Investigating the Effective Instructional Activities as well as Advising Students to use the Effective Study Strategies related to Their Academic Performance in Less Commonly Taught Language, Particularly Japanese

Masako M. Nunn[1]

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effective instructional activities as well as advising students to use the effective study strategies related to their academic performance in less commonly taught language, particularly Japanese. The sample was college students who studied Japanese from 2017 to 2018 at the beginning level. Factor analysis was used to group items into meaningful factors. Independent *t*tests were used to investigate correlations with Test Scores. The test scores were gathered from the classroom tests (listening and written). Instructions showed that Cooperative and Challenging Instructions revealed statistically positive relation with Test Scores. Communicate Instruction did not show statistically positive relation with Test Scores. Learning strategies revealed statistically positive relation with Cognitive Strategy, Memory Practice, Study Skills, and Resource Management. Romaji (romanization of the Japanese written language) Use showed negative correlation. The pedagogical implications were presented and further investigation will be conducted using online survey.

Introduction

The instructional activities (Ramsden,1992) and learning strategies (Clarke,2008) are important factors for students' academic success, especially for less commonly taught languages (LCTL) where students are required to learn new writing systems and different grammar from their first language, particularly Japanese, which is categorized as one of the most difficult languages to learn (The Foreign Language Institute, 2020). It is essential to utilize the instructional activities to lead them to their academic success. In addition, it is the instructors' responsibilities to advise learners to use effective study strategies so that they can maximize their efforts. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effective instructional activities as well as advising the students to use the effective study strategies related to their academic performance. This study investigates the two following research questions in regard to correlations with the students' academic performance in the instructional activities and learning strategies in learning Japanese:1) How are the instructions related to the students' academic performance? 2) How do the different learning strategies correlate with their academic performance?

Literature Review

According to Brown (2007), communicative language teaching (CLT) is defined as follows:(1) Classroom goals are focused on communicative competence; (2) Language techniques are designed to engage learners in pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes; (3) Fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use; (4) Students ultimately have to use the language productively and receptively. Many studies (Samira, 2014;Ahmad & Rao, 2013) showeffectiveness of students'performance of communicative approach in learning a foreign language. The study by Ahmad and Rao (2013) showed the communicative approach is better than the traditional method in teaching English at the higher secondary level in Pakistan. The studied showed improvement of students' communicative ability as well as their motivation for learning usingthe experimental study with high school students. However, several studies (Chang, 2011; Hu, 2005; Song, 2019; Wei, 2001; Wei, Lin, & Litton, 2018; Zhou & Yin, 2005) showed that the communicative approach might not be effective due to a cultural conflict such as Asian (e.g., China, Vietnam, Korea) and Middle Eastern culture.

---

[1] University of Redlands

Chang (2011) conducted the study to compare the Grammar Translation Method and the Communicative Approach in teaching English for college students in Taiwan using the experimental study. The results showed that students performed better in the Grammar Translation Method than the Communicative Approach. The Communicative Approach is more concerned with fluency.

Due to a cultural conflict, it may take a gradual step to shift the traditional approach to the communicative approach that focus on interactive activities, therefore the mix of these approaches is suggested (Chang, 2011; Goersev & Volkan, 2009).

Before the Communicative Approach, the Traditional approach was used often where the most important concerns are reading and writing skills, then speaking and listening skills are considered secondary. It is teacher-centered, and the main objective is to learn grammar rules and vocabulary unlike the Cooperative Approach where group and pair work are utilized in class activities. Cooperative learning refers to a classroom technique that fosters learner interdependenceas aroute to cognitive and social development (Oxford, 2011). Altamini and Attamini (2014) investigated to show the effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in English language classrooms using the experimental study for undergraduates in Yemen. The findings showed a remarkable development in the students' speaking skills and attitudes after the introduction of cooperative learning techniques.However, the study by Duxbury and Tsai (2010) revealed that cooperative learning approach created statistically significant anxiety for Taiwanese college students whereas American students did not show significant anxiety.

Another approach investigated in this study is the Challenging approach focusing on three areas: 1) i plus 1 with comprehensive input; 2) target only teaching or not; 3) students' curiosity. Krashen's input hypothesis (1982) claims that "we acquire by understanding language that contains structure beyond our current level of competence (i + 1) with the help of context or extra-linguistic information. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (May 2010) made a statement that target language (TL) use is necessary but not sufficient for increasing one's proficiency without providing comprehensive input using a variety of strategies (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). Communicating successfully in the TL depends not only on the nature of the task and the message that must be communicated, but also on the teacher's effective use of communication strategies. However, the study by Xie (2017) revealed that theTL only might not be effective for low proficiency of the TL with Chinese college student learning English. Xie's study showed the participants' target language (TL) use in various communicative contexts in and outside the classroom is ineffective even with a high ratio of teacher talk with TL. The author concluded that one of the reasons was low proficiency in TL besides study environment, limited resources and personality implying that target only in the classroom might not be effective for all levels of the target language.

The third variable investigated in the Challenging Approach is curiosity. According to Cambridge dictionary, curiosity means "an eager wish to know or learn about something".Curiosity is defined as "a basic instinct, an innate mechanism that enabled intelligent species to learn about and master new things in their environments, promoting survival, use of tools, and ultimately technological advances" (Arnone, Small, Chauncey &McKenna, p. 181). Several studies (Ayşegül&Tulgar, 2018; Dörnyei&Csizér, 1998; Mahmoodzadeh&Khaiavy, 2019) have shown that curiosity is just as important as intelligence in determining how well students do in school (Stenger, 2014). Ayşegül and Tulgar (2018) investigated the effects of curiosity on the second language learning process of foreign learners in Turkish. The results of the content analysis revealed that curiosity contributed to the language knowledge and language development of the participants in linguistic, social-cultural and pragmatic knowledge.

The last approach investigated in instructional activities is the Innovative Approach, which includes computer based tools (e.g.,YouTube). Belyaeva, et al. (2019) investigated the most effective innovative tools in learning foreign languages and performed a comparison.As the result of the study, they claimed that the most effective methods are discussion, Information and Communications Technology (ICT) such as Internet, and round table after they interviewed teachers. The use of ICT in the educational process allows the efficiency of the educational process itself to be improved significantly and leads to new approaches and organizational forms of educational work.

Learning strategy instruction would be most valuable for students who are not successful learners, yet these are the students who may be least motivated to try new strategies (O'Malley &Chamot, 1990 as cited in Pigott 2008). Therefore, it is essential for educators to spend time developing student's study skills, especially learning difficult foreign language (FL) like Japanese for English speakers. Learning strategies can be recognized into cognitive, memory-related, compensatory, meta-cognitive, affective and social (Salahshoura, et al. 2012).

The cognitive strategy is a mental process and when learning, it helps the selection of relevant information and rejection of irrelevant information. It relates to recognizing, comprehending, organizing materials, summarizing, repeating, translating, using formulas and patterns, problem-solving and interacting in the target language. In this study, the factors of learning strategies are concerned with the cognitive strategies, social strategies (hereafter, group study since social strategies are used for cooperative and collaborative learning for instructors), and target language use. Romaji Use was included since it is a controversial issue to investigate the effective time for Japanese language learners to shift from Romaji Use to target only (in this case, Japanese) for Japanese language learners.

First, Pintrich (1996) specified aspects of cognitive strategies in foreign language learning as follows:
1. Cognitive strategies involve the psychological mechanism of attention focusing, the necessary and sufficient condition for encoding into memory. Therefore, basic cognitive strategies include rehearsal (such as saying material aloud when reading, copying material into a notebook, or underlining), elaboration (paraphrasing, summarizing, note-taking), and organizational strategies (e.g., selecting the main idea from a text).
2. Metacognitive strategies deal with the control and regulation of cognition. Therefore, basic strategies include planning (e.g., setting goals for studying), monitoring (e.g., self-testing to ensure comprehension), and self-regulation (e.g., re-reading or reviewing).
3. Resource management strategies include time management, space management, and strategies that call on the support of others.

Rasekh and Ranjbary (2003) investigated the effect of metacognitive strategy training for vocabulary learning for Iranian participants learning English as foreign language in Tehran using the experimental study. The result showed that explicit metacognitive strategy training has a significant positive effect on the vocabulary learning of EFL students.

Yu (2015) investigated the process of self-regulated learning and the effects of an intervention program on self-regulated learning designed for second language (L2) learners. The study had 120 participants who were sophomores majoring in English education at a university in an Asian country. Results of a path analysis reflected Zimmerman's process model of self-regulation (2000, 2004) and suggested that there are causal influences of self-regulated learning variables across three phases (forethought, performance, and reflection phase) in the context of L2 learning. Furthermore, self-efficacy, time and study environment management skills, and students' learning time affected their L2 proficiencies directly. She claimed that student self-regulation influences their L2 proficiency.

Preparation and planning are important metacognitive skills that can improve student learning (Anderson, 2020).By engaging in preparation and planning in relation to a learning goal, students are thinking about what they need or want to accomplish and how they intend to go about accomplishing it (ibid). Liu (2012) investigated the relationship between test preparation and test performance on the TOEFL exam in China. The result showed that English learning strategies and test-specific strategies represented two distinct factors of test preparation suggesting the specific preparation is essential.

Group study is one of learning strategies (Salahshoura, Sharifib&Salahshourc, 2012) and educators often discuss about advantages as well as disadvantages. In this study, group study means self-formed out-of-class study group outside the classroom. According to the Educational Corner, forming study groups is an effective strategy for enhancing learning because students can improve their notes, support each other and cover more material (Becton, 2020). Study groups are particularly effective for completing projects, developing presentations, and preparing for exams (ibid.) However, the following disadvantages are listed: 1) everybody needs to be serious, otherwise the group becomes a social gathering; 2) students in the group need to prepare with the common goal for their study; 3) some students tend to become dependent.

Out-of-class study groups are self-formed and informal study groups that meet outside of class to study course material for quizzes and exams. These groups are not typically directed by the instructor. In a study of undergraduates, students who participated in out-of-class study groups for science classes were more likely to take additional science classes than students who studied individually (Light, 2001). It has been proposed that this type of out-of-class group study has the potential to increase academic performance of students as well as to improve students' confidence, interpersonal communication skills, and diversity awareness (Petress, 2004).

Japanese language learners need to learn three different types of writing, which are hiragana, katakana and kanji (originates from Chinese characters). Learning Japanese is categorized as the most difficult foreign language for English speakers (The Foreign Language Institute, 2020). At the college level, beginners need to learn hiragana and katakana in the beginning level which is very challenging for learners. It's because the Japanese writing system

is quite different from English. Thus, beginners tend to use Romaji (alphabetical spellings of Japanese) more than hiragana and katakana. At a certain stage of learning, learners need to make a shift from Romaji to the Japanese writing system. When Japanese language learners make this shift has been a controversial issue for Japanese instructors.

In Japanese language education, the use of romaji script has been critically viewed by various researchers (e.g., Amanuma 1995; Kano 1992; Kimura 1974; Takebe 1991, 1992).Tamaoka (2014) compared how native Chinese and English speakers learning Japanese for college students to process a text.

No difference was found between Chinese and English speakers' comprehension of the text. Native English speakers showed no difference in understanding the text regardless of whether it was presented in kana/kanji or in romaji. His studies (2014) showed that English speakers understand Japanese written words better with the use of romaji than written words with non-romaji. However, the types of written forms (kana[1]/kanji[2] and romaji[3]) does not affect English speakers in their comprehension of words and content in the text.

Methodology

The sample used college students ($N = 205$) who studied Japanese from 2017 to 2018 at the beginning level (10 weeks to 20 weeks). Their first language is English. The questionnaire was adopted from the study carried out by Schmidt et al. (1996) in Egypt and the study by Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) in learning five different foreign languages (Mandarin, Tagalog, French, Japanese and Spanish). Since questionnaire items were studied on students learning a second language (e.g., English as a second language) or foreign languages, some items were modified to match Japanese language and culture context. The total items consist of forty-four.

Several statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were used to compare each scale. Factor analyses were conducted to determine how the items should be grouped into meaningful factors by using the extraction method (principal component analyses) and rotation method (Varimax with Kaiser Normalization). An eigenvalue of 1.00 or more was used as a criterion for factors that bets fit the data. The Cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained to measure the correlations between items and to examine internal consistency. Independent *t*tests were used to test whether or not significant correlations with the students' test scores related to five instructional factors and seven learning strategies factors.

The data was collected through the survey with the total of 44 items (16 items for instructional activities and 28 items for learning strategies) on a six Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree). The questionnaire consists of two areas :1) Instructional Activities (Communicative Approach, Traditional Approach, Cooperative Learning, Challenging Approach, and Innovative Approach ;2) Learning Strategies (Cognitive Strategies, Active learning, Memory Practice (vocabulary and grammar), Study Skills (review, preparation, and organization), Resource Management (time and space management), Group Study, Study Aids and Romaji Use. The items that did not load on any factors were eliminated.

The average of test scores was collected as students' self-assessed form in the following format: 1)100 ~ 90; 2) 89~ 80; 3) 79~ 70; 4) 69~60; 5) below 59. The test consists of vocabulary (recognition and meaning) and writing (grammar; sentence structure, and knowledge & usage of conjugations). The reading skill was not included since this is the beginning level and students focus on learning Japanese writing system (hiragana, katakana and simple kanji).

Results and Discussions

The analysis of instructional factors revealed 16 items loaded onto 5 factors. They were labeled as follows (See items of each factor below): 1) Communicative (focusing on communicative functions; 2) Traditional Approach (focusing on reading, writing and grammar); 3) Cooperative Approach (group and pair work); 4) Challenging Approach (desire to challenge, curiosity and TL/Japanese only): 5) Innovative Approach (Web tools and games). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for five instructional factors($N = 205$). Table 2 shows internal consistency reliability and several items.In addition, three single items related to TL/Japanese use of instructors were investigated since it is often a controversial issue and they did not load on any factors. See below for more details.

Table 1 Descriptive Analysis of Five Instructional Factors (*N* = 205)

	Mean	SD
Communicative	5.31	.76
Traditional Approach	4.72	1.07
Cooperative Approach	4.59	.89
Challenging Approach	4.85	.97
Innovative Approach	5.05	1.00

As Table 1 shows, Communicative has the highest mean. Surprisingly, Cooperative Approach shows the lowest mean, even though the correlation with Test Scores shows significantly positive as in Table 3.

Table 2 Internal Consistency Reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of Five Instructional Factors

Factors	Alpha	# of items
Communicative	.60	3
Traditional Approach	.60	2
Cooperative Approach	.79	4
Challenging Approach	.70	3
Innovative Approach	.73	2

In order to investigate the correlations of 5 instructional factors with test scores, an independent *t* test was conducted. Table 3 shows the correlations between 5 instructional factors and test scores.

Table 3 Correlations with Test Scores   N= 205

Communicative	Traditional	Cooperative	Challenging	Innovative
$r = .05$	$r = .03$	$r = .15*$	$r = .18*$	$r = .01$

*Correlation is significant at the level of .05 (2-tailes)

   In Table 3, Cooperative Approach and Challenging Approach revealed statistically and positively significant correlations with Test Scores. This result suggests that group work/pair work is encouraged to use for the instructors. Learners earn academic benefits when provided with challenging activities to evoke their curiosity and activities with the proficiency level of i + 1 with comprehensible input. Unexpectedly, Communicative Approach did not show significant correlation with Test Scores, even though it shows the highest mean indicating that learners prefer the communicative approach due to its oral and listening activities. However, the reason(s) why the result did not show a statistically positive correlation with Test Scores cannot be drawn in this study. Further investigation is needed since now Communicative Approach is strongly encouraged in foreign language education, therefore it's worth further research. In addition, according to the result of this study, learners prefer communicative activities versus the Traditional Approach, which focuses on reading, writing and grammar.

   Another surprising result is that the Innovative Approach did not show a statistically significant correlation with Test Scores despite the previous studies (Belvaeva, et al, 2019), which showed positive influence on students' performance. The Traditional Approach showed no significant relationship with Test Scores in this study. Below shows the components of items in each factor.

Factor 1: Communicative Approach	Loading
Q1. Activities in this class should be designed to help the students improve their abilities to communicate in Japanese.	.51
Q2. Communication activities are a waste of time in this class, because I only need to learn what is necessary to pass the Japanese examination(reversed cord).	.31
Q3. Listening and speaking should be emphasized in Japanese class.	.50

Factor 2: Traditional Approach
Q1. Japanese class is most useful when the emphasis is to put on grammar.   .83
Q2. Reading and writing should be emphasized in Japanese class.   .83
Factor 3: Cooperative Approach
Q1. I like Japanese learning activities in which students work together in pairs or small groups.
                                                                                                  .82
Q2. I prefer a Japanese class in which there are lots of activities that allow me to participate actively.
                                                                                                  .69
Q3. I prefer to work by myself in Japanese class, not with other students (reversed question)   .80
Q4. Group activities and pair work in Japanese class are a waste of time (reversed question)   .79

Factor 4: Challenging Approach   Loading
Q1. In a Japanese class, I prefer activities and materials that really challenge me so that I can learn more.
                                                                                                  .80
Q2. In a Japanese class, I prefer activities and materials that arouse my curiosity even if they are difficult to learn.
                                                                                                  .73
Q3. During Japanese class, I would like to have only Japanese spoken.   .58
Q4: I prefer to sit and listen, and don't like being forced to speak in Japanese class (reversed order).
                                                                                                  .60
Q5: I prefer more romaji in teacher's writing along with Japanese writings and also more romaji in the textbook
(reversed order).   .60

Activities and materials that bring more curiosity shows significant correlation with students' Test Scores.
Further, only Japanese (target language) and Less Romaji support enhanced students' learning.

Factor 5: Innovative Approach   Loading
Q1. I enjoy educational game types of activities such as bingo, etc.   .89
Q2. I enjoy watching educational YouTube videos in class to learn new
     words/grammars/expressions and culture.   .89

        As the result of five instructional factors in relation to Test Scores, the Challenging Approach and the
Cooperative Approach are essential to learners' Japanese performance.
Single Items

        Often, in foreign language learning, it becomes controversial whether the instructions need to be taught
in the target language or not.Therefore, the following three single items related to this issue were investigated.
They did not load on any of factors, so this study investigated separately. They were: Q1 Only Japanese; Q2 More
Romaji; Q3 English Sometimes. Below are the questions for each item. Q1: Only Japanese showed significantly
and positively correlated with Test Scores even though the mean shows the lowest among these three items
compared to the mean of English Sometimes in Table 4. Q2: More Romaji revealed significantly and negatively
correlated with Test Scores. This suggests that students prefer instructors to use English sometimes, however, the
result of this study implies that it's better for instructors to use Japanese only and no romaji for students' Japanese
performance.

Q1. During Japanese class, I would like to have only Japanese spoken. $r = .14*, p < .05$
Q2. I prefer that the teacher uses more romaji in his/her writing along with Japanese writings and also more
romaji in the textbook: $r = -.26**, p < .001$
Q3. In my Japanese class, the teacher should explain things in English sometimes in order to help us learn.
                                                                                         $r = .05,\ p = .44$

Table 4 Individual Items (Only Japanese, More Romaji and English Sometime)

	Mean	SD
Only Japanese	3.01	1.18
More Romaji	3.38	1.55
English Sometime	5.10	.79

Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for 8 factors of Learning Strategies (N = 205).The highest mean is Study Aids, next is Cognitive Strategy. This indicates that learners prefer using YouTube and Web-based tools. The lowest mean is Romaji Use.   Unexpectedly, the mean of Romaji Use is relatively low compared to other factors of Learning Strategies in spite of the beginning level who do not have prior learning of Japanese.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of Learning Strategies (N = 205)

Factors	Mean	SD
Cognitive	4.79	1.05
Active Learning	4.78	1.03
Memory Practice	4.63	1.07
Study Skills	4.36	1.12
Resource Management	4.08	.07
Group Study	4.33	1.41
Study Aids	4.96	1.13
Romaji Use	3.17	1.72

Learning Strategies factors revealed 28 items loaded onto 8 factors. They were labeled: 1) Cognitive Strategies; 2) Active learning; 3) Memory Practice (vocabulary and grammar); 4) Study Skills (review, preparation, and organization); 5) Resource Management (time and space management) ;6) Group Study; 7) Study Aids; 8) Romaji Use (alphabetical writing of Japanese). Please see below for items of each factor. The items that did not load on any factors were eliminated. Table 6 shows internal consistent reliability and the number of items of Learning Strategies.

Table 6 Internal Consistency Reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of Seven Learning Strategies

Factors	Alpha	# of items
Cognitive Strategy	.77	4
Active Learning	.70	3
Memory Practice	.83	3
Study Skills	.83	5
Resource Management	.70	2
Group Study	.84	3
Study Aids	.71	3
Romaji Use	.90	2

Table 7 and 8 show the correlations between Learning Strategies and Test Scores.
Table 7 Correlations between Learning Strategies and Test Scores (N = 205)

Cognitive	Active Learning	Memory Practice	Study Skills
r = .18*	r = .22**	r = .31**	r = .19**

Correlation is significant: *p<.05; **p< 0.01

Table 8 Correlations between Learning Strategies and Test Scores ($N = 205$)

Resource Management	Group Study	Study Aids	Romaji Use
$r = .22^{**}$	$r = .02$	$r = .03$	$r = -.18^*$

Correlation is significant: $*p<.05$; $**p< 0.01$

Memory Practice revealed the highest correlation with Test Scores suggesting that instructor's encouraged learners to practice vocabulary and grammar to memorize them until they understand. In addition, it is essential to be active in learning for their academic performance by asking questions to the instructors to clarify their questions and monitor their progress ($r = .22^{**}$). Resource Management (time and space management) revealed a statistically positive relationship with Test Scores (see Table 8), even though the mean ($M = 4.08$; $SD = .07$)is relatively low compared to other factors. Students might consider these important factors for their academic success, therefore it's the instructor's responsibility to explain the importance of setting their time and space of their study. Study Skills are also essential in learning a foreign language for English speakers. Therefore, instructors suggest organizing, reviewing and being prepared for their studies by providing supplemental materials and tutors for class. Especially, tutoring sessionsare a key for their success as this item shows statistically positive with Test Scores ($r = .20^*$, $p< .05$). See below. Instructors can require tutoring sessions participation. Cognitive Strategy shows a statistically positive correlation with Test Scores. Instructors can explain to students how to use Cognitive Strategies in class such as to relate new vocabulary with familiar words, to guess the meaning of new vocabulary via for patterns, etc.

Unexpectedly Group Study did not show a statistically positive relationship with Test Scores. Romaji Use revealed a negative relation with Test Scores to discourage the use of romaji in their study.

Below are the 8 factors of Learning Strategies with loading for each item.

Factor 1: Cognitive ($r = .18^*$)	Loading
Q1: I try to relate to new vocabulary words to other words I know.	.70
Q2: I try to guess the meaning of new vocabulary words from context.	.68
Q3: I look for patterns in Japanese language on my own.	.73
Q4: When studying, I think through a topic and decide what I need to learn about it.	.68

Factor 2: Active learning ($r = .22^{**}$)	
Q1: I ask the instructor to clarify concepts I don't understand well.	.60
Q2: When studying for a test, I try to determine which concepts I don't understand.	.63
Q3: I always evaluate my progress in learning Japanese language.	.78

Factor 3: Memory practice ($r = .31^{**}$)	Loading
Practice vocabulary and grammar.	
Q1: I study grammar until I fully understand it.	.89
Q2: I practice sentence structures until I fully understand it.	.86
Q3: I repeat new vocabulary words to memorize them.	.78

Factor 4: Study skills ($r = .19^{**}$)	
Preparation, review & organization	Loading
Q1: After a test, I always review difficult material to be sure I understand it all.	.74
Q2: In preparing for tests, I usually review the material a few days ahead of time.	.67
Q3: I usually study material periodically rather than in one long time.	.60
Q4: When I study, I carefully organize what I have learned in this class.	.73
Q5: When studying, I reread all the course material.	.74

Factor 5: Resource management ($r = .22^{**}$)	Loading
Time management and space management	
Q1: I have a regular place set aside for studying.	.85
Q2: I always arrange time to prepare before Japanese language class.	.85

Factor 6: Group study ($r = .02$)	Loading
Q1: I try to work with other students from this class on assignments.	.89
Q2: When studying, I often discuss the course material with my classmates.	.91
Q3: When I cannot understand the material, I ask another student in this class for help.	
	.80

Factor 7: Study aids (*r* = .03)   Loading
       Q1: Using YouTube and Web is very useful in learning Japanese.   .81
       Q2: l often use the web-based learning tools.   .81
       Q3: Flash cards are very useful to learn new materials such as vocabulary, verbs.   .76
Factor 8: Romaji Use (*r* = -.18*)   Loading
Q1: I write romaji on the Japanese writings in the textbook since it is easier for me to understand.
                                 .96
       Q2: I always use romaji when I practice reading.   .96

The following single item that did not load on any factors was investigated since many instructors often consider aTutoring Session essential for students' academic performance especially before the tests. Correlation with test scores in Tutoring Sessions (*M* = 3.97; *SD* = 1.58) revealed statistically significant (*r* = .20*, *p*< .05). This result confirmed the instructor's assumption.

The result of this study revealed that the Cooperative and Challenging Approach have a significantly positive relationship for students' academic performance. Unexpectedly, the Communicative Approach did not show a statistically positive result, despite the current trend of emphasis on communicative activities in foreign language education. It might be due to many variables (e.g., teacher's technique, cultural difference, and application of approach) to be considered to investigate its academic effectiveness of Communicative Approach. This conclusion is out of scope from the result of this study andfurther investigations are needed. As for Learning Strategies, there are several strategies that instructors can advise learners: 1) Cognitive; 2) Active Learning; 3) Study Skills; 4) Resource Management.

This study focused on Japanese learning; however, the results of this study can be applied to LCTL that requires learning a new writing system and different grammar from a learners' first language. This is a pilot study by gathering the survey of pen-pencil in classrooms. Due to the pandemic, an online survey will be conducted to collect more data for the purpose of better reliability and generalization.

References

Ahmad, S., Rao, C. (2013). Applying communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language: A case study of Pakistan. Porta Linguarum, 22.
     https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289653909_Applying_Communicative_Approach_in_Teaching_English_as_a_Foreign_Language_a_Case_Study_of_Pakistan

Altamini, N. O. M., &Attamini, R (2014) Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in Enhancing
Speaking Skills and Attitudes towards Learning English.
     https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276180876_Effectiveness_of_Cooperative_Learning_in_Enhancing_Speaking_Skills_and_Attitudes_towards_Learning_English

Amamura, Y. (1995). Rōmaji no tsuzurikata [The way of romaji spelling]. Nihongo to nihongokyōiku 8: Nihongo no mojihyōki (hō) [Japanese and Japanese education, Vol.8: Japanese letters and script, Vol. 1, ed. By Y. Takebe. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Anderson, N. (2002).   The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning.
     https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED463659.pdf

Arnone, M. P., Small, R. V., Chauncey, S. A., & McKenna, P. (2011). Curiosity, interest and engagement in technology-pervasive learning environments: A new research agenda.
     https://experts.syr.edu/en/publications/curiosity-interest-and-engagement-in-technology-pervasive-learnin

Ayşegül, Ö. Ü., &Tulgar A. (2018). The Effects of Curiosity on Second Language Learning in terms of Linguistic, Social-cultural and Pragmatic Development.
     https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330040041_The_Effects_of_Curiosity_on_Second_Language_Learning_in_terms_of_Linguistic_Social-cultural_and_Pragmatic_Development

Bao, E., S. (2018). The Research on Effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching in China.
     https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330098448_The_Research_on_Effectiveness_of_Communicative_Language_Teaching_in_China

Becton, L. (2020). Benefits of study-groups. https://www.educationcorner.com/study-groups.html

Belyaeva, I. G., 1 , Ekaterina A. Samorodova, E. A., Olga V. Voron , O. V., &Zakirova, E. S. (2019). Analysis of Innovative Methods' Effectiveness in Teaching Foreign Languages for Special Purposes Used for the Formation of Future Specialists' Professional Competencies.
     file:///C:/Users/kevnu/Downloads/education-09-00171.pdf

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching. New York: Pearson Education,
        Inc.
Chang, M. & Goswami, J. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in
        Taiwanese college English Classes. English Language Teaching, 4(2).
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080690.pdf
Chang, S. C. (2011). A Contrastive Study of Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Approach in
        Teaching English Grammar. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED522937.pdf
Dörnyei, Z., &Csizér, K. (1998). 'Ten commandments for motivating language learners: results of an empirical
        study' Language Teaching Research 2,3: 203 – 229.
Duxbury, J. G., & Tsai, L. L. (2010). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Foreign Language
Anxiety: A Comparative Study of Taiwanese and American Universities.
        https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED522937.pdf
Goersev, I., & Volkan, I. (2009). Turkish university students' perceptions of communicative and non-
        communicative activities in EFL classroom, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1(1), 618-622.
        https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042809001128
Hu, G. W. (2005). CLT is best for China – an untenable absolutist claim. ELT Journal, 59(1), 65-68.
Khajavy, G. H., &Mahmoodzadeh, M (2019). Towards Conceptualizing Language LearningCuriosity in SLA: An
        Empirical Study. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30311045/
Kimura, M. (1974). Nihongo kyōiku no kihonmondai: Moji kyōiku[Fundamental problems for
teaching   methodology   of   the   Japanese   language: Script   education].   Kōzanihongokyōiku:
        Wasedadigakugogakukyōikukenkyūjo[Lecture series of Japanese language education: Bulletin of the
        institute of language teaching, Waseda university]10:82-93.
Krashen, S. (1982): Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition
        http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf
Light, R. J. (2001). Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
        University Press.
Liu, O. L. (2014). Investigating the Relationship Between Test Preparation and TOEFL iBT® Performance.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264743896_Investigating_the_Relationship_Between_Test_Preparatio
        n_and_TOEFL_iBTR_Performance
O'Malley, M J., &Chamot, A, U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language. Cambridge University press.
Oxford, R. (2011). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning and interaction: Three communicative strands in
        the language classroom. The Modern Language Journal,
        20.https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05510.x
Petress, K. C. (2004). The benefits of group study. Education, 124 (pp. 587–589).
Pintrich, P. R. (1996) The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning.
        https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c70b/c7142920b1ea74f16e14e0defe40ba4846c5.pdf
Protheroe, N., & Clarke, S. (2008). Learning Strategies as a Key to Student Success.
        https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ823093
Ramsden, P. (1992). Learning to teach in higher education.
        https://srhe.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079312331382498?journalCode=cshe20
Rasekh, Z. E., &Ranjbary, R. (2003). Metacognitive strategy training for vocabulary learning. https://www.tesl-
        ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a5/
Salahshoura, F., Sharifib, M., & Neda Salahshourc, N. (2012). The relationship between language learning strategy
        use, language proficiency level and learner gender.
        https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S1877042813001043?token=466115996359E840D3C5B918B
        52038DD3F8A708C3D117C12956111A6FF0BF9C2875A5BA249C6BF78E2DD7DFD1CB3AB2A
Samira, L. (2014). Investigating the Effectiveness of the Communicative Language Teaching
Approach in Enhancing EFL Learners' Oral Proficiency The case of third year students of English at Biskra
        University
Schmidt, R. & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategies, and pedagogical preferences in foreign
language learning. In Z. Dörnyei& R. Schmidt (Eds.), Motivation and second language acquisition (Technical
        Report #23, pp. 313-359). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum
        Center.
Schütz , E. R.,(2019). Stephen Krashen's Theory of second language acquisition.https://www.sk.com.br/sk-
        krash-english.html
Sobhani, M., & Sadegh, M. (2014). Attitudes toward the effectiveness of xommunicative and

Educational Language Games and Fun Activities in Teaching and Learning English. Theory and Practice in
    Language Studies,4(5), 1066-1073.
http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol04/05/27.pdf
Song, B. (2019). The research on effectiveness of communicative language teaching in China, Asian
Culture and History, 11(1).
    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330098448_The_Research_on_Effectiveness_of_Communica
    tive_Language_Teaching_in_China
Stenger,M. (2014).   Brain based learning. https://www.edutopia.org/blog/why-curiosity-enhances-learning-
    marianne-stenger
Takebe, Y. (1991). Moji kyōiku to nihongokyōiku [Script description and Japanese language education. Tokyo,
    Bonjinsha.
Takebe, Y. (1992). Moji hyōki no shidō [Teaching letters and scripts]. Nihongo to nihongokyōiku13: Nihongo
    kyōikukyōjuho [Japanese and Japanese education, 13. Japanese education and teaching methodology
    (early-part)]. Tokyo, Meiji shoin.
Tamaoka, K. (2014). The Japanese Writing System and Lexical Understanding.
http://tamaoka.org/scholarly/sadokuari/2014/130.pdfThe Foreign Service Institute (2020). Language learning
    difficulty.
https://effectivelanguagelearning.com/language-guide/language-difficulty/
Wei, D. D. (2001). Communicative language teaching and Confucianism in China and Taiwan. In
AARE 2002 Conference Papers, Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, 1-11.
    Melbourne, Australia.
Wei, L, Lin, H.H., & Litton, F. (2018). Communicative language 6eaching (CLT) in EFL content in Asia. Asian
    Culture and History, 10(1). 1-9.
Xie, Q. (2017). Investigating the target language usage in and outside business English classroom for non-
    English major undergraduates at a Chinese university.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1415629
Yu, B & B. (2015) Incorporation of Automated Writing Evaluation Software in Language Education: A Case of
    Evening University Students‟ Self-Regulated Learning in Taiwanhttp://www.ijiet.org/papers/616-
    ET020.pdf
Zhou, X. C., & Yin, H. L. (2005). On roles and features of context in CLT. Canadian Social
Science, 1(1), 108-111.

Content Footnotes
[1]Kana is the system of syllabic writing used for Japanese, having two forms, hiragana and katakana in definitions
    from Oxford Languages.
[2]Kanji is a system of Japanese writing using Chinese characters in definition from Oxford Languages.
[3]Romaji is the romanization of the Japanese written language.