

STATE-SUPPORTED PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
INSTRUCTORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNER AUTONOMY

A Master's Thesis

by

MUSTAFA ÖZDERE

Department Of  
Teaching English As A Foreign Language  
Bilkent University  
ANKARA

July 2005

To my beloved parents, Hatice & Mükrem Özdere

STATE-SUPPORTED PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
INSTRUCTORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNER AUTONOMY

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
Bilkent University

by

MUSTAFA ÖZDERE

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
MATER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF  
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

July 2005



## ABSTRACT

### STATE-SUPPORTED PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNER AUTONOMY

Özdere, Mustafa

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Susan Johnston

Co-Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Theodore S. Rodgers

July 2005

The purpose of this study was to investigate state-supported provincial university instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy and towards sharing instructional responsibilities with learners regarding aspects of students' own learning.

The study was conducted with 72 English language instructors working at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Akdeniz University, Balıkesir University, Muğla University, Niğde University, and Zonguldak Köleli University. Data were collected through a questionnaire including Likert-scale questions. The preliminary section of the questionnaire gathered data about the instructors' educational background and teaching experience. The thirteen items in the

questionnaire investigated instructors' ideas about how much instructional responsibility learners should share in accordance with learner autonomy. Respondents were asked to indicate their opinions on a five-point Likert-scale, with 'not at all', 'little', 'partly', 'much', and 'very much' for each item. Additionally, the interviews were conducted with 10 instructors from participating universities.

The results of the data analysis revealed that participating instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy in their formal teaching environments and consider some areas of teaching and learning as more suitable than others for the implementation of learner autonomy. The outcomes also showed that the participating instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy change depending upon the facilities they are provided by their universities and the opportunities for authentic language use in their environments. Moreover, the findings highlighted that an in-service training for the instructors, and systematic and planned adjustments in the curricula might contribute to the promotion of learner autonomy in these universities.

Key words: Autonomy, English language teaching, Turkish Universities

## ÖZET

### DEVLET DESTEKLİ BÖLGESEL ÜNİVERSİTELERDE ÇALIŞAN İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ ÖĞRENCİ ÖZERKLİĞİNE BAKIŞ AÇILARI

Özdere, Mustafa

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Susan Johnston

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Theodore S. Rodgers

Temmuz, 2005

Bu araştırma, devlet destekli bölgesel üniversitelerde çalışan İngilizce okutmanlarının öğrenci özerkliğine ve öğrencilerin eğitimleri ile alakalı konularda yönlendirmesal sorumlulukların öğrencilerle paylaşımına bakış açılarını öğrenmeyi hedeflemiştir.

Bu çalışma, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Muğla Üniversitesi, Nigde Üniversitesi ve Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitelerinde çalışan 72 İngilizce okutmanının katılımı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veri toplama işleri içerisinde Likert-Ölçeği tipinde sorular bulunan bir anketle yapılmıştır. Anketin başlangıç kısmı aracılığıyla okutmanların

eđitim durumu ve đretmenlik tecrbeleri hakkında bilgi edinilmiřtir. Anketteki 13 soru aracılıđı ile okutmanların đrenci zerkliđi dođrultusunda, ders geliřtirmede ynetimsel sorumlulukları đrencilerle ne derece paylařmaları gerektiđi konusuna bakıř aıları arařtırılmıřtır. alıřmaya katılan okutmanlardan ‘hi’, ‘az’, ‘kısmen’, ‘ok’, ‘pek ok’ řeklindeki beř derecelik Likert-leđi formatındaki sorulara cevap vermeleri istenmiřtir. İlave olarak, on okutmanla grřmeler gerekleřtirilmiřtir.

Sonular, alıřmaya katılan okutmanların resmi đretim atmosferi iinde đrenci zerkliđine bakıř aılarının olumluya yakın tarafsız olduklarını ve bazı alanların đrenci zerkliđi uygulamasında diđer alanlara gre daha uygun olduđunu dřndklerini gstermiřtir. Ayrıca, alıřmaya katılan okutmanların đrenci zerkliđine bakıř aıları niversiteleri tarafından sađlanan imknlara ve đrencilerin evrelerindeki otantik dil kullanabilme imknlarına bađlı olarak deđiřiklikler gstermiřtir. Ek olarak, bulgular gstermiřtir ki okutmanlara sađlanacak profesyonel bir eđitim, mfredatta yapılacak planlı ve sistematik ayarlamalar bu niversitelerde đrenci zerkliđinin geliřmesine katkıda bulunabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Otonomi, İngiliz Dili đretimi, Turk Universiteler

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my thesis advisor and the director of the MATEFL program, Dr. Susan Johnston for her never-ending understanding, invaluable guidance, for having such a big heart full of love, encouragement throughout the program and the preparation of this thesis.

I would like to thank Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers, for his continual support in my studies, invaluable guidance, patience and his endless assistance.

I especially owe my special thanks to Michael Johnston whose continual support and guidance helped me to make my way out throughout the preparation of this thesis. Without him, I would never be able to come this far.

I would like to thank Dr. Kamil İşeri, the head of English department at Nigde University, for his support. I am thankful to all colleagues at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Antalya University, Balıkesir University, Mugla University, Nigde University and Zonguldak Karaelmas University for their willingness to participate in my research.

I am grateful to Evren Köse from Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Müzeyyen Aykaç from Mugla University, my friends Pınar Tekkilik from Antalya, Sertan Çınar from Balıkesir for administering my questionnaires.

I would like to thank my inmate Ramazan Alparslan Gökçen whose presence turned this program into an enjoyable experience, and made dormitory life bearable. I am also thankful to all my classmates for sharing this challenge with me and most of all, making it bearable.

I am grateful to my family for their endless encouragement, enthusiasm, trust and emotional and financial support throughout the year. Without the help of family, my life could not have been that easy during the program.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ABSTRACT.....                                                  | iii |
| ÖZET .....                                                     | v   |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....                                          | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....                                        | ix  |
| TABLE OF TABLES .....                                          | xiv |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....                                  | 1   |
| Introduction .....                                             | 1   |
| Background of the Study .....                                  | 2   |
| Statement of the Problem.....                                  | 5   |
| Research Questions .....                                       | 6   |
| Significance of the Study .....                                | 6   |
| Conclusion.....                                                | 7   |
| CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW .....                            | 9   |
| Introduction .....                                             | 9   |
| Definition of Learner Autonomy .....                           | 9   |
| A Brief History of Learner Autonomy .....                      | 12  |
| Origins of Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning ..... | 12  |
| Justifications.....                                            | 14  |
| Philosophical Background .....                                 | 14  |
| Pedagogical Background .....                                   | 15  |
| Summary .....                                                  | 18  |
| Approaches to Learner Autonomy .....                           | 18  |
| Learning Strategies .....                                      | 22  |

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Curriculum in Learner Autonomy .....                              | 24 |
| Course Content .....                                              | 25 |
| Selecting Materials .....                                         | 27 |
| Position of Desks .....                                           | 28 |
| Seating of Students .....                                         | 29 |
| Discipline Matters.....                                           | 30 |
| Record Keeping .....                                              | 30 |
| Homework Tasks .....                                              | 32 |
| The Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson.....                       | 33 |
| Lesson Methodology in Learner Autonomy.....                       | 34 |
| Individual, Pair, and Group Work .....                            | 35 |
| Use of Materials.....                                             | 36 |
| Type of Classroom Activities .....                                | 37 |
| Assessment in Learner Autonomy .....                              | 38 |
| Teacher Role in Learner Autonomy .....                            | 40 |
| Learner Role in Learner Autonomy.....                             | 42 |
| Original Study .....                                              | 44 |
| Culture and Learner Autonomy .....                                | 46 |
| Case studies as related to the promotion of learner autonomy..... | 47 |
| Japan.....                                                        | 48 |
| Hong Kong.....                                                    | 49 |
| Turkey .....                                                      | 51 |
| Present Situation in Turkey.....                                  | 52 |
| Conclusion.....                                                   | 54 |

|                                                                                                                        |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....                                                                                           | 55 |
| Introduction .....                                                                                                     | 55 |
| Participants .....                                                                                                     | 56 |
| Instruments .....                                                                                                      | 60 |
| Questionnaire .....                                                                                                    | 60 |
| Interviews .....                                                                                                       | 63 |
| Data Collection Procedures .....                                                                                       | 64 |
| Data Analysis .....                                                                                                    | 67 |
| Conclusion .....                                                                                                       | 69 |
| CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS .....                                                                                        | 70 |
| Introduction .....                                                                                                     | 70 |
| Quantitative Data .....                                                                                                | 72 |
| Instructors' Overall Attitudes towards Learner Autonomy .....                                                          | 73 |
| Differences among Participating Universities .....                                                                     | 75 |
| Item Grouping in Questionnaire .....                                                                                   | 76 |
| Overall Analysis of Instructors' Views on Sharing Responsibilities<br>with Learners .....                              | 76 |
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University Instructors' Views on Sharing<br>Instructional Responsibilities with Students ..... | 78 |
| Antalya University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional<br>Responsibilities with Students .....                 | 80 |
| Balıkesir University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional<br>Responsibilities with Students .....               | 82 |

|                                                                                                                 |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Mugla University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students .....               | 85  |
| Nigde University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students .....               | 87  |
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students.....  | 89  |
| Analysis of the Relationship of Participating Universities Instructors' Attitudes toward Learner Autonomy ..... | 91  |
| Camilleri Study versus Present Study.....                                                                       | 92  |
| Qualitative Data .....                                                                                          | 97  |
| Student Profile .....                                                                                           | 97  |
| Teaching Environment.....                                                                                       | 98  |
| Instructors' Expectations of Students.....                                                                      | 99  |
| Students' Expectations of Teachers from the Teachers' Point Of View .....                                       | 100 |
| Description of an Effective Learner According to Instructors.....                                               | 101 |
| Conclusion.....                                                                                                 | 102 |
| CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION .....                                                                                     | 103 |
| Introduction .....                                                                                              | 103 |
| Findings.....                                                                                                   | 104 |
| Instructors' Overall Attitudes toward Learner Autonomy .....                                                    | 104 |
| Instructors' Opinions Regarding Learners Sharing Responsibility .....                                           | 108 |
| Most Favored Items .....                                                                                        | 108 |
| Least Favored Items.....                                                                                        | 110 |

|                                                             |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Other Items in Which Instructors are Neutral .....          | 110 |
| Pedagogical Implications .....                              | 111 |
| Suggestions for Further Studies .....                       | 112 |
| Limitations of the Study.....                               | 113 |
| Conclusion.....                                             | 114 |
| REFERENCES .....                                            | 116 |
| APPENDICES .....                                            | 121 |
| A. Teachers' Questionnaire .....                            | 121 |
| B. Interview Questions (English Language Instructors) ..... | 125 |
| C. Informed Consent Form .....                              | 126 |
| D. Interview Form.....                                      | 127 |
| E. Sample Interview .....                                   | 128 |
| F. Analysis Of Sample Interview.....                        | 132 |
| G. Overall results of Camilleri (1997) study .....          | 134 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Characteristics of Participating State Universities .....                                                 | 57 |
| 2. Distribution of Instructors Responding to the Questionnaire .....                                         | 57 |
| 3. Educational Degree of the Participants .....                                                              | 58 |
| 4. Teaching Experience of Participating Instructors .....                                                    | 59 |
| 5. Participant School Experience .....                                                                       | 59 |
| 6. The Structure of the Questionnaire.....                                                                   | 62 |
| 7. Participants in the Interviews .....                                                                      | 63 |
| 8. The List of Universities Originally Contacted for the Study .....                                         | 65 |
| 9. General Interpretations of Likert Scale Entries.....                                                      | 73 |
| 10. Mean Values for Instructors' Overall Attitudes toward Learner Autonomy.....                              | 73 |
| 11. ANOVA Results for the Difference among the Means.....                                                    | 75 |
| 12. Item Grouping in Questionnaire .....                                                                     | 76 |
| 13. Questionnaire Mean Responses to All Questionnaire Items.....                                             | 77 |
| 14. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University to All<br>Questionnaire Items ..... | 79 |
| 15. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Antalya University to All Questionnaire<br>Items.....                  | 81 |
| 16. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Balıkesir University to All Questionnaire<br>Items.....                | 83 |
| 17. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Muğla University to All Questionnaire<br>Items.....                    | 85 |
| 18. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Niğde University to All Questionnaire<br>Items.....                    | 87 |

|                                                                                                                        |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 19. Questionnaire Mean Responses from Zonguldak Karaelmas University to All<br>Questionnaire Items .....               | 89 |
| 20. Analysis of the Relationship of Participating Universities Instructors' Attitudes<br>toward Learner Autonomy ..... | 92 |
| 21. Camilleri Study .....                                                                                              | 93 |
| 22. Present Study .....                                                                                                | 94 |

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

### Introduction

In formal learning environments, the development of autonomy is pursued because learner autonomy supports the learners' involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluating their own learning (Holec, 1981). Learner autonomy is generally associated with long-term success because it enables learners to apply the school knowledge and skills to situations in the outside world (Little, 2001). Additionally, involving learners in the management of their own learning and encouraging them to shape it in accordance with their developing and changing interests and needs will motivate learners intrinsically.

Learner autonomy, in formal educational contexts, is an educational concept in which learners accept the responsibility for their own learning (Little, 1999). The growth of learner autonomy depends upon learners developing an understanding of what they are learning, how they are learning, how successful they are in learning and why they are learning (Little, 1999).

Learner autonomy is based on the theory that only learners can do their own learning, that education or teachers can only guide learning, and that teachers cannot force learning (van Lier, 1996). Also, if learners are consciously aware of their learning goals and methods, learning would be more effective, and they will be able to go beyond the limitations of their own learning environment (Little, 2001).

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes toward learner autonomy among English language instructors working at the following state-supported provincial universities: Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University in Afyonkarahisar, Akdeniz University in Antalya, Balikesir University in Balikesir, Mugla University in Mugla, Nigde University in Nigde, and Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak. Seventy-two English language instructors participated in this study.

### Background of the Study

Learner autonomy is the situation in which learners accept the overall responsibility for their own learning (Holec, 1981; Little, 1991). Learner autonomy necessitates learners' full involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluating their own learning (Holec, 1981; Little, 1991). Little (1994) posits that "learner autonomy not only entails learning but also learning how to learn" (p. 431). From these definitions it follows that autonomous learners have the capacity to determine realistic and reachable learning goals, select appropriate methods and techniques to be used, monitor their own learning process, and evaluate the progress of their own learning (Little, 1991; Holec, 1981; Benson, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Wenden 1991).

Little (1991) maintains that a number of misconceptions about learner autonomy exist. The first misconception is that autonomy is synonymous with self-access learning, self-instruction, distance learning, individualized instruction, flexible learning or self-directed learning. The second misconception is that learner autonomy means absolute freedom for learners. As a matter of fact, freedom within learner autonomy is limited and conditioned (Little, 2001). The third misconception

is that control is handed over totally to learners. The fourth misconception is that learner autonomy entails the isolation of learners. The fifth misconception is that learner autonomy is absolute. Another misconception is that learner autonomy is a new method, teaching technique or approach. A final misconception is that learner autonomy is a fixed state, and that once acquired, can be applied to all areas of learning (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995; Finch, 2001; Benson, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991).

In the literature, there are different approaches to the development of learner autonomy: resource-based, technology-based, learner-based, classroom-based, curriculum-based, and teacher based approaches. Each of these approaches has been developed to promote learner autonomy by applying different methods, techniques and materials (Benson, 2001).

Learner autonomy is based on the idea of the individuality of learners because students' interests, preferences, capacities, and competencies in learning are not all the same. Students learn at different speeds with varying media. They learn differently at different times, in different places and with different teachers. They respond and perform differently with varied forms of feedback, reinforcement, and reward. Additionally, they perform differently in various group arrangements with different styles of content and process organization (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991; Benson, 2001; Brown, 2000). In other words, learner autonomy encourages teachers to "focus on the uniqueness of the individual learner" (Little, 1994, p. 433).

Learner autonomy requires learners to plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning (Little, 2001). In order for learners to become more autonomous, they first

should be involved in the management of their own learning inside the classroom (Little, 2001). Through active involvement, learners will go through a change from a position of being teacher-dependent to a position of an independent learner. For that reason, teachers should be ready and willing to share instructional responsibilities with learners on the basis of negotiation and interaction (Finch, 2001; Benson, 2001; Wenden, 1991).

Teachers in an educational system that promotes learner autonomy act as catalysts, discussants, consultants, observers, analysts, facilitators and counselors to stimulate learning processes in various ways. Additionally, teachers, by being supportive, patient, tolerant, empathetic, open and non-judgmental, can assist learners in setting objectives, planning works, selecting materials, evaluating themselves, acquiring the skills and knowledge needed and overcoming obstacles (Dam, 1995; Scharle& Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991). In other words, learner autonomy demands continuous awareness and discourse expertise from teachers (Little, 2004).

Learner autonomy necessitates active learner involvement, learner reflection and appropriate target language use (Little, 2004). Learners therefore should develop a capacity for reflection and evaluation that they can also apply to other aspects of their own learning (Little, 1998). Learners first must be ready to accept responsibility for their own learning and its outcomes. They should use target language as much as possible. Above all, learners must develop the capacity that enables them to reflect on the process of planning, monitoring, and evaluating their own learning (Little, 2001; Dam, 1995; Sheerin 1997). Little (2001) states that

“learners cannot reasonably be expected to manage independent learning if they are not first involved in the management of classroom learning” (p.36).

### Statement of the Problem

In order for learners to accept the responsibility for their own learning, they must be provided with a share in the control regarding certain aspects of their learning processes (Little, 2001; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991; Benson, 2001). For the promotion of learner autonomy in formal environments, teachers first should be willing and ready to involve learners in decision-making processes. In other words, teachers play an important role in the promotion of learner autonomy.

Yumuk (2002) states that in the Turkish educational system, “teachers are the main authority in the classroom and it might be difficult for them to change their teaching” (p.152). However, in Turkey, little research has been done to investigate English language instructors’ attitudes toward learner autonomy. The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes toward learner autonomy among English language instructors working at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, Antalya University, Balikesir University, Mugla University, Nigde University and Zonguldak Karaelmas University.

This study commenced with the hypothesis that English language instructors may consider some areas of teaching and learning more suitable than others for the promotion of learner autonomy in Turkey. This study may reveal which areas are more suitable for enhancing learner autonomy, thus giving educational planners and administrators a deeper understanding of the implementation of learner autonomy.

Additionally, at the local level, in my home institution which is Nigde University, English language instructors complain about low student motivation and

low participation in the lesson. This may be because Nigde University learners are not involved in determining the processes for their own learning. Because learners are not involved, they may not develop a psychological relation to the teaching process and their own learning. Involving learners in decision-making processes for their own learning may produce more motivated students. To share instructional responsibilities with learners in accordance with learner autonomy may also influence students' attitudes towards their foreign language learning in a positive manner. This study was designed to investigate the following research questions.

### Research Questions

1. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards learner autonomy, specifically involving learners in decision-making processes regarding their own learning?
2. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards sharing responsibility with their students to promote learner autonomy in their classes?
3. What areas of teaching do English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities find more suitable for the promotion of learner autonomy?

### Significance of the Study

Because a large number of learners in Turkey experience the process of learning through traditional educational methods, becoming an effective language learner is a demanding and challenging process in Turkey. One possible solution to enable learners to become more effective language learners may, in fact, be to share

instructional responsibilities with learners. In state-supported provincial universities, in particular learner autonomy may not be a focus of instructing. Thus, the literature has little research on the implementation of learner autonomy in state-supported provincial universities in Turkey.

The primary purpose of this study is to contribute to the literature by identifying aspects of learner autonomy which Turkish foreign language educators find most suitable for formal teaching and learning contexts in state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. The secondary purpose of this study is therefore to investigate if instructors are ready and willing to implement a curriculum designed to promote learner autonomy in their foreign language courses. Because this study will investigate the perceptions of learner autonomy of foreign language instructors who are working at six different state-supported provincial universities, it may provide useful information for curriculum planners and administrators who are planning or revising their syllabi so as to implement and promote learner autonomy in their teaching contexts. At the local level, my home institution, Nigde University, is planning to renew the current curriculum in the following year.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and significance of the problem have been discussed. The next chapter will present the relevant literature on learner autonomy. The third chapter presents the methodology and describes the participants, materials, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures of the study. The fourth chapter, the data analysis chapter, describes the tests that were run and the results of the analyses. In

the final chapter, the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed.

## CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

### Introduction

This study will investigate the attitudes toward learner autonomy among English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. In this chapter, the literature relevant to this study will be reviewed. First, a definition of learner autonomy accompanied by a brief history will be presented. In the following sections, approaches to the development of learner autonomy and learning strategies will be discussed. The subsequent section will be about curriculum considerations and classroom management issues as related to learner autonomy. Next, applications of learner autonomy within classroom methodology and assessment will be covered. Then, the teacher and student roles in learner autonomy will be reviewed. The following section will present the overall picture of the concept of learner autonomy in Turkey as well as the present situation of foreign language teaching in Turkey. In the last section three case studies that were conducted to investigate students' attitudes towards learner autonomy are reviewed.

### Definition of Learner Autonomy

In this section, definitions of learner autonomy and characteristics of autonomous learners are discussed. Learner autonomy refers to the capacity learners have to set their own learning goals, detach and monitor their own learning, and

critically assess their own learning processes and outcomes. In other words, it is the capacity for self-management in learning (Little, 1991). Little defines autonomy as

... a capacity— for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action. It presupposes, but also entails, that the learner will develop a particular kind of psychological relation to the process and content of learning. The capacity for learner autonomy will be displayed both in the way the learner learns and in the way he or she transfers what has been learned to wider contexts.

(Little, 1991, p. 4)

Learner autonomy is also defined as the ability that enables learners to have and hold the overall responsibility for their own learning (Holec, 1981). According to Holec, learner autonomy is “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning” (1981, p. 3). He defines learner autonomy in detail as the ability

... to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning, i.e.:

- determining the objectives;
- defining the contents and progressions;
- selecting methods and techniques to be used;
- monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, place, etc.);
- evaluating what has been acquired.

(Holec, 1981, p. 3)

Both of these definitions imply that learner autonomy is the situation in which learners have responsibilities and choices concerning their own learning process.

Little and Holec view autonomous learners as being able to determine their own objectives, define the content and progressions of their own learning, select the appropriate methods and techniques to use, monitor their own process of acquisition, and evaluate the outcome of what they have acquired and what they need to learn. Thus, they know how to accelerate and regulate their own learning (Holec, 1981; Little, 1991).

To clarify the meaning of learner autonomy, it is important to discuss what it is not. Little (1991) maintains that a number of misconceptions about learner autonomy exist. The first misconception is that learner autonomy is synonymous with self-access learning, self-instruction, distance learning, individualized instruction, flexible learning or self-directed learning. Each of these approaches may promote the development of learner autonomy, but none of them have the same broad meaning as learner autonomy. The second misconception is that learner autonomy means the unconditional freedom of learners. In learner autonomy, freedom is limited by learners' social relations and requirements (Little, 2001). The third misconception is that control is handed over totally to learners. Only educators can determine the limits of freedom and the responsibility of learners. The fourth misconception is that learner autonomy entails the isolation of learners. The fifth misconception is that learner autonomy is absolute. There are degrees of autonomy. Thus, achieving complete autonomy is always a goal that is rarely reached. The sixth misconception is that learner autonomy is a new method. In fact, learner autonomy is neither a method nor an approach. The last misconception is that learner autonomy is a fixed state and that once acquired, can be applied to all areas of learning. On the contrary, it is a hard-won state that must be constantly nurtured and maintained (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995; Finch, 2001; Benson, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000). This section presented what learner autonomy is and what it is not. The next section will present the history of learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning.

## A Brief History of Learner Autonomy

In this section, the history of learner autonomy in language learning will be reviewed. The growth of learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning, and the origins in the fields of psychology and philosophy will be presented from a historical point of view.

### Origins of Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning

Learner autonomy as a general educational goal has attracted attention since the 1960s (Finch, 2001). After the 1960s and as a result of changing and developing politics and technology in Europe, learning to learn in some ways has become more important, some say even more important, than learning the knowledge itself (Gremmo, 1995, as cited in Benson, 2001). Learner autonomy, especially in the field of foreign language learning was clearly articulated in the 1979 report prepared by Holec for the Council of Europe under the title “Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning” (Holec, 1981). In this report, Holec views the development of learner autonomy as a primary requisite of learning beyond school in democratic societies. He states that

the need to develop the individual's freedom by developing those abilities which will enable him to act more responsibly in running the affairs of the society in which he lives.

(Holec, 1981, p.1)

The Council of Europe's Modern Languages Project in 1971 aimed primarily to provide adults with opportunities for lifelong learning (Benson, 2001). As a part of this project, the Centre de Recherches et d' Applications en Langues (CRAPEL) was founded by Yves Châlon in France (Benson, 2001). In fact, Yves Châlon was later considered the father of learner autonomy, particularly in the field of foreign

language learning. Following the death of Yves Châlon in 1972, Henri Holec was appointed as chairman of the Center. He still holds an important place within the field of foreign language learning in terms of learner autonomy (Benson, 2001).

Holec's report in 1979 was the first document which mentions learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning (Little, 1991; Benson, 2001). The focus was on enabling and encouraging individuals to develop their own freedom so that they could act more responsibly in the affairs of society (Benson, 2001). In other words, the aim was to make people the producers of society, not the products of society (Holec, 1981). The autonomy that Holec articulated did not specifically relate to formal learning environments, but applied to nearly every other area of life (Little, 1991).

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, learner autonomy and learner independence emerged as increasingly important learner-centered approaches to language education. Learner-centered approaches include the following: the learner-centered curriculum, the negotiated syllabus, learner training, learning-strategy training, the project-based syllabus, experiential and collaborative learning and learner-based teaching (Finch, 2000). These approaches all aimed to enable learners to become more independent in how they think, learn and behave. In summary, they all focused on the uniqueness of individuals. Due to the fact that individualization and autonomy focus on meeting the needs of individual learners, learner autonomy was closely associated with the concept of individualization (Benson, 2001). However, Little (1991) argues that individuality does not mean the isolation of learners, and states that the development of autonomy mostly entails collaboration and interdependence.

### Justifications

In the literature, several justifications have been proposed to explain why learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning should be a desired educational goal. In this section, philosophical and pedagogical reasons for advocating learner autonomy in language learning will be presented.

#### Philosophical Background

In a democratic society, the primary purpose of education should be to prepare students to take an active part in both social and political life by having them gain the skills and attitudes they need for democratic social participation (Dewey, 1916). Holec (1981) supports Dewey's idea and further states that education should enable people to become producers of society, not just the products of society (Little, 1991). Furthermore, the individual has the right to make personal decisions and exercise his or her own choices in learning as well as in other parts of life (Crabbe, 1993). Following these ideas, learner autonomy entails the idea that in formal learning environments, learners should be equipped with "action knowledge" that they can apply in all areas of their life rather than just "school knowledge" (Barnes, 1976 as cited in Little, 1991, p. 11). Therefore, learner autonomy requires learners' active participation in the decision making processes concerning their own learning (Barnes, 1976 as cited in Little, 1991). Accordingly, the educational aims should be the learners' rather than those of the teachers or administrators (Dewey, 1916).

The starting point to encourage learners to become more autonomous is to have them accept the responsibility for their own learning. According to Holec (1981), learners should be given the responsibility to make decisions concerning all aspects of their own learning because they each have their own special learning

styles, capacities and needs. Therefore the starting point of learning must be the learners' needs (Finch, 2000; Dewey, 1916).

### Pedagogical Background

Learning can only be accomplished by learners. According to van Lier (1996) "teaching cannot cause or force learning, at best it can encourage and guide learning" (p. 12). According to Candy (1991) knowledge must be constructed by the learner himself/herself because it cannot be taught. Following these thoughts, learning can be associated with the idea that each individual construes the world in different ways and thus learning is an ongoing process of "hypothesis-testing and theory-revision" (Little, 1991, p. 17) as well as constructing and reconstructing the knowledge.

In his theory of personal constructs, Kelly (1963) points to the fact that each individual has a unique way of constructing his or her own world. Each generates rules and mental models so that they make sense of experiences ([http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/encyclopedia/P/Pe/Personal\\_construct\\_psychology.htm](http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/encyclopedia/P/Pe/Personal_construct_psychology.htm)). Learning is a search for meaning. Therefore, learning must start with the issues around which students are actively trying to construct meaning. The key to success in learning depends on allowing each individual to construct his or her own meaning, not make them memorize and repeat another person's meaning. In formal learning environments, learners can be enabled to construct their own personal learning spaces in accordance with their personal and educational needs (Schwienhorst, 1997, Benson, 2001; Little, 1991). It seems that if learners are given a share of responsibility in the decision-making processes regarding dimensions such as pace, sequence, mode of instruction, and content of study, learning could be

“more focused and more purposeful, and thus more effective both immediately and in the longer term” (Little, 1991, p. 8). According to Benson “the key idea that autonomy in language learning has borrowed from constructivism is the idea that effective learning is ‘active’ learning” (Benson, 2001, p.40).

As discussed above, individuality is mostly associated with autonomy. Individuality should not be mistaken for the isolation of learners because learner autonomy favors the interdependence of the individual-cognitive and the social-interactive (Little, 2001). In addition, in his work on developmental psychology, Vygotsky posits that learning is the product of supported performance and the starting point of the learning is the social interaction based on learners’ prior knowledge and experience. Vygotsky (1978) in his theory of ‘the zone of proximal development’ makes his assumption explicit and states that the idea of collaboration is a key factor in the development of autonomy.

Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under the guidance or collaboration with more capable peers.  
(Vygotsky, 1978, p.87)

While constructivist tradition mainly stresses the importance of social interaction, Vygotsky argues that

...under the guidance from adults or more experienced peers, children internalize meanings acquired through linguistic interaction as the directive communicative speech of others is transformed into self-directive inner speech.  
(Vygotsky, 1978, p.88)

According to Vygotsky, learners are in the centre of learning and learning is a process of making necessary adjustments in accordance with the demands of the problem thus achieving a goal at hand. Similar to Vygotsky, Piaget argues that for

the cognitive development of learners, learners need to be provided with activities or situations that engage and require them adapt. By these means, their cognitive development can be facilitated. According to Piaget, cognitive development is a process of the interpretation of events in terms of existing structures and also by adapting the cognitive structure to make sense of the environment

(<http://tip.psychology.org/piaget.html>). The stages of cognitive development are as follows: *sensory-motor* (birth – 2 years old), the child differentiates self from objects; *pre-operational* ( 2-7 years old), the child learns to use language and to represent objects by images and words; *concrete-operational* (7-11 years old), the child can think logically about objects and events; *formal operational* (11 years and up), the person can think logically about abstract prepositions and test hypotheses systematically (<http://www.learningandteaching.info/learning/piaget.htm#Stages>). In other words, Piaget views cognitive development as a process that is driven by “active problem-solving” (Little, 1991, p. 15). Little states that “according to this view, the child is autonomous in the sense that the stimulus to develop comes from within itself and the process of development is not subject to external control” (Little, 1991, p. 15).

Following these ideas, the curriculum in formal learning environments, therefore, should enhance students’ logical and conceptual growth and be customized to the students' prior knowledge. In addition, curriculum designed to promote autonomy, based on these ideas, should emphasize interaction between learners and learning tasks and emphasize hands-on problem solving.

## Summary

Learner autonomy is based on the idea that if learners are involved in decision-making processes regarding their own learning, they are likely to be more enthusiastic about learning (Littlejohn, 1985). In addition, learners' active involvement in their own learning will lead to a better understanding of the nature of learning and of the requirements of the task at hand. Also, learning is likely to be more purposeful and more focused in both the short and long term (Little, 1991; Holec, 1981; Dickinson, 1987). Additionally, the barrier between living and learning that exists in traditional teacher-led educational systems will be minimized so that learning becomes a part of living, and learners then become more useful members of society as well as more effective participants in the democratic process (Little, 1991).

In this section, the historical development of learner autonomy has been reviewed. The next section will present the approaches that are designed to promote learner autonomy.

## Approaches to Learner Autonomy

In the literature, there are different approaches to the development of learner autonomy: resource-based, technology-based, learner-based, classroom-based, curriculum-based and teacher-based approaches. Each of these approaches will be discussed below as well as learner strategy training.

Resource-based approaches to learner autonomy include self-access, self-instruction and distance learning. Resource-based approaches focus on the learners' independent interaction with learning resources by providing learners with opportunity to exercise control over learning plans, the selection of learning

materials, and the evaluation of learning. In the resource-based approach, learners are encouraged to develop skills by trial and error as a result of the process of experimentation. Therefore, freedom of choice is fundamental in this approach.

Self-access rooms are physical examples of this approach to learner autonomy because they provide learners with various learning materials. Learners analyze their needs, set objectives, plan a program of study, chose materials and activities, work without being supervised, and evaluate their own progress (Sheerin,1997). A resource-based approach is effective in terms of development of learner autonomy because learners are provided with various opportunities to direct their own learning. They are provided with the freedom to develop control over their own individual learning in self-access rooms, but they may not have many opportunities to participate in the collective process of teaching and learning (Finch, 2000; Benson, 2001).

Technology-based approaches to learner autonomy such as computer assisted language learning (CALL) and the Internet focus on technologies used to access resources. Technology-based approaches may include student-produced video, computer-enhanced interactive video, electronic writing environments, concordance, informal CD-ROMs, E-mail language advising, and computer simulations. Technology-based approaches are similar in many respects to other resource-based approaches. Technology-based approaches are effective in terms of the development of learner autonomy since learners are provided with various opportunities and the freedom to develop control and direct their own learning (Robbins, 2002; Raya & Fernandez, 2002; Benson, 2001; Schwienhorst, 1997; Schwienhorst, 2003).

Learner-based approaches to learner autonomy focus directly on the production of behavioral and psychological changes that will enable learners to take greater control over their learning. Learner-based approaches give importance to strategy training. Learners are given direct and explicit training on language learning strategies and techniques. It is believed that learners who acquire the ability to use strategies flexibly, appropriately, and independently are in effect autonomous. Learner-based approaches are considered to be effective in terms of the development of learner autonomy because they enable learners to take greater control over their learning by directly providing them with the skills they need to take advantage of these opportunities (Finch, 2000; Benson, 2001).

Classroom-based approaches to learner autonomy focus on opportunities learners are provided to enable them to make decisions regarding their learning within a collaborative and supportive environment. Autonomy is fostered in the classroom if learners are involved in the process of making decisions concerning the planning of classroom activities and evaluation of their outcomes. Classroom-based approaches are considered to be effective in terms of the development of learner autonomy because learners are involved in decision-making processes dealing with the day-to-day management of their learning. In addition, having control over the management of classroom activities may lead to the development of control over both cognitive and content aspects of learning. As a result of having control, learners may develop the capacity to define the content of their learning through an ongoing cycle of negotiation and evaluation to the extent that curriculum guidelines permit. Curriculum-based approaches are effective because learners may develop the capacity for control over their learning by exercising their autonomy at a number

of levels. Learners, as a result of this freedom of choice, may accept more responsibility automatically at an early stage of a course (Finch, 2000; Benson, 2001, Littlejohn, 1985).

Teacher-based approaches to learner autonomy focus on teachers' professional development. Teachers leave their traditional roles and become facilitators, helpers, coordinators, counselors, consultants, advisers, knowers and resource people. Teachers help learners to plan and carry out their independent language learning by means of needs analysis (both learning and language needs), objective setting (short and long), work planning, selecting materials and organizing interactions. In addition, teachers help learners evaluate themselves (by assessing initial proficiency, monitoring progress, and peer-and self-assessment). Lastly, teachers help learners acquire the skills and knowledge needed to implement the above by raising learners' awareness of language and learning, and by providing learner training to help them identify learning styles and appropriate learning strategies (Wright, 1987 as cited in Benson, 2001; Little, 2004). Teacher-based approaches are effective in promoting learner autonomy because learner autonomy actually starts with teacher autonomy in formal teaching environments. The promotion of learner autonomy demands continuous awareness and discourse skills from teachers (Little, 2004). Teachers who are caring, supportive, patient, tolerant, empathetic, open, and non-judgmental may more easily encourage learners to share responsibility for their own learning. Teachers also help by encouraging commitment, dispersing uncertainty, helping learners overcome obstacles, conversing learners to support learner autonomy. In contrast, teachers need to avoid manipulating, objecting, interfering, and controlling learners to motivate them.

Teachers also can raise learners' awareness by explicitly calling attention to preconceptions about learner and teacher roles, thereby helping learners perceive the utility of, and necessity for, autonomous learning (Wright, 1987 as cited in Benson, 2001; Little, 2004; Benson, 2001; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991).

### Learning Strategies

In the previous section, the approaches developed to promote learner autonomy have been reviewed. In this section, learning strategies as related to learner autonomy will be presented.

Learners need to be provided with training on learning strategies to support the development of learner autonomy. In the literature several different perspectives exist relating to learner strategies. Wenden (1991) argues that learning strategies may help learners understand the nature of a language and the requisites of the language learning process. Learner strategies may help learners in planning the content of their own learning, in determining the methods and techniques to be used and in self-evaluating the learning process and learning experiences (Wenden, 1987).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classify learning strategies as cognitive, metacognitive and social. Cognitive strategies are the actions performed directly on the material to be learned; metacognitive strategies utilize the knowledge of cognitive progression to regulate the learning process; social strategies are described as the ways in which learners cooperate with others and control themselves in order to boost their learning. In addition, metacognitive strategies are also used to think about the learning process, plan for learning, monitor the learning task, and evaluate how well one has done. Besides the classification given above, Oxford (1990)

speaks of direct and indirect learning strategies. Direct strategies entail mental processing of the target language, whereas indirect strategies (metacognitive, social and affective) support learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation, and empathy (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990).

Cohen (1998) states that direct guidance in language learning strategies and techniques may be useful for the promotion of learner autonomy. Cohen (1998) writes that in order for learners to find their own ways to success, learners need to be provided with explicit training on how to apply language learning strategies and language use materials. In addition, according to Cohen (1998), language learning may be easier if learners are made aware of the variety of possible strategies to select consciously and use during the process of language learning. He indicates that by means of explicit strategy training, learners may become aware of their weakness and strengths in the language learning process and what they need to learn in the language. In addition, learning strategies may help learners develop wide-ranging analytical skills. Learners, through experiencing learning strategies, may be able to learn to make decisions on how to handle a given language task. To Cohen (1998), learning strategies may help learners to monitor and self-evaluate their language learning performance and also transfer successful learning strategies to new learning contexts.

Chamot and Rubin (1998) present a teaching procedure for strategy training that may promote learner autonomy. First of all learners may be encouraged to realize the learning strategies they are already employing for particular tasks. Second, new learning strategies may be presented and described to learners

explicitly. Third, to enable learners to understand the nature of the language strategy, learning strategies may be modeled. Fourth, learners may be provided with clear and explicit explanations on why, when and how the strategies may be used. Finally, learners may be encouraged to practice learning strategies with authentic tasks and then discuss their own use of the strategies and their effectiveness with teachers (Chamot, 1998).

Miller (1993), however, argues that there is no experimental evidence presenting a casual link between awareness of strategies and success in language learning. Moreover, according to Rees-Miller, some behaviors associated with success cannot be classified as strategies and they cannot be taught (Miller, 1993).

In this section, the approaches designed to promote learner autonomy and learning strategies in the literature have been discussed. The next section will be about curriculum considerations in the implementation of learner autonomy.

### Curriculum in Learner Autonomy

A curriculum designed to promote learner autonomy is based on a mutual understanding between learners and teachers. In other words, learners are closely involved in the decision making process concerning the content of their own learning and how it should be taught (Nunan, 2004). The learners' active involvement in decisions concerning their own learning may support better learning because learning can be more focused and purposeful for learners (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995, Wenden, 1991; Benson, 2001; Nunan, 2004). Additionally, involving learners in the decision making process may have them feel the ownership over their own learning so that they may accept to undertake some additional responsibility for their own learning (Holec, 1981; Chan, 2003 Finch, 2000; Benson, 2001).

An ideal curriculum developed to promote learner autonomy needs to be flexible so that learners and teachers, through negotiation, may exercise their individuality. Additionally, they can make individual decisions and implement initiatives in their classes. In order for learners to understand the nature of a language, learning process and facilities available and to formulate learning goals negotiation between learners and teachers on the curriculum is essential (Bloor and Bloor, 1988 as cited in Sancar, 2001).

Little and Dam (1998) state that eliminating the barriers between learning and living may make learning more meaningful and purposeful for learners. Therefore, an ideal curriculum should include learners' present and future personal and educational learning needs in addition to their past experiences. Additionally, an ideal curriculum should include a variety of learning activities, materials, techniques so that learners can choose the appropriate ones that meet their own learning goals and styles of learning. By means of such curriculums, learners may develop their language learning skills and cognitive capacity as well as their sense of competence and self-worth using their creativity and innovation (Brown, 2001; Raya & Fernandez, 2003).

### Course Content

In the last section, a curriculum designed to promote learner autonomy was presented. It is also important to understand how to determine the course content to promote learner autonomy. Involving learners in the decisions concerning the course content and giving them a share of responsibility for planning and conducting teaching –learning activities may lead to better learning (Dam, 1995). In formal learning environments, the first thing to note is the uniqueness of

learners (Dam, 1995; Brown, 2000). Learners' individual differences and individuality should be fully acknowledged because this may give learners a sense of belonging and a sense that they are responsible for their own learning (Little, 2004).

A course content developed to promote learner autonomy should include three principles of learner autonomy 'learner empowerment, target language use and reflectivity' (Little, 2004, p. 119). In other words, course content should engage students in the business of learning and necessitate them to use target language so that learners may develop an understanding the nature of target language as well as how they learn. As a result, students may discover reasons for learning and use target language (Little, 2000).

Learner autonomy encompasses the idea that learners need to establish a personal agenda to make their own learning more meaningful and purposeful. For that reason, the content of their own learning should be related to their needs and interests and thus reachable to them (Little, 1994).

A course should provide learners with choices that meet their precise learning needs. However, providing learners with choices may be difficult because some classes may be overcrowded, physical conditions in the classroom may not be appropriate, the curriculum may not be flexible, the administration may not be tolerant, students may not be willing to learn, and courses may be more exam-oriented than learning-focused (Brown, 2001). In such cases, teachers may have to act as both technicians and diplomats, and be ready to endure hardship (Brown, 2001). Consequently, in institutional contexts, in order for learners to have control of content for their own learning, first and foremost, curriculum may have to be

designed in such a way that teachers and learners have the flexibility to develop their own capacity to participate in social interactions. Also teachers may create situational contexts in which learners can determine the topics and tasks (Benson, 2001).

In this section, aspects of determining course content to promote learner autonomy were presented. The next section is about the material selection in relation to the promotion of learner autonomy in formal learning environments.

### Selecting Materials

Learner autonomy posits that learners can develop an understanding and capacity to decide what materials may assist them in reaching their learning goals. In addition, they need teachers' guidance and special expertise in choosing and developing appropriate materials. The primary concern for both teachers and learners is to select materials that can give rise to learners' individual learning processes (Little, 1991; Littlejohn, 1995; Dam, 1995).

Learners need more linguistic input than teachers can possibly provide orally. For instance, they need dictionaries and grammars for words and rules; they need authentic texts that are produced in the target language community for some purposes other than language learning to give them themes and models (Little, 2000). For that reason, they should be provided with access to as wide a range of materials as possible, such as written and audio-visual data, reference books, including dictionaries and grammars, newspapers and magazines, learner-designed material. Additionally, they should be encouraged to use learning materials on their own in accordance with their individual needs and interests (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995; Finch, 2000).

Most learning in formal environments is based on a coursebook and the selection of the coursebook necessitates teachers' special expertise (Little, 1994; Fenner, 2000; Littlejohn, 1985). Learner autonomy requires that coursebooks should be chosen with care and teachers should be ready to complement it with extra materials to enable learners to make a connection between the "new knowledge that the coursebook presents and the knowledge that learners already possess" (Little, 1994, p. 439). Additionally, if the materials that are used as a basis to present the linguistic knowledge through texts with topics that are already familiar to learners, learners may find it easier to boost their linguistic knowledge (Little, 1994).

Learner-selected and learner-designed materials – journals, posters, texts of various kinds, perhaps audio or video recordings- provide clues to the teachers about the learners' preferences, interests and needs. Additionally, teachers may learn more about the classroom process from learner products. These materials may also help learners monitor their progress and evaluate. Therefore, a compromise between learner-selected and teacher-selected materials in foreign language classes is appropriate (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995).

In this section, the important factors concerning material selection have been presented. The next section will discuss aspects of classroom management in learner autonomy.

### Position of Desks

For decisions concerning the layout of a foreign language classroom, teachers need to take many factors into account, such as the mobility of the desks, the number of the students, the content of the tasks, the classroom activity, proficiency level and age of the students.

To support the development of learner autonomy, desks need to be arranged to take students' focus off the teacher and the blackboard as the center of attention (Brown, 2001). Therefore, desks, if they are movable, can be rearranged in a U-shape way so that students do not face the teacher and the blackboard. Nevertheless, due to the frequent immobility of desks or to overcrowded classrooms, teachers and learners may have to accommodate existing physical conditions (Dam, 1995; Brown, 2001; Wenden, 1991; Scharle & Szabo, 2000).

In the Turkish educational system, even the physical layout of the classroom gives students an idea that the teacher is the main authority in the classroom. In almost every classroom, there are platforms for teachers. The presence of a platform in a formal teaching environment may be an obstacle for the promotion of learner autonomy because this physical distance between teachers and learners means that teachers are in charge.

### Seating of Students

In formal learning environments, activities such as pair work and group work necessitate that teachers make decisions related to the seating of students. Teachers may use their authority and decide who is going to sit next to whom either alphabetically, randomly or based on students' preferences and characteristics. However, in order for learners to feel they have control over their own learning and learning environments, they should be able to determine for themselves because learners naturally fall into a comfortable pattern of self-selection (Brown, 2001). Additionally, by letting students choose for themselves, teachers show respect for learners' decisions, thereby supporting the promotion of learner autonomy. However, if a teacher feels the need for a different arrangement because of some

discipline matters or unacceptable behavior of students, teachers may naturally follow a different arrangement (Dam, 1995; Brown, 2001; Wenden, 1991).

### Discipline Matters

In every classroom there needs to be a range of rules that determine what students can and cannot do. In order for learners to feel the ownership over their learning contexts, they can be encouraged to formulate classroom and group rules through negotiation (Brown, 2001; Dörnyei, 2001). Dörnyei (2001) believes that if learners are actively involved in determining the classroom and group norms, they naturally tend to abide by these rules without teachers' having to exercise their authority. In case of a disciplinary problem, learners will likely to be able to cope with such deviations themselves.

Teachers also need to be steady in their control and pay enough attention to the enforcement of the established norms. However, for learner autonomy to be implemented teachers should respect the learners and be extremely careful not to control the classroom too much because learner autonomy is dependent upon learners' being actively involved in all aspects of their own learning (Brown, 2001; Dörnyei, 2001).

### Record Keeping

Learners can be encouraged to keep records concerning their learning progress by keeping records of works completed, marks earned, and class attendance. Keeping records entails reflection and thus help learners accept responsibility for their own learning and then act on that responsibility. Keeping records also helps learners develop metacognitive control of the learning process as well as raising their conscious awareness of the target language (Little, 2000; Dam, 1995).

Learner autonomy requires self-reflection on the part of learners and the capacity for reflection grows out of the practice (Little, 2000). Through record-keeping learners may develop an awareness of what their strengths and weaknesses are, what they have acquired, what more they need, and what learning strategies work well with them. Through record keeping, learners can also share their ideas with their teachers and other classmates. Learners thus may learn from their mistakes as well as their peers'. Through learners' records, teachers may follow the work of individual or group of learners, and discover learners' interests, learning styles, favorite learning activities, past experiences, attitudes toward learning the foreign language, their strengths and weaknesses and needs (Benson; 2001, Scharle& Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991).

The process and outcome of record keeping necessitates learners' reflection on learning goals, plans, activities, outcomes, and gains. These can be recorded on posters or in learners' individual diaries or logbooks. These records help learners keep track of the work undertaken, the activities conducted, and new words or expressions they used (Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991). By means of diaries or logbooks, learners may also evaluate how well the individual and group work progressed and how the group worked. Consequently, they may gradually develop a capacity for metacognitive control of the learning process as nurturing their intrinsic motivation (Little, 2000; Dam, 1995; Scharle& Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991).

Dam (1995) mentions the preparation of posters as useful materials for both learners and teachers to keep records of works done inside and outside the classroom. By means of posters, learners not only keep records of works accomplished, but also the posters illustrate their ideas, plans, perhaps their favorite

proverbs, and drawings. Learning therefore becomes a part of their lives. Thus, posters, as a process syllabus for each class, and as learner autonomy necessitates, make teaching and learning processes visible.

### Homework Tasks

Homework tasks play an important role in the development of learner autonomy because for the development of learner autonomy, learners should use the target language in extended periods of time in the world outside the classroom (Little, 1994). Homework tasks require additional practice on the part of learners. Homework tasks also have learners search for opportunities for practice and reflect their own learning based upon the corrective feedback from their teachers or peers.

Homework tasks can prove to learners that English is not limited to the classroom only because language from the outside world may be taken to the classroom to investigate and work with, as well as the things that have covered in the classroom may be used outside of the classroom. Also, homework assignments urge learners regularly to step back from the process of learning and reflect on how well they did as a group or as an individual (Dam, 1995; Scharle& Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991; Brown, 2001; Benson, 2001).

The homework tasks can take many forms, depending upon such factors as the age of learners, the level of proficiency they have already achieved in the target language, the size of the class, and the availability of technical and other supports. To foster learner autonomy, homework tasks should be related to things learners are personally involved with or interested in and something they can manage on their own. Therefore, learners should be involved in the process of determining the content of homework assignments. For instance, teachers can present a list of ideas

or ask learners to list the topics they would like to work on and subsequently ask them to choose one (Little, 1994; Brown, 2001). In other words, teachers should be open to negotiation on the quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks (Dam, 1995; Brown, 2001; Wenden, 1991)

### The Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson

To encourage learners to take some of the initiatives that help them shape their own learning process, they should be considered as equal partners and through the process of interaction they thus should be given a share for determining the time, place and pace of the lesson (Little, 1994; Dickinson, 1987).

In formal learning environments, the degree of control of the classroom time may increase or decrease depending upon the proficiency level of the students, the nature of the classroom activity, and the content of the learning material (Brown, 2001). For example, for beginning level students, class-time, place and pace of the lesson is usually teacher-controlled. Additionally, teachers may also have more control over the topics, tasks, activity types, time-on-task, and what to focus on from learning materials. As the proficiency level of students' increases, control may be handed over to the learners gradually in terms of time, place and pace of learning (Dam 1995; Scharle& Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991; Benson, 2001).

This section presented the aspects of classroom management according to learner autonomy. The next section discusses aspects of learner autonomy related to the methodology of the lesson.

## Lesson Methodology in Learner Autonomy

In this section, aspects of learner autonomy in relation to the methodology of the lesson in terms of individual, pair, and group work as well as the selection of materials and type of classroom activities will be discussed.

In formal educational contexts, learners need to be involved as equal partners in the decision making process regarding the methodology of the lesson if they are expected to take initiatives that shape their own learning processes and accept control over more aspects of their own learning ( Little, 1991; Little, 2003; Dam,1995).

Because the purpose of language learning in formal learning environments is to enable learners to communicate through the target language, an ideal foreign language class therefore needs to be designed as a rich and natural learning laboratory or workshop where learners, in the company of teachers, test and investigate new things by exploiting the same interactive mechanisms that they used in first language acquisition (Little, 1994). In this type of class, learners are encouraged to make decisions concerning their own learning, teachers give up some control, evaluation is an integral part of the course, and the learning process is made visible. Additionally, learning and the content of learning are mutually dependent and the content of learning is determined by negotiation (Little, 2003; Dam, 1995, Wenden, 1991; Finch, 2000).

In a second language class designed to promote learner autonomy, learners may become automatically more interested, engaged in learning, and more motivated. They may become more confident as a result of interaction, partnership, collaboration and cooperation. Their learning may be more focused and purposeful

because they are provided with learning opportunities and classroom activities that match their personal and learning needs and interests (Little, 2003; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991; Brown, 2001).

### Individual, Pair, and Group Work

One important aspect of lesson methodology is how class activities are structured in terms of individual, pair and group work. Research reveals that whole-class instructional methods are more prevalent in formal learning environments, followed by a preference for individual work (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Learner autonomy highly favors pair and group work rather than individual work in the classroom because pair and group work develop learners' capacity to use target language as a medium of communication (Little, 1994). In addition, learners learn how to talk to negotiate meaning, convey the message and listen for a reason so that they can establish solid links between the classroom and the world outside the school and improve their social abilities as well as their proficiency levels (Little, 2004; Brown, 2001; van Lier 1996).

Learners can be required to operate on a task using an interactional style of group arrangements, pair work, individual study, or whole-class participation, depending upon the nature of the task or teacher and learner preferences. Each structure may engage learners in different cognitive, emotional and motivational orientations. However, learning situations in which individuals act as active participants are revealed to be more stimulating (Dörnyei, 2001). Thus, for the promotion of learner autonomy in formal learning environments, learners should be provided with tasks that necessitate that learners interact with each other and that involve of all participants in completing the activity because these types of activities

increase learner participation, reduce teacher dominance, promote collaboration among learners and reduce language anxiety (Dörnyei, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Brown, 2001).

### Use of Materials

Techniques and materials used in the classroom involve the use of various modes of interactive discourse in which learners discover, exploit and extend autonomy (Little, 2004). In addition, classroom techniques and materials provide learners with room so that they can take initiatives that shape their own learning processes (Little, 1994). Most importantly, they meet learners' needs, styles and learning goals as well as increase their linguistic knowledge (Brown, 2001).

Given the uniqueness and individuality of learners, learners are provided with access to as wide a range of materials as possible that they can use on their own according to their individual needs and interests in the foreign language classroom (Little, 1991; Dam, 1995; Finch, 2000). This includes, as stated earlier, written and audio-visual data, reference books (including dictionaries and grammars), newspapers and magazines, and learner-designed material.

In formal learning environments, curriculum normally predetermines the content of learning and suggests the use of a list of coursebooks. For learners to be able to establish a personal agenda for their own learning, teachers within a flexible curriculum, following the curricular guidelines, may use and encourage learners to use a variety of materials that provide relevant content to their needs and interests and are thus accessible to them (Wenden, 1991; Brown, 2001; van Lier 1996; Littlejohn, 1985; Hedge, 2000).

### Type of Classroom Activities

In an autonomous classroom, to help learners develop a feeling of ownership over their learning, learners are given limited control over the type of classroom activities they participate in (Brown, 2001). In classrooms in which learner autonomy is a desired goal, there are many different activities with different content and varied topics because learners' needs and interests are naturally unique. Following the curricular guidelines, the activities require learners to be active in the classroom (Dam, 1995). Teacher-talk is reduced to a minimum as learners work in groups, do role plays, fill in charts or grids, give their personal opinions using target language, and generally engage in more oral work (Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991; Littlejohn, 1985).

Littlejohn (1985) argues that the type of classroom activities designed to promote learner autonomy should be carefully chosen and taken from real life. These activities should also be stimulating and based on situations in which learners may actually need to use English. This will enable learners to use learning strategies and thus establish bridges between the classroom and the world outside the classroom (Brown, 2001). Learners are provided with meaningful choices about their learning, such as the amount of time spent on the learning material, what to focus on in the learning materials, the learning goals, the type of classroom activities they will study, the type of evaluation, and the degree and nature of guidance (Littlejohn, 1985).

In this section, aspects of classroom management in learner autonomy have been discussed. The next section will be about the notion of assessment.

## Assessment in Learner Autonomy

Assessment plays an important role in any educational program because assessment and evaluation, whether traditional or alternative, provide teachers with feedback to make decisions about their students. Traditional and alternative assessments differ from each other in terms of promoting learner autonomy. Little (2003) points out that formal types of assessment may work counter to the promotion of learner autonomy if they strictly predetermine the content of learning, materials to use, and learning activities. In addition, exams may make learners exam-oriented and may also limit learning because exams cause a separation between day-to-day living and learning (Little, 2003; Chuk, 2003; Dam, 1995; Brown, 2001).

Alternative assessment approaches require learners to show what they can do, what they are able to recall and produce. Alternative assessment, according to Huerta-Marcias (1995) is used to gather information about how students are approaching, processing, and carrying out real-life like tasks in a particular field.

Dam (1995) argues that assessment and evaluation require time, reflection and honesty on parts of both learners and teachers in an atmosphere of trust and respect. Reflection on what is learned and how it is learned can make learners more effective because they may become more aware of their strengths and attitudes towards language learning (Egel, 2003). Reflection, as a part of self-assessment, motivates learners and enables them to set more realistic learning goals in the language learning process (Little, 2003; Benson, 2001).

Self-evaluation and self-assessment are key concepts in learner autonomy because these activities can facilitate autonomy in language learning. Through self-

evaluation and self-assessment, learners can monitor and reflect on the effectiveness of their own learning progress. Additionally, they can revise their learning goals, objectives, learning process and the product based on their own feedback from their perceptions and goals. Learners can also relate learning to their individual learning needs, and thus develop a basis of experience and awareness to use in planning for future activities (Little, 2003; Brown, 2001; Bailey 1996 as cited in Kucuroglu, 1997).

Because self-assessment enables learners to make some judgments about the effectiveness of their learning performance, the notion of self-assessment is desirable for the promotion of learner autonomy (Dickinson, 1987). Learners should be encouraged to self-assess themselves rather than be tested because self assessment “enables learners to undertake more responsibility regarding their own learning, identify their weak and strong areas as well as effective language learning strategies and materials, establish more realistic learning goals, and help them to become more motivated and goal-oriented” (McNamara & Deane 1995 as cited in Kucuroglu, 1997, p. 27).

Self-assessment can actually promote learning because it raises learners’ awareness and encourages them to think critically and reflect on their own competence (Oskarson, 1996 as cited in Kucuroglu, 1997). Self-assessment provides teachers with richer and fuller profiles of learners’ needs, learning progress, and competencies. Moreover, self-assessment enables and encourages learners to share the responsibility of assessment with teachers.

Consequently, a number of alternative assessment types developed to meet the needs of a variety of classroom contexts have been presented in the literature. The

most common examples of these alternative assessment tools are as follow: assessment portfolios, journals, logs, conferences, interviews, discussions, oral reports, project works, checklists of students' behaviors/products, (teacher observation data), and video recordings (Brown, 1998). Learners, depending on the nature of the alternative assessment task type, can be encouraged to self-assess themselves weekly, monthly or annually (Kucuroglu, 1997).

Learners can be trained how to self-assess themselves (Egel, 2003). Additionally, teachers should be ready to provide learners with guidance and support so as to help them develop self-assessment skills. A drawback of self-assessment may be that self-assessment for young learners may be challenging because they may have little or no experience as well as knowledge regarding learning (Kohonen, 2000, as cited in Egel, 2003).

In this section, the importance of assessment in learner autonomy was discussed. The next section will present the transition teachers need to undergo to encourage learners to become more autonomous.

### Teacher Role in Learner Autonomy

For the implementation and development of learner autonomy, teachers play an important role because they are responsible for developing a learning environment conducive to promoting learner autonomy. However, Little (1995) points out that in order to promote learner autonomy in their teaching contexts, teachers need freedom so that they can apply their own autonomy in teaching.

Learner autonomy is based on the idea that teachers teach learners how to learn. Therefore, teachers, first, recondition learners while assisting them to develop a conscious awareness of their language learning strategies and their effectiveness,

and their beliefs about the language learning process. Additionally, teachers train learners to gradually become more active, reflective and critical thinkers in using learning strategies for their own learning as well as encouraging them to initiate experimental practice inside and outside the classroom. Moreover, teachers involve learners in the decision making process. Teachers encourage learners to set up reachable learning goals based on the feedback from evaluation and self-assessment (Little, 1998; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991).

Learner autonomy requires teachers to act as catalysts, discussants, consultants, observers, analysts, facilitators and counselor to stimulate the learning process in various ways (Little, 1991). Furthermore, teachers are supportive, patient, tolerant, emphatic, open and non-judgmental. To support learner autonomy, teachers consider learners as their partners in achieving common goals. They motivate learners by encouraging commitment and self-confidence. As partners, teachers help learners overcome obstacles. They are always ready to enter a dialogue with learners (Benson, 2001; Brown, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991).

For the promotion of learner autonomy in foreign language classes, teachers help learners set objectives, plan work, select materials, evaluate themselves, and acquire the skills and knowledge needed. Teachers also change students' concepts about the traditional role of the teacher and learner in the classroom. As a part of this awareness-raising process, teachers explain explicitly objectives and reasons for particular activities. Teachers train learners to help them identify learning styles, appropriate learning strategies and, more importantly, the utility of learner autonomy and necessity for autonomous learning. Besides, teachers let learners make mistakes, and to choose learning materials so that learners may have more

influence on their own learning process. Teachers respect learners' ways of handling tasks (Chan, 2003; Benson, 2001; Brown, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000).

In this section, the roles of teachers in learner autonomy were discussed. The next section will discuss the transition learners need to undergo to become more autonomous accordingly.

### Learner Role in Learner Autonomy

This section discusses how autonomous learners are defined in the literature. Following the definition, the prerequisites, such as developing capacity, awareness and reflection will be discussed.

Basically, autonomous learners are those who take charge of their own learning. They are aware of their personal and educational needs and can determine the objectives and goals for their own learning. Also, they can establish a link between what is to be learned, how to learn, and the resources available. They develop a capacity that enables them to define the content and progression of their learning, select methods and techniques to be used, monitor the procedures of acquisition and evaluate what has been acquired (Holec, 1981; Little, 1991). The characteristics of autonomous learners are as follows: methodical and disciplined; logical and analytical; reflective and self-aware; curious, open and highly motivated; flexible, interdependent and interpersonally competent; persistent and responsible; venturesome and creative; and self-confident. They also have a positive self-concept and should be independent, self-sufficient, information seekers, knowledgeable and skillful about learning processes and critical thinkers (Candy, 1991).

Following the above definition, learners, first and foremost, become willing and ready for the change learner autonomy requires. However, in non-western cultures, because most of the learners are already traditionally and culturally conditioned, they cannot be expected to become willing and ready for change (Yumuk, 2002; Sancar; Tayar, 2003; 2001; Chan, 2001; Chan, 2003). Therefore, Yumuk (2002) speaks of a gradual and smooth transition for the implementation of learner autonomy on the part of learners. Additionally, learners are provided with time to experience and become aware of their strengths, the individual's sense of identity, and independence (Little, 1995; Dam, 1995; Saegusa, 2004; Finch, 2000).

As a prerequisite, learners have the capacity that enables them to detach, monitor, think critically, evaluate and reflect their own learning process independently and cooperatively (Little, 1991; Benson, 2001; Scharle & Szabo, 2000). The capacity learner autonomy necessitates may be innate or may be learned afterwards. The capacity whether it is innate or learned afterwards may grow with practice or it may be lost if it is not used (Little, 1991; Holec, 1981).

Another prerequisite for the promotion of learner autonomy on the part of learners is awareness. Language awareness can be defined as explicit theoretical knowledge about the nature of the language, and consciousness perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use (Sancar, 2001). Learners need to be consciously aware of how language systems work and what they need for an effective learning process. Similar to capacity, awareness may also develop naturally and gradually and learners thus may start taking initiatives by exercising and nourishing their capacity. Through awareness learners may set up learning goals, plan and practice learning activities, select and use appropriate

learning strategies, monitor their progress, and actively engage in the learning process (Holec, 1981; Little, 2004).

Learner autonomy requires learners to reflect on their own learning process. Learner reflection requires learners to analyze and develop an understanding of their knowledge and attitudes towards the language learning process and themselves as learners. Through reflection, learners may realize their strong and weak points in the language learning process. As a result of reflection, learners may plan a program of study, exercise choices, and select the appropriate materials, activities, techniques, and methods within their limits (Benson, 2001; Chan, 2001).

### Original Study

In the previous section, the overall considerations concerning the promotion of learner autonomy in formal learning environments were discussed. The present study is based on the research conducted in 1997 by George Camilleri. The original study, “Learner Autonomy: The Teachers’ views” investigated teachers’ attitudes towards learner autonomy. The study was based on the idea that teachers may consider some aspects of teaching and learning a foreign language to be more suitable than others for the implementation of learner autonomy. By pointing out the aspects of teaching and learning a foreign language that teachers favor, the study was helpful to educational planners, administrators and people who are working on the promotion of learner autonomy in the field of foreign language teaching.

To collect data for the Camilleri’s study, a detailed questionnaire was administered to practicing English teachers in Malta, Slovenia, The Netherlands, Poland, Estonia, and Belorussia. The questionnaire was in English and members agreed to translate it into the subjects’ mother tongue if it was felt necessary. In

October 1997, the questionnaires were administered in Belorussia, Estonia, Malta (Teacher Group 1), Malta (Teacher Group 2), The Netherlands, Poland, and Slovenia by project members and the contributors.

For data analysis, Camilleri considered entries in the 'Not at all' and 'Little' columns in combination as an expression of resistance to learner autonomy. The entries in the 'Much' and 'Very Much' columns were interpreted in combination as an expression of support for learner autonomy. The entries in the 'Partly' column were not interpreted as an expression of neutral attitude but rather as support of learner autonomy. The results were presented in tables and graphs. The results revealed that participating instructors think that learners should be encouraged to formulate their own explanations (Q12) and to find their own learning strategies (Q13). While participating instructors' attitudes towards sharing responsibility with learners in terms of being consulted on class management (Q6), contributing to self-assessment (Q9), and determining course content (Q2) were neutral to slightly positive, their attitudes towards the aspects of teaching such as being consulted on homework tasks (Q8), being consulted on methodology (Q5), being consulted on record keeping (Q7), being consulted on learning tasks (Q11), establishing course objectives (Q1), choosing materials (Q3), selecting study time, place and pace (Q4), and being consulted on teaching focus (Q10) were neutral to slightly negative. Overall, the participating teachers in Camilleri study did not express strong resistance towards learner autonomy or involving learners in decision-making processes regarding their own learning.

The study appears in a publication consisting of four articles written by project members. All articles, as well as the reflections of George Camilleri on the global

findings, were edited and published by George Camilleri as part of the European Center for Modern Languages (ECML). The study can be downloaded from the website ‘[www.ecml.at/documents/pubCamilleriG\\_E.pdf](http://www.ecml.at/documents/pubCamilleriG_E.pdf)’. In addition to the articles, a copy of the questionnaire, tables containing and showing the actual study, list of project members, and short professional biographies of the contributors were given in the appendices. The data were also presented in the form of graphs (Camilleri, 1997). The questionnaire for the present study originated from G. Camilleri (1997).

In the next section, learner autonomy will be viewed from an overall cultural point of view. In addition, the characteristics of the Turkish educational system and Turkish foreign language learners will be discussed.

### Culture and Learner Autonomy

In this section learner autonomy will be viewed from a cultural point of view. Before an overall picture of the characteristics of the Turkish educational system and Turkish foreign language teachers and learners relating to learner autonomy, three case studies that were conducted in non-Western contexts to investigate whether or not the promotion of learner autonomy in formal learning environments is possible will be presented.

The cultural appropriateness of the idea of learner autonomy is a controversial issue in the literature. Various studies in relation to the culture and promotion of learner autonomy reveal that cultural setting plays an important role for the promotion of learner autonomy (Sancar, 2001; Egel, 2003). For instance, in many non-Western societies, such as China, Japan, and Turkey, the education systems are ‘examination-oriented’ and ‘highly-competitive’ (Chan, 2001, p. 507). Thus,

learners are mostly “dependent, lacking in intellectual initiative and incline to favor rote learning over creative learning” (Chan, 2003, p. 34; Yumuk, 2002).

Little (1999) states that autonomy is a universal human capacity. The cultural setting in which learning takes place should be paid attention to because different cultural contexts may necessitate different practices and produce different outcomes particularly enhancing learner autonomy in formal learning environments (Chan, 2001). Additionally, in order to present whether or not there is a significant relationship between the culture and the promotion of learner autonomy in non-Western cultures, some of the studies conducted to investigate if the promotion of learner autonomy is an achievable educational goal in non-Western cultures were successful while some of them were not (Egel, 2003; Yumuk, 2002). For instance, Yumuk’s study (2002) revealed that the promotion of learner autonomy is achievable particularly having students develop an ownership of the learning process and becoming more self-confident in questioning their teacher-dependent learning habits (Yumuk, 2002). The following section will present three sample case studies conducted in the non-Western contexts of Japan, China and Turkey to investigate the relationship between culture and the promotion of learner autonomy.

#### Case Studies as Related to the Promotion of Learner Autonomy

In this section, three sample case studies that were conducted in the non-Western teaching contexts of Japan, China and Turkey to investigate students’ attitudes towards learner autonomy. The titles of the case studies are as follows: “Learner autonomy: learning from the student’s voice by Miyuki Usuki, Japan; “Autonomous Language Learning: Hong Kong Tertiary Students’ Attitudes and Behaviors” by Victoria Chan, Mary Spratt and Gillian Humphreys, China; and

“Letting go of control to the learners: The role of the Internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation course” by Ayse Yumuk, Turkey.

### Japan

The study “learner autonomy: learning from the student’s voice was conducted by Miyuki Usuki. The purpose of the study was to discover students’ opinions about both their role as learners and the role of their teachers’ in classroom.

The study was conducted with the participation of 52 Japanese students majoring in English in a private university in Kanazawa, Japan, in 1998.

The data for this study was collected through journals in which students were asked to keep and write freely about the role of the learners and the role of the teachers in a classroom. Participating students wrote their journals in Japanese. The student journals then were translated into English.

For the analysis, the transcriptions were compared and the common themes were categorized. According to the frequency of the themes in the data, percentages of the common themes were calculated. The data set was coded and divided into eight groups as follows: (a) self-direction, (b) seeking opportunities for self-growth, (c) seeking learning opportunities, (d) being aware of objectives and goal setting, (e) self-monitoring, (f) self-motivation, (g) environmental structuring, and (h) getting information.

The researcher states that Japanese students are mostly described as passive learners who are accustomed to accepting the teacher’s authority without questioning. However, the results showed that there seems to be a gap between learners’ external passivity and their internal perceptions. The results revealed that

students seem to be aware that they need to be active and that they should seek interactions with others in the classroom.

The researcher argues that learners should be encouraged to change their learning styles and learning strategies. The researcher also states that learner training often concerns raising learners' awareness of their own learning processes by teaching effective strategies. The learners may not know what they should do, but the biggest problem for them may be a psychological barrier. For that reason, strategy training, learner training or awareness-raising, group work or Project work settings would lead students to develop a more autonomous learning vision.

### Hong Kong

In the study titled "Autonomous Language Learning: Hong Kong Tertiary Students' Attitudes and Behaviors", Victoria Chan, Mary Spratt and Gillian Humphreys investigated Hong Kong Polytechnic University students' (a) views of their responsibilities and decision-making abilities in learning English, (b) their motivation level and (c) the actual language learning activities they undertook inside and outside the classroom with a view to measuring their readiness for autonomous learning.

The study was a large-scale survey on learner autonomy conducted with the participation of a group of Hong Kong Polytechnic University students in 2002. The primary purpose of the study was to discover the relationship between students' attitudes towards learner autonomy and their autonomous practice, and also to discover how ready students are to take on autonomous learning behavior in the wider learning environment.

The data for this study was collected through a questionnaire to which 508 undergraduates at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University responded. Of the participating undergraduates, 421 were degree students and 87 were higher diploma students from a range of academic departments in the university. In addition to the questionnaire, interviews were conducted with a selected group of students to make sure that both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered.

The student questionnaire consisted of 52 questions, divided into four main sections. The participating students were asked to indicate their opinions regarding (a) their perceptions of the English teachers' responsibilities and their own, (b) their perceptions of their decision-making abilities, (c) their motivation to study English, and (d) how often they carried out different autonomous activities both inside and outside the classrooms.

Results showed that the majority of the participating students think that it is the teachers' job (a) to choose learning materials, (b) to evaluate, (c) to decide what to learn next in the English lessons, (d) to choose what activities to use to learn English in the English lessons, and (e) to decide the objectives of the English course. The interviews also revealed consistent responses. The majority of the students stated that 'the teacher was paid to do the job', and 'the teacher had the expertise'. Yet, for the areas such as 'deciding what to learn outside the class', 'making students work harder', 'making sure they make progress outside class', students expressed that they should take more responsibility.

For questions regarding students' decision-making abilities, one-third of the participating students indicated that they were good or very good at identifying their own weaknesses in English, and choosing learning materials and activities outside

class. For in-class activities, almost one-third of the participating students indicated that they cannot handle areas such as choosing learning materials in class, deciding what to learn next in the English lessons, and choosing learning objectives in class.

### Turkey

The study ‘Letting go of control to the learners: The role of the Internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation course’ was conducted by Ayse Yumuk, Turkey. This study investigated how an Internet information search based program in an academic course can encourage learners to take more responsibility for their own learning.

This study was conducted with the participation of 90 third-year Turkish-speaking Bilkent University translation students in 2002. For this study, the Internet information search based program was implemented to encourage students to use the Internet in order to select, analyze, evaluate and apply relevant information to enhance the accuracy of their translations. The purpose of the study was to design and evaluate a program that may encourage students to use the Internet to select, analyze, evaluate and apply relevant information to boost the accuracy of their tasks as well as promoting a change in students’ attitudes from a traditional mode of teaching to a more autonomous view of learning. This study began with the hypothesis that by means of the Internet, learners’ critical thinking ability may be developed and thus they may start questioning their teacher-dependent learning habits.

For this study, the data was collected using pre-and post- course questionnaires, post-course interviews, and a teacher journal that is kept by teacher weekly. The pre- and post-course questionnaires consisted of one open-ended

question and 11 yes/no and 'why' questions to try to understand whether or not there was a change in learners' traditional, teacher-dependent view of learning towards a more autonomous view. In the interviews, interviewees were asked 8 questions in relation to their attitudes towards the new techniques that were applied during the program.

The gathered data were analyzed by making a comparison between the responses to the pre- and post-course questionnaires. The interview results and diary were coded and analyzed as they are related to the categories of the analysis of questionnaires.

The results of the study revealed that the program was successful. The students who were unwilling to take responsibility for their own learning in the initial stages became actively involved in the learning process by searching for, analyzing, and transferring information from the Internet to translation tasks.

The researcher concludes her paper indicating that the Internet can be a beneficial tool to enable learners to have more control in selecting, analyzing, evaluating and applying information for their own purposes.

In this section, the role of culture in terms of the promotion of learner accompanied by three sample case studies was presented. The following section will discuss the current Turkish educational system and the applicability of theory of learner autonomy in formal learning environments in Turkey.

#### Present Situation in Turkey

The promotion of learner autonomy is strictly related to the education system. The Turkish education system is mostly defined as traditional and the schools are rule-bound institutions where virtues such as independence, individuality and

creativity of students are not as valued as virtues such as diligence, obedience, conformity and discipline. Yumuk (2002) describes the Turkish educational system as follows:

In Turkey recitation is a common mode of teaching in both the primary and secondary educational systems. The majority of learners undergo the process of learning through traditional educational methods in which the teacher is the 'authority' rather than the 'facilitator'. The teacher-student relationship is mainly limited to one-way channels of communication in which teachers transfer information to learners. The assessment of learner performance is generally product-oriented rather than process-oriented, mainly a summative evaluation in the form of exams that are based upon learners' memorization of information they have learned in the course.

(p.143)

In most of the state schools in Turkey, learners are trained to adopt dependent behavior which may be difficult to recondition (Sancar, 2001). In addition, one of the main problems discouraging learners to become independent in Turkey is the way teachers are educated (Yumuk, 2002).

Because teachers are also educated in the same Turkish educational system, where the teacher is the main authority in the classroom, it might be difficult for them to change their teaching strategies in a short period of time.

(Yumuk, 2002, p.152)

In brief, the educational system in Turkey can be described as being traditional, teacher-dominated, and authority-oriented in which expository and didactic teaching methods are common. Additionally, schools are mostly rule-bound places in which independence, individuality and creativity are less favored than obedience, conformity, discipline and diligence. As a result of the competitive examination system in Turkey, Turkish learners are mostly syllabus dependent, passive, exam-oriented, and do not volunteer to take initiatives.

Teachers can play an important role in supporting change in the educational system toward learner autonomy. Because learner autonomy supports the development of individuality and learning choices, how much teachers know about it is crucial. This research attempts to fill the gap in the literature by investigating whether or not Turkish English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities in Turkey are ready and willing to promote learner autonomy in their teaching contexts and in what areas of teaching they find the promotion of learner autonomy to be more suitable than others.

### Conclusion

In this chapter the literature on the theory of learner autonomy was reviewed. The literature on the definition of learner autonomy, approaches to promote learner autonomy, learning strategies, curriculum, classroom management, lesson methodology, assessment, teacher and student roles in learner autonomy, as well as the original study, and learner autonomy in Turkey were discussed. The next chapter will be concerning the methodology used in this study, including participants, instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

### Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the attitudes towards learner autonomy among English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. I attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards learner autonomy; specifically relating to involving learners in decision making processes regarding their own learning?
2. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards sharing responsibility with their students to promote learner autonomy in their classes?
3. What areas of teaching do English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities find more suitable for the promotion of learner autonomy?

This methodology chapter is composed of four sections. In the first section, the participants in the study and their profiles are described. In the second section, the materials and instruments used will be explained. In the third section, detailed information on data collection procedures will be presented. The final section gives information about how the data was analyzed.

## Participants

The study was conducted at six state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. Participant universities were as follows: Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University in Afyonkarahisar, Akdeniz University in Antalya, Balikesir University in Balikesir, Mugla University in Mugla, Nigde University in Nigde, and Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak. At these six universities a total of 72 English language instructors completed the learner autonomy questionnaire.

I chose to conduct the study at state-supported provincial universities listed above because my home university, Nigde University, was identified as the starting point for this study. The chosen universities have similar characteristics to Nigde University: they are located in relatively small cities (population less than 250,000), were founded relatively recently (since 1980), and have common curricular emphases (e.g. a vocational focus in curricula). In addition, accessibility was also a consideration. The first criterion for the selection was location. As shown in Table 1 below, apart from Akdeniz University located in Antalya, the other participant universities were located in provincial cities. Cities with a population below 250.000 were considered ‘provincial’ cities. Although Antalya Akdeniz University did not match the size criterion, it was included in this study because of its accessibility and match with the other criteria of founding date and curricular emphasis. As shown in Table 1, all participant universities were established after 1980, and therefore are considered to be ‘new’ for the purposes of this study. In addition, all selected universities were state-supported and have similar vocational-oriented curricula.

Table 1

Characteristics of Participating State Universities

| Name of participating universities | City           | Population | Founding date |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University | Afyonkarahisar | 128.516    | 1992          |
| Akdeniz University                 | Antalya        | 603.190*   | 1982          |
| Balikesir University               | Balikesir      | 215.436    | 1992          |
| Mugla University                   | Mugla          | 43.845     | 1992          |
| Nigde University                   | Nigde          | 78.088     | 1992          |
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University     | Zonguldak      | 104.276    | 1992          |

Total: 6 universities

\*Note. As mentioned above, although Akdeniz University is located in a larger city than the others in this study, it is included because of its accessibility and fit with other criteria.

For this study 72 English language instructors from the participant universities (see Table 1) agreed to participate in the study. The distribution of the participants according to university can be seen in Table 2 below. The percentages presented in the table are of the total number of questionnaires returned. Because the rate of return from each university was different, the numbers have no relationship to the total numbers of instructors at each university.

Table 2

Distribution of Instructors Responding to the Questionnaire

| Name of the participating university | TN  | N  | PR    | PRT   |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|-------|
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University   | 12  | 8  | 66.67 | 11.1  |
| Akdeniz University                   | 27  | 9  | 33.33 | 12.5  |
| Balikesir University                 | 17  | 10 | 58.82 | 13.9  |
| Mugla University                     | 45  | 24 | 53.33 | 33.3  |
| Nigde University                     | 16  | 12 | 75.00 | 16.7  |
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University       | 29  | 9  | 31.03 | 12.5  |
| TOTAL                                | 146 | 72 | 49.32 | 100.0 |

Note. TN = total number of English language instructors; N = number of respondents; PR = percent of respondents from participant universities; PRT = percent of total returned for this study

The preliminary section of the questionnaire (See Appendix A for questionnaire sample) included items relating to instructors' education and background experience. Table 3 presents the educational profile of the participants.

Table 3

Educational Degree of the Participants

| Educational Degree | N  | P     |
|--------------------|----|-------|
| BA                 | 44 | 61.1  |
| MA                 | 20 | 27.8  |
| Ph.D.              | 1  | 1.4   |
| Not specified      | 7  | 9.7   |
| TOTAL              | 72 | 100.0 |

Note. N = Number of responses; P= percent

The portrait of the instructors' educational degrees reveals that BA degree holders are the dominant community in the field. As seen in Table 3, more than half of the instructors are university graduates while almost 28% had Master's degrees. Almost 10 % of the participant instructors did not give information in relation to their educational degree.

The background experience section in the preliminary section of the questionnaire collected information about the teaching experience of the participants. This information is summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Teaching Experience of Participating Instructors

| Years of teaching experience | N  | P     |
|------------------------------|----|-------|
| Less than one year           | 1  | 1.4   |
| 1-4 years                    | 14 | 19.4  |
| 5-8 years                    | 14 | 19.4  |
| 9-12 years                   | 26 | 36.1  |
| 13-16 years                  | 6  | 8.3   |
| More than 20 years           | 3  | 4.2   |
| Not specified                | 8  | 11.1  |
| TOTAL                        | 72 | 100.0 |

Note. N = Number of responses; P = percent

An analysis of teaching experience of participating instructors reveals that the most of the instructors have been in the field between 9 and 12 years. The second largest groups represented in the questionnaire have been in the field of English language teaching (ELT) between 1 to 4 years, and 5 to 8 years. As seen in the Table 4, almost 12 % of the participant instructors did not provide information in relation to their teaching experience.

The types of schools participant instructors indicated experience in are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Participant School Experience

| Type of schools                           | N  | P     |
|-------------------------------------------|----|-------|
| Vocational college (2 yr.)                | 4  | 5.6   |
| University faculties (4 yr)               | 7  | 9.7   |
| Vocational college + University faculties | 11 | 15.3  |
| Preparatory school (1yr)                  | 36 | 50.0  |
| University faculties + preparatory school | 3  | 4.2   |
| All                                       | 1  | 1.4   |
| Not specified                             | 10 | 13.9  |
| TOTAL                                     | 72 | 100.0 |

Note. N = Number of responses; P= percent

As seen in Table 5, the largest group of instructors has been teaching English at preparatory schools. The second largest group of instructors with the percentage of 15.3 % has been teaching English at both vocational colleges and faculties.

This section presented detailed information about the participants for this study. The next section is about the instruments used to gather data for this study.

### Instruments

Materials used in this study included a questionnaire on learner autonomy and a set of interview questions. Below, I will describe both instruments in detail.

#### Questionnaire

The questionnaire, (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire) was adapted from Camilleri's (1997) study, 'Learner Autonomy: The Teacher's Views'. The original study investigated teachers' attitudes towards learner autonomy. The study was based on the idea that teachers may consider some aspects of teaching and learning a foreign language to be more suitable than others for the implementation of learner autonomy. To collect data for the study, a detailed questionnaire was administered to practicing English teachers in Malta, Slovenia, The Netherlands, Poland, Estonia, and Belorussia. The questionnaire was in English and members agreed to translate it into the subjects' mother tongue, if it was felt necessary. In October 1997, the questionnaires were administered in Belorussia, Estonia, Malta (Teacher Group 1), Malta (Teacher Group 2), Netherlands, Poland, and Slovenia by project members and the contributors.

Before administering the questionnaire, some adaptations were made, primarily to simplify the language and make it more accessible for the respondents. For example, the question "How much should the learner be involved in decisions

on what is to be learned from materials given by the teacher?” was changed into “How much should the learner be involved in decisions on what to focus on from materials given by the teacher?”. In addition, the question “How much should the learner be encouraged to find out learning procedures by himself or herself?” was changed into “How much should the learner be encouraged to find out learning strategies by himself or herself?”. Third, question 6 in the original questionnaire was moved to become question 11 in the questionnaire because of concerns related to the format of the questionnaire. Last, the abbreviation ‘AVA’s’ was changed into ‘Authentic learning material’ for ease of comprehension.

After having completed necessary adaptations, this questionnaire was distributed or made available to all English language instructors at each institution listed above (See table 2). The questionnaire consisted of 13 main questions designed to find out teachers’ ideas as to what extent learners should be involved in decision making processes concerning the general aspects of their own learning. Questions from 1 to 10 included sub-category items concerning more detailed aspects of learning. Table 6 below presents a summary of the structure of the questionnaire and the question types used in it. The questionnaire also included a consent form informing participants that the questionnaire was voluntary and confidential (see Appendix A). Because the respondents are English language instructors, and the English language in the questionnaire was determined to be quite straight forward, the questionnaire was distributed in English.

Table 6

The Structure of the Questionnaire

| Items in the questionnaire | Subsection parts grouped | Grouped items by purpose           | Question Types |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Q1                         | a, b                     | Establish course objectives        | L-S            |
| Q2                         | a, b                     | Determine course content           | L-S            |
| Q3                         | a, b, c                  | Choose materials                   | L-S            |
| Q4                         | a, b, c                  | Select study time, place, and pace | L-S            |
| Q5                         | a, b, c, d               | Be consulted on methodology        | L-S            |
| Q6                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on class management   | L-S            |
| Q7                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on record keeping     | L-S            |
| Q8                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on homework tasks     | L-S            |
| Q9                         | a, b, c                  | Contribute self-assessment         | L-S            |
| Q10                        | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on teaching focus     | L-S            |
| Q11                        | -                        | Be consulted on learning tasks     | L-S            |
| Q12                        | -                        | Formulate own explanations         | L-S            |
| Q13                        | -                        | Find own learning strategies       | L-S            |
| TOTAL: 13 main items       |                          | 29 subsection parts grouped        | L-S            |

Note. L-S = Likert – Scale

Note. See appendix A for a sample of questionnaire

The thirteen items in the questionnaire were designed to investigate English language instructors' ideas about how much learners should be involved in determining various aspects of course development. These included whether learners should be given a share of responsibility in the decision making process regarding the course objectives; course content; material selection; study time, place and pace; lesson methodology; class management; record-keeping; homework tasks; self-assessment; learning tasks; and learning strategies. Respondents were asked to indicate their opinions on a five-point Likert scale, with 'not at all', 'little', 'partly', 'much' and 'very much' options for each item. In addition, respondents were given the option of writing a comment after each individual question.

## Interviews

For this study interviews were conducted with volunteer English language instructors to follow up on specific information from the questionnaire. The respondents of the questionnaire were asked whether they would like to be the participants for the interviews. There was no specific criterion for the selection of the participants for the interviews. Table 7 below presents a summary of the participants for the interviews. (See Appendix D for a copy of the interview protocol).

Table 7

### Participants in the Interviews

| Participant universities           | N  | Type of interview               |
|------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University | 3  | Face-to-face (group discussion) |
| Antalya University                 | 1  | Face-to-face                    |
| Mugla university                   | 1  | Telephone interview             |
| Nigde university                   | 4  | Face-to-face                    |
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University     | 1  | Telephone interview             |
| TOTAL                              | 10 |                                 |

Note. N= Number of participants

As seen in Table 7, six of the interviews were face-to-face. Two of the interviews were conducted on the telephone because I could not visit Balikesir University, Mugla University or Zonguldak Karaelmas University. The interviewees from Mugla University and Zonguldak Karaelmas University were contacted by telephone. I could not contact any instructors from Balikesir University to conduct interviews.

At the beginning of the face-to-face interview, interviewees were asked if they would like to speak in English or Turkish. All participants indicated a preference for Turkish; thus, all interviews were conducted in Turkish. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed afterwards for analysis. In addition, at the beginning of the

telephone interviews, interviewees were asked if they would like to participate in the telephone interview. After the interviewees agreed to participate, they were asked if they would like to speak in English or Turkish. All participants indicated a preference for Turkish; thus all telephone interviews were also conducted in Turkish. I also took careful notes on paper while talking to interviewees. Because I did not have technical equipment to record the telephone interview, these interviews were not recorded

In the interviews, interviewees were asked nine questions about their teaching contexts, their expectations from their students, administration, and their students' attitudes towards learning English. Some sample interview questions follow: (a) "How would you describe the learners, in general, at your institute?" (b) "What are the general characteristics of learners at your institute?" (c) "How would you describe the teaching environment on the part of your colleagues in relation to instructional innovation?"

This section presented detailed information in relation to the instruments used to gather data for this study. The next section concerns how data were collected for this study.

### Data Collection Procedures

In the first week of February 2005, after preparing the questionnaire, I wrote e-mails to ask permission to conduct this study to the heads of foreign language departments of the universities. The universities contacted were as follows: Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University in Afyonkarahisar, Balikesir University in Balikesir, Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University in Bolu, Çanakkale University in Çanakkale, Karadeniz Technical University in Trabzon, Kirikkale University in

Kirikkale, Mugla University in Mugla, Nigde University in Nigde and Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak. Table 8 below presents information in relation to which universities were selected and which were not and why.

Table 8

The List of Universities Originally Contacted for the Study

| Universities                       | Selected Universities | Reasons Not Selected        |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University | Yes                   |                             |
| Balikesir University               | Yes                   |                             |
| Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University | No                    | Not accessible              |
| Çanakkale University               | No                    | Not accessible              |
| Karadeniz Technical University     | No                    | Did not fit in the criteria |
| Kirikkale University               | No                    | Not accessible              |
| Mugla University                   | Yes                   |                             |
| Nigde University                   | Yes                   |                             |
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University     | Yes                   |                             |

In addition, formal follow-up letters written by the MA TEFL Program Director were sent to the heads of foreign language departments of selected universities introducing the research project. A sample of the questionnaire and sample interview questions were attached to the letters. Following the letter distribution I contacted the heads of foreign language departments of the universities that were accessible to schedule meetings.

I first went to Afyonkarahisar to distribute questionnaires to English language instructors at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University on March 4, 2005. After receiving permission from the head of the foreign language department, ten questionnaires were given to the instructors available at that time. Eight of the questionnaires were completed and returned. Upon completing the questionnaires, I asked the English language instructors whether or not they would like to be interviewed. Three English language instructors volunteered and a group interview

was conducted. The interview took approximately 45 minutes. The interview was tape-recorded, and in addition, I took careful notes as the interview was being conducted.

I next went to Antalya to administer questionnaires and conduct interviews at Antalya Akdeniz University. Because many of the English language instructors were working at that time of the day, the questionnaires and interview forms were given to the department secretary for later distribution. Because of time restrictions, an acquaintance in Antalya was asked to collect and to send the questionnaires. A total of 9 questionnaires were returned. I conducted an interview with only one instructor from Antalya University. The interview took almost 45 minutes. The interview was tape-recorded and in addition, I took careful notes as the interview was being conducted.

I also traveled to Nigde to administer questionnaires and conduct interviews with the English language instructors working at Nigde University. On March 8, 2005, I visited the head of the foreign language department of Nigde University to get permission to conduct the study. Upon receiving permission, I distributed the questionnaires. In two days' time, 12 English language instructors completed and returned the questionnaires. In addition, four of them volunteered to take part in interviews.

On March 10, 2005, I went to Kirikkale but because of some formal administrative problems at Kirikkale University, I could not conduct this study at that university.

For Mugla University and Zonguldak Karaelmas University, I asked colleagues in the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University who were working at

Mugla University, Müzeyyen Aykaç, and Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Evren Köse, to administer the questionnaires at their home institutions. In the second week of March, 2005, they administered the questionnaires at their home institutions. Forty questionnaires were given to Müzeyyen Aykaç for distribution to English language instructors at Mugla University, and 24 of them were returned. As for Zonguldak Karaelmas University, ten questionnaires were given to Evren Köse for distribution to English language instructors and nine were returned. In addition, I contacted some instructors from each university by telephone to conduct telephone interviews. One instructor from Mugla University and one instructor from Zonguldak Karaelmas University agreed to participate in telephone interviews. I took careful notes as the telephone interview was being conducted.

For Balıkesir University, the study was conducted by a former colleague living in Balıkesir. Fifteen questionnaires were sent by mail to Balıkesir University. Ten questionnaires were completed by instructors at Balıkesir University. I tried to contact instructors from Balıkesir University by telephone to conduct telephone interviews, but could not conduct any interviews.

This section presented detailed information in relation to how the data for this study was gathered. The next section summarizes how the gathered data was analyzed.

### Data Analysis

The data for this study was composed of both quantitative data, from the questionnaires, and qualitative data, from the interviews. In order to analyze the qualitative data, the Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS 13.0) was used. Both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were used to present the data

and draw conclusions. In order to present the data, the items in the questionnaire were grouped under various topics according to topic similarity.

The distribution of the participants according to universities was shown in the form of both numbers and percentages in a separate table in the section about participants in this chapter (See Table 2). In addition, the distribution of the participants according to their educational background (See Table 3), years of teaching (See Table 4), and type of schools in which they had been teaching (See Table 5), were shown in the form of both numbers and percentages in separate tables in the section about participants in this chapter. For the questionnaires, items on the five-point Likert scale were assessed values ranging from 1 to 5. The scoring for the statements were as follows: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Little, 3 = Partly, 4 = Much, 5 = Very much. To investigate the instructors' perceptions of learner autonomy one ANOVA test was run. ANOVA was used to show the differences among participant universities in the overall perceptions towards learner autonomy. Tukey's HSD was used for *post hoc* analysis in order to determine the exact location of differences when significant results were indicated in the ANOVA tests. Also, in order to understand whether or not there is a relationship among the participating universities instructors' opinions in terms of the extent that learners should be given a share of the instructional responsibilities, Kendall's coefficient concordance test was run.

For qualitative data analyses, the interviews conducted were first transcribed and then analyzed. After the interviews were analyzed, the ideas which were common were chosen and used as the basis for qualitative data for this study.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, descriptions of the participants, instruments used, and data collection and analysis procedures were presented. The next chapter explains the data analysis procedures and specific outcomes in more detail.

## CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

### Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the attitudes towards learner autonomy among English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. I attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards learner autonomy, specifically relating to involving learners in decision-making processes regarding their own learning?
2. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards sharing responsibility with their students to promote learner autonomy in their classes?
3. What areas of teaching do English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities find more suitable for the promotion of learner autonomy?

This study was conducted with the participation of 72 English language instructors working at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University in Afyonkarahisar, Akdeniz University in Antalya, Balikesir University in Balikesir, Mugla University

in Mugla, Nigde University in Nigde, and Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak.

This first section of this chapter presents an analysis of qualitative data collected for this study through questionnaires (See appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). The analysis will be presented in three different sub-sections. The first sub-section presents respondent participating instructors' general attitudes towards learner autonomy. In the second sub-section, an analysis of participating instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners and how items in the questionnaires were grouped are presented. The third sub-section presents the results of an analysis of participating universities. In this sub-section, each participating university instructors' opinions as to what extent learners should be involved in the decision making process are presented. Next, the results of the original Camilleri study are compared to the present study. Following the discussion of the questionnaire responses, the next section of this chapter presents data collected through interviews conducted with 10 English language instructors.

The second section of data analysis chapter will present qualitative data from 10 interviews organized into five sub-sections. The first sub-section presents a general overview of students' characteristics identified by instructors during interviews. The second sub-section presents instructors' thoughts about their teaching contexts in relation to learner autonomy. In the next sub-section, instructors' expectations concerning their students and students' expectations concerning their teachers will be presented from the instructors' point of view in relation to learner autonomy. The last sub-section will present instructors' ideas

about what makes an effective learner as these ideas emerged from interviews on learner autonomy.

### Quantitative Data

The results of this study were based first on quantitative data collected through questionnaires. Items in the questionnaire were designed on a five point Likert scale and were assigned values ranging from 1 to 5. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements given within the questionnaire. The scoring for “agreement” statements was as follows: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Little, 3 = Partly, 4 = Much, 5 = Very much. For data analysis, one ANOVA test was run to investigate the attitudes towards learner autonomy among participant universities. ANOVA was used to compare among groups in the overall attitudes towards learner autonomy and towards the degree that learners should be involved in decisions concerning their own learning. When significant results were indicated in the ANOVA test, Tukey’s HSD was used for *post hoc* analysis in order to determine the exact location of the differences.

I considered entries between values ranging from 1 to 2.49 as an expression of resistance to learner autonomy. Concurrently, the values from 3.5 to 5 were considered as an expression of support for learner autonomy. The values ranging from 2.49 to 3.49 were considered as a neutral attitude towards learner autonomy. For the general interpretations of entries, see Table 9 below.

Table 9

General Interpretations of Likert Scale Entries

| Actual scale              | Not at all | Little     | Partly | Much       | Very much |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------|------------|-----------|
| Values                    | 1          | 2          | 3      | 4          | 5         |
| Value range               | 1- 2.49    | 2.5 - 3.49 |        | 3.5 - 5    |           |
| Interpretations of ranges | Resistance | Neutral    |        | Supportive |           |

The next section presents a general overview of participating instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy.

Participating Instructors' Overall Attitudes towards Learner Autonomy

Instructors' overall attitudes towards learner autonomy are presented in Table 10 below. Participating universities were ranked by means from most supportive to least supportive of learner autonomy in terms of overall positive responses to questionnaire statements. As is shown in Table 10, a score of 3.09 reveals that the general attitude among participating universities toward learner autonomy and therefore involving learners in the decision making process regarding their own learning is neutral to slightly positive. However, given the fact that only 49 % of working instructors responded to the questionnaire, this result cannot be considered as a reflection of all working instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy.

Table 10

Mean Values for Instructors' Overall Attitudes toward Learner Autonomy

| Participant universities           | TN  | N  | %     | M    | Interpretation      |
|------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|------|---------------------|
| Zonguldak Karaelmas University     | 29  | 9  | 31.03 | 3.60 | Strong support      |
| Balikesir University               | 17  | 10 | 58.82 | 3.22 | Neutral to positive |
| Mugla University                   | 45  | 24 | 53.33 | 3.18 |                     |
| Antalya University                 | 27  | 9  | 33.33 | 3.15 |                     |
| Nigde University                   | 16  | 12 | 75.00 | 2.88 | Neutral to          |
| Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University | 12  | 8  | 66.67 | 2.76 | negative            |
| TOTAL                              | 146 | 72 | 49.32 | 3.14 |                     |

Note. TN = total number of instructors working N= number of participating English Language instructors; % = percentages; M= 5 point Likert-scale mean

As can be seen in Table 10, Zonguldak Karaelmas University (ZKU), with nine instructors participating, has the highest mean value of 3.60. A score of 3.60 indicates that ZKU instructors support learner autonomy (see Table 9 for general interpretations of the entries) and, thus, agree that learners should be involved in many of the decision-making processes regarding their own learning. Balikesir University (BU) instructors, with the second highest mean value of 3.22, and a participant number of ten, are neutral to slightly positive toward the promotion of learner autonomy and toward involving learners in the decision making process. Similar to BU, Mugla University (MU), with twenty-four participating instructors and a mean value of 3.18, and Antalya University (AU), with nine participating instructors and a mean value of 3.15, are also neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy.

In summary, this data revealed that BU, MU, and AU instructors seem to be neither strongly supportive nor resistant to the promotion of learner autonomy. Nigde University (NU), with twelve instructors participating and a mean value of 2.88, and Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University (AKU), with nine instructors participating and a mean value of 2.76, are neutral to slightly negative toward learner autonomy.

The general picture of attitudes of instructors towards learner autonomy in the examination of questionnaire responses reveals that participating instructors neither support nor resist the promotion of learner autonomy and the notion of involving learners in decisions concerning their own learning. Thus, one interpretation could be that instructors working at these universities are neutral towards the promotion of

learner autonomy and the notion of involving learners in the decision making process regarding their own learning.

This section presented the general picture of attitudes of participating instructors towards learner autonomy. The next section will discuss the significant differences among participating universities.

#### Differences among Participating Universities

In order to compare the possible differences in attitudes among six participating universities, the responses were compared by running an ANOVA test. Tukey's HSD was used where significant ANOVA results occurred to determine where the difference in the results lay.

To compare the instructors' overall attitudes, the responses of instructors were analyzed by calculating individual instructor means and by running an ANOVA test. Table 11 below shows that a significant difference exists between groups.

Table 11

#### ANOVA Results for the Difference among the Means

|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Between Groups | 3.931          | 5  | .786        | 4.245 | .002* |
| Within Groups  | 12.222         | 66 | .185        |       |       |
| TOTAL          | 16.153         | 71 |             |       |       |

Note. F = variance

\*p<.05

The results in Table 11 show a significant difference exists between groups. In order to determine the exact location of this difference, Tukey's HSD was applied as a post hoc test. When the results from Tukey's test are analyzed, it is seen that Zonguldak Karaelmas University showed a significant difference from Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University and Nigde University.

### Item Grouping in Questionnaire

Given that the participating instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy in the analysis above ranged from slightly negative to neutral to slightly positive, it might be beneficial to investigate more specifically those areas in which instructors think the promotion of learner autonomy is more suitable than others. For that reason, the items in the questionnaire were grouped according to topic similarity.

Table 12 below presents a summary of how items in the questionnaire were grouped for analysis.

Table 12

#### Item Grouping in Questionnaire

| Items in the questionnaire | Subsection parts grouped | Grouped items by purpose           |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Q1                         | a, b                     | Establish course objectives        |
| Q2                         | a, b                     | Determine course content           |
| Q3                         | a, b, c                  | Choose materials                   |
| Q4                         | a, b, c                  | Select study time, place, and pace |
| Q5                         | a, b, c, d               | Be consulted on methodology        |
| Q6                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on class management   |
| Q7                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on record keeping     |
| Q8                         | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on homework tasks     |
| Q9                         | a, b, c                  | Contribute self-assessment         |
| Q10                        | a, b, c                  | Be consulted on teaching focus     |
| Q11                        | -                        | Be consulted on learning tasks     |
| Q12                        | -                        | Formulate own explanations         |
| Q13                        | -                        | Find own learning strategies       |
| TOTAL: 13 main items       |                          | 29 subsection parts grouped        |

Note. Purposes as given in the table are short-hand versions of the full questionnaire items which can be found in Appendix A

### Analysis of Instructors' Views as to What Instructional Responsibilities Should Be Shared with Learners

Table 13 below is designed to present the participating instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners. Table 13 may also

be interpreted as the analysis of certain areas instructors find more appropriate for the promotion of learner autonomy.

Table 13

Questionnaire Mean Responses to All Questionnaire Items, All Instructors

| Items | Item focus                       | N  | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|----------------------------------|----|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies     | 71 | 4.14 | Support             |
| Q12   | Formulate self explanations      | 71 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment       | 70 | 3.58 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives      | 68 | 3.39 | Neutral to positive |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks   | 72 | 3.24 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology      | 72 | 3.08 |                     |
| Q12   | Determine course content         | 71 | 3.01 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus   | 71 | 3.01 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management | 71 | 3.00 |                     |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping   | 71 | 3.00 | Neutral to negative |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks   | 71 | 2.64 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place, pace   | 71 | 2.58 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                 | 70 | 2.44 | Resist              |
| TOTAL | 13 items                         | 72 | 3,14 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored;

As explained above, the items in the questionnaire were grouped (see Table 12) for data analysis and ranked from the most favored to the least favored on the basis of mean responses of participating instructors. As is seen in Table 13, instructors seem to agree that learners should be encouraged to discover learning strategies by themselves, formulate self-explanations for classroom tasks, and contribute self-assessment.

Table 13 shows that participating instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward sharing instructional responsibilities with learners in areas such as establishing the objectives of study, choosing learning tasks, methodology of the lesson, course content, classroom focus, classroom management, and record-keeping. However, as can be seen in Table 13, the instructors' attitudes toward

involving learners in the decision making process in terms of homework tasks; the time, place, and pace of the lesson are neutral to slightly negative.

The item, Q3, ‘choose materials’, attracted the lowest responses. A score of 2.44 can be interpreted as instructors having expressed resistance toward the promotion of learner autonomy and involving learners’ in the process of material selection.

Apart from the items, Q13, ‘learning strategies’; and Q3, ‘choose material’ the general attitude among instructors toward learner autonomy and sharing instructional responses with learners is generally neutral. Consequently, one conclusion that can be drawn is that participant instructors neither support nor resist the promotion of learner autonomy in their teaching contexts.

This section presented the instructors’ views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners. The next section will present instructors views as to what extent instructional responsibilities should be shared in their specific teaching institutions.

#### Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University Instructors' Views on Sharing

##### Instructional Responsibilities with Students

In order to understand Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University (AKU) instructors’ attitudes toward learner autonomy and sharing instructional responsibilities with learners, mean values for grouped items were computed and results were ranked. Table 14 below presents a summary of the thoughts of instructors working at AKU.

Table 14

Questionnaire Mean Responses from AKU to All Questionnaire Items

| Items | Item focus                        | N | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 8 | 3.88 | Support             |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 8 | 3.25 | Neutral to positive |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 8 | 3.13 |                     |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 8 | 3.13 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 8 | 3.00 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 8 | 2.75 | Neutral to negative |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 8 | 2.63 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 8 | 2.50 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 5 | 2.50 |                     |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 8 | 2.50 | Resist              |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 8 | 2.38 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 8 | 2.38 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 8 | 1.88 |                     |
| TOTAL |                                   | 8 | 2.76 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

It appears from Table 14 that Q13, ‘find own learning strategies’, attracted the highest responses. A score of 3.88 can be interpreted as AKU respondents having expressed strong support of learner autonomy. One conclusion that can be drawn from this is that AKU instructors may be willing to bring in learner choice on learning strategies into the classroom experience.

As can be seen in Table 14, AKU instructors are neutral to slightly positive towards learner autonomy and involving learners in decision making process regarding areas such as self-assessment, class management, formulating their own explanations, learning tasks, selection of study time, place and pace, teaching focus, homework tasks, establishing course objectives, and determining course content. The collected data, however, implies that teachers are willing to accept and encourage learner autonomy in different aspects of classroom operations.

However, it appears from Table 14 that the weakest votes for learner autonomy were for Q7, Q5, and Q3. The data collected suggests that AKU instructors have expressed a strong resistance to learner autonomy in sharing instructional responsibilities with learners in areas such as record keeping, methodology of the lesson and material selection. Selecting textbooks and deciding on the time and place of the lesson are in many countries the traditional domains of the school system within which teachers and learners operate. Yet, this cannot be considered to be a reflection of instructors' professional views. Rather, it reflects a situation in schools where some aspects of the classroom experience are dictated by forces outside the classroom, and beyond the influence or discretion of the instructors or learners. Additionally, the traditional domains of the school system within which teachers and learners operate may make instructors feel themselves incapable of initiating any innovations or changes in these areas of the classroom experience. This is very much the case in centralized education systems, where, for example, texts are prescribed by the central authority and in schools where the availability of space and resources is extremely limited (Camilleri, 1997).

Apart from a few areas, AKU instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy are neutral to slightly positive. One conclusion that can be drawn is that at AKU teaching and lessons take place within a tightly knit system but that there exists room for change or flexibility.

#### Antalya University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students

In order to understand Antalya University (AU) instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy, mean values for grouped items were computed and results were

ranked to understand AU instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners. Table 15 below presents a summary of the thoughts of instructors working at AU.

Table 15

Questionnaire Mean Responses from AU to All Questionnaire Items

| Item  | Item focus                        | N | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 9 | 4.33 | Support             |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 9 | 3.56 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 8 | 3.44 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 9 | 3.33 |                     |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 9 | 3.33 | Neutral to positive |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 9 | 3.11 |                     |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 9 | 3.11 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 9 | 3.11 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 9 | 3.00 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 9 | 3.00 | Neutral to negative |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 9 | 2.89 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 9 | 2.44 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 9 | 2.22 | Resist              |
| TOTAL |                                   | 9 | 3.14 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

It appears from Table 15 that, Q13, 'find own learning strategies', attracted the highest responses. A score of 4.33 reveals that AU instructors have expressed strong support of learner autonomy. The second highest score in favor of learner autonomy (3.56) occurred in Q7. The attitude that such responses indicate is that AU instructors stress the importance of giving learners the space to develop their own learning style and consult them on the record-keeping process.

The areas that AU instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy appear in Table 15 as follows: Q9, 'contribute self-assessment'; Q10, 'be consulted on class management'; Q10, 'be consulted on teaching focus'; Q12, 'formulate own explanations'; Q1, 'establish course objectives'; Q2, 'determine

course content'; Q3, 'choose materials'; Q5, 'be consulted on methodology'; and Q11, 'be consulted on learning tasks'. However, for Q6, 'be consulted on class management', attitudes toward learner autonomy among participating instructors are neutral to slightly negative. The results indicate that AU instructors do not resist bringing learner autonomy on different fronts of the classroom experience.

It appears from Table 15 that the weakest votes for learner autonomy were for Q8, 'be consulted on homework tasks', and Q4, 'select study time, place and pace'. The data collected shows that AU instructors have expressed strong resistance to learner autonomy in sharing instructional responses with learners in areas such as, homework tasks and select study time, place and pace. Decision on the time and place of the lesson are in many countries the traditional domains of the school system within which teachers and learners operate. Therefore, this cannot be considered as a reflection of instructors' professional views. Rather, it reflects a situation in schools where some aspects of the classroom experience are dictated by forces outside the classroom, beyond the influence or discretion of the instructors or learners.

Apart from a few areas, AU instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy are neutral to slightly positive. One conclusion that can be drawn is that at AU teaching and lessons take place within a tightly knit system but there exists room for change or flexibility.

#### Balikesir University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students

In order to understand Balikesir University (BU) instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy, mean values for grouped items were computed and results were ranked to understand BU instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities

should be shared with learners. Table 16 presents a summary of the opinions of instructors working at BU.

Table 16

Questionnaire Mean Responses from BU to All Questionnaire Items

| Items | Item focus                        | N  | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----|------|---------------------|
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 10 | 3.90 | Support             |
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 10 | 3.80 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 10 | 3.70 |                     |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 10 | 3.50 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 10 | 3.40 | Neutral to positive |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 10 | 3.30 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 10 | 3.10 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 10 | 3.10 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 10 | 3.00 | Neutral to negative |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 10 | 2.90 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 10 | 2.90 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 10 | 2.80 | Resist              |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 10 | 2.40 |                     |
| TOTAL |                                   | 10 | 3.22 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

It appears from Table 16 that Q11, ‘be consulted on learning tasks’, attracted the highest responses. A score of 3.90 reveals that BU instructors have expressed strong support of learner autonomy and indicates that learners should be consulted on learning tasks. The other highest scores in favor of learner autonomy occurred in Q13, ‘find own learning strategies’, with a mean value of 3.80; Q9, ‘contribute self-assessment’, with a mean value of 3.70; and Q2, ‘determine course content’, with a mean value of 3.50. The attitudes that such responses indicate are that BU instructors stress the importance of giving learners the freedom to air their thoughts on learning tasks, find their own learning strategies, contribute self-assessment and determine the content of a course of a study. In simple terms, instructors agree that

learners should be provided with space to develop their own learning goals, their learning styles and self-assessment.

The areas that BU instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy appear in Table 16 as follows: Q1, ‘establish course objectives’; Q12, ‘formulate own explanations’; Q5, ‘be consulted on methodology’; Q6, ‘be consulted on class management’; and Q10, ‘be consulted on teaching focus’.

However, the results show that BU instructors’ attitudes toward learner autonomy and involving learners in the decision making process in terms of Q4, ‘select study time, place and pace’; Q8, ‘be consulted on homework tasks’; and Q3, ‘choose materials’, are neutral to slightly negative.

It appears from Table 16 that the weakest vote in favor of learner autonomy is for Q7, ‘be consulted on record-keeping’. A score of 2.40 implies that BU instructors have expressed strong resistance to learner autonomy and consulting learners on record keeping. Record keeping is also in many countries the traditional role of teachers (Camilleri, 1997). Therefore, this cannot be considered as a reflection of instructors’ resistance toward learner autonomy.

In summary, BU instructors’ general attitudes toward learner autonomy are neutral to slightly positive. One conclusion that can be drawn is that BU instructors are willing to promote learner autonomy in their classes if they are provided with room for change and flexibility.

Mugla University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities  
with Students

To understand Mugla University (MU) instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy mean values for grouped items were computed and results were ranked. Table 17 below presents a summary of the thoughts of instructors working at MU.

Table 17

Questionnaire Mean Responses from MU to All Questionnaire Items

| Items | Item focus                        | N  | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 24 | 4.46 | Support             |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 24 | 4.21 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 23 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 23 | 3.54 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 24 | 3.25 | Neutral to positive |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 23 | 3.08 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 24 | 3.08 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 23 | 3.00 |                     |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 24 | 3.00 | Neutral to negative |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 23 | 2.88 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 23 | 2.54 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 24 | 2.48 | Resist              |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 23 | 2.25 |                     |
| TOTAL |                                   | 24 | 3.27 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

It appears from the Table 17 that Q13, 'find own learning strategies', attracted the highest responses. A score of 4.46 reveals that MU instructors have expressed strong support of learner autonomy and indicates that learners should be encouraged to find their own learning strategies. The other highest scores in favor of learner autonomy occurred in Q12, 'formulate own explanations', with a mean value of 4.21; Q9, 'contribute self-assessment', with a mean value of 3.74; and Q1, 'establish course objectives', with a mean value of 3.54. These scores indicate that MU instructors stress the importance of giving learners room to find their own learning

strategies, formulate their own explanations, contribute to self-assessment and establish course objectives.

The areas that MU instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy appear in Table 17 are as follows: Q11, 'be consulted on learning tasks'; Q7, 'be consulted on record-keeping'; Q5, 'be consulted on methodology'; Q6, 'be consulted on class-management'; and Q2, 'determine course content'. However, the results show that MU instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy and involving learners in the decision making process in terms of Q10, 'be consulted on teaching focus', and Q8, 'be consulted on homework tasks' are neutral to slightly negative.

It appears from Table 17 that the strongest votes against learner autonomy are for Q4, 'select study time, place and pace', and Q3, 'choose materials'. A score of 2.48 and a score of 2.25 indicate that MU instructors have expressed strong resistance to learner autonomy and giving learners a share of responsibility for the selection of study time, place, and pace as well as learning materials. Therefore, this cannot be considered as a reflection of instructors' resistance toward learner autonomy but rather reflects a situation where some aspects of the classroom experience are dictated by forces outside the classroom, and beyond the influence or discretion of the instructors or learners.

In summary, MU instructors' general attitudes toward learner autonomy are neutral to slightly positive. One conclusion that can be drawn is that MU instructors are willing to promote learner autonomy and are ready to share instructional responsibilities.

Nigde University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities  
with Students

In order to understand Nigde University (NU) instructors' attitudes toward sharing instructional responsibilities with learners, mean values for grouped items were computed and results were ranked. Table 18 below presents a summary of the opinions of instructors working at NU.

Table 18

Questionnaire Mean Responses from NU to All Questionnaire Items

| Items | Item focus                        | N  | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 12 | 3.75 | Support             |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 12 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 12 | 3.58 |                     |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 12 | 3.25 | Neutral to positive |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 12 | 3.17 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 12 | 2.75 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 12 | 2.67 | Neutral to negative |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 12 | 2.67 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 12 | 2.67 |                     |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 12 | 2.50 | Resist              |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 12 | 2.42 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 11 | 2.25 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 11 | 2.17 |                     |
| TOTAL |                                   | 12 | 2.89 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

It appears from Table 18 that Q13, 'find own learning strategies' attracted the highest responses. A score of 3.75 can be considered as those NU respondents that have expressed strong support of learner autonomy. The other highest scores in favor of learner autonomy occurred in Q9, 'contribute self-assessment', with a mean value of 3.67; and Q1, 'establish course objectives', with a mean value of 3.58. These scores indicate that NU instructors stress the importance of giving learners

room to find their own learning strategies, self-assess themselves, rather than be tested, and establish course objectives.

As can be seen in Table 18, NU instructors are neutral to slightly positive towards learner autonomy and involving learners in decision making processes in areas such as Q12, ‘formulate own explanations’; and Q5, ‘be consulted on methodology’. The collected data implies that teachers are willing to bring in learner autonomy in different areas of the classroom experience. However, NU instructors’ attitudes towards sharing instructional responsibilities with learners are neutral to slightly negative in areas such as Q10, ‘be consulted on teaching focus’; Q8, ‘be consulted on homework tasks’; Q2, ‘determine course content’; Q11, ‘be consulted on learning tasks’; and Q7, ‘be consulted on record-keeping’.

At the same time the strongest votes against learner autonomy were for Q6, ‘be consulted on class management’; Q4, ‘select study time, place and pace’; and Q3, ‘choose materials’. The data collected implies that NU instructors have expressed strong resistance to learner autonomy and sharing instructional responses with learners in areas such as, class management, study time, place and pace and material selection. Class management, selecting textbooks and deciding on the time and place of the lesson are in many countries the traditional domains of the school system and teachers’ traditional jobs. Therefore, this cannot be considered as a reflection of instructors’ professional views. Rather, it reflects a situation in schools where some aspects of the classroom experience are dictated by forces outside the classroom, and beyond the influence or discretion of the instructors or learners. Additionally, the traditional domains of the school system within which teachers

and learners operate may make instructors feel themselves incapable of initiating any innovations or changes in these areas of the classroom experience.

Apart from a few areas, NU instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy are neutral to slightly negative. One conclusion that can be drawn is that at NU teaching and lessons take place within a tightly knit system in which there is no room for change or flexibility.

#### Zonguldak Karaelmas University Instructors' Views on Sharing Instructional Responsibilities with Students

To understand Zonguldak Karaelmas University (ZKU) instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy, mean values for grouped items were computed and results were ranked to understand ZKU instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners. Table 19 below presents a summary of the reactions of instructors working at ZKU.

Table 19

#### Questionnaire Mean Responses from ZKU to All Questionnaire Items

| Items | Item focus                        | N | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 8 | 4.22 | Support             |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 9 | 4.11 |                     |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 8 | 4.00 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus    | 9 | 3.89 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 9 | 3.78 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 9 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 9 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 9 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment        | 9 | 3.56 | Neutral to positive |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 9 | 3.33 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 9 | 3.22 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 9 | 2.89 | Neutral to negative |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 8 | 2.78 |                     |
| Total |                                   | 9 | 3.60 |                     |

Note. N= number of participants responding to the questions in the questionnaire; M= Summed means of 5 point Likert-scale 1 = least favored; 5 = most favored

In Table 19, Q13, ‘find own learning strategies’ attracted the highest responses. A score of 4.22 reveals that ZKU instructors have expressed strong support of learner autonomy and indicates that learners should be encouraged to find their own learning strategies. The other highest scores in favor of learner autonomy occurred in Q7, ‘be consulted on record-keeping’, with a mean value of 4.11; Q12, ‘formulate own explanations’, with a mean value of 4.00; Q10, ‘be consulted on teaching focus’, with a mean value of 3.89; Q1, ‘establish course objectives’, with a mean value of 3.78; Q6, ‘be consulted on class management’, with a mean value of 3.97; Q5, ‘be consulted on methodology’, with a mean value of 3.67; Q11, ‘be consulted on learning tasks’, with a mean value of 3.67; and Q9, ‘contribute self-assessment’, with a mean value of 3.65’. The data gathered from table 19 reveals that ZKU instructors among the six participating universities have clearly expressed the strongest support of learner autonomy.

The areas that ZKU instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy appear in Table 19 as follow: Q2, ‘determine course content’, with a mean value of 3.33; and Q4, ‘select study time, place and pace’, with a mean value of 3.22. However, the results show that ZKU instructors’ attitudes toward learner autonomy and involving learners in decision making process in terms of Q8, ‘be consulted on homework tasks’, with a mean value of 2.89; and Q3, ‘choose materials’, with a mean value of 2.78 are neutral to slightly negative. As can be seen in Table 19, ZKU instructors do not express resistance to learner autonomy in any area.

ZKU instructors’ seem to support the promotion of learner autonomy in their teaching contexts. The conclusion that can be drawn is that ZKU instructors are

willing to promote learner autonomy and are ready to share instructional responsibilities with their learners in their classes.

Analysis of the Relationship of Participating Universities Instructors' Attitudes  
toward Learner Autonomy

In order to understand whether or not there is a similarity among the participating universities instructors' opinions in terms of the extent that learners should be given a share of the instructional responsibilities, Kendall's coefficient concordance test was run. The data revealed that there is significant similarity in how these instructors view the relative importance of the learning questionnaire items. Table 12 presents the results of Kendall's coefficient concordance test. As can be seen in the Table 12, in terms of Q13 'find own learning strategies', there is a significant similarity among participating English language instructors. The majority of the participating instructors have indicated that learners should be encouraged to find their own learning strategies.

Table 20

Analysis of the Relationship of Participating Universities Instructors' Attitudes  
toward Learner Autonomy

| Items | Item focus                        | N  | MR    | Chi <sup>2</sup> | df    | KW  | Asymp<br>sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----|-------|------------------|-------|-----|---------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies      | 70 | 10.40 | 159.61           | 12.00 | .19 | .00*          |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations        | 70 | 8.85  |                  |       |     |               |
|       | Contribute                        |    |       |                  |       |     |               |
| Q9    | self-assessment                   | 69 | 8.47  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives       | 66 | 7.83  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks    | 71 | 7.15  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology       | 70 | 6.81  |                  |       |     |               |
|       | Be consulted                      |    |       |                  |       |     |               |
| Q10   | on teaching focus                 | 69 | 6.67  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping    | 69 | 6.60  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q2    | Determine course content          | 70 | 6.47  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management  | 70 | 6.47  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks    | 70 | 5.26  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q4    | Select study time, place and pace | 69 | 5.09  |                  |       |     |               |
| Q3    | Choose materials                  | 65 | 4.92  |                  |       |     |               |
| Total |                                   | 72 |       |                  |       |     |               |

Note. N = Number of respondent participants MR= Mean ranked; Chi<sup>2</sup> = Chi-Square; df = degrees of freedom; KW = Kendall's W (a)

\*p<.05

In this section, the analysis of quantitative data gathered through questionnaires was reviewed. The next section will present the comparison of the results of the Camilleri's (1997) study and the present study.

#### Original Study versus Present Study

This section will present the results of the original study upon which this study is based and will compare these results to the results of the present study.

The results of the original study were originally presented as percentages, and the 32 items (13 main items and sub-items) were analyzed individually. To be able to make a comparison between the original study and the present study, the results of the items of the original study were grouped as was done for the present study.

Table 21 below presents the results of the original study, and Table 22 presents the results of the present study.

Table 21

Camilleri (1997) Study\*

| Items | Item focus                         | N   | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----|------|---------------------|
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations         | 328 | 4,05 | Support             |
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies       | 328 | 4,02 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management   | 328 | 3,29 | Neutral to positive |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment         | 328 | 3,09 |                     |
| Q2    | Determine course content           | 328 | 3,07 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks     | 328 | 2,99 | Neutral to negative |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology        | 328 | 2,96 |                     |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record keeping     | 328 | 2,94 |                     |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks     | 328 | 2,94 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives        | 328 | 2,88 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                   | 328 | 2,81 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place, and pace | 328 | 2,81 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus     | 328 | 2,81 |                     |

Note. N = Total number of the participating teachers; M = Mean

Note. Items were ranked by mean values from most supportive to least supportive

\*The data of the original study was reformed to fit the presentation style of the present study

Table 22

Present Study

| Items | Item focus                       | N  | M    | Interpretation      |
|-------|----------------------------------|----|------|---------------------|
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies     | 71 | 4.14 | Support             |
| Q12   | Formulate self explanations      | 71 | 3.67 |                     |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment       | 70 | 3.58 |                     |
| Q1    | Establish course objectives      | 68 | 3.39 | Neutral to positive |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks   | 72 | 3.24 |                     |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology      | 72 | 3.08 |                     |
| Q12   | Determine course content         | 71 | 3.01 |                     |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus   | 71 | 3.01 |                     |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management | 71 | 3.00 | Neutral to negative |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record-keeping   | 71 | 3.00 |                     |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks   | 71 | 2.64 |                     |
| Q4    | Select study time, place, pace   | 71 | 2.58 |                     |
| Q3    | Choose materials                 | 70 | 2.44 | Resist              |

Note. N = Total number of the participating teachers; M = Mean

Note. Items were ranked by mean values from most supportive to least supportive

As can be seen in Table 21, while participating teachers of the Camilleri (1997) study expressed that learners should be first encouraged to formulate their own explanations and then find their own learning strategies, participating instructors of the present study think that learners first should be encouraged to find their own learning strategies and then be encouraged to formulate their own explanations. Whereas the participating teachers of the present study indicated that learners should contribute to self-assessment, the participating instructors of the original study appear to be neutral to slightly positive towards the process of students' assessing themselves, rather than be tested.

In the original Camilleri (1997) study participating instructors' attitudes towards the areas of teaching such as being consulted on class management (Q6), contributing self-assessment (Q9), and determining course content (Q2) were neutral to slightly positive. However, in the present study participating instructors' attitudes towards the areas such as establishing course objectives (Q1), being

consulted on learning tasks (Q11), being consulted on methodology (Q5), determining course content (Q2), being consulted on teaching focus (Q10), being consulted on class management (Q6), and being consulted on record-keeping (Q7) are neutral to slightly positive.

For the areas such as being consulted on homework tasks (Q8), being consulted on methodology (Q5), being consulted on methodology (Q7), being consulted on learning tasks (Q11), establishing course objectives (Q1), choosing materials (Q3), selecting study time, place and pace (Q4), and being consulted on teaching focus (Q10) the original study participants' attitudes were neutral to slightly negative. Yet, there were no areas of teaching in which they resisted the implementation of learner autonomy and the learners' active involvement in the decision-making processes.

The present study participants' attitudes towards areas such as being consulted on homework tasks (Q8), and selecting study time, place and pace (Q4) were neutral to slightly negative whereas they resisted learners' active involvement in the learning material selection. (See Appendix G for the percentages and graphs of the original study and present study.)

As for the similarities between two studies, as can be seen in the Tables 21 and 22, all participating English language teachers agree that learners should be encouraged to formulate their own explanations (Q12) and find their own learning strategies. In addition, all participating English language teachers indicated agreement on learners' active involvement in decision making processes in terms of being consulted on class management (Q6), determining course content (Q2), and contributing self-assessment (Q9). Also, in terms of items such as being consulted

on homework tasks (Q8), and selecting study time, place and pace (Q4), all participating English language teachers expressed neutral to slightly negative attitude.

Overall, the participating English language teachers in Camilleri (1997) study indicated support and neutral to slightly positive attitude towards five areas of teaching while the participating English instructors in the present study indicated support and neutral to slightly positive attitude towards ten areas of teaching. In addition, the participating English language instructors in Camilleri (1997) study expressed neutral to slightly negative attitude towards eight areas of teaching; they did not express resistance towards any areas of teaching. Yet, for the present study, participating English language instructors indicated neutral to slightly negative attitude toward two areas of teaching whereas they resist the implementation of learner autonomy or involving learners in decision-making processes in material selection. Because in present study, ten items were considered positive and in the Camilleri study only five were positive, one of the conclusions that can be drawn is that perhaps Turkish English language instructors are more aware of the importance of implementation of learner autonomy. In addition, Camilleri study was conducted in 1997 when the concept of learner autonomy in formal learning environments was a considerably new concept. The present study was conducted in 2005 when learner autonomy is mostly considered as a desired educational goal in formal learning environments and English language instructors are more aware of its importance. Also, the present study was conducted with the participation of only 72 English language instructors from six universities whereas Camilleri (1997) study was conducted with the participation of 328 English teachers from six countries.

Because of the fact that the participating teachers number in Camilleri (1997) study outnumbers the present study participating English language instructors' number, the results of Camilleri (1997) study may be considered as a better reflection of actual thinking.

The comparison of the each item of the original study and the present study can be seen in Appendix G in forms of graphs. In this section, an overall comparison between the original study and the present study was presented. The next section will present the data analysis gathered through interviews.

### Qualitative Data

Interviews were conducted with volunteer English language instructors to triangulate the data. The data gathered from the interviews provides some evidence of why attitudes towards learner autonomy may have become more negative. These interviews constitute the only qualitative data. This data was analyzed in terms of the common points raised in the interviews.

### Students' Profile

Interviewees were asked to describe their learners to understand what instructors think about their students. Almost all of the interviewees stated that their students lack motivation. Some of the interviewees further stated that their students were usually passive, were exam-oriented and were not willing to take initiatives.

### Sample Interviews Concerning Students' Profile

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviewee (MU) | Generally they are willing to learn English at the beginning of the year but unfortunately are not willing to do so during the year. Their motivation level is low. They haven't got the necessary skills to study. They want to be spoon fed. They think they can learn English by just attending classes. They don't show any effort outside the class. |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviewee (ZKU) | Although generally they want to learn English, they are not aware of their inner strengths and learning strategies to learn English. Generally, they tend to be dependent on teachers. They are not aware of strategies to deal with the language learning process. |
| Interviewee (AU)  | Except for a few, they are not autonomous at all. They don't like much homework. They think they will learn English without any personal effort.                                                                                                                    |
| Interviewee (NU)  | They are used to being taught and not used to learning. They expect their instructors to teach them everything and they assume they will learn without any work.                                                                                                    |

### Teaching Environment

The teaching environment is an important issue for the promotion of learner autonomy. Instructors who were teaching at preparatory schools stated that their teaching environments are not bad. They said that their classes were not overcrowded, and that they were provided with various teaching materials as well as technical devices. They also stated that they were provided with space and flexibility to put their innovations into practice. However, instructors who were teaching at vocational colleges and university faculties complained about their working conditions. These instructors argued that some programs at their institutes were overcrowded because different programs were scheduled to attend English courses together. Therefore, the physical atmosphere was not suitable for them to teach English. Additionally, they stated that most of the programs have just three hours of English lesson per week and teaching English, therefore, is very hard for them.

### Sample Interviews Concerning Teaching Contexts

Interviewee (AKU) Because some programs were grouped, we sometimes have to

teach 100 students in a small classroom. It is also impossible to teach English to them in three hours a week.

Interviewee (NU) My classes are very crowded. The students are not responsible. They don't bring books or notebooks to the lesson. They don't do their homework. I cannot check their homework. I cannot make them practice English in class.

Interviewee (NU) Students are lazy. They are students at vocational colleges. They did not even enter the university entrance exam. They have no reason to learn English. I also agree that they do not need English. No matter how hard I try to motivate them to learn English, they do not want to learn.

### Instructors' Expectations of Students

In order to analyze what an ideal student is, as defined by instructors, they were asked to describe their expectations of their students. Most of the interviewees stated that they expected their learners to study hard for the lesson, finish their homework assignments in the way they had been asked and hand them in on time. They further stated that the students had to be diligent, obey classroom and school rules, and have good manners. At the same time, some of the interviewees stated that they wanted their students to have responsibility for their own learning, participate in classroom activities voluntarily, be creative, and regulate their own learning by discovering their strong and weak points.

### Sample Interviews Concerning Instructors' Expectations of Students

Interviewee (ZKU) Students should be conscious of what they are doing, set goals for their own learning and try to achieve these goals through regular study.

Interviewee (MU) I want my students to express themselves in the target language using both written and spoken communication. I also expect them to be autonomous.

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviewee (AU)  | I expect my students to be eager to learn. They should study regularly, and should join the conversations.                                                                                                    |
| Interviewee (NU)  | Students should be more interested in lessons and must show respect to the teachers. They must participate in the class, come to the class prepared, listen to what teachers say and obey the rules in class. |
| Interviewee (ZKU) | I want them to have a positive attitude towards learning a language. They should be motivated in doing so and willing to cooperate with the teacher.                                                          |

### Students' Expectations of Teachers from the Teachers' Point Of View

In order to understand the expectations of students from the instructors' point of view, instructors were asked what their students expect of them. Many of the interviewees stated that all their students wanted were to pass their classes. Interviewees stated that their students were mostly exam-oriented and wanted teachers to spoon-feed them.

### Sample Interviews Concerning Students' Expectations of Teachers

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviewee (NU)  | It depends on the students. Generally, they want us to take care of everything for them.                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Interviewee (ZKU) | They are still expecting traditional teacher roles. You will motivate them, encourage them and tell them what to do.                                                                                                                                                         |
| Interviewee (AKU) | They want to be successful in the final exam. Learning English is not a major priority.                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Interviewee (NU)  | They expect me not to tire them with too much homework, actually no homework. They say they want speaking activities, but during these activities they do not participate. Unfortunately, they want grammar revision before exams and Turkish explanations of grammar rules. |

### Description of an Effective Learner According to Instructors

According to instructors, effective language learners are the ones who know their responsibilities, their strengths and weaknesses in learning. They must also have developed strategies to overcome problems. In other words, effective language learners are highly motivated, cooperative, autonomous researchers. Such students do not expect their teachers to take care of everything for them. They also know how to associate meaning and the target language directly.

### Sample Interviews Concerning Description of an Effective Learner

Interviewee (ZKU)    Effective learners challenge the teacher.

Interviewee (MU)    They are eager to learn, follow their success and have things to say on topic.

Interviewee (ZKU)    A successful and effective learner knows how to use learning strategies effectively; they discover their own methods of learning and aware of their own responsibilities. They are also willing to do something outside the class.

Interviewee (NU)    He is a researcher, reviser, a question asker, and answer finder...

Interviewee (MU)    They do the activities voluntarily in and outside the classroom, regulate their own learning through discovering strong and weak points, regularly study and spend extra time on learning.

Interviewee (AU)    An effective learner takes charge of his or her own learning.

## Conclusion

In this chapter qualitative and quantitative analysis of the results was presented. The qualitative data analysis section included the following sub-sections: a general overview of the instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy, an analysis of grouped and rank ordered items in the questionnaire, comparisons between groups and within groups. The quantitative data analysis section included the following sub-sections: profile of students from the instructors' point of view, instructors' teaching contexts, instructors' expectations of students, students' expectations of their instructors, and definition of an effective learner from the instructors' point of view. In chapter five the major findings of the study, pedagogical implications, suggestions for further studies, and the limitations of this study will be presented.

## CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

### Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the attitudes towards learner autonomy among English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities in Turkey. I attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards learner autonomy, specifically relating to involving learners in decision-making processes regarding their own learning?
2. What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities towards sharing responsibility with their students to promote learner autonomy in their classes?
3. What areas of teaching do English language instructors working at state-supported provincial universities find more suitable for the promotion of learner autonomy?

This study was conducted with the participation of 72 English language instructors working at Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University in Afyonkarahisar, Akdeniz University in Antalya, Balikesir University in Balikesir, Mugla University

in Mugla, Nigde University in Nigde, and Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak.

This chapter will report the major findings of this research. Implications for state-supported provincial universities, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research will be presented.

## Findings

The major findings of this study will be presented in three different sections: instructors' overall attitudes toward learner autonomy; instructors' opinions as to what extent learners should share responsibility in certain educational areas; instructors' views as to which instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners; and instructors' views about their students and their specific teaching contexts in relation to the promotion of learner autonomy.

### Instructors' Overall Attitudes toward Learner Autonomy

The overall picture of the results showed that participating instructors are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy with a mean value of 3.14 on the 5 point Likert-scale questionnaire (See Table 13).

Zonguldak Karaelmas University (ZKU), with nine participating instructors and a mean value of 3.6 (See Table 19) on the questionnaire seemed to support most strongly the promotion of learner autonomy. The results gathered from the interview conducted with an instructor from ZKU support the results of the questionnaire.

Interviewee (ZKU) .....Our students are enthusiastic and ready for any challenging work. ....Additionally, they are hard-working, motivated and aware of the importance of learning English for their future careers..... They ( the students) are very well aware that unless they support each other and work as a team, they will not be able to reach the goals we have set beforehand.....

Additionally, from the interview response below, instructors working at ZKU are provided with flexibility as well as other resources to put their initiatives and innovations into practice.

Interviewee (ZKU)      We (instructors) have almost all-technical support: computer lab, video, overhead projector, tape recorder, DVD and etc. in addition to written materials.

Because just 31% of the working instructors at ZKU responded to the questionnaire and only one instructor was interviewed, the data cannot be considered as a reflection of all ZKU English language instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy. However, ZKU instructors, based on the data analysis, appear to support the promotion of learner autonomy in their teaching contexts.

The other participant universities, Balikesir university (BU), with a participant number of 10 and a mean value of 3.22 (See Table 16); Mugla University (MU), with 24 participating instructors and a mean value of 3.27 (See Table 17); and Antalya University (AU), with 9 participating instructors and a mean value of 3.14 (See Table 15) are neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy. The instructors' slightly positive attitudes toward learner autonomy may be because MU and AU have a one-year preparatory school. Additionally, the instructors interviewed stated that because AU and MU are located in cities in which tourism is a very important source of income, learners are more motivated and aware of the importance of learning English. According to participant interviewees from AU and MU, most of their students usually work in tourism during their summer holidays and gain self-confidence in terms of expressing their ideas, taking initiatives in the classroom and thus actively participate in English courses.

Because only 56% of the instructors from BU, 54 % of the working instructors from MU and just 34 % of the instructors from AU participated in this study and responded to the questionnaire, the results cannot be considered as a reflection of all the instructors' at BU, AU, and MU attitudes toward learner autonomy.

Nigde University, with 12 instructors participating and a mean value of 2.89 (See Table 18) and Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University, with 8 instructors participating and a mean value of 2.76 (See Table 14) are neutral to slightly negative toward learner autonomy. Because of the fact that 75% of Nigde University instructors and 67 % of Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University instructors participated and responded to the questionnaire, I will consider the results as a reflection of the majority of the instructors working at these two universities.

A discussion of these two universities follows. A majority of the instructors working either at AKU or NU reported that they do not have preparatory school and each English class meets two to four hours a week. Almost all of the interviewees stated that it is almost impossible to teach English effectively in two to four hours a week. They further stated that because of registration irregularities and budget issues English classes sometimes are overcrowded with up to 60 or 70 students per class. NU instructors also stated that they felt undervalued by the administration and not provided with suitable teaching contexts and technological equipment. Additionally, they said that most of their students come from different backgrounds, often with negative past experiences in terms of foreign language learning. For that reason the students resist taking an active part in English lessons. Consequently, according to the interviewed instructors at NU, a majority of their learners think that they do not need English, and, if they happen to need it, they can

attend a private course or get special tutoring. In addition, based on the interviews, a majority of students are pessimistic about their futures and future careers.

Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University instructors are enthusiastic about the next academic year because they will start a preparatory program. Some of the Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University instructors made comments in relation to the items in the questionnaire and stated that “responsibilities regarding the items in the questionnaire can be shared with learners only if you are provided with an appropriate teaching context. Luckily, our teaching context will be appropriate for the promotion of learner autonomy and therefore you should come and conduct the same study next year.”

The overall results showed that English language instructors’ attitudes towards learner autonomy change depending upon the facilities they are provided by their universities and the opportunities for authentic language use in their environments. When participating universities are analyzed one by one, the reasons for instructors’ attitudes toward learner autonomy are more clear. Zonguldak Karaelmas University instructors have just started a preparatory school and they seem to be provided with physical and technical equipment as well as administrative support. In Mugla University and Antalya University which are located in cities where tourism is a very important source of income, learners therefore are more aware of the importance of learning English in both the short and long term. Additionally, because Mugla University, Antalya University students mostly work in tourism, they seem to be developing awareness in terms of setting personal and educational goals and seem to be capable of directing their own learning. Balıkesir University, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University and Niğde University do not have preparatory

schools. Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University and Nigde University English language instructors seem not to be provided with technological or administrative support. Additionally, not only English language instructors, but also students seem discouraged by inappropriate teaching and learning contexts. However, both Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University and Nigde University instructors are very well aware of how ideal foreign language programs and English language teachers should be, and they, thus, seem to be willing and ready to change in accordance with learner autonomy if their teaching context is improved.

In this section, instructors' overall attitudes toward learner autonomy and possible reasons of their positive or negative attitudes were presented. The next section presents respondents' opinions as to what extent learners should share the responsibility in certain educational areas.

#### Instructors' Opinions Regarding Learners Sharing Responsibility

This section presents detailed information about participating instructors' views as to what areas and to what extent learners should share instructional responsibilities. The items in the questionnaire include the following ideas: learners should establish course objectives; determine course content; choose materials; select study time, place and pace; be consulted on methodology, class management, record-keeping, homework tasks, teaching focus, learning tasks; find their own learning goals; formulate self explanations; and contribute self-assessment.

#### Most Favored Items

The results revealed that Q13, 'find own learning strategies', attracted the highest responses. It seems that the majority of respondents think that learners should be encouraged to find their own learning strategies. I had difficulty in

analyzing this result because question 13, ‘find own learning strategies’, implied that learners can find learning strategies by themselves. Interpreted in this way, the respondent instructors might have misunderstood the content of Q13. Respondent instructors may not have paid attention to the statement, ‘by himself or herself’, in the question or they may have considered that learners in question were provided with explicit training in learning strategies. Although there are different ideas in the literature in relation to learning strategies, many scholars think that learners should be provided with explicit training on how to apply their own language learning strategies to become more effective learners (Little, 1991; Wenden, 1991; Cohen, 1998). Following explicit training on learning strategies, learners can be encouraged to find and apply these strategies appropriate for them in their contexts. The level of uncertainty was high for this question because there was not a question asking about explicit training in learning strategies in the questionnaire to cross-check this item.

The majority of instructors in this study also strongly supports the promotion of learner autonomy and believes that learners should be encouraged to formulate their own explanations for classroom tasks. Q12, ‘formulate own explanations’, stresses the importance of giving learners the space to develop their own learning styles. Respondent instructors also believe learners can self-assess, rather than be tested. The three items, Q13, ‘find own learning strategies’; Q12, ‘formulate own explanations’; and Q9, ‘contribute self-assessment’, address more complex aspects of the process of teaching and learning (Camilleri, 1997) and require awareness-raising on the part of learners. These items suggest that instructors do not share instructional responsibility in their formal teaching environments because they are not directly related to classroom management.

### Least Favored Items

The instructors reported that learners should not share responsibility in terms of Q3, ‘material selection’, but this result cannot be interpreted as a strong resistance among participant instructors toward the promotion of learner autonomy in terms of material selection. The process of selecting textbooks or other learning materials is in many centralized education systems the traditional domains of the school system (Camilleri, 1997). Additionally, textbook selection requires special expertise of teachers. As for other learning materials selection, almost all scholars in the literature agree that responsibility in terms of material selection should be shared with learners because learner-selected and learner–designed materials give clues about the learners’ preferences, interests and needs (Little, 2003; Fenner, 2000; Littlejohn, 1985; Finch, 2000).

### Other Items in Which Instructors are Neutral

The participating instructors seem neutral to slightly positive toward learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision making processes regarding course objectives, learning tasks, methodology, course content, and teaching focus. Generally, Q1, ‘course objectives’; Q11, ‘learning tasks’; Q5, ‘methodology’; Q2, ‘course content’; and Q10, ‘teaching focus’ are related to how the curriculum is developed. Some instructors reported that they develop curriculum based on the results they gathered from needs-analysis research in the previous years. Additionally, the instructors consider the needs of the departments as well as society in developing the curriculum.

The results revealed that participating instructors are neutral to slightly negative in the promotion of learner autonomy and involving learners in Q6, ‘class

management'; Q7, 'record-keeping'; Q8, 'homework tasks'; and Q4, 'selection of study time, place and pace'. As can be seen, these items were directly related to teaching and learning processes in the classroom. The results support Yumuk's (2002) claim that most teachers in Turkey are the dominant authority figures who control learning, causing Turkish university students to thus become teacher-dependent. Interpreted in this way, Turkish instructors are neither ready nor willing to let go of control in their classrooms.

### Pedagogical Implications

The analysis of the data revealed pedagogical implications that the promotion of learner autonomy in formal learning environments depends on the development of the physical conditions of teaching and learning contexts. In addition, instructors need to be provided in-service training so that they may be current.

First, the results showed that state-supported provincial universities that do not have preparatory classes should consider starting preparatory class programs to motivate both instructors and learners. Teaching English two or three hours per week to overcrowded classes of unwilling culturally and traditionally conditioned learners seems to be causing instructors to lose motivation and experience 'burn-out'. This naturally affects learners and may cause them to lose enthusiasm in learning English. Because starting a preparatory class program is a long-term process, these universities should consider keeping the number of students per class at a reasonable limit. Additionally, these universities might increase the English class hours per week as well as provide instructors with the necessary technical or written equipment. These changes should be tailored to individual universities because some recommendations suggested above have political implications.

The results of the study also indicated that instructors should be given professional training in order to be able to promote learner autonomy effectively. Moreover, because teacher commitment is considered to be very important for the promotion of learner autonomy, the instructors should be informed about learner autonomy, and its demands on instructors. If they are provided with a variety of opportunities to understand the meaning of learner autonomy, its prerequisites, and its benefits for their teaching and student learning, they may be willing to become more autonomous themselves. This might lead to promising results in terms of enabling and encouraging learners to also become more effective and autonomous language learners.

#### Suggestions for Further Studies

This study covered six state-supported Turkish provincial universities and investigated English language instructors' attitudes toward learner autonomy. In further studies, the attitudes of both administrators and students towards learner autonomy can be explored. Through this triangulation, a more reliable picture of the prerequisites for promotion of learner autonomy at state-supported provincial universities can be drawn. In this way, the areas that need special attention in the current systems can be identified, and any necessary measures for the promotion of learner autonomy can be introduced to change the system. Because professional development for administration and teachers is crucial for the promotion of learner autonomy, such research would help in understanding what kind of professional training is necessary.

In addition, case studies of instructors applying techniques and methods to promote learner autonomy might be conducted. Obtaining data through multiple

sources, such as carefully recorded interviews with administrators, instructors and students, reflective journals or learning logs kept by both instructors and learners, pre- and post-treatment questionnaires might provide detailed information concerning the advantages, or challenges of the promotion of learner autonomy in their specific teaching and learning contexts.

Another study could identify the influence of training on the effectiveness of learner autonomy to enable learners to become more effective language learners. The study could involve two groups of instructors, one encouraging learners to become more autonomous and one following the traditional way of teaching. Later, a comparison of these groups in terms of applying techniques, and methods to promote learner autonomy could be conducted. Such a study might clarify the issues concerning what the training should focus on, whether or not Turkey is a promising ground for the promotion of learner autonomy, what methods and techniques may work in specific contexts with certain type of students, and what changes should be made to enable students to become effective learners.

The outcomes of this thesis also revealed a need for a study on how to integrate teaching techniques and methods to promote learner autonomy into existing curricula of universities.

### Limitations of the Study

This research had to be completed in a very limited amount of time, which prevented me from accessing more institutions and increasing the amount of data obtained. If the number of institutions had been greater, the results could be more generalizable. In particular, the information related to participating instructors' views as to what instructional responsibilities should be shared with learners could

have been more enlightening if the number of instructors responding to the questionnaires were higher. Because of the fact that time for the research was limited, I managed to visit only three universities. For that reason, I could not make personal observations at the other universities in terms of setting, and physical conditions. If I could have visited all the universities, personal observations would have enabled me to make comments on the possible reasons and solutions for the promotion of learner autonomy in these specific teaching and learning contexts.

The other research instrument, interviews, was conducted with volunteer instructors to add more depth to the data. However, because of the limited amount of time to conduct the study, I conducted interviews with only 10 instructors and three of these interviews were conducted by telephone. If these interviews had been conducted face-to-face, I could have obtained more detailed information about their practices. In this way, instructors' knowledge, specifically about their teaching contexts, could have been better understood, and interpretations related to their specific teaching contexts would have been more solidly grounded.

### Conclusion

The findings of the research revealed that state-supported provincial universities are promising grounds for the promotion of learner autonomy. However, to encourage instructors to promote learner autonomy and thus enable learners to become more autonomous and effective language learners, some issues should be taken into consideration. These involve providing instructors with better teaching contexts, such as preparatory class programs, less crowded classes, more class hours, and more technological and written teaching resources. Additionally, an in-service training for instructors, and systematic and planned adjustments in the

curricula might contribute to the promotion of learner autonomy in these universities.

## REFERENCES

- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (eds.) (1998). *New ways of classroom assessment*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Camilleri, G. (1997). *Learner autonomy: The teachers' views*. (WWW document) [Online] Retrieved on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2004 from [www.ecml.at/documents/pubCamilleriG\\_E.pdf](http://www.ecml.at/documents/pubCamilleriG_E.pdf)
- Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6, 505-519.
- Chan, V. (2002). Autonomous language learning: Hong Kong tertiary students' attitudes and behaviours. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 16, 1-18.
- Chan, V. (2003). Autonomous language learning: The teachers' perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8, 33-54.
- Chamot, A.U. (1998). *The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach in the Foreign Language Classroom*. The NCLRC Language Resource. (WWW document) [Online] Retrieved on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2005 from <http://www.nclrc.org/caidl22.htm>
- Chuk, J. Y. P. (2003). Promoting learner autonomy in the EFL classroom: the Exploratory Practice way. *Proceedings of the independent learning conference*. (WWW document) [Online] Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from [http://www.independentlearning.org/ila03/ila03\\_chuk.pdf](http://www.independentlearning.org/ila03/ila03_chuk.pdf)
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. NY: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Crabbe, D. (1993). Fostering autonomy from within the classroom: the teacher's responsibility. *System*. 21 (4) 443-452.
- Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy: From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. (WWW document) [Online]  
Retrieved on 11<sup>th</sup> May 2005, from <http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/publications/dewey.html>
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egel, İ. P. (2003). *The impact of the European language portfolio on the learner autonomy of Turkish primary school students*. Unpublished Doctorate thesis, Anadolu University: Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Fenner, A. B. (2000). *Approaches to materials design in European textbooks – Learner autonomy*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://www.library.georgetown.edu/newmaterials/archive//may2004/philology.html>
- Finch, A. E. (2000). *A Formative Evaluation of a Task-based EFL Program for Korean University Students*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Manchester University, UK. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://www.finchpark.com/arts/autonomy.htm>
- Healey, D. (2002). Learner autonomy with technology: What do language learners need to be successful? *Paper presented at TESOL 2002, Salt Lake City*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://oregonstate.edu/~healeyd/tesol2002/autonomy.html>
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holec, H. (1981): *Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Huerta-Macias A. 1995. Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal*, 5, 1, pp. 8–11.
- Kucuroğlu, Ç. (1997). *The effects of direct formative testing on learner Performance and the development of learner autonomy*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University: Ankara, Turkey.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Little, D. (1994). Learner autonomy: a theoretical construct and its practical application. *Die Neueren Sprachen*, 93, 430-442.

- Little, D. (1995). *The politics of learner autonomy*. Paper presented at the Fifth Nordic Workshop on Developing Autonomous Learning, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, Copenhagen, Denmark, 24-27 August.
- Little, D. (1996). Learner autonomy-first language/second language: some reflections on the nature and role of metalinguistic knowledge. *Education(Malta)*, 5(4), 3-6.
- Little, D. (1997). Language awareness and the autonomous language learner. *Language Awareness*, 6, 93-104.
- Little, D. (1998). Learner Autonomy: What and Why? *Speech given at JALT98*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from [http://www.kotesol.org/publications/tec/tec\\_pdf/tec\\_9811.pdf](http://www.kotesol.org/publications/tec/tec_pdf/tec_9811.pdf)
- Little, D., (1999). Learner autonomy is more than a Western cultural construct. In: Cotterall & D. Crabbe (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the Field and Effecting Change* (pp. 11-18). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Little, D., 2000. Learner autonomy and human interdependence: some theoretical and practical consequences of a social-interactive view of cognition, learning and language. In B. Sinclair & I. McGrath & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions* (pp. 15-23). Harlow: Longman.
- Little, D., (2001). How independent can independent language learning really be? In J. A. Coleman & D. Ferney & D. Head & R. Rix (Eds.), *Language Learning Futures: Issues and Strategies for Modern Languages Provision in Higher Education* (pp. 30-43). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.
- Little, D. (2003). Learner autonomy and public examinations. *Learner autonomy In the foreign language classroom: teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Little, D. (2004). Democracy, discourse and learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom. *UTBIDNING & Democratic*. 13,105-126.
- Little, D. (2004). Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy and the European language Portfolio. *Paper presented at UNTELE, Université de Compiègne*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://www.utc.fr/~untele/2004ppt/handouts/little.pdf>
- Littlejohn, A. (1985). Learner choice in language study. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39, 253-261.

- McCarthy, C. (2004). Learner training for learner autonomy on summer language courses. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved on 04<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/McCarthy-Autonomy.html>
- Miller, S. P., & Mercer, C. D. (1993). Using a graduated word problem sequence to promote problem-solving skills. *Learning Disability Research & Practice*, 8, 169-174.
- Moore, M. G. (1973). Definition of independent learning and teaching: Toward a theory of independent learning and teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 44, 661-679.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Nine steps to learner autonomy*. Plenary speech, Shantou University, China, 13 March, 2004. Retrieved on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2005, from [http://www.nunan.info/presentations/steps\\_learner\\_autonomy\\_files/frame.htm](http://www.nunan.info/presentations/steps_learner_autonomy_files/frame.htm)
- O'Malley, J.M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle and Heinle.
- Sheerin, S. (1997) An exploration of the relationship between self-access and independent learning. In Phil Benson and Peter Voller, eds: *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*, 54-65. London: Longman.
- Raya, M. J. & Fernandez, M. P. (2002). *Learner autonomy and new technologies*. Retrieved on 04<sup>th</sup> December 2004, from [http://www.icem-cime.com/anglais/emi39\\_1.html#e9](http://www.icem-cime.com/anglais/emi39_1.html#e9)
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, J. A. (2002). *Approaches to learner autonomy*. Retrieved on 04<sup>th</sup> December 2004, from <http://jillrobbins.com/articles/autonomy.html>
- Saegusa, K. (2004). Since when does teaching belong only to teachers?: Exploring learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom. *The 49th Benkyoukai, October 20, 2004*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2004, from <http://spot.colorado.edu/~saegusa/benkyoukai/autonomy.htm> - 20k
- Sancar, I. (2001). *Learner autonomy: A profile of teacher trainees in pre-service teacher education*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey.

- Scharle, A., & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwienhorst, K. (1997). Talking on the MOO: Learner autonomy and language learning in tandem. *Paper presented at the CALLMOO: Enhancing language learning through internet technologies*, Bergen, Norway. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> 2004, from <http://www.tcd.ie/CLCS/assistants/kschwien/Publications/CALLMOOtalk.htm> - 22k
- Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Learner autonomy and tandem learning: Putting principles into practice in synchronous and asynchronous telecommunications environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16, 427-443.
- Tayar, A. B. (2003). *A survey on learner autonomy and motivation in ESP in a Turkish context*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2001). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved on 04<sup>th</sup> November 04 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html>
- Usuki, M. (2002). Learner Autonomy: Learning from the Student's Voice. CLCS Occasional Paper. *Trinity Coll., Dublin (Ireland). Centre for Language and Communication Studies*. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2005 from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content\\_storage\\_01/0000000b/80/22/60/9e.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/22/60/9e.pdf)
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Published originally in Russian in 1930.
- Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners*. UK: Prentice Hall International.
- Yumuk, A. Ş. (2002). Letting go of control to the learners: The role of the Internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation course. *Educational Research*, 44, 141-156.

## APPENDIX A

### Teachers' Questionnaire

#### Learner Autonomy: Teachers' Views

Dear English Instructors,

I am an MA TEFL student at Bilkent University and I am conducting this study to gather information on English instructors' perspectives of learner autonomy, so that educational planners will be better informed on what English instructors think about this important educational issue. For this purpose, I am distributing this questionnaire among English instructors in several provincial universities. I therefore would like to know your views about *Learner Autonomy*, and I would like to thank you in advance for your contribution and time.

All responses will be kept confidential. If you would like to learn the results of this study, please provide your e-mail address below, and I will keep you informed.

Kindly fill in the attached questionnaire, and return it to either to me or the designated coordinator in your home institute.

Respectfully yours,

Mustafa Özdere  
MA TEFL program  
Bilkent University, Ankara  
Tel: (090) 3122906275

ozdere@bilkent.edu.tr

#### Personal information

**Name** ( optional) : \_\_\_\_\_

**Gender:** Male ☐ Female ☐

**Educational degree:** BA ☐ MA ☐ PhD ☐

**How long have you been teaching English?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of School you are teaching:** 2 years ☐ 4 years ☐ prep school ☐

**E-mail address:** (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone number:** (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**Questionnaire**  
(Please check (x) the boxes)

|                                                                                                           |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------|--------|------|-----------|
| 1. How much should the learner be involved in establishing the <b>objectives</b> of a course of study?    | Short-term                   | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Long-term                    | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Comment:                     |            |        |        |      |           |
| 2. How much should the learner be involved in deciding the <b>course content</b> ?                        | Topics                       | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Tasks                        | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Comment:                     |            |        |        |      |           |
| 3. How much should the learner be involved in <b>selecting materials</b> ?                                | Textbooks                    | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Authentic learning materials | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Realia                       | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Comment:                     |            |        |        |      |           |
| 4. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on <b>the time, place and pace</b> of the lesson? | Time                         | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Place                        | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Pace                         | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Comment:                     |            |        |        |      |           |
| 5. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on the <b>methodology</b> of the lesson?          | Individual/pair/group work   | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Use of materials             | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Type of classroom activities | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Type of homework activities  | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                           | Comment:                     |            |        |        |      |           |

|                                                                                                                          |                              |            |        |        |      |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------|--------|------|-----------|
| 6. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on <b>classroom management</b> ?                                 |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|                                                                                                                          | Position of desks            | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Seating of students          | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Discipline matters           | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
| Comment:                                                                                                                 |                              |            |        |        |      |           |
| 7. How much should the learner be involved in decisions about <b>record-keeping</b> ?                                    |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|                                                                                                                          | of work done                 | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Of marks gained              | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Attendance                   | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
| Comment:                                                                                                                 |                              |            |        |        |      |           |
| 8. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on <b>homework tasks</b> ?                                       |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|                                                                                                                          | Quantity                     | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Type                         | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Frequency                    | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
| Comment:                                                                                                                 |                              |            |        |        |      |           |
| 9. How much should the learner be encouraged to <b>assess</b> himself or herself, rather than be tested?                 |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|                                                                                                                          | Weekly                       | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Monthly                      | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Annually                     | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
| Comment:                                                                                                                 |                              |            |        |        |      |           |
| 10. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on <b>what to focus on</b> from materials given by the teacher? |                              | Not at all | Little | Partly | Much | Very much |
|                                                                                                                          | Textbooks                    | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Authentic learning materials | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
|                                                                                                                          | Realia                       | ①          | ②      | ③      | ④    | ⑤         |
| Comment:                                                                                                                 |                              |            |        |        |      |           |

|                                                                                                                    |                 |             |             |           |                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| 11. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on the choice of <b>learning tasks</b> ?                  | Not at all<br>① | Little<br>② | Partly<br>③ | Much<br>④ | Very much<br>⑤ |
| Comment:                                                                                                           |                 |             |             |           |                |
| 12. How much should the learner be encouraged to formulate his or her own <b>explanations</b> for classroom tasks? | Not at all<br>① | Little<br>② | Partly<br>③ | Much<br>④ | Very much<br>⑤ |
| Comment:                                                                                                           |                 |             |             |           |                |
| 13. How much should the learner be encouraged to find out <b>learning strategies</b> by himself or herself?        | Not at all<br>① | Little<br>② | Partly<br>③ | Much<br>④ | Very much<br>⑤ |
| Comment:                                                                                                           |                 |             |             |           |                |

|                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------|
| General comments on the content of this questionnaire : |
|---------------------------------------------------------|

### End of the Questionnaire

Thank you for filling in the questionnaire

\*This questionnaire is adapted from the study 'Learner autonomy: The teachers' views' that was compiled and edited by George Camilleri (1997).

## APPENDIX B

### Interview Questions (English Language Instructors)

1. How would you describe the learners, in general, at your institute?
2. What are the general characteristics of learners at your institute?
3. How would you describe the teaching environment on the part of your colleagues to instructional innovation?
4. How do you feel an atmosphere of trust and confidence between teachers and learners for teaching can best be created?
5. What are your expectations from your students in classes?
6. What are your students' expectations from you in classes?
7. What do you think your most important role is in the class as an English language instructor?
8. How would you describe an effective learner?
9. A well-known educator said that the role of higher education is helping students "Learn how to learn". Would you agree with this? How might you modify or change this statement?

## APPENDIX C

### Informed Consent Form

Dear interviewee,

You have been asked to participate in a survey study which is intended to investigate the English language instructors and heads of foreign language departments' that are working at developing universities about their perceptions of learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning.

In order to achieve the goals of the study, please answer a questionnaire, which investigates your perceptions of learner autonomy. An interview will be the second phase of the study. You will be interviewed in order to discover insights of your perceptions of learner autonomy at your home institute.

Your participation in the interview will bring valuable contribution to the findings of the study. Any information received will be kept confidential and your name will not be released. This study involves no risk to you.

I would like to thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Mustafa Özdere

MA TEFL program

Bilkent University

I have read and understood the information given above. I hereby agree to my participation in the study.

Name: .....

Signature: .....

Date: .....

## APPENDIX D

### Interview Form

#### Research question

What are the attitudes of English language instructors working at developing universities toward learner autonomy? In what ways can the promotion of learner autonomy in foreign language classes be achieved?

**University:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date and hour (starting and finishing):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Interviewee:** \_\_\_\_\_

Hello! My name is Mustafa Özdere and I am an English language instructor at the foreign language department of Nigde University. Besides, I am an MA TEFL student at Bilkent University. I am conducting this study to understand the attitudes of English language instructors working at developing universities in Turkey toward learner autonomy. I would like to talk to you about this concept. The results of this study may help educational planners actualize the educational changes in the future. For this reason, I am interested in your ideas related to the attitudes towards the concept of learner autonomy in terms of its applicability at your institute.

- Everything you will say during this interview will be kept confidential. No one except the researcher will see or read your ideas. Furthermore, following transcription of interview, the identification of the participants will not be revealed in the report.

- Before starting, do you have anything to ask or add related to what I have said?

- With your permission, I would like to record the interview. Would you mind if I taped the interview?

- The interview consists of two sessions. In the first session, I will ask a number of questions related to the concept of learner autonomy and your professional point of view. Nevertheless, I think that you may want to ask a couple of questions to me and therefore, I will be happy to answer your questions in the second session. You will be welcome to ask any questions related to the concept of learner autonomy in the second session.

- It is estimated that this interview will last about an hour. With your permission, I would like to begin.

## APPENDIX E

### Sample Interview

(Translated From Turkish)

I: Good morning, I would like to record our meeting with your permission!

P: Good morning, with pleasure, please go ahead!

I: Let me begin with the first two questions! How would you describe the learners, in general, at your institute? And what are the general characteristics of learners at your institute?

P: our students mostly come from middle class or lower class families; they are generally the children of families with low income and mostly from provincial cities in central Anatolia region.

I: Do you think your students are aware of their learning goals and objectives and thus made a conscious selection for your institute?

P: Some of our students are, as you pointed out, conscious and aware of their goals and objectives, however, a number of them are not like the ones that we have just described. Generally speaking, most of them have not been able to do good enough to attend a big university, and they chose our institute just because they did not want to spend some more years studying for the university exam. Some students did not even take the university entrance exam and enlisted vocational colleges in our university because they are from this city or come from neighboring cities.

I: So, you mean that you don't think your students are conscious about their education?

P: You may say that, but we also have students who are very well aware of what they want, where they want to attend and they know they will get a job when they graduate, specially ones who attend educational faculty. Apart from a little number of students, I do not think it is possible to consider our other students as conscious about their selections.

I: How do you think they view especially foreign language learning?

P: Generally speaking, their attitudes toward learning a foreign language are negative. We can enumerate the reasons of their negative attitudes as follow: In our institute, we do not have a one-year preparatory school and foreign language lessons are only 2-3 hours a week as a compulsory lesson. For that reason, our students do not take English lessons serious and they also do not believe that they can learn English under these circumstances. They only attend English classes because they have to take and pass it due to the regulations. Although most of our students seem to understand the importance of learning a foreign language, they do not think that they can learn it here. Additionally, a large number of them are, depending upon the program they are attending, are not hardworking, diligent, and hopeful for the future. However, as mentioned earlier, students from educational faculty or engineering faculty are pretty clever, hardworking and ambitious in learning.

I: Do you think your students appreciate the importance of learning a foreign language for a better future career and thus do their best to learn a foreign language effectively?

P: You are definitely right, they all worry about their future but as you know, there seems to be something wrong with the Turkish educational system in terms of foreign language teaching policy. For instance, foreign language lesson is only for freshmen students in many institutes. Some vocational programs may have extra foreign language lessons and it is certainly not enough. Besides, from primary school to universities, students have English classes and most of them state that they have not been able to learn anything. Therefore, they do not believe that they can learn English or they do not like it. In other words, they seem to have lost their motivation and negatively conditioned against the notion of learning a foreign language. Besides, some of them also think that they will not need a foreign language, and if they happen to need it, they may learn it in other ways. There are, of course, some students who are aware of the need of a foreign language and highly motivated but they are outnumbered by those who are not. Also, unfortunately, I think we do not have appropriate teaching contexts to change students' negative attitudes towards the notion of learning a foreign language.

I: In summary, is it possible to conclude that your students can be motivated if they are provided with appropriate learning circumstances?

I: Yes, because of inconveniences, most of our students leave the process of learning a foreign language to the next level. They mostly say that if they first find a job, they could go and attend foreign language course or get private tutoring to learn English. For example, some of the seniors come here (YADEM) to attend a foreign language course thinking that they may get a job if they learn English. Apart from these few samples, they mostly do not feel the need that to learn a foreign language and believe that they can learn it as a part of their formal learning.

I: So, it seems that your students attitudes toward learning a foreign language is not positive, is it?

P: unfortunately, the foreign language lessons are available but because of the inconceivable conditions, they do not seem to work well. Besides, personally speaking, we do not have suitable teaching contexts to teach a foreign language effectively. For example, in previous years, because of registrations irregularities and budget issues, some programs attended the same English lesson and therefore not only teachers but also students lost their motivation.

I: It seems to me that we have a third dimension now! Is it possible to say that not only your students but also your colleagues have low motivation?

P: Absolutely, if your students are not willing to learn, and if you feel that what you say do not make any change in your students' attitudes, you naturally lose you motivation. Additionally, if you are not provided with appropriate teaching contexts, and you are asked to teach English to overcrowded classrooms in 2-3 hours a week, how can you be motivated?

I: Correct me if I am wrong! You mean that you do not have appropriate teaching environment for an effective foreign language teaching. By the way, what you think teachers should do to motivate their students under these circumstances?

P: First of all, lessons should be student-centered. I mean, students should learn how to express themselves in the target language, understand what is being spoken, speak what he understands and therefore teachers should involve learners in

lessons. I think teachers should act as facilitators, helpers and direct learning but not spoon-feed students. Besides, teachers should create appropriate learning contexts for their students.

I: So, you think that lessons should be designed so that learners can determine their own learning. Do you think it is difficult to teach English effectively in a traditional exam-oriented educational system?

P: You are right; this is not only universities or instructors' problem. The problem in terms of foreign language learning is everywhere because of the drawbacks of the Turkish educational system. I also don't think it is possible to teach a foreign language effectively with 3 hours a week. Besides, most of our students are negatively conditioned against foreign language learning.

I: Then, can we say that the instructors' job is to recondition the students who are traditionally negatively conditioned?

P: Absolutely, but we should not ignore the problems that instructors face everyday. I believe that our foreign language teaching policy needs a radical change. We should not teach foreign language just for the sake of teaching but actually teach it. As we have mentioned earlier, it does not seem possible to teach English effectively in 3 hours a week. A foreign language can be learned effectively in Anatolia high schools, or English medium universities or preparatory-schools. Otherwise I don't think it can be taught effectively.

I: I would like to ask another question? What are your students' expectations from you?

P: Our students want to pass their classes and want us to ease their job. What I mean is that most of them simply do not want to learn English; they just want to pass their classes.

I: So, can we sum up saying that you think your students do not think they need to learn a foreign language. Do you think this may have something to do with the selected learning materials? I mean, maybe the topic are not familiar to students and they do not attract their attention as simulating them?

P: You may be right, but I think the reasons why they are not motivated are the circumstances they are experiencing. You know, in order to give an effective language teaching, the number of the students in a class is very important, besides, the technological and other sources should be available. However, none of them exist in my teaching context.

I: By the way, what do you think your most important role is in the class as an English language instructor?

P: I think, a foreign language instructor should have a good command of language, devote himself-herself to his-her students and the job he-she is doing, and be up-to-date.

I: What about an effective learner?

P: An effective language learner needs to be capable of expressing himself-herself in written or spoken English and should view the language as a mean of communication, if he –she is communicating, that is it.

I: If we consider the things you have mentioned regarding the teaching contexts that you are experiencing, what do you think the administration is expecting from you? Could it be that instructors should teach learners how to learn?

P: An effective teacher should be aware of what you say. The key point may be to teach how to learn. As mentioned earlier, it seems impossible to teach English effectively in 3 hours.

I: last question, a well-known educator said that the role of higher education is helping students “Learn how to learn”. Would you agree with this? How might you modify or change this statement?

P: I totally agree. In addition, if the students are aware of the importance of learning, they will learn, but I think the most difficult part is to encourage them to learn, I mean have them feel the need of learning.

I: Thank you, I appreciated you cooperation.

## APPENDIX F

### Analysis Of Sample Interview

| <i><b>Focus</b></i>                                                           | <i><b>Participant</b></i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Teaching context</i>                                                       | In our institute, <b>we do not have a one-year preparatory school and foreign language lessons are only 2-3 hours a week as a compulsory lesson</b> . For that reason, our students do not take English lessons serious and they also do not believe that they can learn English under these circumstances. |
| <i>Students' profile</i>                                                      | Additionally, a large number of them are, depending upon the program they are attending, are <b>not hardworking, diligent, and hopeful for the future</b> .                                                                                                                                                 |
| <i>Traditional Turkish educational system</i>                                 | There seems to be something wrong with the Turkish educational system in terms of foreign language teaching policy. For instance, <b>foreign language lesson is only for freshmen students in many institutes</b> .                                                                                         |
| <i>Turkish students' attitudes toward learning a foreign language</i>         | They seem to have <b>lost their motivation and negatively conditioned</b> against the notion of learning a foreign language.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <i>Teachers' motivation and administrative shortcomings</i>                   | ... in previous years, because of <b>registrations irregularities and budget issues, some programs attended the same English lesson</b> and therefore not <b>only teachers but also students lost their motivation</b> .                                                                                    |
| <i>Inappropriateness of teaching contexts</i>                                 | ...if you are not provided with <b>appropriate teaching contexts, and you are asked to teach English to overcrowded classrooms in 2-3 hours a week</b> , how can you be motivated.                                                                                                                          |
| <i>Students expectations of their teachers</i>                                | Our students want to <b>pass their classes and want us to ease their job</b> . What I mean is that most of them simply do not want to learn English; they <b>just want to pass their classes</b> .                                                                                                          |
| <i>The importance of teaching contexts for an effective language teaching</i> | ...in order to give an effective language teaching, <b>the number of the students in a class is very important</b> , besides, the <b>technological and other sources should be available</b> . However, none of them exist in my teaching context.                                                          |
| <i>Effective learner</i>                                                      | An effective language learner needs to be <b>capable of expressing himself-herself in written or spoken English</b> and should <b>view the language as a mean of communication</b> , if he –she is communicating, that is it                                                                                |

|                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Teaching how to learn</i> | ...if the students are aware of the importance of learning, they will learn, but I think the most difficult part is to <b>encourage them to learn, I mean have them feel the need of learning.</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

# APPENDIX G

## Overall results of Camilleri (1997) study

| <b>Q</b>   | <b>NAA</b> | <b>L</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>M</b> | <b>VM</b> | <b>I</b> |
|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| <b>1A</b>  | 11%        | 19%      | 39%      | 26%      | 4%        | 1%       |
| <b>1B</b>  | 14%        | 22%      | 35%      | 20%      | 7%        | 2%       |
| <b>2A</b>  | 10%        | 17%      | 41%      | 24%      | 8%        | 0%       |
| <b>2B</b>  | 9%         | 19%      | 39%      | 23%      | 9%        | 2%       |
| <b>3A</b>  | 18%        | 25%      | 39%      | 15%      | 2%        | 1%       |
| <b>3B</b>  | 10%        | 13%      | 43%      | 22%      | 5%        | 6%       |
| <b>3C</b>  | 7%         | 14%      | 30%      | 26%      | 16%       | 6%       |
| <b>4A</b>  | 16%        | 28%      | 33%      | 16%      | 5%        | 1%       |
| <b>4B</b>  | 15%        | 25%      | 36%      | 20%      | 5%        | 0%       |
| <b>4C</b>  | 10%        | 17%      | 32%      | 28%      | 11%       | 1%       |
| <b>5A</b>  | 7%         | 22%      | 38%      | 26%      | 6%        | 2%       |
| <b>5B</b>  | 7%         | 19%      | 40%      | 27%      | 5%        | 0%       |
| <b>5C</b>  | 6%         | 26%      | 40%      | 24%      | 3%        | 1%       |
| <b>5D</b>  | 12%        | 16%      | 38%      | 27%      | 6%        | 2%       |
| <b>6</b>   | 8%         | 18%      | 44%      | 22%      | 6%        | 2%       |
| <b>7A</b>  | 6%         | 13%      | 33%      | 32%      | 16%       | 1%       |
| <b>7B</b>  | 6%         | 13%      | 27%      | 34%      | 18%       | 2%       |
| <b>7C</b>  | 10%        | 16%      | 34%      | 22%      | 16%       | 1%       |
| <b>8A</b>  | 20%        | 15%      | 20%      | 29%      | 14%       | 2%       |
| <b>8B</b>  | 16%        | 17%      | 26%      | 24%      | 15%       | 2%       |
| <b>8C</b>  | 20%        | 18%      | 21%      | 22%      | 17%       | 2%       |
| <b>9A</b>  | 6%         | 20%      | 40%      | 23%      | 10%       | 1%       |
| <b>9B</b>  | 10%        | 24%      | 33%      | 25%      | 7%        | 1%       |
| <b>9C</b>  | 11%        | 21%      | 40%      | 20%      | 7%        | 1%       |
| <b>10A</b> | 13%        | 24%      | 36%      | 17%      | 8%        | 2%       |
| <b>10B</b> | 9%         | 27%      | 35%      | 20%      | 6%        | 3%       |
| <b>IOC</b> | 10%        | 22%      | 32%      | 24%      | 9%        | 4%       |
| <b>11</b>  | 1%         | 6%       | 13%      | 37%      | 41%       | 1%       |
| <b>12</b>  | 3%         | 5%       | 10%      | 36%      | 43%       | 3%       |
| <b>13A</b> | 8%         | 11%      | 25%      | 30%      | 20%       | 5%       |
| <b>13B</b> | 4%         | 12%      | 30%      | 35%      | 11%       | 7%       |
| <b>13C</b> | 10%        | 17%      | 27%      | 25%      | 14%       | 8%       |

Note. NAA = Not at all; L = Little; P = Partly; M = Much; VM = Very Much; I = Invalid

\* The table is directly copied from Camilleri (1997) study.

### Camilleri (1997) Study\*

| Items | Item focus                         | NAA | L   | P   | M   | VM  | I  |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Q1    | Establish course objectives        | 13% | 21% | 37% | 23% | 6%  | 2% |
| Q2    | Determine course content           | 10% | 18% | 40% | 24% | 9%  | 1% |
| Q3    | Choose materials                   | 12% | 17% | 37% | 21% | 8%  | 4% |
| Q4    | Select study time, place, and pace | 14% | 23% | 34% | 21% | 7%  | 1% |
| Q5    | Be consulted on methodology        | 8%  | 21% | 39% | 26% | 5%  | 1% |
| Q6    | Be consulted on class management   | 7%  | 14% | 31% | 29% | 17% | 1% |
| Q7    | Be consulted on record keeping     | 19% | 17% | 22% | 25% | 15% | 2% |
| Q8    | Be consulted on homework tasks     | 9%  | 22% | 38% | 23% | 8%  | 1% |
| Q9    | Contribute self-assessment         | 7%  | 13% | 27% | 30% | 15% | 7% |
| Q10   | Be consulted on teaching focus     | 11% | 24% | 34% | 20% | 8%  | 3% |
| Q11   | Be consulted on learning tasks     | 8%  | 18% | 44% | 22% | 6%  | 2% |
| Q12   | Formulate own explanations         | 1%  | 6%  | 13% | 37% | 41% | 1% |
| Q13   | Find own learning strategies       | 3%  | 5%  | 10% | 36% | 43% | 3% |

Note. NAA = Not at all; L = Little; P = Partly; M = Much; VM = Very Much; I = Invalid

\*Note. As shown in the Table 23, the questionnaire items were analyzed individually in Camilleri (1997) study. To be able to make a comparison between the results of the both studies, questionnaire items were grouped and calculations were done as it was done for the present study.

### Present Study

| Questions | Question focus                     | NAA | L   | P   | M   | VM  | I  |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Q1        | Establish course objectives        | 2%  | 10% | 35% | 33% | 14% | 6% |
| Q2        | Determine course content           | 14% | 21% | 33% | 21% | 7%  | 4% |
| Q3        | Choose materials                   | 18% | 24% | 30% | 20% | 6%  | 3% |
| Q4        | Select study time, place, and pace | 18% | 28% | 35% | 12% | 6%  | 1% |
| Q5        | Be consulted on methodology        | 10% | 25% | 25% | 30% | 9%  | 1% |
| Q6        | Be consulted on class management   | 16% | 18% | 27% | 25% | 13% | 1% |
| Q7        | Be consulted on record keeping     | 22% | 10% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 3% |
| Q8        | Be consulted on homework tasks     | 18% | 24% | 32% | 22% | 4%  | 0% |
| Q9        | Contribute self-assessment         | 4%  | 9%  | 22% | 43% | 20% | 2% |
| Q10       | Be consulted on teaching focus     | 12% | 18% | 19% | 32% | 7%  | 3% |
| Q11       | Be consulted on learning tasks     | 4%  | 15% | 40% | 33% | 7%  | 0% |
| Q12       | Formulate own explanations         | 4%  | 7%  | 28% | 33% | 26% | 1% |
| Q13       | Find own learning strategies       | 1%  | 4%  | 10% | 42% | 42% | 1% |

Note. NAA = Not at all; L = Little; P = Partly; M = Much; VM = Very Much; I = Invalid

