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In this study, 94 university freshmen undertook an authentic, experientially driven media production project at a Japanese university which promotes a target language (TL)-only classroom language policy. The project was staged across six 90-minute lessons and sought to promote culturally and socially relevant task-based activities grounded in the belief that authentic learning can only occur through tasks that result in achievement which is significant and meaningful rather than that which is trivial or useless (Newmann and Wehlage 1993). The project manipulated the on-task language policy of the students by assigning 47 of the students to work under strict TL-only policy whilst the other 47 students were permitted to use both the TL and the native language. General student satisfaction and the specific attributions of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the project under both language conditions were recorded through a questionnaire and analysed in relation to attitudes toward the optimal language-learning environment.

Language policy

Language policy has long been a contentious issue with the TEFL profession. Support for target language (TL)-only usage within the L2 classroom has tended to be based on the idea that the quantity of exposure to the TL is the primary factor in facilitating the language acquisition process (Chaudron 1988). However, the use of the native language (NL) in the L2 classroom has been shown to play an important role in L2 learning. Macaro (2005: 68) argues that ‘the language of thought for all but the most advanced L2 learners is inevitably his/her L1’. Likewise, Brooks and Donato (1994) observed in their study of Spanish learners that less proficient learners tended to use their L1 in order to manage the task and their exchanges in the TL. They suggest that some use of the L1 during L2 interaction ‘is a normal psycholinguistic process that facilitates L2 production and allows the learners both to initiate and sustain verbal interaction with one another’ (p. 268).

Focusing specifically on the Japanese context, Critchley (1999) reports that there have been very few actual studies on the use of Japanese in the EFL classroom. Critchley adds that many Japanese learners support the use of the NL in the classroom although they also recognize the dangers of over-dependence. In a similar study, Dwyer and Heller-Murphy (1996) highlight that the use of the NL within the classroom is commonplace between Japanese learners although most do not show a preference toward
either a bilingual or a monolingual language environment. In a more recent study, McMillan, Rivers, and Cripps (2009) undertook an investigation into the attitudes of EFL teachers toward L1/L2 classroom usage within a Japanese university. They conclude by advocating a professional development action research approach in order to affirm the ability of both teachers and students to develop their own localized strategies for maximizing TL comprehension and use. Indeed, such a flexible approach would seem to be appropriate based on principles of teacher and student autonomy by moving away from a one-size-fits-all language policy mantra that may be counterproductive when assessing other factors in the learning process such as language learner task/project satisfaction.

**Satisfaction**

Oliver (1989) refers to learner satisfaction as being the favourability of a student’s subjective evaluation of the various outcomes and experiences associated with an educational process. The multitude of possible factors which act to shape the subjective evaluation of the student can be approached from an independent learning perspective which focuses on the identification of individual differences and the subsequent promotion of learner autonomy. Rogers (1991: 276) emphasizes that ‘the only kind of learning which significantly affects behaviour is self-discovered self-appropriated learning’. This perspective is also shared by Good and Brophy (1994: 228) who propose that ‘the simplest way to ensure that people value what they are doing is to maximize their free choice and autonomy’. Subscribers to such an autonomy-centred approach advocate the belief that the notion of student satisfaction can be heavily attributed to the degree in which a student’s preferred learning style is reflected in the immediate teaching environment (Fraser 1994). The identification and tailoring of activities, tasks, and materials toward a student’s preferred learning style in order to promote self-discovery, self-appropriation, and, thus, satisfaction is possible through the adoption of the Learning Style Inventory (KLSI) (Kolb 1999). This inventory identifies four basic learning styles which are associated with preferred ways of approaching a task. The KLSI expands on the idea that in seizing and utilizing experience learners often behave quite differently from each other. For example, it is possible that some learners perceive new information by immersing themselves within a set task or challenge, whereas other learners perceive new information through observation rather than through direct action or involvement.

The four learning styles identified within the KLSI are

- a diverging style of learning in which the learner prefers to generate ideas based on observation and the gathering of information before conducting creative activities such as brainstorming and note taking
- an assimilating style of learning in which the learner prefers to deal with solid problems through the formulation of clear criteria in order for solutions to be found
- a converging style of learning in which the learner favours hypothetical deductive reasoning, especially when shown how ideas and concepts can be practically applied within the learning context
- an accommodating style of learning in which the learner learns whilst ‘on-task’ through direct experience by adapting to the immediate situation.
**Rationale**

Set within an investigative pedagogical framework of language policy and satisfaction the task-based activity used within the current study attempted to adhere to guidelines proposed by Newmann and Wehlage (op. cit.) who stress that achievement which is significant and meaningful rather than that which is trivial or useless is only possible through authentic learning activities.

With specific regard to on-task language policy, the current project considered the views of Cook (2001: 402) who argues that the use of the L1 aids cooperative learning between classmates and that ‘... the first language can be a useful element in creating authentic L2 users rather than something to be shunned at all costs’. Consequently, two differing on-task language polices (TL only + TL and NL) were applied in order to gauge student attitudes toward each respective policy as well as seeking a more autonomous foundation for the analysis of student satisfaction and its interplay with variations in on-task language policy.

For a maximized likelihood of positive student satisfaction ratings, in addition to the manipulation of on-task language policy, the current project attempted to meet the following three basic conditions:

1. It presented a series of tasks which allowed for all four styles of learning to be operationalized as proposed in the KLS1 (Kolb op. cit.).
2. It provided an opportunity for self-discovery and self-appropriation (Rogers op. cit.: 276) as well as the maximization of free choice and autonomy (Good and Brophy op. cit.: 228).
3. It ensured that the tasks presented were communicative and challenging yet within accessible reach of the students’ proficiency levels.

**Research question**

Based on the rationale outlined above, the current project sought to answer the following research question.

Do students report higher levels of satisfaction when given the autonomy to use the TL and the NL, rather than enforcing a TL-only policy?

**Participants and context**

The participants in this study were 94 freshmen students studying for a bachelor degree in English at a university in Japan. The study was incorporated into four random freshmen classes (n24/n24/n23/n23) during the spring semester of 2008. The native-speaking teachers of these classes usually follow a task-based curriculum with their students, which is delivered in accordance with a TL-only classroom language policy. The students in these classes were of a similar proficiency level, which was equivalent to a score of 400–550 on the TOEIC test.

**Procedure**

The students were informed that as a part of their course, they were going to complete a media production project which would involve small groups of students researching a specific area of the university campus in order to produce a ten minute explanatory video.

The project was culturally framed drawing heavily on ideas present within Japanese society, primarily through the promotion of a sense of social responsibility grounded in the senpai/kouhai (superior/inferior) interpersonal dynamic. This dictates that the more experienced students...
members of society have a duty to share their experiences and knowledge with the less experienced students (members of society) as a means of reproductive social education and structured hierarchical interaction. Accordingly, it was stressed to all students that the outcome of the project would serve as a welcome guide to new students coming to the university in 2009.

A detailed student handout initiated the process of working toward the completion of the macro-level task through the negotiation of a number of structured and semi-structured micro-level tasks spread across six, 90-minute lessons. The classroom instructions were standardized across each class with particular attention given to the on-task language policy rules for the project which were explicitly stated. Two of the four classes were assigned to work under a strict TL-only policy whilst the other two classes allowed both the TL and the NL to be used during all the micro-level tasks although all groups were informed that the final video must be produced in the TL only. The outline below summarizes the individual stages of the project and the micro-level tasks involved as well as the learning style which each task targeted according to the KLSI (Kolb op. cit.).

Lesson 1 + 2

**Social framing, procedural explanation, and study commencement**

Targeted learning style: diverging style

Each group randomly selected an area within the university campus as the focus of their video and were introduced to three different styles of video production (action style, guide style, and combination style). Each group was instructed to visit their chosen area to look around and gather information before brainstorming which features they would like to include in a welcome video for new freshmen. Students were also encouraged to reflect on their own experiences of when they first came to the university and to consider the numerous issues connected to making an on-site video.

In Lesson 2, students continued with independent information collection within their selected areas. The teacher assisted as required and monitored each group from a distance without acting to directly influence or manipulate their behaviours.

Lesson 3

**Scriptwriting and organizing information**

Targeted learning style: assimilating style

Both Lesson 3 and Lesson 4 were recorded with a video camera to support future project development and to add an extra element of formality in order to indirectly remind students about their respective on-task language policies. The students were instructed that they were to use the information gathered from their area to prepare a script as the basis of their video dialogue. Each group received a scriptwriting booklet which gave explicit instructions on how to complete the task. This was achieved following the guidelines below.

Each group member must take a turn writing for 15 minutes ($5 \times 15 = 75$). The first person to write will write on the pages marked ‘Writer #1’, the second writer will write on the pages marked ‘Writer #2’, and so on.
The group members should discuss ideas for writing the script before dictating clear and concise information to the writer. The writer is not allowed to look at the notes or any of the collected information so it is important that you create a clear dialogue before relaying the information to the writer. Dictionaries may be used, but all speaking and writing must conform to the language policy of the class.

At the end of this lesson, the scripts were collected and the teacher gave suggestions on form although explicit corrections were not made.

Lesson 4

**Script writing continuation and cue card creation**

Targeted learning style: assimilating style and diverging style

In this lesson, the students’ scripts were returned. They were instructed to follow the same procedure as on the previous day although on this occasion they were to focus on improving the script through making only minor changes and alterations. Each writer was given five minutes rather than fifteen. After the writing cycle had finished, the students were given five B4-sized cue cards. They were instructed to follow a previously practised technique of selecting ten keywords from each writer’s script to write down on the respective card in larger lettering. These cards were to be used during the video shoot to guide the speaker as students were not allowed to read directly from the script during the shoot—instead other group members could hold up cue cards behind the camera in order to guide their speech rather than explicitly control it.

Lesson 5

**Introduction to technology and final preparation**

Targeted learning style: converging style

This lesson was used as a final preparation lesson where students were free to practise their reading, tidy up their cue cards, and finalize any other procedural issues before their real on-site video shooting. The students were also given a video camera and had a 45-minute orientation session on how to use the video equipment. By the end of this lesson, all students were confident using the equipment and had generated specific ideas for videoing within the confines of their selected area.

Lesson 6

**Final movie shoot**

Targeted learning style: accommodating style

During the final lesson, the students went to their selected area and shot their final video. The students were not limited to a single performance with all the associated performance pressures. Instead, they were given 90 minutes in which time each member could reshoot their individual segment numerous times. After 90 minutes, all students reported back to the classroom, and their final videos were collected.

Data collection

Upon completion of the project, all students were given a multiple-item Japanese questionnaire which asked them to rate their overall satisfaction with the project on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Within the questionnaire, the students were also presented with 24 conflicting statements regarding possible factors which shaped overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
ratings. The students were instructed to select only 3 of these 24 statements and rank them as first, second, or third in order of their perceived influence on their overall feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The 24 statements reflected a mixture of language-related issues and general communication issues as well as issues connected directly with the project and the various tasks set by the teacher.

The students were also required to answer a final open-ended question which asked the TL-only classes how they felt about being told to use the TL only, whilst the TL and the NL classes were asked how they felt about having the freedom to use both languages during the project.

Table 1 illustrates the students reported feelings of overall project satisfaction under both on-task language policy conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project satisfaction</th>
<th>Total (n = 94)</th>
<th>TL only (n = 47)</th>
<th>TL/NL (n = 47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td>54 (57.4%)</td>
<td>24 (51%)</td>
<td>30 (63.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26 (27.6%)</td>
<td>13 (27.6%)</td>
<td>13 (27.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied</td>
<td>14 (14.8%)</td>
<td>10 (21.2%)</td>
<td>4 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 illustrates the specific factors reported as being responsible for satisfaction/dissatisfaction ratings. The descriptive attribution rank was created by totalling the number of first-, second-, and third-place ratings given to each of the 24 statements. The sum of the first-place ratings were then multiplied by three, the sum of second placed ratings were multiplied by two, and sum of third placed ratings remained in their original state. This produced the final attribution values shown in the table below. It should be noted that only the eight most prominent factors are presented as those ratings which fell below this point dropped off significantly and, therefore, could not be discussed on a general level of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction/dissatisfaction summary (n = 94)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had a good relationship with my group</td>
<td>+91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a new challenge which I enjoyed</td>
<td>+79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not speak English as much as I wanted to</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My group was not able to produce a final product I was happy with</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not successful in communicating my own ideas to the group</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helpful to the group and collaborated well with others</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study was beneficial to my learning of English</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could use some of the skills from my regular lessons</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the specific factors reported as being responsible for satisfaction/dissatisfaction ratings according to the on-task language policy. As previously noted, those factors which are not presented could not be discussed on a general level of analysis.
### Table 3
The specific factors reported for feelings of satisfaction according to classroom language policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of satisfaction</th>
<th>TL only ((n = 47)) rank</th>
<th>TL/NL ((n = 47)) rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had a good relationship with my group</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a new challenge which I enjoyed</td>
<td>+45</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helpful to the group and collaborated well with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study was beneficial to my learning of English</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could use some of the skills from my regular lessons</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could use Japanese when I had a problem</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My group produced a final video I was happy with</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could speak English as much as I wanted to</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
The specific factors reported for feelings of dissatisfaction according to classroom language policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of dissatisfaction</th>
<th>TL only ((n = 47)) rank</th>
<th>TL/NL ((n = 47)) rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could not speak English as much as I wanted to</td>
<td>−31</td>
<td>−13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My group was not able to produce a final video I was happy with</td>
<td>−19</td>
<td>−20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not successful in communicating my own ideas to the group</td>
<td>−16</td>
<td>−17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not helpful to the group and did not collaborate with others</td>
<td>−6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not use any of the skills from my regular classes</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have a good relationship with my group</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not understand what was required of me during the project</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the results of a random selection of 13 questionnaire responses taken from students working under the TL-only on-task language policy and Table 6 shows the results of a random selection of 13 questionnaire responses taken from students working under the TL and NL on-task language policy. The responses shown are addressed in the following discussion.

### Student attitudes toward the TL only on-task language policy

- ‘I think it is a good idea and it helps us improve our English skills’ +
- ‘Being required to speak English all of the time motivated my group’ +
- ‘At first I thought it would be too hard but I came to realize that it helped me a lot’ +
- ‘I always want opportunities to speak in English so this policy was a good idea’ +
- ‘This study seemed natural that we use English only’ +
- ‘Because I like speaking English it is good that we were all told to use English only’ +
- ‘I think that it is a good idea and it helps us improve our English skills’ +
- ‘If we experience studies like this I am sure that our English skills will improve a lot’ +
- ‘I was frustrated but I learned to communicate better through speaking English only’ +/-
‘It was troublesome but fun so I enjoyed this policy a lot’ +/
‘It was very difficult but I needed an environment like this in order to improve my English’ +/
‘Without the presence of my teacher my group members used Japanese a lot’ –
‘I felt a great deal of stress and worried whether I could convey my thoughts or not’ –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student attitudes toward the TL and NL on-task language policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘It was easier to convey my thoughts and feelings through Japanese’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It is a good idea to use both languages as it is important to state our opinions clearly’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It was a very good idea because it made it easier to communicate with each other’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I thought it was helpful when exchanging information’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Using Japanese made it easier for me to talk to my group members’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It was easy to understand each other speaking Japanese’ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Speaking in Japanese was helpful but it may become a bad habit’ +/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It was helpful in terms of preparation but in terms of English learning it was not effective’ +/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Since we tended to rely too much on Japanese it would be better to speak English only’ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I relied too much on Japanese because it was easy to do so’ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Due to the fact that we could speak Japanese I thought that this study did not help me at all’ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Since I relied on Japanese I never spoke English therefore I prefer the English only class’ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I used Japanese all of the time except for the video so I this study did not help me at all’ –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
Attitudes toward the TL only on-task language policy

‘It was easier to convey my thoughts and feelings through Japanese’ +
‘It is a good idea to use both languages as it is important to state our opinions clearly’ +
‘It was a very good idea because it made it easier to communicate with each other’ +
‘I thought it was helpful when exchanging information’ +
‘Using Japanese made it easier for me to talk to my group members’ +
‘It was easy to understand each other speaking Japanese’ +
‘Speaking in Japanese was helpful but it may become a bad habit’ +/-
‘It was helpful in terms of preparation but in terms of English learning it was not effective’ +/-
‘Since we tended to rely too much on Japanese it would be better to speak English only’ –
‘I relied too much on Japanese because it was easy to do so’ –
‘Due to the fact that we could speak Japanese I thought that this study did not help me at all’ –
‘Since I relied on Japanese I never spoke English therefore I prefer the English only class’ –
‘I used Japanese all of the time except for the video so I this study did not help me at all’ –

### Table 6
Attitudes toward the enforcement of a TL and NL on-task language policy

#### Discussion

From the results presented, 57.4 per cent of the 94 students reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the project. Whilst there was a fair amount of neutrality (27.6 per cent), the amount of dissatisfaction remained relatively low (14.8 per cent). When looking at project satisfaction across the two language conditions, it is apparent that students in the TL and NL classroom language policy groups reported higher levels of satisfaction. A total of 63.7 per cent of the TL and NL classroom language policy group students were either satisfied or very satisfied compared to only 51 per cent of the TL-only groups. This pattern was also replicated with feelings of dissatisfaction with 8.5 per cent of the TL and NL on-task language policy students and 21.2 per cent of the TL-only students being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Further investigation into student satisfaction through the satisfaction attribution ranks revealed that across both on-task language policy groups, students attributed a similar range of factors as justification for their reported feelings of satisfaction. Under both on-task language policy conditions, student satisfaction originated predominately from intrinsic factors associated with enjoyment and group collaboration rather than specific language or ability-related factors. A much clearer distinction
between on-task language policy conditions was observed on the third factor. Within the TL-only group, ‘The study was beneficial to my learning of English’ was ranked as +24, whilst the TL and NL groups ranked, ‘I was helpful to the group and collaborated well with others’ as +25. These third-placed factors were exclusive to each respective on-task language policy condition which suggests that there were a number of differences between the two language conditions when it came to attributing specific reasons for reported feelings of satisfaction.

It could be argued that the TL and NL groups experienced better in-group relations due to the fact that they had the option of using the NL within the class to maintain the group relationship in situations where TL ability was lacking. This view of the NL as a facilitator of group interaction was alluded to in Table 6 where student comments included; ‘It was a very good idea because it made it easier to communicate with each other’, ‘Using Japanese made it easier for me to talk to my group members’, ‘It was easy to understand each other speaking Japanese’, ‘It is a good idea to use both languages as it is important to state our opinions clearly’, and ‘It was helpful in terms of preparation but in terms of English learning it was not effective’.

As the TL-only group ranked ‘the study was beneficial to my learning of English’ as their third most contributory factor toward their feelings of satisfaction, it could be hypothesized that a good relationship with group members and the feeling of a task or project being beneficial to English language development were not possible whilst working under the same on-task language policy condition. This is further supported when observing the comments in Table 5. The comments which show a majority of supportive attitudes toward the implementation of TL-only on-task language policies indicate that a TL-only on-task language policy, although perceived as being beneficial to learning, sacrificed other aspects. Comments such as ‘I was frustrated but I learned to communicate better through speaking English only’, ‘It was troublesome but fun so I enjoyed this policy a lot’, ‘It was very difficult but I needed an environment like this in order to improve my English’, and ‘I felt a great deal of stress and worried whether I could convey my thoughts or not’ all suggest that the TL-only on-task language policy condition is not an easy environment for students.

Within classes which have mixed-level students or students of a low ability, there are occasions where TL-only implementation is not only inappropriate but also impossible to enact. The current study found that a strong source of student dissatisfaction attribution came from the factor ‘I could not speak English as much as I wanted to’ (−44). Within the TL-only groups, this dissatisfaction had an attribution score of −31; however, within the TL and NL groups, it was only −13. This indicates that although students wanted to use the TL only, their actual language abilities were either lacking or as previously shown, in-group communication was impossible or very difficult to maintain. The use of bilingual dictionaries as well as having the safety net of the NL when communication problems arose could have promoted an increased amount of TL transactions. If students in the TL and NL groups encountered a problem, there was always the option of using their NL, whereas in the TL-only groups, the options for problem negotiation were severely limited.
For both on-task language policy conditions, dissatisfaction in the final product produced –39 and was an important shared factor, suggesting that students needed further instruction as to what constituted a good final product. This may also indicate that the lack of immediate teacher feedback or extrinsic rewards was something the students were unaccustomed to and, thus, they felt that their final product was lacking in some way. One possible area for future investigation is in the traditional focus on activity or task product appraisal rather than process appraisal. This project followed a detailed process leading up to the production of a final video which challenged the students in different ways through focusing on their individual learning styles. Whilst such a process was considered valuable to their development, there was no effort made to grade or assess the processes involved prior to the shooting of the final product. It would be interesting to observe whether a shift from product- to process-based grading and evaluation would change student attitudes toward on-task language policy and task/project satisfaction.

Conclusion

One of the central tenets of task-based language teaching (TBLT) is the assumption that pedagogical tasks should aim to create an environment that promotes interactive learning. Furthermore, this interactive learning should be performed through contextually bound activities which promote the negotiation of meaning as TBLT dictates that performance, on any given task, should represent a rehearsal for future social or professional interaction.

From a pedagogical perspective, the two core issues addressed in this study—on-task language policy and student task/project satisfaction—are both of central relevance to all TBLT classrooms. The interplay between a student’s preferred on-task language policy based on preconceptions about the ideal language acquisition environment and the manner in which this impacts upon satisfaction should be considered as a focal point for future projects of this nature. This is especially true for those projects which aim to be practical yet empirically supported by relevant research literature. The current author would recommend that other classroom action research projects adopt the KLS1 (Kolb 1999). Gibbs (1988: 9) stresses the pedagogical benefits of the KLS1 claiming:

It is not enough just to do, and neither is it enough just to think. Nor is it enough simply to do and think. Learning from experience must involve linking the doing and the thinking.

Such a well-balanced dynamic model of learning behaviours allows the teacher/researcher to shape not only the content and nature of the tasks presented to students but also the environment in which the students experience learning.
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