An Evaluation of a Student Resource Centre

Bob Courchêne

The use of Student Resource Centres to support L2 students' language learning is a very recent pedagogical innovation at the post-secondary level in language-teaching institutions in Canada. In this study the author reports very briefly on how to set one up and, then, goes on to survey student opinion on the role of self-directed learning in learning a second language. Information on topics such as type and suitability of material used, frequency of use, relation of self-study to classroom teaching gathered through a series of questionnaires and formal and informal interviews is analyzed and interpreted in a descriptive manner. The paper concludes with comments on the role of self-directed learning in L2 teaching and learning.

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970's, the publication of research such as Munby's (1978) *Communicative Syllabus Design* and Coste et al.'s (1976) *Un Niveau Seuil* brought to the attention of language teachers and researchers the importance of the student's role in the teaching/learning process. To admit that it was necessary to consult students, to take their needs, learning styles and background into consideration in designing and implementing language courses meant that the locus of control in the "curriculum" process had shifted from designers who were removed from the classroom to designers (teachers, for the most part) who were part of the process. Attempting to take the learner seriously spawned many movements within the language teaching field—student-centered activities, student-centred curricula (Nunan, 1988), needs analysis (Chancerel et Richterich, 1978), English for special purposes (Robinson, 1980). For the teacher, these movements have had a certain liberating effect in that he or she no longer feels completely responsible for choosing all the content for the language classroom or deciding how it should be taught or learned. In another way, however, they have placed a greater burden on the teacher who has to be continually recreating the curriculum with the students, making certain that the optimal conditions necessary for learning exist in the L2 classroom. For the student, this centering on individual needs has resulted in a heightened consciousness concerning what is involved in learning a

language, of what the learner can do to make this process easier and more efficient.

The logical evolution of this new awareness of the student's role in learning has been the movement toward self-directed learning. Students, especially adults, who are more attuned to their language needs and how they might best be met, want to take charge of their own learning. They want to select the materials to be used, they want to work on them in an order that is meaningful for them, they want to work on them when it is convenient for them to do so. To respond to this need, different language teaching institutions have set up resource centres where students are given an opportunity to manage their learning. In most cases the students are provided with some initial guidance—a type of needs analysis—and then offered suggestions concerning the types of activities and tasks that might be relevant for their needs. After this initial contact, students are encouraged to set their own goals for learning and to chart their langauge learning progress.

Initially such centres were only found in Europe (CRAPEL, the British Council, Bell Trust) but more recently, language institutions in Canada and the USA have set up similar facilities for their students.[1] Four years ago, the Second Language Institute at the University of Ottawa, a bilingual institution, established it own student resource centre based on a modified European model. In addition to offering the students a large variety of language learning materials, including computer assisted learning, the Student Resource Centre (SRC) also offered students guidance through full-time teachers assigned to it. The role of these teachers was to act as consultants, to provide advice to students who wanted to improve their L2 ability.

As this centre was one of the first of its kind in terms of university level institutions, we were keenly interested in how the students would react, in how they would evaluate its role in their L2 learning. As a result, from its inception, we systematically administered questionnaires, interviewed people both formally and informally and talked to other language teaching experts who visited and worked in our centre to obtain feedback. The study that follows is an initial report of data collected over a two-year period from 1987-1989 at the Second Language Institute (SLI).

The study begins with a description of the different instruments used in the evaluation of the SRC. In the next section, the results are presented and discussed. Finally, the paper ends with some preliminary conclusions on the role of the centre and suggestions for future areas of research.

BOB COURCHÊNE

THE STUDY

From the number of visits we have had in the four years of operation (45,000), and from the comments gathered through informal monitoring of the users, it was obvious that the learners considered the SRC an effective tool in helping them learn their L2. To be able to verify such impressions in a more rigorous manner, a series of questionnaires together with an oral interview were prepared and administered to a cross section of students who frequented the SRC.

The Subjects

The subjects for the study $(N=250+)^2$ came from five (5) different categories:
1) ESL/FLS students enrolled in intensive programs (21 hpw),
2) ESL/FLS students in the summer bursary program (22.5 hpw),
3) ESL students preparing for university entrance (TOEFL, CanTEST),
4) ESL/FLS students enrolled in credit/non-credit classes at the SLI (usually 4 hpw), and
5) ESL/FLS students/staff not enrolled in formal classes.

The Questionnaires

The three questionnaires were administered over a two-year period from March, 1987 to August, 1989. As no questionnaires were readily available in the literature, they were adapted from different models used at resource centres in North America and Europe and from research on self-study and self-evaluation (Dickinson 1987; Oskarsson 1978; LeBlanc & Painchaud, 1985).

The purpose of the first questionnaire (Q #1), which was administered on a regular basis from 1987-1988, was to collect data of a more practical nature related to the following questions:
1) how the users spent their time at the SRC (reading, listening, computer-assisted learning (CALL), etc.),
2) what types of materials they used for their study,
3) how they felt about the physical set-up and materials,
4) what suggestions they might have for improving the SRC.

The second questionnaire (Q #2) was administered from August 1988-August 1989. In addition to containing a block of information similar to Q #1, the particular focus of Q #2 was as follows:

1) language learning activities outside of class and SRC, time (television, radio, movies, newspapers),
2) the role of computers in their autonomous learning,
3) the effect of self-study on their L2 learning.
The third questionnaire (Q #3) was constructed to:
1) survey students' reasons for using the SRC,
2) determine what specific aspects of their L2 learning most benefited from self-study,
3) discover which aspects of "taking responsibility for their own learning" they considered to be the most important.

Questionnaire #3, more than the other questionnaires, tried to tap personal attitudes and opinions on why students undertook self-study in the first place, and how they perceived it in terms of their overall L2 learning goals.

The Oral Interviews

The oral interviews were conducted by an experienced ESL teacher who was familiar with the operations of the SRC but had never worked there herself. She had also had extensive experience in interviewing L2 students. The purpose of the interviews was to allow us to discuss many of the questions asked in the questionnaire in a more thorough manner. The questions during the interview reflected some of the results and questions that had come out of the analysis of the questionnaires.

All the interviews were audio-taped (if the interviewee agreed) and analyzed by the interviewer and the researcher responsible for the project. In general, each interview lasted from 30-40 minutes. In all cases, the interviewer encouraged the students to express their opinions but never forced them to do so.

For all interviews and questionnaires, respondent selection was on a voluntary basis. (The use of any other criteria for the selection of subjects goes against the principles of autonomous learning.) An effort was made in all cases to distribute the questionnaires and interviews across the various user populations.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

To simplify the presentation and discussion of results, the data collected from the different intakes for the three questionnaires have been integrated and presented in the series of tables found below.

Reasons for Learning Target Language

When we asked users why they were learning their target language, we expected to find a higher percentage of responses in the academic category (see Table I below). In the highest number of cases, however, the students replied that they came to the SRC for personal reasons and not the result of their teacher having assigned them work of a academic nature. In the "Other" section, students mentioned reasons related to professional and personal priorities—"I'm married to a Francophone", "I have a lot of French customers at work", "I want to take a trip to the States this summer". Their responses are related to what Lambert and Gardner (1972) call both integrative and instrumental motivation. Knowing a language is important for making a living (instrumental) but it is also important for cultural and linguistic reasons (integrative).

TABLE I
REASONS FOR LEARNING THE TARGET LANGUAGE

REASON	CHOICE EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT
ACADEMIC	56.3
PROFESSIONAL	65.0
PERSONAL	83.7
OTHER	16.2

To take the survey beyond these macro-reasons for using the SRC, we then asked questions to find out if there were also reasons of a more practical nature that motivated their use of the SRC (see Table II below). The results partially confirmed what was found in Table I—use of the SRC is for both personal and academic needs. The results also indicate that use is related to the type of pedagogical material housed at the SRC. In both the interviews and informal conversations, the students made it clear they like both the variety and type of material (immediate feedback through answer keys, computer programs). As the data show, their motivation for coming had little to do with the fact that there was no place available in the classes.

TABLE II
SPECIFIC REASONS FOR USING SRC

REASON	FREQUENCY OF CHOICE EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT
I want TL practice beyond what I get in class	72.5
My teacher assigns work to do at the SRC	47.5
TL materials are not available elsewhere	40.0
It would be to costly to purchase the materials found at the SRC	57.5
I can't fit a course into my timetable	6.3
There are not appropriate TL courses being offered this semester	5.0
The TL courses were full when I tried to register	1.2
I prefer the SRC to class	21.2

Attitudes Towards the Target Language

In trying to arrive at a profile of the type of person that engages in autonomous learning, we wanted to know if SRC users had more positive attitudes towards the target language, if they were more motivated to learn second languages (see Tables III and IV below). From the data found in Tables III and IV, we believe that one can at least begin to sketch such a profile. He or she is a person who is motivated to learn the L2, has a positive attitude towards it, and has had success in academic environments. This person is probably at the intermediate to advanced level in terms of L2 ability. These results confirm our informal observations – the largest number of SRC users are highly motivated academic and professional people. As most need to use their L2 on a daily basis, they need to have a fairly high level of proficiency.

It is interesting to note that the number of hours spent in the SRC (see Table IV) correlates negatively with all criteria except "Attitude toward the academic environment." This is somewhat surprising since the correlations among the four other factors (MLTL, ATL, SAE, AAE), while not high, are at least respectable.

Further and more rigorous research is needed to determine if, in fact, these "traits" form the basis for a possible autonomous learner profile.

TABLE III
ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE TARGET LANGUAGE

TARGET LANGUAGE = TL   ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENTS = AE
1 = Low   5 = High
N = 80

FACTOR	LEVEL EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
PROFICIENCY LEVEL	11.7	3.9	32.5	24.7	27.3
MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING TL	1.2	1.2	12.5	36.2	48.7
ATTITUDE TO TL	1.3	1.3	11.8	39.5	46.1
SUCCESS IN AE		2.5	22.8	50.6	24.1
ATTITUDE TO AE	1.3	1.3	3.8	52.6	25.6

TABLE IV
CORRELATION MATRIX
FOR ATTITUDES TOWARDS TARGET LANGUAGE

	PLTL	MLTL	ATL	SAE	AAE	HSRC
PLTL	1.000					
MLTL	.0356	1.000				
ATL	.0758	.4367	1.000			
SAE	.1700	.4091	.5076	1.000		
AAE	.0327	.2757	.5620	.7125	1.000	
HSRC	-.3434	-.0500	-.0285	-.0190	.0285	1.000

PLTL = PROFICIENCY LEVEL IN TARGET LANGUAGE
MLTL = MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING TARGET LANGUAGE
ATL   = ATTITUDE TO TARGET LANGUAGE
SAE   = SUCCESS IN ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENTS
AAE   = ATTITUDE TOWARDS ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENTS
HSRC = HOURS SPENT AT THE SRC

Autonomous Study and Changes in L2 Skills and Attitudes

In the next section of our study, we attempted to determine what influence, if any, autonomous study had on different aspects of the

students' language proficiency as well as their attitudes to the TL and language learning in general (see Table V below). If the findings presented in Table V are accurate, then self-directed learning has a double-barrelled effect. First, it helps students improve their second language skills; second, it results in important changes in affective factors related to L2 learning—attitude, motivation and confidence. While data for this was not available from the present study, one can speculate that the changes in affective factors could be related to student control over the learning process. From Table V, it would not appear that increased academic success (17%) would be important enough to produce these positive attitudes towards learning the L2.

TABLE V
INFLUENCE OF TIME SPENT AT THE SRC TO PERCEIVED CHANGE PROFICIENCY AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE TARGET LANGUAGE

PERCEIVED INFLUENCE	PERCEIVED CHANGE EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT
My grades are better	17.5
My comprehension is better	71.2
My confidence in using the TL has increased	43.8
My oral skills are better	33.7
My writing skills are better	37.5
My reading skills are better	50.0
My attitude to the TL has improved	31.3
I am highly motivated and it helps to me to do extra work	33.7
I like to feel in control of my learning situation	61.2
I am used to working on my own	61.2

In Q #2, a similar question was asked of the students except that it sought to see if there was any perceived influence of autonomous learning on out-of-class language related activities. The results of this question are found in Table VI. Even though one must be cautious in interpreting the results (% of responses is low), autonomous study does seem to have spill-over effects in terms of

out-of-class activities. The habit of seeking out materials to use within the SRC seems to transfer once the student leaves either the SRC or the classroom. What is especially encouraging is that students not only want to continue their L2 studies but want to take sheltered or content-based courses in their L2. This indicates they feel increased confidence about their L2 ability.

TABLE VI
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF TIME SPENT AT THE SRC
ON OUT-OF-CLASS L2 ACTIVITIES

PERCEIVED CHANGE IN BEHAVIOUR	CHANGE EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT		
	% of responses	yes	no
Read more magazines in L2	36.8	88.0	12.0*
Watch television in L2	39.7	88.9	11.1*
Attend classes in L2	38.3	80.8	19.2*
Will take courses in the future in L2	38.3	80.8	19.2*
Have become a more independent language learner	38.3	80.8	19.2*
Have become a better language learner	39.9	85.2	14.8*

* p = .003

Learning Environment

In order to isolate which factors students considered important in terms of their L2 learning environment, they were asked to rate a series of points using a scale ranging from "Not Important to Important" (see Table VII below). The results found in Table VII show that students prefer a learning environment that is tailored to their learning style and needs. They want to be part of the decision making process, they want to determine what will be studied, how it will be worked on and with what frequency. They do not want to be spectators on the sidelines. We believe that it is this need to be in control of their learning process that brings them to the SRC.

TABLE VII
FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENTS' SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

FACTOR	DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE		
	1	2	3
1. Have the program suit your specific L2 requirements	5.0	21.0	62.5
2. Have the program suit your learning style	5.0	23.7	60.0
3. To be able to study when you want	5.0	20.0	62.5
4. To be able to study how much and how long you want	3.7	18.8	65.0
5. To be able to study without wasting time	1.2	21.2	66.2
6. To have someone else determine your program	37.5	41.2	8.7
7. To have someone else direct your program	31.3	43.8	11.2
8. Determine yourself what your needs are	8.7	50.0	32.5
9. To control the learning situation yourself (i.e., speed with which you do each lesson, number of repetitions, etc.)	5.0	35.0	51.2
10. To know the purpose of the activity	2.5	31.3	57.5
11. To suit the activities to your mood	16.2	32.5	40.0

1 = NOT IMPORTANT   2 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT   3 = IMPORTANT

For criteria 6 and 7 above, there were significant differences for the French and English populations in the study. In both cases, the students studying French believed that it was more important that someone else play an important role in setting up and running their program. However, both groups of students indicated that it was equally important for them to determine their own needs. Such results are difficult to explain. Are they a reflection of two different approaches to the teaching of English and French? Are they a reflection of the structure of the two languages—the greater importance given to structure in French, the perceived difficulty of French grammar? Is English more message centred and therefore less focused on form? While it was not our intention in this study to explore such questions, they certainly raise interesting research possibilities.

Suggested Changes to the Organization of the SRC

In an attempt to improve the quality of the services offered at the SRC but also to see how much importance students accorded existing services, they were asked to rate them on a scale from not important to important (see Table VIII below). While the results in Table VIII need little comment, it is worth noting that students would like to continue their autonomous learning at home with the materials found in the SRC. They would also like it to be open longer hours, especially in the evenings and on the weekends (it is already open 46 hours a week including two nights and Saturday morning). Students, and more specifically, the highly motivated foreign students cannot understand why the SRC closes or why the materials cannot be borrowed. They see it as a resource that should be available for use on a 24-hour-a-day basis.

TABLE VIII
EVALUATION OF SERVICES TO PROMOTE AUTONOMOUS LEARNING
OFFERED BY THE SRC

SERVICE – THE SRC WOULD BE BETTER IF	EVALUATION		
	1	2	3
1. I were given assignments with deadlines	75.0	18.1	6.9
2. I were given more guidance	43.1	45.8	11.1
3. The equipment was of better quality	32.9	38.4	28.8
4. My classroom teacher were familiar with the SRC materials and directed to them	30.4	49.3	20.3
5. The computer had an audio component**	29.7	41.9	28.4
6. Practice in the SRC were timetabled into language courses	25.7	34.3	40.0
7. The computer had a built-in dictionary	24.3	38.6	37.1
8. There were exercises I could take home	23.0	39.2	37.8
9. Someone could correct my grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation	16.4	38.4	45.2
10. There were better facilities for oral practice (i.e., cubicles)	12.2	29.7	58.1
11. The language lab were attached to the SRC	11.0	38.4	50.7
12. It were open evenings and weekends*	9.5	17.6	73.0
13. The material could be borrowed	7.9	30.3	61.8

1=NOT IMPORTANT 2=SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 3=VERY IMPORTANT
* The SRC is now open at night and on Saturday.
** There is only one program with an audio component.

THE ORAL INTERVIEW

The oral interviews provided us with a rich and varied source of information related to important questions, namely,

1) What is the language background of the students?
2) How do we learn a language?
3) How have your views concerning how to learn your L2 changed since you have been working at the SRC?
4) What is the role of computers in language learning?
5) What are the advantages of using the SRC?

1. Language Background

In analyzing the forty-one (41) interviews, we discovered that nearly 90% of the students came from bilingual or multilingual homes. As the students were not selected with any pre-knowledge of their family's linguistic history, this is certainly statistically significant for this group of subjects. It might not be the case, however, if these results were compared with the general University of Ottawa population. It might be possible that this university attracts many bilingual and multilingual students because of its lingusitic policy. Having stated this, what might these results mean in terms of the type of candidate who is interested in autonomous learning? Different interpretations are possible. As these students have already learned other languages at home, they were already good language learners and found it easy to add a third or fourth language. In addition, of the 41 interviewees, 11 had come from multilingual countries (Switzerland, Belgium) or had travelled and sojourned for long periods of time in different countries and had, therefore, been exposed to several new language learning situations. Another possible reason for the high incidence of such students might be related to cultural identity. In the interviews, a number of students mentioned that they came from a French-English background but had not learned French as they had grown up in a unilingual area or their father or mother did not use the language with them at home. They found themselves as a result with a French name but not being able to speak French. By coming to the SRC, they hoped in some way to regain a part of their cultural and linguistic heritage. A final reason might be that such people have realized the value of knowing languages for all types of reasons — personal, professional, academic. Whatever the reason, being raised in a bilingual or multilingual household would seem to be a good predictor of candidates for autonomous learning.

2. How do we Learn a Language?

The students interviewed can be sorted into two groups in terms of how they think one should go about learning a language. The first group would jump into the bath—go to where the language is spoken and immerse themselves in the environment. After this experience, they would like to return to the classroom to "refine and polish" their language. The second group would begin by taking courses to learn the basic grammar of the language and then they would jump into the bath. In a recent article, Nunan (1989) calls these two approaches the "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches, respectively, to language learning. (It is interesting that the students have come up with the two approaches most commonly found in the language teaching literature.) In support of the first position, students stated that being in the L2 environment forced them to use the language, provided more realistic opportunities; one of the interviewees also pointed out that if one were to wait to learn all the grammar rules before trying to speak, one would never speak. The students who favoured beginning the language learning process in the classroom more frequently stated that one needed a combination of classroom experience and informal (their expression) practice.

In addition to their general suggestions for language learning, the students also made some very practical ones.

"Don't be afraid to make mistakes."
"Get the basics and then practice."
"Immerse yourself and listen to informal conversations."
"Use self-study."
"Take courses given in English (sheltered courses)".
"Motivation is very important—both internal and external."
"Focus on meaning or conversations."
"Must write words and be able to keep them in memory."

Some of the students found it difficult to answer this and other questions about language learning. They said that they had not really thought about such questions a lot and were not really able to provide us with any reasoned responses.

3. How Have your Views on Language Learning Changed?

For the interviewees, this was probably the most difficult question to answer. While many said they "felt" they were certainly better and more efficient language learners, they could not be any more

specific than that. Some stated that they were certainly more autonomous in their learning–they felt better equipped to find or create language learning situations; they also knew where to get help. Others stated that while they were not certain how they had changed, they could give a friend advice on how to go about learning a language. Finally, others found that motivation for learning the second language had changed. Not only were they more motivated, they were self-motivated. They were now learning the language because they wanted to and not because it had been imposed or required.

In summary, this is the type of question that might be best answered in terms of a longitudinal study. It might take such learners a few years to evaluate the benefits of self-study. Once they leave the university and begin to use their L2 for professional and personal reasons, they would certainly be more aware if such an approach to L2 learning was effective or not.

4. The Role of Computers in L2 Learning

Since the opening of the SRC, the computers have been used with increasing frequency (see the statistics for grammar in Table II; most grammatical study is done through computer-assisted programs). In the context of the formal interviews and in informal conversations, the students mentioned that while they are willing to study "dry" grammatical points with the help of the computer for an hour, they would be bored after 10 minutes if they had to study them from a book. One of the students summed up this attitude when he said, "My generation grew up on TV, video games and computers. It is only natural that we want to learn in the same way. We are the video and computer generation."

For the students, CALL has many advantages:
1) The computer provides positive reinforcement and feedback.
2) The stimuli on the computer break up the learning process; it is, as a result, less tedious and psychologically more stimulating.
3) The computer provides visual support: you see the words on the screen. (One student in three in the interviews mentioned that they were visual learners and that the computer was especially helpful for them.)
4) The computer allows one to move quickly through a program and to get help rapidly.
5) The computer helps learners to see patterns in the language.

A few students ($N = 3$), however, stated that learning with a computer was not any easier or more stimulating that any other method. Others said that while they found it exciting to work with them now, they wondered if in ten years we wouldn't become bored with such an approach to learning and look for newer methods.

Overall, the students' attitude to CALL is very positive. They like the visual, immediate-feedback, tailor-made, packaged approach to learning that the computer is able to offer them.

5. Advantages of Using the SRC

In commenting on the advantages of spending time at the SRC, many of the reasons offered related to Krashen's (1981, 1982) five hypotheses underlying his theory of second language acquisition, especially, the comprehensible-input and affective-filter hypotheses. Based on an analysis of student comments, one can isolate eight (8) important advantages for using the SRC in trying to learn an L2.

1) The pedagogical materials, consultation and preparation of individual study plans enable students to meet their particular language learning needs (i.e., get comprehensible input).
2) In the SRC, there is no pressure to perform; it reduces tension especially for shy or nervous people (affective filter).
3) Students can work at their own pace; they do not have to follow someone else's work schedule.
4) Students can work at times that are most convenient to them.
5) It allows students to work on their own.
6) It allows students to match their learning style with the available learning material (i.e., visual learners who choose CALL).
7) It allows students to work on something when they need it and not when it comes up in class.
8) The materials provide students with immediate feedback (most materials have answer keys; the computers also provide such assistance).

It would be a mistake based on the above comments to decide to do away with the language teaching classroom. Even though the students who used the SRC were very positive in their support of it, they also recognized that the classroom had a role to play in language learning. Many felt that the classroom was especially helpful at the beginning stages of language learning. According to them, the SRC is an excellent way to both learn on one's own and to supplement what one get from the L2 classroom.

CONCLUSION

Self-directed/autonomous learning is not another movement or miracle method that will solve all the problems of the language-teaching profession. Rather, it is an approach to learning that allows the student to participate in the decision-making process related to language learning. When it is available as an option within an institutionalized framework, such as the SRC, it helps language educators meet the needs of a large population with limited resources and personnel.

The results of this study have shown that as an approach to learning, autonomous learning results in important gains in terms of L2 skills and affective factors that play an important role in language learning—attitude, motivation, self-confidence and independence. In addition, there are also important spill-over effects in terms of out-of-class activities (i.e., reading magazines, watching TV in the L2) and willingness to take further courses in the second language.

While the results of this research have been encouraging, there are still a large number of questions to explore. Are learners with specific learning styles more attracted to autonomous learning than others? Are the gains in confidence and motivation long term or will they be lost when students stop frequenting the SRC? Can students with little or no language ability benefit from autonomous learning? Is it possible to construct a profile of the "typical" autonomous learner? The answers to these and other related questions can only come from rigorous empirical research.

NOTES

1. Student resource centres have been set up at many locations: the Public Service Commission, Carson Road, the Language School at the Canadian Forces Military Base in St. Jean, Québec, Carleton University, Canada/ China Language Centre, Beijing, China.

2. If all the questionnaires were included more than 250 persons participated in the survey. As there was often overlap between the questionnaires or only partially completed questionnaires (students were not able to answer different questions), it is hard to estimate the number exactly. Some respondents chose only to write comments on the questionnaire saying that they could not assign a percentage or rank order specific items. Finally, others agreed to

chat informally about the SRC without completing any question-naire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE AUTHOR

Robert Courchêne has taught ESL/education at the University of Ottawa for over 20 years. He is presently Academic Advisor at the Canada/China Language Centre at Beijing Normal University, PRC. His research interests include comprehension based teaching/learning, self-directed learning and team-teaching as a form of teacher training.

REFERENCES

Coste, D. et al. (1967). *Un niveau seuil*. Paris: Hatier.
Courchêne, R. J. (1989, November). Setting up a student resource centre. Paper presented at *TESL Ontario*, Toronto.
Courchêne, R. J. (1990, March). Quand les éudiants se prennent en main. Paper presented at *AQELFS*, Montreal.

Courchêne, B. (1990). Setting up a student resource centre. In J. Sivell & L. Curtis (Eds.), *TESL '89: of special interest. Proceedings of the 1989 TESL Ontario Conference* (pp. 119-134). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Kelly, L. G. (1969). *25 Centuries of language teaching.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon.

LeBlanc, R. & Painchaud, G. (1986). Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument, *TESOL Quarterly, 19.*

Lightbown, P. (1989, May). Can they do it themselves? A comprehension-based ESL course for young children. Paper presented at Conference on Comprehension-Based Language Teaching, Second Language Institute, University of Ottawa.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oskarsson, M. (1978). *Approaches to self-assessment in foreign language learning.* London: Pergamon.

Richterich, R. & Chancerel, J.-L. (1978/1980). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Robinson, P. (1980). *ESP (English for specific purposes).* Oxford: Pergamon.