Maintaining Control

Autonomy and Language Learning

Edited by

Richard Pemberton, Sarah Toogood and Andy Barfield

香港大學出版社

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art
explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has
written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This
signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the
distinctive nature of our English-language books published in
China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing
more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way
of rendering English words in the format of a square so they
resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able
to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers,
however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when
meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Contributors

Naoko Aoki is Professor in the Graduate School of Letters at Osaka University, Japan, and works with pre-service and in-service teachers of Japanese as a Second Language (JSL). She is a co-founder of JALT's Learner Development SIG and has published on the topics of learner autonomy and teacher autonomy in the context of JSL. Her current pedagogical and research interests are narrative-based teacher education, particularly applications of narrative inquiry, and second language user (rather than learner) stories. Her latest pet projects are the Japanese Language Portfolio and bringing a plurilingual Japan into reality.

Andy Barfield is Professor in the Faculty of Law, Chuo University, Japan. His publications include *Autonomy You Ask!* (2003, co-edited with Mike Nix), *Reconstructing Autonomy in Language Education* (2007, co-edited with Steve Brown), *Lexical Processing in Second Language Learners* (2009, working title; co-edited with Tess Fitzpatrick), and *Researching Collocations in Another Language: Multiple interpretations* (2009, co-edited with Henrik Gyllstad). Andy has taught in the UK, France, Spain and Yugoslavia, and he is co-editor of the IATEFL Learner Autonomy SIG newsletter, *Independence*.

Phil Benson is Professor in the Department of English at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. He has worked in Hong Kong since 1991, and formerly taught English and Applied Linguistics in the English Centre at the University of Hong Kong. His main research interests are in autonomy in learning and narrative-based research. He is the author of *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning* (2001), and co-editor of *Learners' Stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (2005, with David Nunan).

Sara Cotterall taught in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, from 1986

to 2005, and from 2005 to 2008 was Associate Professor at Akita International University in Japan, where she taught courses in Independent Language Learning and Communication. Between 1996 and 2002 Sara was co-convenor of the AILA Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning and in 2007 she was co-convenor of the Independent Learning Association Japan Conference. Sara is currently a PhD student at the University of Macquarie, Australia. Her publications include *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (1999, co-edited with David Crabbe).

Leni Dam took her first steps towards developing learner autonomy in language teaching and learning in 1973 at Karlslunde school near Copenhagen, Denmark, where she taught for 40 years. From 1979 she also worked as an in-service teacher trainer and pedagogical adviser at University College, Copenhagen, a post which provided excellent opportunities for implementing the principles of learner autonomy in teacher education. Her publications include *Learner Autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice* (1995). From 1993–1999, Leni was co-convenor of the AILA Learner Autonomy in Language Learning Scientific Commission. In 2004 she was awarded an honorary doctorate from Karlstad University, Sweden. In 2007 Leni retired and is now working freelance, applying her experiences with school children to the language education of adult refugees.

Edith Esch is Senior Research Fellow in the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, UK, and a Fellow of Lucy Cavendish College. Her interest in autonomy dates to the beginning of her career when she worked with the CRAPEL (Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues) in Nancy, France. She developed this interest further in Cambridge as Director of the University Language Centre. Her main current interest is in second language education, especially the British and French pedagogical cultures in post-colonial contexts. These sociolinguistic and sociocultural themes are the extension of her life-long interest in bilingualism and cross-linguistic communication and language change. Her publications include *The Bilingual Family: A handbook for parents* (1985 & 2003, with Philip Riley) and *Self-Access and the Adult Language Learner* (1994).

Terry Lamb taught languages in secondary schools for 16 years, and now works at the University of Sheffield, UK, where he is Director of

Initial Teacher Education and of the MA in Applied Professional Studies in Education, as well as supervising doctoral students in his research fields of learner autonomy, teacher education, linguistic diversity and language policy. Terry has published widely in these fields, and is also convenor of the AILA Research Network on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning and founder editor of the journal *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. Terry's work with a number of key national and international bodies involves him in policy development in the UK and beyond. Since January 2007, he has been President of the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes.

David Little retired in 2008 as Head of the School of Linguistic, Speech and Communication Sciences and Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at Trinity College Dublin. His principal research interest is the theory and practice of learner autonomy in second language education. From 2001 to 2008 he was Director of Integrate Ireland Language and Training, a government-funded unit that provided English language courses for adult newcomers with refugee status and supported the learning of English as a second language in Irish schools. He is currently chair of the Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio Validation Committee. His numerous publications on learner autonomy include *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems* (1991).

Lindsay Miller is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at the City University of Hong Kong where he teaches courses in self-access learning, materials development and critical pedagogy on BA and MA TESOL programmes. He also trains secondary school teachers. He researches and publishes in the areas of self-access learning and listening. He has published *Second Language Listening* (2005, with John Flowerdew) and *Establishing Self-Access: From theory to practice (*1999, with David Gardner). He has worked in primary, secondary and tertiary level educational establishments in the UK, the Middle East, Thailand and Hong Kong.

Mike Nix is Professor in the Law Faculty at Chuo University, Japan. His research and teaching focus on helping students to use English to engage critically through research, discussion and writing with legal, political and global issues of concern to them. He is also interested in questions of identity in language learning and use, especially in relation

to the glocalisation of English, as well as in exploring possibilities for collaborative curriculum and teacher development with full-time and part-time colleagues. His publications include *Autonomy You Ask!* (2003, co-edited with Andy Barfield).

Richard Pemberton is Associate Professor in TESOL in the School of Education at the University of Nottingham, UK, where he teaches and supervises MA and PhD students. He taught for nearly 15 years at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, where he co-ordinated the Self-Access Centre team, and before that taught ESL at secondary and tertiary level in the UK, Zimbabwe and Papua New Guinea. He co-edited *Taking Control: Autonomy in language learning* (1996, with Edward Li, Winnie Or and Herbert Pierson) and his interests include learner autonomy, L2 listening and vocabulary acquisition, and technology-enhanced language learning.

Philip Riley is Emeritus Professor of Ethnolinguistics at the University of Nancy, France, and a former Director of the CRAPEL (Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues). He has taught English, Linguistics and Language Didactics in Finland, Malta and France and has made extended visits to Italy, Hong Kong and New Zealand. His main areas of interest include autonomous language learning, identity studies and intercultural communication. His latest publications include *Domain-specific English: Textual practices across communities and classrooms* (2002, edited with Giuseppina Cortese) and *Language, Culture and Identity: An ethnolinguistic perspective* (2007).

Barbara Sinclair is Associate Professor of Education (TESOL) in the School of Education at the University of Nottingham, UK, where she has worked since 1992. She is currently Director of the MA TESOL and supervises research students. For over 25 years, her research has focused on issues relating to the development of autonomy in language learners, including metacognition, 'learner training', the assessment of learner autonomy and, more recently, autonomy in on-line learning. Her publications include *Learning to Learn English* (1989, with Gail Ellis) and *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future directions* (2000, co-edited with Ian McGrath and Terry Lamb). She has worked in Spain, Germany and Singapore, and has provided consultancies and courses on learner autonomy in Mexico, Turkey, UAE, Austria, Malaysia, Brunei and Cyprus.

Richard Smith is an Associate Professor in the Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick, UK. His research interests and professional activities are mainly in the areas of learner autonomy, teacher development, cultural issues in ELT and the history of language teaching. He co-edited *Learner Autonomy across Cultures: Language education perspectives* (2003, with David Palfreyman) and has a particular interest in innovative approaches to language teaching 'in difficult circumstances'. He runs the DAHLA project ('Developing an Archive and Histories of Learner Autonomy') as a means of recording practice in the field of pedagogy for autonomy, oversees the online journal *English Language Teacher Education and Development* and is co-editor of *Independence*, published by the IATEFL Learner Autonomy SIG.

Sarah Toogood is an Instructor and Self-Access Language Learning Adviser at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. She was President of the Hong Kong Association for Self-Access Learning and Development from 2001 to 2005 and continues to be an active member. Her main interests are concerned with devising ways of integrating self-access language learning into the curriculum and looking in particular at how to advise and assess for self-access language learning projects. She has published widely in these areas and has conducted teacher-training workshops on self-access language learning and advising for tertiary and secondary level contexts. Her current research is developing a Virtual English Language Adviser (VELA): http://vela.ust.hk/.

Ema Ushioda is Associate Professor in the Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick, UK, where she teaches MA courses and coordinates the Education Doctorate programme. Her main research interests include language learning motivation and its theoretical interface with learner autonomy, and relevant implications for classroom practice and teacher education (*Learner Autonomy 5: The role of motivation*, 1996). In recent years, she has been exploring language motivation from the perspective of Vygotskian sociocultural theory as well as theories of social and cultural identity, and is currently developing an approach to examining how language motivation is socially constructed in discourse.

1

Maintaining Control: An introduction

Richard Pemberton, Sarah Toogood and Andy Barfield

The origins of this book lie in a major conference entitled 'Autonomy and Language Learning: Maintaining control' held in Hong Kong and Hangzhou (mainland China) in June 2004. That conference was the younger sibling of another important conference held 10 years earlier, also in Hong Kong and mainland China, which formed the basis of the book *Taking Control: Autonomy in language learning* (Pemberton et al. 1996).

Back in June 1994, at the time of the first of these two conferences, the concept of autonomy in language learning — together with related practices of self-directed and self-access language learning (SALL) — had been around for some 20 years, starting out from the Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues (CRAPEL) at the University of Nancy in France in the early 1970s (cf. Harding-Esch 1977a; Holec 1979, 1981; Riley 1985) and spreading to the UK, Denmark, Ireland and elsewhere in Europe. At the wider international level, the concept of autonomy in language learning was starting to become more popular: a Learner Autonomy Scientific Commission had been formed as part of the Assocation Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA) and had just held its first symposium. However, autonomy had not yet become part of mainstream theory and practice in second language education. East Asia, the region that the three of us are most familiar with, is a case in point. In Japan, interest was just beginning to develop, as evidenced and aided by the formation of the Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT)[1] Learner Development Special Interest Group in 1993, and the publication of its first newsletter *Learning*

Learning in Spring 1994 (see Andy's 'story' below and Richard Smith's 'autobiography' in Chapter 13). In Hong Kong, the concept of learner autonomy was familiar to a relatively small group of teachers involved in supporting SALL at university level (and in some companies) (e.g. Gardner & Miller 1994), but was not familiar to local language teachers in general. In mainland China, where self-access had yet to 'take off', the concept was even less well known, and to our knowledge there had been no publications or presentations on the subject.

Ten years later, however, presentations at the 2004 conference in Hangzhou by both local and overseas participants were filled to overflowing, and to date more than 35 papers written by participants from mainland China have resulted from this landmark event (see Sarah's 'story' below). This growth of interest in China is part of a global trend, which, as Phil Benson (this volume) details, has seen autonomy take up a central position in second language education literature since the turn of the millennium, becoming, in Benson's words, "an idea that researchers and teachers ignore at their peril".

Similarly, Richard Smith and Ema Ushioda argue in their concluding chapter that the expansion in the 'autonomy movement' from small university-based circles scattered here and there to a much larger and more diverse grouping means that new voices need to be listened to and conflicting interpretations engaged with. But just as it is vital to keep opening out to different narratives and understandings, it is also important to understand how we got to where we are today. It is in this spirit, then, that we would like to share with you *our* stories of how the two conferences and this book came to be.

Taking control in 1994: Richard's story

In the early 1990s, when I arrived in Hong Kong, the University Grants Committee had decided to provide each of the seven UGC universities/ polytechnics with a language enhancement grant, in order to improve the language proficiency of Hong Kong undergraduate students (which was perceived to be in decline) and to maintain Hong Kong's position as a regional international financial centre in the face of competition from Singapore and Shanghai. These funds, involving very large sums of money, allowed universities to employ more language teachers, so that the number of language classes could be increased and class sizes reduced. They were also a vital ingredient in the mushrooming of

university self-access centres (SACs) across Hong Kong in the early 1990s. Within a few years, each institution had set up its own SAC so that learners could develop their language skills outside regular class time; there was an active Association for Self-Access Learning and Development (HASALD) drawn largely from university teachers; and Hong Kong quickly developed a 'cutting edge' reputation for the design of SACs and support of SALL at university level.

In the early days, as we planned and started running our SACs, we were very much focused on practical issues such as lay-out, shelving, cataloguing and copyright. However, extended consultancy visits to Hong Kong in 1992 and 1993 by Philip Riley helped me make the connection between the 'what' of self-access and the 'why' of autonomy — to see why we were supporting self-access in the first place. To borrow Phil Benson's (2002b: 4) description of his own growing awareness under Philip Riley's guidance: "Ever so gently, Philip made me aware that there was not much point to self-access without autonomy".

However, in 1993, as an SAC coordinator, with our own centre about to open, SACs and SALL were still very much to the forefront of my mind. So when, in the same year, the director of our Language Centre at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) asked for volunteers to convene the next in our series of annual joint-venue conferences, my first suggestion for a theme was not 'autonomy' but 'self-access'. Luckily, our director suggested a broader theme, and so 'autonomy' it was. (Interestingly, Phil Benson [2002b] reports a similar intervention by his director, David Nunan, which resulted in the Benson and Voller [1997] book having an 'autonomy' rather than a 'self-access' theme.)

With an appropriate conference focus in mind, I then asked Herbert Pierson if the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) would be our institutional partner for the conference. At the time, CUHK had just created a very impressive open-plan Independent Learning Centre, and Herb, as ILC director at the university, had been responsible for bringing Philip Riley to Hong Kong to advise SAC teams at all the tertiary institutions about both the theory and practice of SALL. Herb agreed, and my colleague Austin Conway joined as co-organiser from HKUST. Together we set about planning the conference.

Our first decisions concerned who to invite as keynote speakers. With two sponsoring institutions and support from the British Council, we were able to fund the attendance of the following five pioneering figures in the fields of learner autonomy, self-access and learning to

learn: Edith Esch (University of Cambridge, UK), David Little (Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland), Philip Riley (University of Nancy, France), Barbara Sinclair (University of Nottingham, UK) and Ken Willing (Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia). We were also lucky that David Nunan had recently joined the University of Hong Kong as director of its English Centre, and had accepted our invitation to give a plenary presentation — and so there were six keynote speakers.

The schedule we decided on for the conference was to have two days at HKUST, followed by a morning at CUHK, and then an afternoon trip across the border into mainland China to visit Shenzhen University, where the final keynote presentation, by David Little, was to be given. Cramming three locations and two countries into three days seemed like a good idea at the time, but the final afternoon trip across the border with no air conditioning in a packed coach (Austin Conway had to perch on David Little's knee) was — in hindsight — overdoing it, memorable though the trip was.

Overall, the conference was very successful, attracting some 150 enthusiastic participants from Asia, Oceania and Europe. It was one of those occasions where something occurs in the right place at the right time. Hong Kong University Press had just published *Directions in Self-Access Language Learning* (Gardner and Miller 1994), which had been well received, and offered to publish selected papers from the conference as soon as they heard about it. My SAC team colleagues Edward Li and Winnie Or agreed to join Herbert Pierson and myself as editors, and the four of us set about editing the volume that came to be called *Taking Control*.

Little did I think that 10 years later I — along with many of the participants at the 1994 conference — would be helping to bring *Taking Control*'s younger sister into the world.

Maintaining control in 2004: Sarah's story

The idea behind holding the 2004 conference was not, as some may have initially thought, 'a good excuse for a reunion party', although that may have been one of its positive outcomes. The opportunity to hold a 10-years-on conference was, in fact, quite serendipitous. One afternoon in early 2003, I was called into our director's office. He wanted me to convene the next Language Centre conference and had some ideas as to the theme and potential collaborative partners. As I listened,

I decided that I would be happy to convene a conference but would prefer the focus to be on autonomy and language learning. My proposal was met with approval and I was given full control to organise the conference as I wished.

As soon as I left the director's office, I sought out Richard and told him the news. He thought it was a wonderful idea and, being good at maths, saw an immediate marketing angle if we connected the 2004 conference with the 1994 conference that he had convened. I saw an immediate opportunity for a bit of word play. As *Taking Control* was the name of the book that resulted from Richard's 1994 conference, *Maintaining Control* was the name I proposed for our 2004 conference — with the prospect that in another 10 years, we might have fully lost control and would have a hat-trick to mark the end of our careers. Richard, weary of my puns, wasn't too keen on the idea. There was more to it, however. Having spent almost 10 years at HKUST researching ways in which to improve the support of SALL for our learners through the SAC and through course integration, my feeling was that the issues we faced as frontline promoters of language learner autonomy were now more to do with progress and maintenance rather than beginnings and taking. As Richard mentioned above, many tertiary institutions in Hong Kong had been given rich resources to set up SACs, providing learners with the opportunities required to 'take' control. Yet there were instances where some of these institutions had lost their space, people had moved on and materials were merged with the main library collections. At HKUST we had experienced a situation where teachers had begun to refer to our SAC as a white elephant. This galvanised a small group of us to propose changes to our provisions which aimed to maintain understanding, interest and collaboration among colleagues and learners. It seemed to me that the idea of maintaining control as a progression from taking control could be an inspiring concept for practitioners and researchers dealing with the need to ensure progress and continuation not only of 'set-ups' in the form of SACs but also in provisions that scaffold autonomous language learning inside and outside a SAC. Richard and I then agreed on *Maintaining Control* as a working title.

Our next step was to set up a team of committee members and, in keeping with the idea of 'one conference, more than one venue', we proposed a collaboration with Pang Jixian, vice-dean of the School of International Studies at Zhejiang University in Hangzhou. Pang readily agreed to a joint venture whereby participants would be at HKUST for

the first two days and then move on to Zhejiang University for the following two days, with a day for travelling in between. The committee then sat down and discussed who to invite. We ended up with a very long list of people, not just to maintain a connection with the 1994 conference but also to represent progress in research and practice 10 years on. Luckily our Language Centre was extremely supportive and allocated enough funding to invite 12 key speakers (six plenary and six invited). This, however, gave us quite a challenge in working out our programme, given that we only had a total of four days for plenary and parallel sessions. (Andy explains how we got round that conundrum in his 'story' below.)

The conference proved a great success. Phil Benson (2007c: 1) calls it "the largest to be held on the subject of autonomy and language learning to date … attracting participants from all over the world". It's also possibly the only conference to generate five publications (so far), including this one. On the first day of the conference it struck me that it might be a good idea if we could publish a variety of volumes instead of one proceedings. David Little (editor of the Authentik *Learner Autonomy* series) was one of our plenary speakers and the way in which we (with Phil Benson's great help) had organised the abstracts into clear 'themes' headed by invited speakers seemed to cry out for separate Authentik *Learner Autonomy* volumes with invited speakers as the editors. On our way back from Hangzhou, David agreed to the idea. *Learner Autonomy* volumes 8, 9 and 10 (Benson 2007b; Gardner 2007; Miller 2007) are currently on the shelves in the form of one set of proceedings from the conference. Another volume of Chinese papers produced by the School of International Studies at Zhejiang University, entitled *Selected Papers from the International Conference on Autonomy and Language Learning: Maintaining control* (Fan & Pang 2005), came out in 2005. It's taken a little longer for us to produce this special volume, also called *Maintaining Control,* containing the work of our plenary and invited speakers.

Maintaining momentum 2004–07: Andy's story

I joined the JALT Learner Development SIG in late 1994 and started reading in the SIG's newsletter, *Learning Learning*, fascinating accounts of a conference in Hong Kong that had recently taken place. Although I had missed the conference itself, I soon met Richard Smith in Japan;

and through a shared interest in teacher education and learner development, we became involved in bringing David Little and Leni Dam as main speakers to the international JALT Conference in Tokyo in November 1998. Their joint plenary lecture, delivered to a packed conference hall with people standing in the aisles and everyone listening with rapt attention, was perhaps one of those moments when the waves of interest in autonomy in language education from Hong Kong in 1994 started to gather speed, at least in Japan, and scattered groups began to surf together.

A few years later at the AILA Conference in Singapore in 2002, I met up with Richard (Pemberton) and Sarah and many others, swapping stories and different ideas for conferences and collaborative participation by speakers. I mentioned the 1998 joint plenary in Tokyo, and we brainstormed ideas for creating a different kind of format for plenary partners for the upcoming autonomy conference in Hong Kong. From these different conversations came the idea of twinning David Little and Leni Dam, Philip Riley and Edith Esch, and Phil Benson and Naoko Aoki for the plenaries. Later, together with Sara Cotterall, Terry Lamb, Lindsay Miller and Barbara Sinclair, Mike Nix and myself ended up as invited speakers. The conference was a huge success, but what about the proceedings? Having submitted our original paper two years earlier, Mike and I felt, when I rang Richard in late 2006, that a decent enough interval had now passed to ask anew about the intended publication date. "Is it…?", "Well, not quite …" — and then I said the fateful words: "I have some free time coming up in the next few months …".

Within a short while, Richard, Sarah and myself had worked out a tentative schedule and draft plan of action. Now, several drafts — and many draft action plans later — with free time itself fading in memory more quickly than an editorial deadline ever did, we have almost completed our editorial work. It is good to get here, and it just remains for us to say a word or two about the organisation of this volume.

Reading on

We have organised the chapters in this book into three main sections. As you read on, you will find that the next three chapters (Chapters 2 to 4, by Benson, Esch, Riley) provide the theoretical foundation for the rest of the book, looking at current conceptualisations of autonomy from a critical and sociocultural perspective. Benson and Esch highlight

problems that occur in a globalised world in which 'autonomy' has come to be seen either as a 'must-have' skill for members of a flexible workforce or as the 'freedom' to make ill-informed and self-constraining 'choices'; while Riley focuses on problems that occur when autonomy means different things to different people and the discourses of autonomy diverge.

As you will see, we have grouped the remaining chapters into two main sections: one that is concerned largely with developing *learner* autonomy (Chapters 5 to 8, by Lamb, Cotterall, Miller, Dam) and the other dealing mainly with developing *teacher* autonomy (Chapters 9 to 12, by Little, Sinclair, Aoki, and Nix and Barfield). As is often the case, these divisions are somewhat rough and ready — for example, the chapters by Miller and Dam could also have come under the 'Teacher autonomy' section, while those by Little and Aoki could also have been grouped together under the 'Learner autonomy' section — but they serve as useful starting points.

Another way of navigating through the book is to read the concluding chapter by Smith and Ushioda (Chapter 13) — either first or last. If you read it before you read the other chapters, it will help you identify the major themes of the book, and serve as a useful introduction to the field of learner autonomy as it has changed in the last 10 years. On the other hand, if you read it last, it will offer you a delicately critical view of particular chapters and overall trends.

As learner and teacher autonomy become more mainstream in second language education, and as the waters we chart become at the same time more diverse and more congested, we hope that this 10-years-on collection will, like its predecessor *Taking Control,* inspire you to maintain control and momentum on your own voyages into autonomy over the next 10 years and beyond.

December 2007

Richard Pemberton, University of Nottingham, England
Sarah Toogood, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
Andy Barfield, Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan

Note: For further details of the 2004 conference, see the conference website: http://lc.ust.hk/~centre/conf2004/

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Now the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Chapter 4

1. This is not to suggest that this is the only form or source of discursive dissonance, of course. The complex of attitudes and behavioural norms usually bundled together under the label 'peer pressure' is another. The bored tone adopted by, say, a teenage male student even as he is giving a right answer to a teacher's question is a clear discoursal manifestation of an attempt to reconcile his group's attitudes and values with those of the institution (cf. two further examples mentioned in the Conclusion).
2. Available at: http://www.education.gouv.fr/bo/2006/23/MENE0601048C.htm. This is the most recent general 'circular' on the topic. See also: http://www.education.gouv.fr/botexte/bo010607/MENE0101172N.htm.
3. The recent controversial prohibition against the wearing of the Muslim veil, which seems to be an important exception to this rule, results from its being categorised by officialdom as a religious symbol and not merely as clothing. Religious symbols are forbidden in the strictly secular system of public education.

Chapter 8

1. My experience derives from courses in as well as outside Denmark for language teachers wanting to change their teaching approach towards the implementation of learner autonomy.
2. Again my 'evidence' derives from my workshops with language teachers, teaching different levels of learners — schoolchildren as well as adults.
3. We are talking about 10- to 15-year-old learners in a Danish comprehensive 'Folkeskole', with English levels ranging from beginning to intermediate.
4. The data shown were collected from a mixed-ability group of 9th graders, i.e. 14- to 15-year-olds.
5. A detailed description of the structure and contents of these workshops as they developed over the years is given in Dam 1999b.

6. In earlier years I used the term 'diary'. However, the term was often misinterpreted as being something very closed and only for personal use, which was not along the lines I envisaged its being used. I therefore started using the term 'logbook'.

7. These 'steps' would to a large extent be similar to the ones mentioned by the teachers in the 1993 data. However, the introduction of learners' logs would now in most cases have first priority.

8. For examples of successful use of logbooks (diaries) at tertiary level — often written on a weekly basis — see, for instance, Yang 1998; Toogood & Pemberton 2002: 104–5; and Barfield 2003.

9. For the use of posters in the autonomous classroom, see, for example, Dam 1995: 41–2 and 1999b: 122–9.

10. I have had this class since they started learning English at the age of 10/11 where the logbook was also introduced (see Figure 8.1).

11. The learners will by this time have had approximately 560 English lessons of 45 minutes each.

Chapter 10

1. NudistVIVO is software for the analysis of qualitative data. It helps researchers to access, manage, shape and analyse detailed textual and/or multimedia data and provides a range of tools to help clarify the data, discover meanings and patterns and arrive at answers to questions. By performing manual tasks like classifying, sorting and arranging information, the software frees the researcher to devote more time to analysis and insight.

2. UoN: Barbara Sinclair, Ian McGrath, Tricia Hedge, Ann Smith.

3. BFSU: Gu Yueguo, Wang Tong, Cao Wen, Tang Jinlan; BNU: Wang Qiang, Zeng Tiangui, Wang Guangzhou, Chen Zehang.

4. UoN: Carol Hall, Eric Hall, Lindsay Cooper.

5. UoN: Gordon Joyes, Kevin Caley, Paul Distant.

6. UoN: Luong Quang Nghi, Colleen McCants.

Chapter 11

1. Following Aoki (2002), I define 'teacher autonomy' as the capacity, freedom and responsibility to make choices concerning one's own teaching in the service of one's learners' needs and aspirations.

2. Some theorists distinguish narrative and story whereas others use them interchangeably. I shall follow the latter approach in this paper.

3. Trustworthiness is a criterion for evaluating constructivist qualitative research.

4. This is not my invention. Qualitative researchers have been aware of these issues since the crisis of representation in ethnography in the mid-1980s. Many have become reflexive and started including their own voices in their writing (Denzin & Lincoln 2000).

5. In the constructivist paradigm, consensus is one of the conditions that contribute to establishing trustworthiness.

6. This is something similar to the distinction between 'a' and 'the' in English.

7. This story is factitious. I synthesised several 'true' stories with a bit of my imagination.

8. The idea of using photos in the interview came from Harrison (2002). I asked Hiroaki to bring to the interview some photos of people, things or events that had been influential in his career. In the interview, Hiroaki explained these photos in a chronological order and I asked him to elaborate on them going backwards and forwards in time.

9. To do justice to this teacher, I must emphasise that he started running 'Basics of JSL Education' separately with relevant content a few years later.

10. Due to the space limitation, I have had to cut the story short. Hiroaki went to Korea to teach after this, came back to Japan two years later, spent a couple of years teaching part-time at several universities, and finally got a full-time position in a university.

Chapter 12

1. 'After the Sheep? Exploring Threads in Developing Academic Literacy at the Curricular Level' represents our thinking up to September 2004 (available at: http://c-faculty.chuo-u.ac.jp/~mikenix1/cd/v&v/sheep.html). This unpublished paper includes visualisations of the curriculum development process by students, part-time colleagues, full-time colleagues and administrative staff. It also includes critical responses from Michael Lomas, Sonthida Keyuravong and Yoko Morimoto — who attended the Hong Kong conference and who were also similarly concerned with curriculum development at their universities in Australia, Thailand and Japan, respectively. We felt that it would be useful to refer to particular insights and emerging principles from the 2004 paper in the present chapter.

2. It is estimated that at least 25% of Japanese workers now work on a part-time or temporary basis (Nakamura 2007). Experts judge that this trend will continue to increase as employers keep the cost of wages and social benefits down by taking on more workers on limited-term contracts (Rengo 2007). Increased casualisation in tertiary education is part, then, of a powerful trend in Japanese society.

3. We organised large-scale surveys and small-scale focus groups to understand better why students did or didn't take certain courses and what kind of changes they thought would be appropriate.

4. In late 2007, we are moving towards dropping all reference to *skills* in course
    titles to signal a much stronger emphasis on content-based rather than
    skills-based learning. It is likely, for example, that the 'Basic Discussion
    Skills' course will be re-named 'Basic Research and Discussion'. The overall
    course objectives will probably be framed much more simply in terms of
    learners developing 'comfort, confidence, control, clarity, criticality' through
    engaging in the three interconnected macro processes of 'Researching and
    gathering information and ideas', 'Exchanging and explaining information
    and ideas' and 'Analysing and organising information and ideas'.

Index