

# EXPLORING STUDENTS' CONTROL OVER LEARNING MANAGEMENT: A TECHNICAL PERSPECTIVE OF AUTONOMY IN LANGUAGE LEARNING

Priyatno Ardi

Universitas Siswa Bangsa Internasional, Jakarta

## Abstract

*Autonomy in language learning suggests that students control their own learning (Benson, 2001). Students' control over their own learning consists of three aspects, namely controls over learning management, cognitive process and learning content. This paper aims at exploring students' control over learning management while working on project-based English language learning, namely the collaborative audio-journal project. It is argued that project-based language learning provides a principled and practicable route toward autonomy (Thomas, 1991, cited in Benson, 2001: 21). In this regards, students themselves plan, monitor, solve problems, and evaluate the project accomplishment without much intervention from the teacher.*

*A qualitative method was employed in this study. Two instruments were used to obtain the data, namely reflection sheet and interview. The results obtained from the study revealed that students employed four major controls over learning management, including planning, problem solving, monitoring, and evaluating. The planning included time and quality, creativity, and strategy. The students also encountered the constraints, such as time management, language proficiency, and laziness, which entailed problem solving strategies. The monitoring included rereading, re-listening, and comparing. Lastly, the students conducted self-evaluation on the process and the product.*

**Key words:** *learner autonomy, project-based language learning, and control over learning management.*

## INTRODUCTION

Autonomy in language learning is a relatively new pedagogy that must be precisely considered in practical ways. The notion which shares a common principle with other concepts which are derived from different theoretical framework, viz. active learning, authentic learning, self-regulated learning, and independent learning, emphasizes the greater active involvement of learners in learning (Niemi, 2002).

Holec (1981: 3) defines autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning." Putting the emphasis on the importance of learning management, Benson (2001: 47) defines autonomy as "the capacity to control one's own learning". In his viewpoint, the idea of controlling over learning is more observable than that of taking charge. Hence, to hold learning autonomy as an observable field, the term "take charge" is changed into "control". Moreover, he elaborates the levels of control the students employ consisting of three interdependent aspects, namely control over learning management, control over cognitive processes, and control over learning content.

The issue of autonomy is indeed worth considering in teaching English as foreign language in Indonesia. Since English is a global language and a lot of knowledge is conveyed through English, possessing a working knowledge of English becomes a requirement for Indonesians to take part in international communication, to improve "global literacy" (Hart, 2002: 35), and to share values with other countries. Notwithstanding, it seems difficult to acquire the condition for the growth of English knowledge in Indonesia, considering the fact that English is regarded as no more than a compulsory subject taught in school and unfortunately most of the students rely much on the teacher in learning English. Most of the students hardly possess self-initiatives to learn English on their own. As to East culture, the teacher is viewed as the decision maker of learning process (cf. Littlewood, 1999).

Such a condition indeed signifies a challenging task for teachers to provide autonomous learning settings in which students' greater control over their learning is exercised and thus students are more independent from the teacher in learning English. Likewise, the viewpoint that learning occurs only in class-

room is altered into the notion that learning takes place wherever and whenever.

Accordingly, providing innovations in teaching happens to be a new challenge for teachers to enhance autonomy in language learning. One of the efforts, called collaborative audio-journal project, was conducted by an instructor at a private university, which was treated as a biweekly home assignment. Incorporating portable MP3 or MP4 players, the project facilitates the students to accomplish the given tasks outside the classroom.

This paper aims to explore students' control over learning management during the accomplishment of collaborative audio-journal project, namely planning, monitoring, problem solving and evaluating.

## METHODOLOGY

This project was conducted outside the classroom, in which the students worked in a group of 4 or 5 during the semester. Six audio-journals were provided by the lecturer and each student should respond to each journal, both in written and audio forms. Thus, in one semester, each student produced six series of audio-journal response. During the accomplishment, the group members exchanged their journals and helped revise the journals. Six students enrolled in the project were chosen as the participants of this study.

Two instruments were developed to elicit data, namely structured reflection and interview guide. The reflection consisted of the three principles, of which the characteristics were retrospective, introspective, and prospective, which were embedded in five guiding questions. The retrospective questions were likely to reveal the activities the students carried out. To raise a deep awareness of the activities, the introspective questions followed the retrospective ones, inquiring the feelings, opinions, judgments on their project accomplishment. Future orientation was considered through the prospective ones, revealing students' plans. Each student was required to write down reflection on each journal-response accomplishment based on the reflection guide.

To conduct the systematic interview within the limited time and to serve the consistent basic lines of inquiry delivered to

each participant (Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003), the interview guide was developed to make the stream of questions "fluid rather than rigid" (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, cited in Yin, 2003: 89). The questions in the interview guide were open-ended so that the researcher might ask the participants about "the facts of a matter as well as their opinions about events" (Yin, 2003: 90). Probing questions were also employed, enabling the researcher to pursue the deeper information based on the previous ones.

The raw data of each instrument were then read repeatedly and were categorized into similar cluster to find the thematic organization (Holliday, 2002), known also as data coding (Yin, 2003). Data triangulation was conducted so as to ascertain "the consistency of findings" (Patton, 2002: 556). To do so, the data of two instruments were cross-checked so that the findings were trustworthy.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Planning*

Based on the obtained data, there were three kinds of planning, namely time and quality, creativity, and strategy.

First, the students planned their time to successfully accomplish the project itself and other assignments. Many students held various responsibilities, such as joining student organization and part-time job. Planning the time suggested that the students attempted to arrange and prioritize the activities and assignments in such a way that all of them were successfully done. In regard to time management, four participants, including Student A, B, E, and F, articulated the time planning in their reflection sheet.

Student E and F articulated their awareness that it was urgent for them to manage their time. They wrote:

*I'll try to do anything as fast as I can. So, I can manage the best time for me (Student E, Reflection III).*

*The important thing that I should do to make it better is time management. So, to make my journal better, I will try to manage my time (Student F, Reflection II).*

Moreover, Student F considered the correlation between the time management and the quality of journal response. In this case, a

good time management may bring about a qualified journal response. Likewise, intending to produce better journal responses, Student B and Student D also set up their time so as to accomplish the project in time. Their intention was to finish the project some days before the submission day. Consequently, finishing the project in time, they were able to revise it in such a way that the results were better. Student B admitted "In the following project, I will try to prepare my work days before the submitting day [sic] so I can perform better."

Student A also intended to give the best quality for his project by managing his time and he proposed the time more specifically. More interestingly, in the interview, Student A also admitted that his group had established a group agenda which was functioned to schedule the activities during the project accomplishment. As a consequence, during the semester, the activities of accomplishing the project were patterned so that each group member knew the time and step which they should take in two-week time. He said, "On Friday, I listened to the journal. I wrote and organized the ideas on Monday. It was finished on Tuesday."

Second, the planning was creativity. Being creative, some students attempted to produce the journal responses which were more innovative than those of others. Benson (2001) contends that creativity becomes one of the natures of autonomous learners. Furthermore, the innovative journal responses, to a certain extent, conveyed students' quality. Two participants, Student A and B, articulated their planning in terms of creativity. They wrote:

*I'll try to mix my journal with a song or instrumental music to make it more entertained* (Student A, Reflection, III).

*In the last project, I hope I can do better by trying to use various vocabularies* (Student B, Reflection IV).

Student A's aim of including music as the back-sound of his fourth recorded journal response was to make the journal sound alive instead of flat. His being creative, hence, suggested that he cared about the audience who would listen to his recorded journal. In this sense, his creativity was considered to be technical. Meanwhile, Student B proposed the creativity in terms of content. She wanted to

use various vocabularies so as to make her journal response interesting to read and to listen to. It was her awareness that the audience who read or listened to her journal response would be bored if the vocabularies were repeatedly used. In this respect, she attained organization planning, viz. generating a plan for language function to be used in handling a task (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990, cited in Benson, 2001).

Third, the students planned the possible learning strategy used to accomplish the following tasks. It was in line with the second objective of planning proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), cited in Benson (2001). They assert that planning fosters the students to propose strategies for handling the upcoming tasks. Proposing the strategies constituted that the students anticipated the constraints and also their weaknesses which might be encountered in the following tasks.

Experiencing the difficulty of obtaining the ideas to respond to the fourth journal, Student F aimed to recall all of her previous experiences in order to respond to the fifth journal. She believed that her past experiences would inspire her so that it was easy for her to write the journal response. Nevertheless, the fact that she easily forgot the ideas which came to her mind became one of her problems. Looking forward to such a weakness, she planned to mine the ideas and take notes as she came up with the ideas. In her reflection, she wrote:

*I will imagine my experience first and then I will write it directly because if I don't write it directly, I will forget everything in my mind* (Student F, Reflection IV).

Student D, who found many grammatical and pronunciation mistakes in her second journal response, proposed to self-check her grammar and pronunciation before submitting the third journal response to the teacher. Self-checking was considered to be an urge for her to produce better journal responses. In her second reflection, she mentioned:

*I will prepare my journal more seriously. Then, I will correct my grammar and pronunciation, and record my voice.*

Different from Student D who had in mind to self-check her journal response, two participants, namely Student E and Student B,

insisted that others' help be very important for they would give significant feedback on their journal responses. They planned to ask more capable persons to help them check their grammar and pronunciation. Accordingly, the obtained feedback was useful to improve their grammar and pronunciation. They wrote:

*I won't something extreme, I just want to try step by step. I will always ask to [sic] anybody who knows more than me, like my lecturer especially (Student E, Reflection II).*

*In the following project, I will prepare my journal better, like prepare it days before or consult it with senior or friends, so I can reduce the grammatical and pronunciation mistakes (Student B, Reflection II).*

### **Problem Solving**

During the accomplishment of the collaborative audio-journal project, the students inevitably found some difficulties. The encountered difficulties were by no means considered to be an integral part of students' experiences for they also entailed problem solving strategies. In this manner, an autonomous learner was a problem solver (Benson, 2001). He might solve the problems by himself or through others' help. Based on the obtained data, there were three major constraints the students encountered in the project accomplishment.

First, the constraint appeared in the project accomplishment was time management. Living busy life, as either the students of university, part-timer, or organization activists, the students were committed to carrying out so many jobs or other assignments. It did suggest that they had to spend much time and energy to do so. Yet, it was noteworthy that their time and energy were so limited that they had to prioritize them in an attempt to carry out those responsibilities. The self-responsibility played a crucial role in this case. Having a sense of responsibility to all assignments, the students had to manage their time. A participant, Student A, was aware that time management became one of his problems when he accomplished the second journal. In his second reflection, he admitted:

*I hadn't used use [sic] of time well. I wasted too much time for other things (Student A, Reflection II).*

However, learning from the experience of accomplishing the second journal response, Student A tried to manage his time in such a way that he managed to accomplish all of his responsibilities successfully afterward. Finally, in the interview, he admitted that he learned how to manage his time in the project accomplishment.

A participant, Student D, who worked as a part-timer in a café admitted that when she felt tired, it was hard to accomplish the project. In her fourth reflection, she noted:

*I'm very busy, so I always feel tired. Finally, I don't have a mood to do my fourth journal (Student D, Reflection IV).*

It seemed hard for her to build motivation to complete the project due to her being tired. Notwithstanding, it did not happen because she believed that she had to be professional. It meant that she was not able to neglect the project although she worked as a part timer. Thereby, her self-belief supported her very much in accomplishing the project as best as she could afford to. In the interview, she confessed that she had to accomplish the task professionally, even though she felt tired.

Another participant, Student F, who joined a student choir organization, articulated that it was difficult for her to manage her time in order that she could accomplish her duties, including the collaborative audio-journal project. Since there would be a choir concert, she had to join the singing practice four times a week. She admitted in the interview:

*I had so many activities. I had to practice singing four times in a week. When I had no time, I accomplished the journal at midnight.*

It was clear that the activities fostered her to set a priority. She felt responsible to both the choir organization and her study. As a result, she managed her time in such a way that she could accomplish both of her tasks. Even, she spent her effort at midnight to complete the audio-journal response.

On top of it all, setting the priority of the activities really appeared to be the most effective way to overcome the time constraint. Not prioritizing the activities, the students

were not able to decide what to accomplish first. Instead, they merely felt confused of what to do even though there were so many tasks at hands. As a consequence, the project was not accomplished maximally and optimally.

Second, the students experienced the difficulty in terms of language proficiency. Most of the participants admitted that they found the difficulties in terms of diction, grammar, organization, and pronunciation. They had limited knowledge about them. In spite of facing such constraints, the students were encouraged to make use of the available resources. In this regard, the students' autonomy was exercised because the students actively sought for the information needed in the available resources. One of the participants, Student F, revealed that she asked her friends and read the books to overcome her limited knowledge. She admitted:

*I asked some friends to help me correct my grammar, vocabularies, and my pronunciation. Besides, I used grammar book and dictionary to help me correct my pronunciation (Student F, Reflection III).*

Similar to Student F, Student C stated that he had difficulties in pronunciation and grammar. Nonetheless, he kept trying to overcome it by learning much more. In the fifth reflection, he explained:

*The difficulties are still about my structure and my pronunciation in making the journal. I practice my speaking and learn about structure more (Student C, Reflection V).*

Sometimes, the students also found confusion when they had to respond to the audio-journals that they listened to. A participant, Student A, articulated his being stuck because he did not know what to write. In his reflection, he wrote:

*I was very confused. I didn't have any idea to respond and to write my journal. I got an idea to write on Monday night and I wrote it on Tuesday morning. I got the idea when my friend lent me a song book and there was an interesting song which title [sic] is "Children Cry" (Student A, Reflection III).*

It was very interesting that a song inspired him to respond to the teacher made audio journal. That he had kept thinking of what he intended to write before he found the idea from the song was also articulated in his reflection. In this regard, he did not want to let his being stuck remain in his mind. Instead, he attempted to overcome it. Fortunately, he finally activated his creative thinking by including the message of the song in his journal response.

Third, the problems seemed to stem from laziness. A participant, Student E, conveyed that he felt lazy and bored when he completed the first and second project. It seemed that laziness and boredom appeared to be his main problem in learning English. Unfortunately, he was not able to overcome such psychological constraints yet. In his reflection, he wrote:

*Firstly, if I got anything in English language, I always felt so lazy and bored (Student E, Reflection II).*

It was undeniable that laziness became the problem which was internally caused. Each student experienced such a feeling. However, some students successfully overcame it. Certainly, they possessed the high degree of motivation and willingness to overcome it. In this regard, motivation and willingness became the central part of autonomy (Littlewood, 1996). Such internal forces were important to maintain because without possessing motivation and willingness, the students hardly possessed self-driven learning.

### **Monitoring**

The students use the monitoring strategy to check how they are doing in learning. Based on the data obtained, there were three ways used by the students to monitor their project accomplishment, namely rereading, re-listening, and comparing.

First, the students reread their written journal response to monitor the project. Rereading the written journal responses, the students were able to check whether their writing was well-organized. Finding the unorganized ideas of their writing, the students were fostered to restructure the organization. Besides, while rereading the written journal responses, the students gave attention to grammar and vocabularies. As a result, they identified the

grammatical mistakes and inappropriate diction. Having such a metalinguistic awareness, the students attempted to correct the grammatical mistakes and change the inappropriate diction into the appropriate one so as to make their writing more qualified than before.

Student A and B admitted in the interview that they reread their written journal responses soon after they finished writing them. In doing so, they attempted to check whether the writing made sense. If the written journal responses did not make sense, they had to track back and made adjustment to their writing so as to produce organized and meaningful journal responses. If their writing sounded meaningful, they went to the next step, i.e. recording it. Consequently, the revised journal responses were better and more qualified than before. Student A mentioned:

*After listening, I brainstormed what I wanted to write and wrote it. Afterward, I reread it. After the style was good, I got my friends to read it.*

Student F also reread her written journal while she was typing it in the computer. Finishing each paragraph, she attempted to ensure whether the paragraph was logically linked to other paragraphs. Realizing that a paragraph was not coherent with the previous ones, she needed to look back and reorganize them. This strategy was employed under the influence of her awareness that she often experienced confusion about the organization of her writing. She admitted in the interview:

*I often felt confused of the organization of my writing. When I attained the second paragraph, for example, I found that some parts had to be written in the first paragraph.*

Two participants, Student B and C, also admitted that they reread their written journal responses directly on computer's screen. Since Student C was lack of knowledge about English grammar, he took advantage of grammar checking tool provided in the computer. It facilitated him to identify his grammatical mistakes. As a result, he was able to correct them directly on the computer's screen. On the other hand, Student B, who intended to employ a variety of vocabularies, made use of the thesaurus tool in the computer to find the synonym of words so as to include various vocabularies in her journal responses.

Second, the students re-listened to their recorded journal responses to gain feedback on their voice. The fact that the students were not native speakers of English implied that their recorded voice sounded Indonesian or Javanese. Besides, their speaking was also not so fluent. Although their voice sounded Indonesian or Javanese and their speaking was not so fluent, re-listening to their recorded journal responses benefited them very much because it gave feedback on their pronunciation or speaking fluency. As a result, the students raised their speaking awareness. Such an awareness was useful to help the students improve their recorded journal responses and certainly also their speaking skills.

Student B, E, and F confessed in the interview that they re-listened to their recorded journal responses to obtain feedback on their voice. While re-listening to their recorded journal, they also thought of the quality of the recording. If the recording was not satisfying, they decided to record it again so as to obtain better recording. In addition to submitting the recorded journal responses to the lecturer, a participant, Student A, kept all the copies of his recorded journal responses. It was intended to enable him to listen to the recording again. Therefore, keeping all his recorded journal responses facilitated him to monitor the improvement of his recording, from the beginning to the end of the semester.

Third, the students monitored the process of project accomplishment by comparing each project to the previous ones. Comparing the project accomplishments suggested that the students gave attention to the accomplishment of each project. Hence, the students kept the process which they had accomplished previously in mind instead of being left behind. It was also useful to control the quality of the present project and to see the differences existing in each project accomplishment, whether the present process of the project accomplishment was better than the previous one. Consequently, the students became aware of their own progress.

Two participants, Student F and Student E, were aware of their progress. Student F tended to monitor her readiness and improvement in accomplishing the project. In the second reflection, she compared the

process of accomplishing the second journal response to that of accomplishing the first journal response. She felt that she was more comfortable in the second project accomplishment because she already had the device. Additionally, she also monitored her progress and identified a lesser amount of mistakes in her third journal response. She wrote:

*I felt more relax than before because I had not [sic] an MP4 before so I must borrow it to [sic] my friend (Student F, Reflection II).*

*I felt that I'm not in progress. But, after I compared it with my previous work I found that the mistakes lesser [sic] than before (Student F, Reflection III).*

On the other hand, Student E monitored his project accomplishment by comparing the rate spent to listen to the teacher made audio journals. In the third journal accomplishment, he considered that he made a significant improvement in obtaining the points of the audio journals, compared to the pace he spent in obtaining the points of the first and second journal. In the reflection sheet, he wrote:

*I was so difficult to get the point of each journal by hearing 3-4 times repetition [sic] but now I just hearing [sic] 1-2 times (Student E, Reflection III).*

### **Evaluating**

While monitoring is to check how the students are doing, the assessment is to judge how well the students are doing in accomplishing the task (Gardner, 2000). The students who self-assess their learning indicate that they regulate their own learning. Hence, regardless of whether the self-assessment is reliable, it is crucial to bear students' autonomy for the students themselves actively decide how well they carry out the process of learning and judge the weaknesses and strengths of the results of their learning. Based on the obtained data, there were two kinds of evaluation conducted by the students in the project accomplishment, namely the process and the result.

First, the students evaluated the process of accomplishing the project. The evaluation of the process was intended to judge how well the students carried out the project. Certainly, in doing so, critical self-reflection was employed so as to look at the processes and attain the judgment on them. As a result, the students realized that the process strongly influenced their current status (Chamot et al., 1999). Four participants, including Student D, F, B, and A, revealed that they evaluated the process of the project accomplishment.

Student D admitted in the fourth reflection sheet that she had not been satisfied with her previous journal responses. Her dissatisfaction was because she had not done the project accomplishment maximally. In this respect, she was really aware of the relation between her current condition, i.e. her dissatisfaction, and the process which caused it. She wrote: *I'm not really satisfy [sic] because until now I haven't do [sic] my duty maximum.*

Student A also revealed that he was not in progress. His judgment was based on his experiences in accomplishing the third journal response. He considered that what he did to accomplish the third journal response was the same as that to accomplish the second journal response. However, his effort spent to accomplish the third journal was worth appraising. He realized that he did more than what he did in the previous journal responses, i.e. mixing his third recorded journal response with music, although he failed due to the technical mistake. He wrote:

*I don't feel I'm in progress now cause [sic] I just did what I did before. But, at least, for the third journal I had tried to mix my journal with music even though I failed. There was a technical mistake.*

Interestingly, some participants also evaluated their mental disposition to the process of the project accomplishment. Student F evaluated her tendency which existed in the process of accomplishing the project. In finishing the fourth journal, Student F felt more relaxed because she was able to manage her time well. Additionally, in the sixth journal response accomplishment, she did

not think that the sixth journal response burdened her. She wrote:

*I feel better on doing my forth [sic] journal because I did my work more relax without any stressing and hastiness...I feel in progress now, especially in my time management.*

Second, the students evaluated the product of the project. As a result, they were able to measure the weaknesses and strengths of the results of their journal responses, either the written or the recorded. Chamot et al. (1999) state that students' ability to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses is a first step to attain self-regulated learning. Indeed, self-assessment on the outcome of the project was the manifestation of autonomy because the students themselves measured the quality of the product.

Some participants in the reflection were aware of the weaknesses of their journal responses. They revealed that their journal responses contained so many mistakes, including grammar and pronunciation. As a result, the mistakes found in the journal responses inevitably brought about the dissatisfaction of the participants. For example, Student C experienced dissatisfaction on his second journal response. He wrote in his reflection: "I'm not satisfied enough about my work because there are many mistakes." Similarly, two participants, Student F and Student B, also assessed the mistakes found in their journal responses. They made grammatical and pronunciation mistakes. Student B wrote: "I am not satisfied with my work for I still make mistakes both in grammar and pronunciation."

Besides finding the weaknesses, some participants also considered the strengths of the results of their journal responses. A participant, Student A, compared his second journal response to the first one. He admitted that his second journal response was better than the first one. Furthermore, he was sure of the strength of his third and fourth journal responses so that the reader would be interested in listening to them. He wrote:

*My second journal is little bit better than the first one, I think. At least, I could make my writing more interesting to read (Reflection II).*

*I think what I wrote for the third journal and the fourth journal is just more interesting for who listen to it (Reflection IV).*

Similarly, Student D, in the second reflection, realized that her second recorded journal response was better than the first one. Moreover, after finishing the fifth journal response, she considered the improvement of her writing. She noted: "I feel in progress because the sound effect and the record are better than before. I feel a little progress in writing."

Another participant, Student C, also experienced the improvement of his listening ability in the fifth project accomplishment. In the interview, he also articulated that his grammar and writing became better. He mentioned, "I feel my listening ability improve [sic] continuously although only for a little." Student F also evaluated the improvement of her grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation after accomplishing the collaborative audio-journal project. In the interview, she mentioned: "The grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation of my first journal response were so bad. But, after I practiced, they were improved."

## CONCLUSION

This project-based language learning fosters the students to control their learning management. The students themselves planned, monitored, and evaluated the project accomplishment. Moreover, they solved the encountered constraints by making use of the available resources. In this respect, they were exercised to make decision and choice without much intervention of the teacher. Hence, the students employed greater control over learning management. In this sense, student-centeredness was practically displayed and the students actively paced themselves to accomplish the project. Thereby, it can be inferred that the project "provides a principled and practicable route toward autonomy" (Thomas, 1991, cited in Benson, 2001: 21).

## REFERENCES

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

- Hart, N. (2002). Intra-group Autonomy and Authentic Materials: A Different Approach to ELT in Japanese Colleges and Universities. *System*, 30, 33-46.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and Developing Autonomy in East Asian Contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (1), 71-94.
- Niemi, H. (2002). Active Learning – A Cultural Change Needed in Teacher Education and Schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 763-780.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (Third Edition). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Did you make planning during the project accomplishment? What did you plan?
- How did you monitor the writing process of your journal responses?
- How did you monitor your recording?
- What difficulties did you find during the project accomplishment? How did you overcome the difficulties?
- Did you evaluate your journal responses? What aspect did you evaluate?

## APPENDICES

### *Appendix 1: Guiding Questions for Reflection*

Here are questions for guiding the reflection on the process of accomplishing each project.

What steps/strategies did you use?

What did you feel? Why? Did you find any difficulties, either physically, emotionally, or intellectually? How did you overcome? How did you make use of the available resources (books, teacher, friends, instruments, etc)?

Did you feel responsible to your work? Have you done your best?

Do you feel in progress now? (Please compare to your previous work, in terms of grammar, organization, chosen words, etc). How far is your progress? Are you satisfied with your work? What values do you get from the process?

What do you plan to make better work in the following projects?

### *Appendix 2: Guiding Questions for Interviewing the Participants*

What is your opinion about the *audio-journal project*?

How did you make use of your creativity during the accomplishment of the *audio-journal project*?