

The Role of Task Analysis in Promoting Learner Self-Management¹

By Joan Rubin and Patricia McCoy

Planning is one of the most important procedures in Learner Self-Management (LSM) that expert learners use to be successful in their language learning. Of the four major components of planning (defining/selecting goals; setting criteria to measure goal achievement; task analysis; and setting a time line), Task Analysis, while frequently cited, has not been extensively incorporated into the promotion of LSM.

This paper will detail and then illustrate our development of Wenden's (1995) tripartite task analysis--i.e. task purpose, task classification, and task demands. It will then present our analysis of how these three components interact and are mutually dependent. The paper will conclude with the results of an experiment to determine the effects of promoting detailed task analysis on learners' language performance and feelings of self-efficacy.

Task Analysis

In order to understand the role of task analysis, it is important to understand its place in the entire set of metacognitive procedures. Following Rubin, 2001 and Rubin 2005, there are five major procedures: planning, monitoring, evaluating, problem-identification/problem-solution, and implementation of a problem-solution.

Task Analysis (TA) is part of planning. Planning usually begins with a Task (that is, some activity the teacher assigns or learners assign themselves). Based on their understanding of the task, the learner establishes a **Goal**, that is, whatever aspect of language he/she wants to learn and considers which criteria (behavior) will confirm that the learner has accomplished his/her goal. At this point the learner is ready to carry out TA. Once learners complete their task analysis, they are ready to make an action plan.

Wenden, 1995, suggested that there were three parts to Task Analysis: Task Purpose, Task Classification, and Task Demands. Task Purpose answers the question "Why bother?" This provides the motivation for carrying out the task. Most academic learners only consider pedagogical reasons such as "to pass the course" or "to get a good grade" but when learners are able to associate a task with one of their life purposes, their motivation is much stronger. Task Classification asks three questions: What kind of task is this? What do I know about the task? and How do I feel about the task? The answer to Task Classification is dependent on the learner's goal and to some extent on his/her Task Purpose.² Finally, Task Demands uses the results of Task Classification to consider the

¹ Published in slightly modified form in: 2008. In C. Griffiths, ed. Lessons from the Good Language Learner. Cambridge University Press

Our sincere thanks to Joie Starr for the statistical analysis, and to Pilar Caamano and Vicky de la Garza for serving as Control Teachers.

² For example, if a listening task is the basis for a debate, then the learner needs to consider the characteristics of a debate as well as of listening.

following questions: How do I feel about the Task? and What strategies and actions could I use?

With the information gleaned from TA, the learner is ready to establish an action plan and determine a time line. Without an adequate TA the learner's approach to a task is very much a 'hit and miss' approach that doesn't allow the learner to take charge of their learning.

Following is an example of a Task Analysis³:

Task: To listen to an interview
Task Goal: To find out what some positions on Mexican-American immigration are
Task Purpose: Because I have relatives in the United States

Task Classification	Task Demands
<i>Nature of Listening:</i> No word boundaries, Importance of intonation in English	Think about rising and falling intonation
<i>Genre:</i> An interview consists of Qs and As	Try to predict Qs and/or As
<i>Rhetoric Style:</i> Expository, might be persuasive	If it is persuasive, I should listen for reasons or propositions or maybe some sort of support for the propositions.
<i>Language:</i> Fairly formal, hence more complex, might be planned (hence little slang)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider connectors that make language more formal. 2. Consider whether there are any 'compare and contrast' examples or any 'cause and effect' arguments. 3. Look for what is topicalized and what is put in the background.
<i>Vocabulary:</i> Words relating to immigration, border problems, benefits, liabilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Migrant labor, illegal, green card 2. Coyote, vigilante groups, 3. Willing and available labor, direct aid 4. Cost of patrolling, English classes, health care and education
<i>Background Knowledge:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Know a little about immigration but not much about the contributions or liabilities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Read an article about the latest the speaker has said about this topic or what the interviewer's opinion is about the topic

³ Obviously, these are just illustrative of how a learner, following the categories listed, might classify the task and identify possible strategies to address aspects of this classification. Every learner may bring different background knowledge or feelings about the topic and task as well as consider different aspects of vocabulary, language, rhetoric or genre. Depending on their experience and training, learners can be expected to have different knowledge about a particular skill.

2. Don't know much about the interviewer	2. Read reports about the topic
<p><i>Feelings about the topic and task:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am a little familiar with interviews so I think I can do the task. 2. I am very interested in the topic so I will work hard. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think I have enough time to do a good job 2. I am not worried about listening but I need to pay attention. 3. I will need to find time to get the reading done. 4. I need to clear my mind so I can attend to the task

In this example, we can observe the following sequence:

1. The learner is given a task "To listen to an interview"⁴
2. The learner decides WHAT he/she will listen to: "A discussion about immigration" Then, the learner determines what it is he/she wants to learn from the interview in this case "some positions on Mexican American immigration."
3. The learner may at the same time consider his/her purpose for doing this task or have chosen this topic because he/she had a good reason for learning about the topic.
4. The learner then starts to do some task analysis, first considering task classification and possibly at the same time, thinking about the task demands (that is, how they will accomplish the task).
5. In this example, the learner considers 7 aspects of the task:
 - a. Skill: The nature of listening
 - b. Genre: That is, the type of text, basic structure or organization of the text⁵
 - c. Rhetoric style: the ways ideas are organized
 - d. Language: characteristics of the language: formal/informal; planned/unplanned; level of syntactic complexity
 - e. Vocabulary: kinds of words related to the topic
 - f. Knowledge about topic and personages
 - g. Feelings about topic and task
6. While or after doing task classification, the learner uses the information to consider how he/she will accomplish the task. The learner may come up with

⁴ In some cases, the teacher may give the topic; nonetheless, the learner needs to decide what he/she will focus on, that is, his/her own Goal.

⁵ Recent work by Heidi Byrnes and her colleagues (see Genre List for Fall 2003 on their webpage:

<http://www3.georgetown.edu/departments/german/programs/curriculum/genresleveliiiv>)

on raising learner awareness of the role of genre appears to have improved the proficiency of German students from beginning to advanced learners.

a large number of possible strategies to deal with aspects of the task classification. Only when he/she creates an action plan will he/she make the final determination of how he/she is going to proceed.

Role of Metacognitive Knowledge

In order to plan, learners need knowledge and the more knowledge they have the more skilled they can be at planning. The relationship of knowledge to procedures was clearly and repeatedly outlined by Wenden, 1995, 1998, and 2001 and elaborated by Rubin, 2001 and Rubin, 2005. In the Rubin model, there are five kinds of knowledge:

1. task knowledge (knowledge about kinds of purposes, kinds of tasks, kinds of demands)
2. self knowledge (knowledge about one's learning style and the kind of things that motivate a learner)
3. strategy knowledge (knowledge about cognitive and affective strategies and how these interact with particular kinds of tasks)
4. background/prior knowledge (what learners know about the target language, their own language, other languages, and about the culture of the target language as well as textual, contextual, and world knowledge)
5. beliefs about learning and about language learning

Task analysis requires that learners bring all of their knowledge to the process. In addition, they need to be ready to develop new knowledge to accomplish the task.

Our work on Task Analysis builds on Wenden's tri-partite description of Task Analysis by spelling out more detailed task classification, by linking task demands directly to task classification and task purpose, and by clearly separating goal from task purpose.

Implications of Task Analysis for Novice Learners

Novice learners often do little or no planning before beginning a task so that a task analysis approach is one that requires a fair amount of modeling and coaching for learners to be able to use this important tool. What we advocate is that teachers help learners develop sufficient skill in approaching a task until these learners can be successful working on their own.

Having elaborated Wenden's Task Analysis, we wanted to determine whether the ability to do task analysis could be successfully promoted and whether this knowledge and skill would have an effect on learner performance. We set up an experiment to test this.

Our Experiment

The sample. The experiment was conducted in the Language Department at a major private university in Mexico. Four sections of the same EFL course, LE 102, participated. Pat McCoy taught the two experimental sections and two colleagues, both highly

evaluated instructors, each taught a control group. The number of students per class was similar but not equal.

Chart I: Experimental Groups

Control one N=17	Experimental one N=19
Control two N=21	Experimental two N=20
TOTAL = 38	TOTAL = 39

The course. The course used for the experiment, LE102, is primarily a reading and writing course at the intermediate level. There is a unique aspect to this course: it was designed to give students that need it an extra semester at the same intermediate level before going on to a much tougher reading and writing course at a low advanced level LE201. Thus, the learning objectives of this course are very similar to the previous one. The text is different, and there is more reading and writing, but grammatical structures are recycled, not new. About 90 percent of the previous LE 101 student population take this course instead of skipping it. Chart II shows how these courses fit together.

Chart II: Required English Courses

101	TOEFL range 400-459	Four skills course	Students place into this course.
102	TOEFL range 430-459	Emphasis on reading & writing	Students with grade of 89% or lower in 101
201	TOEFL range 460-499	Reading & writing	Placement, 101, or 102

General characteristics of the learners in LE102.

We were keen to try out Task Analysis at this level because of the challenge of this student population. Most of the students view their English classes as a burdensome requirement, and not a tool for future endeavors.

Here are some general characteristics of the LE102 population:

1. There is a 30-40% failure rate, both for this course (102) and for the previous English course (101) taken at this university.
2. 10% of the students in the sample had taken this course, or the previous one, several times before, either because they failed it or because they dropped it.
3. Low motivation. Students would often suggest to the teacher that they go eat breakfast

rather than stay in class, and would start getting ready to leave about ten minutes before the class was over.

4. High absenteeism and failure to turn in assignments.
5. Students often use inappropriate study strategies, for example, students would limit their studying to reading textbook pages without engaging in productive tasks.
6. Student learning behaviors are not consistent with stated beliefs. For example, one student stated that it was very important to create a system to identify one's own errors but seldom did it.

The Experimental Group: The Task Analysis Instruction

Our experiment used Task Analysis instruction in the expectation that it would contribute to the difference between success and failure at this level through the use of appropriate planning procedures.

In the two experimental groups, Task Analysis was regularly presented throughout the semester, while this was not routinely provided in the control groups.⁶ In what follows, we present an example of how TA was presented. In this case, the task assigned was a writing task.

The first step was to establish SMART goals for the writing task. Students worked through exercises like the one below.

TASK ANALYSIS EXERCISE

Establish SMART goal, purpose, and criteria for evaluation:

S = specific M= measurable A= attainable R = relevant T = time based
--

GIVEN THE TASK:

To write a five paragraph composition (introduction/body/conclusion) about traditional versus alternative medicine.

CLARIFY MY PURPOSE (AND HOW IMPORTANT THE TASK IS):

1. To comply with a class assignment
2. Practice writing

⁶ However, one of the control group teachers, Control 2, often sent her learners to the McCoy's web page so there was some contamination.

3. Prepare for future study abroad program where I will need to write in English
CONSIDER TIME I HAVE TO ACCOMPLISH THE TASK:
15 days (given the complexity of the writing task, time is an important factor)
ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION:
Use the checklist provided for you to make sure the composition is complete and correct. (List created through discussion with student input included as well as instructor's suggestions)

Much scaffolding was required throughout the process of getting learners to state their SMART goals. Particularly challenging for learners was establishing criteria for evaluation. In fact, we provided much of the information because learners could not come up with evaluation criteria on their own, nonetheless, any student-generated criteria were also included (see Appendix 1 for the checklist of criteria).

After goal setting, we worked on task classification. Since this was new to the students, we provided the larger categories of what was involved as part of the scaffolding. For a writing task, this classification included genre, rhetorical style, audience, informational content, different aspects of language, self-knowledge, and time frame. We used a table design so that students could write down their task demands directly to the right of the task classification. This visual scheme made sense for the students, and resulted in a long list of choices for creating the action plan. See Appendix 2 for an example of what the Task Classification and Task Demands looked like when we worked through the process in class.

Then, the experimental group worked on developing an action plan using the form below.

Your action plan
Given everything you have considered above, what will you do to write this composition? Think of possibly doing it in parts (body, introduction, conclusion, revision and editing)
First I will...
Then I will...
Next I will...
Continue the action plan...
Finally, I will use the checklist to verify I have reached my goal.

The students looked at the strategies they had proposed in the right hand column of task demands, and selected those strategies they deemed appropriate for themselves. We reminded them not to lose sight of the criteria for evaluation as they set up their action plan.

The complete task analysis form was available on McCoy's web page for students to consult. It was constantly updated as the semester progressed.⁷

McCoy's class presentations, linked to her web page as power point lessons, also included task classification and demands in order to model them for different skills.

The students then followed their own action plan for the assigned writing task. As a final step, they were asked to evaluate how well the action plan worked for them using the following form.

Using the action plan

What did you end up doing? State specifically every action you did.
How did that work for you?
What adjustments would you consider for the next time?

The Control Group

The control group was not taught Task Analysis. However, all foreign language learners are expected to complete weekly tasks in the Self-Access Center that foster learner self-management. See Appendix 3 for their weekly report form used in the Self-Access Center.

As noted above, the teacher in Control Group 2, recommended McCoy's web page to her students, thus, those students that used McCoy's web page to complement their instruction had some exposure to Task Analysis.

Measures

We used two different measures to determine if there were any differences between the control and experimental groups.

1. Change in Language Ability was measured by the departmental final exam which all students at a particular level take.
2. Measure of Task Analysis. See Appendix 4 for the Task Analysis Questionnaire which both control and experimental learners took at the beginning and end of the semester. The tasks for the pre- and post-questionnaires were different.

⁷ To see how TA fit into McCoy's course, look on her webpage (<http://www.udlap.mx/~mccoy>) and check under LE 102.

As a limitation, it is useful to note that the evaluation of academic performance is based solely on the final exam. Additional correlations could be made with other indicators of academic performance (e.g. midterm or a series of quizzes) but time did not permit this in this course.

Results

The comparative experiment used two groups of language students; a control group consisting of 38 students who were not given specialized Task Analysis training (although indirect training and exposure exist as part of the syllabus) and an experimental group consisting of 39 students who received additional specialized instruction and practice in the fundamentals of Task Analysis.

The primary variables considered were Task Analysis ability and the Final Exam Score.⁸

Comparison of Average Loss/Gain on Task Analysis

In comparing the pre-scores on Task Analysis (see Table 1 below), we can see there is no significant difference between the groups (both scored 94). That is, both groups started with about the same amount of Task Analysis knowledge.

However, after instruction in Task Analysis, the comparison between the post-test scores of the combined Experimental Groups and the combined Control Groups was significant at the .01 level. The Experimental groups improved their TA scores by +1.44 whereas the change in the Control groups was only +.96.

TABLE 1
TASK ANALYSIS SCORES

Class	# of students doing Task Analysis	Total Score Pre-TA	Total Score Post-TA	Difference Between Pre- & Post TA	Average Loss/Gain On T.A.
Control 1 (05)	12	41	36	-05	5/12= -.41
Control 2 (07)	19	53	61	+08	8/19= +.42 ⁹
TOTAL	31	94	97	+3	3/31= +.096

⁸ We also asked learners to fill out a measure of autonomy and self-efficacy but this did not yield any significant results.

⁹ As can be noted, students in the 07 Control Section did better than those in the 05 section. We attribute this to the fact that the 07 section consisted of younger students who may not have been contaminated by the negative reputation of the course and perhaps by the fact that some may have looked at McCoy's web page.

Experiment 2 (09)	15	44	61	+17	17/15= +1.13
Experiment 1 (08)	14	50	75	+25	25/14= +1.79
TOTAL	29	94	136	+42	42/29= +1.44

Comparison on the Final Exam Score

Looking at Table 2 below, we observe that the Experimental groups significantly outperformed the Control Groups on the final exam. 61.5% of the Experimental Groups got a passing grade of 75% or higher on the final exam, while only 52.6% of the Control Groups got a passing grade on the final exam.

TABLE 2
FINAL EXAM SCORES

Class	# of Students	Passed Final Exam (75% or higher)	% Pass
Control 1 (05)	17	8	47%
Control 2 (07)	21	12	57%
TOTAL	38	20	52.6%
Experiment 2 (09)	20	12	60%
Experiment 1 (08)	19	12	63%
TOTAL	39	24	61.5%

Comparison of Gains on TA scores and Exam Performance

The correlation between TA total scores and final exam scores of the two groups, Experimental and Control, although not a strong predictor of final exam scores, does suggest a positive linear correlation—that is, the final exam scores tend to generally increase with Task Analysis knowledge. Although this is a fairly weak correlation, it could change significantly with a much larger sample.

Summary and Discussion

Our results indicate that learners can improve their ability to do TA with intensive instruction. In addition to the improved TA scores, the Experimental Groups evidenced greater mention of emotions, of the time needed to accomplish a task, of the need to pay attention while working and of the need to have a good attitude when studying. Also, in the language used to reply to the TA task, in the pre-test both Experimental and Control groups often responded with one or two words while in the Post-test, the Experimental Groups wrote several lines of relevant information.

We might also note that there was some evidence that students did continue to use Task Analysis after this course: in one case, a student who had taken LE 102 five times, took the next course in the summer and passed it with a grade of 9; another learner reported that he had begun apply Task Analysis to his architecture classes.

On the other hand, there are some things that appear to be hard to change. These include the following:

1. Even though we provided a fair amount of instruction to be able to state SMART goals, learners found this difficult to do and evidently, needed more scaffolding.
2. Learners had difficulty distinguishing between a Goal (that is, **what** you want to learn) and a Purpose (that is, **why** you want to learn it)
3. Probably the part of TA that requires the most instruction and is most critical for a learner to be able to self-manage is the ability to state criteria for success. What we aimed for was the ability to have some observable measure that you have learned something (i.e. reached your Goal) **before** taking a quiz or an exam, **not after the fact** through a quiz grade or final exam grade. Our goal was that learners checked to verify that they had covered all the important indicators of learning.

Although expert learners use their knowledge to do TA and are continually revising their planning skills; for most novice learners, TA is new and requires lots and lots of scaffolding. With instruction it can enable learners to gain control of the learning process. With adequate planning, learners are able to select “appropriate” strategies for a task, for their learning style, for their purpose and not just using strategies in a random fashion.

We believe this is the first experiment testing the effect of Task Analysis instruction and considering its impact on language performance. Given that this was a highly unmotivated group of students, we feel the instruction should be even more effective with language classes where the course does not have such a bad reputation (that is, one that is required and with a record of lots of failure).

References

- Rubin, J. 2005. The Expert Language Learner: A Review of Good Language Learner Studies and Learner Strategies. In K. Johnson (ed.) Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching. Basingstoke, Hants, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rubin, J. 2001. Language Learner Self-Management. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 11:1:25-37.

- Wenden, A. 2001. Metacognitive Knowledge in SLA: the Neglected Variable. In M.P. Breen (ed.) Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research. Harlow, Essex, U.K.: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Wenden, A. 1998. Metacognitive Knowledge and Language Learning. Applied Linguistics 19:4:515-537.
- Wenden, A. 1995. Learner Training in Context: A Knowledge-Based Approach. In L. Dickinson and A. Wenden (eds.) Special Issue on Autonomy System 23:2:183-194.

APPENDIX 1 Criteria for Evaluation

Introduction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The text begins with an introduction. • The introduction begins with an interest technique. • The topic is stated. • The author's point of view is stated.
Body
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each paragraph begins with a topic sentence. • The topic of the paragraph is explained or supported by four or five sentences that provide information. • The text has anecdotes and uses evocative words such as <i>imagine, consider, this could happen to you</i>, that relate the information directly to the reader. • The text uses adjectives, descriptions and details that make the information interesting.
Language
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vocabulary employed is correct for the sentence context. • Sentences are varied in length. • When a peer reads my work, he or she can readily understand it. • Connecting words are used where ideas change in order the make the relationship among ideas more clear. (Look for evidence of words list below) <p>'However...', 'although...', 'if so...', 'and so...', 'but...', 'clearly...', 'on the other hand...', 'therefore...', 'therefore...', 'supposing that...', 'furthermore...', 'looked at another way...', 'in contrast...', 'on the contrary...', etc.</p>
Conclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is short, no longer than 10 percent of the length of the text. • The conclusion uses specific concluding techniques such as a quote, a summary, a concluding story, a dramatic statement. • My view is emphasized or restated. • The peer who read my text can restate my viewpoint from reading the conclusion.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If necessary, my conclusion is emotional.
Mechanics (note: failure to note these grammar points are common to Spanish speakers)
<p>Subject-Verb agreement = the subject and the verb agree in number, or the subject is written.</p> <p>Verb tense = the verb tense used is correct for the context of the sentence.</p> <p>Gerund/infinitive = either a gerund or an infinitive is required here.</p> <p>Active/Passive = check active/passive usage</p> <p>Verb Form = check for correct verb form</p> <p>Punctuation = check for run on or other punctuation.</p> <p>Number = check for correct singular or plural (make sure adjectives are singular)</p> <p>Article (agreement/form) = check that article is present, correct, or not needed.</p> <p>Vocabulary = check for correct vocabulary usage.</p> <p>Pronoun = check that pronoun is correct and present.</p> <p>Preposition = check for correct preposition.</p> <p>Word order = check that word order is correct.</p> <p>Idiomatic Expression = check that the expression is stated correctly in English.</p> <p>Spelling = check for spelling errors</p>

APPENDIX 2 Example of Results of Class Discussion of Task Classification and Accompanying Task Demands

<p><i>What kind of a task is this? What do I know about this kind of task?</i></p> <p><u>“TASK CLASSIFICATION”</u></p>	<p><i>Given this classification, how am I going to accomplish this task? What strategies and actions could I use?</i></p> <p><u>“TASK DEMANDS”</u></p>
<p>Genre: What is the format and structure of this writing task?</p> <p>It is a composition, therefore the structure is: Introduction, Body, Conclusion</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anecdotes, stories, and surprising facts are good attention getters. 2. The body will provide reasons. 3. Strong quotes can be effective conclusion devices.

<p>Rhetoric: The style of the composition is persuasive. Therefore, the body will present a reason followed by an explanation.</p> <p>Emotions can be used to support the persuasion.</p> <p>The point of view might also refute the other viewpoint.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Persuasion can be accomplished by presenting reasons to believe, followed by sound evidence. 2. Use words to appeal to how the audience will feel about my viewpoint. 3. Paint pictures with words. 4. Have arguments to refute the other Point of view
<p>Audience: Information the audience already knows or believes about this topic.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does my audience already agree with me, or are they radically opposed?
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Is the audience my age? If not, how does that affect the arguments I might use? 3. Do we come from the same culture? If not, what do I need to consider? 4. What does my audience already know about my topic? 5. What might they not know, that I can use to persuade them?
<p>Information Content: Reasons (facts, anecdotes, numbers) that support the thesis.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider what I already know about this topic. 2. Find reasons and supporting data. 3. Select three reasons (ideas) to support my thesis. Think about my audience when selecting them. 4. Organize my ideas and details into an outline Use persuasive text patterns to organize the information.
<p>Language: Tone and vocabulary</p> <p>The writing is easy to follow.</p> <p>Language will evoke emotions.</p> <p>Vocabulary will be specific to the topic of alternative medicine, migraines, etc.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use connecting words or discursive markers (although, however, because, furthermore, etc) 2. Use words that involve the audience: Imagine you have terrible migraine headaches that send you to a dark and quiet room for two days at a time. 3. Identify (from information sources) vocabulary I can use in the essay.
<p>Language Mechanics The language is correct, including punctuation.</p>	<p>Use the checklist provided by instructor/counselor/peer</p>
<p>Language Knowledge needed to complete the task</p>	<p>Connectors, difference between nouns, adjectives, adverbs (happiness, happy, happily)</p>

Consider self-knowledge (emotions, beliefs, learning styles and preferences)	
Consider difficulty of the task for me. How might difficulty affect timing, support, strategies, etc.?	
Time needed to accomplish the task. Think about and plan how much time I will need to complete the language task: length of time; frequency of time on task; how many days, weeks, months	

APPENDIX 3 Report Form Used by Control Groups

In your log, you are required to discuss your goals, process and results for each learning activity you choose to work on in the CAL. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that you write in your log during the time you spend in the CAL¹⁰. Below are some suggested guideline questions you could discuss in your log. These are designed to help both you and your professor assess your needs and performance.

G O A L S

1. What did you want to learn with this activity?
2. Why did you think that this is important to learn?
3. How long did/do you plan to spend on this activity?
4. Do you think you needed or need more time to accomplish your goals? If so, how much time do you need?

P R O C E S S

1. Where and when did you do this activity?
2. Describe the activity
 - a. Did you work individually, with a partner or in a group?
 - b. What media did you work with (written, electronic, "human")?
 - c. What skill(s) did you practice (reading, writing, listening, speaking/pronunciation, grammar, spelling, vocabulary)?
 - d. What specific exercises did you do? (name texts, programs, activities, etc.)

R E S U L T S

1. What did you learn? For example:
 - a. Vocabulary

¹⁰ CAL is the Self-Access Center. This report is available on-line on the CAL webpage.

- b. Communication skills (describe the functions of the communication acts which you practiced)
- c. Grammar (describe the particular points you focused on)
- 2. Would you do this activity again? Why or why not?
- 3. Did you like this activity? Why? How do you think it helped you?
- 4. Would you recommend this activity to your friend or classmate? Why or why not?
- 5. Do you think this activity helped you prepare for future exams, classes? How?
- 6. How do you like to learn? Did you use this style in the CAL?
- 7. Did you ask for help from a CAL advisor? How did she/he help you?
- 8. Where and when in the CAL did you decide to work (computers, workshop, audio, etc.)?
- 9. Was it a good time to come to the CAL?
- 10. Any other comments you would like to make about your learning process in CAL?
- 11. Can you think of some other activities you can do to help yourself?

APPENDIX 4 Language Task Questionnaire

I want to learn a little about the way you approach class tasks. Please fill in the following form.

Here are 3 language tasks you may be asked to do in class:

(Note: These were used for the Pre-Test)

- a. Write approximately 300 words about the activities you do with your family.
- b. Read a newspaper article about sick people who refuse medical treatment.
- c. Use gerunds and infinitives correctly in sentences (*living* versus *to live*)

(Note: These were used for the Post-Test)

- a. Learn 20 vocabulary words related to child psychology
- b. Write an essay expressing your opinion about obligatory social service
- c. Teach the class how to make *huevos rancheros*.

Pick one task, and assume it is homework for tonight. Then answer the following questions about the task you chose.

1. Which task did you choose?	
2. What was your language goal for this task?	
3. What is your purpose for doing this task? What will you do with the	

information you get from this task?	
4. What do you know about this kind of task?	
5. In order to accomplish this task, what actions, knowledge and emotions will you need to consider?	
6. How exactly do you plan to work?	
7. How will you know you have reached your language goal? (stated in 2)	