

## **Complementing Learner Journal Reflection with Peer Discussion**

David E. Shaffer  
(Chosun University)

### **ABSTRACT**

The language learner journal have been promoted as a second language learning tool instrumental in increasing self-direction and motivation in the language learner, and thereby leading to better study practices and improved learning. It is, in general, suggested that language learners reflect on the language learning methods and learning strategies that they use to self-evaluate their effectiveness and make adjustments that they may think will be helpful in improving language learning program. However, little research has been done and little guidance has been given in second language literature as to frequency of writing, amount of writing expected, or how to situate the journal writing project in order to make it a desirable and motivating task rather than one that is viewed as an undesirable chore, generating less true reflection.

In order to discern what students may perceive as useful and enjoyable practices in English learner journal writing, two groups of university English majors of 70 students each were asked to complete varying journal writing projects. They differed in length of project, expected entries per week, expected words per week, and in integration with a complementary project.

A post-project survey indicated that options in project design that were more flexible produced more student satisfaction by creating student agency and thereby producing reasonably high levels of student reflection and journal writing. Pedagogical implications are that incorporating flexibility into a journal writing project can serve to enhance the effectiveness of the project as a language learning tool.

### **I. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Education in Korea has traditionally been teacher-designed, teacher-directed, teacher-centered, and test-driven. There was very little decision-making available to the student concerning their study. This is still true to a large

extent in Korea's high school education system. Accordingly, many students enter the radically different university education system discovering that they need much more concentrated English language study than that built into the curriculum of required courses, but are unsure as to how to go about it. They find themselves lost, directionless, not knowing exactly what to study or how. Consequently, they also become demotivated. As reflective learner journals and student portfolios have been promoted as both creating motivation and fostering autonomous learning, it was decided to examine their effectiveness as language learning tools to increase motivation and nurture self-direction the English study of Korean university students.

Journal writing is considered to be a beneficial mechanism to encourage students to be more critical and reflective in a growing body of research across a range of disciplines (Jarvis, 2001). Journals are able to provide a means for reflection before, during, and after a learning experience (e.g., Mills, 2008). Paton (2006) concludes that reflective journals help foster critical thinking, while Connor-Greene (2000) and Kerka (1996) show that students can use journal writing to enhance their learning by asking questions, engaging in higher order ideas, and making connections between theory and practice. Dymont and O'Connell (2003) recognize that journal writing holds great potential for enhancing learning in experiential education, and Anderson (1993) concludes that journal writing helps students develop their writing skills through experimentation with less-structured writing that may be highly personal and speculative. Fritson, Forrest, and Bohl (2011) found that through reflective journaling, university students were more successful at thinking about and finding ways to make course material relevant to their lives, applying the material to their lives, and finding ways to make the material more interesting. Compared to classes without journal assignments, the students in classes with journal writing reported a greater desire to learn the material. Additionally, the students in Dymont and O'Connell's (2008) study generally agreed that journal writing is a helpful form of reflection. In the language-learning environment, it has been found that as both a research tool and an extended classroom activity, strategy journals help provide access to the often hidden processes that ESL and EFL learners use to accomplish their goals. The effectiveness of a language-learning journal, in combination with a portfolio, in generating motivation and directing autonomous English language learning in Korean university students is examined in this study.

The learner's portfolio has been widely regarded as a tool that has the potential to increase student motivation

(e.g., Apple & Shimo, 2005) as well as self-direction in one's studies (e.g., Davies, 2003), providing the language learner with better study practices (e.g., Shimo & Apple, 2006; Smith, 2002) and providing the teacher with an additional assessment tool (e.g., Delett, Barnhardt, & Kevorkian, 2001; Shimo, 2003). One of the aims of this study is to gauge the impact of the language-learning portfolio in promoting motivation and self-directed learning for the English language learner at the university level in Korea.

## **II. METHOD**

### **1. Participants**

The participants in this study totaled 76 EFL students at a large private university in Korea. The participants broke down into 17 males (22%) and 59 females (78%). The participants were divided into two experimental groups: group A contained 47 students (10 male, 37 female), and group B contained 27 students (7 male, 22 female). Their mean age was approximately 22.1 years and the median age was 22. All the participants were juniors or seniors majoring in an English language-related major.

### **2. Instruments**

The instrument administered in this study was an online survey created through the web-based survey provider SurveyMonkey. The survey was administered at the end of a combined journal-portfolio project. The participants were provided with the survey's URL and asked to complete the survey online and submit it as instructed. The survey contained biographical questions about the participant and questions about the participant's impressions of the language-learning journal-portfolio project, and about the contents, amount, and frequency of their journal writing and portfolio keeping. The journal- and portfolio-related questions were multiple-choice type, several with Likert-scale type responses. All survey items appeared in Korean so that the possibility of misunderstanding the items would be minimized.

### **3. Procedure**

The participants, students enrolled in advanced English oral skills courses, were asked to keep a language-

learning journal-portfolio for ten weeks as part of the course requirement during the first semester of 2013. They were informed that the main purpose of this journal-portfolio project was for them to reflect upon their individual language-learning practices and procedures through writing about them in their journals and through placing samples of their work in the portfolio. The portfolio was to be a clear file folder containing both samples of their language learning and journal entries. They were informed that journal entries could but need not be about the other portfolio items. They were also informed that more than just describing their language learning practices and procedures, they were to reflect on them, evaluate their effectiveness, and make decisions about revising their practices as they felt necessary; examples were given. They were told to include in their journal-portfolio their English study plan for the semester and to also include any changes that they made to that plan throughout the semester. The students were divided into two groups on the basis of the classes they were enrolled in. Group A was given no minimum requirements for words to be written per week or for number of journal entries. Group B was advised that the minimum journal requirements were 2 entries per week and 200 words per week.

The participants were told that their journals-portfolios could be checked during the semester, and it was stressed that the contents were of primary importance, not the grammar or spelling of written text. In addition, Group B was allotted one class period of 45 minutes per week to discuss with a partner their English language learning practices and procedures, how well they worked and other reflections on them, and what their language learning plans would be for the coming week. For each of the ten weeks, the student was paired with a different discussion partner. Some days the end of the discussion period was devoted to students sharing with the whole class noteworthy practices that they learned of from their partner or that they had personally had success with.

During the semester, spot checking of the journal-portfolios was carried out, misunderstandings of proper procedures were pointed out, students' questions about the project were answered, and the journal-portfolios were collected and assessed at the end of the semester. It was at this time that the participants were instructed to complete the online survey concerning both their journal-portfolio projects.

Through these procedures, the objective of the study is to ascertain which application – the journal-portfolio project with no minimum writing limits set, or the same project with minimum writing limits and weekly discussion sessions – generates more reflection and experimentation with language learning methods, and

generates more motivation for language learning. In addition, these results will be compared with concurrent but not combined journal-writing and portfolio-keeping projects designed for promoting self-directed language learning skills, motivation, and reflection on one's language learning practices, and reported in Shaffer (2012).

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 1. Comparison of This Study's Experimental Groups

The survey questions, which were administered to the participating students at the end of the 10-week application period, are delineated in Table 1 along with the percent of responses to each response item. Many of the response items (e.g., questions 6-15), the original 5-item responses have been conflated to three – one positive, one neutral, one negative – due to space limitations and for ease of comparison. Group A had a large majority of its participants making journal entries twice a week (question item 2; 63.8%), while group B had more participants writing more than twice a week (34.5 v 25.6%). This could be due to the compelling effect of the minimum limit and/or the motivating effect of the in-class partner discussions. However, group A also had more participants writing less than 100 words per week (item 3; 25.5% v 6.9%). Again, this is likely due to no lower limit on word count and no added motivation from any in-class discussion sessions.

For a sizable number of the question items, group B responded to the most positive response with approximately 10% higher frequency. These include a response of “yes, a lot” to making changes to their study plans (item 5; 20.7 v 8.5%), writing about various areas of English study (item 6; 72.4 v 61.7%), writing about various methods for each area of study (item 7; 62.1 v 51.1%), and a response of “yes” to planning to continue keeping a journal in English after the course project finishes (item 9; 69.0 v 57.5%). These differences are considered to most likely be due to motivation generated in the

**TABLE 1**  
**Participant Responses to Language Learning Journal-Portfolio Survey Questions**

Question	Response	Group Percentages		
		All	Group A	B
1. What was your impression of the language learner journal-portfolio writing assignment at the beginning of the semester?	Beneficial	26.3	17.0	41.4
	Beneficial but hard	68.4	78.8	51.7
	So-so	4.0	2.1	6.9
	Hard / not beneficial	1.3	2.1	0.0
2. On average, how often did you write in your	< 1	4.0	2.1	6.9

journal-portfolio? (times/wk)	1	9.2	8.5	10.3
	2	57.9	63.8	48.3
	3	17.1	14.9	20.7
	4-5	11.8	10.7	13.8
3. How much did you write in your journal-portfolio each week? (wds/wk)	< 100	18.4	25.5	6.9
	100-200	27.6	25.5	31.0
	200-300	18.4	10.6	31.0
	300-600	26.3	29.8	20.7
	600-899	6.7	6.4	6.9
	> 1000	2.6	2.2	3.5
4. Did you include your English study plan for this semester in your journal?	Yes	81.6	85.1	75.9
	No	18.4	14.9	24.1
5. Did you include changes to your English study plan in your journal?	Yes, a lot	13.2	8.5	20.7
	Yes, a few	48.7	53.2	41.4
	No	19.7	17.0	24.1
	No, no change	18.4	21.3	13.8
6. Did you write about various areas of English study in your journal (ex. speaking, listening, vocabulary, TOEIC)?	Yes, a lot	65.8	61.7	72.4
	Yes a little	31.6	36.2	24.1
	No	2.6	2.1	3.5
7. Did you write about various study methods for each area of study (e.g., Speaking: (1) taking an English course, (2) speaking with a friend)?	Yes, a lot	55.3	51.1	62.1
	Yes a little	38.2	40.4	34.5
	No	6.5	8.5	3.4
8. Did you alter your English study plan in any way because of keeping a journal?	Yes, a lot	29.0	31.9	24.1
	Yes a little	52.6	53.2	51.8
	No	18.4	14.9	24.1
9. Will you continue to keep a journal in English after this course finishes?	Yes	61.9	57.5	69.0
	Not sure	30.3	31.9	27.6
	No	7.8	10.6	3.4
10. Will you continue to keep a journal in Korean, rather than English, after this course finishes?	Yes	40.8	51.1	24.1
	Not sure	42.1	40.4	44.8
	No	17.1	8.5	31.1
11. Will you continue to keep a portfolio after this course finishes?	Yes	60.5	59.6	62.1
	Not sure	32.9	31.9	34.5
	No	6.6	8.5	3.4
12. Do you plan to continue to keep a journal/portfolio after this course as you did for this course?	Yes	57.8	57.4	58.6
	Not sure	29.0	27.7	31.0
	No	13.2	14.9	10.4
13. Do you think that keeping a language learning journal/portfolio was helpful in improving your English study methods?	Yes	96.1	95.8	96.5
	Not sure	0.0	0.0	0.0
	No	3.9	4.2	3.5
14. Do you think that keeping a language learning journal/portfolio was helpful in improving English proficiency?	Yes	96.1	97.9	93.2
	Not sure	2.6	2.1	3.4
	No	1.3	0.0	3.4
15. Do you think that keeping a language learning journal/portfolio was helpful in improving your English communication skills?	Yes	73.7	74.5	72.4
	Not sure	21.1	19.2	24.1
	No	5.2	6.3	3.5

Note. N = 76

**TABLE 1 (cont.)**  
**Participant Responses to Language Learning Journal-Portfolio Survey Questions**

Question	Response	Group Percentages		
		All	Group A	B
16. What is your impression of the language learner journal-portfolio assignment after one semester of keeping a portfolio?	Beneficial	42.1	42.6	41.4
	Beneficial but hard	55.3	55.3	55.2
	So-so	1.3	0.0	3.4
	Hard / not beneficial	1.3	2.1	0.0
17. On average, how often did you add items to your journal-portfolio?(times/wk)	< 1	14.5	17.0	10.3
	1	39.5	40.4	37.9
	2	39.5	36.2	44.9
	3-4	5.2	4.3	6.9
	> 5	1.3	2.1	0.0
18. How many items did you include in your portfolio?	< 10	7.9	6.4	10.3
	10-20	22.4	25.5	17.2
	20-30	50.0	55.3	41.4
	> 30	19.7	12.8	31.1
19. Select 2 or 3 of the following items that you included in your journal/portfolio most.	Newspaper/magazine	38.2	36.2	41.4
	Movie/TV scripts	46.1	42.6	51.7
	Test-related	32.9	36.2	27.6
	Grammar-related	31.6	36.2	24.1
	Vocabulary-related	59.2	66.0	48.3
	Writing-related	46.1	36.2	62.1
	Others	15.8	14.9	17.2
20. Do you think it would have been more productive to have done only a journal project this semester rather than a joint journal/portfolio project?	Yes, for sure	5.3	6.4	3.5
	Yes, somewhat	25.0	29.8	17.2
	I'm not sure	36.8	40.4	31.0
	I don't think so	32.9	23.4	48.3
	No, definitely not	0.0	0.0	0.0
21. Do you think it would have been more productive to have done only a portfolio project this semester rather than a joint journal/portfolio project?	Yes, for sure	5.3	6.4	3.5
	Yes, somewhat	34.1	36.2	31.0
	I'm not sure	30.3	31.9	27.6
	I don't think so	29.0	25.5	34.4
	No, definitely not	1.3	0.0	3.5
22. Do you think that your English skills have improved more this semester with the journal/portfolio project that they would have without the project?	Yes, for sure	13.2	12.8	13.8
	Yes, somewhat	39.4	36.2	44.8
	I'm not sure	25.0	27.5	20.7
	I don't think so	17.1	19.2	13.8
	No, definitely not	5.3	4.3	6.9
23. Do you think that your knowledge of language learning methods has improved more this semester with the journal/portfolio project that they would have without the project?	Yes, for sure	18.4	17.0	20.7
	Yes, somewhat	39.5	34.0	48.3
	I'm not sure	26.3	31.9	17.2
	I don't think so	15.8	17.1	13.8
	No, definitely not	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Do you think that 10 weeks was a suitable length of time for the journal/portfolio project?	No, too long	30.2	34.0	24.1
	Yes, suitable	64.5	66.0	62.1
	No, too short	5.3	0.0	13.8
25. Do you think it would be beneficial to do a journal/portfolio project for one more semester next semester?	Yes, for sure	15.2	11.1	23.8
	Yes, somewhat	51.5	55.6	42.9
	I'm not sure	28.8	28.9	28.6
	I don't think so	4.5	4.4	4.7
	No, definitely not	0.0	0.0	0.0
26. How much of your journal writing was about describing your study methods?	> 50%	30.2	23.4	41.4
	26-50	40.8	46.8	31.0
	16-25	23.7	23.4	24.1
	6-15	4.0	4.3	3.5
	< 5	1.3	2.1	0.0
27. How much of your journal writing was about reflection on your study methods?	> 50%	47.4	40.4	58.6
	26-50	36.8	40.4	31.0
	16-25	10.6	12.8	6.9
	6-15	2.6	4.3	0.0
	< 5	2.6	2.1	3.5

Note. N = 76

B group by the weekly discussion sessions. Group B also responded with a high percentage against keeping a journal in Korean (item 10; 31.1%), indicating that they believe that writing a journal in English is more beneficial.

Both A and B groups had high percentages of students altering their study plans due to journal writing (item 8; 85.1 and 75.9%). Both similarly responded with high percentages that they will continue to keep a portfolio after the course project finishes (item 11; 59.6 and 62.1%). Similarly, both groups plan to continue to keep a combined journal-portfolio after the course (item 12; 57.4 and 58.6%). Indeed, both groups had a high opinion of the project both at the beginning of the project (item 1; 95.8 and 93.1%) and at the end (item 16; 97.9 and 96.6%), however, at the end of the project, 25.6% from “beneficial, but hard” to “beneficial” to become comparable with group B’s 41.4% for “beneficial.” These are very satisfying results.

Other very satisfying results for both groups that testify to the desirability of the combined journal-portfolio project, regardless of writing limits or group discussions, were also obtained. High percentages in both groups think that keeping a journal-portfolio was helpful in improving their English study methods (item 13; 95.8 and 96.5%), that it was helpful in improving their English proficiency (item 14; 97.9 and 93.2%), and that it was helpful in improving their communication skills (item 15; 74.5 and 72.4%). Students of both groups thought so highly of this, admittedly time-consuming, journal-portfolio project that two thirds of them responded that they thought continuing the project for the next semester would be beneficial to them (item 25; 66.7 and 66.7%), while most of the remaining respondents remain unsure.

A number of the survey responses, while directly indicating significant student satisfaction with the journal-portfolio project, also indirectly point to a positive effect exhibited by the weekly partner-discussion element incorporated into the B-group application. A larger percentage of B-group respondents (item 20; 48.3 v 23.4%) thought that the journal-portfolio project would not have been more productive with only a journal project (although it would have been less work for them). Similarly, a larger portion of B-group respondents (item 21; 37.9 v 25.5%) thought that the journal-portfolio project would not have been more productive with only a portfolio project (although it would have been much less work for them). A larger proportion of group B (item 22;



58.6 v 49.0%) considered their English skills to have improved more throughout the semester than they would have without the journal-portfolio project. Likewise, a larger percentage of group B (item 23; 69.0 v 51.0%) thought their English-related knowledge of language-learning methods had improved more throughout the semester than it would have without the journal-portfolio project. Also, while two thirds of the students in each group were undecided about whether ten weeks was a suitable duration for the journal-portfolio project, a substantial percentage of group B responses (item 24; 13.8 v 0.0%) indicated that the respondents thought that the project length was too short. The large percentages of undecided responses in both groups A and B could be due to the students not having and similar project to compare this project to.

One of the main purposes of this journal-portfolio project was to induce students to reflect on their language-learning practices, and through analyzing their effectiveness, consider making changes to their language-learning practices to make them more efficient. High percentages of respondents in both group A and group B indicated that they included large amounts of both description of their study methods and reflection on their study methods. Of the A group, 23.4% indicated that descriptive writings were 26-50% of their total journal writing, while another 48.6% indicated that their descriptive writing was over 50% of their total writing (item 26). Similar amounts were recorded for group B: 26-50% descriptive = 31.0%, and over 50% descriptive = 41.4% (item 26). Even higher percentages were recorded by both groups for the percentage of their journal writing that was reflection on their study methods. Of group A, 40.4% indicated that their reflective writings were 26-50% of their total journal writing, while another 40.4% indicated that their reflective writings were over 50% of their total writing (item 27). Similar amounts were recorded for group B: 26-50% reflective = 58.6%, and over 50% reflective = 31.0% (item 27). These percentages for both groups are impossibly high mathematically, and assessment of their journal writings showed that that reflective, as opposed to descriptive, writing comprised a rather small portion of total journal writing, and for most students, it was rather shallow reflection. This was in spite of the students being given explanations of what reflection consisted of and being supplied examples.

Both groups A and B were asked to give their opinions of the desirability of having weekly discussion sessions with a classmate partner to share their study methods for the week, their reflections on them, and their planned study procedures and practices for the following week. Although group A did not participate in discussion

sessions, the participants were asked if they thought such sessions would help in improving their study methods. While 30.8% of the respondents were understandably not sure, 50% thought they would be somewhat helpful, and 11.5% thought they would be quite helpful (see Table 2, item 2). For group B, whose members did participate in the discussion sessions, the favorable results were considerably higher: 54.2% thought the sessions were somewhat helpful, while another 25.0% thought they were quite helpful. Additionally, the students in group B were observed to be highly engaged in discussion for the duration of each session and for the duration of the 10-week period. They also related that they learned about new study methods and materials from their classmates through these discussions.

**TABLE 2**  
**Participant Responses to Language-Learning Methods-Discussion Survey Questions**

Question	Response	Group Percentages	
		Group A	Group B
1. Did the once-a-week partner discussion on study methods helped in improving your English study methods? (n = 24)	Yes, for sure	-	25.0
	Yes, somewhat	-	54.2
	I'm not sure	-	12.5
	I don't think so	-	8.3
2. Do you think that once-a-week partner discussions on study methods would help in improving your English study methods? (n = 26)	Yes, for sure	11.5	-
	Yes, somewhat	50.0	-
	I'm not sure	30.8	-
	I don't think so	7.7	-

*Note.* N = 50

## 2. Comparisons with Previous Study

In the latter half of 2011, Shaffer (2012) conducted a similar but different study on language-learning journal writing and portfolio keeping with a comparable group of student participants. The students were asked to keep a reflective journal on their language learning and also to compile a portfolio representative of their language learning activities. They were not, however, asked to link the two projects. The journal was to be kept in a notebook, and the portfolio in a clear file holder. In that study, the participants expressed favorable attitudes towards both the journal and the portfolio projects in an end-of-project participant survey. The Shaffer (2012) survey contained many of the same survey items as in this survey.

For almost all items in the two surveys, however, both the A group and the B group in the present study produced higher positive percentages than did the participants in the Shaffer (2012) study. For example, a slightly higher percentage of present study participants (both A and B) thought this project was beneficial than did

participants in the 2012 study for the journal project. More wrote over 300 words per week in their journals; more made changes to their study plans; more wrote about various areas of English study; more wrote about various study methods; more made alterations to their study methods; and more said they would keep a journal and a portfolio after the project ended. More participants in the present study also thought that keeping a journal-portfolio was helpful in improving their English study methods, and more thought that it was helpful in improving their English proficiency. These results suggest that there was a higher degree of preference for a combined journal-portfolio project than for separate but concurrent language-learning journal and language-learning portfolio projects, although the percentages for the 2012 study group were also high.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study has shown that the combination language-learning journal-portfolio is a highly effective tool in helping Korean university students to reflect on their language learning practices and procedures, and to make informed decisions about and adjustments to their individual language-learning programs as a teacher-initiated course project. Students evaluated it as more useful than either the journal-writing portion or the portfolio-keeping portion of a concurrent journal and portfolio project, though they also evaluated that project as highly helpful. Setting a minimum limit on words per week and number of entries per week at 200 and 2 for the journal-writing portion of the present project had little effect on outcomes other than to concentrate production around these limits for group B while group has more students writing below the limit as well as quite a few writing much higher than the limit. The absence of announced writing limits, while allowing some to produce less, motivated others to excel in written journal production. The weekly 45-minute sessions of paired discussions applied to group B, in which students discussed their language-learning experiences proved to be very engaging for the students, motivating them to reflect more on their language-learning practices, make changes to them, and experiment with new methods.

It has been observed that university students are neither trained in nor skilled at autonomous learning techniques. Research has also observed that it is the learner who applies self-directed learning techniques who is the good learner. The combined language-learning journal-portfolio has been shown to be an effective vehicle for

moving the student from being an unguided language learner to being a well-guided, reflective, and motivated language learner. The findings of this journal-portfolio support Apple and Shimo (2005), Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000), and Shimo (2003), whose study of portfolio use led to the conclusions that (a) learners are given the opportunity to reflect over their learning processes; (b) it is possible to make a continuous assessment of their progress over a long period of time; (c) learners can make original products, allowing them to feel a greater sense of achievement; (d) learners can take control over their learning and feel more responsibility for it; and (e) learners can assess weaknesses and strengths in their language learning, increase their proficiency, and set and reset goals more effectively by viewing and reviewing their work.

It is recommended that the language-learning journal-portfolio be incorporated into and language skills program from beginning young-learner programs to advanced adult programs, with the scope of the project adjusted to their skills level. The sooner the reflective element is introduced to the learner, the sooner self-directed learning will begin, and the sooner the learner will become a reflective and effective autonomous learner. It is also recommended that for upper-level learners, regular sessions be scheduled in which students share with another student or students their reflections on their own language learning practices and show their portfolio for the other students to comment on and inquire about.

Students have a very limited concept of what reflection entails and how to approach it. It is therefore that the instructor not only explain what reflection is and give written examples of it, but also have students do group tasks to crystallize the concept before setting out on their individual reflective language learning projects. It is also recommended that the suggestions of Dymont and O'Connell (2003, 2010) are heeded: (a) making sure that the expectations of a journal-writing project are clear to the students; i.e., the purpose, the fit into the program, the readership, assessment criteria, and specific requirements, and (2) that for journal writing to be more effective, it should include detailed feedback and journal-writing scaffolding for the students.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (1993). Journal writing: The promise and the reality. *Journal of Reading*, 36(4), 304-309.

- Apple, M., & Shimo, E. (2005). Learners to teacher: Portfolios, please! Perceptions of portfolio assessment in EFL classrooms. In T. Newfields (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2004 JALT Pan-SIG Conference* (pp. 53-58). Tokyo: JALT Publications.
- Connor-Greene, P. A. (2000). Making connections: Evaluating the effectiveness of journal writing in enhancing student learning. *Teaching of Psychology, 27*(1), 44-46.
- Davies, S. J. (2003). Learner portfolios: Who is at the controls? In A. Barfield & M. Nix (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy in Japan 1: Autonomy you ask!* Tokyo: Learner Development Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.
- Delett, J. S., Barnhardt, S., & Kevorkian, J. A. (2001). A framework for portfolio assessment in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(6), 559-568.
- Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. (2010). The quality of reflection in student journals: A review of limiting and enabling factors. *Innovative Higher Education, 35*, 233-244.
- Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. (2008). Student perceptions of journaling as a reflective tool in experience-based learning. *Journal for the Art of Teaching, 10*(1), 101-108.
- Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. (2003). *Journal writing in experiential education: Possibilities, problems, and recommendations*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document EDO-RC-03-5)
- Fritson, K. K., Forrest, K. D., & Bohl, M. L. (2011). Using reflective journaling in the college course. In R. L. Miller, E. Amsel, B. Kowalski, B. Beins, K. Keith, & B. Peden (Eds.), *Promoting student engagement, Volume 1: Programs, techniques and opportunities*. Syracuse, NY: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://www.teachpsych.org/ebooks/pse2011/vol1/volume1.pdf>

- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (2000). *Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Jarvis, P. (2001). Journal writing in higher education. In L. M. English & M. A. Gillen (Eds.), *Promoting journal writing in adult education: New directions for adult and continuing education* (pp. 79–86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kerka, S. (1996). *Journal writing and adult learning*. (Technical Report No. 174). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document ED 339413)
- Mills, R. (2008). “It’s just a nuisance”: Improving college student reflective journal writing. *College Student Journal*, 42(2), 684–690.
- Paton, M. (2006, September). *Reflective journals and critical thinking*. Uniserve Science Symposium—Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, NSW, Australia. Retrieved from [http://sydney.edu.au/science/uniserve\\_science/pubs/procs/2006/paton.pdf](http://sydney.edu.au/science/uniserve_science/pubs/procs/2006/paton.pdf)
- Shaffer, D. E. (2012). Language learning journal writing and portfolio projects: Efficacy and sustainability. *2012 KAFLE International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 383-394). September 13-14, 2012. HUFS, Seoul.
- Shimo, E. (2003). Learners’ perceptions of portfolio assessment and autonomous learning. In A. Barfield & M. Nix (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy in Japan I: Autonomy you ask!* (pp. 175-186). Tokyo: Learner Development Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.
- Shimo, E., & Apple, M. (2006, March). Portfolio use in the classroom. Retrieved from <http://tht-japan.org/proceedings/2006/shimo77-80.pdf>
- Smith, K. (2002). Learner portfolios. *English Teaching Professional*, 22, 39-41.

**BIODATA**

Dr. David E. Shaffer received his Ph.D. in Linguistics, specializing in English semantics. He also has advanced certificates in TESOL. He has taught for over 30 years at the university level, being involved with graduate and undergraduate instruction in English education and with teacher education programs as a program coordinator and teacher trainer. Dr. Shaffer's professional interests include professional development, teaching methodology, cognitive theories of linguistics and language learning, and loanwords. He is an associate professor in the Department of English Language at Chosun University. Email: [disin@chosun.ac.kr](mailto:disin@chosun.ac.kr)