SCHMIDT Maria Gabriela

Transparency and reflective learning - Using the CEFR in the classroom including classroom-diary and peer- / self-evaluation[1]

1   Introduction

This paper attempts to give examples on how transparency and reflective learning can be established in a foreign language teaching environment at university education in Japan, balancing the curriculum, textbook, learners' needs, teachers' role and assessment/evaluation. Transparency in teaching and learning foreign languages for all stake holders involved is one of the key points of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)[2]. The focus is to give students the opportunity to monitor and reflect on their learning and to get them involved in the evaluation process. The concept of the CEFR however seems to be quite abstract and the suggested tools of the language portfolio are in the range of the learner him-/herself and out of reach for the teacher. The pedagogic approach suggested here tries to facilitate the learning/teaching process by adapting CEFR-inspired techniques for classroom teaching. First, the author introduced a so-called "classroom diary", to give the students at the end of each lesson some minutes to take notes. Second, tasks were integrated in the classroom teaching with self- and peer-evaluation of the students. Finally, to include students in the overall evaluation, a final self-evaluation sheet was used. These measurements are intended to scaffold the process of learning and teaching and make it more transparent to the students. This paper gives examples of these implemented tools and discusses their value in relation to foreign language teaching and reflective learning.

2   Principles of the CEFR

The original purpose of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) includes promoting multilingualism and action-based learning for the purpose of developing autonomous, inter-culturally competent citizens[3]. The CEFR has a long history and was developed during the 1990's and conglomerated the main trends in foreign language teaching as were known up to that time: learner autonomy, task based teaching, pragmatics and culture[4]. Autonomy of the learner is not a concept unique to the CEFR. It is a basic concept of the CEFR, but it is originally related to the finding, that some learners are good learners, more successful than others[5]. A good learner is self-directed and using all tools that have been known in practice and confirmed by research in neuroscience:[6] (a) repeating regularly (spaced repetition), (b) try to apply what they learned, (c)

Transparency and reflective learning - Using the CEFR in the classroom including classroom-diary and peer- / self-evaluation[1]

19

reflect on learning, (d) monitor their learning. This is not exclusively related to foreign language learning as well. When reflective learning is discussed in this paper, it is related to the background of the CEFR. That is because the CEFR is a point of reference in foreign language teaching and its integrating conception[7]. The CEFR can become a shared point of reference, not a standard, to compare contextual choices (Coste 2007, pg. 42) in areas such as teaching methods, textbook development, assessment, etc. These are the pre-assumptions for this contribution.

The CEFR proposes a so-called language portfolio (ELP, European Language Portfolio) for all learners to take care of the evaluation and documentation of the acquired languages. A language portfolio consists of a language passport, a language biography and a dossier. The functions of the language portfolio are the following:

> The European Language Portfolio (ELP) is a document in which those who are learning or have learned a language - whether at school or outside school - can record and reflect on their language learning and cultural experiences. (Council of Europe *European Language Portfolio*).

The process of reflection is not only focused on the aspect of assessment but on reflecting on the process of learning and teaching in total. North calls this a "stimulus for reflection on current practice" (North 2014, pg.9). Learners should be able to evaluate their own learning by

(1) Compiling a language portfolio (European Language Portfolio, ELP)

(2) Using the self-evaluation grid with descriptors on six levels and four skills, resulting in can do-descriptors, and

(3) Preparing a learner biography with a dossier including various documents.

How to establish this approach in a Japanese learning environment on university level? Is it possible to introduce it? Will the students accept this kind of learner oriented approach? The background is that Japanese foreign language teaching, especially English, with the other languages as German, French, Chinese, is in a very strict test oriented corset. In this sense, the concept of the CEFR is the opposite as a more learner-oriented, life-long learning process. Sakai emphases that Japanese language teaching tries to avoid the taxonomy of *communicative categories*, which is one of the exact rationales behind the CEFR. The other problem is that, although the can-do descriptors are discussed, other principles of the CEFR are rarely mentioned (Sakai 2014, pg.76; Schmidt/ Runnels/ Nagai 2016, pg.24).

The rather abstract concept of reflective learning of the CEFR becomes more real with the three pedagogic tools suggested here for classroom teaching. The adapted versions of classroom diary, self- and peer-evaluation for tasks and the final-self-evaluation can help to bridge the gap between the outside-learner-oriented-side (CEFR) and the inside-classroom-needs (instructed teaching). It gives the learner a tool, to raise his/her awareness on the learning process and hands over responsibility for his/her language learning. To summarize the concept of instruction suggested here, see the following table:

Determine in-coming the level of the class					
Teaching material (e. g. textbook)					final-evaluation
classroom-teaching concept		Can do - task e. g. Speaking (single, group)	Self- and peer-evaluation and teacher --------- reflection	Assignment out of class homework mail ….	Can do-list	in total- self-evaluation - criteria - grade with reasoning <reflection>
class 1	class n+1 …					
Classroom diary						Evaluation by the teacher
Language and culture (pragmatics)						
Determine the out-going level						

Table 1: Overview of the meta-structure of classroom instruction

Yet, the CEFR should assist learners and teachers to coordinate their efforts. How can this gap be bridged? The next chapter will outline some practices used in classroom teaching, trying to bridge the gap between the research results and the classroom practice. Opinions from students will show their level of acceptance.

3   Adapting the tools of reflective learning for classroom use

3.1   Classroom diary - learner diary

A diary or a journal is a very personal and private item, and is normally not shared with anybody. A diary with notes on learning, a so-called *learner diary* (in German *Lernertagebuch*; in English *log-book, journal, reflective journal, diary*)[8] is supposed to be an important tool in self-directed learning, as it supports the meta-level of learning trough reflection and repetition. Because the learner does this in private, this is out of reach for the teacher. The same could be said of the function of the European Language Portfolio and the learner biography. These are tools for monitoring the individual progress on foreign language learning. They can be disclosed to the teacher, but they do not have to be disclosed, as they are private and individual. To ask the students to write a reflective journal and then read it as a teacher is a kind of bias. Reflection should support the more individual, cognitive process of learning. When it is used for evaluation, the original intention is put aside. How can this idea of a diary be integrated into classroom instruction? There are two ways discussed:

(1) The students write a journal on their lesson as homework. They turn it in in intervals. The teacher reads it, comments it and may assess it. This form of reflection and feedback is becoming recently very popular: Tim Murphey (1998) used log-books as reflective journal writing; H.Ogawa/ J.M.Hall (2011) used journal writing and peer evaluation and Y.Saito (2016) emphases on "Portfolio for English as a Tool for Global Communication". These are some examples among others.[9] One teacher mentioned that he/she uses the journal as a spaced repetition, as it is peer-evaluated at the beginning of the next lesson. He/she

assesses then the journal with the feedback in intervals.

Bringing this technique in a lesson-flow-scheme, the journal is written after the lesson and the feedback of the teacher is discontinued. The second version is that the journal is used as repetition for the next lesson, which is done through peer-evaluation:

(a) Lesson /> Journal as homework /> Lesson /> Teacher's feedback (in intervals) discontinued

(b) Lesson /> Journal as homework /> Lesson & Peer feedback as repetition; /> … /> Teacher's feedback – Peer feedback has the effect of spaced repetition

The way reflective journal writing is used in classroom instruction may depend on the classroom-management. A fresh written comment/feedback may focus on different aspects of the classroom instruction than a journal written as homework. Some students may be reluctant to write the journal thoroughly. If peers are involved it may benefit to raise more attention.

(2) <u>Some students write minutes of the lesson and submit it to the teacher.</u> The following week all students get the minutes. All members of the class will have a summary of the classroom-instruction. This is helpful for students who missed the class. But it does not involve the reflective part.[10]

(3) <u>The students write a classroom diary at the end of the lesson.</u> They have some minutes at the end of the lesson to write a short memo, what they have learned today, new expressions, questions and comments. They turn it in immediately at the end of each lesson. As the classroom-diary is written at the end of the lesson, the memory and emotional impression of the class is still vivid. The students should focus on this aspect, as this is important for the learning process. The teacher reads the classroom-diary and can use it as a teacher-student-communication tool. He/she is aware of the students' needs immediately after the lesson and can answer questions or react on irritations in the next lesson. As the time interval is shorter, it stays more related to the classroom interaction and the teaching contents.

3.2   Classroom diary as a practice tool

The author of this article used in 2004 for the first time a so-called "classroom diary" as a pilot study. The primary goal was, to make the process of learning and teaching, especially the unit of the lesson more structured, giving the lesson a starting and an ending point. Another aspect was to cope with utterances of students as: "I did study German for one year, but I really don't know anything". The second goal was to give the students the opportunity to reflect on their learning, to raise awareness. Students are able to monitor it consciously and write a memo. In order to do so, the students get a few minutes at the end of each lesson for taking notes on their fresh impression. They select the language of choice: Japanese, English and German. The original intention was to help students raising awareness. Yet, (as a teacher) reading the classroom-diary of the students, it was the other way round. The perception of the classroom interaction of the students in their written feedback made the process more transparent to the teacher. The immediate feedback of the students on the class is a real valuable treasure, getting insights on students' perception on instruction. They are very honest, asking frank questions, giving comments. Since then, the classroom diary has become a basic part of the classroom instruction.[11] It takes

some time to prepare it, to read it, but this effort and time is it worthwhile. The classroom diary is compiled on one B4-sheet, folded B5 size, which is used for all lessons throughout one term.[12]

What notes do students take after their lesson in the classroom diaries?
Case of Class A: Here are two examples of two different classes. In class A with students of Sciences as major, out of 15 students, 13 attended the 3rd lesson of the spring term. Find here their perception of the same lesson taught (T = Translation by the author):[13]

A-3-S1   使えるドイツ語を学べて．ドイツ語の形がようやく分かってきた気がする．発音が難しい。 T: I could study useful German. I had the impression, to understand the German forms well. Pronunciation is difficult.

A-3-S2   今日の自己紹介はスラスラ話せずにつまってしまったので．練習してスラスラ言えるようになりたい。 T: Today I could not speak fluently for the self-introduction and got stock. (I have to) exercise to be able to speak fluently.

A-3-S5   出身と住まいを教える．職業を教える．男性と女性のときでスペルが違う。 T: Studying origin/hometown and living. Study profession. For male and female nouns (forms) the spelling is different.

A-3-S13   自己紹介ができるようになった． T: I can introduce myself.

A-3-S15   ドイツ語での少し長めの自己紹介のしかたを学び．英語との発音のしかたの違いが難しかったです。 T: I learned to do in German a quite long self-introduction. (Compared) to English the pronunciation is different and difficult.

The comments of the students in class A do differ. Some do recount the contents of the class (origin, profession, preposition etc.). Others do focus on their achievement "I can do introduce myself" They talk about the difficulties they encounter (pronunciation, gender of nouns) and they compare their new experience in German with the previous experience in English. But they do evaluate their performance as well "I could not speak fluently", or for further goal setting "I have to repeat it" or "I want to be able to do self-introduction"

Case of Class B: On a different weekday a class with a similar contents, we call it class B with Humanities as a major, wrote these records for their 3rd lesson of the spring term. 17 students out of 18 were present. One student did not turn in the classroom diary.[14] Here are some selected citations:

B-3-S1   自己紹介を少しずつではあるができるようになってきた。長い単語があって少しむずかしかった。 T: I can do self-introduction, a little bit step by step. There are long words, they are a little bit difficult.

B-3-S6   Today's class is very very interesting for me! It is a little hard for me to speak German (Emoji). But this study heighten my ability.

B-3-S8   発音がとても難しかったです。今はてきたいけれど．だんだんできるようになりたいです。自己紹介も自然に話せるようにがんばります。 T: The pronunciation was very difficult. I want to do it. I will try hard and I want to be able to do the self-introduction in a natural way.

B-3-S10   自己紹介の基本となる文章を習いました。女性名詞と男性名詞の違いや発音を覚えてスムーズに自己紹介できるようになりたいと思います。 T: I learned the text of the basic self-introduction. For female nouns and male

B-3-S12 自己紹介で使うような基本的な文法・表現を覚える。何も見ずに自己紹介ができるように発表を意識して練習する。 T: I have to remember the basic grammar and the expressions used for the self-introduction. I want to do the self-introduction without looking at a note and I want to be aware of it and want to exercise.

B-3-S16 短いが自己紹介をした。「Universität」の発音が難しかった。また、長くのばす「e」と短く発音する「e」「ö」の発音の違いが口のひらきなどでよく分かりました。 T: Did a short self-introduction. The pronunciation of "Universität" (university) was difficult. As well, as long spread "e" and short spoken. The pronunciation of "e" and "ö" is different, the openness of the mouth I did understand exactly now.

B-3-S18 I'm happy because at least after today I've learned to say an actual paragraph in German. I still have to work on my pronunciation a lot (esp. "r", "ch", "ä", "ö", etc.) Ü:

Students choose Japanese or English for writing their classroom diary. Most students give at least one topic, in this case the brief "self-introduction". This is the learning goal, the task they had to perform at the end of the lesson. But many have a strong impression from the pronunciation exercises, giving them very different sound patterns. For a few of them, this is a real challenge, but other students do not feel comfortable yet, as they say it is difficult. Some other students note grammatical forms as the gender of the nouns or the prepositions. These are linguistic patterns they experience the first time.

The classroom diary gives insight in the perception of the learning goal and the contents of the class by the students. The teacher gets immediate feedback related to the classroom management and can take this into consideration for the next lesson. The class becomes transparent to the teacher. In this data, there are no questions uttered by the students. In other contexts there are. The teacher can answer the question in the next lesson, without pointing to a singular student.

3.3   Tasks including self- and peer-evaluation

Class instruction is often based on a textbook. The textbook may be mandatory given by a joint curriculum or chosen by the teacher. Most textbooks have lessons for various topics related to contents and grammar. In many classes these textbook items become the target for evaluation, assessment through testing the grammar, the vocabulary, the contents and the exercises of the textbook used in class. This is called teacher/textbook centered or traditional pedagogy[15]. To involve the learners in the process of evaluation and give them the opportunity to reflect on their achieved levels, tasks were introduced, to give the teaching a transparent learning objective – arranging along a red line the contents of various text books (grammar, vocabulary, etc.) with the classroom instruction. The task tries to reflect on their learning outcomes. The CEFR uses in this case can do-descriptors based on an evaluation grid.[16]

One example of a task and the related objective is given through the following steps. It has to be taken into consideration:

Step 1: I can state and understand name, place of origin, living place and

profession in spoken production (monolog).

Step 2: I can state and understand information on family members in spoken production (monolog).

Step 3: I can state and understand likes and dislikes including hobby/ pass-times.

(Indirect objective, written) (indirect can do: writing): preparing a personal text for spoken presentation to present oneself to their classmates

Objective for the term (CEFR level A1): "I can introduce myself in oral production (speech, monolog) using simple sentences, using expressions from classroom instruction. And I can talk about my family and things I like and don't like."

These considerations are taken into account for the self- and peer-evaluation during the presentation. The sitting order is (if possible) a conference style square-shape arrangement.[17] The follow-up of the presentation is decided by random numbers. No fixed order is given in advance. Every student gets a two-sided evaluation sheet. On the first page, the students have to write in order of the presentation the name of the presenter, note if they can understand what he or she is saying and make some comments on the presentation. Finally they can grade the presentation in their favorite way. Grades are: A+ ◎ very good // A ○ good // B △ fairly well.

On the second page they have to write first an evaluation of their presentation, second, to compare their presentation with that of their peers and finally they can comment on the evaluation task (exam, test) itself. 自己評価 (self evaluation): (1) 自分の発表はいかがでしたか。 How was your own performance?, (2) 自分の発表とほかのクラスメートの発表を比べるとどうと思いますか。 What do you think, if you compare your own performance and the performance of your classmates?, (3) 試験についての意見 What is your opinion on (this kind of) test?

Here are two examples of self- and peer evaluation for each class.

In class A - student 12 comment on his/her own performance:

A-S12-SB「少し緊張してしまい．同じ事を二度言ってしまった。発音の仕方もふ十分だったような気がした。」T: I was a little bit nervous. I did say the same thing twice. I had the impression, even my pronunciation was not sufficient.

The same student comments on the performance of his/her class-mates:

A-S12-Vgl「クラスメートの発表はほとんどの人がスムースに話せてあり、発表も上手であった。内容もユニークなものもあり、とてもよかったと思う。自分の発表内容はもう少し工夫があるとよいと思った」T: What is concerning the performance of the class-mates, they almost all had spoken smoothly, some of them were very good. Some had a unique contents, that was very good, I thought. The contents of my talk could have been a little more elaborated, I thought.

There were no entries or comments on the task or the evaluation.

Classmates of class A gave the following peer-evaluation for student 12 (in selection):

A-S12_vP_S1 ゆっくりで聞きやすかった (B) T: Slowly, that was easy to understand.

A-S12_vP_S2 もう少し声を大きくすると good! (A) T: A little louder, than good!

Transparency and reflective learning - Using the CEFR in the classroom including classroom-diary and peer- / self-evaluation[1]

25

A-S12_vP_S3 家族の紹介良い (B) T: To introduce family, good.

A-S12_vP_S4 声が少しだけ小さかった (B) T: Only the voice was a little weak.

A-S12_vP_S5 情報の量が豊富だった. (A) T: The amount of information was enjoyable.

The comments focus on different aspects (the voice, the contents). Many students did only note the grade, without commenting. In total the classmates give grade between good and very good, close to the teacher. The teacher gave student 12 the following assessment for this task:

A-S12-L (85 points = A), speaks slowly but continuously, quote important topics of self-introduction, speaks about something and someone.

The second example is student 2 of class B. He/she gives the following evaluation for his/her performance:

B-S2-SB "I feel very nervous because I was a first student to speak. I tried to tell as many information about myself as possible. May be I can introduce myself well, but I think I should speak more louder and fluently."

The same student writes the following remarks on the performance of his/her classmates:

B-S2-Vgl "Many people tell a lot of information about themselves. so as I do. However, some of them talked about not only themselves but also their family members. I also talked about my sister, but I may have to introduce my family more."

The student writes the following comment concerning the examination:

B-S2-Mg "First, I can't understand what should I do about this exam and I feel nervous about it."

Student 2 of class B (B-S2) receives the following comments of his/her peer classmates (in selection):

B-S2_vP_S3 マンガ読むのがすき、サエという妹 (○) T: Likes to read manga, Sisters name is Sae.

B-S2_vP_S4 準備不足? (○) T: Was the preparation sufficient?

B-S2_vP_S6 ゆっくりで聞きとりやすい! (○) T: Slowly, but good to understand.

B-S2_vP_S7 覚えた言葉をしっかり使っている (A) T: Used the learned vocabulary in the right way.

B-S2_vP_S8 神戸出身、コーラ、マンガ (△) T: Comes from Kobe, Cola, Manga

B-S2_vP_S9 言葉につまることが多いと感じた。(○) T: Have the feeling, that the words were jammed.

B-S2_vP_S10 もう少しなめらかに話せると良かったかも (B) T: It would have been good, if he/she would have spoken a little bit softer, I thought.

B-S2_vP_S13 内容がわかりやすい (◎) T: The contents was good to understand.

B-S2_vP_S14 神戸より・妹あり (○) T: From Kobe, has sister.

B-S2_vP_S15 福岡出身　マンガを読むこととかすき. 内容いろいろ伝わってよかった。(○) T: Comes from Fukuoka, like to read Manga, told various contents, was good.

The comments focus on different aspects (pronunciation, contents). Student P-B-S4 is quite critical as he/she asks, if the preparations were sufficient. Even the grades had the full range of very good – good – fairly good. So it is good with a slight minus, as the presentation was not fully fluent. The teacher did assess

the performance of the task of student 2 in class B as follows:

B-S2-L   (80 points, A-), speaks slowly but clear, jammed sometimes, mentions the most important topics for self-evaluation, sister, like, hobby.

The note taking during the presentation of their peers shows that many students can understand the spoken production of their classmates. Some students however only note a grade without using the possibility of taking notes or commenting. Involving the students in the task-evaluation, opens up the opportunity, to get a massive input on spoken production. The task is therefore one more real exercise. They can understand their peers when using a foreign language.

3.4   Self-evaluation and grading

Another facet of reflective learning process is the self-evaluation. In order to give the students the opportunity to evaluate their own learning, a self-evaluation sheet was used to reflect and grade the students' own learning.

The self-evaluation sheet was designed in a simple, open form, containing questions as (1) この授業について勉強になったところは何ですか。 Please write a summary about your studies in German language (text, half page), (2) 自己評価 *Please evaluate yourself,* (3) attendance, participation in class, homework/ assignment etc., (4) propose a grade: 私の成績の方は I think my grade should be around and (5) give reasoning: 成績を説明してください。 Explain why your grade is appropriate.

The criteria for self-evaluation, grading and assessment by the teacher are the same. Therefore the grading process is transparent. For the self-evaluation, first the students are asked to write a short text passage on their learning during the lessons. They are free to use their classroom diary. After that they had to answer some questions concerning their attendance and learning habit during the term. They are free to grade themselves, but they have to argue, why this grade is appropriate.[19]

Here are two examples from the final self-evaluation sheet of one student from each class. Example 1 is from student 12 in class A (science major). The student wrote all relevant entries in Japanese throughout the term, with some expressions in German:

A-S12-Eval   「初日ではドイツ語の文化なでについて学びました。授業ではドイツ語のあいさつから、自身を XX するための簡単な表現方法を学びました。とくに、Das heißt .. auf … ? などの表現を用いることによって、分からない単語や表現を聞くことができることなでが勉強になりました。ドイツ語を楽しく学ぶことができました。ありがとうございました。」T: The first day I learned German culture. The class was about greetings in German, to introduce oneself, we had to learn simple expressions. Especially the expression Das heißt ... auf ? (This means in German ...) etc. we used for asking the meaning of words and expressions. I studied German in a entertaining way. Thank you.

Student 12 grades him-/herself 85 points and gives the reasoning:

A-S12-grade   「色々な表現を学ぶことができたが、発音なでがまだ不十分であったため。」T: I was able to study various expressions, because the pronunciation was not sufficient,

The second example is of Student 2 in class B. The final-self-evaluation is the

following:

B-S2-Eval: "First, I studied the culture of German, and then studied some simple German dialogues. I also learned some expression in conversation and nouns in German. It was so hard for me to memorize sexes of nouns! Some words of German are similar to that of English, but usually grammers of German and English have many different points and sometimes I was confused. Learning German is hard, but I understood some grammer rules and simple dialogues during this class. Learning dialogues caused me to learn new words and phrases, so I think memorizing dialogues is good for learning new languages!"

Student 2 of class B grade him-/herself 80 points and gives the following reasoning:

B-2-grade "In this semester, I studied German a lot, but I think I can study much harder than I was so I choose this score to study more on next semester."

The overall impression is that students can evaluate themselves and are willing to do so, if they are given the opportunity to. They can see their weakness as well as their strength.

4   Conclusion

The CEFR suggests the use of a language portfolio for the learners.[20] But there are not many examples for successful implementations of language portfolios in Japan, one documented is the Japanese version of the "European Language Portfolio – Junior version" at Keio University.[21] On the other hand reflective journal writing is getting more and more attention. For the learner biography there are almost no traces.[22] Beside the success of can do-descriptors, it seems that some features of the CEFR are not easy to integrate in the instructed teaching/learning process. This article focused on the question how these pure learner-centered tools of the CEFR can be adapted and integrated in the instructed classroom teaching balancing the learner-centered concept on the one side with the requirement of the curriculum on the other side. It exemplified a classroom diary, self- and peer-evaluation for tasks and a final-self-evaluation. The reflective learning oriented approach can be integrated into classroom instruction for language teaching and showed text excerpts of students as self-reporting data. To reach a more learner centered teaching and following the concept of the CEFR is useful, yet, it has to be adapted to the local needs. The data shown are some examples and more data have to be displayed and analyzed and re-evaluated over and over again.

These measurements have been shown to be effective when they are implemented in a coherent way. Therefore tasks, related to can do-descriptors, have to be used to bring all parts together.

This is the first time the combination of the adapted tools (classroom-diary, self/peer-evaluation, self-evaluation-grading) are discussed here as a set including tasks of achievement for classroom management to bridge the gap between the theory behind learner autonomy and the classroom practice. The gap is not yet closed, but it is getting closer, when the adaptation is made and implemented.

The classroom-related approach of transparency and reflective learning seems to work:

CEFR/concept	Bridge --- GAP closer	Classroom/Practice	
Reflective learning		Supporting monitoring, reflection	
<Can do>		Self-evaluation	
<Language portfolio>		Task related – self/peer-evaluation	
<Learner biography>		Classroom-diary	
			Assessment

On the left side are the tools from the learner autonomy, on the right side the adapted form for the practice in the classroom. On the right side below you will find "assessment", which is very much related to classroom instruction. This will remain part of the teachers' responsibility. The students' self-evaluation can be taken into account, but it will not replace the assessment. The form of evaluation may show variation, e.g. simple tests vs. tasks. But the final decision is with the teacher, as he/she is the person responsible and in charge in relation to curriculum and the institution.

This is a table of a moderated version of the lesson plan, take the students' reflection (classroom diary, self-/peer-evaluation for the tasks, final self-evaluation (grade)) into account and compare it with the teachers' evaluation:

Lesson plan			Institution	
Lesson ….	Evaluation	Lesson n+1		Assessment
classroom diary	Can do's self-/peer-evaluation	classroom diary	assignment tests homework	self-evaluation
	Tasks		grade/teacher	
Curriculum	Goal setting			

This is moderated learner centered approach, making the classroom management and teaching objective transparent, giving the students the possibility to monitor their own learning process and get involved in self-evaluation. Yet, this study has no data on the students' reflection on this moderated teaching concept, taking them into the evaluation process, a domain only accessible for the teacher up to now. Therefore, more studies are needed to get insights as to how the students' perceive this kind of teaching.

That the concept of moderated, reflective classroom management may have some impact was shown to the author the first time in April 2016. In an anonymously conducted class-evaluation inquiry by the university in December 2015, one second year student wrote as a free written comment:「毎日日記をつけることで自分が何を学んだか見直せるのがよい。」The possible translation could be; *Every time to do the (classrooom)diary, what (I) myself learned, (it) was good, to be able to look it up again*. This spontaneous not elicited utterance of a student shows, that the offered concept was accepted and appreciated by the student. How many other students may have thought it but not uttered, there is no way to know. There are autonomous Japanese learners in Japan. This might be a true example of an autonomous, self-directed Japanese learner of foreign languages. The author would like to dedicate this article to this student. To get more insight in this process how students do perceive these methods, more qualitative research has to be conducted.

Notes

[1] Acknowledgement: This contribution contains research results conducted under the Grant-in-Aid research projects granted by the Japanese Society of the Promotion of Science „Critical, constructive assessment of CEFR-based language teaching in Japan and beyond" (Kaken no.26370624) and "Designing a support system for innovative language education" (Kaken no.16K02835).

[2] Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR; Council of Europe 2001). Japanese translation in 2004 by Yoshijima and Ohashi.

[3] Sugitani & Tomita in Byram & Parmenter (eds, 2012) pg.203.

[4] Trim underlines the importance of "Transparency and coherence in language learning in Europe" in the process of developing the CEFR (in Byram & Parmenter (eds) 2012, pg.29).

[5] Peer-feedback - H. Ogawa & J.M. Hall (2011).

[6] A.U. Chamot emphases, "Students evaluate their success in using learning strategies, thus developing metacognitive awareness of their own learning processes." (2008, pg. 4). As well O. Takeuchi (2003) "good learners". - For the results of neuroscience see T. Tokuhama-Espinosa (2011, pg. 87).

[7] Byram & Parmenter (2012, pg.3). - O'Dwyer & Nagai state: "The CEFR also emphasizes transparency and coherence in language teaching and promotes autonomous learning." (2012, pg.142)

[8] K. Kleppin "Lernertagebuch". - Tim Murphy published on log-books in 2003 in the former online-journal Languaging! (Dokkyo University). See Schmidt (2006).

[9] Motoko Teraoka presented at JALT Pan-Sig 2015, May 16th, in Kobe; A. Foale used a language portfolio in a self-study center (2016).

[10] E. Hayashi-Mähner "Stundenprotokoll" (2004).

[11] F. O'Dwyer writes on the use of ELP: "The second day Sunday [March 9th, 2009] focused more on the ELP with the day starting with a workshop dealing with the part reflection can play in the language learning classroom. As with all workshops this topic elicited lively discussion. Dr. Maria Gabriela Schmidt. Then explained how she is using the CEFR and adapting the ELP in her German classes at Tsukuba University. Participants were particularly impressed with her use of diaries in classes. […] the seminar wrapped up by participants explaining and discussion personal action plans for use of the CEFR and LP in upcoming classes. This was useful as it is not often that we get the chance to discuss such topics." FLP SIG homepage s.v. Events.

[12] On the use of classroom diary see Schmidt (2006), (2007), (2008), (2010).

[13] All notes are given literally as in the diary itself. Therefore some linguistic expressions may not be in right wording or spelling.

[14] The classroom diary is highly recommended by the teacher in the first lesson. But if students are not willing to do so, there are no further actions by the teacher. In this case, the thin line between pedagogy and privacy is kept.

[15] Nagai/ O'Dwyer state: "the implementation of the CEFR requires major changes in the basic philosophies and practices (e.g. traditionally students have been trained to be receptive and quiet in teacher-centered classrooms) of language education in Japan" (2012: pg. 142). – See the recent study on "Self-, Peer, and Teacher Assessments of Student Presentation Videos" by Joel P. Rian (Hokkaido Information University, Don Hinkelman (Sapporo Gakuin

University), Matthew Cotter (Sapporo Gakuin University) in JALT2014 Conference proceedings, pg. 688-697.

[16] "The use of 'Can Do' statements as checklists in a course to facilitate learners' self-regulatory learning is indeed widespread in Japan and it has also been rather successfully implemented (Schmidt et al, 2010). Sato (2010) demonstrated a great success in improving learners' ability to monitor their learning. The main positive impact of the pedagogical use of 'Can Do' statements can be said to be the perceived shift from teacher-centered knowledge driven classes to students-centered communication-oriented instruction". Other aspects see Collett and Sullivan 2010, Schmidt /Runnels /Nagai 2016, pg.24.

[17] On sitting order see the opinions of the students in Schmidt (2014a).

[18] With data of five classes, see Schmidt (2014b).

[19] The evaluation of Prof. Oyabu at Kanazawa University, English curriculum, is similar in that way, as she stated during an interview on the use of CEFR in GE curriculum on September 15th, 2015.

[20] An adapted and translated version of a language portfolio for Japanese universities was compiled by the Framework and Language Portfolio Special Interest Group in the Japanese Association of Language Teaching (FLP SIG, JALT). See portfolio online https://sites.google.com/site/flpsig/flp-sig-home/language-portfolio-for-japanese-university (access September 27th, 2016).

[21] Contribution of Keio University by Haraguchi et al. (2010) and others.

[22] The learner biography has to take into account all languages learned. Therefore an approach across the languages would be wise. - In Europe, universities promote very much the Language Portfolio as an online portfolio, for example the Language Center of Bremen University. These online portfolios include the learner biography. See A. Buschmann-Göbels & B. Kühn (2016) on the EPOS-project.

References

Buschmann-Göbels, A., B. Kühn (2016). "A CEFR-informed e-portfolio in blended learning at a German university." In: O'Dwyer, F. et.al. Critical and constructive … Japan and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 91 – 100.

Byram, M. and Parmenter, L. (eds), (2012). The Common European Framework of Reference: The Globalisation of Language Education Policy. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Chamot, A. U. (2008). Teaching Learning Strategies. Online

Collett, P., K. Sullivan (2010). „Considering he use of can do statements to develop learners self-regulative and metacognitive strategies." In: Schmidt et al. (eds) Can do statements … of the CEFR – Tokyo: Asahi Verlag, 167 – 183.

Coste, D. (2007). Contextualising uses of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe (without year). European Language Portfolio (ELP): Principles

and Guidelines with added explanatory notes. Online

Foale, A. (2016) "Developing ELP-informed self-access centre learning materials
    to support a curriculum aligned to the CEFR. In: O'Dwyer, F. et. al. (eds)
    Critical and constructive … beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University
    Press, 226 - 246.

Horiguchi, S., Y. Harada, Y. Imoto, S. Abe (2010). "The implementation of a
    Japanese version of the "European Language Portfolio – Junior version
    –" In: Schmidt et al. (Hgg.) Can do statements … in Japan and beyond -
    Applications of the CEFR – Tokyo: Asahi Verlag, 138 – 154.

Murphey, T. (1998). Language Hungry! An introduction to language learning
    fun and self-esteem. Tokyo: Macmillan.

Nagai, N. and O'Dwyer, F. (2012). The actual and potential impacts of the CEFR
    on language education in Japan. In: Synergies Europe n° 6 – 2011, 141-152.

O'Dwyer, F., M. Hunke, A. Imig, N. Nagai, N. Naganuma, M. G. Schmidt (eds.,
    2016, in print). Critical and constructive assessment of CEFR-informed
    language teaching in Japan and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University
    Press.

Ogawa, H., J. M. Hall (2011). "Using Group Work and Reflective Journals
    for Developing Learner Autonomy in an EFL Classroom at a Japanese
    University." In: Iwate Prefectural University, Research Journal, vol. 10. 1 – 9.

Saito, Y. (2016). "Developing a portfolio for English as a tool for global
    communication." In: O'Dwyer, F. et al (eds) Critical and constructive
    assessment … beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 292 – 302.

Sakai, S. (2014). "Towards Implementing the Principles of the Common
    European Framework of Reference for Languages within the Japanese
    Educational System." In: C. Merkelbach (ed). The CEFR in an East Asian
    Context. Taipei (Taiwan): National University Press, 71-99.

Schmidt, M. G. (2006). „Teaching-methods in the mirror: logbook and group-
    work/ Unterrichtsmethoden im Spiegel: Lerntagebuch und Gruppenarbeit".
    In: Reitaku University Journal, vol. 80, 113-142.

Schmidt, M. G. (2007). „Implications of the Common European Framework
    of Reference for Japan". In: Languaging. The Exploratory Learning and
    Teaching Newsletter of Dokkyo-University, vol.9, 30-33.

Schmidt, M. G. (2008). „Der Gemeinsame Europäische Referenzrahmen (GER)
    und seine Möglichkeiten in Japan". Studies in Foreign Language Education
    (Tsukuba University), vol. 30, 35-50.

Schmidt, M. G. (2010). „Kannbeschreibungen zur Strukturierung eines frei
    gestalteten Unterrichts auf der Niveauebene B1". In: Schmidt/ Naganuma/
    O'Dwyer/ Imig/ Sakai (edd.) Can do statements in language education in
    Japan and beyond/ 日本と諸外国の言語教育における Can-Do 評価. Tokyo:
    Asahi Press, 281-298.

Schmidt, M. G. (2014a). „Studentische Selbst- und Fremdbewertungen von
    mündlichen Leistungen". Studies in Foreign Language Education (Tsukuba
    University), vol. 36, 47-58.

Schmidt, M. G. (2014b). „Meinungen von Studierenden zu den Sozialformen im
    Unterricht"(research note). In: Deutschunterricht in Japan, vol. 18, 53-61.

Schmidt, M. G., J. Runnels, N. Nagai (2016). "The past, present and future of the

CEFR in Japan." In: O'Dwyer, F. et. al. (eds) Critical and constructive … in Japan and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 18 – 48.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). "What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context." In: System 31. 395 – 392.

Tokuhama-Espinosa, T. (2011). Mind, Brain, and Education Science. A comprehensive guide to the new brain-based teaching. W.W. Norten: New York & London.

Yang, N. D. (2003). "Integrating portfolios into learning strategy-based instruction for EFL college students." In: IRAL, 41, 293-317.

Yoshijima, S., R. Ohashi (20041, 20142): Gaikokugokyouiku (2): gaikokugo no gakushuu, kyouju, hyouka no tame no yooroppa kyoutsuu sansyou waku (CEFR Japanese translation). Tokyo: Asahi Syuppansha.

Abstract

This paper reflects the students' ability of self-assessment by using a classroom diary, self-evaluation and peer-evaluation. The aim is to support a language portfolio as suggested by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), to be compiled by the learners themselves and will integrate as part of the teaching/ learning cycle. Studying a second foreign language is done in Japan only for a year or two, passing the examination and forgetting about it. A more reflective approach to own's own language acquisition and achievement can foster a deeper impact. Language learning should last and have benefits in the long-run. A topic of the CEFR is transparency, the learners' autonomy and the lifelong learning perspective. The article will show and discuss reflective data of students from classroom diaries. CEFR, as an important toolkit of reference, can be useful in making classroom instruction more lasting.