

November 2016 – Volume 20, Number 3

Learner Behaviors and Perceptions of Autonomous Language Learning

Nilüfer Bekleyen

Dicle University, Turkey
<nbekleyen@gmail.com>

Figen Selimoğlu

Bingöl University, Turkey
<fselimoglu@hotmail.com>

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the learners' behaviors and perceptions about autonomous language learning at the university level in Turkey. It attempts to reveal what type of perceptions learners held regarding teachers' and their own responsibilities in the language learning process. Their autonomous language learning activities in and out of the class were also examined in an attempt to clarify the details of their autonomous learning behaviors. The study also examined whether the participants' autonomous language learning activities differed according to gender and motivational levels. The results indicated that learners perceived their teachers as more responsible for the language learning process even though they considered themselves responsible for some areas of language learning and shared the responsibility with their teachers in some cases. The findings also suggested a significant difference between the autonomous language learning activities of the students with high and low levels of perceived motivation.

Key words: learner autonomy, students' beliefs and perceptions, autonomous learning activities, language learning responsibilities, motivation.

Introduction

Since learner autonomy has attracted a considerable amount of attention in the last decades, a myriad of studies have been conducted in the area (e.g., Holec, 1981; Little 1995; Chan, 2002; Benson, 2006, 2007, 2008; Balçıkanlı, 2010; Illés, 2012; Shahsavari, 2014). The existing literature involves various concepts presumably used in the same sense with learner autonomy, such as *learner independence*, *self-direction*, *autonomous learning*, and *independent learning* (Palfreyman, 2003). As expected, it is hard to come

up with only one perfect definition of learner autonomy because people may focus on different aspects of this concept in their attempts to define it. For instance, Stanchina wrote the following definition of autonomy in 1975:

Autonomy is an experiment in how learning can be freed from the bounds of any institution, and in how the individual can reclaim control of and responsibility for his or her own education, while investigating the opportunities to learn from a variety of authentic sources. (1975, cited in Benson 2008; p. 30)

Later, autonomy was succinctly defined as the ability to take charge of one's own learning. The present study is based on this definition, first introduced by Holec in a report that was published by the Council of Europe and focused on adult education (1979; cited in Holec, 1981). *Capacity* was sometimes considered an important factor that might affect autonomous behavior and from time to time, it has been used instead of the concept of *ability* that was used in Holec's definition (Little, 1991). Dam, emphasized the role of *willingness* in promoting autonomy, stating that, in order to develop autonomous behavior, learners should first be *willing* to learn (1995). Sinclair, on the other hand, mentioned the role of capacity and willingness in the development of autonomy, which requires conscious awareness of the learning process with an emphasis on conscious reflection and decision making (2000).

Although the concept of learner autonomy was first associated with adult education, there was an important shift in the understanding of the concept in the 1990s and 'learner autonomy now seemed to be a matter of learners doing things not necessarily on their own but for themselves' (Little, 2007; p. 14). According to Deci's self-determination theory, *autonomy* is one of the three basic needs human beings need to fulfill along with *competence* and *relatedness* (Deci and Flaste, 1995). A feeling of competence is experienced when 'optimal challenges' are confronted and successfully overcome (p. 66); and relatedness occurs when someone loves and is loved by others (p. 88).

Autonomy is not inborn but instead, it is something that should be acquired afterwards. Little (1991) states that autonomous learners have a capacity for detachment, critical reflection, and decision-making. They take independent actions and *volunteer* greater responsibility for their own learning. They exercise that responsibility by setting goals, determining content, selecting resources and techniques and assessing progress (Cotterall, 1995, 2000). Autonomy starts after the learner's acceptance of *responsibility* for his or her learning. After that, learners develop a positive attitude towards learning and a capacity to reflect on the content and process of learning.

Chan classifies the abilities that the autonomous learner is expected to develop to take charge of his/her own learning in the following order (2001, p. 506):

- setting learning goals;
- identifying and developing learning strategies to achieve such goals;
- developing study plans;

- reflecting on learning (which includes identifying problem areas and means of addressing these problems);
- identifying and selecting relevant resources and support;
- assessing one's own progress (which includes designing criteria for evaluating performance and learning).

Teachers and students perceive autonomy from different perspectives (Benson, 2008). Teachers tend to evaluate autonomy within institutional and classroom learning arrangements. From the teachers' perspective, learners do not question the underlying legitimacy. Benson thinks that the teachers' views are tangential to the students' views, rather than opposed to. While teachers focus on institutional learning, learners tend to associate autonomy with learning and "its relationship to their lives beyond the classroom" (p. 23).

Since human behavior is governed by beliefs, autonomous language learning behavior may also be affected by the beliefs held by students (Cotteral, 1995). For example, teachers may not be able to transfer responsibility to learners because of their expectations of teacher authority. Cameron (1990) indicates that learners' beliefs are affected by culture and educational background. In each community, students are educated in a certain way. As a result of the leading education system in their communities, they may develop certain beliefs, which are difficult to change afterwards.

There has been a wide discussion concerning the interpretation of autonomy in different cultures (Adamson and Sert, 2012). Some writers like Pennycook (1997) suggest that autonomy is a Western value. However, there are some who find this idea unrealistic and biased against Asian learners who are stereotyped as obedient listeners. This prejudice against Asian learners leads to the idea that they do not display autonomous behavior. Littlewood (2000) conducted a study that compared the Asian and European students' responses to three statements related to preconceptions about Asian countries. The results indicated that Asian students did not want to sit passively in class, as is commonly believed by many people. In an attempt to understand how autonomy is perceived in different cultures, Littlewood (1999) classified the concept of autonomy under two levels: reactive and proactive. In reactive autonomy, learners organize their resources autonomously to reach a goal that has been set (p.75). In proactive autonomy, they participate autonomously in setting the goals themselves. At this level, students take active roles in planning or selecting materials, which are generally regarded as teachers' responsibilities. Littlewood emphasized that, in western culture, proactive autonomy is valued. However, in most Asian countries, this type of autonomy is not promoted.

In Turkey, most of the studies pertaining to autonomy have been conducted during the last decade (e.g., Köse, 2006; Balçıkanlı, 2008; Üğüten, 2009; Tanyeli and Kuter, 2013). Sert who investigated English language learning autonomy behaviors among EFL student teachers in a Turkish university found that, in addition to being unable to identify which aspects of the language to master and how to do so efficiently, the students also lacked the capacity for self-assessment in monitoring their language

learning process (2006). However, compared to the study performed by Sert, most of the other studies conducted in Turkey had conflicting results. For example, both Yıldırım (2008) and Üstünlüoğlu (2009) found that students were capable of performing autonomous behavior and they sometimes engaged in autonomous learning activities. These conflicting results show that more studies about learner autonomy are required in the country.

The present study aims to investigate the learners' perceptions and behaviors about autonomous language learning at the university level in Turkey. The following research questions are examined in this study:

1. What type of perceptions do the participants hold, regarding their teacher's and their own responsibilities in the language learning process?
2. To what extent are the learners involved in autonomous language learning activities?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' genders and autonomous language learning activities inside and outside of the class?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the students' perceived motivational levels and their autonomous language learning activities inside and outside of the class?

Methodology

Participants

The population of the present study includes first, second, third and fourth-year undergraduate students of a state university in Eastern Turkey during the 2013-2014 academic year, majoring in English Language and Literature. In spite of the fact that their English proficiency levels are intermediate or above, improving their English language proficiency is one of the objectives of their undergraduate education since English is their second or third language. The participants consisted of 171 undergraduate students, who were present on the day of the questionnaire administration. There were 114 females and 57 males, whose ages ranged from 18 to 40.

Data collection instruments

In order to collect data, a questionnaire adapted from Chan, Spratt and Humphreys was administered (2002). The original questionnaire consisted of 52 questions, classified under three main parts. However, for the purposes of the present study, 40 questions were used. The instrument was translated into Turkish in order to provide a complete understanding of the questions and to avoid possible misunderstandings. The translated versions were examined by two English language instructors for accuracy. In order to test the reliability of the translated version of the instrument, a reliability analysis was conducted. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be .77 for the first and second part of the questionnaire, and .84 for the third part.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts, each of which was related to a different component of autonomous language learning: a) students' perceptions of teacher's and

their own responsibilities in language learning, b) students' perceptions of their own motivation levels to study English, and c) to what extent they perform activities in and outside the classroom. As suggested by Chan, Spratt and Humphreys, the activities that learners perform inside and outside the classroom could be regarded as demonstrations of learners' autonomous language learning behavior (Chan, Spratt and Humphreys, 2002).

Analysis of the Data

The descriptive statistics and the results of the statistical analysis were generated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 19.0. A t-test and an ANOVA were run respectively to see whether there was a statistical difference in terms of gender and motivational levels.

Results

The frequencies of student responses to single items have been presented in three groups, in the order they were presented in the questionnaire.

Learners' perceptions of their English teachers' and their own responsibilities in language learning

The first part of the questionnaire mainly focuses on the participants' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities during the language learning process. The participants have been asked to respond to the statements by choosing one of the five options: *not at all*, *a little*, *some*, *mainly* and *completely*. To show a clearer picture, the negative answers given to the options *not at all* and *a little* have been combined as well as the positive answers that are indicated by the options *mainly* and *completely*. Otherwise, it would be more difficult to deal with the amount of data. The same questions were asked twice and the students answered first considering the teachers' role and then their own roles.

As can be seen from Appendix 1, 71.3% of the participants believe that teachers should be held responsible for the students' progress during the lessons whereas they feel themselves responsible for their progress outside the class (93%, mainly/completely). In general, the respondents tend to assign the responsibilities regarding courses and course planning to the teachers. For instance, teachers are attributed the responsibility for choosing the materials in the English lessons (87.1%, mainly/completely), deciding what they should learn in their English lessons (85.4%, mainly/completely), choosing the activities to be used in English lessons (81.3%, mainly or completely), evaluating their learning (80.1%, mainly/completely), deciding how much time should be spent on each activity (77.8%, mainly/completely), and evaluating the course (77.1%, mainly/completely). However, when it comes to making students work harder and deciding the objectives of the English course, students take the responsibility (83.1%, mainly/completely, 76.6%, mainly/completely respectively). Since the percentages of the answers given by the students are close, it can be said that the students share the responsibility with their teachers for stimulating interest in English lessons (74.9%,

mainly/completely, 75.4%, mainly/completely respectively) and identifying their own weaknesses (70.2%, mainly/completely, 69.6%, mainly/completely respectively).

Learners' behaviors regarding learning activities inside and outside the class

In the last part of the questionnaire, the learners were asked how often they were involved in activities inside and outside the classroom. The full results pertaining to the answers given to that part of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix 2. The activities that are carried out by the respondents out of the class are listed as follows in the order of frequency:

- listened to English songs: 91.3% (sometimes or often)
- watched English movies: 88.9% (sometimes or often)
- watched English TV programs: 85.3% (sometimes or often)
- noted down new words and their meanings: 82.5% (sometimes or often)
- read books or magazines in English: 79.6% (sometimes or often)
- done revision not required by the teacher: 69.6% (sometimes or often)
- read English notices around them: 66% (sometimes or often)
- practiced using English with friends: 64.9% (sometimes or often)
- done English self-study in a group: 63.2% (sometimes or often)
- talked to foreigners in English: 59% (sometimes or often)
- read grammar books on their own: 57.9% (sometimes or often)
- done grammar exercises: 57.4% (sometimes or often)
- used the internet in English: 56.2% (sometimes or often)
- collected texts in English (e.g., articles, brochures, labels etc.): 54.4% (sometimes or often)

As can be seen above, the most common activity is listening to English songs. The learners reported that they were *rarely* or *never* occupied with the following:

- written English letters to pen pals: 78.9% (rarely or never)
- written a diary in English: 70.7% (rarely or never)
- sent e-mails in English: 60.2% (rarely or never)
- read newspapers in English: 51.4% (rarely or never)
- listened to English radio: 50.9% (rarely or never)
- done assignments which are not compulsory: 50.3% (rarely or never)
- gone to see your teacher about your work: 49.7% (rarely or never)

Among the autonomous in-class activities performed by the respondents, the least preferred one was to make suggestions to the teacher (49.1%; rarely or never). The

other in class activities, which were used more often by the students included noting down new information (89.5%; sometimes or often), asking the teacher questions when they did not understand (74.8%; sometimes or often), taking opportunities to speak in English (70.1%; sometimes or often) and discussing learning problems with classmates (52.6%; sometimes or often).

The mean frequency scores of male and female students regarding their learning activities in class are 2.96 and 2.84 respectively. For out of class activities the scores seem slightly lowered and the mean score for males is 2.71 whereas the mean score for females is 2.67. The t-test results do not show a significant difference between *in class* [$t(169) = 1.36, p > .05$] and *out of class* [$t(169) = 0.48, p > .05$] language learning activities of males and females.

Learners' perceptions of their motivation levels to study English

According to the results of the data analysis, most of the participants describe themselves as *motivated* (35.7%) and *well motivated* (31.6%) to study English. A few of the participants (19.9%) think they are *highly motivated* whereas a small number of participants regard themselves as *slightly motivated* (11.1%) and *not at all motivated* (1.8%).

Table 1. Mean scores of students with different motivational levels according to their language learning activities

Activities	Motivational level	N	M	SD
Inside class	Not at all motivated	3	2.10	0.72
	Slightly motivated	19	2.32	0.28
	Motivated	61	2.56	0.39
	Well motivated	54	2.80	0.41
	Highly motivated	34	2.99	0.31
	Total	171	2.68	0.43
Outside of class	Not at all motivated	3	2.60	0.53
	Slightly motivated	19	2.36	0.46
	Motivated	61	2.73	0.51
	Well motivated	54	3.05	0.52
	Highly motivated	34	3.20	0.53
	Total	171	2.89	0.43

Table 1 shows the means scores of the students with different motivational levels. It has been observed that students with higher motivational levels have higher usage of autonomous learning activities. To find out whether this observed difference was

statistically significant, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated (Table 2). The results indicated a significant difference. Namely, there was a significant relationship between the students' motivational levels and their autonomous activities both in and out of class ($F(4.166)=14.50, p<.05$; $F(4.166)=11.13, p<.05$ respectively).

Table 2. ANOVA results for students' motivational levels and their autonomous learning activities

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Inside class	Between Groups	8.433	4	2.108	14.50	.000
	Within Groups	24.130	166	.145		
	Total	32.563	170			
Outside class	Between Groups	11.723	4	2.931	11.13	.000
	Within Groups	43.704	166	.263		
	Total	5.427	170			

$p<.05$

To find out the groups in which significant differences were observed, a post-hoc Tukey test was performed. The results of this test, displayed in Appendix 3, indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the students who are *well motivated* ($M=3.05$) and *highly motivated* ($M=3.20$) and those who are *not at all motivated* ($M=2.60$), *slightly motivated* ($M=2.36$) and *well motivated* ($M=2.73$) in terms of their autonomous activities outside of the class. Similarly, the mean scores of the students that are *highly motivated* ($M=2.99$) and *well motivated* ($M=2.80$) are significantly higher than those that are *slightly motivated* ($M=2.32$) and *motivated* ($M=2.56$) according to their autonomous language learning activities inside the class.

Discussion

From the outcome of our investigation, it is possible to conclude that the participants generally consider teachers responsible for choosing what activities to use in their English lessons and deciding what to learn next. This means that the respondents tend to assign the responsibilities regarding courses and course planning to the teachers. This finding is consistent with the findings obtained by Nicolaidis, whose study examined the beliefs of learners about their roles in the development of language learning-autonomy. In her study, the students admitted that it was important to discover their own knowledge. However, they did not get involved in pedagogical matters and organizational and academic structures since these topics were considered teachers' responsibilities (2008).

The results of the present study also agree with the findings of Koçak (2003), who states that "participants' reluctance to take responsibility for their own learning might result

from their teacher-dependent learning characteristics” (p. 89). This means that the learners still perceive themselves in need of teacher’s help and guidance to be able to learn effectively. This learner characteristic may stem from the traditional role of teachers in Turkey. As suggested by Üstünlüoğlu (2009), in the traditional Turkish education system, teachers may be rather evasive when it comes to giving responsibility to their students in their learning process, although the students feel that they do have this capacity. In her study about learner autonomy in language classes, she found that students held their teachers responsible for most areas like choosing learning activities and objectives inside and outside of class, deciding how long to spend on each activity and evaluating their learning. These findings are consistent with the findings obtained from the present study. Here, it is necessary to state that similar findings were also obtained in the study performed by Chan et al. (2002). When it comes to making themselves work harder, making progress on their own or deciding what to learn outside class, students tend to take responsibility.

In the present study, particular attention has been paid to the autonomous language learning activities performed by the students inside and outside of the classroom. The findings indicate that, learners mostly preferred listening to English songs, watching English movies and TV programs. The reason for the emphasis on these activities may be the fact that those are easily accessible by the students without much additional cost. Some other activities like writing English letters to pen pals or writing a diary in English were the least preferred ones, probably because they are not of interest to the new generation of language learners. Here, it is useful to note that teachers can help students find out how to learn autonomously. As suggested by Railton and Watson, ‘autonomous learning should be explicitly conceived as a skill that can be acquired in the same way as other academic skills and that practices which encourage the development of this skill must be embedded within the learning, teaching and assessment strategy’ (2005, p.192).

Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) made a list of Ten Commandments for motivating language learners and stated that autonomy was one of the important factors that led to motivation. In contrast to similar reports in the literature which emphasize that autonomy leads to motivation, Spratt et al. consider motivation as a determining factor that leads students to autonomous language learning (2002). They believe that the absence of motivation inhibits the practice of learner autonomy. The findings of the present study are in agreement with these reflections since the participants with higher motivational levels tended to show more autonomous learning activities compared to their less motivated peers. As suggested by Ushioda, autonomy in “the sense of self-regulating one’s learning” depends on motivation (2011, p. 223). In other words, in order to be involved in autonomous self-regulated learning behaviors, students need to be motivated.

Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research

It should be noted that teachers have an important role in promoting autonomy: a new role of guiding. Voller (1997) listed three different roles for teachers to foster learner autonomy: the role of facilitator, counselor and resource. However, they may also need some guidance as this is a completely new role for them. As suggested by Borg and Al-

Busaidi (2012), in theory, most teachers support learner autonomy. However, when it comes to practice, they do not think that learners have the desire and capacity for autonomous activities. Similarly, in some studies conducted in the Turkish context, it has also been found that teachers do not believe their students have the capacity for learning autonomously (e.g., Tanyeli and Kuter, 2013). These results indicate that future studies on autonomy may focus on the role of teachers in promoting autonomy.

In conclusion, it would be useful to suggest that learners' awareness and readiness for autonomous language learning should be investigated before any attempt to enhance learner autonomy. It would be more useful to explore learners' perceptions, beliefs and behaviors about autonomous language learning because it was previously stated that 'the beliefs learners hold may either contribute to or impede the development of their potential for autonomy' (Cotterall, 1995: 196). Zhong (2013) suggested a number of techniques for teachers to find out the beliefs their learners hold about language learning. Teachers have a number of options such as asking learners to write or talk about their perceptions of different aspects of language learning as well as administering a simple questionnaire to survey their beliefs.

About the Authors

Nilüfer Bekleyen is an associate professor and chair of Department of English Language Teaching at Dicle University, Turkey. Dr. Bekleyen holds a Master's degree in ELT from Bilkent University, and a Doctoral degree from Çukurova University, Turkey. Her topics of professional interest include language teacher education, teaching English to young learners, language anxiety, and CALL.

Figen Selimoğlu is currently working as a lecturer at Bingöl University, Turkey. She holds a Bachelor's degree in ELT from Yıldız Technical University. Her studies mainly focus on second language writing, learner autonomy and CALL.

References

- Adamson, J., & Sert, N. (2012). Autonomy in learning English as a foreign language. *International Journal of Global Education*, 1 (2), 23-27.
- Balçıklı, C. (2008). Fostering learner autonomy in EFL classrooms. *Gazi University Kastamonu Education Journal* 16, 277-284.
- Balçıklı, C. (2010). Learner autonomy in language learning: Student teachers' beliefs. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (1), 90-103.
- Benson, P (2006). Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning. *Language Teaching and Learning* 40, 21-40.
- Benson, P. (2008). Teachers' and learners' perspectives on autonomy, In T. Lamb & H. Reinders. (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses*. (pp. 15-32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 40, 21-40.
- Borg, S. & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding learner autonomy. *ELT Journal* 66(3) doi:10.1093/elt/ccr065
- Cameron, L. J. (1990). Staying within the script: personality and self-directed learning. *System* 18, 65-75.
- Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6 (4), 505-517.
- Chan, V., Spratt, M., & Humphreys, G. (2002). Autonomous language learning: Hong Kong tertiary students' attitudes and behaviours. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 16:1, 1-18.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: investigating learner beliefs. *System* 23(2), 195-205.
- Cotterall, S. (2000). Promoting learner autonomy through the curriculum: principles for designing language courses. *ELT Journal* 54 (2), 109-117.
- Dam, L. (1995). *From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik
- Deci, E. L., & Flaste, R. (1995). *Why we do what we do: Understanding self-motivation*. New York: Guilford.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research* 2(3), 203-29.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Illés, E. (2012). Learner autonomy revisited. *ELT Journal* 66 (4), 505-513.
- Koçak, A. (2003). *A study on learners' readiness for autonomous learning of English as a foreign language*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Köse, N. (2006). *Effects of portfolio implementation and assessment on critical reading and learner autonomy of ELT students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System* 23 (2), 175-181.
- Little, D., (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D., (2007). Language learner autonomy: some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1 (1), 14-29.
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied linguistics*, 20(1), 71-94.
- Littlewood, W. (2000). Do Asian students really want to listen and obey? *ELT Journal* 54(1), 31-36.

- Nicolaidis, C. S. (2008). Roles learners believe they have in the development of their language learning-autonomy included? In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses*. (pp. 141-160). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Palfreyman, D. (2003). Introduction: Culture and Learner Autonomy, In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith, (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy across Cultures: Language Education Perspectives*. (pp. 1-17). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy, In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.) *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*. (pp. 35-53) Harlow: Longman.
- Railton, D. & Watson, P. (2005). Teaching autonomy: Reading Groups and the development of autonomous learning practices, *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 6 (3), 183-193.
- Sert, N. (2006). EFL Student Teachers' Learning Autonomy. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8 (2), 180-201.
- Shahsavari, S. (2014). Efficiency, feasibility and desirability of learner autonomy based on teachers' and learners' point of views. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4 (2), 271-280.
- Sinclair, B. (2000). Learner autonomy: The next phase?, In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions* (pp. 4-14). Harlow: Longman.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: which comes first? *Language Teaching Research*, 6 (3), 245-266.
- Tanyeli, N., & Kuter, S. (2013). Examining learner autonomy in foreign language learning and instruction. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 19-36.
- Ushioda, E. (2011). Why autonomy? Insights from motivation theory and research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5 (2), 221-232.
- Üğüten, S. D. (2009). *The use of writing portfolio in preparatory writing classes to foster learner autonomy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2009). Autonomy in language learning: Do students take responsibility for their learning? *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5 (2), 148-169.
- Voller, P. (1997). Does the teacher have a role in autonomous learning?, In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning* (pp. 98-113). London: Longman.
- Yıldırım, Ö. (2008). Turkish EFL learners' readiness for learner autonomy. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4, 65-80.
- Zhong, Q. (2013). Learner Beliefs and Learner Autonomy: A Case Study of Two Chinese Migrant Learners in New Zealand, In May, S. (Ed.) (2013). LED2011: *Refereed conference*

proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Language, Education and Diversity.
Auckland, New Zealand: The University of Auckland.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Learners' perceptions of their own and their English teacher's responsibilities in language learning

	Items	Teacher's responsibility (%)			Their own responsibility (%)		
		Not at all/ A little	Some	Mainly/ Completely	Not at all/ A little	Some	Mainly/ Completely
1	Making sure you make progress during lessons	2.3	26.3	71.3	3.5	32.2	64.3
2	Making sure you make progress outside class	43.9	35.7	20.4	2.4	4.7	93
3	Stimulating your interest in learning English	3	22.2	74.9	3.5	21.1	75.4
4	Identifying your weakness in English	8.8	21.1	70.2	6.5	24	69.6
5	Making you work harder	14	33.3	52.6	2.9	14	83.1
6	Deciding the objectives of your English course	16.4	28.1	55.6	4.7	18.7	76.6
7	Deciding what you should learn next in your English lessons	6.4	8.2	85.4	20.5	43.9	35.7
8	Choosing what activities to use to learn English in your English lessons	8.2	10.5	81.3	31.5	39.2	29.2
9	Deciding how long to spend on each activity	7.6	14.6	77.8	33.9	33.3	32.7

	Items	Teacher's responsibility (%)			Their own responsibility (%)		
		Not at all/A little	Some	Mainly/ Completely	Not at all/A little	Some	Mainly/ Completely
10	Choosing what materials to use to learn English in your English lessons	4.1	8.8	87.1	37.2	36.8	26.4
11	Evaluating your learning	5.3	14.6	80.1	16.4	33.9	49.7
12	Evaluating your course	5.9	17.0	77.1	15.2	30.4	54.3
13	Deciding what you learn outside class	39.2	36.8	24	2.9	4.7	92.4

Appendix 2. Learners' behaviors for language learning activities inside and outside the class in %

Items		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Out of class activities					
5	read grammar books on your own	12.9	45.0	32.7	9.4
16	done assignments which are not compulsory	15.8	33.9	28.1	22.2
17	noted down new words and their meanings	46.2	36.3	13.5	4.1
18	written English letters to pen pals	7.0	14.0	17.5	61.4
19	read English notices around you	29.2	36.8	24.6	9.4
20	read newspapers in English	9.9	38.6	32.7	18.7
21	sent e-mails in English	17.5	22.2	22.8	37.4
22	read books or magazines in English	28.7	50.9	15.8	4.7
23	watched English TV programs	40.9	44.4	12.3	2.3
24	listened to English radio	22.2	26.9	17.0	33.9
25	listened to English songs	66.7	24.6	7.6	1.2
26	talked to foreigners in English	25.1	33.9	22.2	18.7
27	practiced using English with friends	18.7	46.2	31.0	4.1
28	done English self-study in a group	22.8	40.4	28.1	8.8
29	done grammar exercises	21.1	36.3	30.4	12.3
30	watched English movies	59.1	29.8	7.0	4.1
31	written a diary in English	12.9	16.4	17.5	53.2
32	used the internet in English	28.1	28.1	29.8	14.0
33	done revision not required by the teacher	21.6	48.0	21.1	9.4
34	collected texts in English (e.g., articles. etc.)	30.4	24.0	25.1	20.5
35	gone to see your teacher about your work	14.6	35.7	29.2	20.5
In-class activities					
36	asked the teacher questions when you didn't understand	37.4	37.4	19.9	5.3
37	noted down new information	61.4	28.1	8.2	2.3
38	made suggestions to the teacher	11.7	39.2	31.0	18.1

Items		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Out of class activities					
39	taken opportunities to speak in English	25.1	45.0	21.1	8.8
40	discussed learning problems with classmates	18.7	33.9	31.6	15.8

Appendix 3

Results of the post-hoc Tukey test

Dependent Variable		(I) motivation	(J) motivation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Out of class activities	Tukey HSD	not at all motivated	slightly motivated	-.23058	.23686	.867
			motivated	-.46136	.22547	.249
			well motivated	-.71340*	.22615	.016
			highly motivated	-.89216*	.22963	.001
		slightly motivated	not at all motivated	.23058	.23686	.867
			motivated	-.23078	.10017	.149
			well motivated	-.48283*	.10170	.000
			highly motivated	-.66158*	.10921	.000
		motivated	not at all motivated	.46136	.22547	.249
			slightly motivated	.23078	.10017	.149
			well motivated	-.25205*	.07124	.005
			highly motivated	-.43080*	.08160	.000
		well motivated	not at all motivated	.71340*	.22615	.016
			slightly motivated	.48283*	.10170	.000
			motivated	.25205*	.07124	.005
			highly motivated	-.17875	.08347	.208
		highly	not at all	.89216*	.22963	.001

Dependent Variable		(I) motivation	(J) motivation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
		motivated	motivated			
			slightly motivated	.66158*	.10921	.000
			motivated	.43080*	.08160	.000
			well motivated	.17875	.08347	.208
In-class activities	Tukey HSD	not at all motivated	slightly motivated	.24211	.31877	.942
			motivated	-.13770	.30344	.991
			well motivated	-.45185	.30436	.574
			highly motivated	-.60000	.30904	.300
		slightly motivated	not at all motivated	-.24211	.31877	.942
			motivated	-.37981*	.13481	.043
			well motivated	-.69396*	.13687	.000
			highly motivated	-.84211*	.14697	.000
		motivated	not at all motivated	.13770	.30344	.991
			slightly motivated	.37981*	.13481	.043
			well motivated	-.31415*	.09587	.011
			highly motivated	-.46230*	.10982	.000
		well motivated	not at all motivated	.45185	.30436	.574
			slightly motivated	.69396*	.13687	.000

Dependent Variable		(I) motivation	(J) motivation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
			motivated	.31415*	.09587	.011
			highly motivated	-.14815	.11233	.680
	highly motivated	not at all motivated	.60000	.30904	.300	
		slightly motivated	.84211*	.14697	.000	
		motivated	.46230*	.10982	.000	
		well motivated	.14815	.11233	.680	

p<.05

© Copyright rests with authors. Please cite TESL-EJ appropriately.