［論文］

# A Tandem Learning Approach to Task Evaluation

ティモシー　スチュワート

**Timothy Stewart**

**ABSTRACT**

This paper describes an approach to task evaluation that emerged out of the process of course development. The multi-layered approach to task evaluation described synthesizes student and teacher evaluations of tasks written in journals with more traditional course evaluation data in a reflective process of course development. Ultimately, the approach opens up dynamic insights into the appropriateness of tasks by incorporating the views of both students and teachers. The paper concludes by illustrating how the multi-layered approach to task evaluation addresses the three requirements of tandem learning: commitment, reciprocity and autonomous learning.

**Key Words**：tandem learning, task-based learning, evaluation, reflective teaching, collaborative research, team teaching

## 1. Introduction

This paper presents an approach to task evaluation that is designed to try and narrow the gap between teacher and student perceptions of learning in order to facilitate course development. Teachers often talk about what “worked” in their lessons, but most do not know much about what their learners think about those same lessons. Much of what teachers do know is either through summative evaluations（Genesee & Upshur, 1996）, or intuitive reflection（Burns, 1999）. Another way of knowing about learner perceptions is studies conducted by external researchers in language classrooms（e.g., Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Block, 1996; Breen, 1991）. Recently, practitioners have begun to conduct classroom or exploratory/action research in their own classrooms. The approach to task evaluation described in this paper represents this trend as it is situated in local treatments of

teaching, rather than generic studies（Bailey & Nunan, 1996; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Murphy & Byrd, 2001）.

The literature reveals that student views of classroom events are not often solicited in teaching practice. Willis（1996, p. 17）, to offer just one example, suggests that teacher-centred instruction is a mainstay of TESOL classrooms. The evidence points to a disconnect between teachers and learners. Shared understanding of events is created through negotiation. Yet, teachers "tend to assume that the way we look at a task will be the way learners look at it. However, there is evidence that while we as teachers are focusing on one thing, learners are focusing on something else"（Nunan, 1989, p. 20）. That is, learners often have alternative ideas on what lessons have been about（Allwright, 1984）. Based upon this knowledge, I argue in this paper for a multi-faceted approach to task evaluation as a way to match teacher and learner impressions of task appropriateness. Without a multi-layered evaluation that reflects upon both student and teacher impressions, how much can teachers truly know about the appropriateness of classroom tasks?

The focus of this article is on the *tandem* aspect of the evaluation of tasks used in the course. The type of tandem evaluation of learning tasks highlighted in this article involves co-teachers evaluating tasks simultaneously with the students in their course. The context in which the approach developed was an interdisciplinary team-taught course（see Stewart, 2007a; Stewart, Sagliano & Sagliano, 2002）. The course was co-taught by a TESOL specialist and a professor of cross-cultural studies to undergraduates at a Japanese university.

Tandem learning theory in the second language field is strongly associated with trends in learner autonomy. Furthermore, it is based on the principles of reciprocity and commitment（University of Sheffield, n.d.）. In autonomous learning terms this means that students will work to help each other at improving their language skills in ways that are reciprocal. I believe that teacher and learner autonomy are fundamentally entwined（Stewart, 2007b）making one impossible without the other. Underlying this belief is the practice of reflective teaching（e.g., Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Schon, 1995）. Through the

collaborative practices outlined in this article, my teaching partner and I worked in tandem with our students to bring tandem learning into the classroom and give it a new focus. Rather than students working in tandem on improving their language skills, this project involved teachers and students thinking about the benefits of learning tasks in the course. The data generated by these tandem evaluations of course tasks then became the content for further tandem reflections by the two co-teachers.

## Classroom-based Evaluation

In any evaluation process for decision-making about teaching it is imperative to collect data upon which informed decisions can be taken that improve teaching and enhance learning (Genesee & Upshur, 1996). In reality, we always receive feedback from our learners, whether we seek it or not. All learners more or less naturally evaluate course tasks critically (Breen, 1987). Evaluating tasks through a set of question prompts can, therefore, be seen merely as one way to formalize something that naturally occurs. I advocate a multi-layered process for promoting teachers' understanding of learner perceptions. Each layer adds a deeper level of understanding. Thus, it is the inverse of the peeled onion metaphor.

## Multi-layered Approach to Task Evaluation

To expect busy teachers to conduct classroom-based evaluation, procedures must be *practical*. It should also generate information that is *relevant* to the purpose and situation. Finally, this kind of teacher-driven evaluation has to be *useful* for making decisions. According to Genesee and Upshur (1996) : "One might undertake evaluation in order to make decisions about follow-up instruction for an entire class or to ascertain the effectiveness of particular instructional units with a view to improving them" (p. 6). The multi-layered approach can be used for both.

The approach is shown in Figure 1. The first reflective stage occurs in layers 1 and 2, at the individual level. Then, in layer 3, all student journal entries are coded and teacher evaluations summarized. After this, the next stage of reflection takes

place by comparing the teacher evaluations to the coded student evaluation summaries. What is sought at this stage, of course, are “recurring patterns or salient events”（Bailey, 1990, p. 215）, but idiosyncratic comments are important. The point is to see where participant perceptions of the learning generated by course tasks converge and diverge（Kumaravadivelu, 1991, 2003）. Reflecting on layers 1 to 3 first involves the two teachers writing individual reflections on the journal data. Then, after reading these written reflections, further reflection in discussion is recommended. This discussion phase is where tentative decisions can be made. Then, in layer 5 tabulate course-end questionnaire data, and compare it to the student journal evaluations of tasks. At layer 6, teachers reflect upon the possible meanings of all of this information in discussion and review decisions on course development.

**Figure 1: Multi-layered Approach to Task Evaluation**

1. in-class student journals
2. in-class teacher journals
3. summaries of journal entries
4. teacher reflections on 1~3
5. course evaluation questionnaire data
6. teacher reflections on 4 and 5

## Information Generated by the Approach

I used the Multi-layered Approach for two years（2001 and 2002）in an effort to improve a course called Issues in Cross-cultural Communication. A key course objective was to prepare students for a semester studying abroad at an English-medium university. Unlike courses at most Japanese universities, this second-year class met three times per week for a weekly total of 5.5 hours. The tasks I evaluated together with my teaching partner and students were mostly longer sequences of instruction extending over several lessons（Willis, 1996）, linked by themes which

produced a set of lessons and activities (Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001). These tasks were primarily concerned with meaning; related to the world outside the classroom; focused on task completion; and assessed in terms of task outcome. This follows the definition of learning task proposed by Skehan (1996, 1998). His main contention is: "What counts, in task-based approaches, is the way meaning is brought into prominence by the emphasis on goals and activities" (Skehan, 1998, p. 268). In other words, tasks need outcomes to motivate learners into participation (Willis, 1996). Below, I outline the six steps of the approach in detail. Readers who seek further explanation of the approach should consult Stewart (2007a).

*1. In-class Student Journals*

The main point about journals, or learning logs, is that they are meant for students to be able to communicate with their teachers through a vehicle that is non-threatening. These student journals are a series of evaluations of learning related to individual tasks. They give teachers a unique window into the "real world needs" that Long and Crookes (1993) recommended as the basis for selecting tasks. These journals form records of learner needs as expressed by learners themselves. This evaluation format with its simple prompts (see Appendix A) seems much more valid than that which commonly happens. Often teacher reflections do not go beyond asking themselves whether the lesson was "a good one or not, and why" (Ur, 1996, p. 219).

Practicality

Teachers are busy professionals. Interactive journals, commonly called dialogue journals (Peyton & Reed, 1990; Peyton & Staton, 1993), can consume a lot of time. "Teachers often avoid dialogue journals because of the time needed to read and respond to them" (Alexander, 2001, p. 23). But with planning, journals do not have to consume an inordinate amount of teacher time (Quirke, 2001).

The journal format for the Issues in Cross-cultural Communication course, was not interactive. My parter and I promised the students in 2001 that we would not read journals until the course ended. Our concern was that learners would write to

please us if they knew we checked the journals regularly（Anderson, 1992; Barkhuizen, 1995）. We did not notice any change in the content or volume of journal entries in 2002 when my partner and I did read journals as the course progressed.

Relevance of Information

Using student journals for course evaluation and revision follows the advice of researchers（Barkhuizen, 1998; Daloglu, 2001; Genesee & Upshur, 1996; Richards, 2001）. By focusing the journal entries with question prompts, a pool of information was created specifically on what teachers and learners believed was learnt from particular tasks. Additionally, the timing for each evaluation immediately followed the completion of a task. So the prompts and the timing focused the journal writing on the evaluation of learning, while some questions（*What did you learn? Please explain your rating.*）were purposely kept open-ended so as not to give learners any signals that we expected certain responses.

Allwright（1984）and Sharp（1990）contend that there are a variety of problems related to collecting student opinion. Yet, student goals are “sometimes more reliable than those of the teacher”（MacKay, Oates & Haig, 2000, p. 52）. Significantly, learners in our classes raised criticisms of course tasks in their evaluations. This is a testament to the relevance of the information generated. Although, reading individual student journals, left me and my teaching partner feeling we were not learning anything new. That is, viewed individually the entries do not seem to be of much value to teachers. This is characteristic of classroom research: “Information about teaching and learning is rarely meaningful by itself. It becomes meaningful when it is interpreted”（Genesee & Upshur, 1996, p. 4）

**Key Points About Student Journals**

- ➢ One-way journals not so time consuming.
- ➢ Prompts focused learner entries on task evaluation whilst remaining open-ended.

- To prevent confounding effects, teachers should avoid reading student journals until their own entries are complete.

*2.Teacher Journals*

Teachers and learners evaluated course tasks in tandem using identical question prompts. While writing journal entries, my impressions of the process ranged from elation to self-doubt. The timing and freedom of the reflection process allowed me to capture my thoughts on tasks, and that was elating. However, I often felt, especially the second time around in 2002, that what I had to say was fairly self-evident and need not be recorded. I now believe this conclusion to be mistaken. Without a record fresh from the moment, it is all but impossible to reconstruct accurate impressions of a lesson.

Practicality

This one-way approach resembling a personal diary, is not time consuming. In fact, entries should be completed during lessons. It takes about fifteen minutes to complete evaluations. Teachers will find the information even more convenient if evaluations are stored on computers.

Relevance of Information

As co-teachers, we routinely discussed our impressions of student participation, learning, and the appropriateness of tasks. Our Monday, Wednesday, Friday class schedule, meant that we talked nearly every working day. So neither of us was unaware of the other's general perceptions when we wrote our evaluations. It is unclear how much this influenced our individual evaluations, but it was an important part of the process of thinking through what was happening in our lessons.

Journal entries formed an invaluable record of our impressions of the course (see Appendix B). They contained information about the tasks that we would have had great difficulty recalling later for decision-making purposes, such as whether instructional plans and practices matched. Having these permanent records of

impressions of learning systematized our course development reflections and discussions. This information provided legitimacy to discussions and decisions. We had data that we could interpret and use to make informed decisions.

**Key Points About Teacher Journals**

- ➢ Form an invaluable record about course tasks for decision-making.
- ➢ Take about fifteen minutes to complete.
- ➢ More convenient, if possible, to store on computers.

*3. Summaries of Journals*

The journals contain raw data for analysis. Analysis begins in layer three where journal information is coded for summarization. Our practice was certainly guided by the tradition of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). We read through all journals, and created categories out of the data that generalized ideas found in the entries. At this point the data began to make sense and we could foresee dividends for our efforts.

Practicality

It did not take an unreasonable amount of time to read and code the journal entries. Teacher journal entries were easier to compile because there were only two and they were stored on computers. My teaching partner and I put the teacher evaluation summaries side-by-side in point-form for easy comparison (see Appendix C). Student journals required more effort. Appendix D is a sample summary of student evaluations. It took us about three hours to compile the summaries. Since there were two teachers working in this course, we had obvious advantages over many colleagues. Later, we used our two sets of eyes and re-analyzed all of the data to cross-check findings.

Relevance of Information

The coding process of analyzing qualitative data gives it a quantitative dimension.

Simply put, we as the teachers could see the number of points raised by students, the number of students who mentioned a particular point, and which students concurred on the point. This information easily allowed us to identify what our learners saw as the main strengths and weaknesses of particular tasks. Essentially these summaries made the raw data accessible. They threw open the covers of the journals and created a mosaic of student perceptions for interpretation. Without this step in the process, it would have been impossible to determine the patterns of responses and the salient issues needing reflection. Student and teacher evaluation summaries were easily compared. Taken together, these summaries formed an impression of the course that fostered decision-making. Reading journal entries from all participants made things much more transparent. Through this concert of voices, relevant issues became clear and my own writing in the learning log took on a significance not previously visible to me.

**Key Points About Journal Summaries**

- The coding process of analyzing qualitative data gives it a quantitative dimension.
- After coding, teacher and learner data is easily compared.
- Working with a colleague allows you to use two sets of eyes to re-analyze data and cross-check findings.

*4. Teacher Reflections on 1~3*

The fourth layer of the multi-layered approach to task evaluation began after reading the summaries of teacher and student task evaluations. The summaries for each task were contemplated first in writing by each instructor (see Appendix E). We then exchanged our written reflections and considered these for a day or so before meeting. In this meeting, we continued the process of reflection through discussion. These focused conversations led to tentative decisions about the future shape of the course.

Practicality

All teachers naturally reflect on lessons. The depth of reflection varies. The range broadly is from talking to oneself briefly, to a formal observation-evaluation for promotion or tenure. There are two steps in the teacher reflection process in this layer, written and spoken. The written reflection can take several days to complete, but it is well worth the effort to secure a written record. Given that this is a course co-taught by two instructors, we are able to talk at length about these additional written reflections on the tasks. Collaboration in teaching is, therefore, encouraged (Burns, 1999; Edge, 2002)

Relevance of Information

Thinking deeply and reflecting in writing seems to me to be vital to course development. The act of committing thoughts to paper is an integral part of the process of thinking through ideas. As student perceptions and teacher's views were revealed to us we needed to relate this information to our own thoughts. The relevance of the information generated by this cycle of written and spoken reflection is a product of its focus. Evaluation of each task was done in tandem with all participants using an identical set of prompts. In layer four, teachers compared these evaluations and wrote additional reflections for each task. Adding the step of discussion with co-teachers ensured that the data was interpreted and reinterpreted several times. Thus, there is a genuine research process here far beyond the norm of intuitive reflection.

**Key Points About Teacher Reflection on Journals**

- ➢ Teacher reflection in this layer is both written and spoken.
- ➢ Committing thoughts to paper is an integral part of the process of thinking through ideas about teaching and course development.

*5. Course Evaluation Data*

At the end of the course, students have a final opportunity to evaluate key tasks.

The end-of-course questionnaire, distributed in the last class, is an anonymous survey that asks students for a 1（low）to 4（high）rating on each task listed in the categories of enjoyment, English learning and content learning. A space for comments is provided under each task. Also, at the end of the survey we asked for "other comments" and "suggestions for improving the course," as well as the question: "What are the most useful/important things that you learned?" The tabulation and interpretation of this data was purposely left until after the journal evaluations had been summarized and initially reflected upon as described in layer four above（see Appendix F）.

Practicality

This type of evaluation of activities is common. It is quite easy to design, complete and interpret.

Relevance of Information

Naturally, by the end of the course some tasks will have long since been completed. Therefore, to refresh memories we projected transparencies of key handouts for each task on a screen before learners complete the questionnaires. In addition, students were allowed to look through their notebooks and ask questions as they filled in the anonymous survey. Notice from the example in Appendix F that our end-of-course survey evaluated major course tasks in three categories. Learners could write comments about each task, too. Moreover, the open-ended solicitations for information at the end of the form allow students to make general comments about the course as a whole. This provides added information for decision-making. At the end of a course, students may be better able to see the purpose of tasks and how tasks link. This kind of data is very useful in a supplementary role, but it may fail to generate much qualitative information. I stress here that the common practice of basing decisions on this kind of data alone is inadequate. In short, these end-of-course surveys are no substitute for data collected during or immediately after tasks.

**Key Points About End-of-Course Questionnaire Data**

- ➢ Quite easy to design, complete and interpret.
- ➢ Gives learners a final opportunity to reflect on and evaluate course tasks.
- ➢ Evaluates major course tasks in three categories.
- ➢ Learners can write comments about each task and make general remarks.

*6. Teacher Reflections on 4 & 5*

My teaching partner and I held further reflection discussions to consider the additional data from layers four and five. During this discussion, we talked about the tentative plans for course development made in layer four in relation to the end-of-course questionnaire data. We also discussed how the journal summary information from layer three related to these end-of-course evaluations. Now we felt prepared to make some decisions.

Practicality

When developing a course, a good deal of discussion should occur. In a team-teaching situation, it is impractical not to have on-going discussions with teaching partners about the course. This is simply a natural part of team-teaching.

Relevance of Information

The end-of-course evaluation adds another layer of data to the process. Given that learners are asked to evaluate tasks from three angles, include comments specifically about each task, as well as comment about the course as a whole, this is useful additional information for course development. By adding this new layer of data we continue to employ the dynamic form of research called *triangulation*. Learners get a final opportunity to reflect on and evaluate the course tasks. Teachers can compare these evaluations with earlier ones and include this information in course development discussions. As the purpose of evaluation is to facilitate decision-making（Brown, 1989; Genesee & Upshur, 1996）, this depth of investigation adds to the teacher's understanding of learners' views on the course.

**Key Points About Further Teacher Reflection**

- ➢ Reflection is a natural part of teaching and course development.
- ➢ Teachers can compare additional information with other data.
- ➢ Depth of investigation adds to teacher's understanding of learners' views.

## Discussion

The usefulness of the approach outlined above can be illustrated by how it confirmed for me and my teaching partner what we thought we knew, and helped us discover things we did not know. "[S]econd language evaluation is concerned with making decisions about instruction or plans for instruction" (Genesee & Upshur, 1996, p. 3). The multi-layered approach is focused on evaluation of tasks. This fact makes it highly useful for decision-making as tasks can be modified or replaced. Furthermore, the information collected at each stage is relatively easy to synthesize since it is focused. This provides teachers with highly focused information that can be used to guide course development decisions.

Because this was a course aimed at preparing students to study abroad at English-speaking universities, we felt it essential to include research projects. But our evaluations revealed that we and some learners felt exhausted after completing two extensive research projects. Even some of the top students mentioned getting lost in these projects. My partner concluded in 2002 that we needed to "drop" the task. In reflective discussions, however, she recalled that "learning how to do research" was cited as being important by most students. Journal data and end-of-course surveys strongly indicated that we needed to retain a research project of some kind. This confirmed what we knew from our experience in the programme. Our decision was not to drop research tasks, but to make them more transparent, less extensive and more directly related to the student interests revealed in evaluations.

The reflective journals also showed us that we had a different focus in the course than our learners. Our journal entries revealed that we were concerned with processes (i.e., research skills) whereas students focused on learning content. Many students wrote that they learnt about Japanese society and culture change. Others

mentioned becoming more aware of their own actions and assumptions. By systematically analyzing and interpreting data we were able to see our blind spots. For instance, my partner stated in a later reflection that she lost sight of students' learning about the content of their research projects. She wrote: "While we were focusing on how students analyzed and synthesized data they gathered, students were focusing on what they were learning as a result of doing the research."

Converging views are easily dealt with in planning. When perceptions of learning tasks diverge between teachers and students, a deeper level of reflection is required. Student perceptions should have a major influence on course development decisions, but teacher views hold considerable weight as teachers have the power to direct a course. With two year's worth of experience and comparative data backing us, we felt a sense of empowerment. That is, the knowledge that we had gained gave us confidence that the changes we would make to the course would actually be improvements. This is the main indicator of the usefulness of the approach for course development.

This approach to task evaluation is "a kind of action research that enhances common sense, a form of inquiry that builds on and feeds back to modify what we already know-in-practice" (Schon, 1995, p. 34). Teachers' knowledge cannot be discounted. However, this knowledge encompasses only part of the story of classroom interaction. With the multiple perspectives offered by the approach described in this paper, a more holistic picture of learning can be built. As Breen explains, "A learner will define the purpose of the task through his or her orientation in the *value* of the task personally" (1987, p. 26). Having access to students' interpretations of tasks has a clarifying effect that is empowering to teachers. My teaching partner and I felt empowered to take action to improve our course and, indeed, saw ways to do so.

## Conclusion

I have described an alternative method for teachers to discover learner perceptions of class activities. Instead of the published studies that feature learner diaries written

by linguists（McDonough, 2002）, this is a case of regular students and their teachers recording impressions of learning. Unique to this approach is that teachers and learners evaluate tasks in tandem. The journals are not as wide open as dialogue journals. They resemble learning logs since they are structured with prompts and describe learning（Genesee & Upshur, 1996）. Journals are a preferred method for collecting data on student perceptions（Genesee & Upshur, p. 260）. Their major strength is that they are under the control of students. All other evaluation methods according to Genesee and Upshur, are controlled by teachers, including interviews which seem to be the most popular method for probing student perceptions. While journals can be problematic（Anderson, 1992; Barkhuizen, 1995）, they can also encourage some learners who may be reluctant to speak up in classes（Nunan, 1988）. This is quite attractive for Japan.

The approach illustrated in this paper is multi-layered. Because of the widely acknowledged influence of learners on lesson outcomes（Breen, 1989; Nunan, 1988）, task-based pedagogy success is measured by teachers on the “degree to which teacher intentions and learner interpretation of a given task converge”（Kumaravadivelu, 1991, p. 100）. Concern for closing this gap in perceptions evolved the multi-layered approach to task evaluation, the purpose of which was to facilitate decision-making. When making decisions about courses, experts advise to gather as much information as possible from different perspectives（Brown, 1989; Burns, 1999; Genesee & Upshur, 1996）. Since there were two teachers involved, this was a case of tandem learning or collaborative action research. Combining different methods and perspectives can give collaborative research more reliability and validity than individual action research（Burns, p. 25）. I maintain that the approach used in this study contrasts with the norm of intuitive reflection as there is a genuine research process of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, this study is grounded in the expanding area of “new scholarship” that views action research by teachers as one valid form of scholarship（Boyer, 1990; Schon, 1995; Zeichner, 1999）.

This paper details how teachers evaluated course tasks in tandem with their

students and later compiled and analyzed the data in tandem to try and improve a learning situation. The approach is a combination of *illuminative* and *formative* evaluation. Illuminative because it "seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the process of teaching and learning" (Richards, 2001, p. 289) and formative as it is concerned with "ongoing development and improvement" of a course (Richards, p. 288). Illuminative evaluation is useful for understanding learner perceptions of lessons (Block, 1998; Sharp, 1990). As it incorporates data from learners in curriculum development decisions, the approach is learner-centred (Nunan, 1988). If learning diaries or logs are kept only by teachers, their viewpoint simply gets reinforced (McDonough, 1994), thus serving to perpetuate teacher-centredness. The evaluative approach described above is an attempt to correct this bias toward teachers by employing the principles of tandem learning in new ways.

The underlying principles of tandem learning are reciprocity, commitment and autonomy. In the process this paper describes students and teachers show their commitment by completing the in-class learning logs together. Since the information sought by the learning log prompts is authentic, the condition of authentic communication with a native speaker demanded by tandem learning theory is at least partially met (University of Sheffield, n.d.). The co-teachers further express a commitment to course development by analyzing the data with care and engaging in acts of reflective teaching.

Reciprocity occurs on a number of planes in this process. First, in the common sense of 'reciprocity' used in descriptions of tandem learning, that is, students worked together in groups and helped one another in language learning activities. Second, through a collaborative action research dynamic, the two co-teachers reflected on their teaching in a more methodical and deeper way than normal. In effect, they worked reciprocally by being sounding boards for individual interpretations of classroom interaction. What transpired was that aspects of these individual interpretations became junctions for reciprocal professional development exchanges as they were shared and discussed. Third, the student learning logs impacted the development of the course over a two-year period in significant ways.

Although this instance of reciprocity was the weakest in this process, because the impact was delayed until the course was revised, it arguably had the greatest impact overall.

Finally, the notion of autonomy is woven throughout the multi-layered process for task evaluation. Each participant evaluates course tasks independently. This reflects the basic idea of autonomous learning that learners must take responsibility for their own learning. Through the independent learning logs, each student has control over their evaluation of the classroom task within the framework of the question prompts. The logs are anonymous so students are encouraged to reply honestly to the writing prompts. The same is true for the teachers, and it should be stressed that teachers are learners as well. This is what makes the process an example of tandem learning. Teacher autonomy ultimately develops out of deeper understanding of classroom interaction and student attitudes toward activities in lessons. The multi-layered approach to task evaluation can help teachers to gain the insights they need to develop their pedagogy in ways that students will appreciate. Thus, the reciprocal nature of this commitment toward deeper understanding reveals the underlying connection between teacher and learner autonomy illustrated by this example of learning in tandem.

## References

Alexander, N.（2001）. A long day's journal into night: A primer on writing dialogue journals with adolescent ESL students. In J. Burton & M. Carroll（Eds.）, *Journal writing*（pp. 23-35）. Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Allwright, D.（1984）. Why don't learners learn what we teach? –The interaction hypothesis. In D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little（Eds.）, *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*（pp. 3-18）. Dublin: IRAAL.

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M.（1991）. *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, J.（1992）. Journal writing: The promise and the reality. *Journal of*

*Reading, 36* (4), 304-309.

Bailey, K. M. (1990). The use of diary studies in teacher education programs. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 215-226). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Voices from the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Barkhuizen, G. P. (1995). Dialogue journals in teacher education revisited. *College ESL*, 5 (1), 22-35.

Barkhuizen, G. P. (1998). Discovering learners' perceptions of ESL classroom teaching/learning activities in a South African context. *TESOL Quarterly, 32* (1), 85-108.

Block, D. (1996). A window on the classroom: Classroom events viewed from different angles. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 168-194). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. N. Candlin & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Language learning tasks* (pp. 23-46). Lancaster Practical Papers in English Language Education 7. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M. (1991). Understanding the language teacher. In R. Phillipson, L. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 222-241). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Burns, A.（1999）. *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M.（2001）. Introduction. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain（Eds.）, *Researching pedagogic tasks*（pp. 1-20）Harlow, UK: Longman.

Daloglu, A.（2001）. Fostering reflective teaching from the start: Journal keeping in preservice teacher education. In J. Burton & M. Carroll（Eds.）, *Journal writing*（pp. 87-100）. Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Edge, J.（2002）. *Continuing cooperative development*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. A.（1996）. *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R.（Eds.）.（2002）. *Teachers' narrative inquiry as professional development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B.（1991）. Language-learning tasks: Teacher intention and learner interpretation. *ELT Journal, 45*（2）, 98-107.

Kumaravadivelu, B.（2003）. *Beyond methods*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G.（1985）. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Long, M., & Crookes, G.（1993）. Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass（Eds.）, *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice*（pp. 9-53）. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

MacKay, A., Oates, K., & Haig, Y.（2000）. Negotiated evaluation in a primary ESL context. In M. P. Breen & A. Littlejohn（Eds.）, *Classroom decision-making*（pp. 44-54）. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McDonough, J.（1994）. A teacher looks at teachers' diaries. *ELT Journal, 48*（1）, 57-65.

McDonough, J.（2002）. The teacher as language learner: Worlds of difference? *ELT*

*Journal, 56* (4), 404-411.

Murphy, J., & Byrd, P. (2001). *Understanding the courses we teach*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculu*m. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Peyton, J. K., & Reed, L. (1990). *Dialogue journal writing with nonnative English speakers: A handbook for teachers*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Peyton, J. K., & Staton, J. (1993). *Dialogue journals in the multinational classroom: Building language fluency and writing skills through written interaction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Quirke, P. (2001). Maximizing student writing and minimizing teacher correction. In J. Burton & M. Carroll (Eds.), *Journal writing* (pp. 11-22). Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schon, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change, 27* (6), 26-34.

Sharp, A. (1990). Staff/student participation in course evaluation: A procedure for improving course design. *ELT Journal, 44* (2), 132-137.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17* (1), 38-62.

Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 268-286.

Stewart, T., Sagliano, M., & Sagliano, J. (2002). Merging expertise: Developing partnerships between language and content specialists. In J. Crandall & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in higher education settings*

(pp. 29-44). Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Stewart, T. (2007a). Learners and teachers evaluating course tasks together. *ELT Journal, 61* (3), 256-266.

Stewart, T. (2007b). Faculty development and the promotion of autonomous learning practices. *Report of MEXT Project Grant for Advanced Educational Practice Support*, Kumamoto University, 95-112.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

University of Sheffield (n.d.). Language learning in tandem. Retrieved November 1, 2007 from http://www.shef.ac.uk/mirrors/tandem/learning/idxeng11.html

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 28* (9), 4-15.

***Appendix A: Sample In-class Student Journal Entry***

Layer 1

Activity #6: Final Research Project

1) Were you absent for part of this activity?

No.

2) What did you learn from this activity?

I learned how to collect the data. There are some ways to collect the data. Observation, interview, questionnaire and counting number are used when I did research project. "Thick description" is also good practice to describe for me.

3) How much did you learn from this activity?

I learned much (3).

4) Explain your reasons for the above rating.

I learned many things from this activity. For example, we learned hypothesis. I think it is useful because I have to write senior thesis. When I write senior thesis, I have to make good hypothesis. Research project is good practice for senior thesis. However, I knew that collecting the data is difficult. I interviewed some workers in arcade, but almost all worker rejected my interview.

Reproduction of student #20 journal written in class 6/26/02.

***Appendix B: Sample Teacher Journal Entry***

Layer 2

Teacher A Date: June 26, 2002 Activity: Final Research Project
Journal entry #6

2) It seems to me that the students are beginning to learn how to put a research project together and complete it. They generated the topics for research with some examples coming from us. We formed the working groups based on their choice of topic. They then wrote questions about things they would like to learn about their topic. Next, they grouped the questions and formed categories of study using the research plan for project number one that we gave to them. After they wrote hypotheses which we checked. Once they were ready, we let them type up their research plan in the CCR. All of this was review from the model project on restaurants. They then went into the field and collected data and brought it back for analysis. So they should have learned something about developing a research idea into a plan with specific questions and definitions, and collecting and analysing data.

3) I think that much (3) learning was generated by this task.

4) The fact that most of the students could come up with reasonable hypotheses and definitions of key terms without much comment from us indicates success. Another indicator is the fact that they all were able to organize their research and findings for analysis. The harder part will be whether they can explain how their data relates to their hypothesis and then make conclusions drawing on course concepts to make their analysis meaningful. But at this stage in the project, I think we can see evidence of success. They still need a lot of help with the process and with the logic of their own plans but overall seem to have an idea of how to proceed with this kind of research.

## *Appendix C: Teacher Journal Summary Sample*

Layer 3

Final Research Project

| Teacher A | Teacher B |
|---|---|
| STUDENT LEARNING:<br><br>➢ difficulty of doing research and analysis<br>➢ developing a research idea into a plan with specific questions and definitions, and collecting and analysing data. | STUDENT LEARNING:<br><br>➢ I think they learned how to think and communicate systematically. Beginning with inkling, a question, or a guess (hypothesis), they went about seeking information to confirm or disconfirm their guesses.<br>➢ Perhaps this activity is also too oblique for the students<br>➢ Should consider replacing it. |
| Rating: 3.5 | Rating: 3 |
| REASONS FOR RATING:<br><br>➢ majority of Ss able to write reasonable hypotheses, many need prompts from us<br>➢ all were able to organize their research and findings for analysis<br>➢ analysis remained weak<br>➢ Better students forced to carry some of weaker ones | REASONS FOR RATING:<br><br>➢ learned about research method in a passing sort of way<br>➢ dissatisfied with their ability to make inferences about their data<br>➢ The learning outcomes achieved did not measure up to the length of time it took to do the project |

### *Appendix D: Student Journal Summary Sample*

Layer 3

Final Research Project

| **WHAT STUDENTS SAID THEY LEARNED** | **Journal No.** |
|---|---|
| 1. I learned that there are small cultures everywhere in society. | 1 |
| 2. I learned new information about our chosen research topic. [big connection between topic and Jpn culture] | 1, 3, 4, 7, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 |
| 3. I'd like to do more thorough research. [need to spend more time to prepare a detailed research plan] | 1, 3 |
| 4. I found it interesting to do original research and test my own hypotheses. | 3, 10 |
| 5. I learned how to do research. [observation, learned to observe carefully, reporting, hypothesis, comparison, thick description good practice for me] | 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21 |
| 6. I learned about Japanese culture today. | 4, 15, 21 |
| 7. I enjoyed the group work. [saw importance of good group work] | 4, 13, 14 |
| 8. I think the project was too long; I was exhausted. | 5 |
| 9. I learned that it is important to ask questions. | 9 |
| 10. I saw how difficult it is to write good hypotheses and plan how to test them. | 11 |
| 11. I think this project is useful preparation for study abroad &/or other MIC classes. | 11, 20, 22 |

### *Appendix E: Sample of Additional Teacher Reflections on Journal Data*

Layer 4

October 2002
***Final Research Project***

Teacher B:
Again the length of these projects is something that concerns both of us. And one student mentioned feeling exhausted by the final project. My impression is that we need to focus more directly on aspects of Japanese culture using sources from books and the internet as research material. As so many students mentioned again learning about how to do research, it indicates that we should include some research project. At least three mentioned how they enjoyed the group work involved. Developing much shorter research projects and/or including more checkpoints along the way could better ensure that some students don't do the lion's share of the work.

Teacher A:
My partner's ratings of the research related tasks in the course indicate her frustration with the projects in terms of length and outcomes. In reading our journals it doesn't seem that either one of us is content that the outcomes have been equal to the time and effort expended. For example, I stated in my journal reflection that conclusions drawn were not well connected to the course. I felt that we did a better job at this last year. This point, of course, gets back to our shared concern over devising a theoretical framework for the course that is as useful and meaningful as it is transparent to the students.

### *Appendix F: Sample of 2002 End-of-Course Questionnaire Data*

Layer 5

**(Ratings on 4.0 scale)**

| ACTIVITY | ENJOYMENT | ENGLISH | CONTENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Model Research Project** | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| **Final Research Project** | 3.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 |

**Overall average: 3.6**