Teacher education for teacher-learner autonomy

Richard C. Smith
Centre for English Language Teacher Education (CELTE)
University of Warwick, UK

Teacher-learner autonomy, by analogy with previous definitions of language learner autonomy, might be defined as the ability to develop appropriate skills, knowledge and attitudes for oneself as a teacher, in co-operation with others. By focusing on the teacher as learner in this manner I do not mean to diminish the importance of 'being free from constraints on one's teaching', i.e. teacher autonomy in the more commonly understood sense of the term. Rather, as I shall attempt to illustrate in this paper, considering teachers' autonomy as learners may allow us to view just one aspect of their lives more clearly, at the same time enabling us to adopt useful perspectives from recent discussion of language learner autonomy (for example, on the role of interdependence, issues of cross-cultural appropriateness, and the relative merits of 'deep-' and shallow-end' approaches). The enhancement of teacher-learner autonomy in relation to a variety of areas of pedagogical, attitudinal and content-related expertise can be argued to have an intrinsic value within teacher education programmes (aside from its value in preparing teachers to engage in pedagogy for autonomy with students) since teacher-learning is inevitably a largely self-directed process. Examples will be provided of activities and other arrangements designed explicitly to promote teacher-learner autonomy in some of these areas, within particular teacher education settings in Japan and the UK.

Introduction

Learner autonomy has recently acquired a prominence in discourse on second language education which discussion of *teacher* autonomy seems set to emulate. Evidence for this comes from the way 'teacher autonomy' is increasingly being focused on as a theme at conferences (see Appendix), among them Nottingham 1998 (cf. Sinclair, McGrath and Lamb 2000), Hong Kong 2000 (cf. Benson and Toogood, forthcoming), Shizuoka 2001 (cf. Barfield et al. forthcoming) and now Edinburgh 2001. Teacher autonomy was also identified as a major emerging concern at the 1999 AILA Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy Symposium in Tokyo (cf. Dam 2002), and 'Relationships between Learner and Teacher Autonomy' has been designated as the overall theme of the follow-up Symposium to be held in Singapore in December 2002.

However, attempts to clearly specify the meaning – or possible *meanings* – of the term 'teacher autonomy' have been absent from most discussions so far. Those contributions which have contained definitions have tended to advocate one *aspect* to the exclusion of others, from teacher autonomy as a generalised 'right to freedom from control' (Benson 2000), to teachers' capacity to engage in self-directed teaching (Little 1995, Tort-Moloney 1997), to teachers' autonomy as *learners* (Smith 2000, Savage 2000). Notable exceptions in this respect have been McGrath's (2000) attempt

to identify different *dimensions* of teacher autonomy (further discussed below) and a more recent discussion by teacher-researchers in Japan (Barfield et al., forthcoming) which ends up not with a definition so much as an agreed statement of possible *characteristics* of 'autonomous teachers'. Finally, Aoki's (2000) paper offers perhaps the most explicit 'catch-all' definition of teacher autonomy to date, suggesting that this involves 'the capacity, freedom, and/or responsibility to make choices concerning one's own teaching'.

The present paper does not aim to establish one overall definition. Instead it aims to clarify further the different possible dimensions of teacher autonomy, and is written in the belief that, as responsible teacher educators, we need to be clear about which dimensions it is appropriate to promote *before* discussing how to go about this. In other words, to adapt a phrase from Dickinson (this volume) there is a need to further 'question teacher autonomy', as a prerequisite to considering its possible promotion.

One starting-point might be to look at the issue of definition contextually, with regard to *reasons* for the recent emergence of the concept of teacher autonomy in the field of second language education. It seems clear that the motivation arises largely from recent discussions of issues connected with the promotion of *learner* autonomy. 'The teacher' seems to be making more and more of an appearance in such discussions, partly as a corrective to earlier misconceptions that 'learner autonomy' refers to a *situation*: that of learning without a teacher (at home, with a computer, in a self-access centre, etc.), and/or that it does away with the need for a teacher. Instead, it has been emphasised (e.g. by Little 1991) that learner autonomy needs to be seen as a *capacity* (for taking control of learning) which can be developed and deployed in a number of ways and situations, including in the classroom. Nowadays, more and more reports are appearing of classroom-based approaches to the development of learner autonomy, partly as a result of the recent incorporation of autonomy as a goal in national curricula in European countries and elsewhere (see Sinclair 2000). The rise to prominence of learner autonomy as a goal in classroom settings, in turn, has led to needs for retraining and an enhanced awareness both of the importance of the teacher in structuring or 'scaffolding' reflective learning and of the complex, shifting interrelationship between teacher and learner roles in a 'pedagogy for autonomy' (if students are to learn to 'take control', the teacher may need to learn to 'let go', even as she provides scaffolding and structure (cf. Page 1992, Voller 1997). At the same time, teacher resistance to retraining, and the reality of other *constraints* on pedagogy for autonomy in various contexts are becoming more salient as teacher educators take on board the need to promote learner autonomy more widely. How to prepare teachers for engagement in 'pedagogy for autonomy' is, then, a pressing practical concern. But what is the link between teacher *autonomy* and learner autonomy (why not talk simply of 'ability to promote learner autonomy' (cf. Aoki 2000)? And does teacher autonomy have any kind of intrinsic value, apart from this link? In this paper I hope to shed light on these important questions by clarifying further what might be meant by 'teacher autonomy'.

Different uses of the term 'teacher autonomy'

Since early on, users of the term 'teacher autonomy' have focused on different *dimension*s, as is clear from the following examples:

> (1) (Capacity for) self-directed professional *action*: [Teachers may be] 'autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching, exercising via continuous reflection and analysis . . . affective and cognitive control of the teaching process' (Little 1995)

> (2) (Capacity for) self-directed professional *development*: [The autonomous teacher is] 'one who is aware of why, when, where and how pedagogical skills can be *acquired* in the self-conscious awareness of teaching practice itself' (Tort-Moloney 1997, emphasis added).

> (3) *Freedom from control by others* over professional action or development: 'In the United States teacher autonomy has been declining for at least a decade. First, uniform staff development programmes based on research on effective teaching have become widespread. Second, classroom observations have become an integral part of imposed teacher evaluations' (Anderson 1987).

Undoubtedly (3) above reflects the most widely accepted sense of the term 'teacher autonomy' in the general educational literature (where use of the term in this sense, i.e. 'freedom from external control' is by no means new). Senses (1) and (2) above have been contributed by theorists with specific interests in learner autonomy. When the term 'teacher autonomy' is employed in the field of second language education, we need to be clear, in the first instance, which of the above dimensions is being referred to. Otherwise, there seems to be a danger of our *seeming* to be talking about the same thing when in fact we may be meaning different things. As we have seen, the term 'teacher autonomy' may be used in different ways, with different dimensions being emphasised, although this has not usually been acknowledged in previous discussions.

Dimensions of teacher autonomy

An awareness that 'teacher autonomy' can be used with different meanings has been shown by McGrath (2000). His article helped me personally to confront the fact that my own attempt to define what I called 'teacher-learner autonomy' in the same volume (Smith 2000) neglected senses (1) and (3) in the above examples, focusing exclusively on dimension (2) (this focus reflected my own experience and interests in the field of *learner* autonomy).

The dimensions identified by McGrath (ibid.) are as follows:

(1) Teacher autonomy as self-directed action or development;

(2) Teacher autonomy as freedom from control by others.

While useful, this bipolar distinction seems to require further unpacking, for the following reasons:

- professional development could be considered as one form of professional action, but action and development are not necessarily the same thing (we may act (e.g. teach) in a self-directed manner, but do not necessarily learn from the experience);

- allowance needs to be made for a distinction between *capacity for* and/or willingness to engage in self-direction and actual self-directed *behaviour* (in the learner autonomy literature, the term 'autonomy' is generally reserved for the former).

On the basis of these further distinctions, the following might serve to clarify the different dimensions of teacher autonomy as this term might be used in the domain of second language education, influenced as it is by notions connected with learner autonomy . On the left below are the possible dimensions of teacher autonomy which emerge from the above discussion; on the right are explanatory terms which I shall use for clarity's sake in the rest of this article to refer to these different dimensions; it should be remembered, however, that the term 'teacher autonomy' may be employed by different writers for one, some or several (as in Barfield et al., forthcoming) of these dimensions:

Dimensions of teacher autonomy

In relation to professional action:

A. Self-directed professional action   (= 'Self-directed teaching')

B. Capacity for self-directed professional action   (= 'Teacher autonomy (I)')

C. Freedom from control over professional action   (= 'Teacher autonomy (II)')

In relation to professional development:

D. Self-directed professional development   (= 'Self-directed teacher-learning')

E. Capacity for self-directed professional   (= 'Teacher-learner autonomy (I)')
development

F. Freedom from control over professional   (= 'Teacher-learner autonomy (II)')
development

In clarification of the above, the following further points can be made:

- If consistency is to be maintained for the meaning of 'autonomy' in the expressions 'learner autonomy' and 'teacher autonomy', the latter expression should probably be avoided when describing actual self-directed behaviour (i.e. A. and D. above);

- B. and E. above might be considered to involve a 'technical' / 'psychological' interpretation of autonomy (Benson 1997), while C. and F. refer to its 'political' dimension (ibid.);

- In the 'technical' / 'psychological' sphere, some writers on learner autonomy (e.g. Little 1991) emphasise the learner's 'capacity' while others (e.g. Dickinson 1992) emphasise also her 'willingness' to engage in self-directed behaviour. These different emphases might be seen as sub-dimensions within B. and E;

- In the 'political' sphere, Benson (2000) has argued that autonomy can be seen as a 'right' to freedom from control (or an ability to exercise this right) as well as actual freedom from control. These different emphases might be seen as sub-dimensions within C. and F.

- 'Professional development' ('teacher-learning') is a sub-set of 'professional action'. Thus, the term 'teacher-learner autonomy' (Smith 2000) can be retained for use when the focus is primarily on professional development / teacher-learning (and this may enable direct insights to be drawn from work on learner autonomy, as will be shown in section 4 below), but this is just one domain within the broader area of teacher autonomy.

Clarifying links between teacher autonomy and (pedagogy for) learner autonomy

Having defined terms in the above manner, we may now be in a better position to clarify possible links between teacher autonomy and (the promotion of) learner autonomy. The conviction that such a relationship exists seems to have motivated current use of the term 'teacher autonomy' in the second language education field (Aoki 2000), but different dimensions of teacher autonomy have been emphasised by different authors. According to previous writers, in order to promote learner autonomy teachers may need to have:

(1) *A capacity for self-directed teaching* ('Teacher autonomy (I)' above):

> 'In determining the initiatives they take in their classrooms, teachers must be able to apply to their teaching . . . reflective and self-managing processes' (Little 2000; cf. also Aoki 2000, McGrath 2000, Thavenius 1999, Vieira, e.g. 1999, 2000).

(2) *Freedom from control over their teaching* ('Teacher autonomy (II)'):

> 'In practice, . . . language teachers often work in situations where their capacity to grant learners greater freedom in learning is severely constrained' (Benson 2000: 115); 'Learner autonomy develops within the space that the teacher is able to open up for it in their interpretation of the broader constraints on the learners' freedom of action in learning' (ibid.: 116; cf. also Breen and Mann 1997, Lamb 2000).

(3) *A capacity for self-directed teacher-learning* (Teacher-learner autonomy (I)'):

> 'It is unreasonable to expect teachers to foster the growth of autonomy in their learners if they themselves do not know what it is to be an autonomous learner' (Little 2000; cf. also Savage 2000, Smith 2000).

It now becomes possible to see how teacher education programmes aiming at the promotion of learner autonomy can and may need to focus on various *dimensions* of teacher autonomy. Before we consider this in more detail, however, there is another connection between (the development of) teacher autonomy and (the development of) learner autonomy which has been alluded to in previous work, and which can in some ways be seen as the strongest link between the two. This involves consideration of how, in practice, teacher autonomy – in the sense of potential for self-directed teacher-learning – can develop *in symbiosis with* engagement in a pedagogy for

autonomy. An awareness of this kind of developmental link is apparent in statements from practitioner perspectives such as the following:

> Learner autonomy is also to be seen as the right of teachers to develop as human beings. Teachers have always said that they learn from their pupils. It is time to be more aware of that. It is personal development all the time in negotiation and in combination with learners. (Leni Dam, quoted in Page 1992: 66)

> [Via engagement in a pedagogy for autonomy] Teaching becomes a sort of research and research becomes a way of teaching. Teachers, as learners, become involved in a process of autonomization, thus feeling more *empowered to take charge of their own course of action*. (Vieira 1997: 65; emphasis in original)

One explanation of the power of this link could be as follows:

> In [the] process of attempting to understand and advise students, teachers are likely to be engaged in various investigative activities, asking questions which are themselves useful in raising students' awareness of learning. And in order to engage students in autonomous and effective reflection on their own learning, teachers need to constantly reflect on their own role in the classroom, monitoring the extent to which they constrain or scaffold students' thinking and behaviour . . .
> There is a sense, then, in which teachers and students can *learn together* and together become more empowered in the course of pedagogy for autonomy combined with reflective teaching. (Smith 2001: 43-4)

Preparing teachers to promote learner autonomy

Several implications for preparing teachers to promote learner autonomy may be derived from the above discussion:

Firstly, convincing teachers of the value of learner autonomy in the abstract seems to be insufficient. Just as, if not more importantly, it is necessary to focus on the development of teachers' own autonomy, ideally in all of the dimensions we have identified (although previous writers tend to focus on only one or two dimensions). Actual *engagement in* and *reflection on* pedagogy for autonomy appear to be particularly powerful means for developing teacher(-learner) autonomy, in particular, perhaps, when (as in the work of Flávia Vieira and her colleagues in Portugal) this type of pedagogy is explicitly linked to an action research orientation and when there is an effective support network of teachers similarly engaged. How to prepare teachers for taking the first steps towards such an engagement is another matter, however, and there are likely to be various possible approaches. In many contexts it might be most appropriate for teacher educators to focus directly on developing a willingness and *capacity* for self-directed teaching and teacher-learning, linked to induction into a pedagogy for learner autonomy, while acknowledging and as far as possible preparing teachers to address the constraints which might operate in practice on their *actual* freedom in these areas (for further considerations along these lines, see section 4 below).
What teacher educators may need to adopt then is a 'pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy' in order to prepare teachers appropriately for their own engagement in a pedagogy for autonomy with students. This gives rise to a number of questions regarding the teacher educator's own ability to engage in such an approach. Presuming that teacher educators have the requisite capacities for self-directed teaching and teacher-learning themselves, what of their freedom from control over

these? This issue was raised in discussion of some papers at the Edinburgh conference, with UK-based teacher educators commenting on the way externally imposed quality assurance regimes may paradoxically hinder engagement in pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy due to the way they impose needs for transparency, accountability and definition in advance of learning outcomes (the example from the U.S. context cited in section 1. above is relevant in this respect). Can we engage teacher trainees in self-assessment (as recommended by Dickinson, this volume), for example? Do we have an intrinsic motivation to continually learn from and develop our teacher education practices in the way we recommend to students or are we ourselves the victims of various obligations to 'jump through hoops' (fulfil a requisite number of peer observations, produce a teaching portfolio designed to satisfy external criteria for promotion, and so on)? Evidently, we need to be critical of ourselves and our own situations if we are to engage in credible pedagogies for teacher(-learner) autonomy (cf. Vieira and Marques, forthcoming). This links back to comments above on the way engagement in and reflection on pedagogy for learner autonomy can be a powerful means for the development of teachers' own autonomy. The same should equally be true for teacher educators engaged in a pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy. Thus, Moreira et al. (1999: 18) have discovered that their 'own professional empowerment makes greater sense when it builds on the empowerment of student teachers, just as theirs gains meaning from a focus on pupils' empowerment'. However, in order to gain and impart these benefits we may need to acknowledge and as far as possible address constraints on our own 'teacher educator autonomy'.

Promoting teacher autonomy: broader considerations

On the need for making a link between teacher and learner autonomy as goals, Flävia Vieira (quoted in Barfield et al. 2001) is quite clear: 'What's the use of having a concept of . . . teacher autonomy which can accommodate transmissive, authoritarian or even oppressive purposes?' (cf. also Aoki 2000). There seems to be much justice in this point of view, indeed an absolute degree of teacher autonomy (II) (freedom from control over professional action) is probably undesirable for precisely this reason, apart from being unlikely in all but the most 'ideal' circumstances. In other words, constraints on independent action are necessary to prevent abuse, and one legitimate constraint could involve the argument that self-directed 'professional' action needs to benefit students' learning (a more positive way of putting this, with less emphasis on constraints, might be that teacher autonomy necessarily involves *inter*dependence, or 'relatedness', not just individualism; indeed, this has been stressed in recent discussions of the concept of learner autonomy (e.g. Benson 1995, Aoki and Smith 1996, Littlewood 1999; see also the 'Bergen definition' of learner autonomy which includes the notion of readiness to act 'independently *and in co-operation with others, as a socially responsible person*' (cited in Dam 1995; emphasis added).

Qualifications of this nature may allow us to see how teacher autonomy *can* be seen as a legitimate goal of teacher education programmes, even when it is not tied explicitly to the promotion of pedagogy for learner autonomy. This may be convenient for two reasons: firstly, a focus within teacher education on promoting pedagogy for autonomy (such as that assumed in section 3 above) might be seen as overly restrictive in some (perhaps, many) contexts, given the large number of other

requirements for developing subject knowledge and general pedagogic skills; secondly, the promotion of particular notions of and/or approaches towards learner autonomy can be seen as an inappropriate imposition in non-western settings (although counter-arguments have been made to this suggestion; cf. Aoki and Smith 1999, Smith 1997). Despite my own belief in the value of promoting learner autonomy generally, these two reasons for *not* focusing my attention exclusively on doing so have been salient in my own teacher education practice both previously in Japan and currently in the UK (where I teach on Diploma and MA courses for students from a wide variety of world-wide contexts, with attendant dangers of 'ethnocentrism' (cf. Liu 1998)).

The objections that have been made in the past with regard to inappropriate imposition of (certain approaches to) learner autonomy in non-western contexts might also be made in relation to the promotion of teacher autonomy in some settings, in particular, perhaps, if this is seen to involve a 'political' advocacy of freedom from control over professional action and/or development (teacher autonomy (II) and teacher-learner autonomy (II) above). However, the other dimensions identified above, namely capacity for self-directed professional action and/or development (i.e. teacher autonomy (I) and teacher-learner autonomy (I) above) *are*, it can be argued, appropriate and useful goals for teacher education in any context, whether or not they are explicitly linked to the promotion of a pedagogy for autonomy.

The promotion of these capacities is highly relevant, I would argue, because they are fully consistent with, indeed are a *sine qua non* of teachers' own development of appropriate methodology in and for their own classrooms, in other words they lie at the heart of what it means to teach 'appropriately', in any context. After all, if teachers do not know how to / are not willing to engage in self-directed teaching and teacher-learning for their own benefit and that of their students, they are, of necessity, the 'victims' of received ideas. As Widdowson (1990: 25) has put it: '[The] view of the dependent teacher has been challenged over recent years. It has been argued that . . . effective pedagogy is necessarily a reflective and research-oriented activity, that the role of practitioner does not preclude that of theorist, and that the professional status of teachers as mediators depends on the *justification of an appropriate expertise of their own*' (emphasis added).

In this connection, the particular value of what I have been calling 'teacher-learner autonomy (I)' may deserve a special emphasis. The importance of reflective teaching (reflection on and learning from the experience of teaching) has been recognised for some time now, and corresponds well with an overall focus within teacher education on developing a 'capacity for self-directed professional action' (our 'teacher autonomy (I)'). What has not been discussed so much is the importance of reflective teacher-learning, in other words reflection by teachers on when, where, how and from what sources they (should) learn, including but not confined to any learning they can achieve via teaching (see below). In order for teachers to gain better abilities and a greater willingness to learn for themselves in developing 'an appropriate expertise of their own', this kind of reflection seems to be essential.

In previous work (Smith 2000) I have already argued for the intrinsic relevance of teacher-learner autonomy (I) (relating this argument to needs for career-long development) and have attempted to show how insights from the literature on learner autonomy can inform a new focus within teacher education on the development of this

capacity. I have also indicated how teacher-learner autonomy can be practically promoted in relation to teachers' life-long language learning (ibid.) and via appropriately designed in-service workshops and conferences (Barfield and Smith 1999). In my current teacher education work I have made it my practice to engage students in critical reflection on the goals, contents and processes of their learning with regard to appropriateness or lack of appropriateness in their own contexts. I am now attempting to enhance pre-service students' abilities to learn from their future teaching (via a 'simulated action research' strategy reported in Smith, Alagöz, Brown and Îçmez, forthcoming), with a view to preparing them to be career-long learners in this area. My explicit goal in this current work is teacher-learner autonomy (I), which I have been defining for practical purposes (in course descriptions, for example) as the 'ability to develop appropriate skills, knowledge and attitudes for oneself as a teacher, in cooperation with others'.

What I believe would *not* be appropriate in my current practice would be to directly advocate teacher autonomy (II) or teacher-learner autonomy (II). To do so would be to attempt to involve myself in local politics in teachers' own (future) teaching contexts world-wide – this would be unrealistic as well as presumptuous However, as I have suggested above, this is not to deny that teacher educators need to develop an awareness among teachers of possible constraints on their (future) freedom of professional action / development, and to enhance their capacities to deal with such constraints. I am currently seeking ways to do so, and believe that an appropriate strategy is to base improvements on feedback from former students while continuing to investigate and attempt to address the constraints on my own practice as a teacher educator engaged in pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy (cf. Smith and Barfield 2001).

Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to clarify different dimensions of 'teacher autonomy', as this term might be used in emerging discussions in the field of second language education, influenced as these are likely to be by the current prominence of 'learner autonomy'. I have also attempted to illustrate the usefulness of this (kind of) clarification by reviewing statements by previous writers in relation to the role teacher autonomy may be expected to play as a necessary prerequisite to, accompaniment for or consequence of the promotion of pedagogy for learner autonomy.

Clarifying terms in this manner also enabled the argument to be made above that while certain dimensions of teacher autonomy may be appropriate as general goals of teacher education (whether or not this is tied to the promotion of pedagogy for autonomy), the promotion of other (more 'political') dimensions may not be, depending on circumstances. The idea that teacher education should aim at developing 'teacher autonomy (I)' is not at heart a new proposition (advocates of 'reflective teaching', 'teacher development', 'action research', 'teacher-research' and so on would appear to share this goal implicitly). What might be a relatively new idea for teacher educators (due to the relatively recent rise to prominence of the concept of learner autonomy) is the emphasis I have been placing on the development of 'teacher-learner autonomy (I)'. By focusing on the teacher as learner in this manner I do not mean to diminish the importance of the broader capacities involved in 'teacher

autonomy (I)', nor of 'being free from constraints' ('teacher autonomy (II)'), that is, autonomy as understood in wider educational parlance. Rather, as I have indicated, considering teachers' autonomy as *learners* may allow us to focus on one aspect of their lives – namely their professional development – more explicitly, at the same time enabling us to adopt useful perspectives from recent discussions of language learner autonomy. In this connection, the importance of interdependence and issues of cross-cultural appropriateness have been alluded to in this paper, while more could be said about the relative merits of different approaches to the development of teacher(-learner) autonomy on the basis of approaches adopted in the field of learner autonomy (see Benson 2001 for a useful overview).

I return now to the starting-point of this paper, the recent increase in use of the phrase 'teacher autonomy', following on from a previous rise to prominence of learner autonomy. The paradoxical danger of a possible *imposition* of 'fashionable' concepts of learner, and now teacher autonomy on teacher trainees has been one theme of this paper. If teachers' autonomy as learners is to be genuinely respected, the question should be asked by opinion-leaders *at the outset*: what kind of teacher autonomy are we advocating, and is its promotion appropriate as a goal in all contexts? Some dimensions may be, others not, hence the attempt which has been made to clarify terms in this paper.

Finally, the above discussion has shown that there may be a need to investigate constraints on our own (teacher educator) autonomy if we are to engage successfully in a pedagogy for teacher(-learner) autonomy. This implies that we need to consciously develop our own capacities for self-directed (learning of) 'teacher-educating', and to investigate and attempt to address the political constraints on our own work.

References

Anderson, L.W. (1987) The decline of teacher autonomy: tears or cheers? *International Review of Education* 33. 357-73.

Aoki, N. (2000) Aspects of teacher autonomy: Capacity, freedom and responsibility. Paper presented at 2000 Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Centre Conference.

Aoki, N. and R.C. Smith (1999) Autonomy in cultural context: The case of Japan. In S. Cotterall and D. Crabbe (eds.) *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 19-28.

Barfield, A. and R.C. Smith (1999) Teacher-learner autonomy: The role of conference and workshop design. In *Proceedings of teachers develop teachers research (TDTR) 4* (CD-ROM). Whitstable, Kent: IATEFL.

Barfield, A., T. Ashwell, M. Carroll, K. Collins, N. Cowie, M. Critchley, E. Head, M. Nix, A. Obermeier and M. C. Robertson (forthcoming). Exploring and defining teacher autonomy: A collaborative discussion. In *On developing autonomy, Proceedings of the 2001 CUE Conference, Shizuoka, Japan.* Tokyo: JALT.

Benson, P. (1995) Self-access and collaborative learning. *Independence* 12. Reprinted in A.C. McClean (ed.) *SIG Selections 1997: Special Interests in ELT*. Whitstable, Kent: IATEFL. 55-59.

Benson, P. (1997) The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson and P. Voller (eds.) *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman. 18-34

Benson, P. (2000) Autonomy as a learners' and teachers' right. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman. 111-117.

Benson, P. (2001) *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.

Benson, P. and S. Toogood (eds.) (forthcoming) *Learner autonomy 7: Challenges to research and practice*. Dublin Authentik.

Breen, M. and S. Mann (1997) Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson and P. Voller (eds.) *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman. 132-149.

Dam, L. (1995) *Learner autonomy 3: From theory to practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Dam, L. (ed.) (2002) *AILA Review* 15.(Special issue containing papers from Symposium of the Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy, AILA 1999, Waseda University, Tokyo, August 1999).

Dickinson, L. (1992*) Learner autonomy 2: Learner training for language learning*. Dublin: Authentik.

Lamb, T. (2000) Finding a voice: Learner autonomy and teacher education in an urban context. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman. 118-127.

Little, D. (1991) *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D (1995) Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System* 23/2. 175-182.

Little, D. (2000) We're all in it together: Exploring the interdependence of teacher and learner autonomy. Paper presented at Autonomy 2000, University of Helsinki Language Centre, 7-9 September 2000. *In Newsletter of the IATEFL PL Autonomous Learning SIG* 4. Available online: http://www.iatefl.org.pl/sig/al/al1.html

Littlewood, W. (1999) Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguistics* 20/1. 71-94.

Liu, D. (1998) Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal* 52/1. 3-10.

McGrath, I. (2000) Teacher autonomy. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman. 100-110

Moreira, M.A., F. Vieira and I. Marques (1999) Pre-service teacher development through action research. *The Language Teacher* 23/12. 15-18, 36. Available online via: http://www.jalt.org

Page, B. (ed.) (1992) *Letting go, taking hold: A guide to independent language learning by teachers for teachers*. London: CILT.

Savage, W. (2000) A dimension of teacher (and learner) autonomy. Paper presented at 2000 Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Centre Conference.

Sinclair, B. (2000) Learner autonomy: The next phase? In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman. 4-14

Sinclair, B., I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) (2000) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman.

Smith, R.C. (1997) From Asian views of autonomy to revised views of Asia: Beyond Autonomy 2000. *Learning Learning* 4/1. 16-19 (also in *LALL* (newsletter of the AILA Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy in Language Learning) 3, 6-9. Available online: http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/LALLnews/news1997.html

Smith, R.C. (2000) Starting with ourselves: Teacher-learner autonomy in language learning. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions*. London: Longman. 89-99.

Smith, R.C. (2001) Learner and teacher development: Connections and constraints. *The Language Teacher* 25/6. 43-4.

Smith, R.C., with A. Barfield (2001) Interconnections: Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy (in 2 parts). *Learning Learning* 7 & 8/1. 5-6. Available online: http://www.miyazaki-mu.ac.jp/~hnicoll/learnerdev/

Smith, R.C., S. Alagöz, P. Brown and S. Îçmez (forthcoming) *Faute de mieux*? Simulated action research, from participant perspectives. In *Proceedings of Teachers Develop Teachers Research (TDTR) 5* (CD-ROM). Whitstable, Kent: IATEFL.

Thavenius, C. (1999) Teacher autonomy for learner autonomy. In S. Cotterall and D. Crabbe (eds.) *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change*. Frankfurt am Main. 163-166.

Tort-Moloney, D. (1997) *Teacher autonomy: A Vygotskian theoretical framework*. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 48. Dublin: Trinity College, CLCS.

Vieira, F (1997) Teacher development for learner autonomy: Ideas from an in-service teacher training project. *English Language Teaching News* (The British Council and Teachers of English in Austria) 33. 61-7.

Vieira, F (1999) Pedagogy for autonomy: Teacher development and pedagogical experimentation – an in-service teacher training project. In S. Cotterall and D. Crabbe (eds.) *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the field and effecting change*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 153-162.

Vieira, F. (2000) Teacher development towards a pedagogy for autonomy in the foreign language classroom. In R. Ribé (ed.) *Developing learner autonomy in foreign language learning*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona. 221-236.

Vieira, F. and I. Marques (forthcoming) Supervising reflective teacher development practices. *English Language Teacher Education and Development* (CELS, University of Birmingham and CELTE, University of Warwick, UK) 6.

Voller, P. (1997) Does the teacher have a role in autonomous language learning? In P. Benson and P. Voller (eds.) *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman. 98-113.

Widdowson, H.G. (1993) Innovation in teacher development. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13. 260-75.

Richard C. Smith is a lecturer in the Centre for English Language Teacher Education (CELTE), University of Warwick. Previously, he spent a total of thirteen years in Japan.

Appendix: Conferences and Symposia Mentioned in the Paper

Nottingham 1998: Colloquium on 'Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions', at the Centre for Research into Foreign and Second Language Pedagogy, University of Nottingham, April 1998.

Tokyo 1999: Symposium of the Scientific Commission on Learner Autonomy, AILA 1999, Waseda University, Tokyo, August 1999.

Hong Kong 2000: Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Centre Conference, Hong Kong, June 2000.

Shizuoka 2001: 'Developing Autonomy': One-day conference sponsored jointly by JALT College and University Educators, Learner Development and Teacher Education SIGs, and Shizuoka Chapter, Shizuoka, May 2001.

Edinburgh 2001: 'Autonomy in Language Teacher Education. The 9th IALS Symposium for Language Teacher Educators, IALS, University of Edinburgh, November 2001.

Singapore, forthcoming (2002): Symposium of the Scientific Commission On Learner Autonomy, 'Relationships between learner and teacher autonomy', AILA 2002, Singapore, December 2002.