

## NEWSLETTER OF THE AILA SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION ON LEARNER AUTONOMY

<http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/div1/ailasc/news2000.html>

Editor: Sara M Cotterall

March 2000 Issue # 6

### A WORD FROM THE EDITOR

Welcome to the 2000 newsletter of the AILA Scientific Commission (SC) on Learner Autonomy.

Please consult the guide to the contents below, to help you navigate your way around the newsletter:

- 1 Review of 1999-2000 activities
  - Membership
  - SC website
  - Newsletter
  - Liaison with AILA
  - AILA Review No 14
  - SC Convenorship
  - LAPI
  - AUTO-L
- 2 Report on AILA 12th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan, August 1-6, 1999
  - a Symposium on Learner Beliefs
  - b Keynote Address on Learner Autonomy
  - c SC Symposium on Learner Autonomy
  - d AILA SC Business Meeting
- 3 Fourth SC Symposium on Learner Autonomy, Singapore, 2002
- 4 Forthcoming Conferences and Courses
- 5 Contributions from Scientific Commission Members
  - Marie-France Champagne
  - Francisco Gomes de Matos
  - Carol Hosenfeld
  - Francis Jones
  - Terry Lamb
  - Phillip Mahnken
  - Luciano Mariani
  - Hayo Reinders
  - Jonathan Shaw
- 6 Book Reviews
- 7 Recent Publications on Learner Autonomy

### 1 REVIEW OF 1999-2000 ACTIVITIES

Sara Cotterall, Leni Dam, William Savage

#### Membership

There has been an increase in our membership once again. Richard Smith recently did an analysis of SC membership and reported that our membership comprises the following groups:

- Asia (64) - mostly Japan (26), Hong Kong (20) and Thailand (11);
- Europe (except UK / Ireland) (63) - 14 countries in all, especially Spain (13), the Netherlands (12) and Finland (11);
- Australia and New Zealand (41);
- USA and Canada (27);
- UK and Ireland (25);
- Central and South America (15) - mostly Brazil (10);
- Africa (2);

See Section 5 for an introduction to a number of our newest members. Sara is responsible for maintaining our membership list and for recruiting new members. You can help with this by:

- forwarding the SC website URL and newsletter announcement to colleagues
- printing and circulating your copy of the newsletter to colleagues
- adding links to the SC's website from your autonomy-related website
- passing on the SC's website address to interested colleagues and encouraging them to contact Sara if they are interested in becoming members.

Sara's e-mail address is <sara.cotterall@vuw.ac.nz>; her "snail mail" address is: School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand.

### **Website**

In December 1999, Irina Elgort of the Language Learning Centre at Victoria University of Wellington contributed her technical expertise and creativity to help Sara Cotterall design and develop a website for the Scientific Commission. (Until this year the SC's newsletters could be accessed on the VUW School of LALS website.) The Scientific Commission's website was launched in March, 2000 with the publication of Issue 6 of the newsletter, and can be found at: <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/div1/ailasc/>

The website is intended as a first point of contact for researchers and students interested in learner autonomy in language learning, and as a clearing house for information on resources, conferences and publications. After discussion with Phil Benson of the University of Hong Kong, we agreed to have our site direct visitors to Phil's excellent bibliography on learner autonomy on his own website (<http://ec.hku.hk/autonomy/bibliog.html>), rather than try and provide an additional listing of resources. We encourage you to explore our new site, contribute information for the "What's New?" page, and tell friends and colleagues about it. (However, please note that maintenance of the website is a *voluntary* job which Sara has agreed to undertake in addition to her normal research and teaching at VUW; there may be some delays between your sending details to Sara to post on the site, and that information appearing.)

### **Newsletter**

The newsletter has grown significantly over the last three years, providing a useful vehicle for the exchange of ideas and information on conferences, courses and publications. In November 1999, prompted by a request made at AILA in August 1999, we added the first two issues of the newsletter to issues already available on the website, so that now all back issues can be accessed electronically. Unfortunately, we are no longer able to send hard copies of the newsletter to members who do not have e-mail. If you know of members who have recently obtained e-mail and who would like to subscribe, please encourage them to contact Sara.

### **Liaison with AILA**

At AILA 1999, Kees de Bot encouraged convenors to promote the activities of the SC by organising regional events in the SC's name and by developing our own website. We are pleased to have been able to act on the second of these suggestions so promptly, and urge all members to seriously consider Kees' other suggestion. Each year the SC convenors also contribute a report of SC activities to the AILA Scientific Commissions Coordinator. We have also contributed copy to recent issues of AILA News, which can be found at <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/langcent/>. Furthermore, as Leni reports below, we have been given the opportunity to have some of the papers presented at the AILA 99 symposium published in a forthcoming issue of the AILA Review.

### **AILA Review No. 14 (Leni Dam)**

As organiser of the symposium in Tokyo, in February 1999 I was contacted by the main editors of the AILA Review, Ulrike Meinhof and David Graddol, and asked if the SC would like to have some of the papers presented at the 1999 symposium appear in a forthcoming issue of the AILA Review (with myself acting as editor). We felt that this was a wonderful opportunity both for the commission and for the presenters. After having contacted the presenters and obtained their agreement I began the

possible to send the first collection of papers to the principal editor, David Graddol, before the Congress in Tokyo.

As there were problems with AILA Review No. 13 - *'English in a Changing World'* (edited by David Graddol and Ulrike Meinhof) - presenters were given the opportunity to make minor changes to their papers late last year. At present, the final editing of the manuscript is taking place, so that the next issue of AILA Review appearing in 2001 should be entitled *'Promoting Learner Autonomy - New Insights'*.

### **Scientific Commission Convenorship**

At the AILA SC Business Meeting held in Tokyo at the AILA Congress in August 1999, Leni Dam, William Savage and Sara Cotterall were elected co-convenors for the next three years. As Leni and Sara have served for 3 years already, this ensures continuity beyond 2002, when William can be elected for a second term along with "new blood". Leni agreed to continue with her responsibility for the LAPI (see below), William accepted responsibility for organising the SC symposium at the AILA 2002 congress together with Terry Lamb, and Sara remains responsible for membership and producing the newsletter. Sara also accepted responsibility for developing a website for the SC.

### **LAPI - Learner Autonomy Project Inventory (Leni Dam)**

In our last newsletter and at our business meeting in Tokyo, I mentioned that I was planning to send out an updated version of the SC's LAPI. Accordingly, I invited members to send me descriptions of research projects by October 1, 1999. The updated LAPI will shortly be available on the SC website, listed under Activities, LAPI. Please contact the persons in charge of the projects if you want further information. More research projects within learner autonomy are no doubt taking place. If you are involved in a project, please send me (<[Dam@dlh.dk](mailto:Dam@dlh.dk)>) a brief description of your project and details of where and how to obtain further information. Many people working with learner autonomy - also a number of students - contact me for information on ongoing projects.

### **AUTO-L - Electronic Discussion Forum (Anita L. Wenden)**

AUTO-L is an electronic discussion forum whose purpose is to promote dialogue and exchange among language teachers and researchers involved in the following subfields of language learning and teaching: learner autonomy, self-directed learning, learning strategies, learner development, learner independence, learner training and self-access.

The list has now been in operation since October 1996 and totals 310 subscribers. AUTO -L is co-moderated by Anita Wenden and Leslie Dickinson, with Anita responsible for activities between September and January and Leslie between February and June. Technical support for the list is provided by Kamrul Ahsan, Educational Technology, York College, City University of New York. Requests to be subscribed to the list or removed from it should be sent to Anita Wenden.

In order to promote dialogue and exchange among the members, the list moderators invite guest moderators, who provide background information and recent insights on topics related to the promoting of learner autonomy. Guest moderators and topics for the last year have been :

- (1) Cynthia White - Distance learning
- (2) Sada Daoud - Teacher autonomy and learner autonomy
- (3) Leena Karlsson, Felicity Kjisik, Joan Nordlund - Autonomous learning in a university setting

This past year these organized discussions have also included an e-colloquium on self-access language learning and an e-roundtable on language learner metacognitive knowledge and beliefs. We would like to take this opportunity to thank our guest moderators and the participants in the colloquium and roundtable for their contributions .

Finally, this is to remind you that the quality of the exchange on the list depends on the subscribers. It is intended as a conduit of information about research projects, materials and methodology, conferences and publications. You are, therefore, encouraged to share this information with list members directly by posting it on AUTO-L or, if you prefer, send it to either one of the list coordinators

In addition, if you have suggestions for future roundtable and/or colloquium discussions or for a guest coordinator series, and if you would like to volunteer to participate, please contact either of the moderators: Anita L. Wenden <[wldyc@cunyvm.cuny.edu](mailto:wldyc@cunyvm.cuny.edu)>, or Leslie Dickinson <[les-dickinson@churchill.demon.co.uk](mailto:les-dickinson@churchill.demon.co.uk)>

## **2 REPORT ON AILA 12<sup>TH</sup> WORLD CONGRESS OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS TOKYO, JAPAN, AUGUST 1-6, 1999**

Scientific Commission members were active in various parts of the Congress programme. Four programme components specifically related to the interests of the SC are reported on here in the sequence in which they occurred. Readers are encouraged to contact contributors where they wish to follow up on matters reported here.

- a Symposium on Learner Beliefs about Language Learning, Tuesday 3 August, 1999**  
**Stephen J. Gaies (University of Northern Iowa, USA) and Keiko Sakui (Konan University, Japan)**  
Report contributed by Stephen Gaies, Symposium Co-organiser

A four-hour symposium on learners' beliefs about language learning, organized by Stephen J. Gaies <[sigaies1204@hotmail.com](mailto:sigaies1204@hotmail.com)> and Keiko Sakui <[ksakui@hotmail.com](mailto:ksakui@hotmail.com)> was held on August 3, 1999. The Symposium was designed to offer an opportunity for Symposium presenters, discussants and Congress participants to identify and discuss conceptual and methodological issues in research on beliefs in language learning, to share the findings of recent research in this area and to develop an agenda for further research.

The two-hour morning session began with introductory remarks by Anita Wenden <[wldyc@cunyvm.cuny.edu](mailto:wldyc@cunyvm.cuny.edu)> (York College, City University of New York, USA), who recently edited a special issue (Fall 1999, Vol 27/4) of *System* devoted to beliefs and metacognitive knowledge in language learning. These remarks emphasized that beliefs can be viewed as a component of metacognitive knowledge and that research on learners' beliefs about language learning can make substantial contributions to both theory and practice. These remarks were followed by two reports of research. Rod Ellis's <[r.ellis@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:r.ellis@auckland.ac.nz)> (University of Auckland, NZ) "A Metaphorical Analysis of Learner Beliefs" reported the findings of an analysis of the language-learning diaries of six adult learners of German. On the basis of his study, Ellis concluded that notwithstanding several methodological limitations, metaphor analysis may reveal the underlying conceptual systems that learners use to make sense of their language-learning experience and to handle the cognitive and affective demands of language learning. In "Some Beliefs of Second Language Learners Are 'Emergent Phenomena'", Carol Hosenfeld <[inscarol@acsu.buffalo.edu](mailto:inscarol@acsu.buffalo.edu)> (State University of New York at Buffalo, USA) used data from three case studies of adult language learners to argue for a more complete view of the nature of beliefs: for example, a view that recognizes that beliefs can be either stable or emergent, either stable or backgrounded.

In his discussion of these two papers, Stephen Gaies raised the question of how to distinguish different kinds and levels of belief (and other mental representations). Drawing on the work of Phil Benson and Winnie Lor (University of Hong Kong), Gaies suggested that learners' metaphors may represent relatively stable conceptions of learning, whereas some of the mental representations discussed by Hosenfeld may be dynamic responses to a new learning context or novel experiences.

The final presentation in the morning session and the opening presentation in the afternoon session focused on methodological issues. Mia Victori's <[mia.victori@uab.es](mailto:mia.victori@uab.es)> (Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain) "Methodological Issues in Research on Learners' Beliefs About Language Learning" described the advantages and limitations of different research approaches and instruments. Many of the problems in collecting and interpreting data stem from the complexity of beliefs themselves: learners may not be conscious of these beliefs, or they may not be able to

describe them. In addition, there are numerous reasons for discrepancies between reported beliefs and actual behavior.

In “Methodological Issues in Research: How Reliable and Valid is the Japanese Version of Oxford’s *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning?*” Gordon Robson <[robsongo@swu.ac.jp](mailto:robsongo@swu.ac.jp)> and Hideko Midorikawa <[hmidori@swu.ac.jp](mailto:hmidori@swu.ac.jp)> (Showa Women’s University, Japan) report a validation study of a self-report instrument similar to many of the ones used in research on language learners’ beliefs. Robson and Midorikawa recommend that researchers take a very cautious approach to the use of self-report questionnaires, particularly when an existing questionnaire is to be translated for use in another language community.

The afternoon session featured three reports of research on learners’ beliefs. In “Brazilian Learners’ Beliefs About Language Learning”, Ana Maria F. Barcelos <[abarcelo@bamaed.ua.edu](mailto:abarcelo@bamaed.ua.edu)> (University of Alabama, USA) reported her ethnographic study of the “culture of learning languages” of a group of students majoring in English at a federal university in Brazil. The study found that in the class of fourteen students (taught by Barcelos, who thus functioned as a participant-researcher), three beliefs were predominant: language learning means learning grammar, the teacher has a central role in ensuring that learning takes place, and English-speaking countries are the ideal site for learning English. These beliefs were all rooted in the learners’ previous language-learning experiences.

In “An Exploration of the Structures of Language Learners’ Beliefs: Epistemological Beliefs and Language Learning Beliefs”, Yoshiko Mori <[moriy@gusun.georgetown.edu](mailto:moriy@gusun.georgetown.edu)> (Georgetown University, USA) reported research on the beliefs of U.S. university learners of Japanese. Mori’s analysis identified six factors on which learners’ beliefs about language learning loaded; a modest number of significant correlations were found between these factors and five dimensions of general epistemological beliefs described by Madeleine Schommer.

Jonathan Shaw’s <[jshaw@alphaserve.ait.ac.th](mailto:jshaw@alphaserve.ait.ac.th)> (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand) “Experiential Learning and Epistemological Beliefs: A Case Study of Vietnamese Graduate Students”, also used Schommer’s framework of epistemological beliefs to examine what happens to students’ conceptualizations of teaching and learning when they encounter an educational approach radically different from any in their previous educational experiences. One of Shaw’s conclusions - that students do not necessarily subscribe to the values that define a system in which they succeed, but rather adopt a pragmatic understanding of what is expected by their teachers - raises interesting questions about the relationship between beliefs and achievement.

Sara Cotterall <[sara.cotterall@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:sara.cotterall@vuw.ac.nz)> (Victoria University of Wellington, NZ), the discussant for the afternoon session, provided a synthesis of the entire Symposium. First, she identified three key themes on which there appeared to be widespread agreement. The first of these was that language learners’ beliefs are an important area for research. The second was that in order to explore learners’ belief systems, it is necessary to engage learners in dialogue about teaching and learning. Thirdly, a number of participants articulated the need for research on beliefs about language learning to strive for conceptual, methodological and psychometric rigour.

Cotterall then commented that the symposium had highlighted the need for better communication among researchers and greater awareness of each other’s work. She observed that the different research focus of Symposium participants had determined the need for different methodological approaches, but that justifying inferences about beliefs on the basis of either quantitative data (e.g., factor analysis) or qualitative data (e.g., interviews) is difficult at best. Cotterall also recommended that the study of language learners’ beliefs encompass both what they say and what they *do*, since there are often discrepancies between learners’ beliefs and their learning behaviours.

Cotterall concluded her discussion by suggesting a number of guidelines for future research. She recommended that researchers involved in this area seek greater agreement on the definition of basic terms and concepts. It was important too, she suggested, for researchers to network with each other and find ways to share their work and collaborate on research studies. She commented that the

purposes, and challenged participants to explore new research approaches and procedures such as metaphor analysis and discourse analysis.

The lively discussion generated in both sessions by the Symposium participants and members of the audience (who numbered close to 150 in the morning) indicates that on most issues, we are still far from either a clear understanding of the nature of beliefs or from consensus about how best to conduct research in this area and what we can hope to achieve. At the same time, the interest in this event suggests that future meetings of this kind and publications such as the Fall 1999 special issue of *System* (Vol 27/4, 1999) will get an enthusiastic response.

**b Keynote Address on Learner Autonomy - Anita Wenden, Thursday 5 August 1999**

Report contributed by Alison Hoffmann, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

*Autonomy in Language Learning: Retrospect and Prospect*

Anita began her address by noting that while the social forms might differ, autonomy was a universal goal of human development. She then explored the field to date by contrasting two main approaches to the promotion of autonomy in language learning. She began with the view from inside the classroom, with what she termed the strategies in language learning approach, stemming from insights into the strategies used by successful language learners, and with the improvement of the language learning process as the desired outcome. She contrasted this view with the self-directed learning approach, associated with Self Access Centres and so taking place outside the classroom.. This approach stems from insights into the benefits of taking control of one's own learning, and sees the ability to plan, direct and evaluate the language learning process as the desired outcome. Anita noted how these two approaches have clearly sprung from very different theoretical bases and have resulted in divergent research questions, methodologies and practices in the field.

In the next part of her address Anita gave examples of ways in which the two approaches have converged in recent years. For example, she referred to the development of the twin goals of learner strategies and self-direction within the classroom, and the trend towards the institutionalisation of learner training for learner autonomy. She also explored a number of recent theoretical refinements, such as new awareness of the role of beliefs and affective factors in language learning, and a new understanding of the role of the teacher as both teacher and advisor in the language learning process.

Anita then summarised what she saw as the major contributions of the field to applied linguistics. Through research into autonomy we now have a much greater awareness of the importance of the role of both the learner and of learner differences, and an expanded understanding of both unconscious and deliberate strategies in the language learning process. Anita concluded her very detailed and informative address by identifying some future directions for research, in particular the need for a better understanding of the sub-processes of self-direction and more exploration of the expanded role of the teacher. Anita hopes to have a revised version of the address published and has undertaken to provide publication details when she has them.

**c Scientific Commission Symposium on Learner Autonomy, Thursday 5 August 1999**

**'Promoting Learner Autonomy - New Insights'**

Report contributed by Leni Dam, Symposium Organiser

Finally, after 3 years of planning and hard work, the day for our symposium had arrived. Among 100 other symposia at the congress, ours had been programmed to take place on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> from 11.20am until 4.30pm B a morning session and an afternoon session B each session lasting 2 hours. 14 speakers from all over the world were to present 10 papers. Some of the speakers knew each other from earlier events; others had never met before. A new face for all of us was Beverly-Anne Carter from the West Indies who had applied for B and won B one of a small number of All A

meet on Wednesday night to discuss the proceedings of the symposium and to get to know each other. An excellent initiative B and an excellent evening.

### **Morning session**

At 11.10am, the 10 speakers who were to present 6 papers during this session were seated up front, waiting for the symposium to start. Programmes for the whole day as well as handouts for the individual papers were placed at the 4 entrances. By 11.20am, more than 100 people had found their way to the SC symposium, even though another symposium of interest to learner autonomy researchers and practitioners - namely Rebecca Oxford's Symposium on Learner Strategies, Styles, Beliefs and Attitudes - was taking place at the same time - an unfortunate organisational oversight. After a welcome to speakers and audience and a short introduction to the programme, the floor was given to the speakers.

The morning session was intended for people who were interested in getting an overview of what is going on within the field of learner autonomy, as well as for people already working within the area. The papers presented were clustered around two themes - 'Dimensions of learner counselling' and 'Assessment of processes and outcomes.'

### **Dimensions of learner counselling**

Three papers associated with the first theme - 'Dimensions of learner counselling' - were presented by researchers from New Zealand, Hong Kong and the Caribbean.

#### **Paper 1: Learner Advisory Sessions: Problems, Goals and Beliefs**

David Crabbe <[david.crabbe@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:david.crabbe@vuw.ac.nz)>, Alison Hoffmann <[alison.hoffmann@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:alison.hoffmann@vuw.ac.nz)> and Sara Cotterall <[sara.cotterall@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:sara.cotterall@vuw.ac.nz)>, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

#### **Abstract**

Papers presented at the AILA 1996 Symposium on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning included a number which focused on discourse in learner counselling. This presentation reports on a study of learner-advisor sessions which focused on language learners' strategic thinking and behaviour. The following three questions are addressed:

- 1 In what way is any task difficulty framed through the process of the interview itself?
- 2 What learning goals are explicitly or implicitly set by or for the learner?
- 3 What underlying learner beliefs about language learning emerge from the interviews?

#### **Paper 2: Approaches to Advising for Self-directed Language Learning**

Richard Pemberton <[lcrpem@uxmail.ust.hk](mailto:lcrpem@uxmail.ust.hk)> and Sarah Toogood. <[LCSALLY@USTHK.UST.HK](mailto:LCSALLY@USTHK.UST.HK)>  
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

#### **Abstract**

This paper examines the expectations of four advisers and some 50 learners involved in a semester-long self-directed language-learning programme for postgraduate learners. The programme is the subject of a two-year action research project and has just finished its second year of implementation. Drawing on data from a variety of sources, and focusing mainly on case studies of the four advisers and selected learners, we will discuss: (a) to what extent learner perceptions match the perceptions of their advisers; (b) whether certain styles of advising are appropriate with different types of learner and at different stages in a project. We will relate these findings to guidelines for advising established elsewhere, report the ways in which we have adapted our differing approaches to advising after the first year of the project, and discuss the effect of these adaptations on the second year of the programme.

#### **Paper 3: The ABCs of Learner Autonomy: Awareness, Beliefs, Counselling of Advanced Foreign Language Learners**

Beverly-Anne Carter <[carters@carib-link.net](mailto:carters@carib-link.net)>, University of West Indies, St. Augustine

#### **Abstract**

This paper presents the preliminary findings of a project that sought to introduce a group of advanced learners of French to the concept of learner autonomy. It discusses the role of Teacher Awareness, Learner Beliefs and Counselling in the promotion of learner autonomy. With regard to Teacher Awareness, the paper reminds the teacher/researcher of the need to gain a better understanding of

the case of the learners in this study, their educational background is a constraint on their potential for autonomy. On Learner Beliefs, the paper draws on data collected during the project to discuss how individual and group beliefs about language learning contribute to or hinder autonomy. The paper concludes by recommending a counselling system designed to support the promotion of learner autonomy.

### **Assessment of processes and outcomes**

Three papers associated with the second theme - 'Assessment of processes and outcomes' - were presented by researchers from Hong Kong, Thailand and Germany.

### **Paper 1: Towards an Analytic Approach to Assessing Learner Autonomy: the Construction of Measurement Scales for Self-direction in Language Learning**

Jose Lai <[joselai@cuhk.hk](mailto:joselai@cuhk.hk)>, English Language Teaching Unit, Chinese University of Hong Kong

#### **Abstract**

Learner training or learning to learn as a pedagogical practice has received increased attention over the past decade or so. Although positive outcomes have been reported on learners' increased capacity for self-direction in language learning through learner training, most findings tend to be descriptive rather than empirical. This is probably due to a lack of validated measurement scales for assessing the construct 'self-direction' in language learning. This paper aims to (1) address the urgent need of adopting a more analytic approach to assessing learners' capacity for self-direction, and (2) more importantly, introduce two validated measurement scales developed to assess learners' self-direction, both at the micro (task) and macro (overall organization) levels of their language learning process. It is believed that these scales will find universal utility in settings in which learner training is implemented. The rationale, development and validation of these measurement scales will form the core of the discussion.

### **Paper 2: Talkbase, Tasks and the Assessment of Learner Autonomy and Language Learning**

Marie-France Champagne <[mariefc@ait.ac.th](mailto:mariefc@ait.ac.th)>, William Savage <[william@ait.ac.th](mailto:william@ait.ac.th)>, and Jonathan Shaw <[jshaw@ait.ac.th](mailto:jshaw@ait.ac.th)>, Center for Language and Educational Technology, Asian Institute of Technology Bangkok, Thailand.

#### **Abstract**

An action research project by a group of faculty colleagues working as teacher-researchers culminates in qualitative and quantitative measures to assess learners' engagement of their autonomy and the improvement of their language capability through an experiential educational approach. The project begins by reviewing conceptualizations of task, autonomy and language as these have been informed by practitioner-researchers in various disciplines, and developed over fourteen years in the AIT Center for Language and Educational Technology. During the first phase of this year-long study, tasks on our pre-masters program called Talkbase are described, as are their autonomy and language objectives. During the second, assessment measures are designed and piloted, and in the third, implemented and evaluated. The paper problematizes and addresses the interdependent issues of how learner autonomy can be assessed, and how the learning of language can be measured in a manner consistent with a critical pedagogy that explicitly promotes learner autonomy.

### **Paper 3: The Development of Discourse Behaviour of Young Autonomous Learners**

Lienhard Legenhausen <[legenha@uni-muenster.de](mailto:legenha@uni-muenster.de)>, University of Münster, Germany

#### **Abstract**

The paper will focus on the discourse behaviour of young learners and especially the way this behaviour develops and changes over time. The data are based on the research project LAALE (Language Acquisition in an Autonomous Learning Environment) set up in 1992 (cf. Dam / Legenhausen 1996, 1997 etc.). Within this project, whose aim it is to follow the linguistic development of a class of autonomous learners from the beginning to the end of their school career, conversational data were systematically elicited after 17 and 48 months of English. In order to facilitate the interpretation of the recorded conversations, and to compensate for the lack of baseline data, peer-to-peer talks from traditionally taught learners of the same age will be

adduced. The paper will go into the question whether the conversations between peers also provide rich enough input data for developing a 'socio-pragmatic competence'.

## **Discussion**

After the presentation of papers within each theme - presentations had to be very brief as only half an hour was allocated for all three papers - the audience was given 15 minutes to discuss in groups any new insights that the presentations had triggered for them, and to note down any questions or comments they wanted to address to the presenters. Half an hour at the end of the morning session was set aside for these questions and responses from the presenters in plenary. Unfortunately there was not enough time to discuss all the issues that had come up. We attempted to make up for this in the afternoon session. Feedback suggests that participants found the morning session lively and profitable.

## **Afternoon session - 'Contexts and constraints when developing learner autonomy'**

After a rushed lunch in a nearby café the presenters for the afternoon were seated up front, and at 2.30pm we were ready to begin the afternoon session. This was intended to be a session where practitioners and researchers in the field of learner autonomy were given an opportunity to share their views, experiences and insights on the issue 'Contexts and constraints when developing learner autonomy'. Again a big group turned up, newcomers as well as people from the morning session, and after a short introduction to the afternoon, four papers on the theme were presented within 40 minutes.

### **Paper 1: Deconstructing 'the Asian Learner': An Action Research Perspective**

Richard Smith <[R.C.Smith@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:R.C.Smith@warwick.ac.uk)> Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Japan (now at Warwick University, England.)

#### **Abstract**

It is almost a truism to say that language teaching approaches developed in western countries are not necessarily appropriate in Asian settings. However, it is still far from clear how (western) teachers can seek to teach more appropriately. A typical response has been to argue for revised teaching suggestions on the basis of generalizations (sometimes justified by survey results) about Asian learners. Thus, in the field of learner autonomy, much has been made in different Asian settings of students' supposed collaborative tendencies, with modified self-access or classroom arrangements being proposed which suit students' (alleged) cooperative requirements or capabilities. However, it seems implausible to suggest that appropriate pedagogy can be developed solely on the basis of such generalizations. At worst, proposals may be seen to derive from essentialist, indeed, orientalist assumptions. This paper argues, then, for a localized, interpretive and recursive (i.e. action research) approach to the development of appropriate pedagogy by teachers of Asian students. In support of this argument, results of learning style / strategy surveys will be contrasted with data from ongoing action research connected with the negotiation and evaluation of self-directed learning in a Japanese university context.

### **Paper 2: Looking Around: the Institutional and Psychological Context of Learner Autonomy**

Naoko Aoki <[naoko@let.osaka-u.ac.jp](mailto:naoko@let.osaka-u.ac.jp)>, Osaka University, Japan

#### **Abstract**

In Finland I argued with Richard Smith that the issue of cultural incompatibility of learner autonomy requires critical reviewing of what autonomy and culture refer to. We also emphasized the need to listen to learners' voice before condemning learner autonomy for cultural incompatibility. This paper is a case study in which I try to clarify how learners' voice reflect institutional and psychological context outside classroom. As Pierson (1996) argues, social structure in education is thought to influence learners' propensity for autonomy. Learners' attitude towards, or affect associated with, autonomy may also have its root in the institutional environment that surrounds the place where learning actually takes place. The context one needs to take into account in order to fully understand learners' voice may be wider than researchers have normally thought to be. Based on my experience moving into a new university, I shall explore what might be behind utterances and behaviours of the students. In concluding I shall contend that learners' voice, or its absence, is embedded in the milieu they live in, and that taking it as face value without probing

what each learner's authentic thoughts and wishes are would run the risk of ignoring whether learners are happy with their present degree of autonomy.

### **Paper 3: Promoting Learner Autonomy through the Use of Critical Reading Strategies**

Vera Maria dos Santos <[vx santos@adf.com.br](mailto:vx santos@adf.com.br)> , Linguistics Department, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria - RS, Brazil

#### **Abstract**

Due to traditional teacher directed teaching environments in Brazil, it has proved difficult to get learners at university level to act and to interact independently. This paper reports a study and its results carried out in Santa Maria, Brazil. The subjects were undergraduate students of Language and Linguistics and the main hypothesis was that if strategies on critical reading were specifically introduced to their students programs, students would become more autonomous both as readers and as individuals. The study was conducted for a period of two years (1996-1998) and consisted of interviews, some strategies teaching and class observation.

### **Paper 4: Investigating contexts for learner autonomy: the case of teacher and learner beliefs and practices**

Flávia Vieira <[flaviav@iep.uminho.pt](mailto:flaviav@iep.uminho.pt)> , Institute of Education and Psychology, Department of Methodologies of Education, Universidade do Minho, Portugal

#### **Abstract**

Studies on the concept and implementation of learner autonomy have shown that a pedagogy for autonomy must be context-sensitive, but not much research has been done on the contexts where applications have been tried out. Despite the growing emphasis on issues such as cultural variation, learner and teacher representations, teacher autonomy, etc., the focus has been more on procedures and outcomes rather on how those factors act as situational variables which may either facilitate or constrain the introduction of autonomy in institutional settings. The aim of the paper is to present insights from a research study on teacher and learner beliefs and practices based on 2 parallel survey questionnaires administered to a sample of EFL secondary school teachers and learners in Portugal. Learner data refer to sense of agency, regulation of learning in class, and out-of-class contact with the foreign language. Teacher data refer to perceptions about the above learner variables. From an interpretative analysis of main findings, implications will be derived as regards both the feasibility of a pedagogy for autonomy in the (Portuguese) school context and the specific measures to deal with potential constraints.

### **Poster: A survey of teacher and learner beliefs and practices with reference to a pedagogy for autonomy in the school context**

Instead of joining the general poster session, Flavia Vieira <[flaviav@iep.uminho.pt](mailto:flaviav@iep.uminho.pt)> and Isabel Marques <[imarques@iep.uminho.pt](mailto:imarques@iep.uminho.pt)> decided to display their poster presentation at the back of the room in which our symposium took place.

#### **Abstract**

The poster presents research instruments and data from a research study on teacher and learner beliefs and practices, based on 2 parallel survey questionnaires administered to a sample of EFL secondary school teachers and learners in Portugal. Learner data refer to sense of agency, regulation of learning in class, and out-of-class contact with the foreign language. Teacher data refer to perception about the above learner variables. Results are expected to show how teacher and learner beliefs/practices can potentially facilitate or constrain a pedagogy for autonomy in institutional settings.

### **Plenary - 'Statement of New Insights'**

At 3.20pm it was time to form groups B in a room with 160 fixed chairs! However, with the help of William Savage and Richard Smith it was made possible. Three groups were formed around the themes: Counselling, Assessment, and Contexts and Constraints. Presenters joined the groups and generated discussion as well as responding to unanswered questions and issues from the morning session. 10 minutes later, heated discussions were taking place B with people placed on tables as well as chairs. Unfortunately some people had to leave in the middle of the session because they had papers to present themselves B also on the topic of learner autonomy! Another

At 4pm representatives from the groups reported back in plenary on 'Statements of New Insights'. These statements were collected by William Savage to be fed into the organisation of the SC Symposium in Singapore in 2002 (see Section 3 of the newsletter.) At 4.30pm another lively and most satisfactory session had come to an end. Let me take this opportunity once more to thank all the presenters for their great job, and to thank William Savage and Richard Smith for their invaluable support with the event.

**d AILA SC Business Meeting, Thursday 5 August, 1999**  
Report contributed by Sara Cotterall, Victoria University of Wellington

Members of the SC were sent an electronic copy of the Minutes of the AILA 99 SC Business Meeting in September 1999. A copy of these minutes can also be found on the SC website. The meeting re-elected Leni Dam and Sara Cotterall as co-convenors of the SC for another 3 year period, and elected William Savage for his first three year term. Leni Dam led a discussion of the aims of the SC which culminated in David Crabbe, Naoko Aoki and Jon Shaw being asked to work on revising these, and to present the revised statement to the convenors early in 2000. We are grateful to David, Naoko and Jon for their work on behalf of the SC. Their revised statement of aims is presented below:

**Purpose**

The AILA Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy is established to advance understanding of the role of learner autonomy in successful language learning.

**Aim**

The aim of the Commission is to promote research and disseminate findings on:

- 1 the nature of learner autonomy
- 2 the conditions under which learner autonomy develops in individuals
- 3 processes by which teachers or advisors might encourage or enhance learner autonomy in specific learning contexts

**Objectives**

The objectives of the Commission are:

- 1 to maintain a data-base of its members and the research projects undertaken by them and other researchers
- 2 to maintain a website and a bibliography of material related to learner autonomy
- 3 to prepare an annual newsletter
- 4 to hold forums at the International Congress of AILA and at other appropriate times in which research is presented and discussed.

There will be an opportunity to discuss this revised statement of aims at the 2002 Symposium of the SC to be held at the AILA Congress in Singapore in December 2002. (The original statement of aims can be found on the SC website.) In the meantime, SC members who wish to comment on the revision should e-mail comments to one of the SC convenors.

**3 The 4<sup>th</sup> SYMPOSIUM OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION ON LEARNER AUTONOMY, 13<sup>TH</sup> WORLD CONGRESS OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS, SINGAPORE, 16-21 DECEMBER, 2002**  
Report contributed by William Savage and Terry Lamb

Early planning is now under way for the triennial gathering of colleagues in our world-wide learner autonomy community. The co-organizers of the Singapore Symposium, Terry Lamb and William Savage, have identified two themes to carry on from the 1999 Tokyo Symposium: the relationships between learner and teacher autonomy, and innovative research methods to use in exploring

Although it is a little too early for Symposium programme or framework details, Terry and William have been thinking about how the lead-up to the Symposium can be made much more interactive by using the Internet. Thus, the Symposium itself would be, in keeping with the theme for AILA Singapore 2002, an "Opportunity for Innovation and Creativity" in conference session formats.

Any suggestions colleagues have on either the themes or framework of the Symposium are most welcome. Just get in touch with either Terry Lamb, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, <[Terry.Lamb@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:Terry.Lamb@nottingham.ac.uk)> or William Savage, Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand, <[william@ait.ac.th](mailto:william@ait.ac.th)>. Information about the AILA Congress to be held in Singapore can be found at:

<http://www.saalnet.org/saalnet/aila2002index.html>

#### **4 FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES AND COURSES**

A number of members have asked us to publicise forthcoming courses and conferences.

##### **LT2000 "Quality Language Teaching through Innovation and Reflection" Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 19-23 June, 2000**

Website: <http://lc.ust.hk/~centre/conf2000/LT2000.html>

Venue: Hong Kong University of Science and Technology/Tsinghua University, Beijing

Dates: 19-23 June, 2000 (19-20 June Hong Kong; 21-23 June Beijing (optional))

Keynote speakers include Phil Candy, Robert Vanderplank, Mike Wallace, Peter Trudgill

The conference will include a colloquium on 'Learner Autonomy'; SC members Naoko Aoki, David Gardner and William Savage are amongst confirmed speakers for the colloquium. Visit the website:

<http://lc.ust.hk/~centre/conf2000/colloquia.html#LearnAuto> for more information.

There will be a strand on self-access/self-directed learning at the conference and two of the keynotes (Phil Candy and Robert Vanderplank) will be addressing matters related to lifelong learning/learner autonomy.

##### **COURSE: "Learner Autonomy and the Role of the Teacher" Santiago de Compostela, Spain, July 10 to July 21, 2000**

This is a Lingua B course organized by Conselleria de Educacion e Ordenacion Universitaria and Centro de Formacion y Recursos de Santiago de Compostela in partnership with the University of Uppsala (Sweden) and DAFCO-CAFOC (Paris, France). The objectives of the course include the following:

- 1 To increase one's ability to develop autonomous learning;
- 2 To reflect on the implications of a pedagogy for autonomy for teacher development/the teacher as learner;
- 3 To reconstruct one's theories and practices of foreign language teaching with reference to a pedagogy for autonomy in the school context and for adults.

The target audience includes foreign language teachers, teacher developers/trainers, advisors, and material writers. The cost is 183.000 ptas (course fees and half-board). For more information contact Maria Jose Dopico Rodriguez, Centro de Formacion y Recursos de Santiago de Compostela, Rua Villaldia, 37, 15706 Santiago de Compostela, Spain, (<[cefosant@mx2.redestb.es](mailto:cefosant@mx2.redestb.es)>) or Gunilla Bouvin (<[Gunilla.bouvin@telia.com](mailto:Gunilla.bouvin@telia.com)>) or Michele Dubois (<[Michele.Dubois@soparis.fr](mailto:Michele.Dubois@soparis.fr)> or <[dubois.dafco@wanadoo.fr](mailto:dubois.dafco@wanadoo.fr)>).

## **EUROCALL 2000, August 31- September 2, 2000**

EUROCALL 2000 will be held from 31 August to 2 September 2000 at the University of Abertay Dundee, Scotland. Keynote speakers are: Stephen Heppell, Ron Cole, Ray Kurzweil, Carol Chapelle. The Conference main theme and title is: Alnnovative Language Learning in the Third Millennium@. For all details of the Conference, please refer to the EUROCALL 2000 Website at\_ <http://dbs.tay.ac.uk/eurocall2000/>

## **CERCLES International Conference, Antwerp, Belgium, 14-16 September 2000**

The 6th CercleS International Conference will be hosted by NUT (Nederlandstalige Universitaire Talencentra) at the University of Antwerp/UFSIA in central Antwerp.

### **Themes**

- Incorporating Intercultural Communicative Competence
- Languages for Special Purposes
- Less Widely Spoken Languages/Languages of New Member States
- Quality and the European Framework/European Language Portfolio
- The Changing Role of Language Trainers

For further information contact: CercleS Secretariat, Department of Modern Languages, University of Plymouth, Drake Circus, Plymouth, PL8 4AA, UK, Tel/Fax+44 (0) 1752 232249, Email: <cercles@plymouth.ac.uk>

## **5 CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SC MEMBERS**

The Scientific Commission is a worldwide collection of individuals committed to promoting research and disseminating findings on learner autonomy in language learning. This section of the newsletter offers an opportunity to hear the voices of some of our members. E-mail addresses of all contributors are provided in the interests of promoting discussion with readers.

**Marie-France Champagne** <mariefc@ait.ac.th> works at the Center for Language and Educational Technology (CLET) at the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) in Thailand with a team of people including Jon Shaw (see below) and William Savage (co-convenor of the SC). Marie France writes: "Like Jon Shaw, I work at CLET. When I came to AIT in 1993, I thought I would stay for a maximum of two years, and I am still here ... Since my arrival, I have been fascinated by the following two interrelated aspects of CLET: the pro-autonomy approach used on the courses, and the collaboration among teachers, the way we constantly re-examine and question our practices. CLET's spirit of collaboration enabled our predecessors to set up Talkbase, which in turn strengthened team work. At the moment, I am interested in the following:

*Team-teaching*, which means teaching every class session as a team with the same colleague. Collaboration through team-teaching is not about deciding before class who will do what, but about jumping together into the unknown, and reacting on the spot, which means constantly adapting. This helps us to really become members of the group. It takes off our shoulders the teacher' role, illustrates the kind of interaction we would like to see happening among students, and offers them two potentially diverging view points. As Jon mentions below, discussions we have had led Matthew Laszewski and me to get rid of the schedule on our last team-taught pre-masters programme. This allowed us, among other things, to negotiate with the group what the next activity should be, according to what had been done and what was felt needed. The most important thing is not the typical type of activities groups go through (following a schedule), but how they go through these activities, and how we can help them decide for themselves which activity is most relevant at a particular moment in the course. That sort of course is for me an opportunity to learn so much! Learn about my students, learn about the subjects they are interested in, learn about life and about myself.

The use of *Bourdieu's* concepts of `habitus', `field' and `capital' to try to: (1) conduct my own socio-analysis and realize the cultural/social/personal biases of my teaching attitudes and assumptions; (2) analyze my teaching situation and unravel its pedagogical assumptions, social constraints, etc.

how these determine their own conceptions of learning. And of course, the three points above relate to and influence each other. Central to this is the fact that we are all both influenced and influencing the `fields' we evolve in.

This idea is very close to what Buddhism calls `interbeing', and has led me to my newest interest: *Engaged Buddhism* and its conceptions of education. I am now learning about the activities of movements like the International Network of Engaged Buddhists and the Spirit in Education Movement. I like their emphasis on the need to re-focus education to not only address our students' intellectual needs for knowledge, but also help them develop their human potential, see the relevance - as interbeings - of what they learn, to their own societies, and be aware of the implications of their actions and life choices. I am now exploring further these ideas in my (teaching) life. If you want to discuss these interests, please contact me at: <mariefc@ait.ac.th>".

**Francisco Gomes de Matos** <[fkgm@cashnet.com.br](mailto:fkgm@cashnet.com.br)> is Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Federal University of Pernambuco in Recife, Brazil. He has been probing learners' and teachers' linguistic and intercultural rights since his pioneering Plea for a Language Rights Declaration in 1984. Gomes de Matos is a member of the Follow-up Scientific Council of the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (Barcelona, 1996). He questions the way language education curricula have neglected the human-edifying-and-dignifying dimension. He writes: "Helping language users learn how to use languages clearly, coherently, cohesively, consistently, correctly, and creatively is necessary but not sufficient. We should also prepare language users to learn how to use languages constructively, peacefully." Gomes de Matos has provided us with a copy of an article on learners' vocabulary rights which he wrote recently. The text, originally published in BRAZ-TESOL Newsletter, Sao Paolo, Brazil in December 1999 (page 18), is reproduced here with permission.

### **Learners' vocabulary rights: a checklist**

**Vocabulary: value-laden, valued, varied, variable, vast, versatile,...vital!**

Although the word "Vocabulary" seems to have entered Written English between 1525 - 1535 (cf. Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1997, p. 1437), the climbing of the "Everest of a language" (as David Crystal so very perceptively put it in his *Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language*, 1995, p. 117) is a fascinating aspect of the 25-century-old History of Language Learning. Given its longevity, Vocabulary has remained an ever-challenging aspect of Language Teaching, particularly so of ELT, a professional domain in which substantial financial investment has been made in lexical studies. Despite praiseworthy, creative efforts by teachers/researchers in English to Speakers of Other Languages, the truth of the matter is that we have not been doing as effective a job as Vocabulary systematizers as could be expected.

As Crystal cogently sees it: "the thing that worries me most about vocabulary is the way that it has received so little investigation, either in semantic or development terms, so that pedagogical principles for grading it are conspicuous by their absence. Typically learners are dropped into a bath of vocabulary, and expected to pick it up. For example, at the end of a chapter in one coursebook I just looked at there were about 20 items as orange, handkerchief, grass, tractor, and upset. No effort was being made to group the items in a sensible semantic way, or to introduce vocabulary systematically. So, learners surely have a right to expect that this massive area of language should be presented to them in a reasonably systematic way? I can't think of anything more basic than that." (Personal communication, September 20, 1999).

After having asked that distinguished British linguist-encyclopedist what would be the most fundamental vocabulary rights of language learners, I decided to formulate a Checklist which could be suggestive and/or inspiring to colleagues (teacher-educators, teachers, applied linguists, materials writers) interested in exploring an untrodden territory: learners' vocabulary rights/responsibilities.

Limitation of space will preclude me to focus on the equally relevant/revealing semantic rights and responsibilities of teachers and materials writers, but a plea is made for such equally indispensable work to be carried out realistically by groups, so that the issue(s) of perception/formulation/implementation of vocabulary rights will reflect collective rather than individual thinking/decision-making. An additional strategy which has been proven productive in my Seminars on Learners' Pronunciation and Grammatical Rights could be tried out in connection with Vocabulary Rights, namely, that of using current works on Methodology, Applied Linguistics, English Grammar, etc as sources for such rights. It is sometimes the case that statements made by authors of such books can be "translated" into Learners/Teachers Rights Discourse. Two examples: *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*, edited by James Coady and Thomas Huckin, Cambridge University Press, 1997. Its Chapter 12, Teaching Vocabulary (by Paul Nation and Jonathan Newton) is a mine for learners' rights-minded TESOLers. Another potentially inspiring source is Ronald Carter's *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, Second Edition, Routledge, 1998 (Cf Chapter 7, Learning and Teaching Vocabulary).

For a very recent, corpus-based source of inspiration to vocabulary teaching, see *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Pearson Education Limited, 2000). Its Chapter 13 "Lexical Expressions in Speech and Writing" features both findings and insights of applicational value, especially those focusing on Lexical bundles (Expressions with "know", "I think", "I like", "I want", "I mean", etc).

### **Learners' vocabulary rights: an open list**

Do I assure my students of their semantic right to learn to use lexical items:

- 1 systematically, in lexical sets, or as word families, or through concept mapping, etc.
- 2 contextually, that is, in typical situations in which the vocabulary item is used
- 3 realistically - as far as data on frequency of use is concerned - so that more commonly used lexical items can be prioritized? A related semantic right would be the learners' right to access to dictionaries providing such guidance, as for instance the Collins Cobuild Dictionary (1995)
- 4 appropriately - as regards information on word appropriateness, through usage labels such as formal, slightly formal, informal, slang (rude/taboo) as provided, for instance, by the Cambridge Dictionary of American English (CUP, 2000)
- 5 humanizingly - by being sensitized to the constructive, human-dignifying power of words and by being helped make use of such hitherto little explored vocabulary.

This area of investigation/classroom teaching is in need of systematic probing, if we are to help our learners use English not only clearly, coherently, cohesively, correctly, creatively but also constructively, as advocated in some of this author's writings. (Cf. Gomes de Matos "Using English for communicative peace", BRAZ-TESOL Newsletter, September 1991, p.2) One such communicative-peace-enhancing rights of students would be the right to learn how to translate (potentially) aggressive/violent vocabulary into positively used language. TESOLers are urged to expand and refine such a listing, so that the teaching of vocabulary can retain "its rightful place as a fundamentally important aspect" of ELT, as so very cogently expressed by our TESOL President, David Nunan in his illuminating and well-organized *Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Heinle and Heinle, 1999, p.103).

In short, once a Checklist of Learners' Vocabulary Rights/Responsibilities has been collectively designed (by teachers from the same school or from the same TESOL local affiliate, etc), how would the items on such listings be prioritized, to what extent, why? May this be a plea for TESOL action in an area which can be made even more vivacious: vocabulary learning and teaching.

**Carol Hosenfeld** <inscarol@acsu.buffalo.edu> writes: "My interest in learner autonomy grew in discussions I had with new and old friends at the 12<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Applied Linguistics in

the State University of New York at Buffalo. I am designing a graduate level course on Learner Autonomy which I intend to give in May, 2000. This will be the first course on learner autonomy ever given at the university as far as I can ascertain. I am also conducting an ethnographic study in my Masters level course on Learning a Second, Third, or Fourth Language. This course leads right into the course on Autonomy. I'm excited about this new journey and I find the readings - many suggested by Anita Wenden - to be completely aligned with my beliefs and philosophy about learning. "

**Francis Jones** <[f.r.jones@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:f.r.jones@newcastle.ac.uk)> writes "My interests are in "teacher-free" language learning rather than in classroom autonomy (though obviously the dividing-line is a fuzzy one). One of my tasks as an EFL lecturer at Newcastle University Language Centre is to act as a language learning advisor, specialising in the learning of "little known" or "exotic" languages.

My PhD looked at strategies, materials and achievement for package-led and fully-autonomous FL self-instruction with British learners ("Going it alone: self-instruction in adult foreign language learning", Dept of Education, University of Newcastle, UK, 1996). A colleague (Maria Fernandez Toro) and I have written an advice manual for learners on this topic which we have just delivered to CILT (London)"DIY Techniques for Language Learners". I've also written several articles on solo language learning.

I'd be especially interested in getting in touch with anybody else who has interests in solo language learning - particularly in the under-researched area of learning with dedicated "teach-yourself" packages."

**Terry Lamb** <[Terry.Lamb@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:Terry.Lamb@nottingham.ac.uk)> (from the University of Nottingham Centre for Research into Second and Foreign Language Pedagogy) has submitted this report of a research project he is currently involved in. The Centre is involved in research, research supervision, and teaching mainly in the field of learner autonomy. Terry's particular focus is on the teaching of foreign/additional languages to secondary age pupils in schools. Related to this he runs the European PGCE course (an initial teacher training initiative) and is Course Director of the MA in Urban Education and Social Policy. Terry will also be co-coordinating (together with William Savage) the next symposium of the Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy in Singapore 2002. He would welcome any responses to the content or methodology of his research, which he describes below.

## **Children's constructions of learning: metacognition, motivation, and achievement**

### *Overall aim of the research*

Despite a general improvement in examination performance levels (1998 Youth Cohort Study, reported in Slater et al, 1999), the gap between children from professional backgrounds and those from households with no one in paid employment is increasing. Within this broader picture, many schools are becoming increasingly concerned about learners' attitudes to modern foreign languages (MFLs). Achievement in MFLs is, in fact, well below the average of all subjects across the curriculum, and many still achieve no qualification, largely due to poor motivation. Teachers point to a variety of factors leading to this situation, such as the position of English as a world language, and the teacher-intensive nature of MFL methodology with its high demands on pupil concentration and application (Place, 1997; Barton, 1997).

My research began with the broad aim of investigating the relationship between children's motivation to learn languages and their experience of learner autonomy. The research context is an inner city school, and students involved are from a range of Year 9 languages classes (German and French) all with experience of autonomous learning. The first phase of my research consisted of general observation of a range of language classes with the intention of recording in as much detail as possible what exactly was happening in the lessons. The objective was to find a clearer

focus for further investigation by allowing the questions to emerge from the observation (in the tradition of ethnography).

During this period it became clear that the value of classroom observation was limited as far as my question was concerned. The most interesting insights came when I adopted the role of participant observer, circulating and helping learners when they were working independently. By asking them to explain what they were doing and why they were doing it, I realised that there was a whole range of understandings regarding the nature of learning and learning tasks. Some students seemed to be relating well to the learning content and activities, revealing, for example, an understanding of what the intended purpose of an activity was, how it fitted in with their own particular learning needs, and how to approach it, as well as a readiness to take charge of this. In other words some students seemed to have a well-developed level of metacognitive awareness. Others, on the other hand, seemed to be working without understanding the point, and others of course were trying to avoid work altogether. Interestingly such understandings of learning seemed not necessarily to correspond to achievement levels. Was there a relationship with their motivation?

### *Phase 2*

The second phase of my research focused on a desire to explore the ways in which learners themselves relate to learning, what supports or prevents this, and how it relates to their motivation to learn languages and to their achievement levels. Furthermore I focused exclusively on learners' own perceptions of this with a commitment to their voices being heard. In particular I was interested in exploring the ways in which learners' own constructions of learning relate to aspects of learner autonomy (in particular metacognitive knowledge and understanding of self-management), and from this developing theories which may help us to understand and optimise the learning processes. As such my research is not disinterested; it is intended to be transformative. It is grounded in critical theory with a commitment to empower students to make the most of an education system from which they may feel alienated. Such a commitment is reflected both in the focus of the research (learners' own constructions of learning) and in the process (accessing voices through focus groups and peer research).

It should be mentioned that the research is not collecting data on learning in action. The ability to describe does not necessarily imply use. However the main focus of the research is on constructions rather than use, on metacognitive knowledge rather than metacognitive strategies.

In order to facilitate the research design (and analysis) I pre-conceptualized "Constructions of learning" as metacognitive knowledge and understanding of self-management (as two forms of metacognition - see Malicky et al, 1997). The former I initially divided according to Wenden (1991) into self-knowledge, task knowledge, and strategic knowledge. The latter I defined as the awareness of one's own role in managing learning, i.e. in planning, monitoring and evaluation of one's own learning (also Wenden, 1991). In each case, I was interested in how the learners describe and evaluate the factors which affect their learning. This includes not just what they have to say, but also how they say it i.e. the language they have at their disposal to enable them to talk about learning.

Of course there is a tension between a commitment to accessing learners' constructions of learning and a research design which is based on a pre-determined theoretical framework, but it is essential to have a tight design to make the best use of time (particularly as one of the sub-aims is to consider the effectiveness of the research tools and their possible applicability to teachers working with their own students). Tools of analysis have to be sensitive to this issue and allow sufficient flexibility to enable a new framework to emerge if necessary. (Indeed one of the outcomes of the research will be an analysis of the discrepancy between accepted etic frameworks and emerging emic ones.) The concepts of "connectedness" (a term borrowed from Ruddock et al (1996) and adapted to include the extent to which learners relate to learning in general, and, more specifically, to the what, why and how of learning), and "locus of control" (the extent to which learners feel responsible for and in control of their own learning) are possible

analytical tools which will allow a consideration of “relatedness” (a concept which relates both to motivation theories and critical theory).

I spent the first part of phase two working with four focus groups in a series of sessions, each session with a different focus. The four focus groups were:

- 1 high achievers, motivated
- 2 high achievers, not motivated
- 3 low achievers, motivated
- 4 low achievers, not motivated

The rationale for grouping students according to achievement and perceived motivation levels was, firstly, to encourage more voices and greater variety in data (low achievers may feel ‘silenced’ by high achievers - or vice-versa), and secondly, to allow some level of comparison (though the intention is not to draw generalisable conclusions but rather to produce hypotheses).

Each focus group met six times and took part in group discussions and activities (projective techniques) to encourage articulation of learners’ own knowledge, beliefs and attitudes. This had implications for my role as researcher. On the one hand, data collection in groups was intended to shift the balance of power away from me as researcher, minimising the possibility that students will say what they assume I want to hear. On the other hand, my role as researcher had to be supported by my previous experience as a teacher in order to gain the co-operation of the learners.

### *Phase 3*

This phase is based on the notion of critical learner autonomy developed in a recent publication (Lamb, to be published 2000). It is intended to explore ways in which learners can empower themselves through adapting learning to suit their needs (whilst learning to recognise the constraints under which they and their teachers must operate). Though the intention is not to conduct action research, it is hoped that application of some of the principles of critical learner autonomy will provide data beyond that acquired in Phase 2, offering further insights into learners’ perspectives on the learning situation.

This time data will be collected through a series of meetings with one focus group, which will consist of eight students (two volunteers from each of the previous four focus groups). The intention is that the group will further explore language learning in the school context. They will be made aware of immovable constraints (e.g. National Curriculum, GCSE syllabus, legal requirements on supervision of students, resource and financial constraints), but within this will explore ways in which they would improve the quality of language learning if they were teachers. The precise focus will be chosen by them in an attempt to access their constructions of learning and minimise my power as researcher.

In addition, the group will identify any aspect of language learning (from previous focus group work) which they consider to affect motivation, and conduct peer research with other Year 9 students. Discussion of possible research methods will be necessary at this point. Furthermore, students’ attitudes towards involvement in such peer research will be discussed.

### **References**

- Barton, A. 1997. ‘Boys’ underachievement in GCSE modern languages: reviewing the reasons’, *Language Learning Journal*, no.16, September: 11-16
- Lamb, T E, >Finding a voice - learner autonomy and teacher education in an urban school=. In Sinclair, B, I McGrath and T Lamb (eds), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions* (Addison Wesley Longman, forthcoming)

Malicky, G.V. and Juliebo, M.F. 1997. 'Scaffolding of metacognition in intervention lessons', *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, vol XLIII, no 2/3, pp 114-126

Place, J. Dianne 1997. 'Boys will be boys' - boys and under-achievement in MFL@, *Language Learning Journal*, no.16, September: 3-10

Ruddock, J., Chaplain, R. and Wallace, G. (eds.) 1996. *School Improvement: What Can Pupils Tell Us?* London: David Fulton

Slater, J, C Dean and R Brown, >Learning gulf divides rich and poor pupils= in *Times Educational Supplement*, (2 April, 1999)

Wenden, A. 1991. *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall

**Phillip Mahnken** <PMAHNKEN@usc.edu.au > studied French, Indonesian and some Dutch at the Australian National University at the beginning of the 1970's. He became a foreign language teacher in his native Tasmania for 14 years interspersed with a year of free lance travel in Europe and a year working in Indonesia. Since then he has completed an Education Masters degree with a dissertation about "realism and real politik in language teaching". In 1990 he moved to the University of Tasmania where he established the first ever tertiary Indonesian programme in that state. In 1997 he transferred to the newest University in Australia, the University of the Sunshine Coast, where he is now Coordinator of Languages (Indonesian, Japanese and Italian). Phillip has been doing a part-time, distance, qualitative PhD on "learner perceptions of knowledge, interaction and motivation in a CALL environment". His website can be visited via <http://intranet.usc.edu.au/wacana/>.

**Luciano Mariani** (<luciano.mariani@iol.it>) writes: "In 1999 I carried out a review of research literature and reports of experiences on the relationship between learning styles/learning strategies and the use of new technologies. The review was aimed at producing a bibliography and a list of references which could serve as a starting point for further discussion and investigation in Italian teacher-training contexts. Three main themes emerged as a result of the review:

- a) how (self-)observation processes can help to throw some light on the ways learning styles affect and are affected by human-computer interaction;
- b) how commonly shared views of learning strategies may be challenged by the new demands that technologies make on learners;
- c) what balance should be struck between the need for user-friendly technologies (which may sometimes lead us to envisage a machine-controlled learning environment) and the need to maintain and possibly improve learners' control and decision-making skills - the question of "control" taking on new facets in the autonomy debate. A preliminary report of this review was presented at the LEND (Lingua e Nuova Didattica) National Conference at the Università della Calabria, Cosenza, Italy (September 9-11, 1999), and a revised report is scheduled for the British Council 19th National Conference for Teachers of English (Bologna, Italy, March 23-25, 2000). The report, and the relevant bibliography and list of references, will be available later in the year on my web site: [http://utenti.tripod.it/learning\\_paths](http://utenti.tripod.it/learning_paths). This site has recently been redesigned and updated and now includes pilot on-line demonstrations of strategy applications, for teachers' and learners' use."

**Hayo Reinders** <hayo@hayo.nl> writes: "My name is Hayo Reinders and I am from the Netherlands. My interest in languages (and in learning as many as possible) led me to study Applied Linguistics and Arabic and Hebrew, for both of which I am currently writing my MA theses. From November 1999 until February 2000, I worked as a research intern with Sara Cotterall at Victoria University in Wellington New Zealand, where we conducted a research project on Self-Access Language Learning (SALL). We used questionnaires, interviews and observations to study

with classroom learning. An interesting preliminary finding is that almost 40% of the students indicated that they only 'sometimes' used English outside the university. This is a surprising finding since the learners are studying English in an English-speaking country; the learners' lack of practice with the language probably constitutes one of the greatest obstacles for teachers. If you are interested in the results of this study, you will soon be able to find these on my website (<[www.hayo.nl](http://www.hayo.nl)>). My other interests and experience include Computer Assisted Language Learning, Learner Autonomy and Metacognitive Awareness in language learning."

**Jonathan Shaw** <jshaw@ait.ac.th> writes: "I've been working with the Center for Language and Educational Technology (CLET) at the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) in Thailand since 1989. AIT's a fascinating place: it's one of the only universities I know of that has an explicitly developmental mission. Most of the students here are studying for masters degrees in fields such as Urban Environmental Management, Computer Science or Management. We've got students from most every country in Asia, and increasingly from Europe too, and faculty from some 40 different countries, all working through the medium of English (which is where we come in). During the past ten years, I've seen a shift in the demographics of the Institute away from South Asians and Filipinos towards Vietnamese, Cambodian and Lao students, and increasingly young Thais. This last group tends to bring the average age of students down, but the majority still arrive here with several years or more work experience.

For much of my time at AIT, I've been working as a teacher on our pre-masters programme, Talkbase. What I'm interested in at present is integrating the use of computers, the web, web-based language learning tools and web authoring into the well-established taskbased framework of the program, and how this affects learner autonomy. I'm also interested in finding better ways of using the Collins Cobuild English dictionary in the programme. This is one of my favourite resources for autonomous language learning, and I've only just started to find ways of using it in Talkbase.

With other colleagues at the Center, in August 1999 I participated in the Symposium on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning at AILA in Tokyo, which I enjoyed tremendously. Our paper was on how we are using self assessment in Talkbase. I think that our collective effort was useful, but the work we set out to do has really only just begun, and others - such as Jose Lai - are further along the road we've started travelling down. In the next few months, I'd like to look at two areas:

### **1 Self-assessment as a means of assessing language in programmes whose overarching goal is learner autonomy.**

How exactly are we using the instruments we have developed so far to measure what? Is this consistent with the ways others are using self-assessment instruments, or is it something else? I don't think there have been any articles on self-assessment in the journal *Language Testing* (which we stopped taking a couple of years ago, but should start again) since 1990.

In the discussion groups at the end of the symposium, Lienhard Legenhausen proposed that the apparent paradox of using self-assessment in systems and situations in which formal externally-administered tests distorted the educational endeavour could be resolved if we made external tests a means of validating students' own self assessments. Now how can that be achieved in practice? In the Schools at AIT?

### **2 Team-teaching as a means of negotiating autonomy and shared understandings of what we are doing.**

This was something my colleagues Matt Laszewski, Champagne and I have talked a lot about during the past year, culminating with their dispensing with the timetable altogether in their most recent collaboration. This raises the question of what teacher autonomy means - I'm not sure how autonomous we can be when we are constrained - knowingly or otherwise - by any timetable that locks us into a pre-conceived way of doing things. The measure of autonomy is then found in the discourse of team teachers B what they assume, what they question, how they reinvent a course

or a program, and how they come to shared understandings of what's happening. Tasks then are ideally always appropriate to the moment.

If anyone is interested in discussing any of these issues further, please contact me at <jshaw@ait.ac.th>."

## 6 BOOK REVIEWS

**Morrison, B. (ed). 1999. *Experiments and Evaluation in Self-Access Language Learning*. Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Association for Self-Access Learning and Development (ISBN 962-85495-1-0, 136pp, \$HK70,00)**

Reviewed by Hayo Reinders, University of Groningen, The Netherlands.

The study of self-access language learning has matured over the years. It has developed from a more or less spontaneous and perhaps not very scientific by-product of interest in learner autonomy, to a more well-defined and scientifically founded field of study. This volume is a reflection of that development. It is a collection of papers presented at the second HASALD (Hong Kong Association for Self-Access Learning and Development) conference in 1998. Its title reflects two major themes which emerged from the conference - experiments and evaluation - and which are representative of current directions within this field. In contrast to earlier stages in the development of research on self access language learning, more deliberate attempts are now being made to implement innovative self-access practice. In line with this, there is now a stronger need for sound evaluation of different aspects of self-access language learning.

This collection has been divided into two sections reflecting the two themes. The first of these - Experiments - includes five articles, two of which describe the implementation of self-access programmes. Pemberton et al. and Mak and Turnbull devised programmes which fostered self-directed learning in university students. Both report on factors which they felt were crucial in the implementation of the programmes. Miller's paper describes the development, on a national scale, of self-access centres in Malaysian primary and secondary schools. He stresses the role of the teacher and claims the transferability of the Malaysian experiences to schools in Hong Kong. Learner and teacher perceptions are recognized by all authors as having an important influence on the positive outcome of these experiments. Tsang's paper investigates resistance to self-access learning and identifies beliefs related to negative perceptions of teachers and students. She then suggests ways of overcoming these negative perceptions. The final paper in the first section, by Fitzgerald, discusses the complexities of providing computer resources in self-access centres, and presents a guide for the process of implementing hardware and software as part of self-access centre resources.

The second section, which focuses on Evaluation, includes three articles. Sinclair considers ways of evaluating learner autonomy, focusing especially on the development of metacognitive awareness. Both Gardner and Morrison focus on the evaluation of self-access centres. Gardner proposes a six-step model for evaluation, based on the notions of efficiency and effectiveness. Morrison bases evaluation on the questions *why evaluate, what to evaluate and by whom?* All in all, this volume presents an interesting collection of articles which reflect current practice in research, implementation and evaluation in self access language learning, all underpinned by a firm theoretical basis.

**Voller, P. (1998) *One to One Consultations*. Hong Kong: The English Centre, University of Hong Kong.** (Video, PAL VHS, 45 minutes)

Reviewed by Sara Cotterall, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

This video and guidebook, produced by Peter Voller and colleagues from the English Centre at the University of Hong Kong, make a valuable contribution to our understanding of language learning consultations (also referred to as language counselling and language advising). The authors claim

takes place and the ingredients of a successful process” as well as “help teachers become more proficient at managing the process of negotiation between consultant and learner.” The video compiles a series of authentic consultations filmed with learners of English at the University of Hong Kong in 1997. These learners were enrolled in a programme of weekly consultations which supported them in their individual language learning experiences over a 4-week period. The video allows us to observe part of the dynamic of each consultation, and to pay attention to the linguistic forms used by the consultants to encode their “moves” in each session.

The video presents guidelines concerning the most important points to cover in the consultation process and pauses at several points to allow those watching to discuss and respond to questions included for self study or group work. It is accompanied by a guidebook which identifies the key elements in the consulting process and illustrates a number of strategies which, it argues, are crucial to the consultant’s role. These include one group of strategies related to active listening, and another set related to motivating the learner. The guidebook also identifies three key concepts that underpin the consultation approach: listening, negotiation and reflection, as well as providing numerous illustrations of these concepts in action.

These materials provide timely insight into the complex dynamics of the consulting process and allow us both to observe and comment on the actual experience, without intruding. Video recordings of these authentic sessions complement theoretical models of the interactive consultation process, and provide valuable training and professional development material. While reports of learner consultations have been with us for some time (e.g. Fu, Hoffmann and Voller et. al in Cotterall and Crabbe (eds) 1999; Pemberton and Toogood, and Crabbe et. al. in the AILA 1999 SC symposium), this is a first in providing more than brief transcribed extracts of learner-consultant encounters. The video material is richer than any audio recording or transcription could ever be, in that it captures something of the affective element of the sessions, as well as the hesitations and extended pauses of the consultants. Thanks to Peter and his colleagues. We are indebted to you.

Contact Peter Voller at <PVOLLER@hkucc.hku.hk > for details of how to obtain copies of the video and guidebook.

## **7 RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON LEARNER AUTONOMY**

This section includes a listing of books, newsletters, journal articles and other manuscripts on learner autonomy published within the last 12 months.

### **Collection of Papers presented at the SC Symposium held at the AILA Congress, 1996**

An edited collection of papers presented at the SC Symposium on Learner Autonomy held in Finland at AILA 1996 is now available. The collection, entitled *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the Field and Effecting Change*, is edited by Sara Cotterall and David Crabbe (1999) and published by Peter Lang, Frankfurt. Copies can be obtained from Peter Lang, Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, Eschborner Landstrasse 42-50, D-60489 Frankfurt a.M., Germany, Fax.:++ 49/69/78070550 or E-mail: <101622.27@compuserve.com>.

### **Collection of Papers presented at 1998 HASALD Conference**

Bruce Morrison (<ecbruce@polyu.edu.hk>), who is co-ordinator of the Centre for Independent Language Learning in the English Language Centre at Hong Kong Polytechnic University, reports that the selected proceedings of the 1998 Hong Kong Association for Self-Access Learning and Development (HASALD) Conference has been published and is now available, price HK \$ 100 (world-wide postage included). The collection is entitled "Experiments and Evaluation in Self-Access Language Learning". To order copies, please e-mail Bruce Morrison at <ecbruce@polyu.edu.hk> or write to: HASALD, c/o Bruce Morrison, English Language Centre, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Abstracts and some complete papers can be found at the HASALD website <http://engl.polyu.edu.hk/hasald/book-conf98.htm>>. A review of this collection appears in Section 6 of this newsletter

### **Collection of Papers presented at 1998 IATEFL Conference**

Barbara Sinclair, Ian McGrath and Terry Lamb (eds) *Learner Autonomy Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*, Addison Wesley Longman. (This book is part of the Longman 'English Language Teaching Review' series edited by Chris Kennedy and is expected to be available 'in all good bookshops' by the end of March 2000. )

The collection of articles arose from a colloquium held in April 1998 at the University of Nottingham by the Centre for Research into Second and Foreign Language Pedagogy. The authors are concerned with learner autonomy and teacher autonomy in teaching English to speakers of other languages and modern foreign language learning. Section One is concerned with the nature of autonomy in language learning and how it relates to the learner both as a concept and in practice. The papers in Section Two take a broader view of autonomy in learning and teaching. They relate to the various roles of the teacher in learner autonomy and explore the concept of teacher autonomy itself.

The collection has two broad aims: to share experiences and research, and to suggest directions for further exploration. The writers draw on their variety of experiences as teachers, teacher educators, researchers and managers in primary, secondary, tertiary and self-access language learning contexts, including those in Denmark, France, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, Singapore and the UK.

### **Chapter on Teacher Autonomy**

Kees van Esch (<[C.v.Esch@let.kun.nl](mailto:C.v.Esch@let.kun.nl)>) writes in from the Netherlands that he and a number of colleagues have recently had a chapter on teacher autonomy published in the first volume of a new series on Language Teaching in Europe, published by Peter Lang. The book's advance publicity states "the book is the first volume of a new series called *Foreign Language Teaching in Europe*. It is concerned with the education of teachers who teach foreign languages to learners of school age. The authors come from many European countries. It will be a forum for the expression of views and ideas from sources throughout the European Union." This first volume visits different themes: autonomous learning, the use of computers, teacher education initiatives, reflective teaching, research into teacher education and several others. Kees reports "Our chapter is the first in the book and belongs to the first section which deals with "New demands in EFL Teacher Training". Part II is called 'Issues for debate', Part III 'Research into Teacher Education', Part IV 'Reflective Teaching' and Part V 'English in Primary School'. Another contribution in the same book related to autonomous learning is a chapter about Co-operative learning in Teacher Training (Peter Slagter and Annelien Haitink, pp. 69-89).\_ [ISSN 1437-3157; ISBN3-631-34653-0; US-ISBN 0-8204-4321-2. Published by Peter Lang Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, approximately USD\$30.]

### **AILA News #3, November 1999, Newsletter of the International Applied Linguistics Association**

Editor Dick Baldauf (University of Sydney) produced Issue 3 of "AILA News" in November, 1999. The newsletter, which appears twice each year, is available in four different formats on the University of Sydney's Language Centre website at: <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/langcent/>. Double click on the AILA News on the bottom of the home page, and on the next page on the desired format.

### **SYSTEM special issue on Metacognitive Knowledge and Beliefs in Language Learning**

Anita Wenden has edited a collection of papers on metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning which has been published as a special issue of *System*, Volume 27, 4, 1999. Details of the papers included in this collection can be found in the final section of the newsletter. If SC members would like to buy a copy of this special issue they should contact Elsevier Author Services at <[authors@elsevier.co.uk](mailto:authors@elsevier.co.uk)>, Tel: +44 1865 843900, Fax+44 1865 843905. The cost is \$104USD.

In the interests of keeping our membership informed of recent research reports, books and journal articles published in the field, a number of recent publications on learner autonomy are listed below. Members who wish to bring other articles to the attention of SC members are invited to contribute information to the "What's New?" page of the SC website and post details on AUTO-L.

Benson, P. and W. Lor. 1999. "Conceptions of language and language learning." *System* 27, 4: 459-472.

Cotterall, S. 1998. "Roles in autonomous language learning." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 21, 2: 61-78.

Cotterall, S. and D. Crabbe. (Eds.) 1999. *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the Field and Effecting Change*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Cotterall, S. 1999. "Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them?" *System* 27,4: 493-513.

Crabbe, D. A. 1999. "Learner autonomy and the language teacher." In C. Ward and W. Renandya (eds) *Language Teaching: New Insights for the Language Teacher*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. Anthology Series 40 pp 242-258.

Horwitz, E. 1999. "Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies". *System* 27, 4: 557-576.

Hurd, S. 1999. "Developing skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: lessons from autonomy in language learning", *New Academic* 8, 1: 3-7. (ISSN 0964 6353)

Little, D., Dam, L. and J. Timmer (Eds). (2000). *Focus on Learning rather than Teaching: Why and How?* Dublin: CLCS, Trinity College. (236 pp. Price IR£12 + postage and packing)

Morrison, B. (Ed.) 1999. *Experiments and Evaluation in Self-Access Language Learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Association for Self-Access Learning and Development.

Sakui, K. and S. Gaies. 1999. "Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning". *System* 27, 4: 473-492.

Van Esch, K., Schalkwijk, E., Elsen, A. and W. Setz. 1999. "Autonomous learning in foreign language teacher training", in Faber, P., Gewehr, W., Jimenez Rayons, M. and A. J. Peck (Eds.) *English Teacher Education in Europe*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, pages 15-31. (ISSN: 1437-3157; ISBN: 3-631-34653-0; US-ISBN 0-8204-4321-2)

Victori, M. 1999. "An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: a case study of two effective and two less effective writers". *System* 27, 4: 537-555.

Voller, P. 1998. *One to One Consultations*. Hong Kong: The English Centre, University of Hong Kong. (Video and guidebook)

Wenden, A. 1999. "An introduction to 'Metacognitive Knowledge and Beliefs in Language Learning': beyond the basics". *System* 27, 4: 435-441.

White, C. J. 1999. "Expectations and emergent beliefs of self-instructed language learners". *System* 27, 4: 443-457.

Yang, N. D. 1999. "The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use". *System* 27, 4: 515-535.

## **Issue 7, Links and Letters, Autonomy in L2 Language Learning**

Mia Victori reports that this journal will be published in April 2000. It includes articles, an interview and some book reviews. A "sneak preview" of the contents can be found below. Copies can be obtained from: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Apartado Postal 20, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain, Phone: +34 93 581 1715 Fax: +34 93 581 2000. The cost of the special issue has not yet been announced. If you would like further information, e-mail Mia Victori at: <Mia.Victori@uab.es>.

### **ARTICLES**

Manchón, Rosa María (Universidad de Murcia)

"Fostering the autonomous use of strategies in the foreign language classroom: the why and how of communication strategies training".

Gardner, David (The University of Hong Kong)

"Self-assessment for autonomous language learners".

Aldred, Deborah (The University of Hong Kong)

Williams, Gareth (Christchurch College of English Language, New Zealand)

"The need for a focused approach: a case study"

Serra, Oscar (Universitat de Barcelona)

"Integrating a self-access system in a language learning institution: a model for implementation".

Marina Mozzon-McPherson (The University of Hull)

"Promoting and supporting independent learning out of the classroom: an analysis of the skills of advising and their implications on the emerging role of language learning advisers".

Lynch, Tony (University of Edinburgh)

"The thick end of the wedge: encouraging autonomous learning by advanced-level ESL university students".

Hurd, Stella (Open University, UK)

"Strategy use and distance language learners: perceptions, practice and possibilities".

### **MISCELLANEA : ARTICLES ON SLA**

Block, David (Institute of Education, University of London)

"Revisiting the gap between SLA researchers and language teachers"

Istvan Kecskes (State University of New York)

"Conceptual fluency and the use of situation-bound utterances in L2"

### **INTERVIEW**

Views on Self-Access Language Learning

A talk with Leslie Dickinson, Lindsay Miller, Gill Sturtridge and Radha Ravindran. Edited by Mia Victori, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

### **BOOK REVIEWS**

David GARDNER and Lindsay MILLER (1999). *Establishing Self-Access: From Theory to Practice*> (Reviewed by Felicity O'Dell. Eurocentre, Cambridge.)

Andrew COHEN. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. (Reviewed by John Bradbury, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.)

Phil BENSON and Peter VOLLER (1997). *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*. (Reviewed by Montse Martínez. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.)

Michael D. BUSH· Robert M. TERRY (eds) (1997) *Technology-enhanced Language Learning*

Leni DAM (1995). *Learner Autonomy 3: From Theory to Classroom Practice*. (Reviewed by Anthony Nicholson. Ajuntament de Barcelona).

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Victori, Mia (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

A selected and annotated bibliography on Autonomy and Independence in L2 Language Learning.