Self-Access at SRU -- Towards an Effective Model

Chris Hawes

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยเรื่อง รูปแบบการส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองของนักศึกษาเอก
ภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสุราษฎร์ธานี มี
จุดมุ่งหมายเพื่อประเมินผลการจัดกิจกรรมส่งเสริมการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษแก่นักศึกษา
ณ ห้องฝึกภาษา (Language Lounge) จากการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลแบบสอบถามและข้อมูล
การสังเกตที่ได้บันทึกไว้ พบว่า นักศึกษามีความพอใจกับห้องฝึกภาษา สื่อและกิจกรรม
ต่างๆที่จัดให้บริการ แม้หากพิจารณาแนวคิดและทฤษฎีแล้ว ห้องฝึกภาษาจะค่อนข้าง
คับแคบ และอาจจะยังขากเป้าหมายที่ชัดเจนในแง่ของการดำเนินการ นอกจากนี้ยังเห็น
ว่าห้องฝึกภาษาควรมีเป้าหมายที่จะช่วยสร้างนิสัยให้ผู้เรียนเป็นผู้ที่รักการเรียนรู้ด้วย
ตนเอง แทนที่เป็นเพียงสถานที่เพื่อฝึกภาษาเพิ่มเติมเพียงอย่างเดียว มีข้อเสนอแนะ
ต่างๆ ที่จะช่วยพัฒนาให้ห้องฝึกภามีลักษณะที่สามารถปรับให้สอดคล้องกับหลักการและ
ทฤษฎีการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองให้มีประสิทธิภาพมากยิ่งขึ้น

A b s t r a c t

This research evaluates a newly commissioned self-access centre within
the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Suratthani Rajabhat University
(SRU) in Southern Thailand. Student satisfaction with the centre was first
gauged, using a questionnaire and recorded observations, the latter being used
to validate the former, the results of which were used as a precursor from which
to consider other more well-established self-access programs and the research
that has arisen from them. While students who participated in the pilot

programme tended to view the centre, and the resources and activities within it, favourably, an extensive review of the literature found the centre to be too narrow and limiting in terms of its nascent aims and goals. Rather than just providing additional engagement and practice time with the language, the self-access centre should assist in the process of helping students become autonomous learners. Accordingly, a number of suggestions are offered as to how the centre can be reorganized so as to achieve a more dynamic and pedagogically principled approach to self-access learning, and by so doing assist students in becoming autonomous learners.

1.0 SALCs - Historical Overview

For the past thirty to forty years self-access language learning centres (SALCs) have enjoyed something of a renaissance in terms of both proliferation and research. Many universities in Asia, Europe and North America have endorsed the pedagogical principles underlying SALCs and spent considerable sums on establishing such centres for their students. Understandably, research has kept pace with this growth, and helped to both inform and direct it, as witnessed by the plethora of articles and publications devoted to establishing (Gardner & Miller, 1999), equipping (Case, 2008; Vettorel, 2012), managing (McMurry & Anderson, 2010; Gardner & Miller, 2010;) and evaluating (Reinders & Lazaro, 2007; Morrison, 2011) SALCs.

Historically, the advent of self-access language learning coincided with a growth of maturity within the TEFL profession as researchers began to eschew debates over competing teaching methodologies in favour of a much wider perspective that validated the importance of issues related to the learner and the learning process. Gardner and Lambert (1972), Gardner (1985), and Dornyei's

(1990) pioneering work on motivation, Selinker (1972), Krashen (1981) and Ellis' (1985) work on second language acquisition, Rubin (1975) and Naiman's (1978) research on "the good language learner" and Oxford's (1989) research on language learning strategies all contributed to expanding the research agenda well beyond the arguably myopic limitations of teaching methodologies. At the risk of over-simplifying the process, from the mid-1970s onwards the focal point within the TEFL profession has changed from that of the teacher and how he or she teaches to that of the learner and how best to assist his or her learning.

SALCs have since their inception in the 1970s been closely associated with independent and autonomous learning. Holec (1981: 3), the first to coin the term, originally defined autonomous learning as 'the ability to take charge of one's own learning.' According to this perspective, SALCs should provide learners with both the material and mentoring resources needed for taking control of the learning process. As Gardner and Miller (1999: 8) put it "self-access is probably the most widely used and recognized term for an approach to encouraging autonomy." Whether a given SALC can actually achieve learner autonomy among its users or whether it represents, as Nunan (1997 : 193) suggests, an ideal to strive towards depends on a variety of conditions and factors, which are in essence the rationale underlying this research.

2.0 Conditions at Suratthani Rajabhat University (SRU)

Arguably, few places warrant the inculcation of learner autonomy among its students more than SRU. Given that students study individual English courses once a week only for a maximum of three hours per session, students have few opportunities to engage the language outside the confines of their respective

classes. Moreover, classes are frequently canceled owing to conflicting scheduled and unscheduled events. While some teachers attempt to fill the *contact gap* with homework, self-study activities and term projects, students often exhibit a lackadaisical attitude towards the completion of such assignments as amply demonstrated by the number of incomplete and late submissions and incidences of plagiarism. Succinctly expressed, students at SRU need not only language training but perhaps even more importantly, they need effective instruction on learning how to learn. As Dickinson notes (as quoted in Victoria, 2000: 165), self-access language learning should include 'both language learning and learner training' if learner autonomy is ever to be actualized.

Realizing the limitations inherent in its present language programmes, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences piloted a self-access Directed Studies Programme (DSP) from November, 2011 to February, 2012 with 167 students at its newly opened Language Lounge. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the merits and limitations of this pilot program with an eye towards refining and improving activities for next academic session's intake of students.

3.0 Research Methodology

For the purposes of this study two instruments were used: a student questionnaire and repeated on-site observations. The questionnaire, conducted in Thai during the last week of classes, utilized a Likert rating scale to ascertain personal satisfaction with the various activities that comprised the DSP. Additionally, a comments section at the end of the questionnaire encouraged students to offer suggestions for improving the program. On-site observations, in turn, took two forms: unobtrusive and interactive observations. Unobtrusive observations involved monitoring students while they completed each week's

prescribed activities, noting time on-task and adherence to activity protocols. Interactive observations included discussions and assistance rendered to students during the completion of program activities. Results were compiled and weaknesses and problem areas were discerned. A comprehensive review of the literature then followed and recommendations designed to improve program delivery were offered.

Three classes of English majors and three classes of Tourism majors participated in the pilot programme. Although attendance was compulsory, students were free to choose the times they attended. Participating students were expected to come to the Language Lounge for 1.5 hours twice a week to engage in a series of user-responsive and self-checking activities based on a station approach, what Gardner and Miller (1999: 57) refer to as a structured model of self-access, as outlined in Table 1.0.

Station	Activities	Skill Focus	Modality	Required Time
Computers	Mavis Beacon Teaches Typing	Keyboarding: accuracy & speed	visual, tactile	15 minutes [sequential]
	New Interchange INTRO	Listening comprehension, Vocabulary, Grammar	auditory, visual, tactile	15 minutes [one unit per week]
SRA Reading	Levels-based reading cards with self-checking comprehension & word-skills exercises	Reading, Vocabulary	Visual	30 minutes

Grammar Vocabulary	Deductively formulated grammar, vocabulary & collocation exercises	Reading Grammar Vocabulary	Visual Oral	30 minutes

Table 1.0 DSP Station Activities

The rationale behind the choice of a station approach was, in turn, grounded on both logistical and pedagogical considerations. As the room could seat forty students at a time, it was necessary to limit time on the twenty-four available computers by having students move from one area of the room to another to mitigate against *'bottle-necks'* during peak hours. Moreover, a station approach permitted variety in terms of input and modality, helping to off-set the lethargy that comes from sitting for too long in one place. The station approach, using computer applications, individualized reading cards and self-checking grammar/vocabulary exercises, permitted students to study individually, in pairs and in small groups according to their personal preferences.

4.0 Results

4.1 Questionnaire

Despite being obligated to attend sessions in the Language Lounge, students generally responded favourably across all categories of the questionnaire, as shown in Table 2.0 (*see next page*)

In terms of ease of use and perceived benefit the majority of students viewed each of the station activities positively, which in turn likely contributed to the overall high rating students gave to the enjoyment category question.

Although few in number, written comments tended to mirror such sentiments as well. Such sentiments do, however, stand somewhat in contrast with responses to the question, "Would you like to continue using the Language Lounge?" Unlike the high level of enthusiasm observed in other categories, only 62.3% of students said they were keen to continue using the Language Lounge. Another 28.7% said they were willing to keep using the SALC if instructed to do so by their teachers. Apparently, the majority of students do perceive a value in using the SALC but their enthusiasm may be tempered by the requirement of having to attend each week.

Language Lounge Student Survey Results

February, 2012

Survey sample size = 168

How often did you use the Language Lounge this semester?

    Frequently=82.8%   Sometimes=14.9%   Rarely=2.3%

Did you enjoy using the resources at the Language Lounge?

    Yes, very much=81.3%   It's OK=18.1%   No, I don't=0.6%

Have the resources helped you this semester?

    Yes, very much=81.6%   Somewhat=17.8%   No, they haven't=0.6%

Do you feel that coming to the Language Lounge has helped your English improve?

    Yes, very much=75.9%   Somewhat=23.5%   No, it hasn't=0.6%

How easy to use and understand were the following station resources:

	Easy	OK	Difficult
SRA	71.6%	27.3%	1.1%
Grammar/Vocabulary	75.6%	24.1%	0.6%
Mavis Beacon Typing	78.2%	20.5%	1.2%
New Interchange INTRO	70.8%	29.2%	0.0%

How useful were the following station resources to your personal development?

	Very Useful	Somewhat	Not Useful
SRA	79.3%	18.3%	2.4%
Grammar/Vocabulary	82.1%	17.3%	0.6%
Mavis Beacon Typing	80.5%	16.4%	3.1%
New Interchange INTRO	74.9%	23.9%	0.0%

How helpful were the Language Lounge staff?

    Very helpful=78.4%   Somewhat=20.4%   Not at all=1.2%

Was the Language Lounge open enough?

    Yes=91.9%   No=8.1%

Would you like to continue using the Language Lounge next semester?

    Yes, very much so=62.3%   Yes, if required=28.7%   No, not at all=9.0%

Table 2.0 DSP Student Questionnaire Results

4.2 Observations

• During the first week of classes, participating students were brought to the Language Lounge and shown how to use the various resources along with receiving instructions on the rules and protocols to follow. As a lot of information was presented in these sessions, notices and signs were also prepared and prominently displayed in the room to remind students of how to properly engage resources. Information booklets for accessing the resources on computers were also printed and placed at each terminal. Students were closely monitored and assisted over the next three weeks as they familiarized themselves with both the resources and the protocols to follow. Recurring problems noted during this time are outlined in Table 3.0

Station / Activities	Problems
Computers	• Locating correct applications & logging in • Navigating within an application • Persevering on some activities at the expense of others • Not following units sequentially
SRA	• Selecting reading cards at an appropriate level • Jumping from one level to another • Not understanding vocabulary section instructions • Over-reliance on bi-lingual dictionaries
Grammar/Vocab	• Failure to read explanations and instructions correctly • Removing shared answer keys from the SALC
Overall	• Budgeting time equitably between the three stations

Table 3.0 Observed Problems During DSP Start-up Phase

By the third or fourth week most students had adapted well to using the assigned resources, and a routine was established, requiring little assistance

from staff. Few problems or incidences of off-task behaviour were observed over the next six weeks as most students became increasingly comfortable and adept at using all three stations. As the end of the term approached, however, time on task and concentration levels appeared to ebb among students as the incidences of off-task behaviours increased and attendance rates fell.

In summary, problems tended to occur both at the beginning and towards the end of the pilot study. Those that occurred at the beginning arose from the steep learning curve students experienced in handling equipment, navigating computer applications and following SALC protocols. Those that occurred towards the end may have arisen from a failure to effectively address student needs. That is, station activities were linked to a single course that each group of student studied during the semester. Since term project due dates and final exams in six or more courses loomed imminently before students, the DSP's lack of flexibility in allowing students a choice as to the activities they pursued may have undermined the value students assigned to activities that were targeted to and integrated with a single course.

5.0 Discussion

Although the Language Lounge's directed studies pilot programme did provide six classes of students with additional exposure to the language, permitting achievable practice opportunities that they might not otherwise have had, the DSP did little in the way of developing and fostering learner autonomy.

With few rare exceptions, students perceived their sessions in the Lounge as a

necessary obligation for fulfilling the requirements of a single course and not as an enterprise to be valued for its potential contribution to their learning. The principal issue to reconcile, therefore, is how to effectively create a system that fosters independent learning in students who have had little or no experience learning on their own without the constant supervision and direction of their teachers.

Bridging the gap between teacher-centered and learner-centered instruction requires teachers to work together and send a consistent message to students regardless of the courses they are teaching. Rather than focusing on just course content and language training *per se*, teachers must also focus on learning strategies training, a necessary first step in fostering independence. As Thornton (2010 : 158) explains 'by teaching specific strategies for different learning tasks, encouraging reflection and self-analysis, and raising learners' awareness of their own learning processes in addition to features of the language they are studying, teachers can help learners to assume more responsibility for their own learning.'

Of these, reflection and self-analysis may be the most daunting for SRU students as their entire learning careers have mitigated against such an approach to learning. Freeing up class time to discuss self-assessment, using questionnaires such as Horwitz's Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) and Oxford's Strategies for Language Learning Inventory, having students conduct their own needs analysis and set SMART goals for themselves and encouraging students to keep reflective journals of their learning are all well-documented ways to help students begin the formidable process of reflective learning. In order to take root, however, such activities and discussions need to be integrated across all language courses and not remain the exclusive reserve of one or two advocates at disparate points in time. Crabbe, as quoted in

Gardner and Miller (1999: 156), expressed this most succinctly when he said autonomous learning 'needs to be a reference point for *all* classroom procedure.' (*their emphasis*).

The same can be said about organizing and managing the Language Lounge: teams of teachers should work together to devise activities and select resources that support and reinforce shared course goals, providing students with clear *pathways* (Thompson et al, 2010: 50) so that students are not overwhelmed with too much choice, at least initially when they are first exposed to studying in the centre. This can be accomplished by color-coding or cataloging resources or by positioning them in selected locations within the available rooms. Over time, as students become both increasingly familiar with using the SALC and increasingly mature in terms of assessing their own needs, more choices can be offered.

Another way to support learner autonomy is to examine the role of Language Lounge support staff. In order to insure the SALC was open a minimum of forty hours per week, the faculty employed a full-time resource person whose job has been to provide technical support, keep attendance records and assist students when they encounter problems. Gardner and Miller (1999: 183) among others recommend, however, the inclusion of a counselor whose job description extends well beyond providing technical support and fielding questions. In terms of promoting autonomy, a counselor collaborates with learners to (*ibid*) 'formulate specific goals', and 'establish boundaries and define achievement'.

That is, a counselor, as the title implies, works with individuals and helps each person negotiate the array of resources that are best suited for meeting the specific needs of each learner through a process of consultation and dialogue. Whether such an indispensable position would involve upgrading the

present resource person's job description or would involve hiring additional staff depends, of course, on budgets and the number of students targeted for inclusion. In either event, specialized training would be necessary. The Indonesia Australia Language Foundation, for example, offers a 150-hour Certificate in Self-Access Centre Design and Management (C-SACDM) course that may help to meet this need.

6.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

As noted in a recent evaluation of English programmmes at SRU, commissioned by the British Council (Wilson, 2012: 22), "Guided self-access study should...be a mandatory part of the syllabus for all English Major students." While this study has tentatively confirmed the value of directed self-access studies at SRU, at least in terms of student endorsement, the present system falls well short of what advocates of self-access learning consider to be a SALC's true potential. Rather than being an appendage of or addendum to regular class sessions, a well-planned and managed SALC contributes in a discernible and quantifiable way to independent learning.

In order to realize the Language Lounge's potential a number of changes need to be instigated to facilitate the transition from course support to autonomous learning:

6.1 At least one member of staff should be sent for self-access management training at an accredited institution, and that person should then be responsible for transfer of training to other language teachers. Additionally, study tours to some of the more well-established SALCs at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Singapore

Polytechnic, Singapore National Institute of Education's Teachers' Language Development Centre, and Chulalongkorn University Language Institute should be organized for a limited number of staff.

6.2   Access to campus SALCs need to be prioritized according to proficiency level needs.   Students requiring B2 level proficiency (i.e., Faculty of Humanities English & Business English majors and Faculty of Education English majors) should be given priority over other students. To support both prioritized students as well as other students and staff, all existing SALCs should be integrated and managed together and an on-line version, accessible both on and off campus, should be designed and managed.

6.3   Teams of teachers should collaborate both in terms of planning directed studies pathways for various proficiency levels, which support common curricular goals, and in terms of embedding activities that support learning strategies training within each of their respective courses.   The same teams of teachers should be required to work in the Language Lounge an assigned number of hours per week so that they can assist students as necessary and provide both speaking and writing opportunities, two skills that were missing from the pilot programme.

6.4   As autonomy requires freedom of choice, a four-year self-access programme for English majors should be planned and implemented based on a phased approach that witnesses a gradual shift from structured activities for first and second year students to fully self-directed activities for third and fourth year students.   Both teachers and

the counselor can assist in the transitioning process from directed to self-directed studies.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, successful self-access learning programmes must heed the importance of each learner's feelings regarding self-access learning. As Valdivia et al (2011: 95) stress 'developers need to take affective factors into account in order for learners to successfully engage in independent study.' To be successful a SALC must be an enjoyable experience for learners, a place valued not only for the intrinsic rewards that learning provides but also a place where people can socialize and use the target language in a supportive, nurturing environment. Equipment and materials are, of course, important but inevitably it will be the motivating influence of people's personalities that draw learners to the centre and keep them coming back.

References

Anderson, H., Reinders, H. & Jones-Parry, J. (2004). **Self-access : Positioning, pedagogy and future directions**. *Prospects, 19(3) : 15-26.*

Anh, L. (2007). ***Improving Cantho University English Majors' Reading Performance with Self-Access Language Learning,* M.A**. Thesis. Ministry of Education and Training Can Tho University, http://www.ctu.edu.vn/.../LUU %20Hoang%20Anh_Master%20Thesis.pdf [Accessed: 2012-04-03].

Case, A. (2008). ***Things to put in a Self Access Centre or Student Library***.

http://www.usingenglish.com/articles/things-to-put-in-self-access-centre-or-student-library.html [Accessed: 2012-04-08].

Chiu, C. Y. (2006). **Autonomy and language learning: two ideas in search of a definition**. *Proceedings of 2006 Taiwan TESL Conference. Yunlin, Taiwan*.

Cooker, L. & Torpey, M. (2004). **From the classroom to the self-access centre: A chronicle of learner-centred curriculum development**. *The Language Teacher, Issue 28.6.*

Diaz, L. (2010). **Self-access Language Learning – Students' perceptions and experiences within this new mode of learning**. *Biblioteca Digital de Humanidades 4, Universidad Veracruzana*.

Dornyei, Z. (1990). **'Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning'**, *Language Learning, : 40.*

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford : Oxford University.

Foale, C. (2011). **Self-access Learning: Thinking Outside the Box**. Learner Autonomy in Language Learning.

Gardner, D. & Miller, L. (1999). **Establishing Self-Access : From Theory to Practice.** Hong Kong : Hong Kong University.

Gardner, D., & Miller, L. (2010). **Beliefs about Self-Access Learning : Reflections on 15 years of change**. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 1(3) :* 161-172.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Godeo, E. (2003). **Self-access and the multimedia language laboratory: designing a resource centre for EFL university students**. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3(2): 289-294.*

Hadley, G. & Brown, H. (2009). ***Improved Language Learning through Self-Available.*** http://www.nuis.ac.jp/ic/library/kiyou/10_hadley.pdf. [Accesed : 2012-03-28].

Hess, H. (2001). **Resource Databases for Self-access Language Learning**. In Kember, D./ Candlin, S./ Yan, L. (eds) *Further Case Studies for Improving Teaching and Learning from Action Research Project*, Hong Kong: Action Learning Project. 361-376.

Holec, H. (1981). **Autonomy and foreign language learning**. Oxford : Pergamon.

Klassen et al. (1998). **Does Self-Access Language Learning at the Tertiary Level Really Work?.** *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8: 55-80.*

Krashen, Stephen. (1981). ***Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.*** New York: Pergamon.

Lazaro, N. & Reinders, H. (2007). **Innovation in Self-Access: Three Case Studies**. *CALL-EJ Online, 8(2),* Available http://callej.org/journal/8-2/lazaro_reinders.html [Accessed 2012-04-14].

McCarthy, T. (2003). **Developing a classroom-based self-access learning course: A course evaluation**. *ELTWorldOnline.com, 17 August 2011*, http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/2011/08/17/developing-a-classroom-based-self-access-learning-course-a-course-evaluation/ [Accessed: 2012-04-15].

McMurry, B, L., Tanner, M. W., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). **Self-Access Centers:**

Maximizing Learners' Access to Center Resources. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 1(2): 100-114.*

Morrison, B. (2011). **A framework for the evaluation of a self-access language learning centre.** *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 2(4), 241-256.*

Murray, G., Gao, X. & Lamb, T. (2011). **Identity, Motivation & Autonomy in Language Learning**. *Second Language Acquisition, 54.*

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). **The good language learner.** *Research in Education Series No. 7, Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.*

Nunan, D. *Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In: Benson, P &* Voller, P. (1997). **Autonomy and independence in language learning.** London : Longman.

Oxford, R. (1989). **Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training**. *System, 17,* 235–247.

Reinders, H. (2000). '**Do it yourself? A learners' perspective on learner autonomy and self-access language learning'**. Groningen: Unpublished MA thesis, available from http://www.innovationinteaching.org. [Accessed: 2012-04-13].

Reinders, H. & Lazaro (2007). **Current Approaches to Assessment in Self-Access Language Learning**. *TESL-EJ Vol., 11(3) : 1-13.*

Reinders, H. (2004). **Self-access centres: Teaching language and teaching learning.** *The Language Teachers (28)6.*

Reinders, H. & Lewis, M. (2005). **How Well Do Self-Access Call Materials Support Self-Directed Learning?** *The JALT CALL Journal, 2005, 1(2): 41-49.*

Rubin, J. (1975). **What the "good language learner" can teach us**. *TESOL Quarterly, 9:* 41–51.

Salvia, O. (2000). **Integrating a self-access system in a language learning institution: a model for implementation**. *Links & Letters 7: 95-109.*

Selinker, L. (1972). **Interlanguage**. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-231.

Thompson, G., & Atkinson, L. (2010). **Integrating self-access into the curriculum: Our experience**. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 1(1):* 47-58.

Thornton, K. (2010). **Supporting Self-Directed Learning: A Framework for Teachers.** *Language Education in Asia*, 2010, *1*(1): 158-170.

Valdivia, S., McLoughlin, D., & Mynard, J. (2011). **The importance of affective factors in self-access language learning courses.** *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 2*(2), 91-96.

Vettorel, P. (2012). *Teaching Technologies: Setting up Self-access Centres*. http://www.onestopenglish.com/support/methodology/teaching-technologies/teachingtechnologies-setting-up-self-access-centres/146524.article [Accessed: 2012-05-04].

Victoria, M. (2000). **Views on self-access language learning -- A talk with Leslie Dickinson, Lindsay Miller,Gill Sturtridge and Radha Ravindran**. *Links & Letters 7:* 165-180.

Victori, M. (2004). **Eliciting and Fostering Learners' Metacognitive Knowledge About Language Learning in Self-Directed Learning Programs : A Review of Data Collection Methods and Procedures**.

Wilson, J. (2012). **English Language Major Programmes at Suratthani Rajabhat University, Thailand - An external evaluation and a proposal for reform**. Unpublished internal document, p. 2-23.

Xiaoxia, Q. (2005). **Helping EFL Learners Become Autonomous Readers: Self- access through Metacognition**. *CELEA Journal 28(1):* 60-64.