

Exploring the development of learner autonomy from a postmodern and social constructivist perspective: prioritising voices

O'LEARY, Christine

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/22863/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

O'LEARY, Christine (2018). Exploring the development of learner autonomy from a postmodern and social constructivist perspective: prioritising voices. *The Learner Development Journal*, 2.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Exploring the Development of Learner Autonomy from a Postmodern and Social Constructivist Perspective: Prioritising Voices

Christine O'Leary, Sheffield Hallam University

Learner autonomy, defined as the learners' ability to take charge or control of their own learning (Holec, 1981; Benson, 2011), is considered as a key to effective lifelong learning (Dam, 2011). However, the multidimensional nature of the concept combined with the need to access both individual and social constructions or understandings of learner autonomy, from a social constructivist perspective, presents significant ontological and epistemological challenges. Although learner autonomy has been explored using a range of paradigms and theoretical frameworks, no previous studies appear to have examined its development, within a formal educational context, from a postmodernist perspective. This paper aims to discuss the benefits and practical implications of using a postmodernist approach to explore the development of learner autonomy in undergraduate specialist and non-specialist students studying advanced level French in an institution-wide language programme in combination with International Business or other subject areas, within a large UK higher education institution, based on its application within my own PhD study. After considering the background and examining in some detail the learner autonomy construct, the paper discusses the rationale for the choice of methodology and the challenges presented by prioritising voices, within a multifaceted and multidimensional theoretical framework. I show how a postmodernist approach was applied in practice, using a few illustrative extracts from the study. The paper article concludes with some recommendations and considerations of the limitations of such an approach, together with some reflection on the process and outcome of the research, including some implications for practice in a formal educational context.

学習者が自分の学習に責任を持ち、自分でコントロールする能力と定義される学習者オートノミーは生涯学習の鍵になると考えられている。しかしながら、個人や社会的構築物との関係性を伴うその概念の多次元的な性質は、社会主義的な観点からは存在論と認識論への挑戦を提起する。学習者オートノミーとその発達に関しては、さまざまなパラダイムや理論的枠組みから考察されているが、教育分野ではポストモダニストの観点から学習者オートノミーの発達に関して十分な研究が行われているとは言い難い。本稿はイギリスの高等教育で上級レベルのフランス語を専門にする学生とそうでない学生を対象に、学習者オートノミーの発達においてポストモダニストアプローチを用いる利点や実用的意義について考察する。学習者オートノミーの概念の背景を提示し、この概念を構築している要因を詳細に分析した後で、方法論の選択に関して述べるが、それは多角的かつ多次元的な理論的枠組みの中から、「声」(voices)を優先したゆえに表出された方法論である。そして、本方法論より得られた実際のデータを引用しながら、実践への応用に関しても考察する。最後に教育分野における実践への意義に加え、事例研究のプロセスや成果の省察とともに、本アプローチの限界に触れ今後に向けた提言を行う。

Keywords

learner autonomy, postmodernist research, Higher Education, pedagogy for autonomy, learner voices

キーワード

学習者オートノミー、ポストモダニスト研究、高等教育、オートノミーの教授法、学習者の声

As a key to effective lifelong language learning (Dam, 2011) and learner motivation (Raya & Lamb, 2008; Hoidn & Kärkkäinen, 2014), the development of autonomous language learners has been the subject of many studies (e.g., Raya & Lamb, 2008; Benson, 2011; Everhard & Murphy, 2015) since Holec (1981) first defined the term as learners taking charge of their learning. However, many authors have warned against simply equating an autonomous learner with an independent one, pointing out that the development of a capacity for autonomy does not happen in isolation but through interactions involving peers and teachers (Little, 2000; Raya & Lamb, 2008; Raya, Lamb and Vieira., 2007). To become autonomous, therefore, learners need to develop the psychological and emotional capacity to control their own learning collaboratively as well as independently (Kohonen, 1992; O'Leary, 2014; Oxford,

1990, 2016). From a social constructivist perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), the multidimensional nature of the concept (Benson, 2011) combined with the need to access both individual and social constructions of learner autonomy presents significant ontological and epistemological challenges. Learner autonomy and its development have been explored using a range of paradigms and theoretical frameworks ranging from positivist quantitative approaches, such as Fazey and Fazey (2001)'s study of the autonomy of first-year undergraduates, to narrative qualitative ones (e.g., Karlsson & Kjisik, 2009).

Within my own PhD research relating to the development of autonomy, the need to take into account all the voices on equal terms, without privileging my own or those of theorists from the literature, was of particular concern when selecting my methodology. This demanded an approach which would not frame the participants' responses within a "meta-narrative" from the literature or my own beliefs whilst still allowing all voices to interact. Language also needed to be problematised as words could hold different meanings and or connotations for an individual or a group of individuals (see Derrida, 1976). A postmodernist stance (see for instance Lyotard, 1984) appeared to offer the most suitable research orientation. Although postmodern theory has been associated with practical applications for promoting learner autonomy (e.g., Curtis, 2004), I have not found any studies to date that have researched the development of learner autonomy using a postmodern orientation, at least not explicitly, so this new approach may be of interest for fellow researchers within the field of learner development/autonomy.

In this paper, I aim to discuss the benefits and practical implications of using a postmodernist approach to explore the development of learner autonomy, in undergraduate specialist and non-specialist students, studying advanced level French modules¹ in an institution-wide language programme in combination with International Business or other subject areas, within a large UK higher education institution. After considering the background to the study and providing a detailed examination of the learner autonomy construct, I will discuss the choice of methodology in view of the challenges presented by prioritising voices within a multifaceted and multidimensional theoretical framework. Although a full discussion relating to methodological choices, issues and challenges is beyond the scope of this paper, I will show how the methodology was applied in practice, using a few illustrative extracts from the study's data analysis. I will conclude with some recommendations and consideration of the limitations of such an approach, together with some reflection on the process and outcome of the case study research.

Background to the Study

The research was based on a case study of undergraduate specialist and non-specialist students studying French at the advanced stages of the University Language Scheme (ULS) – Stage 5 (CEFR² B2/C1) and Stage 6 a or b (CEFR C1) (Council of Europe, 2000).

The ULS, as an institution-wide language programme, offers electives to students of other disciplines (non-specialists) and core modules to students majoring or minoring in Languages (specialists), alongside other specialisms such as International Business, Tourism or TESOL, in six stages of language proficiency mapped on the CEFR, from ab-initio (A1) to degree standards (C1). Although the ULS comprises seven languages, only Spanish, French, German and Italian can be studied at the two most advanced levels due to more limited demand in other languages at these levels overall.

The ULS has a vocational orientation with three key aims at the advanced levels:

- the development of language skills to enable students to function in both a social and business environment;

- the acquisition of basic knowledge of the country/countries where the target language is spoken, together with the development of students' awareness of its/their society/ties, traditions, customs and business culture(s);
- the fostering and development of autonomous language learners.

Although the language study on the ULS could be described as common core rather than discipline specific, Stages 5 and 6 module designs allow students specialising in other disciplines to focus part of their language study on their subject specialism through the production of a subject-specific portfolio, report and presentation. In the case of students majoring or doing a minor in Languages at ULS 6, the portfolio involves the development of more specialist language skills such as negotiation, translation and interpreting. To encourage planning and reflection, each portfolio includes a planning record and self-evaluation (normally in L2 although some were written in L1). ULS 5 and 6a students were also encouraged to keep a research diary in their L1 or 2. A summary of the assessment programme for both the specialist and non-specialist routes can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Assessment Programme

ULS 5 & 6-Assessment Programme			
Semester	ULS 5	ULS 6	
		Route a (non-specialists)	Route b (Languages specialists)
1	<p>Oral with tutor: defending their opinion (25%)</p> <p>Translation into English (25%)</p>	<p>Mini-portfolio: negotiation/ translation (50%)</p>	<p>e.Portfolio: negotiation/ translation/ interpreting (10, 50 or 70%)</p>
2	<p>Written portfolio and report on topic of own specialism (25%)</p> <p>Presentations on above topic (25%)</p>	<p>Written portfolio and report on specialist area (25%)</p> <p>Presentations on above topic (25%)</p>	<p>Time-constrained translation (15, 20 or 25%)</p> <p>Interpreting with tutor (15, 25 or 25%)</p>

Learner Autonomy as a Construct

Individual level

As a starting point for this study (O'Leary, 2010), I decided to use Benson's (2001) model of autonomy for control at the individual level (p. 86) and William and Burden's (1997) social constructivist model for learning and teaching (p. 43) for the social dimension of the process. On the basis of an extensive literature review relating to learner autonomy, Benson (ibid) identifies control over cognitive processes as probably "the most fundamental level." (p. 87). His model includes three key areas for control over cognitive processes:

- *attention*: active engagement with linguistic input, involving conscious apprehension and awareness of specific aspects of the language;
- *metacognitive knowledge* at task level encompassing any evidence of: decision to carry out

the task, decisions about content, progression, place and time of learning, the selection and use of cognitive strategies, and the criteria selected for evaluation;

- *reflection*: any form of reflection on the language, the learning process, learners' role within that process (pp. 86–87).

Social Level

William and Burden's (1997) social model of the teaching and learning process complemented Benson's (2001) individual model through taking into account the learning environment and the learning partnerships between teachers and learners. I adapted William and Burden's model slightly by adding a learner-to-learner dimension as shown below (see Figure 1).




Figure 1. A social constructivist model of the teaching-learning process, adapted from Williams and Burden (1997, p. 43) by O'Leary (2014, p. 22)

The Significance of Metacognition

Whilst attention and reflection were clearly important, my initial review of the literature suggested that the development of metacognitive knowledge (Wenden, 1995, 1998) was perhaps the most significant factor for the growth of autonomous learners. This led me to choose a working title of “The Development of Metacognition within a Social Context” as a working title for my thesis.

Postmodernism as a Theoretical Framework: What can it offer to learner autonomy research?

Other studies

Previous studies on learner autonomy have used a very wide range of paradigms. For instance, Cotterall (1995) and Lai (2001) used psychometric approaches including and/or developing rating scales for understanding the development of autonomy. More recently, mixed methods using a (neo) realist and pragmatist³ theoretical framework have been a methodology of choice (see Cooker, 2015; Tassinari, 2015). Practitioner action research involving a strong reflective/reflexive element within the process has been favoured by researchers such

as Champagne, Clayton, Dimmitt, Laszewski, Savage, Shaw, Stroupe, Thein, & Walter (2001) and Karlsson (2008). Complexity Theory, which seeks to reflect the complexity of the learning process in relation to autonomy, has also gained ground as a theoretical paradigm (see for instance Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015), whilst narrative and highly inductive qualitative stories can be used to privilege the learner's voice (see Benson & Cooker, 2013). However, I was looking for an approach that would enable me to access all the voices, including the teacher's perspective without privileging any. I was also conscious of the potential influence of dominant theories within the literature. In addition, I wished to reflect the social and interactive dimension of the research and its closeness to practice, within a social constructivist paradigm. I also wanted to find a research approach which acknowledged the relativity of language whilst still providing some answers to my questions relating to the case study.

Postmodernism as a Research Orientation

Whilst modernism can be seen as the culture of modernity underpinned by a belief in the power of science to deliver unified and legitimate knowledge (Sarup, 1993), postmodernism, on the other hand, tends to reject "metanarratives" which convey a unified and monolithic view of the world (Lyotard, 1984). Derrida (1976) rejects these narratives and their claims to unmediated knowledge. He asserts that we can only know reality through our own concepts or constructs within the theoretical frameworks we develop to make sense of our experience and research data. The postmodern approach therefore assumes a pluralist perspective and multiple "truths" contingent to specific settings. Haber (1994) stresses that postmodernism is both "*committed to*" and "*constitutive of difference*" (p.13). Although there is not one unified Postmodern Theory, postmodern theorists would all agree on "the arbitrary and conventional nature of everything social—language, culture, practice, subjectivity, and society itself" (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 20). Despite its inherent relativism (Hargreaves, 1994) and much criticism of its excessive relativity (Hill, McLaren, Cole, & Rikowski, 1999), a postmodern stance can offer new insights into complex and dynamic phenomena in a situated context such as researching educational practice (Brown & Jones, 2001; Stronach & McLure, 1997). Moderate postmodernism is a variant of postmodernism which accepts cumulative knowledge (Roseneau, 1992), including non-postmodernist as well as postmodernist works, thus enabling rigour (i.e., in-depth theoretical consideration) without rigidity (e.g., imposition of a metanarrative). Roseneau's study, which considered works emanating from various philosophical/theoretical traditions, came under the category of "moderate postmodernism." Fox (2000), for example, distinguishes between three key principles guiding postmodern research, particularly in relation to practitioner research/action research namely: "Knowledge is local and contingent; the research is constitutive of difference" meaning that the research question should neither "close down or limit the ways in which the subjects will be understood or conceive of themselves." In other words, participants' responses should not be framed at the outset; and "the theory should be related to practice" suggesting that research questions and "their theoretical consequences will be of direct practical relevance to practice" (p. 20).

There are four main reasons why I decided to adopt a postmodernist stance to explore the main themes of my study:

- a desire to reflect a "pluralist perspective", i.e., not privileging individual or groups of individuals' constructions of the world, including my own based on experience and/or existing literature;
- a recognition that the learners' constructions, or their version of the "truth", was contingent on the specific setting of the research;
- the move away from macro theories as a theoretical framework to a "micro logical/the-

oretical” level, more in line with the study participants’ personal theories and closer to practice;

- the dynamic nature of the research, and the possibility of change at a micro level working within the constraints imposed by the wider society, rather than framing the research within a critical theory of resistance or conflict, in a quest for an ideal practice (Brown & Jones, 2001) or an absolute solution to the development of autonomy.

This was not to negate the inherent political and ideological nature of the concept of autonomy (Pennycook 1997). It is clear that the psychological dimension of autonomy does not operate in a vacuum, independently of the cultural and social values of the broader society, as Pennycook (Ibid) rightly points out. Brown and Jones (2001) speak of “critical pedagogy in a postmodern world” because we need to recognise that these values, and the need for as well as type of change, will be different between individuals and communities depending on their background, education and experiences.

Postmodernism and a Social Constructivist Perspective

A social constructivist approach to knowledge and its acquisition fits in with the postmodernist orientation outlined above, in that it implies a local/personal construction of the broader social context and the relativity of language structures and meanings associated with these constructions. Both my philosophical and theoretical positions in undertaking this study were strongly influenced by constructivist theories of learning. Benson (2001, p. 35) citing Candy (1991) broadly describes constructivism as “a cluster of approaches which hold that knowledge cannot be taught but must be constructed by the learner” (p. 252). Constructivism, described in these terms, forms the basis for the concept of autonomy outlined earlier. Benson (2001) citing Paris and Byrnes (1989, p. 170) links constructivism with psychological theories of learning which assume that “knowledge is produced through socially conditioned processes of interpretation” (p. 36). A constructivist view of learning, therefore, stresses the importance of the learner’s full participation in the learning process for learning to be effective (Benson, 2001, p. 36).

Focus of the Study

Research Questions

The key questions posed in the case study relating to the development of autonomous language learners were:

1. What do undergraduate language students believe about learning and their role within the process?
2. How do these beliefs relate to current conceptualisations of learner autonomy in existing literature?
3. What implications might this have on the conceptualisation of learner autonomy, and associated operationalisation of the construct within the language curriculum and beyond?
4. Is it possible to influence students’ constructions of learning, particularly in relation to tutor dependence?
5. What is the impact of students’ beliefs/constructions of learning on their learning, in relation to the development of autonomy in practice, within the languages curriculum?

Learner Voices and Practice

As I began the study, I was particularly focused on the need to ensure that all voices were heard, including the learners and my own as a learner researcher–practitioner, as well as with the application to practice as an outcome of the research.

Implication of a Postmodernist Orientation

Methodology

The philosophical and theoretical perspective of the research, as outlined earlier meant accessing multiple realities through participants' constructions of these realities, including my own as a learner researcher–practitioner. Guba and Lincoln (1989) see the outcome of constructivist enquiries as “another construction to be taken into account in the move towards consensus” (p. 45) where the investigator/ evaluator acts as “a subjective partner with stakeholders in the literal creation of data” (p. 45). However, my commitment to voices and multiple realities meant not seeking consensus but rather adopting a dialogic approach to my enquiry to risk my own prejudices (such as the importance of metacognition) “in conversation with others” (Smith & Hodkinson, 2009, p. 37). My intention was to facilitate/ take part in the co–construction of meaning within the community of learners (Wenger, 1998; Williams & Burden, 1997) whilst attempting to reflect the various realities, including any differences, which individual participants brought to the research.

In addition to more general methodological considerations, using a postmodern research orientation has a number of practical implications for the research design, the way data is collected and analysed. The first consideration was the best way to approach the literature review to avoid framing the participants' responses around particular theories. I was also aware of my own focus on the development of metacognition as the cornerstone to learner development in relation to autonomy. I decided to divide the research into two phases. *Phase 1* would access the learners' voices prior to any literature being considered apart from the main definition for learner autonomy, answering *question 1* and starting the following literature review from a student perspective. The *literature review* and its implications would respond to *questions 2, 3 and 4*. The *second phase* would concentrate on the practical implications in answer to *question 5*.

Dealing with Language

In line with my own concern at the start of the research, one of the key implications of using a postmodernist research design was giving due consideration to language and the plurality of meaning implied in this theoretical orientation. This meant taking a poststructuralist rather than a structuralist perspective, i.e., moving away from Saussure's (1910–11) structuralist theory of language, where the link between the signifier or word/system of representation and signified or the physical object/idea it represents is constant and stable, to poststructuralist notions of plurality of meanings and shifting meanings. For Derrida, as cited in Sarup (1993), signifiers and signified are continually separating to reattach themselves in “new combinations” (p. 33). In other words, whilst the signifier and signified are still closely linked, the signifier has supremacy over the signified. In practical terms, we cannot assume that there is one privileged interpretation of a written or an oral discourse. Words may have different meanings for different participants. This has implications for the way the data are collected and analysed, i.e., meanings have to be checked with participants during data collection and participants need to have some involvement in the analysis. This was particularly relevant to Phase 1 which reflected the students' perspectives as opposed to Phase 2 which

solely considered the practitioner–researcher perspective and language interpretation, based on pre-determined criteria from Phase 1.

Literature review

The literature review was framed by the learners' responses in Phase 1 rather than framing the responses within key theories in the field, at the outset. It focused particularly on the link between the learners' beliefs and existing literature by exploring primarily the areas highlighted by the focus group participants, including the role of the teacher in the learning process.

My Role as a Researcher-Practitioner

Maykut and Morehouse (1994) suggest that the qualitative/phenomenological researcher adopts the posture of “indwelling”, which they define as living between and within the research meaning: “being at one with the person under investigation, walking a mile in the other person’s shoes, or understanding the person’s point of view from an empathic rather than a sympathetic position” (p. 25). It is, however, clear that my position as one of the voices in the research constitutes more than indwelling. My own reflection and reflexivity here form an integral part of the research process. I became one of the learners as a learner–researcher practitioner within the study, giving my “voice” no more authority than that of the learners. My research diary extracts as a learner–researcher practitioner were analysed in Phase 2 using similar criteria to the ones used in the self-evaluation reports and diaries (see Phase 2 data collection, example of data/analysis and outcomes).

Scope and Limitations of the Research

Maykut and Morehouse (1994) speak of the “trustworthiness” (p. 145) of the research, in relation to its validity. A detailed description of the research process and its expected outcomes can act as a basis for assessing its credibility (Nunan, 1992; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Transparency is an essential feature of qualitative research, particularly a clear audit trail incorporating relevant materials to help readers “walk through the work from beginning to end” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 145). Face validity is another way of considering whether the results of an investigation are valid. Face validity depends on whether the results seem valid, i.e., whether they resonate with the audience’s experiences or whether they have a predictive quality (Krueger, 1994, p. 32). Given its postmodern orientation, how this study’s findings resonate with the readers’ experience and perception of “reality” played an important role in “validating” its results as well as its process of enquiry. From a postmodernist perspective, Smith and Hodkinson (2009) stress that external evidence cannot force or coerce individuals’ agreement to “see the social and educational world in the same way” (p. 38). The reader must be taken through the research journey and convinced by the author’s arguments.

Using a Postmodernist and Social Constructivist Perspective in Practice

Data collection methods and analysis for Phases 1 and 2

As stated earlier, the research was subdivided into two phases:

- *Phase 1* which was concerned with accessing learners’ “voices” through focus groups with the student learners and through a reflective diary by the learner practitioner–researcher as well as by other learner practitioner–researchers’/ researchers’ “voices” from the literature, leading to a revised construct;

- Phase 2 which used the revised construct as the theoretical framework for the analysis of 28 self-evaluation reports and five detailed research diaries, drawn from the same learners as the Phase 1 focus groups' participants, including the learner practitioner-researcher, for evidence of "autonomy in practice", in order to assess the construct's usefulness as well as the autonomy of all the learners involved. The outcome of Phase 2 would determine further intervention through curriculum and assessment design at the advanced stages on the ULS.

Phase 1 Data Collection Process, Examples of Data/analysis and Outcomes

Focus Group Process

Phase 1 used focus group described by Krueger (1994, p. 19) as group interactions aimed at gauging feelings, ways of thinking and perceptions which may differ between participants. Rather than seeking any consensus, the aim was to respect difference as well as to note similarities.

During Phase 1 of the study, four focus groups of between two (Group 2) and five participants (Group 3) met between one and three times over one academic year for a duration of one to one and a half hours). In total, six focus group meetings were carried out: Group 1 met three times, Group 2 once, Group 3 met once and Group 4 once. Each group consisted of student volunteers studying French at Stage 6 (Groups 1 & 3) and French at Stage 5 (Groups 2 & 4). Participants in each group were all experienced language learners studying at the same stage and in the same class with me as their teacher, with the exception of Group 4 (3 students).

The focus groups were carried out in line with standard ethical procedures, including confidentiality and the opportunity to withdraw at any point. An interview guide was drawn up before each focus group with a summary of the outcomes of previous group meetings and other focus groups as applicable, and presented at the beginning of each meeting (Krueger, 1994; Banister, Burman, Parker & Taylor, 1994; Arksey & Knight, 1999). In order to access their constructions or beliefs about the learning process both generally and with regards to languages, participants were asked to: identify the characteristics of a *good teacher/language teacher* and a *good learner/language learner*; describe *successful and unsuccessful learning experiences* both generally and for languages; reflect on their own acquisition of *language proficiency* and outline their *plan for future language learning* after graduating. These questions were kept sufficiently broad to cover their learning/language learning experience in higher education, rather than focusing on the last two years when I taught most of them. This was intended to mitigate the inequalities in the power relationship, between the learners and myself. I used summaries drawn up with the participants to devise the next interview guide for the following group meetings. Some minor modifications were made to the structure of interview guides as the study progressed. In particular, learner and teacher were swapped around to try and elicit more data on the good learner in Groups 2, 3 and 4.

Recording and Analysing the Data

In relation to the analysis of the data, Krueger (1994, pp. 143-144) identifies five possible options: (a) a transcript-based analysis; (b) a taped-based analysis using an abridged transcript based on careful listening of the tape; (c) a note-based analysis; (d) a debriefing session and summary comments at the conclusion of the focus group; and (e) memory-based analysis where an oral account is presented. The approach I adopted is a mixture of the second and third options, with some further adaptation: part of the analysis and the "debriefing" ele-

ments of the third option taking place with the participants as co-constructors/co-researchers in relation to the preliminary findings, as recorded on the flip charts; and I used the tape to produce partial transcripts. This enabled a partial analysis and clarification of meanings with the participants. Pseudonyms were used for each participant to maintain confidentiality.

The interviews were conducted in English (the students' L1) using a "brainstorming" approach in so far as each participant's contributions were recorded, as much as possible in the participants' own words, for instance *Approachability* (Scott⁴, Group 1, meeting 1), *Self-motivated* (Lesley, Group 3), *Curious person* (Dallera, Group 4) and *Participation* (Gregory, Group 2). I recapped the students' responses so far on a number of occasions throughout the interview using the statements written on the flip charts to partly analyse the data with the participants. The following extracts from Group 1, meeting 1 show how the data was collected interactively (in conversation) with the themes identified in the presence of the participants:

[Researcher writing headings: "What makes a good teacher/ what makes a good learner" on different pages of the flip chart.]

Researcher: Let's start with the Teacher, sort of brainstorming. What makes a good teacher?

ANNA-MARIE: Someone who cares about students.

Researcher: In what way?

ANNA-MARIE: cares about the students, about the learning not about their pay packets at the end of the day.

Researcher: right, so somebody who cares about students' progress.

ANNA-MARIE: Yes, yes.

[Researcher writes "student progress" on the flip chart]

[....]

SCOTT: Somebody who understands students what they do and what they want.

[Researcher writes on the flip chart

Somebody who understands students/ what they do/ what they want (SCOTT)]

Researcher: That's interesting, what sorts of things would you say students want?

SCOTT: Every student is an individual, [they] want different things. So it's understanding, I don't know, the different students in your class and their objectives. You know which students are good. You know what they want.

Researcher: Do you mean being aware of the needs of the students?

SCOTT: Know which students are good, who wants to get on.

ANNA-MARIE: What's their objectives.

JANINE: Within that, you know when students need more help as well.

Researcher: so? [Researcher starts writing on the chart

Understand different students and their objectives (SCOTT, ANNA-MARIE)]

Krueger (1994) identifies two essential techniques to moderate group discussions namely: "the 5 second pause and the probe" (p. 115), in order to elicit additional information. From a poststructuralist standpoint, probing was used to seek clarification of the various concepts mentioned by the participants, for instance, "self-motivated" (Group 3):

Researcher: What do you mean by self-motivated?

LESLEY: To be a good learner, you have not just to go to your lessons but you've got to be motivated at home to do the work and learn yourself.

Students were then asked to rank the themes in order of importance with variation in ranking between participants noted on the flip chart such as the extract below from Group 3, meeting 1 concerning the good language learner:

- *Good Language Learner (additional characteristics)* [as written on flip chart]
- *Time out of lesson-learning vocabulary and grammar*
- *Interested in the subject 1 (SIAN/ JOCELYN)/ 1/2 FRANCES (also valid outside of languages)*
- *Very attentive—pronunciation 1 (DAVID)*
- *Immersion in the target language 1(LESLEY).*

The ranking gave an idea of the group's position but also had the potential to highlight differences of opinion in relation to importance of, and/or support for different statements, after they were recorded, thus ensuring disagreements as well as agreements were noted on the chart, in line with the approach's commitment to difference.

Using the Phase 1 Findings

The key findings were used to frame the literature review with a view to developing a conceptual framework for the development of autonomy on the advanced levels of the ULS, which is more aligned with our students' beliefs and experience, and thus, more "in tune" with their "voices". (See Appendix A for extract from flip chart summaries)

The Focus and Outcome of the Literature Review

Based on the main themes identified in Phase 1, the review of existing literature focused, more particularly, on theories and case study research relating to *affect*, including motivation, and cognition/metacognition both from *individual* and *collaborative perspectives*, together with the *role of the teacher* within the learning process.

Although the students' construction of learning (and teaching) were very much what I expected from my own discussions with students, the Phase 1 approach helped reveal the importance of affect in the learning process from these students' perspective. At these levels of study, the affective dimension is seldom considered, particularly in relation to learner development and/or training. This aspect and other finding implications, including learner motivation and the role of collaboration, led to a revised definition and model which emphasized the importance of affect as a category in its own right (as opposed to being implied within the others), as shown in Figure 2.

A Revised Conceptualisation and Theoretical Model




Figure 2. A model for the development of autonomy: individual level. The psychology of autonomous learning, adapted from Benson (2001, p. 86) (O'Leary, 2014, p. 21).

Phase 2 Data Collection, Example of Data/analysis and Outcomes

Based on the revised model of control over cognitive processes and from my own perspective as learner practitioner–researcher, I analysed 28 self–evaluation reports (students produce only one per portfolio–based assessment) and five learner diaries from the student learners (diaries were not compulsory and only five students completed theirs) as well as entries from my own research diaries, as a learner practitioner–researcher, for evidence of control over cognitive processes, using Benson's initial three broad categories, namely attention, meta-cognitive knowledge and reflection, plus one focusing on emotional intelligence/ affect. The evidence contributed to demonstrating control over cognitive processes as proxy for evidence of autonomy.

Self-Evaluation Reports

The findings suggested that, in practice, the student learners displayed *some degree of autonomy*. A few extracts below illustrate the data analysis:

Attention Although perhaps most difficult to identify, seven out of the 28 self–evaluation reports indicated a focus on particular linguistic aspects such as specific items of vocabulary:

I also learnt a lot of new vocabulary as the medical and legal French was quite complicated (SE9)
or specific linguistic skills such as grammar:

Thanks to this report, I think I have made a lot of progress, particularly as far as my vocabulary and grammar are concerned (SE20).

Task Knowledge (Metacognitive knowledge at task level) was quite complex since the task's aims included more than just linguistic development. In the typical example below, the student was approaching the task in a way that is contrary to the advice given, i.e., to find a theme/

topic then plan the content of the report and then search for available sources. Only seven out of all the 28 self-evaluations examined referred to the chosen/theme topic at the beginning.

In doing the portfolio, I found a new way of working: research then write. When I write something for my law course, I write, and then I find examples or quotations to support what I think. (SE 12)

This constituted an indication of some degree of autonomy in the way content is selected based on their prior experience.

Reflection: All the self-evaluation reports contained some form of reflection which is to be expected since their stated purpose is reflection on the learning experience. Not all students covered all the aspects. In fact, the learners seemed to have focused on negative aspects as well as positive ones. Thirteen out of the 28 self-evaluation reports started with difficulties experienced with sources such as:

It was difficult to find sites which simply covered law (SE11).

Fifteen out of the 28 reports highlighted linguistic progress as part of their reflection. Six focused on the acquisition of specialist language, particularly vocabulary:

I have learnt more vocabulary relating to my subject and I have developed my skills. (SE10)

A small number (around 4 of the 28 self-evaluation reports) mentioned an improvement in skills such as reading and writing or more specific ones such as summarising:

I have learnt how to do summaries, and now I can write a summary when I want. (SE17)

Some described progress in very general terms or simply stated that vocabulary and/or grammar had improved. Only two self-evaluation reports identified some weaknesses and suggested how they might remedy them:

Generally, I am pleased with my progress but sometimes my grammar isn't perfect because I have forgotten certain aspects and I need to revise these. (SE27)

Emotional intelligence (affect) was less evident and limited to motivation/engagement:

This project has given me a sense of achievement; also I have put a lot of time and effort into the project. (SE9)

The role/influence of the tutor was not as prominent as might have been expected from Phase 1 findings. Despite the central role given to the teacher in Phase 1, only two students referred to the influence of the tutor on their progress:

[..].the meetings with my tutor ensured that I made regular progress (SE14)

and

The comments, corrections, advice and recommendations of my tutor guided me. (SE5)

Learner Diaries

The five learner diaries ranged from weekly detailed accounts to a one-sentence entry against a list of dates. In terms of process, four of the five started with the search for sources and the problem associated with this:

During the Christmas holidays, I have researched several interesting subjects on the internet relating to law. (LD19)

Four of the five referred to a tutor. A typical entry simply mentioned an appointment with the tutor. Only one diary gives a detailed account of discussions and their outcome:

I arranged an appointment with Mrs. O [...] to check the progress of my research. We examined the sources I had found on work legislation and my ideas on how to plan the report. (LD 19)

The tutor was generally mentioned several times, up to five in one learner diary, LD3. This was in sharp contrast with the self-evaluation reports which were supposed to be based on diary entries. The teacher was not even mentioned once in SE3 relating to the above mentioned diary. The explanation could lie with what they understood a self-evaluation task to be. The available diaries included more information on the role of other agents such as the teacher and much less on reflection about the task and their own progress.

Learner-Researcher Practitioner Diary

My own diaries were analysed using the same categories as for the students'. In all, 27 entries between 10 and 20 pages long were examined. The extracts gave a flavour of the context of the research as I "lived" it / perceived it.

Attention was as difficult to identify as in the case of the student learners. This was perhaps even more the case because my focus was not language as such. However, the following extract from a diary entry suggested a focus on terminology although this is inextricably linked with concepts and therefore overlaps with reflection.

What is self-directed learning as we understand it? Is that the outcome of "proactive autonomy" whilst directed learning would be the outcome of "reactive autonomy" or is it something different altogether? (DOL 1)

Task Knowledge (*Metacognitive knowledge at task level*) was an aspect which had quite extensive coverage both in relation to literature review and the field work. The following extract which was typical of many entries throughout the three years encompass evidence of the decision to carry out the task, select its content and use of cognitive strategies:

[I] decided to spend the afternoon finishing "interviewing for social scientists". The analysis and profile must be written (DOL 4)

Reflection as in the case of the student learners and as might be expected from the nature of a diary is wide-ranging. The diary entries included reflection on concepts and theories, research process, student achievements relating to the study and dealing with dependent students

My last focus group ran just before Easter with a number of stage 4⁵ students (3 actually since 2 didn't turn up). The mix of the group was very different from the previous ones- [...] they were all reasonably cosmopolitan—an "independent" group who were confident of their language ability. They also must have learnt an awful lot of the language whilst abroad and yet were still prepared to assert the centrality of the teacher in the learning process. (DOL 10)

Emotional intelligence (*Affect*) or As was the case for the student learners, , there was little explicit evidence of "control over affect". However, there were a few examples of dialogue relating to curriculum development (partially influenced by the study) which could fit within the social dimension of affect, i.e., "empathising" and "cooperating with others", as illustrated by the extracts below:

We discussed the development of the new ULS 6 module for the linguists. The meeting was tense. FD and GM who had taught translation and interpreting on BAIBL [the old degree programme]

were not keen on portfolios because they were worried about marking workload. [...]I discussed the success of 6A, including my own research, and mooted the possibility of including a collaborative task to encourage peer support. This seems to appeal to most, except for Italian who had small numbers anyway [...]. We discussed criteria. I did not really wish to include performance but was outnumbered. I did argue about it being “low stakes” and we settled for 20% (DOL 12)

The role of the teacher (read here supervisor) was mentioned explicitly in a small number of entries (5 out of 27) but tails back as my thesis progressed. The entries referred to two aspects of the supervisor’s role: help/feedback and as a “motivator” to undertake the various activities relating to the thesis.

Whilst Phase 2 concluded that there was some clear indication of the students demonstrating their autonomy in relation to other aspects, explicit evidence of control over the *affective dimension* was limited. Apart from one or two of the learner-researcher practitioner’s diary entries, there was *no evidence* relating, for instance, to *cooperation* or other *relational aspects* such as empathy with other learners, despite the prominence given to those aspects by the focus groups’ participants who were the authors of the majority of the self-evaluation reports. These findings suggested the need for *collaborative activities* and for paying *more attention* to the *affective dimension* of the *learning process*, through raising learners’ awareness at an individual as well as a collective level. They subsequently informed changes to the curriculum. Creating more opportunities for collaboration with peers and encouraging students to engage with, as well as articulate, the emotional dimension of the learning experience was something which the language team, consisting of all the module leaders of the advanced ULS stages, myself included, considered and developed through revising the curriculum delivery and assessment of the ULS 5, 6A and 6B modules, as a result of discussions arising from the outcomes of the study. In relation to the affective dimension, in particular, we now encourage feedback to peers and self-evaluation relating to these issues after discussing these aspects in class.

Conclusion

In summary, the approach to Phase 1 of the research enabled the identification of emotional intelligence or meta-affect as an important element in the development of autonomy in its own right, leading to a different starting point and initial focus of the main literature review, together with its addition to Benson’s (2001) model. Although affect/meta-affect, including motivation and strategies associated with self-assessment and collaboration, has been the subject of a number of studies/publications linked to autonomy within an educational context (e.g., Aoki, 1999; MacIntyre, 2002; Oxford, 1990, 2016; Ushioda, 1996, 2003, 2006, 2011), influential models for its development such as Benson’s (2001) or (2011) have tended to subsume these aspects within broader categories (e.g., as part of metacognition). Generally, the affective dimension of the learning process is likely to be underplayed (if acknowledged at all) within broader Higher Education pedagogies (Mortiboys, 2005) so highlighting its existence is of particular relevance for learner development or programmes that foster the development of autonomy. Phase 2 showed how the new construct/model could be used to assess the development of autonomy in practice, despite some difficulty with the “attention” criteria. Although all the self-evaluation reports demonstrated that students had developed a degree of autonomy, including some independence from the teacher, evidence of the development of meta-affect was absent.

As demonstrated by the overview of the methodology and the above brief account of its outcomes, I found the postmodern orientation to be an empowering approach in the use of theories and frameworks, which avoided closing down or limiting the ways in which participants

can be understood or “conceive of themselves.” It facilitated a dynamic research design and the adaptation as well as use of existing theories. It also gave me the opportunity to articulate my own voice openly through the analysis of my diary entries and reflection sections, rather than covertly.

The student voices changed my perception that metacognition was the most important element in the development of autonomy. The shift of emphasis in my own understanding of autonomy and focus of research is best reflected by the new broader title of *Developing autonomous language learners within the HE curriculum: A postmodern and social constructivist perspective* finally adopted for the study. This has also impacted the way I approach learner development, in my own practice, particularly in relation to the affective dimension which now forms an integral part of class discussions as well as oral and written peer and tutor feedback, with some initial evidence of success (see O'Leary, 2014).

The relativity of the philosophical/ theoretical approach to this study does limit its scope as a free-standing piece of research. In relation to practice, future student cohorts within the same Programme may hold differing views, both as a collective and individually, so the outcome could change depending on the cohort. However, the research has enabled me to challenge main stream theories and opened the door to alternative perspectives. As such, it has given insights and a focus that may not have been possible with a different approach. As part of an ongoing enquiry into learner autonomy and the practices that may help foster it, it offers a broader definition and a new construct with practical implications and applications, within the wider body of existing and future literature, to be used, revisited and reconstructed as necessary.

Review Process

This paper was peer-reviewed by the following contributor to Issue 2, Ryo Moriya. It was also blind peer-reviewed by members of the Learner Development Journal Review Network.

References

- Aoki, N. (1999). Affect and the role of teachers in the development of learner autonomy. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp.142-155). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Arskey, H., & Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists*. London, UK: Sage.
- Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., & Taylor, C. (1994). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Benson, P., & Cooker, L. (Eds.). (2013). *The applied linguistic individual: Approaches to identity, agency and autonomy*. Sheffield, UK: Equinox.
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Brown, T., & Jones, L. (2001). *Action research and postmodernism: Congruence and critique*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Candy, P. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Champagne, M. F., Clayton, T., Dimmitt, N., Laszewski, M., Savage, W., Shaw, J., Stroupe, R., Thein, M. M., & Walter, P. (2001). The assessment of learner autonomy and language

- learning. In L. Dam (Ed.) *Learner autonomy: New insights. The AILA Review* (pp. 45–55) Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Council of Europe (2000). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Available at <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic>
- Cooker, L. (2015). Assessment as learner autonomy. In C. Everhard & L. Murphy (Eds.), *Assessment and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 89–113). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cotterall S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23(2), 195–206.
- Curtis, B. (2004). *Practical applications of postmodern theory for promoting learner autonomy in a foundation studies program*. Printed proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.138.757&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Dam, L. (2011). Fostering learner autonomy in language learning. In D. Gardner (Ed.), *Developing learner autonomy with school kids: Principles, practices and results* (pp. 40–51). Gaziantep: Zirve University.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D., & Henry, A. (2015). Introduction: Applying complex dynamic systems principles to empirical research on L2 motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 1–7). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Everhard, C., & Murphy, L. (Eds.). *Assessment and autonomy in language learning*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fazey, D., & Fazey, J. (2001). The potential for autonomy in learning: Perception of competence, motivation and locus of control in first-year undergraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 345–361.
- Fox, N. (2000). *Social research in postmodern mood: Reflexivity, collaboration and transgression*. Paper presented at the Current Issues in Qualitative Research Conference, University of East Anglia, UK, 24–25 July.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989) *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury park: Sage.
- Haber, H. (1994). *Beyond postmodern politics: Lyotard, Rorty, Foucault*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London, UK: Cassell.
- Hill, D., McLaren, P., Cole, M. & Rikowski, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Postmodernism in educational theory: Education and the politics of human resistance*. London, UK: The Tufnell Press. Retrieved from <http://www.tpress.free-online.co.uk/post.pdf>
- Hoidn, S., & Kärkkäinen, K. (2014). *Promoting skills for innovation in Higher Education: A literature review on the effectiveness of problem-based learning and of teaching behaviours*. [online]. OECD Education Working Papers, 100. Retrieved from [http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/WKP\(2013\)15&docLanguage=En](http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/WKP(2013)15&docLanguage=En)
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Karlsson, L. (2008). *Turning the kaleidoscope: (E) FL educational experience and inquiry as auto/biography*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki University Language Centre Publications.
- Kohonen, V. (1992). Experiential language learning: Second language learning as cooperative learner education. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 14–39). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Krueger, A. (1994). *Focus group: A practical guide for applied research*. (2nd ed.) London, UK: Sage.

- Karlsson, L., & Kjisik, F. (2009). Whose story is it anyway? Auto/biography in language learning encounters. In F. Kjisik, P. Voller, N. Aoki, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *Mapping the terrain of learner autonomy* (pp. 168–179). Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere Press.
- Lai, J. (2001). Towards an analytic approach to assessing learner autonomy. In L. Dam (Ed.), *Learner autonomy: New insights. The AILA Review* (pp. 45–55). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Little, D. (2000). Learner autonomy and human interdependence: Some theoretical consequences of a social–interactive view of cognition, learning and language. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath, & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions* (pp. 15–23). London, UK: Longman.
- Liotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45–68). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Mortiboys, A. (2005). *Teaching with emotional intelligence: A step-by-step guide for higher and further education professionals*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Leary, C. (2010). *Developing autonomous language learners within the HE curriculum: A postmodern and social constructivist perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Sheffield: Sheffield University.
- O'Leary, C. (2014). Developing autonomous language learners in HE: A social constructivist perspective. In G. Murray (Ed.), *Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning* (pp.15–36). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Rowley, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R. (2016). Powerfully positive: searching for a model of language learner well-Being. In D. Gabrys Barker & D. Galajda (Eds.), *Positive psychology perspectives on foreign language learning and teaching* (pp.21–37). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer International.
- Paris, S., & Byrnes, J. (1989). The constructivist approach to self-regulation and learning in the classroom. In B. Zimmerman & D. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement* (pp. 169–200). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 35–53). London, UK and New York, NY: Longman.
- Raya, M. J., Lamb, T., & Vieira F. (2007). *Pedagogy for autonomy in language education in Europe: Towards a framework for learner and teacher development*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Raya, M. J., & Lamb, T. (2008). *Pedagogy for autonomy in language education*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Roseneau, P. (1992). *Postmodernism and the social sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sarup, M. (1993). *Post-structuralism and post-modernism*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Saussure, F. (1910–11). *Third course of lectures on general linguistics*. New York, NY: Pergamon.

- Smith, J., & Hodgkinson, P. (2009). Challenging neorealism: A response to Hammersley. *Qualitative Inquiries*, 15(30): 30–39.
- Stronach, I., & MacLure, M. (1997). *Educational research undone: The postmodern embrace*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Tassinari, M. G. (2015). Assessing learner autonomy: A dynamic model. In C. Everhard, & L. Murphy (Eds.) *Assessment and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 64–88). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Ushioda, E. (2003). Motivation as a socially mediated process. In D., Little, J., Ridley & E., Ushioda (Eds.), *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 90–101). Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Ushioda, E. (2006). Motivation, autonomy and sociocultural theory. In P. Benson (Ed.), *Learner autonomy 8: Insider perspectives on autonomy in language learning* (pp. 5–24). Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Ushioda, E. (2011). Motivating learners to speak as themselves. In G. Murray, X. Gao, & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenden, A. (1995). Learner training in context: A knowledge-based approach. *System* 23(2): 183–94 as cited in Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning* (pp. 96–97). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning, *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4): 515–37 as cited in Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning* (pp. 96–97). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A

Example of Flip Chart Summary

Focus group 1—Stage 5—meeting 1

Present: Scott, Janine and Anna-Marie

What makes a good teacher?

- Somebody who cares about students progress/ students' experience
- Approachability
- Good listener
- Somebody who understands students/ what they do/ What they want
 - understands different students and their objectives
 - being aware of the needs of students
 - needs to be able to reach the students to inspire them
- Break down barriers between students and teachers- encourages (social worker sort of role)

- Teacher should have an interest in the subject-/passion & enthusiasm which is transmitted to students
- Help should be readily available- they should make time. Job= teaching students therefore should be a priority
- Recognition & rewards to good students
 - prizes/ certificates
 - a word of praise/ book tokens
 - motivation-competition between students
- Main role of the teacher is to get the students to learn
- Ask the students what would motivate them/ setting achievable goals
- Teaching style on the level with their students
- Patience- empathy with students' difficulties
- Know how to handle different students- more experienced teachers appear more confident
- Classroom management/ discipline
- Organisation

What makes a good learner?

- Hard-work
 - make sure you do your homework +reading round or doing something extra
 - ask for help and advice
 - look what you are supposed to have learnt from homework
- Willingness to work
- Learner aware of objectives given by teacher/ to make themselves acquainted with the subject
- Work on their own + go back to teacher with questions- tutors= main experts/ source of advice
- Main objectives= to pass the subject/ to know enough about the subject to pass (major)
- Understanding the subject for further studies (minor)
- the ability to prioritise what they need to learn
- Making friends (minor)
- Enjoying the subject
- Doing extra work to find out more
- Relating to real life
- Looking at background/ concrete examples from

Good teacher (follow-up from last focus group)

- Subject knowledge- 1= (link to enthusiasm for their subject/ teaching)
- Empathy (understanding student needs/ objectives) 4=
- Approachability 4= (link with empathy)
- Experience 3= (link classroom management/ knowledge of teaching methodologies/ how to teach)
- Good preparation 2= (link with organisation)

- Classroom management 3= (link experience/ knowledge of teaching methodologies/ how to teach)
- Organisation 2=(link with good preparation)
- Enthusiasm for their subject/ teaching 1= (link with subject knowledge)
- Knowledge of teaching methodologies/ how to teach 3= (link classroom management/experience)

Good learner—More general points applying to both School and HE

- Willing to do (hard)- work- willingness to learn/ motivation/ organisation/ target setting 1
- Ability to prioritise what they need to learn HE 3= (equal to recognition motivator/ pressure)
- Willing to do extra work/ to find out more -using theory + applying own experience 4=
- Interest in the subject studied 2 (interest= experience)
- School different from HE—HE requires self-motivation/ learning to be independent. Independence taught gradually.

Think of activities when you really learnt something—What/ how/ where/why

Example 1- Working for a seminar. Had to do research and then present it at University. Worked because there was structure and discussion. You did your research, shared ideas and took time.

Example 2- Revision for an exam. Involved group work and discussion in bedroom in France. Successful because worked together as a team / shared

Example 3- Research. Had to visit various places/ sites around the region—to be completed.

Example 4- Revision. Group work- shared your understanding of the concepts /brain storming in library and bedroom. Sharing ideas and concepts/ different points of view / interaction.

Focus group 1, meeting 2 (continued)

Think of activities when you didn't learn What, how, where and why

Example 1-Law lesson in France. Couldn't understand. Paid no attention/ switched off/ confused. At university in France. Couldn't engage in the learning.

Example 2- Group work. Somebody tries to lead/ there is competition/ unequal effort. At School. In HE, it is better. You do your own work but have no overview. Boredom/ lack of interaction.

Focus Group 3- Stage 5- Meeting 1 (only one meeting with this group)**Present: David, Sian, Lesley, Jocelyn and Frances.****Good Learner**

- Self-motivated 1
 - want to learn
 - able to be motivated & learn yourself
- Good listener 3= (equal to attendance/ participation)
 - open-minded- understands & accept others' opinions
- Take time to understand 2= (equal to well-organised)
- Well-organised- organisation/ time management 2= (equal to take time to understand)
- Attendance 3= (equal to take time to understand/ participation)
- Participation 3= (equal to attendance/ good listener)

Good Language Learner (additional characteristics)

- Time out of lesson- learning vocab and grammar.
- Interested in the subject 1 (Sian/ Jocelyn)/ 1/ 2 (Frances) [also valid outside of languages]
- Very attentive- pronunciation 1 (David)
- Immersion in the target language 1 (Lesley)
 - Language- listening to radio/ reading etc..
- Need to sustain effort- learning process gradual

Good Teacher

- Able to come down to the level of the learner 2= (equal to patience)
- No favouritism- no preference for more able people
- Patience 2= (equal to able to come down to the level of the learner/ Relate to students/ Confident)
- Good in-depth knowledge of the subject 1=
- varies the lesson 3=
- involves the student in the lesson- encourage participation 3
 - by not talking too much
 - ask students' opinion
 - group work- classroom discussion
 - move around the class to individual students
 - uses visual aids rather than talking
- Relate to students 2= (equal to able to come down to the level of the learner/ patience/ Confident)
 - not too serious
 - approachability
 - personality
- Confident 2= (equal to able to come down to the level of the learner/ patience)

End notes

1. Modules refer to the constitutive elements of a course or programme of study. Undergraduates students typically study 6 x 20 credit modules a year or a total of 18 (360 credits) for a three-year undergraduate degree.
2. Common European Framework for Languages
3. This is my description of the author's research framework rather than their own.
4. Different Christian names were used to preserve confidentiality.
5. These are referred to as Stage 5 students in the study.