic clues.

3. Grammatical understanding was decent, though not sufficient as far as complex noun clauses and causative and passive sentences are concerned.

4. The materials needed to be supplemented with customized/newly created materials particularly briefing on classification of conjunctions and sentence endings.

### 4.4.4 Quantitative Data collected during the Training in Reading

Quantitative and qualitative data was collected during the training programme to achieve the 5th objective of the study namely ‘To test the effectiveness of the Programme in Japanese reading strategies’. As stated in the chapter on research methodology (3.6.3), in order to specify the term ‘effectiveness’ of the programme, 2 hypotheses were the experimentation as the following:
1. There will be a progress in performance of the learners (reading strategies and skills) after the special training in reading strategies is imparted for a certain period.

2. Learners will be able to ‘center’ their learning, ‘arrange and plan’ their own reading task and learning.

To test the above hypotheses, the quantitative data were collected. The time taken by the participants to solve the paper was measured. The pre-test and post-test were similar in types of questions and the amount of writing. The pre-test was completed in 35 minutes on an average whereas the post-test was completed in 30 minutes.

The pre-test and post-test scores of the reading strategies training are given in detail in annexure. The pre-test and post-test scores are compared per question and are represented in graphs below.

![Graph Q1](image)

**Fig. 4.22 Q1. Understanding of causative and passive forms**
The first question checks understanding of causative and passive forms, where the meaning of the sentence largely differs if the subject and (indirect) object of the verb are not understood correctly. We can see that there is no specific trend in the scores. This particular aspect of reading, i.e. understanding of previously known grammar was not focused on in
the present training because it contributes to the bottom-up strategies which are already prevalent. Therefore, some have shown progress or no change, whereas a few have shown decline in score.

Fig. 4.23 Q2. Understanding the structure of the sentence with long modifying clauses
The learners were asked to pinpoint the scope of the modifying clauses, and identify the subject. 7 Participants show clear progress, 3 have maintained their good performance. However, L6,9,16 and 18 do not show any progress. Particularly participants 6 and 16 have been studying Japanese for longer years and hence it is a matter of more concern that they were not able to implement the strategies taught during the session.

Fig. 4.24 Q3. Identification of the subject, predicate from the complex structure and Understanding the sentence as a whole
The answer to the third question needed understanding of the complex structure of the sentence by decoding the noun clause. The learners are not accustomed to this type of question that ask to identify the basic structure of that Japanese sentence. After the intensive training programme, 5 learners have shown clear progress in the performance, whereas there is no change for 5 and a decline in remaining 8 learners. When probed further through interaction with learners after the session, it was found that “though sometimes learners could decode the sentence, the options given as answers to mark correct or wrong were still difficult to decode or were confusing”. This phenomenon highlights the need to focus on more practice of decoding and rephrasing the same content. More importantly, it also signifies that though most of the classes have been grammar and Kanji-vocabulary oriented classes, the basic few structures are not identified by the learners as they focus on various ‘sentence patterns’, which are necessary for JLPT preparation. Hence while facing new text, they are distracted by extra information given in complex sentences which is a characteristic of a Japanese text.

**Fig. 4.25** Q4. Understanding the connections between sentences through referents
The referents/ demonstrative pronouns in Japanese like これ、それ、あれ many times appear within/ before and sometimes even after the sentence containing the referred content.
Correct understanding of these connections are important in inter-sentence relation. 8 learners seem not to perform better in post-test than the pre-test, and signifies the need of such practice as one time inputs will not bring much improvement. 7 learners have shown clear progress, however, there is no change for almost 5 learners and 6 learners show decline in performance. It is very important to know that in this case too, the type of exercise is not new to the learners, as it is frequently asked question in JLPT which most of the learners appear for.

![Figure 4.25 Q5: Identifying the difference between the fact and the writer's opinion](image)

**Fig. 4.25 Q5. Identifying the difference between the fact and the writer's opinion**

The learners were trained to take linguistic clues like the sentence endings and differentiate between facts and the writer's opinion as well as someone else’s opinion. The performance in this area is highly satisfactory as many learners show a definite progress. 4 have scored full marks in pre-test as well as post-test, so there is no scope of growth in marks. Only 1 learner shows stagnation at the same level.

This shows that the inputs particularly on this reading strategy are enough to change the performance and may not need long-term practice.
Fig. 4.26 Q6. Predicting latter half of the sentence with the help of Conjunctions
Correct understanding of these connections through conjugations are important in knowing the contrasts, changes in meaning, flow and structure of the passage. Although such an exercise was not familiar to learners, they responded with a very positive approach. However, 4 learners seem unable to recollect the conjunctions and their respective functions and as a result, unable to use the strategy. The conjunctions are usually taught in a JFL classroom as and when they appear in a text. Though the learners know the meaning, they are not trained to classify and organise the available conjugations as per their function (from a pragmatic viewpoint).

Fig. 4.27 Q7. Identifying the central idea of each paragraph and flow of the text
The focus of the present study lied on training in global strategies, of which question 7 can be called the essence. The question dealt with “Checking the understanding at MACRO level.
Identifying the central idea of each paragraph and flow of the text”. The learners showed a keen interest in the above part of training and have performed beyond the expected outcome. It shows that they are receptive to the techniques and global strategies which help them to comprehend the text as a whole.

The overall growth in reading skill could be measured and can be verified by the following statistical data and graph.

**Fig. 4.28 Overall Change in the score: Pre-test vs. Post test**

Although the strategy training in reading was a very short-term intensive training in 2 days, in most of the learners, the average post-test scores are higher compared to the average pre-test scores (exception of L11 and 15).

**Table 4.8 Overall Performance t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means</th>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.530820106</td>
<td>0.717725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.04563857</td>
<td>0.022889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.435332908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesized Mean Difference</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Df</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t Stat</strong></td>
<td>-3.94580742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</strong></td>
<td>0.000521387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t Critical one-tail</strong></td>
<td>1.739606726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</strong></td>
<td>0.001042773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t Critical two-tail</strong></td>
<td>2.109815578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesized Mean difference '0' implies that there is no difference in scores due to training. The p-value is less than 0.05 hence the null hypothesis of zero difference can be rejected. The post-test scores are considerably better than pre-test scores.

Based on the above statistical analysis, the hypothesis of the experiment can be said to be proved. It can be said from the improved performance of the learners that the training was a successful effort to train learners in local and global reading strategies.

**Observations made during the training:**

After conducting the intensive training with a pretest-training-posttest model, it was concluded that the learners:

1. Showed progress in identifying the scope of referents.

2. Showed considerable progress in grasping the conjunctions and using them as hints to predict the contents in the following text.
3. Performed better in recognizing the structure and flow of the text units.

4. Showed considerable progress in identifying the difference in the author’s opinion and facts with the help of expressions at the end of the sentences.

**However, the learners**

1. Had a problem in understanding when the basic sentence structure was intertwined with long noun clauses (which is peculiar to Japanese)

2. Were not aware of and hence need more practice in “Top-down” model of reading

3. Were not still able to state the gist/summary of the text

4. Had a problem to some degree in determine the writer’s perspective, particularly in an argumentative text

**4.4.5 Qualitative Data Collected after the training**

The intensive training programme focused on the following learning strategies related with Reading:

1. Training in reading skills and strategies (Direct strategies)

2. prediction and inference (compensation strategies)

3. planning and centering one’s reading(meta-cognitive)

4. pair/group work (Social strategy): think, pair and share while solving the questions on reading comprehension
To orient the learners for review of the sessions, they were asked to reflect upon what they learned new and whether it was useful. Qualitative data was collected through interactions with the learners. The responses received from learners can be seen as a reflection of how they have perceived the training and what they have retained as significant inputs.

The responses relevant for the evaluation of the training in targeted strategies are as the following.

Reflections of L13:

- “I learnt about the points to concentrate on in a dokkai; depending on type of a dokkai. i.e. if it's a news or any analysis etc.” (meta-cognitive: planning and centering)
- I am comfortable while doing dokkais is Answering small (about details) questions. (meta-cognitive: evaluation of oneself being used to bottom-up model of reading)
- I find the following tasks difficult (meta-cognitive: evaluation of one's weak areas):
  1. Selecting one appropriate answer when there are 2 confusing options.
  2. Understanding meaning of a sentence/s in a dokkai (or in options) sometimes when there are contradictory statements or confusing sentence pattern.
  3. Getting meaning of a sentence where one or more Kanjis are not known (evaluating oneself as weak in the newly introduced strategy of inference).
  4. Speedy reading

Reflections L11:
• The most difficult part was to locate the key sentence and including only the required information in the summary. (meta-cognitive: evaluating oneself as weak in the newly introduced strategy of inference)

• I had forgotten to read the title at first which caused some difficulties to me while reading. But then when I read the same passage after reading title and vocabulary first, it was comparatively easier to mark maru and batsu (correct and wrong) in the questions. (retaining the inputs of top-down strategy)

Reflections L4:

• I have learned following important points for understanding the texts and I try to focus on them. (meta-cognitive: planning and centering, retention of inputs)

1. Read heading and try to understand it. (top-down model of reading)

2. Read new words (glossary) (top-down model of reading)

3. Try to understand the structure of paragraph. (top-down model of reading)

4. Find out the key sentence and concept of the paragraph. (skimming)

5. Finding answers of 'WH' questions is important. (skimming)

6. I need to work more on summary writing esp. on finding keywords. (meta-cognitive: evaluating, planning and centring)

Reflections L6:

• Reading strategy is an unconventional theme and your explanation and carefully selected material definitely gave us a better insight into 'dealing' with Dokkai. (direct strategies, meta-cognitive: planning the strategy to ‘deal with’ a passage)
• Thank you for the interesting session. Looking forward to more sessions with you and this group. (**social strategy:** peer learning)

Reflections of L10:

• Your dokkai session was very helpful. In fact, it acted as a trigger for my N2 dokkai study. I am planning to use these strategies in further studies. (**direct strategies, meta-cognitive:** evaluating, planning and centering)

• Me and … san (L11) attended your session and started studying dokkai together the day your session got over!! (**social strategy:** peer learning)

• Would be interested in attending such a session.

Reflections of L16:

• Please take such session at regular intervals. They are really helpful.

Reflections of L17:

• This training helped a lot in solving dokkai in JLPT exam and I cleared N2. Thank you so much for that training. I would like to attend the next one as well. (**direct strategies, meta-cognitive:** evaluating, planning and centering)

• Though I have not appeared for JLPT this time, I am finding these strategies useful while reading and teaching in class too. (**direct strategies, meta-cognitive:** evaluating, planning and centering)
4.4.6 Feedback on the Training Programme

Apart from this, a feedback form was filled up by the learners. The response to the question ‘1 - How do you rate the 2-day session in meeting objective from 0 to 5 with 5 being the highest’ was as the following:

Table 4.9 Overall learners feedback on training programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Feedback Score</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Feedback Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L-11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L-17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating of the training: 4.7

There were various answers to the question ‘what part of session you find most useful’, as the following:

Table 4.10 Feedback on ‘the part of the session that was useful’

2-what part of session do you find most useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-1</td>
<td>The hints of passage structure(types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>Knowing 20 reading strategies and learning selected ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-3</td>
<td>All the parts very interesting and beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-4</td>
<td>Emphasis on what the author is trying to convey. By breaking the Java/story in Bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>Got to know 20 reading strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All sessions were quite effective and useful. Scanning of paragraph division of sentences how to understand the opinion of author and facts. Dokkai solve. The strategies that were thought along with the exercises taken in the class. Techniques of solving. Tests. Fast reading of Dokkai and Methods to understand it. Summarising Dokkai. All parts of session are very interesting. scan, summary of passage, usage of connectors. strategies to read the dokkai with an intention to understand the gist. 語のまとまりと文末表現でひっしゃの意見がどうか決めること (determining the author’s opinion with the help of expressions at sentence ending). ほねぐみ (skeleton/structure), almost all. Solving techniques.

The response to the 3rd question shows the focus with which learners participated in the training.

- The learning for 8 leaners has been *more of global strategies and various reading skills like scanning, skimming* and so on.
- *3 learners have perceived local strategies as most useful strategies* and may even retain them. This may be called the effect of analytical learning which a typical Indian learner is accustomed in general during education.
- 1 learner appreciates that the strategies were taught along with the relevant exercises.
• 3 learners out of 19 have found the training effective because it taught them the techniques to solve the test. This shows the influence of examinations on Indian JFL learners and their orientation to attend the strategy training programme, almost 1/5th of the learners viewed it as a programme giving paper solving techniques.

Responses to the 4th question: ‘what improvement you would recommend for a better session’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Variety of passage(to notice passage structure Types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>I would like to practice 'rapid reading skill'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>The level can be lowered so that the main intention of session is fulfilled of the level is high then, we tend to concentrate more on Kanji's vocal instead of the reading techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Customized session for N1 and Jetro exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>More informative and group activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>It’s very good experience. It will be very useful for me. If possible please arrange it again for long duration e.g. 1 or 2 months (Saturday and Sunday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>little more JLPT exams related lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>JLPT related exams reading strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>It should be for more days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>No suggestion But only request please continue these sessions. I would like to solve more Dokkai's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L13</td>
<td>A test with a short as well as long passage together on a 2nd day of the session would enable to apply things learnt on the first day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14</td>
<td>This session should be for 3 or 4 days if possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to the response to the earlier question, 4 learners have shown interest in more JLPT oriented training. 3 learners have expressed their preference for a lower level of difficulty (choice of materials in terms of vocabulary and Kanji proficiency). Whereas, 8 learners have expressed the need for more such sessions and more practice. They also suggest to have such training at regular intervals.

When asked for suggestions/feedback, 10 out of 18 learners have asked for more such sessions and at regular intervals. 2 learners have suggested to have strategy training for listening and conversation. 1 learner wants to know whether such a strategy training can be designed for Business Japanese test (BJT) and corporate groups.

After conducting the intensive training with a pretest-training-posttest model, a certain amount of improvement was seen in the performance of the learners. Therefore it is proved that the developed product is effective. However it was concluded that the learners were still weak in certain skills and strategies. Though the intensive training had given them a new outlook towards reading, it was evidently not enough for the actual use of strategies. It requires more practice and focus on the techniques introduced in the intensive training. Similarly, the training in looking at one's own learning objectively needs to be conducted and such opportunities need to be provided at regular intervals.
4.4.7 Conclusion of Findings and Analysis

A training programme in Japanese reading was developed as per the Learners’ needs and its effectiveness was proven through the quantitative and qualitative data. The fourth and the fifth objective, i.e. ‘To develop a programme for training in ‘Japanese Reading and the Learning Strategies’ and ‘To test the effectiveness of the programme in ‘Japanese Reading and the Learning strategies’ were achieved successfully. Moreover, the attempt to implement the principles of Autonomy through the use of direct and social strategies was proved to be successful on the basis of the qualitative data.

The learners positively participated in the small group tasks. The learners’ perception of the difficulty in reading was found to be a result of continued focus on Bottom-Up strategies. When given inputs and training in Top-Down strategies, they showed mixed results. They have shown better performance in strategies related to linguistic clues, however identifying the structure of a complex sentence, finding a key sentence, summarizing remain to be the difficult areas. The Top-Down strategies need a long term training and incorporation in regular courses.

4.5 Summary

The present chapter has given a detail account of findings and observations of the present study in all 3 stages of the research.

- Beliefs and readiness survey for Autonomous Learning
- Product development and testing of the long-term training of Japanese conversation and the learning strategies
• Product development and testing of the short-term training of Japanese reading and the
learning strategies

The following is observed and found through the quantitative and qualitative data that was collected through various research methods.

1. The JFL learners wish to get independent as they progress in their studies, however are not aware of the steps necessary for self-directed learning. Secondly, they are in a very strong grip of old beliefs about teaching-learning and a teacher-centric classroom. They are apprehensive about making mistakes in front of the whole class, however are in favour of small group tasks and peer feedback.

2. A long-term training programme in ‘Japanese Conversation and the Learning Strategies’ was developed as per the Learners’ needs and targeted the weak areas of the learners identified in the pre-test.

3. The product developed i.e. ‘Japanese Conversation and the Learning Strategies’ proved to be effective. The learners positively participated in the small group tasks. When trained, they showed comprehensiveness and depth in peer-feedback as well as self-evaluation.

4. The intensive training programme in ‘Japanese Reading and the Learning Strategies’ was developed as per the Learners’ needs and targeted the weak areas of the learners identified in the pre-test.

5. The product developed i.e. ‘Japanese Reading and the Learning Strategies’ proved to be effective. The learners’ perception of the difficulty in reading is a result of continued focus on Bottom-Up strategies. When given inputs and training in Top-Down strategies, they showed mixed results. They have shown better performance in strategies related to linguistic clues, however identifying the structure of a complex sentence, finding a key sentence,
summarizing remain to be the difficult areas. The Top-Down strategies need a long term training and incorporation in regular courses.

6. The attempt to implement the principles of Autonomy through the use of direct, social and meta-cognitive strategies was proved to be successful on the basis of the qualitative data.

In this way, all the objectives of the study set in the beginning were achieved. Though there is a scope for improvement in the two products developed, the study has successfully attempted to find a feasible training programme of strategies and to suggest a direction for further research.