科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告
期末報告

激勵學習的評量及英語榮譽學程的研究

計 畫 主 持 人 ： 黃淑真
共 同 主 持 人 ： 林翰儀
計畫參與人員 ： 碩士班研究生-兼任助理人員：康恆銘
　　　　　　　　大專生-兼任助理人員：吳郁憬

報 告 附 件 ： 出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處 理 方 式 ：
1. 公開資訊：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2 年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中 華 民 國 104 年 04 月 27 日

中文摘要： 本研究計畫在原計畫目標下共完成「激勵學習的評量」與「英語榮譽學程的研究」兩份學術論文，其中第一篇由計畫主持人以英文撰寫，題為 "Understanding learner self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance"，投稿國際期刊 Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education (SSCI)，經修改已獲接受。第二篇由共同主持人暫以中文撰寫，題為「評鑑與教學之關聯 – 以政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程為例」，尚待發表。

第一篇論文 Understanding learner self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance 以學生的自評回饋內容為標的，分析學生自評回饋的廣度、深度與不足之處，並據此對目前的評量回饋理論提出確認與質疑之處。研究者首先依形成性評量理論設計教學活動，讓大專生在練習英語口語能力後，參與原多由教師執行的評量活動，學生自我評量回饋的內容以 Hattie and Timperley (2007) 的理論為架構進行檢視，從理論的三個回饋問題及四個回饋層次來分析學生自評回饋的能力。結果顯示大專學生在適切的導引下，其回饋內容豐富多元且對促進後續教學效能具有相當潛力。其針對自我學習反思的細膩度和完整性，為絕大多數的教師回饋所不能及，且其展現出的學生認知發展與不足處恰可引導教師後續教學，以更為符合學生所需。研究結果除了驗證大部分既有回饋理論的主張外，也發現過去視個人層次的回饋（self-level feedback）為有害學習的說法在本研究的資料中不成立，此點經推論可能與學習者的心智成熟度有關，是相關理論必須考慮調整的部分。然而截至自我回饋為止，學習迴路尚未完成，如何讓這些自我評量回饋後的發現促成更有效的學習，有待後續研究。

第二篇論文「評鑑與教學之關聯 – 以政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程為例」將政治大學外文中心推行多年的英語榮譽學程做了一個系統性的紀錄，並輔以相關評鑑理論文獻的討論及行政文件等。這類學程體檢的研究一般較少受到國內學者的重視，但其對學生的影響卻十分具體。政大外文中心多年來投入相當多的人力在英語榮譽學程的建立與執行，相關的經驗值得被記錄傳承，以供未來推廣類似學程的學校及教師參考。本文詳實地記錄此學程的緣由、沿革及其相關的背景因素，說明課程規劃的宗旨、實質課程內容及執行情形，並訪問相關教師對學成存續期間曾遭遇的困難、暫時停招的始末、及復招的考量與調整作出釐清，最後藉由行政單位做過的評鑑及相關文獻回顧進行整體施行的檢討，提出實際的建

議。

中文關鍵詞： 課室評量、回饋、英語榮譽學程、學程評鑑

英文摘要： Two manuscripts have been completed. The first paper examined the content of learner self-assessment and self-feedback, looking at its variety, richness, and inadequacy. Based on the results, the author confirmed as well as challenged professed premises of existing feedback theories. In the study, college-level EFL learners were guided to self-assess and self-feedback after considerable speaking practices. The content of their self-feedback was scrutinized against Hattie and Timperley's (2007) feedback model, including on the three feedback questions and four feedback levels. Results indicated that learner self-feedback was multifaceted and its comprehensiveness was beyond the capacity of most teacher-made feedback. The learner self-feedback could thus serve as great materials for more focused follow-up teaching and learning. Although the data confirmed most parts of feedback theories, existing claims related to self-level feedback were not supported. Finally, possible explanations and future studies were suggested.

The second paper systematically documented the evolution of the English Honors Program developed by the Foreign Language Center at National Chengchi University. Relevant program evaluation literature and administrative documents were reviewed. This kind of program, although not a mainstream concern in the fields of TESL/TEFL in Taiwan, has persistent pragmatic influence on learners. The Foreign Language Center has in the past years devoted much time and effort in establishing and maintaining the program. This experience was recorded for the reference of teachers/researchers who may be interested in running similar programs. The paper documented why and how the program was established, modified, and what contextual factors influenced these modifications. The objectives, contents, and administration of the program were also described based on interviews with

relevant teachers. More specifically, there was a
focus on problems encountered by the program, its
temporary termination, its revival, and the
underlying considerations. Finally, by way of
literature and document review, practical suggestions
were provided.

論文一

Understanding learner self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance

Understanding learner self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance

Shu-Chen Huang

Foreign Language Center, National Chengchi University

Abstract

This study examines university learners' self-assessment and self-feedback on performance as captured in audio files from a foreign-language speaking test. The learners were guided to listen, transcribe, and analyze their own speaking samples, as well as propose future actions for improvement. Content of learner self-feedback was scrutinized against a feedback model, with data coded into various feedback categories as stipulated in the model for analysis. Results indicated that learner self-feedback was far-reaching and multifaceted. Through self-feedback, learners identified discrepancies, answered feed up, feedback and feed forward questions, and inspected performance at task, process, self-regulation, and self levels. Much of the feedback involved reflections on past learning history, other areas of learning, deviation of performance from preparation, and learner personality traits. The self-feedback went largely beyond most teachers' feedback capacity and bore great potential for learning and instruction. In particular, contrary to theoretical presumptions, self-level feedback seemed quite enlightening. Whether the observed quality self-feedback could actually help learners improve their performance, however, was not clear. It was suggested that some teacher time and effort be directed to the endeavor of facilitating learner self-assessment and self-feedback. Learners' self-feedback capability should also be explored further in the development of relevant pedagogies and theories.

Keywords: self-assessment, self-feedback, foreign language speaking

Introduction

Earlier self-assessment studies focus mostly on the correctness of learner judgment (Boud and Falchikov 1989), with teacher marks as the major yardstick of examination. Results indicate that more advanced learners are usually more accurate (Boud and Falchikov 1989; Lew, Alwis, and Schmidt 2010). Self-assessment has also been shown as a good predictor of information recall in foreign language reading (Brantmeier 2005). In addition to reading, the more transient skill of speaking could also be self-assessed by elementary (Butler and Lee 2006) and tertiary learners (Chen 2008) alike, with on-task assessment permitting more accuracy than the off-task condition. Interestingly, cultural background has a role to play, too. For example, Japanese learners, possibly owing to their high value for modesty as a virtue, tend to be more severe in judging their own writing than judging that of their peers (Matsuno 2009).

Learner self-assessment, however, is not just a matter of accuracy. Some researchers are interested in the power relationship inherent in the act of transferring agency from the teacher to the learner and have investigated the potential of self-assessment activities in empowering learners (Milne 2009; Tan 2004). Yet the core of learner self-assessment studies is not on assessment itself, nor on correctness or power, but on the facilitation and development of learners learning through engaging in self-assessment. As defined by Boud (1995), self-assessment is the act of judging oneself and making decisions about the next step by asking a series of questions – 'How am I doing? Is this enough? Is this right? How can I tell? Should I go further?' By answering these questions through self-assessment, learners are learning to self-regulate and gradually taking over the ownership of their learning.

Self-assessment for the purpose of enhancing learning

Self-assessment has been considered an important part of self-regulation (Butler and Winne 1995). It is also an ability with which learners can benefit from instructional input they receive. Orsmond and Merry (2013) found that higher achievers, because of their better self-assessment ability, gained more from tutor feedback than did their peers. Rivers (2001) studied mature and successful foreign language learners and discovered that these learners regularly engaged in self-assessment. English learners in Korea enhanced performance and confidence by conducting self-assessment (Butler and Lee 2010). College French learners in America obtained pedagogical benefits of self-assessment at both cognitive and

affective levels (De Saint Leger 2009).

With the advantages of self-assessment widely recognized, some studies look at how self-assessment could be better designed and carried out. For example, Andrade (2008) suggests that judgmental marking should be removed from self-assessment, so learners can focus on constructive comments. She emphasized that this simple removal of scores, although subtle as it appears, has a powerful impact. When scores and judgments are absent and the focus lies on answers to the series of questions in Boud's definition of self-assessment (1995), the fine line between assessment and feedback blurs. In fact, self-assessment and self-feedback can hardly be separated, as implied in the definition of self-assessment provided by Hattie and Timperley (2007), that self-assessment 'is a self-regulatory proficiency that is powerful in selecting and interpreting information in ways that provide feedback' (94). Consequently, the focal point becomes the content of feedback that learners generate based on judgments, not their judgments themselves. In this sense, correctness studies of self-assessment do not inform. But to date, beyond judging and correctness, little is known about the nature and characteristics of learner self-assessment and self-feedback. Without a better understanding of what learners see and think in conducting self-assessment and generating self-feedback, our understanding of the potential of formative assessment is limited, and relevant theories and pedagogies are incomplete.

Peer assessment and teacher feedback studies

In the dearth of learner self-assessment and self-feedback research, two types of studies are relevant and informative. One is peer assessment and the other teacher feedback studies. Other than whether assessment is correct or how peers interact when they assess each other, peer assessment is usually discussed together with self-assessment/self-feedback (Orsmond, Merry, and Callaghan 2004) and is a means to other ends, rather than an end itself. Those other ends include facilitating learner understanding of complex work and pertinent criteria (McConlogue 2012) and, as is often the case, making learners better self-assessors. As demonstrated by Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin (2014), learners benefited more in actively furnishing feedback comments for their peers than passively receiving peer feedback. It was through performing the task themselves first and subsequently evaluating peer work against the set of criteria already learned that made them assess their own work more critically and professionally, which eventually contributed to the improvement of learners' own work.

On the other hand, learner self-assessment/self-feedback could also be informed by research in teachers' assessment feedback. Studies on formative assessment or assessment for learning have in recent years focused more specifically on feedback, probably because of feedback's potentiality in taking learners further on the learning journey after assessment. First, dissatisfaction with teacher feedback in higher education became an issue. There were then many endeavors trying to identify possible problems. Some attributed it to teacher misperception of and their lack of readiness for giving quality feedback (Bailey and Garner 2010; Lee 2009). Others demonstrated the misalignment in perception and feedback provision between tutors and learners (Orsmond and Merry 2011). Still others argued that the trouble did not lie as much in the content as in the delivery of feedback. For example, Wingate (2010) pointed to the tone, style, and excessive amount of feedback as factors preventing learners of low motivation and low self-perception from taking advantage of teacher feedback. Furthermore, Price, Handley, Millar, and O'Donovan (2010) analyzed the underlying complexity of higher education and pinpointed the near impossibility of adequately evaluating the effectiveness of teacher feedback.

More recent studies on solutions of the problem seem to point to a similar direction, that is, the involvement of learners in the feedback process. Orsmond and Merry (2013) believe that in the past our understanding and pedagogy of feedback have been tilted and too heavily teacher-oriented, neglecting aspects on the learner side. Many other researchers contend too that, instead of one-way teacher monologues, feedback should be provided, responded to, adjusted, and reflected to form a cycle of teacher-learner dialogues (Beaumont, O'Doherty, and Shannon 2011; Bloxham and Campbell 2010; Yang and Carless 2013). Moreover, Boud and Molloy (2012) assert that, in order for feedback to be effective for learning, our understanding of teacher feedback should shift from the habitual conception of teacher telling to one that depicts students actively seeking.

All the aforementioned literature implies a belief that learners have the ability to actively contribute to the assessment and feedback process. Despite the proliferation of formative assessment and teacher feedback studies, however, the nature of learner self-assessment/self-feedback is largely unknown. Not much has been reported about what learners could do when they are given a chance to assess their own performance and provide feedback accordingly. Without a qualitative understanding, i.e. how they self-assess and what they attend to in real learning situations, further learner self-assessment/self-feedback studies may not be well supported.

Feedback models

Models of feedback have been proposed and modified to reflect development in educational research. Although none focuses particularly on learner-generated self-assessment and self-feedback, these models provide a background for understanding self-feedback from learner self-assessment.

Butler and Winne (1995) proposed to integrate feedback into a self-regulation model. Their model has similar underpinnings to Black and Wiliam's (2009) framework of assessment for learning in that both regard the discrepancy between goals and the current state of performance a critical starting point for learning. With careful monitoring or assessment, the gap is identified; with effective processing of feedback obtained which points to appropriate tactics and strategies, the identified gap can be bridged. As Butler and Winne synthesized from empirical studies, when the level of discrepancy perceived by the learner is high relative to expectation, it has a stronger impact on follow-up learning. Moreover, effects of external feedback are too often filtered by learners' existing beliefs, causing constructive external feedback to be ignored or rejected. More than changing the products of learning with summative outcome feedback, they emphasized the more important role process/formative feedback can play in changing the processes of learning.

Hattie and Timperley's (2007) feedback model also starts with the purpose of learning as reducing the discrepancy between current understandings/performance and a desired goal. To do that, effective feedback has to be more than feeding back, in which students obtain information to the question 'how am I going?' In addition, teachers clarify learner question of 'where am I going' by feeding up. More importantly, feeding forward tells 'where to next?' Hattie and Timperley claim that each feedback question works at four levels: task, process, self-regulation, and self. Feedback at the task level concerns how well tasks are understood or performed; feedback at the process level addresses the main processes needed to understand/perform the task; feedback at the self-regulation level is related to self-monitoring, directing, and regulating of actions; and finally, feedback at the self level is about personal evaluations and affect about the learner. They argue that feedback at the self level is the least effective as it is usually unrelated to performance on the task. Feedback at the process and self-regulation level are powerful for mastery of tasks and deep processing, while task-level feedback has the potential to improve subsequent strategy processing and enhance self-regulation but rarely does so.

More recently, Boud and Molloy (2012) advocate a new feedback mindset by contrasting two feedback models, one with teachers as the drivers of feedback and the other with learners generating and soliciting their own feedback. They argue that the traditional teacher model places false expectations on teachers in the higher education system and does not sustain learning beyond the classroom. In order for the learner model to take place, opportunities need to be created at the inception of curriculum design to help students develop the capabilities to operate as judges and owners of their learning.

Aims of the study

The research reported here is an attempt to explore the nature and characteristics of learner self-assessment and, more precisely, learner self-feedback. By designing a self-assessment task and collecting learner self-feedback in an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) context with a focus on developing speaking skills, it is hoped that empirical data can provide a realistic view of what first-year college students are able and not able to do in furnishing self-assessment and self-feedback. This understanding may be helpful in formulating feedback theories that put learners at the center. More specifically, by adopting the aforementioned Hattie and Timperley (2007) model of feedback, the following research questions guided the study:

(1) What did students find out about, as reflected in their self-assessment/self-feedback, the discrepancies between their EFL oral performance and their learning goals?
(2) To what extent did learner self-assessment/self-feedback feed up ('where am I going'), feedback ('how am I going'), and feed forward ('where to next')?
(3) In terms of the four feedback levels of task, process, self-regulation, and self, how did learners attend to them? Were there similarities or differences between theoretical assumptions and the actual observed learner self-assessment/self-feedback?

Methodology

The context

This paper reports on the implementation of a self-assessment/self-feedback task and its results in a required freshman EFL course in northern Taiwan. The university,

with a total student population of about 15,000, two-thirds of which are undergraduates, requires freshmen to take the *College English I* and *II* courses for two consecutive terms, with two class hours allocated weekly for 18 weeks each term. Although individual teachers have the freedom to select their own materials and methods, the common course objectives are to enhance all four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as well as to foster lifelong learning capabilities and to honor liberal education ideals. Participants in this study were learners enrolled in the *College English* sections taught by the author.

Under the national curriculum, these students started receiving formal EFL education in the third year of elementary school, but many started earlier with private tutors and cram schools. Their EFL proficiency was approximately around B2 in the six-level standard (from basic users of A1, A2, independent users of B1, B2, to proficient users of C1, C2) as stipulated by Common European Framework of Reference for describing achievements of foreign language learners.

There were midterm and final examinations each semester. Each examination consisted of written and spoken parts assessing learner achievement after studying materials from the textbook – *World Class 2* (Douglas and Morgan 2013). Each speaking test required learners to answer six open-ended questions for one minute each in a language lab, in which everyone wore a headset and spoke to a microphone. These oral questions were selected from a course question bank developed and accumulated as the semester progressed. For each unit taught, the author prepared ten short questions covering major materials and class discussions. By answering these questions, learners were expected to retell and summarize information, to reflect on relevant personal experiences and world knowledge, and to provide personal opinions with justification on related issues, all in English. These questions were regularly practiced inside and outside of class, and were posted on the course Moodle platform for constant review and practice. Examples of the questions include:
- *Summarize the article 'What Happens When a Language Dies' (Unit 1: Language and Life);*
- *Describe your spending habits, including how much you spend each month and on what you spend (Unit 2: Money Talks);*
- *What are the advantages and disadvantages of living in a big city (Unit 3: Bright Lights, Big Cities)?* and
- *What did you learn about yourself and your classmates from the 'Life Satisfaction Survey' conducted in class (Unit 4: Being Yourself)?*

To prepare for the midterm examination in the first semester, students worked on 30 questions for the first three units. To prepare for the final examination, they had three more units and another 30 questions added to the question bank, totaling 60, with 80% of their grade allocated to the new questions and 20% to the old ones. Students were advised not to write answers word for word and memorize them. Instead, they were asked to write key words and outlines and practice orally from the brief notes they had written. Because of this, learners were allowed to bring notes of no more than fifteen words per question for both midterm and final examinations.

The self-assessment/self-feedback task

The self-assessment task took place during the second semester. Each student was given his/her own six audio files from the final oral examination in the previou semester and was required to complete a self-assessment/self-feedback assignment. It was hoped that they could benefit from this self-assessment/self-feedback and improve in the midterm and final oral examinations in the second semester. This self-assessment/self-feedback task asked students to do the following. The assignment guideline, as presented below, was accompanied by an example from the course teaching assistant under the instructor's guidance, so as to illustrate what a completed assignment may look like.

1. Listen and choose three from the six one-minute answers.
2. Listen to the three self-selected audio files carefully and transcribe them as truthfully as possible.
3. Based on the transcribed answers, analyze your speaking performance from the following four aspects: a) content and organization, b) pronunciation, intonation, and fluency, c) word choice and meaning expression, and d) sentence structure and grammar. Discuss what you have done well and what you need to improve in the above areas by citing specific examples from your transcript. The language of discussion could be in either English, the target language, or Chinese, your mother tongue.
4. Discuss what you think you can do to improve your English oral proficiency.

Data analysis

Sixty-three completed assignments were submitted and used as data for the study. The researcher/instructor explained the purpose of study, obtained written consent from students, and adhered to research ethics of participant anonymity and exclusive

academic use of data. To ensure the quality of self-assessment/self-feedback data at a basic level, two measures were applied in the first round of screening. First, the typed transcripts were checked against the corresponding audio files and were rated on a scale from 1 to 5 for truthfulness, with 5 being the most truthful. One assignment did not have any transcript included and was removed from the data set. In the remaining 62 pieces, none was rated 1 or 2, i.e. with the transcript contents deviating from the recording for more than 50%. Truthful word-for-word transcripts of no more than two-thirds of recording were awarded 3; those above that level and combined with some additional marking of speech (false starts, repetitions, pauses, or verbal fillers) were awarded 4; and those combined with scrupulous markings of speech were given 5. In the end, there were 7, 14, and 41 pieces rated as 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The data set was then checked for overall compliance to task requirement. Based on the self-assessment/self-feedback task specification, task compliance was rated on a scale from 1 to 3 with 3 being the most compliant. The self-assessment/self-feedback content that covered all four required aspects of analysis and proposed future actions were rated as 3; those missing one or two parts as 2; and those missing more than two parts as 1. Fifty-six pieces were rated as 3, three as 2, and four as 1. The above two types of analysis were carried out by the researcher first. A research assistant was instructed to do the same independently, followed up by discussions after a two-week interval to resolve differences. After removing those rated 3 and below on truthfulness of transcription and those rated 2 and below for task compliance, fifty assignments remained for content analysis.

Through initial readings of the data with no predetermined themes or categories in mind, the researcher decided to adopt Hattie and Timperley's (2007) feedback framework for the analysis of learner self-assessment/self-feedback. Following the model, data was then read and coded respectively for a) discrepancies between goals and performance (denoted as ID), b) answers to feed up (FU), feedback (FB), and feed forward (FF) questions, and c) feedback at task (TL), process (PL), self-regulation (RL), and self levels (SL). Learner self-feedback relating to performance criteria, as having been specified in task requirement, included content and organization (CO), pronunciation, intonation, fluency (PIF), word choice and meaning expression (WM), and sentence structure and grammar (SG). Under each category, meanings illuminated in self-assessment/self-feedback were sought. Following suggestions for thematic data analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006), recurring patterns and the underlying learner conceptions were identified. Data coding was conducted again by the author after a one-month interval, in which minor differences were resolved. Excerpts from data were then selected for the presentation of research

findings. Wherever necessary, excerpts were translated into English and back-translation was used to ensure validity.

Results and discussions

All fifty assignments complied with the self-assessment/self-feedback task specification, but the degree of detail and comprehensiveness varied to a great extent. Some students used very brief, vague, one-size-fits-all comments throughout the four aspects of self-assessment/self-feedback, such as 'my content was good' and 'I need to improve my pronunciation'. Other students demonstrated expert-like critical ability, analyzing each part in detail with terms from the criteria and rubrics they learned in the previous semester. Still others extended their self-assessment/self-feedback beyond the requirement of examining the audio-recorded performance and were able to present a more panoramic review of their EFL learning in general. One element seemed to distinguish the first with the latter two groups of learners, i.e. whether specific transcribed examples were included in the self-assessment/self-feedback. Twenty seven students drew on their transcript samples in the self-assessment/self-feedback; they appeared to be more articulate and provided lots of interesting information. The remaining 23 failed to do so and their self-assessment/self-feedback comments were comparatively superficial and less insightful. The following discussion will follow the major components in Hattie and Timperley's (2007) feedback model.

Identifying discrepancies

Learning goals, although not defined or discussed explicitly for the self-assessment/self-feedback task, seemed to be something learners took as given from their learning in the previous semester and did not need further clarification. Learners clearly pointed out their strengths most of the time. They also identified areas for improvement. Based on existing assessment and feedback theories, these areas are the discrepancies between learning goals and the current performance. However, the identified discrepancies as shown in learner data revealed a much wider spectrum of their observed gaps. In addition to learning goals, learners gauged their actual performance against at least three more types of referents. These referents by which they compared their performance with were: a) what they thought they had performed, b) what they had prepared for the performance, and c) what they were able to perform in a different setting for the same subject matter.

11

Excerpts 1 and 2 are examples of the first type, which was more prevalent than the other two types. These learners had some impression of their own performance, but the self-assessment/self-feedback task gave them a chance to realize that their actual performance somehow deviated from what they believed to be the case. This discovery was often accompanied with a sense of surprise. Although EFL speaking was not a new subject of learning and all participants had been learning the language for ten or more years, for most of them, listening to their own voice in audio recording was a novel experience which enabled them to notice the discrepancy between what they believed they had performed and what they discovered through listening.

(1) My pronunciation was not accurate. When I listened, I was very much surprised by myself. Like in the first question I said *the market of stock*, it took me several times to finally understand what I was saying. In question 2, *picky* sounded like *pity*. And there are many more such cases. (#S12-05-ID-FB-TL-PIF)

(2) I finally got to know what my voice sounded like in others' ears. I always thought I was clear and fluent. But in trying to complete this assignment I had to be super attentive, or I could not understand what I myself was saying. It must be even more difficult for others to understand me. (#S02-01-ID-FB-SL-PIF)

The second type of discrepancy was between the actual performance and the prepared scripts. One learner discovered that, although he had prepared a lot by writing down in advance his ideal answers to each question, his actual recorded answers were very much discounted. This learner said he then realized that proposing answers in writing did not equal to being able to express the same ideas fully by speaking, and more oral practice had to be part of the preparation. It took him two pages in the self-assessment/self-feedback assignment to put down his original written notes and compare them against his spoken transcripts. (Although learners taking this course had always been encouraged to prepare bullet point notes rather than word-for-word scripts, some stuck to their old habits.)

In the third type of discrepancy, as demonstrated in excerpt 3, the learner compared her spoken vocabulary with her written one. To be more specific, she found that she had a larger vocabulary with written texts, i.e. in reading and writing, than what she was able to maneuver in expressing herself orally. This kind of discrepancy, although different from the second type, had similarly invoked in learners awareness about the particularity of EFL speaking as a distinctive skill and was likely to make learners more mindful in their future preparation for speaking assessments.

(3) In terms of word choice and meaning expression, I discovered that my spoken vocabulary is much smaller than my written vocabulary. I think it is because, while speaking, I could only say whatever occurred to me in real time. And the first-moment vocabularies are usually the very basic kind. These simple vocabularies often failed to express my thoughts fully. For example, in question 3, I wanted to say *part-time jobs could provide me opportunities in developing interpersonal skills*, but I only said *experience social life.* (#S21-12-ID-FB-PL/TL-WM)

In addition to discovering discrepancies, some learners went a step further to analyze these discrepancies and make sensible attributions, although it was not a required component of the self-assessment/self-feedback task, as exemplified in excerpt 4.

(4) I guess because I was afraid of speaking English and not quite used to it, and when I was speaking, I was at the same time thinking about grammar and what to say next, that made me sound hesitant all the time. (#S06-02-ID-FB-PL-PIF)

The data illustrated that the discrepancies identified by learners were multifaceted. While current theories inform us of such discrepancy identification as a critical starting point for learning, the discrepancy in most teachers' conception is oftentimes limited to the gap between learner performance and the learning goals. In this particular context, the types of discrepancies were observed by learners as comparisons of performance additionally with an impression, with preparation, and with performance in another situation. These various kinds of discrepancies bear pedagogical significance and may not always attract the attention of teachers or tutors, who have long been the predominant feedback providers. Moreover, we can expect that if the discrepancy was primed by the teacher, it may not have been a self-discovery and invoked the sense of surprise as expressed by many learners. According to Butler and Winne's (1995) self-regulation model, this self-discovery and sense of surprise could have a strong impact on follow-up learning. Nevertheless, the fact that self-assessment/self-feedback from nearly half of the participants (23, or 46%) was relatively vague and ambiguous should not be overlooked.

Feeding up

Feeding up was closely related to identifying discrepancy. On the surface, there

was little feeding up in learner self-assessment/self-feedback, but actually, feeding up was implicit in the background against which learners gauged their performance analysis. When they said this was not good enough or that it had to be changed, there was a pretty clear standard referred to but not overtly spelled out. Without well-acknowledged goals, it may be quite a challenge for learners to do meaningful self-assessment and provide useful self-feedback.

Feeding forward

Feeding forward appeared at two levels. In the final part of task requirement, learners were asked to discuss what they thought they could do to improve speaking proficiency after self-assessment/self-feedback. This part existed in all submitted assignments as a concluding remark and learner responses were rich and varied. Learners proposed for themselves a great variety of cognitive, metacognitive, affective, social, and self-regulative strategies and suggested actions to be taken. Some even came with behavior frequencies prescribed, such as 'reading out loud at least once a day', as future self-regulation reminders. The wide ranging ideas from one single student are illustrated in excerpt 5.

(5) a. Increase the amount of my vocabulary and phrases.
b. Make sure I know how to use the word when I memorize a new one.
c. Try using different kinds of connectors when I converse with others.
d. After I am familiar with basic vocabulary, expression, and grammar, I should fight against my fear of speaking English and express my opinions with confidence.
e. Read English articles and listen to English news when I have time.
f. Make myself fall in love with English.
g. Find opportunities to exchange with foreign students.
h. Be calm and relax in a speaking test. Do not be stressed out to forget what I have prepared. (#23-13-FF-RL-WM/SG)

Other than bullet point listings, some learners provided more justifications and reasoning for the actions they intended to take, as shown in excerpt 6. These feed-forward responses were more comprehensive with the inclusion of personal scrutiny on why certain actions should be taken, how to carry out those actions, what the anticipated difficulties may be, or even an estimate of how likely one would succeed. They have also revealed the spectrum of learner knowledge on tactics and strategies in the subject discipline.

(6) I think the first thing is to increase my vocabulary size and resolve my grammatical problems. For this, I can read more articles and novels, or watch movies and TV series, so as to be familiar with how native speakers talk and gradually internalize that ability, so I can speak grammatical sentences naturally and express myself more accurately. But I know this will take a long time! I feel recording is an effective method. Listen to myself will let me know if I pronounce words clearly or if I am fluent. I often had a lot of interjections and redundancies without consciously knowing it. Now I can warn myself through this method. (#S31-16-FF-RL-PIF/WM/SG)

Another level of feeding forward appeared immediately after analysis of performance as a natural follow-up. For the question 'what you need to improve', some responded with meticulous corrections of mistakes found (as will be discussed in *Feeding back*) while others with future learning strategies for the particular problems observed, as in excerpt 7. This type of more focused feeding forward, compared to the more general kind discussed above, was usually derived directly from the specific weaknesses found and was therefore more precise.

(7) a. My answers were meager and many were not directly related to the questions. They were loosely organized and I tended to speak nonsense randomly.
b. I have to prepare more, first by fully understanding the questions, and then by practicing my answers repeatedly so I could have a better control over what I say. (#S19-10-ID-FB/FF-PL/RL-CO)

Feeding back

Self-assessment/self-feedback content on the more general strengths and weaknesses, or the more detailed analysis of what was done well and what had to be improved were all directly related to feeding back. Some learners observed very carefully and picked up all mistakes or weaknesses they could possibly find. A few even classified their mistakes into different categories, calculated the number, and marked them with different colors, as shown in excerpt 8. Others went further to correct all the mistakes observed, although this was not required or even suggested in the task specification.

(8) I think my pronunciation and intonation is okay. I can hear myself clearly and

understand what I was saying. But for fluency, I don't think I was good. In my transcript, the parts marked blue were meaningless uh's and um's, which occurred eight times in one minute on average. And the parts that I marked green were my self-repeats, occurring about once or twice in each of my answer. (#S40-04-ID-FB-PL-PIF/WM)

Deeper, more complex analysis was also present in the data. For example, in excerpt 9, the learner discovered a problem in her organization of messages by jumping back and forth from one subtopic to another without appropriate transitions. She was able to elaborate her findings with notes in parentheses highlighting the subtopics she identified and placed them in front of relevant transcribed sentences. The issue she raised was not discussed in this particular course but was often taught in EFL writing – one of coherence and transitions.

(9) …As for my weakness, the sequence of my points was messy. Sometimes I spoke on a topic and soon passed to the next one without finishing up the previous topics properly. For example, in Question 5, (normal robots) *It can do laundry and maybe take care of children and cook for people.* (nanobots) *And in the future, there may be nanobots to repair our cells.* (back to normal robots) *And maybe it can deliver packages for people so we don't need mailmen.* (#S09-07-ID-FB-TL/PL-CO)

Interactions between feedback at the task and at the process level

Some feedback messages were solely at the task level, others solely at the process level. A majority of them, however, did not belong to either type; they involved feedback at both the task and the process levels. Feedback exclusively at the task level was related to the immediate performance – whether that particular answer was complete or correct, which could not be transferred to answers for other questions and thus was limited in its implication for the learner. Feedback solely at the process level often seemed rather vague and lacked clear reference. For example in excerpt 10, the learner did not use any transcript in discussing his strengths and weaknesses. This kind of feedback sounded more like cliché and did not have the potential to take learners further.

(10) I used examples to support my answers. But I did not use many examples. And I often explain using unnecessary sentences. (#S42-03-ID-FB-PL-CO)

On the contrary, feedback that appeared more effective usually combined not only specific examples at the task level but also generalized conceptions at the process level, which were in turn deduced from those concrete examples. Excerpts 8 and 9 cited above were such examples. In both excerpts, the learners first gave a summary of their observations, which was at the process level. The general statements of 'not fluent' and 'sequence being messy' were then followed up by precise details collected from the transcripts, which in turn validated the learner self-assessment/self-feedback as well as pointed to much clearer future actions.

Feedback at the self-regulation level

In a broader sense, the learner self-assessment/self-feedback task itself could be seen as training for self-regulation and all learner responses could be considered either attempts or results of self-regulation. By way of following the task directions and completing the assignment through listening, transcribing, analyzing in the four aspects of EFL speaking, and proposing future actions, learners went over self-monitoring on previous performance and self-directing for future behavior regulations. Self-regulation is present in all learner self-assessment/self-feedback responses, despite the fact that some were more successful than others in their potential self-regulation efficacy.

Feedback at the self level

A number of learners produced self-assessment/self-feedback at the self level and, contrary to expectation, this type of feedback appeared to be quite positive in terms of its efficacy and potential for future improvement. Some learners considered their own personal characteristics and dispositions in relation to the learning of EFL speaking in general, as shown in excerpt 11. This learner's candid statements were a result of his observation and deep reflection, which revealed a healthy positive attitude in facing his unique problem. His prescriptions also seemed realistic and well-grounded. Inherent in this kind of self-level feedback were clear perceptions of the self encompassing a reflection in the person's learning habits and history.

(11) I am the kind of person who tends to get nervous easily and could not improvise in stressful situations. Because of this, I think I have to prepare much earlier and more fully for speaking tests like this, more than what is necessary. As for pronunciation and intonation, I think I did well, probably because I heeded to this part when memorizing vocabulary in middle and high

schools. But, owing to my croaking voice, I'd better pay special attention on my intonation. (#S28-12-ID-FB/FF-RL/SL-PIF)

Much of such plausible self-assessment/self-feedback was made possible by learners doing more than what was required in the self-assessment/self-feedback task. For example, in excerpt 12, this learner did not limit himself to the three required transcripts and was able to identify his problems of rigidly adhering to a few templates for all the sixty questions.

(12)   Before the test, I wrote down my answers to all questions. So the content was not a big problem. But just because of that, I tended to use very similar formats in answering all questions. It may not be apparent viewing only from the three selected audio files and their transcripts. But if you check my entire answer profile, you'll find that I followed the same two or three structures all the way through, with only content words replaced. (#S33-14-ID-FB-RL/SL-CO)

Interestingly, the findings on learner self-level feedback seemed to contradict Hattie and Timperley's (2007) argument that feedback at this level is too often unrelated to performance on the task and counterproductive to learning. The majority of self-level feedback, as illustrated above, was illuminating. With the self-assessment/self-feedback opportunity given, many learners made a birds-eye view analysis, realistically taking into consideration their experiences and their congenital strengths and limitations. As exposed in their reasoning and attitude, this self-level feedback represented thoughtful and thorough reflections of the learner assessors. Moreover, these feedback messages helped learners to understand themselves better and become more affectively ready for future learning challenges. A possible reason for this difference may have to do with learner age. While the learners described in Hattie and Timperley (2007) were mainly pupils, those in this study were mature young adults who could be more autonomous and shouldered more learning responsibilities.

In summary, learner self-assessment/self-feedback as shown in this study identified discrepancies of current performance against goals as well as against learner impression, preparation, and performance in other situations. Self-assessment/self-feedback messages encompassed aspects depicted in Hattie and Timperley's feedback model (2007), including answers to feeding up, back, and forward questions, and to the four levels of task, process, self-regulation, and self. The detected features of self-feedback mostly supported what we know about feedback. In

particular, learner self-feedback appeared to be more powerful when there was interaction between the task and the process level, in that task-level details gave solid basis for generalization and transfer at the process level. However, although feedback at the self level is considered counterproductive in Hattie and Timperley's model, the data here suggested that self-level self-feedback was illuminating and beneficial for learners.

Implications, limitations, and conclusion

Before discussing further, let us imagine an alternative scenario of typical teacher feedback for the same learner performance. Most likely, the one or a few more teachers/tutors would spend a few days listening to all audio files and trying to inform each learner, in writing, audio, or face-to-face, the strengths and areas for improvement. In the meantime, because teachers were taking care of the feedback, learners would move on with daily routines and less likely be engaged in what their teacher did, while the memory of how they performed in the ten minutes or so of speaking gradually fades away. Sometime later, learners would passively receive teacher feedback, read or not read it, act or not act upon it, and continue learning the same way or with changes informed by teachers, until they undertake the next speaking test.

With self-assessment and self-feedback, the data examined in this study was generated by learners and was unequivocally learner-centered. Many problems discussed in the literature with teacher feedback did not exist in the observed learner self-feedback. There was certainly no misalignment of perceptions between teachers and learners (Orsmond and Merry 2011). The self-feedback messages were less susceptible to problems such as teachers' delivery, tone, style, or excessive amount that may overwhelm learners or damage their self-esteem (Wingate 2010). Moreover, the self-feedback messages were comprehensible and not filtered out by learners as would be those coming from the teachers (Butler and Winne 1995). In order to complete self-assessment/self-feedback, learners first had to engage in careful post-performance review and reflection, thereby taking over learning responsibilities and turning themselves from passive recipients of feedback into the owners of their own learning. Based on their idiosyncratic background knowledge of the world and of the subject matter, learners discovered more about their learning through self-assessment and self-feedback. In short, similar to what Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin (2014) have found with learners conducting peer assessment, it should be better to give than to receive.

In addition to not having common teacher feedback shortcomings, the study reported here uncovered that learner self-feedback entailed the width and depth that could hardly be expected from any conscientious teacher. Most EFL teachers would not know a learner's vocabulary size in different language skills and its implications for the learner, nor what a learner has prepared for a test and how his/her test performance deviates from it, let alone everyone's past learning histories, personality traits, and emotions. Learners, not teachers, are the ones who possess all this information and could make sense of it through meaningful self-assessment/self-feedback. As can be seen, with some guidance and support, learners could be ideal feedback providers for the self because they are knowledgeable with chronological and cross-sectional background information on their own learning. Besides, in self-assessment/self-feedback, time and effort for feeding back to the self would less likely be divided and diluted as would be the case for teachers teaching large classes. As shown in this study, learners were no longer the usual one among a crowd of many students being served by a single teacher assessor. By way of self-assessment/self-feedback, they made it possible to attend to such details as counting error types and average frequencies, thus permitting more thoroughness in assessment for which most teachers cannot afford.

What learner self-assessment/self-feedback revealed to us bears further implications when viewed together with recent research developments. First, the self-feedback provided important clues to the teacher on what help learners really need. Secondly, as have been discussed, Boud and Molloy (2012) advocate a student-seeking model of feedback shifted from the habitual teacher-telling one. Thirdly, researchers (Beaumont, O'Doherty, and Shannon 2011; Bloxham and Campbell 2010; Yang and Carless 2013) have called for teacher-learner dialogues involving feedback on performance and subsequent reflections and adjustments to replace the kind of feedback featuring only one-way teacher monologues. It follows that with their capacity to produce meaningful and abundant self-feedback, learners could and should initiate this dialogue. Unlike in most circumstances where teachers decide what they teach and prescribe what learners learn, if dialogues are initiated by learner self-feedback as those shown in this study, such learner self-feedback could provide fertile ground for productive teaching and learning. False beliefs and misconceptions could be eradicated or clarified. Positive attitudes and practices could be intensified. Focused instructions could take learners a step closer to learning goals in a more systematic manner. Moreover, since the self-feedback as shown here involved issues of affect, discipline, self-regulation, and personal management, it

provided a good opportunity for teaching lifelong learning skills and for the teacher to share experiences as an expert. In fact, with the multitude of issues involved in assessing EFL speaking, we could reasonably expect that teacher feedback on the same learner performance could hardly come close to coinciding with the content in learner self-feedback. Therefore, with learner self-feedback as a legitimate basis for follow-up teaching, teachers do not have to risk shooting off the target and teaching what learners do not need or cannot take.

It is thus suggested that other than providing feedback to individual learners, teachers' time and effort could also be well spent in designing activities to guide learners in furnishing meaningful self-feedback. For different subject matters, attention and time could be devoted to what learners need to be equipped with in conducting worthwhile self-assessment and generating self-feedback. In fact, self-assessment/self-feedback tasks could be seen as training for self-regulation. Advance preparation could facilitate learners in conducting quality self-assessment/self-feedback. For the self-assessment/self-feedback task in this study, it was positioned at the beginning of the second half of the school year, foregrounded by students practicing the skills for one semester, being tested in a midterm and a final examination, and familiarizing learners with the criteria of proficient EFL speaking. Because students were guided to analyze their multiple speaking samples from the previous speaking test, their self-assessment/self-feedback were by nature not limited to single answers at task level; rather, the self-assessment/self-feedback became by and large stocktaking for EFL speaking at a midpoint of their long learning journeys. Self-assessment/self-feedback at this depth is so far not a common classroom practice in most educational settings, but it could be considered. As research on teacher feedback has been proven less effective due to contextual and structural constraints (Bailey and Garner, 2010; Price et al. 2010) and learner engagement has been pointed out as a possible solution (Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin 2014; Orsmond and Merry 2013), pedagogical considerations that facilitate learner self-assessment/self-feedback in different disciplines for learners at different age warrant further research.

Nevertheless, it has to be noted that the feedback loop was not yet completed in the present study. Although problems were identified, they were not likely to disappear simply because of the self-assessment/self-feedback. A lot of on-task and off-task monitoring as well as extensive practice had to follow and, in fact, were mandatory. This notion points to the limitations of the current study. Although the data analysis showed interesting depth in learner self-assessment/self-feedback, it is not clear if and (if yes) how effectively or quickly learners could indeed improve in areas

21

they noticed. It is not clear, either, whether or how often this kind of learner self-assessment/self-feedback should be repeated regularly during a course. Would the surprise and novelty of self-discovery and its impact brought about by such learner self-assessment/self-feedback be likely to diminish over time if it is repeated? What exactly is it that teachers can do to ensure follow-up learning and improvement? For learners who did not seem to be as engaged in the self-assessment/self-feedback task as their peers were, such as the 23 out of 50 who did not supply specific examples and give more insightful self-feedback, what could be offered to help them and what were the factors involved? Are there certain types of learners or learning that may benefit more from self-assessment/self-feedback more than others? These questions suggest future research directions on learner self-assessment and self-feedback. More studies, such as experiments comparing learning gains with and without self-assessment/self-feedback and interviews with and observations of learners after they have been engaged with self-assessment/self-feedback, are needed to help us understand the mechanism of self-assessment/self-feedback further.

In conclusion, unlike previous studies concerned with the accuracy or effects of learner self-assessment, this study explored the content and potential of college students' self-assessment/self-feedback on their EFL speaking performance. Data analysis indicated that, under guidance, feedback generated by learners answered feed up, feedback, and feed forward questions, and covered levels of task, process, self-regulation, and self. Results supported Hattie and Timperley's (2007) model in that feedback involving both details from the task level and generalization at the process level was more productive than feedback exclusively at either level. However, contrary to theoretical presumptions of self-level feedback being unproductive, learner self-level feedback appeared to be quite beneficial. Learner self-feedback in general did not have many of the problems already known with teacher feedback, and its richness may provide good materials for more learner-focused teaching and learning. It was suggested that teachers, besides preparing feedback for individual learners, spend time designing tasks to facilitate learner self-assessment/self-feedback and use that feedback information as a basis for subsequent instruction. Finally, more research is needed to help us understand the efficacy, consequences, and necessary follow-ups of learner self-assessment/self-feedback.

References

Andrade, H. 2008. Self-Assessment through Rubrics. *Educational Leadership* 65 (4): 60-63.

Bailey, R., and M. Garner. 2010. Is the Feedback in Higher Education Assessment Worth the Paper It Is Written on? Teachers' Reflection on Their Practices. *Teaching in Higher Education* 15 (2): 187-198.

Beaumont, C., M. O'Doherty, and L. Shannon. 2011. Reconceptualising Assessment Feedback: A Key to Improving Student Learning? *Studies in Higher Education* 36 (6): 671-687.

Black, P., and D. Wiliam. 2009. Developing the Theory of Formative Assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability* 21: 5-31.

Bloxham, S., and L. Campbell. 2010. Generating Dialogue in Assessment Feedback: Exploring the Use of Interactive Cover Sheets. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35: 291-300.

Boud, D. 1995. *Enhancing Learning through Self Assessment*. London: Kogan Press.

Boud, D., and N. Falchikov. 1989. Quantitative Studies of Student Self-Assessment in Higher Education: A Critical Analysis of Findings. *Higher Education* 18: 529-549.

Boud, D., and E. Molloy. 2012. Rethinking Models of Feedback for Learning: The Challenge of Design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 38 (6): 698-712.

Brantmeier, C. 2005. Nonlinguistic Variables in Advanced L2 Reading: Learner's Self-assessment and Enjoyment. *Foreign Language Annals* 38 (4): 493-503.

Braun, V., and V. Clarke. 2006. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2): 77-101.

Butler, Y. G., and J. Lee. 2006. On-Task Versus Off-Task Self-Assessments among Korean Elementary School Students Studying English. *The Modern Language Journal* 90 (4): 506-518.

Butler, Y. G., and J. Lee. 2010. The Effects of Self-Assessment Among Young Learners of English. *Language Testing* 27 (1): 5-31.

Butler, D. L., and P. H. Winne. 1995. Feedback and Self-Regulated Learning: A Theoretical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research* 65 (3): 245-281.

Chen, Y.-M. 2008. Learning to Self-Assess Oral Performance in English: A Longitudinal Case Study. *Language Teaching Research* 12 (2): 235-262.

De Saint Leger, D. 2009. Self-Assessment of Speaking Skills and Participation in a Foreign Language Class. *Foreign Language Annals* 42 (1): 158-178.

Douglas, N., and J. R. Morgan. 2013. *World Class 2*. Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Hattie, J., and H. Timperley. 2007. The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77: 81-112.

Lee, I. 2009. Feedback Revolution: What Gets in the Way? *ELT Journal* 65 (1): 1-12.

Lew, M. D. N., W. A. M. Alwis, and H. G. Schmidt. 2010. Accuracy of Students' Self-Assessment and Their Beliefs about Its Utility. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (2): 135-156.

Matsuno, S. 2009. Self-, Peer-, and Teacher-Assessments in Japanese University EFL Writing Classrooms. *Language Testing* 26 (1): 75-100.

McConlogue, T. 2012. But Is It Fair? Developing Students' Understanding of Grading Complex Written Work through Peer Assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 37 (1): 113-123.

Milne, C. 2009. Assessing Self-Evaluation in a Science Methods Course: Power, Agency, Authority and Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25: 758-766.

Nicol, D., A. Thomson, and C. Breslin. 2014. Rethinking Feedback Practices in Higher Education: A Peer Review Perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 39 (1): 102-122.

Orsmond, P., and S. Merry. 2011. Feedback Alignment: Effective and Ineffective Links Between Tutors' and Students' Understanding of Coursework Feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 36 (2): 125-136.

Orsmond, P., and S. Merry. 2013. The Importance of Self-Assessment in Students' Use of Tutors' Feedback: A Qualitative Study of High and Non-High Achieving Biology Undergraduates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 38 (6): 737-753.

Orsmond, P., S. Merry, and A. Callaghan. 2004. Implementation of a Formative Assessment Model Incorporating Peer and Self-Assessment. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 41 (3): 273-290.

Price, M., K. Handley, J. Millar, and B. O'Donovan. 2010. Feedback: All That Effort, but What Is the Effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (3): 277-289.

Rivers, W. P. 2001. Autonomy at All Costs: An Ethnography of Metacognitive Self-Assessment and Self-Management among Experienced Language Learners. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (2): 279-290.

Tan, K. H. K. 2004. Does Student Self-Assessment Empower or Discipline Students? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 29 (6): 651-662.

Wingate, U. 2010. The Impact of Formative Feedback on the Development of Academic Writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (5): 519-533.

Yang, M., and D. Carless. 2013. The Feedback Triangle and the Enhancement of Dialogic Feedback Processes. *Teaching in Higher Education* 18 (3): 285-297.

論文二

評鑑與教學之關聯 –
以政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程為例

評鑑與教學之關聯 –

以政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程為例

政治大學外文中心　林翰儀

前言

近幾十年來，由於全球化、國際化的趨勢，高等教育的殿堂亦朝此方向邁進。政治大學(以下簡稱本校)為配合因應國際化政策，培養學生卓越英語文能力，故開設「英語文榮譽學分學程」供有興趣、有實力的學生選修。

本校最初於 2001 年即成立商學院全英語授課學程(English Taught Program, ETP)，由英語系統籌策劃，並於 2003 年另為外語學院開設類似學程，2005 年社會科學院及傳播學院亦加入此類學程；後因本校組織變革，2004 年改由外文中心(原語視中心)接手統整全校英語文榮譽學程規劃。該學程幾經變革，由原本 15 學分增為 18 或 20 學分學程，且修習年限設為三至四年（例如：為考量學生出國交換計劃）。發展至今，目前本校共有兩個英語榮譽學程，一為外文中心為校內有志加強英語能力的各系（不含英文系）學生所開設的 20 學分學程(已由 18 學分增為 20 學分)，一般稱為 English Honors Program (HP)，另一為商學院為其院內學生開設的英語商管學程，一般稱之為 English Taught Program (ETP)，為 18 學分。

本文將逐一闡述研究計劃之背景、目的與重要性，回顧政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程近年來的發展，說明與大學通識英文以及政大商管英語學程 ETP 之比較；佐以重要參考文獻評述，自本校學程評鑑文件檔案，含書面自評及校級審查，研究者和行政人員參與觀察心得，以及資料收集，如：某學期教學評量問卷結果，呈現英語文榮譽學程的成效檢討；再依據學程評鑑結果，遭遇到之困難，提出對未來發展之建言，提供有志於此類似學程的教育團體參考。

研究計畫之背景、目的與重要性

研究背景概述

研究成套的英語文榮譽學程有別於一般英文課程（英語文榮譽學程與大學通識英文之比較請見表一），其主要理由有三：

1) 不像一般英文必選修課程只能記錄一學期或一學年的學習發展，榮譽學程經英文能力篩選的小眾學生群會在大學四年中持續一同修習一系列循序漸進的英語技能課程，同一批學生的學習進程有長時間、延續性的資料可供檢

視,是很寶貴、可開發的研究資源。

2) 榮譽學程的學生經過英文能力篩選且另付學分費,程度整齊且學習動機較強,研究結果可與先前在零星的必修課中所發現形成對照,加強研究者及一線教師對評量影響學習情形的全面瞭解。

3) 該榮譽學程強調小班教學,每班不超過 20 人,具優良的課程安排條件,且較不受校方整體通識教育規畫的限制,老師們在負擔合理的情況下,以評量促進學習的空間更大、更有機會提供較細膩的個別回饋訊息予學生,相信可因此觀察到過去研究中不曾觸及的多元評量方式,增加我等對問題的瞭解。

<center>表一:英語文榮譽學程與大學通識英文之比較</center>

	英語文榮譽學程	大學通識英文
班級人數	約 20 人	約 35 人
語言技能訓練	聽說讀寫(側重口說與寫作)	聽說讀寫(整合技能訓練)
教材選擇	以寫作為主	以閱讀為主
相關能力測驗	自行設計招生測驗(筆試為主)	大學入學英文測驗及中心特製聽力測驗

政治大學外文中心英語文榮譽學程近年發展概述

本校最初於 2001 年即成立政大英語商管學程(English Taught Program, ETP),由英語系統籌策劃,為 15 學分 4 學年的基礎英語課程;並於 2003 年另為外語學院開設類似學程,仍為 15 學分,且修習年限設為三學年(因考量某些學生進行海外交換計劃,需要精實的課程)。後因本校組織變革,2004 年改由外文中心(原語視中心)自英語系接手統整全校大學通識英、外文課程、英語文榮譽學程、以及各系相關語言訓練課程,此時並由外文中心與英語系教師組成的榮譽學程小組,進行學程更名 English Honors Program (HP)及課程規劃,由原本 15 學分增為 18 學分學程,以精進語言能力整合運用、跨文化溝通,以及職涯銜接發展為目標,後來並將 3 學年的學程改為 4 學年;2005 年社會科學院及傳播學院亦加入此類學程;該學程幾經變革,學生人數及參與此學程的學院亦逐年增加成長。2006 年由小組成員展開問卷調查(自當時 260 位學生回收 163 份問卷),了解新課程規劃實施成效,並依據問卷調查結果,做為學程修正的方向,當時除了將修習科目做了調整,也肯定此學程的教學品質及成效,結果顯示此學程可協助學生未來生涯發展,也因樂於其中學習願意將此學程推薦給他人;並建議學程應定期評鑑,以符合學生和社會的需求(Che, 2005, 2007)。表二及表三為課程改革之前後課程一覽表:

表二：政治大學英語文榮譽學程課程一覽表(94 學年度之前)

課程規劃：3 年修讀 7 門課，共計必修 18 學分；全程以英語授課。

年級	課程名稱	學分數	說明
一	大學英文 (I)：閱讀與寫作 大學英文 (II)：閱讀與寫作	2 2	上下學期各二學分，共計四學分。
二	大學英文 (III)：中級聽力	2/0, 0/2	單學期課程二學分，一班於上學期修，另一班於下學期修。
	口語訓練及寫作 (一年課程)	6(3/3)	上下學期各三學分，共計六學分。
三	進階口語訓練及寫作	3	單學期課程三學分
	進階聽力訓練	3	單學期課程三學分
	總計學分數	18	

表三：政治大學英語文榮譽學程課程一覽表(94-100 學年度)

課程規劃：4 年修讀 8 門課，共計必修 18 學分；全程以英語授課。

修讀年級	課程名稱	學分數	開課期別	開課單位	學分費
一年級	大學英文（一）	2	上學期	外文中心	—
	大學英文（二）	2	下學期		
二年級	大學英文（三）	2	單學期*		採擴大輔系辦法，選課學生需繳學分費
	中級寫作訓練	3	單學期*		
三年級	進階英語聽力	3	單學期*		
	跨文化溝通	2	單學期*		
四年級	進階英文寫作	2	單學期*		
	進階口語溝通	2	單學期*		

*以上單學期課程上、下學期均有開設。

　　發展至今，目前本校共有兩個英語榮譽學程，一為外文中心為校內有志加強英語能力的各系（不含英文系以及商學院 ETP 學生）學生所開設的 20 學分學程(已由 18 學分增為 20 學分)，一般稱為 English Honors Program (HP)，另一為商學院為其院內學生開設的英語商管學程，一般稱之為 English Taught Program (ETP)，為 18 學分，兩者在過去多年來都得到學生熱烈報名參與。目前兩者在經費上都由開課單位（即外文中心與商學院）自行籌措，未得校方專案資源挹注，商學院學程除專任師資由外文中心代為招募外，行政與開課均自行獨立運作。下文僅就外文中心榮譽學程的沿革發展、經營模式、運作現況做一簡單背景介紹，校內外類似學程的發展評估則是本計畫未來研究的重心之一。政大英語文榮譽學程比較請見*附錄 1*。

然而，雖然學程發展穩定成長，但自 97 學年度起，外文中心仍決定停招榮譽學程，主要原因大約是：1) 原本專任教師十分樂於教授榮譽學程，但校方決定要讓學程在財務上自給自足，因此專任教師之基本鐘點不能再包含榮譽學程時數，必須將其安排在正規鐘點之外。這個決定使得專任教師都失去了授課的意願，因為在現今高等教育的環境下，研究壓力使得教師們授課超鐘點幾乎不可能，而沒有研究壓力的專任講師又都有約十五個小時的基本鐘點要求，無力再外加。如此一來，學程課程只能仰賴不固定的兼任老師授課。2) 學程經過數年的經營，陸續有外力加入，例如當時配合歐洲語言學位學程新成立，打出其學生可保證修習英語榮譽學程的招生宣傳，使得原本門檻較高的「榮譽」制度逐漸有了改變。

當時榮譽學程雖停止招收新生，但仍須逐年開課，使既已招募的學生能修完課程以符合畢業要求，97 至 100 這四學年間另聘兼任教師授課。一直到 100 學年度，眼見學程學生已逐步修完課程且紛紛畢業，外文中心面臨了要讓學程關門或重啟招生的決定。基本上，大環境的條件並未改善，校方的財務情形更加嚴峻，專任師資授課的限制仍在，但另一方面，學生對學程的殷切期盼也經由各種管道讓外文中心感受到。在政大以文法商掛帥的環境裏，學生的外語能力一般不弱，但除大一必修的四學分英文課外，選修的英文課在資源有限的情況下永遠是供不應求，部份學生選擇輔修英文系以確保大學四年都能修到英文課，但有很多學生發現英文輔系必修的西洋文學概論、語言學概論等課程與他們想加強英文技能的初衷有段距離，對這些學生而言，榮譽學程以聽說讀寫技能為主的訓練才真正符合他們的需求。在經過大學英文會議委員的討論後，最終決定克服既有的限制，同時檢討學程執行以來的缺失，調整學程的安排，在 100 學年度下學期重啟招生。

新出發的學程做了以下幾點調整：

1. 課程設計革新：將原本 18 學分學程改為 20 學分；新制課程著重英語說寫能力循序漸進的培養，並分為中級與高級，著重學習內容不同，明確設定中高級語文能力應達到之目標，以協助學生為將來生涯發展做準備。

2. 單純以英文能力考試篩選學生，不考慮其它因素：因為學程受歡迎，過去曾依學院別分配招生名額，但因各學院新生入學成績即有落差，此舉造成學程學生程度不夠整齊，且因部份保障名額影響了「榮譽」得來不易的概念。亦曾考慮依整體學業成績篩選，以確保學生一般課業表現優良，但各學生學業成績非在相同的天平上比較，亦容易模糊英文能力的焦點，故決定由中心教師出題考試，以測驗學生寫作能力為主，聽力或閱讀能力為輔，做為篩選的依據。

3. 招新時點改在大一下、升大二之前：過去學程在大一新生入學時即辦理招生，近年的經驗發現大一學生初來乍到，多半未經深思即熱烈參與各種遴選，到大二較清楚自己的方向時部份學生則可能選擇退出，且大一

某些學生仍在思考轉系輔系等，不適合做未來四年的學習承諾。大一快結束將升大二時，學生必修課程已近完成，是思考要不要投入英語榮譽學程的較佳時機。

4. 設置學程主任與導師：因學程學生來自各系，且少有中心教師授課與學生在課堂上互動，為輔導學生學習，且與所有兼任老師做密切的橫向連繫，以便掌握學程進行中的狀況並及早發現與解決問題，有必要由中心專任教師負起整合的責任，是以設立學程主任一人及學程導師二人。

5. 定期辦理迎新、成果發表等活動：為營造榮譽感，讓經過公平競爭得以進入學程的學生感覺受到重視，學程將定期舉辦活動，如迎新會讓老師學生互相認識、期末成果發表讓學生說寫作品有正式發表的場合，也作為展示學程成效的宣傳方式。

榮譽學程的課程規劃經微調後，學生 4 學年修讀 8 門課，共計必修 20 學分，全程以英語授課。小班教學，每班人數在 20 人左右，期待以優質課程及學習環境確保學生在學期間持續精進英語文聽說讀寫能力。101 學年度開始使用之新制課程規劃如表四。

表四：政治大學英語文榮譽學程課程一覽表(101 學年度之後至今)

101 學年復招後新制課程規劃：4 年修讀 8 門課，共計必修 20 學分；
全程以英語授課。

學年	課程名稱	學分	開課期別	總學分數
1	大學英文 (一)	2	上學期	4
	大學英文 (二)	2	下學期	
2	大學英文 (三)	2	上/下學期	4
	英語聽力訓練	2	單學期	
3	中級口語訓練	3	單學期	6
	中級英文寫作	3	單學期	
4	高級口語訓練	3	單學期	6
	高級英文寫作	3	單學期	

課程介紹:

第一學年

• 大學英文（一） 2 學分　著重聽、說、讀、寫的整合訓練，使學生能以英語就個人熟悉之相關主題，清楚表達意見與看法，並且進行基本英文段落寫作。

• 大學英文（二） 2 學分　著重聽、說、讀、寫的整合訓練，使學生能以英語就廣泛的主題，清楚表達個人意見與看法，並且能進行英文短文寫作。

<u>第二學年</u>

- 大學英文（三）　　2學分　　課程副標題有：學術演講聽說訓練、口語訓練與閱讀、新聞聽力、新聞英文、口語訓練與演說、商用聽力與口說訓練等。學生可依其興趣自由修讀。
- 英語聽力訓練　　2學分　　著重商業、時事與文化議題的聽力訓練，同時亦提升學生意見回饋與進行討論的能力。

<u>第三學年</u>

- 中級口語訓練　　3學分　　著重聽、說二項能力訓練，使學生能清楚摘要學術演講內容，清楚表達個人意見與看法外，並能發表專題簡報。
- 中級寫作訓練　　3學分　　加強英文寫作訓練、增進邏輯與分析能力，使學生能以英文寫作條理清晰、具說服力的文章。

<u>第四學年</u>

- 高級口語訓練　　3學分　　藉由進階口語訓練，使學生能於社交、專業與學術領域中，以英語流暢、有效地表達個人意見及看法。
- 高級英文寫作　　3學分　　透過進階英文寫作訓練，使學生能有效撰寫結構完整的文章，並能針對複雜的議題撰寫學術論文。

復招計畫確定後，隨即於 101 年 4 月舉辦招生說明會，向有興趣的學生說明學程內容及相關選課規定，申請至 4 月底截止，再於 5 月中舉行筆試。考題以非選擇題為主，含英文寫作，試卷由中心教師二人分別彌封閱卷並得到頗高的評分者間信度，結果經開會討論後於 6 月中公告，共約 120 人報名，錄取 65 人。教師整合方面，安排好 101 學年第 1 學期開課科目與授課教師後，於 6 月底暑假開始前舉辦教師見面會，由學程主任傳遞學程理念，並讓所有學程的兼任老師有機會討論課程、教材選用細節及迎新活動的安排。9 月中開學前辦理學程迎新，由授課教師分帶英語學習活動，讓學生在學期開始前有相互認識的機會。至此重新啟動的英語榮譽學程已正式上路。

研究目的與重要性

上述學程發展的經過若未能詳加記錄保存，其經驗與啟示難以對未來從事類似規畫的教師與行政人員產生助益，曾有的問題很可能再度發生。此外，學程的發展是否能如預期？目標達成多少？學生的英文能力是否真有進步？進步幅度如何？哪些方面進步顯著，哪些較為困難？教師與學生在整個學程週期中的穩定性與流動率如何？影響的因素有哪些？師生的學程經驗為何？學生完成學程後得到了什麼？這些收穫對他們有什麼實質的幫助？在後續的升學就業路上產生什麼影響？學程還應該朝哪些方向改進？上述種種問題在榮譽學程進行多年後的今天，還未能有完整的答案，而這些答案對榮譽

學程的發展至關重要。要獲致可靠有意義的答案還需清楚界定問題，並妥善規畫各種資料的蒐集與解讀。目前校方雖有來自教務處的學程評鑑機制，但也只是很粗淺地從學生人數、開課情形、完成比率等簡單數據來衡量，所能提供的訊息十分有限。因此，一個由參與學程運作的英語教學研究者規畫的全面性英語榮譽學程評鑑有其必要，此為本計畫主要目的之一，並依循 program evaluation 文獻進行較系統性的全面成效評量與改進方向探討，以期能提出規畫改進建議。

重要參考文獻評述

學程評鑑（**Program Evaluation**）

國內英語榮譽學程雖在某些大學行之有年，但各校對榮譽學程的定義與學程的使命不見得有一致的解讀與看法，加以各校行政資源上的不同限制，學程的理想與現實間恐有一段距離，需要相關行政決策者的取捨與在執行過程中順應環境來修正。另方面，雖然國內英語教學相關研究在近年益見豐富，但英語榮譽學程似是一塊未開發的處女地，鮮有深入的學術探討，實有必要進行系統性的研究，期能貢獻於大學英語榮譽學程未來的發展。以下先將數個學術資料庫蒐尋的結果大略以數據列出，再討論國內外相關文獻的內容。

1. 全國碩博士論文資料庫：以「學程」不限欄位蒐索，得 29,215 筆，以「榮譽學程」、「英語學程」、「英文學程」、「英語榮譽學程」蒐尋則大幅減少，分別得到 0, 5, 1, 0 筆資料，其中僅有 1 筆屏東教育大學教育行政研究所的博士論文「科技大學英語教育政策執行之研究」在主題上與本研究較相近，此外資料庫中再無大學英語學程的相關研究。
2. 國科會計畫查詢：以「學程」為關鍵字，於 78~101 年間查得 177 筆計畫，限縮至人文及社會科學類後剩下 23 筆，其中屬教育學的有 17 筆，語言學僅 1 筆探討跨系翻譯學程，此外資料庫中再無大學英語學程相關的研究。
3. TSSCI 資料庫：以「學程」查詢得 17 筆，多為中等教育學程、師資培育學程等議題；以「榮譽學程」、「英語學程」、「英文學程」蒐尋結果均為「找不到」。
4. LLBA: 以 honors program 為關鍵字僅蒐得 2 筆資料，其一為 1977 年之期刊論文，探討在 honors degree program 中教大一生法文，另一為 1991 年美國 U Penn 的學位論文，探討以母語寫作為本的大學教育，基本上均與英語榮譽學程不太相關。另以 language program evaluation 為關鍵字，限

在學術期刊與書籍類，得到 86 筆，再限制為英文而非其他語文則餘 28 筆資料，最近的一筆在 1995 年，距今竟已有 17 年之久。

5. SSCI: 以文章標題含 language program evaluation 蒐尋得 66 筆資料，經剔除不符主旨的資料、書評後，比較重要的發現是 *Language Teaching Research* 期刊 2009 年的一本語言教育評量專刊 "Special Issue: Understanding and improving language education through program evaluation" 及近年零星出現在 *Foreign Language Annals, Modern Language Journal, Language Learning* 等重要期刊的幾篇論文。

6. 已出版之外語學程評鑑專書：近十來年稍早的系統性論述包括有 Worthen, Sanders, and Fitzpatrick (1997)較廣泛的教育評鑑指南 *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines (2nd edition)*及 Lynch (1996) 側重在語言教育評量的專書 *Language program evaluation – Theory and practice*，近些年的則有 Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005) 的 *Program Evaluation in Language Education* 及 Lynch (2003)將語言評量與學程評鑑合併考慮的討論 *Language assessment and programme evaluation*，以及 Norris 等人編輯的大學外語教育評量專書(Norris, Davis, Sinicrope, & Watanabe, 2009)。這些專書對於學程評鑑的歷史發展脈絡、實證與詮釋主義等不同派典、對利害關係人(stakeholders)的考量、質與量資料的蒐集與詮釋等，都有十分詳盡的討論，並描述多種不同社會環境中的案例供讀者參考。此外，在外語教學的領域，亦有不少的文獻檢討外語師資培育的機制(如 Peacock, 2009)，其評鑑標的雖與本計畫不相同，但其研究問題的框定及執行步驟亦有許多值得本研究參考借鏡之處。

以上僅為初步的關鍵字資料庫及圖書蒐尋，資料庫初步蒐尋所得若再細讀標題、去除主題不符的文獻，則所剩可參考的筆數就更少了。研究者另就實際執行面在國內各大學網站做地毯式的蒐索，以初步瞭解各校相關英語榮譽學程的施行概況，最後整理出至少有十所大學曾經營類似的學程，多為國立大學，分別自民國八十九年起陸續開辦，有的仍在進行，有的已停辦，多由英語系、應外系或語言中心負責，招生人數自 20 人至 160 人不等，亦有不限人數者，篩選的考量有的著重英文能力，有的亦考量整體學業成績。另就學程課程內容來看，各校規畫者似有相當不同的思維，有些課程均為聽說讀寫能力的培養，有些課程則包含了翻譯、文化、戲劇、小說、觀光、英語教學等五花八門的內容，果然各校對英語榮譽學程雖有類似的使命感，卻有相當不同的詮釋，想必經營模式上亦各有創意，十分值得研究者探討、整理，並進一步以學術研究的訓練檢驗已發生的情形，提出未來發展改進的建議。

由上可知，國內英語榮譽學程過去十多年來各自發展興盛，但這個議題在國內相關研究十分有限，在國外則較多為 ESL/EFL 或 EAP 或其它類型的英語學

程研究，於查得資料中沒有所謂的英語榮譽學程。以上一方面說明這類研究近年來嚴重不足，是值得開發的方向，另方面也提醒研究者要謹慎選擇定義問題的角度，才能與主流論述接軌，並提出有意義的研究貢獻。此外，台灣高等教育評鑑，特別是系所與通識評鑑，在過去十多年來已是各大學的全民運動，每次的自我評鑑與外部評鑑莫不動員大批人力，相關的研究與執行經驗已為參與的教研人員建立了很好的評鑑意識。唯類似規模的評鑑很少擴及學分學程，僅有各大學小規模非正式的行政資料，此亦顯示出系統性學程評鑑的必要性。以下各段將整理相關文獻中對本研究有所啟發的內容。

國外文獻中多數冠上「榮譽學程」(Honors Program)之名的討論多不是在談英語為外語的教學，而是以專業領域發展的學程為主，而且各地對這個名詞的認知多有歧異。例如 Kiley, Boud, Manathunga, and Cantwell (2011) 討論澳洲大學的榮譽學程時，特別提及它難以與他國榮譽學程做比較，原來在澳洲的學制下，大學榮譽學程有其在地獨特性，由各系經營且多引以為傲，目的在讓學業成績優異的學生在大學多讀一年，為博士養成的學術研究做準備，類似碩士班的位階。但在高等教育全球化的今日，這樣的制度難以與歐美的碩士、博士班制度接軌，是當地高等教育未來發展要面對的問題。借鏡澳洲經驗，我們的英語榮譽學程究竟在各大學是以什麼樣的面貌呈現？學生與家長對這樣的名稱有何期待？各校老師們理想中的榮譽學程是否與學生與家長的期待有出入？又學程的訓練是否能在學生往後的求學就業路上帶來助益？這些都是檢討榮譽學程時要思考的問題。

若除去 honors/honours 這個用字，則與國內大學英語榮譽學程較為相關的國外文獻多在 program evaluation 或 language program evaluation 這些分類下，且討論的標的多為 ESL/EFL programs 或 language centers，其行政內容在編制上較為接近國內大學的外文中心、語言中心、英語教學中心等以培養學生外語技能發展為主要任務的單位。

學程評鑑的定義在此採用 Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey (1999)的說法，即 "an information-gathering and –interpreting endeavor that attempts to answer a specified set of questions about a program's performance and effectiveness" (p. 62)。評鑑的用處一般則分為 accountability 問責與決策及 development 教學發展兩大類(Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005)。 Norris (2009)表示，學程執行者與教師們過去多半認為評量是外來加諸的負擔，必須配合且是被動的，但在現今的教育發展下，教師多半體認到評量已與自身工作的發展與改進密不可分，改採主動參與的態度(Mackay, Wellesley, & Bazergan, 1995)。另一個不同點在評量所採的資料，早些年一般較看重的多是標準化測驗的量化指標，典型的做法是以前後測對學生考試，從學生考試成績的變化來證明學程的成效。雖然這樣的看法，特別對大學非英語教學專業的高層決策者及教育主管單位而言，恐仍是顛撲不破的保證，英語教育人員有必要在評量時納入及蒐尋更有

詮釋力、有意義的資料，並負起教育非專業人員的責任。Guba and Lincoln (1989)也有類似的歷史觀察，他們早將評鑑的派典演變概分為四個世代，分別是以考試結果為主的第一代、注重考試過程與結果的第二代、以詮釋性資料回饋決策者的第三代、及以詮釋性資料關照個人經驗的第四代，這些說法與 Norris (2009)不謀而合。完全倚賴量化資料的做法基本上已被摒棄，但質性思維的詮釋性研究亦有其容易流於主觀的問題，因此不同來源資料的三角檢證(triangulation)顯得特別必要(Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005)。

Harris (2009)說語言學程評鑑不只是做研究，不能只寫完研究報告就好，它本質上具有影響政策與教育改革的使命，不可偏廢。類似的說法也出現在 Yang (2009)，他談到語言學程評鑑的標準，包括可行性(feasibility)、妥適性(propriety)、正確性(accuracy)及實用性(utility)，在這四者中，他特別強調實用性，並提出評鑑結果有的沒有利用、有的誤用、有的雖使用但沒充分發揮功效，都是資源的浪費，甚或在過程中造成傷害，因此他倡導以調查結果做實際運用為主要目的的評鑑(utility-focused evaluation)才是最有效率的，這樣的評鑑必須在開始規畫時就與報告最終的讀者合作。Yang 所報導的評鑑範例標的是美國大學 ESL 學程新進教師的入門養成計畫，關注的是學期開始前的教師準備工作，這一點也是政大英語榮譽學程正在努力的方向，但沒想到在確保教學品質之外，也可以成為評鑑的標的，這份評鑑報告也提供了一些實際做法的參考。另外，學程評鑑規畫時提出的待答問題至為重要，會直接影響到我們的視角與得到的結果，在這方面 Kiely (2009)表示，過去評量學程效能的大哉問多套用大理論、從學程輸入的資源與產出的成果做評估，但他改問小問題，關心學程的創新、工作中的教師及學生學習經驗的品質，並在一個英國大學的學術英語學程(EAP program)中尋求這些問題的答案，這些過去評鑑文獻較少觸及的問題，經 Kiely 的研究，證明對吾人瞭解學程的發展與效能亦有相當大的助益，提供評鑑的創新思維。

Mackay (1994)將 ESL/EFL 學程評鑑分為外部(extrinsically motivated evaluation)與內部(intrinsically motivated evaluation)兩種，一般而言，外部評鑑多為瞭解施行績效、經費是否有效運用、探究責任歸屬、以及決定後續經費的分配等；內部評鑑一般則是學程參與執行人員為了瞭解及改進而做。Mackay 分析兩者的優缺點後，提出一個希望能兼顧內外部評鑑目的的架構。Gorsuch (2009)在美國大學評量九種外語學程在兩年間的成效，她關注的焦點在學程末期學生的外語自我效能(self-efficacy) 及未來使用外語的期望(future expectancy of second language use)，因為這兩個構念關係到學生在學程結束後能否帶走自學外語的能力，也是她自學程教師群中調查分析得出的核心價值。她的研究方法雖也是一般的問卷調查，但調查的標的聚焦在學習者個別差異(individual difference)的重要構念上，而非從「問責」(accountability)或政治、行政的角度出發，對第一線的教學、研究者而言更易同理。其問卷內容的產生過程，亦對本研究有相當啟發。

Elder (2009) 回溯三個語言學程評鑑的個案,以檢討評鑑本身的問題及可能的改進方向,雖然她的標的是澳洲中小學裏外來移民學生的母語學習(含越南語、中文、阿拉伯語),但其自「對評鑑的評鑑」所歸納出的七點結論中,亦有許多值得借鏡之處,茲列舉重要的三項說明如下:

1) 須與相關人員討論判定學程成效與學習發展的依據 (discuss with stakeholders what will constitute evidence for accountability and development):歷史案例中顯示,評量者與學程行政人員或教師在這方面常各自有不同的認定,卻又假設他人的標準與自己相似,沒有溝通釐清的機會,直到評量結束、報告完成,才發現各說各話,因此有效的評量須在一開始就與相關人員做充分的溝通,以避免類似的情形。

2) 學程評量必須依進程修正,不該固守原計畫以終(be prepared to change the evaluation plan as the program proceeds):在過去案例中,評鑑標的常是千頭萬緒,但隨著計畫的進行,某些各學程特有的現象會逐一浮現,參與人員也會逐漸注意到較有意義的研究問題,此時就該修正計畫,使評量的結果更能切合學程特性與需求。

3) 考慮評量報告的綜效(use synergistic modes of reporting):一個學程的評量結果,各方人馬如高層決策者、教師、學生等人,都會有興趣瞭解,但因其背景與關注的焦點不同,對資料的需求與解讀就有差別,如果只針對一方的需求進行評量,資訊沒有充分發揮效能有點可惜,因此報告的呈現若能事先考慮不同類型的讀者,稍作調整,或可求其效益擴大。

Llosa and Slayton (2009)認為學程評鑑不能光指出問題,還要能分析問題背後的原因,在他們的評鑑例子裏,即清楚指出一個原本要為低成就小學生加強能力的閱讀養成計畫,因為該學區作息的限制及教師間溝通的問題,無預期地成為原本課程的替代而非補充,自然不能達到預期成效。他們同時指出,有用的評鑑須有以下特點:

1) 慎選必要的評量元素:(a)調查並瞭解環境脈絡、(b)資料類型與來源必須多元、(c)分析工具要恰當、(d)一定要包含質性資料;

2) 報導結果須謹慎:(a)對結果提出解釋、(b)綜合考量過去評鑑文獻與受檢學程情形,使評鑑結果與過去已知產生連結,更有意義、(c)提出實際有用的建議。

在評鑑的方法方面,Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005)整理出九○年代末期英國教育界學程評鑑的做法,分別是 experimentalism 實驗設計、the objective achievement model 客觀測量模式、performance indicators 能力表現指標、self-study 理念與發展的自我陳述、expert or peer review 專家或同儕評鑑及 inspection 外部評鑑單位的檢核。以上這些模式,也都提供本研究許多思考的方向。

學程評鑑資料、結果與審查意見

基於以上文獻探討，以下僅就本校所進行的學程評鑑方式，對外文中心英語文榮譽學程評鑑結果分析探討。

學程評鑑採自評及校級評鑑，依＜本校學分學程設置辦法＞及＜本校學分學程評鑑辦法＞相關規定，每五年應進行評鑑乙次。但因本學程自 97 學年度由於師資不足，擔心影響學生權益，因而停招；故於復招之後一學年重新評鑑，採書面評鑑方式辦理。學程自評資料可參照*附錄 2*「國立政治大學學分學程自評指標」(其中標示部份為 102 及 103 學年度更新資料)，後經校級學分學程評鑑委員會議同意，評鑑結果評定為「**通過**」，並附評鑑委員意見茲說明如下：

1. 本學程因學生人數過多，曾自行暫停招生 1.5 年，於 100 學年度第 2 學期復招，仍有大量學生申請，頗受歡迎。
2. 本學程頗為認真經營，規劃頗為落實，例如每班限 20 人、班主任、導師制度等。
3. 本學程對於所屬學生除了授課之外，亦有社群經營。

建議：

1. 本學程注意調控學生人數，籌謀目前師資負擔過重之問題，及早儲備兼任師資，避免重蹈暫停招生之覆轍。
2. 台灣學生的弱點是口語能力不足，課程安排必須強化口語能力，可於寒暑假期間舉辦英語生活營，善用政大許多外籍生之資源，讓學生體驗 24 小時英語一至兩個星期。

學程評鑑結果之討論與建議

討論

綜合以上學程評鑑結果，整體而言，本學程在大環境的影響下所做的革新和努力是受到校方和師生肯定的。**以下先就目前實施情形說明學程未來發展與檢討：**

1. 由於復招後第一年學生人數不多，以目前五位兼任教師授課，師資部份仍游刃有餘；但之後隨著學程持續進行，學生人數增多，開班數增加（*可參考附錄 2，註 1 之實際開課狀況*），師資部份礙於學校有關專任教師基本授課時數規定，未來恐有師資不足之虞。故儲備教學優良之兼任教師實為當務之急！
2. 新的學程以招生測驗代替申請制度，除能有效篩選適合的學生，亦可了解學生進入學程時的英語程度（如聽力理解、寫作能力、批判性思考等），若能妥善保留運用此項資料，或可用於檢驗學生學習成效，也可做為學程評鑑的依據。此外，有關招生考試方式及測驗內容，如：是否加入口說測驗？都是值得研究改進的方向。

3. 新的學程希望以「迎新會」、「導師制度」來加強師生交流聯繫，期待學程中的學生都能在一個愉悅而專業的環境中學習成長，學習過程中的問題也能透過溝通得以解決與改進。目前學程導師已利用「臉書」成立「英語文榮譽學程粉絲團」，定期公告相關活動訊息並了解學生問題，協助解決，也留意學生意見回饋，為之反應至學程行政團隊。雖然目前鮮少有學生利用導師的管道進行諮詢，日後學程仍會持續努力此項工作，以期能與學生密切交流。

4. 由於期末時期師生皆忙碌，原訂於每學年結束前舉辦的成果發表會，將改為延後至下學期初與迎新活動一併進行；各任課教師於期末以錄影或其它方式，收集學生作品或成果表演等紀錄，並於下期迎新活動時展現。成果發表可使新舊生了解教師上課方式及內容，也可讓師生檢視教學成效，分享教學經驗與成果，同時可做為學程發展改進的依據，本學程將會持續定期舉辦這項有意義的活動。

5. 學程中的多項工作仍需專兼任教師的協助，如：招生測驗的出題及閱卷工作，甚至未來可能以口試來篩選學生，這些都需投注大量的人力；此外，迎新活動及成果發表等都需要專兼任教師的參與設計及指導活動進行，故期盼未來在經費運用(如: 工作費、活動設計指導費等)能更加有彈性，讓熱心參與協助的教師有所回饋。

建議

　　事實上，本學程評鑑需為期三年，主因為學程內的學生必須在這段期間才能修完所有的課程，評鑑範圍也才能涵蓋每一門課程；如此一來，此評鑑的過程與成果亦能趨於完整週全。有鑑於本校進行學分學程評鑑僅就行政與教學面向做粗淺的評鑑，未能對本學程做全面的評鑑，且為促進本學程的發展以利各司其責，並使各面向相互緊密配合發展，研究者期能依 Kiely & Rea-Dickins (2005)指出評鑑的三種構念，即分別是由三個不同的視角-教學(a teacher performance construct)、行政管理(a management construct)和學習(a learning construct)，來審視學程的成效。而且，這三種構念相互影響，在學程評鑑中缺一不可。

　　學程課程規劃雖逐年做階段性的更新與改革，但其實用性仍有待進一步檢視；為能有效提昇學生的英語文能力，使其在未來畢業後進修或進入職場，能更有信心地使用英語文於各種情境場合，對學生生涯發展有所助益，應有效地運用需求分析和教學問卷調查，持續努力改進學程規劃及相關活動進行。此外，於學程結業前鼓勵學生加考相關英文檢定考試，或進行口語或寫作前測及後測，以檢核學生學習成果。

　　更重要的，問題的探討若僅侷限在一校一學程恐較難有學術貢獻，國內除政大的兩個榮譽學程外，多所大學均曾辦過或仍舉辦有類似的學程，簡單網路蒐尋即可發推行現此類學程的名單包含有台灣師範大學、交通大學、台灣科技大學、嘉義大學、開南大學、明新科技大學等。雖然教育部沒有對國內高等教育的英文

教學詳加規範，各大學英語教育政策多為校內獨立運作，但若能記錄各校學程的發展情形、訪問曾參與或主導決策的教授及行政人員、瞭解學程執行成敗的關鍵影響因素、蒐集學生的意見與英文能力表現數據、甚或追蹤學程學生畢業後的發展，進而依各大學的屬性將資料加以分類、比較，所得的研究結果應對英語教學的理論、實務與政策均有具體幫助，若進而將研究所得發表在國際學術論壇，則是將在地英語教育發展現況向國際發聲，別具意義。

參考文獻

Che, P. C. (2005). Honors Program Curriculum Reform: A case study of National Chengchi University. *The First English Conference of the Applied English Department,* Tung Nan Institute of Technology, Taipei, Taiwan.

Che, P. C. (2007). College English of Honors Program: A Case Study of National Chengchi University. *The First Conference of College English. Foreign Language Center, National Chengchi University,* Taipei, Taiwan.

Elder, C. (2009). Reconciling accountability and development needs in heritage language education: A communication challenge for the evaluation consultant. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 15-33.

Gorsuch, G. (2009). Investigating second language learner self-efficacy and future expectancy of second language use for high-stakes program evaluation. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(3), 505-540.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Harris, J. (2009). Late-stage refocusing of Irish-language programme evaluation: Maximizing the potential for productive debate and remediation. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 55-76.

Kiely, R. (2009). Small answers to the big question: Learning from language programme evaluation. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 99-116.

Kiely, R., Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Kiley, M., Boud, D., Manathunga, C., & Cantwell, R. (2011). Honouring the incomparable: honours in Australian universities. *Higher Education, 62,* 619-633.

Llosa, L., & Slayton, J. (2009). Using program evaluation to inform and improve the education of young English language learners in US schools. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 35-54.

Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation – Theory and practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, B. K. (2003). *Language assessment and programme evaluation.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mackay, R. (1994). Undertaking ESL/EFL programme review for accountability and improvement. *ELT Journal, 48*(2), 142-149.

Mackay, R., Wellesley, S., & Bazergan, E. (1995). Participatory evaluation. *ELT Journal, 49*(4), 308-317.

Norris, J. M. (2009). Understanding and improving language education through program evaluation: Introduction to the special issue. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 7-13.

Norris, J. M., Davis, J., Sinicrope, C., & Watanabe, Y. (Eds.). (2009). *Toward useful program evaluation in college foreign language education.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(3), 259-278.

Rossi, P., Freeman, H., & Lipsey, M. (1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*

(6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (2nd edition). New York: Longman Publishers.

Yang, W. (2009). Evaluation of teacher induction practices in a US university English language program: Towards useful evaluation. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(1), 77-98.

附錄 1 政大英語商管學程與政大(外文中心)英語文榮譽學程之比較

	政大英語商管學程（ETP）	政大英語文榮譽學程
招收人數	每學年招收 160 名商學院大一新生	約 60 人（依據當年度實際招生情況而定）
申請對象	1. 商學院大學部一年級：指定科考/學測之英語成績符合一定標準。 2. 商學院大學部二年級：ETP 學生經學習評量不符合標準而有淘汰者，其缺額將另舉行轉入考試，甄選大二學生遞補之。	政治大學學士班學生 （不含英文系主修生及商學院 ETP 學程學生）
篩選方式	各系錄取名額：依照各系申請人數比例分配 各系按其名額擇優錄取，取決標準有二： 1. 指定科考之英文成績 2. 學科能力測驗英文級分之總級分	申請者須參加本中心舉辦之測驗： 筆試（測驗以英文寫作為主、聽力或閱讀能力為輔）
修習科目	基礎英語課程 ＋ 專業商管課程 (See Graph 2, Graph 3)	「英語聽力訓練」、「中級口語訓練」、「中級英文寫作」、「高級口語訓練」、「高級英文寫作」… (See Graph 1)
結業證書	每學年結束後將進行學習成績審查，本學程學生只要未達到以下任一標準，將強制轉出 ETP。： 每學期基礎英語課程成績不得低於 70 分。 每學期英語專業商管課程不得低於 60 分。 每學期總平均不得低於 60 分。 進入學程後的第一年上學期必須修畢寫作與口語訓練(一)，下學期必須修畢寫作與口語訓練(二)。	本中心統一於每學年度第 2 學期末開放同學申請結業證書，請填寫證書申請單及歷年成績單至本中心辦理。期間若要提早申請者，請至本中心辦理。

	1. ETP 學程學生修畢 18 學分基礎英語課程，經學程審核合格無誤後，由商學院發給證明書。 2. ETP 學程學生修畢 18 學分基礎英語課程及 36 學分專業商管課程，經學程審核合格無誤後，由學校發給 ETP 英語商管學分學程結業證明書。	
收費	若課程中因授課需要而長期使用語言視聽教室，則亦需依照學校規定繳交語言設備使用費。	依外語學院大學部學分費收費標準，於學雜費外另外收費。
聯絡人	Rebecca Cheng 鄭助教 國立政治大學 商學院 國際事務辦公室 Email: rebecca@nccu.edu.tw 02-2939-3091 ext.65409	曾昭榕 小姐 國立政治大學外文中心 Email: flcenter@nccu.edu.tw 02-2939-3091 ext. 62396
網站	http://etp.nccu.edu.tw	http://lc.nccu.edu.tw/courseHEP

Graph 1: 政治大學英語文榮譽學程課程一覽表

榮譽學程的課程規劃經微調後，學生 4 學年修讀 8 門課，共計必修 20 學分，全程以英語授課。小班教學，每班人數在 20 人以內，課程清單如表一所列。

學年	課程名稱	學分	開課期別	總學分數
1	大學英文 (一)	2	上學期	4
	大學英文 (二)	2	下學期	
2	大學英文 (三)	2	上/下學期	4
	英語聽力訓練	2	單學期	
3	中級口語訓練	3	單學期	6
	中級英文寫作	3	單學期	
4	高級口語訓練	3	單學期	6
	高級英文寫作	3	單學期	

Graph 2: 政大英語商管學程 基礎英語課程
課程規劃：3 年修讀 6 門課，共計必修 18 學分；全程以英語授課。

修讀年級	課程名稱	學分	開課期別	開課單位	學分費
一年級	寫作與口語訓練（一）	3	單學期	商學院	依本校學雜費標準收費（96 學年度學分費為 1,040 元/每學分）
	寫作與口語訓練（二）	3	單學期		
二年級	中級口語訓練	3	單學期		
	中級寫作訓練	3	單學期		
三年級	進階口語訓練	3	單學期		
	進階英文寫作	3	單學期		

Graph 3: 政大英語商管學程

商學院各系專業商管課程修課規劃

	大一	大二	大三	大四
國貿	初級會計學; 經濟學	統計學; 管理學; 財務管理; 行銷管理; 個體經濟學	總體經濟學; 投資學	國際金融; 國際投資; 財務時間序列分析; 固定證券收益; 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
金融	初級會計學; 經濟學	統計學; 管理學; 財務管理; 個體經濟學	投資學; 金融財務數學	衍生性金融商品; 金融市場 銀行財管; 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
會計	初級會計學; 經濟學	統計學; 管理學; 財務管理 個體經濟學; 總體經濟學; 中會	成會; 投資分析	衍生性金融商品 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
統計	微積分; 統計學 初級會計學; 經濟學	線性代數; 統計軟體; 財務管理 個體經濟學; 總體經濟學	投資學; 作業研究; 管理學	衍生性金融商品 行銷管理; 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
企管	初級會計學; 經濟學	統計學; 管理學; 組織行為; 行銷管理; 個體經濟學; 總體經濟	財務管理 證券分析（投資學）	其他 ETP 專業商管課程
資管	初級會計學 經濟學; 管理學	統計學; 作業研究; 投資學	電商策略個案 派翠網路專題	電腦模擬商用 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
財管	初級會計學 經濟學; 管理學	統計學; 財務管理; 個體經濟學 總體經濟學; 中會	投資學; 財務軟體應用 銀行財管	國際投資; 衍生性金融商品; 不動產投資 實用投資管理; 其他 ETP 專業商管課程
風管	初級會計學; 經濟學 保險學; 風險管理	統計學; 財務管理; 個體經濟學; 總體經濟學	投資學; 管理學; 行銷管理	衍生性金融商品 其他 ETP 專業商管課程

附錄 2 國立政治大學學分學程自評指標（標示部份為更新資料）

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">一面向</th><th>指標</th><th>說　　　　　　　　　　　　　　明</th><th>備註</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">行政面</td><td></td><td>學程設立目的</td><td>為配合本校國際化政策，培養學生卓越英語文能力，特開設「英語文榮譽學分學程」供全校學士班學生選修。</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>學程跨領域組成單位</td><td>本學分學程由外文中心開設，置學分學程委員會，成員為外文中心大學英文小組委員，負責課程規畫及學生修習審核等事宜，召集人為本中心主任。</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">教學面</td><td>近五年申請人數</td><td rowspan="3">近五年核准人數
近五年取得</td><td colspan="2">依施行細則每學年度預定招生人數　約 60　人</td></tr>
</table>

依施行細則每學年度預定招生人數　約 **60**　人

學年度	97	98	99	100	101	
申請人數	67 人	--	--	--	138 人	1
核准人數	67 人	--	--	--	65 人	6
取得證書人數	89 人	122 人	76 人	26 人	4	

本學程自 98 學年度起暫停招生，但依規定為服務本學程 97 學年度前的學生完成修習，故自 98 至 100 學年度雖未招生，仍持續開課，協助學生順利取得證書。

後經本中心大學英文委員會決議，自 100 學年度第 2 學期起復招，故分別於 101, 102 及 103 學年度順利招收 65, 68 與 60 位新生。

證書人數		
課程情形（詳註1）	本學程由原本的 18 學分改成 20 學分(詳見*附件一*：<u>英語文榮譽學程修習科目一覽表</u>)，欲進一步加強學生英語口語與寫作能力的訓練。其中前三門課大學英文(一)、(二)、和(三)為隨班附讀；另五門課為學程學生獨立開班，為確保教學品質，故為小班教學，每班人數限 20 人。(詳見*附件二*：<u>英語文榮譽學程歷年開課及修課人數</u>)	
未來學程發展與檢討	經 99 及 100 學年度本中心大學英文會議決議(請見*附件三*：<u>英語文榮譽學程課程規劃及招生相關會議紀錄</u>)，學程內容調整後，自 100 學年度第二學期重啟招募新生。今已於 101 及 102 學年度進行招生考試後，分別錄取 65 及 68 名新生。新的學程設有學程主任一人與班導師兩人，定期舉辦迎新、成果發表與其它相關教學活動，目標是整合運用既有資源，提供優質課程予校內有心精進英文能力的學生。 新的學程規劃已依委員們的建議施行，自修訂開課科目與課程大綱等課程規劃著手(請見*附件四*：<u>國立政治大學英語文榮譽學程施行細則</u>；及*附件五*：<u>英語文榮譽學程課程規劃及內容簡介</u>)、並於每學年開始之前(即前一學期)舉辦招生說明會，為學生們初步介紹學程的課程規劃與相關規定(資料詳見*附件六、七與八*：<u>英語文榮譽學程招生海報、說明及活動照片</u>)；制定招生方式及名額，以測驗方式(筆試為主)，每年錄取約 60 名新生；另為使學生有歸屬感及向心力，本學程亦設置班主任及導師，每學年舉辦迎新會(請見*附件九及十*：<u>英語文榮譽學程迎新活動流程及照片</u>)，並為學生修課及生活問題解惑。另外，為展現師生教學成效，亦計劃每學年舉辦成果發表會，以促進師生交流。本學程的目的為協助學生在學程結業前，能順利習得就學就業所需之英文能力，有效運用於未來進修課業或工作職場中。 **以下僅就目前實施情形說明學程未來發展與檢討：** 1. 由於復招後第一年學生人數不多，以目前五位兼任教師授課，師資部份仍游刃有餘；但之後隨著學程持續進行，學生人數增多，開班數增加(請見*附件十一*：<u>英語文榮譽學程(復招後)歷年招生考試報名及錄取人數</u>)，師資部份礙於學校有關專任教師基本授課時數規定，未來恐有師資不足之虞。故儲備教學優良之兼任教師實為	

當務之急！

2. 新的學程以招生測驗(請見*附件十二*：英語文榮譽學程招生考試測驗卷)代替申請制度，除能有效篩選適合的學生，亦可了解學生進入學程時的英語程度，若能妥善保留運用此項資料，或可用於檢驗學生學習成效，也可做為學程評鑑的依據。

3. 新的學程希望以「迎新會」、「導師制度」來加強師生交流聯繫，期待學程中的學生都能在一個愉悅而專業的環境中學習成長，學習過程中的問題也能透過溝通得以解決與改進。目前學程導師已利用「臉書」成立「英語文榮譽學程粉絲團」，定期公告相關活動訊息並了解學生問題，協助解決，也留意學生意見回饋，為之反應至學程行政團隊。雖然目前鮮少有學生利用導師的管道進行諮詢，日後學程仍會持續努力此項工作，以期能與學生密切交流。

4. 由於期末時期師生皆忙碌，原訂於每學年結束前舉辦的成果發表會，將暫時延後至下學期初與迎新活動一併進行，現已通知各任課教師於期末以錄影或其它方式，收集學生作品或成果表演等紀錄，並於下期迎新活動時展現。成果發表可使新舊生了解教師上課方式及內容，也可讓師生檢視教學成效，分享教學經驗與成果，同時可做為學程發展改進的依據，本學程將會持續定期舉辦這項有意義的活動。

5. 學程中的多項工作仍需專兼任教師的協助，如：招生測驗的出題及閱卷工作，甚至未來可能以口試來篩選學生，這些都需投注大量的人力；此外，迎新活動及成果發表等都需要專兼任教師的參與設計及指導活動進行，故期盼未來在經費運用(如：工作費、活動設計指導費等)能更加有彈性，讓熱心參與協助的教師有所回饋。

6. 學程課程規劃雖已做更新，但其實用性仍有待進一步檢視；為能有效提昇學生的英語文能力，使其在未來畢業後進修或進入職場，能更有信心地使用英語文於各種情境場合，本學程將會持續努力改進學程規劃及相關活動進行。

學程自評結果：☑ **持續辦理**前一學年度被評定□**申請停止辦理** 學分學程申請停
為「待觀察」學程，應提具改善計劃書(詳註2)，止辦理應針對目前已核准
並應就前次評鑑意見說明回覆。 修讀之學生擬定輔導計劃書。(詳註3)

註1：修畢學程應修滿　（舊制)18 /(新制）20　　學分

原規劃科目名稱	學分數	性質(必/群/選)	開課屬性專班/隨班附讀（專業或通識）	實際開課狀況														合計
				97 學年度		98 學年度		99 學年度		100 學年度		101 學年度		102 學年度		103 學年度		
				上	下	上	下	上	下	上	下	上	下	上	下	上	下	
大學英文（一）	2	群修	隨班附讀	66	0	74	0	60	0	59	0	--	--					259
大學英文（二）	2	群修	隨班附讀	0	66	0	73	0	60	0	59	--	--					258
大學英文（三）	2	群修	隨班附讀	10	12	15	18	17	19	21	23	--	--					135
中級寫作訓練	3	選修	獨立開班	3	3	5	2	2	1	1	0	--	--					17
進階英語聽力	3	選修	獨立開班	3	2	4	2	3	2	2	0	--	--					18
進階口語訓練：跨文化議題	3	選修	獨立開班	3	3	5	4	3	2	2	1	--	--					23
進階英文寫作	3	選修	獨立開班	2	4	4	5	4	3	2	2	--	--					26
101 學年復招新生適用以下新制：																		
大學英文（一）	2	群修	隨班附讀	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	58	0	34	0	0		92
大學英文（二）	2	群修	隨班附讀	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	58	0	34	0		92
大學英文（三）	2	群修	隨班附讀	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20	22	43	23	53		161
英語聽力訓練	2	必修	獨立開班	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	17	19	28		67
中級口語訓練	3	必修	獨立開班	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	31	12	20		65
中級英文寫作	3	必修	獨立開班	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	29	19	19		69
高級口語訓練	3	必修	獨立開班	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	1	0	14	18		33
高級英文寫作	3	必修	獨立開班	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	0	14	15		31
合計				87	90	107	104	89	87	87	85	83	85	154	135	153		1346

註2、3： 外文中心英語文榮譽學程重啟招生計劃書

學程名稱：英語文榮譽學程	目前修課人數：46 人（102.5）

本中心英語文榮譽學程最初成立於民國 94 年，當時吸引校內各學院優秀學生加入，中心專任教師亦投注諸多心力於學程之教學工作，成效良好。後隨時間發展，有兩個因素致使學程於 98 學年停招，其一為中心專任教師不得於基本授課鐘點內教授榮譽學程課程，導致專任教師授課意願大幅降低；其二為歐語學位學程（今已為歐文系）成立之初將本學分學程納入必修且不另收費，影響學程的經營與原本的立意。停招後於 98 至 100 學年間續開原規劃之課程，以滿足原學程學生的修課需求。經內部多次討論，決定於 100 學年度下學期重啟招生，並做了多項調整以確保學程成效，主要調整內容為：

一、將原本 18 學分學程改為校內新制之 20 學分；
二、將招生對象由大一剛入學之新生改為大一升大二之在校生，並將招生時點設在每學年下學期約五月份；
三、自辦英文招生考試，並以此為錄取標準，以利教學成效並建立榮譽感；
四、設置學程主任、學程導師，以加強師資間的溝通及學生輔導；
五、由學程主任、導師舉辦迎新及成果發表等活動，營造學程學生的榮譽及歸屬感。

本學程提供學生在學期間持續修習並精進英語文能力的機會，課程內容著重英語說寫能力循序漸進的培養，並以小班制提升教學品質。以目前校內正規課程而言，英語必修課程「大學英文（一）」、「大學英文（二）」屬外文通識，僅佔 4 學分，選修之「大學英文（三）」亦因資源有限供不應求，不少想加強英語文能力的學生對正規且系統化的課程有很高的需求，本學程的目的即在滿足這項需求，以優質課程及學習環境確保學生在大學四年持續精進英文聽說讀寫能力，為未來的生涯發展做準備。

國內曾推出類似學程的國立大學，除本校外另有台灣師範大學、交通大學、台灣科技大學、海洋大學、屏東教育大學等。本學程起

步較早，特色在於學生進入學程的機制較為嚴格，有意申請者一律以整合型寫作考試篩選，且由教師二人以上匿名閱卷，起始程度整齊可確保教學品質及學生榮譽感。除維持班級人數在 20 人以下外，本學程的課程規畫崇尚基本與務實，循序培養說寫能力並設有擋修制度，學生的英文能力表現均在水準以上。

校內與本學程相近的有商學院的 ETP (English Taught Program) 及英文系輔系，其中 ETP 僅對商學院學生開放且依新生入學考試成績篩選，而英文輔系課程涵蓋西洋文學概論、語言學概論等系所專業課程，與本學程在方向上均有所區隔。本學程招生時排除上述兩個學程的學生，希望能提供政大各科系有意加強英語文能力的同學一個優質的修習管道。

計畫書說明事項：(1)跨領域學程內容【含課程跨領域、教師跨領域、統籌單位跨領域】(2)對學生生涯發展助益 (3)本學程在台灣或本校之獨特性 (4)如有相似之輔系，本學程與輔系在課程及教學上之區隔。

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

計畫編號	MOST102－2410－H－004－070－		
計畫名稱	激勵學習的評量及英語榮譽學程的研究		
出國人員 姓名	黃淑真	服務機構 及職稱	政治大學外文中心副教授
會議時間	103 年 7 月 10 日 至 103 年 7 月 13 日	會議地點	Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand
會議名稱	(中文) 社區語言與英語為外語教學研討會 2014 雙年會 (英文) CLESOL 2014 (Community Language and English to Speakers of Other Languages biannual conference)		
發表題目	(中文) 反覆評量以促進學習過程中的師生對話 (英文) Teacher-learner dialogues in iterative assessments for learning		

一、 參加會議經過

7/07 出發; 7/08 抵 Wellington; 7/09 休息;7/10-7/13 全程參與會議;

7/14 回; 7/15 抵台

二、 與會心得

　　筆者首次參加 CLESOL，本會議兩年一次，多為紐西蘭各地各層級英語教學

實務工作者參與，國際參與者亦不少，與會者約三百多人，整個會議氣氛十分

熱絡溫馨，同一時段至多有十三場次，但各場次都是擠滿了人，甚至最後一場

討論字彙教學的大演講廳都座無虛席。

主要的受邀講者有閱讀方面的 William Grabe、語言評量的 John Read、

EAP 的 Deborah Short、語用的 Janet Holmes、發音教學的 Laurie Bauer 及字

彙教學與研究的 Paul Nation，筆者均前往聆聽，受益匪淺。

在個人發表方面，考量到參與者、會議的調性及時間的限制，我的報告較

為偏重在如何演繹理論至創新的課程設計，而非原先設定的資料分析與對相關

理論架構的檢討，果然在場的第一線教師都展現出進一步了解的興趣，在表定

的 Q&A 時間之外又進行了後續討論，並在回國後收到許多要求 email 發表內容

的信件。

三、 發表論文全文或摘要

Teacher-learner dialogues in iterative assessments for learning

Abstract

　　Recent studies refer to formative assessments (FA), or assessment for learning (AfL), as a global positioning system (GPS) for teaching and learning. With assessment and feedback carefully designed into a curriculum, learners may better be informed of where they currently are in relation to where they are expected to go. It follows that the usual gap-bridging efforts in the classroom become more effective with AfL. However, literature to date focuses mostly on what teachers should do. Missing from the picture are empirical evidence that may support or refute existing theoretical frameworks, especially an understanding of learners' reactions to the ideal formative assessment scenario.

　　Based on lessons from AfL theories, this study implemented assessment and feedback principles in the design of a tertiary EFL writing course. Four iterative draft-revision cycles, accompanied by modeling and discussion, peer and self-assessment, and interactive cover sheets (ICTs) on each submission allowing for continuous teacher-learner dialogues, weaved through the course of an 18 week semester. Each ICT included four parts: specific questions initiated by learners, direct teacher response to the questions, teacher feedback on the assignment, and learners' overall reflection on that particular task.

　　Seventy completed ICTs from 18 students were collected. Five learners participated in semi-structured interviews that also included stimulated recalls probing into the thought processes related to particular learner questions and reflections. Hattie and Timperley's (2007) framework of feedback was used as a guide for analysis. As such, focus of learner questions and reflections were categorized into levels of 1) immediate task at hand, 2) process generalizable to other tasks, 3) higher-level self-regulation, 4) the more egocentric self, and 5) others. With data from 18 students in four AfL cycles, a pattern of development from the task to the self-regulation level was observed,

with some exceptions highlighted and their implications discussed.

四、 建議

此次會議中較特別的兩種發表型態分別是 keynote speakers 的 "In Conversation With" 及一般發表者的 "5-minute brilliant ideas"兩種，或可做為未來國內舉辦類似學術會議的型態參考。

會議中改成 "In Conversation With" 型態的大型講座共四場，筆者均全程參與，它的進行方式略有別於一般的 plenary 或 keynote speeches，將一小時的時間切成三等份，由主講者以約二十分鐘帶出主題，並交代在第二個二十分鐘由參與者小組討論的問題，於是與會者不只是被動地聽，還能與鄰座的同行交換意見、進一步就講者拋出的議題討論自身的經驗。在此同時，參與者可基於個別討論，將對主講者的問題以書面提出，所以在最後的二十分鐘主講者又可面對所有聽眾，回應這些討論時產生的問題，達到雙向溝通的目的。

"5-minute brilliant ideas" 則是在一般的半小時 parallel session 中安排約三位講者，簡要清楚地闡述教學上的實務安排，這些講者會在當天或隔天的午餐時分於會場大廳角落等候有興趣進一步了解的與會者，提供深度交流的機會，相當程度地將討論的主動權交到聽者的手上，也是一個促成互動交流的好方法。

五、攜回資料名稱及內容

Conference Handbook 及各場演講 handouts

六、其他

無

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 激勵學習的評量及英語榮譽學程的研究
	計畫主持人: 黃淑真
	計畫編號: 102-2410-H-004-070-　　　　學門領域: 英語教學研究

無研發成果推廣資料

102 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：黃淑真　　計畫編號：102-2410-H-004-070-

計畫名稱：激勵學習的評量及英語榮譽學程的研究

成果項目			量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）
			實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數(含實際已達成數)	本計畫實際貢獻百分比		
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	1	1	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	1	1	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	1	1	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	1	1	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
		博士後研究員	0	0	100%		
		專任助理	0	0	100%		

	其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等,請以文字敘述填列。)	無	

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科教處計畫加填項目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與（閱聽）人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

---

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估
   ■達成目標
   □未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）
   　　　□實驗失敗
   　　　□因故實驗中斷
   　　　□其他原因
   　說明：

---

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：
   論文：□已發表 ■未發表之文稿 □撰寫中 □無
   專利：□已獲得 □申請中 ■無
   技轉：□已技轉 □洽談中 ■無
   其他：（以 100 字為限）

---

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

   本計畫共完成兩份學術論文，其中第一篇由計畫主持人以英文撰寫，題為 "Understanding learner self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance"，投稿國際期刊 Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education (SSCI)，經修改已獲接受。研究結果除了驗證大部分既有回饋理論的主張外，也發現過去視個人層次的回饋 (self-level feedback) 為有害學習的說法在本研究的資料中不成立，此點經推論可能與學習者的心智成熟度有關，是相關理論必須考慮調整的部分。第二篇由共同主持人暫以中文撰寫，題為「評鑑與教學之關聯 － 以政大外文中心英語文榮譽學程為例」，尚待發表。本文將政治大學外文中心推行多年的英語榮譽學程做了一個系統性的紀錄，並輔以相關評鑑理論文獻的討論及行政文件等。這類學程體檢的研究一般較少受到國內學者的重視，但其對學生的影響卻十分具體。政大外文中心多年來投入相當多的人力在英語榮譽學程的建立與執行，相關的經驗被記錄傳承，以供未來推廣類似學程的學校及教師參考。