



ادراك الطلاب نحو الاستقلاليه في تعلم اللغة ومنهجها (ادراك ، استقلاليه ، منهاج

م. بان كاظم عبد

مركز اللغة الانكليزية/ الجامعة التكنولوجية

تاريخ الاستلام : 2020/7/29

تاريخ القبول : 2020/9/3

المستخلص:

في يومنا هذا ، خاصة في مجال المناهج الدراسية ، يركز مصمموا المنهاج جهودهم بشكل تدريجي على جودة التعلم وتحسين الطلاب في تعليم اللغة الانكليزية او اللغة الثانية. ان المنهج الذي يركز على المتعلم هو هدفهم والذي أدى إلى التركيز على استقلالية المتعلم وقيمه في تحفيز تنمية المتعلم.

يهدف البحث الحالي إلى فحص تصورات مائتي طالب جامعي فيما يتعلق باستقلاليتهم في الكتابة وتصورات معلمهم لمهارة الكتابة في المناهج الدراسية في تعزيز استقلالية الطلاب ، وان هذا البحث قدم تحليلاً شاملاً للعمليات التعليمية في تعزيز الاستقلالية في مهاره الكتابه وإلقاء الضوء على المواد التي تتم مراجعتها في مجال مهارة الكتابة بالمنهج.

الكلمات المفتاحيه : ادراك ، استقلاليه ، منهاج



Students' perception towered autonomy in foreign language learning and instructions (perception ,
instruction, autonomy)

Lecturer, Ban Kadhim Abed

English Language Center/ University of Technology

10038@uotechnology.edu.iq

Receipt date: 29/7/2020

Date of acceptance: 3/9/2020

Abstract

In the current day, especially in the field of curriculum, designers are progressively concentrating their efforts on learning quality and student improvement in L2 instruction. Learner-centered approach is their target and has led to an emphasis on learner autonomy and its value in stimulating the development of the learner.

The current paper aims to examine two hundred university students' perception regarding their autonomy in writing and their teachers' perceptions of the writing skill of the curriculum in promoting students' autonomy and this investigation provided a comprehensive analysis of the instructional processes in promoting autonomy in writing skills and shed light upon the subjects that are be reviewed in the writing skill area of the curriculum.

Key words: perception , instruction, autonomy



Introduction:

The movement came into existence when the new century rolled over and when educational curriculum developers set their progressive movements for instance John Dewey who began to discover several aspects that are known as the significant properties for Curriculum based learner. As for an institute in which the learners "learned" the required knowledge via self-directing inquiry while the instructor guides his students throughout the course of learning represented a social response to the common manner of instruction where to teach a "known" body of knowledge is the curriculum aim. These open-minded instructors believed that the course's contents become only exciting for students if such contents fulfilled what the learners need. The content based on a learner point of view which is significant to him/her for the future and he/she get involved in making his her personal objectives of learning as an alternative to the content selected by some experts. Their viewpoint is that institutes must provide chances of learning for students to explore subjects connected to their immediate experiments as well as to offer the learners skills of self-assessing for their personal learning and conduct via cooperating as participating among the persons within a group (Posner 1992: p.50).

Historical Significance of Learner Autonomy

Gremo and Riley (1995:p.140) studied the historic knowledge of autonomy in a broader sense as well as ideas and concepts in relation to education specifically in contextualized language learning that contributed generally to the development of autonomy, different important factors was defined and a shortlist is given of the upmost powerful causes for emerging a learner autonomy was created (ibid. 152-154), this list consists of:



The right movements' minority among educationalists, philosophers, psychologists and linguists, the reaction against behaviourism adult education development

Increase the number of population of the campus of schools as well as universities , broader contact in many countries of education aspects and the new structures of educational development that deals with diverse and huge amount of students the call for a second language Increased

The wide delivery of languages as well as the language learner view of the importance of his role as the technological progress.

These reasons are stranded in history and interconnected firmly with the classification of scholars' arguments to highpoint how learner autonomy is important and the process of its encouragement.

Little (1994:p.230) distinguishes between the term general education debates to autonomy and the psychologic debates to autonomy. The general debates express the development of independent positions which essentially carry out the education procedures to improve the ability of people to achieve free thinking and acting besides being self-defining people. The psychologic debates referred that students that have the ability to integrate new data with prior knowledge are the most effective learners and they have the ability to know how to convey their present information side by side the mission of new learning.

Cotterall (1995:p.219) provides a philosophic, pedagogic, and practice causes for autonomy ability in linguistic learning. The logical reason for his belief is that students should be able to take choices as long as learning is concern. Pedagogic justifying illustrates that adults particularly has better security as far as their learning, an adult learns more effectively, such happens if he could take part in the process of decisions' making regarding the instruction step, arrangement, style and content. Their practice debate can be given when an instructor might not often be present along with his students to achieve their needs, which is that they can be able to learn on their own.



Autonomy's Definition

Littlewood (1999, p.73) say that :

“once autonomy is defined within educational norms as the capacity of learners to learn independently of their instructors, at that time everywhere autonomy could be shown as an unquestionable objective for students, as obviously no student, anyplace, can be in accompany with his teachers throughout life.”

Therefore he will have groups of autonomy perceiving like a vital objective for the entire process of learning.

Autonomy could be produced in a variety of methods which depend on learning contexts, learning contents, learning process as well as learner’s individualities. Holec early defined autonomy (1981, p.3) as

“the capacity of taking responsibility for his learning.”

Little (1994, p. 81) explained autonomy as happened within a large variation of conducts “as an ability for objectivity, critic reflecting, making decisions and independent actions.” Benson (2001, p.47) favors using the notion “the ability to master the one own learning”, because of allowing easy examining against ‘charge’ or ‘responsibility’. After that, Benson along with Voller (1997, p. 2, c.f. Thanasoulas 2000) suggested the notion autonomy

- a) To learners situation for studying where they completely learn depending upon themselves;
- b) To a number of skills that could be taught and applied within self-directing learning;
- c) To an innate capability that can be inhibited by formal educating;
- d) To learners' responsibility to define their own learning; and



e) To learners' right for determining their own learning directions. A useful method may be to explain what to exclude about autonomy. Along with Little (1994, p. 81) autonomy can't be:

- An equivalent word for self-instructing autonomy can't be restricted to learning without an instructor,
- an issue of allowing the students continue ahead with things admirably well – autonomy doesn't involve a surrender of duty with respect to an instructor,
- Something that instructors do to students – it isn't another educating strategy,
- A single, effectively depicted conduct,
- A consistent state accomplished by students.

Autonomy as Process

Learning as autonomy one represents an individual, continuous, endless movement. As Holec (1981, pp. 25–26) clarifies, the most well-known circumstance "would be the one where students that are not yet autonomy yet can be engaged with the way toward gaining the capacity to accept accountability for the study of their own". Such meaning is additionally bolstered by Candy (1991:p.68) that expresses that "student autonomy represents a steady procedure open to instructive intercessions, instead of a state, which is come to for the last time." Therefore dependent on the way that autonomy isn't an item, yet it is a procedure, Oxford (2008:p.115) portrays the idea of autonomy in the accompanying manners:

- 1) Autonomous stages,
- 2) Major autonomous aspect of a winding and
- 3) Autonomous degrees/levels.

The two stage theories:

- a) Social-constructivist theory of stages by Vygotsky's (1978, 1981), and



b) Stages' theory by Noonan (1997).

a) Vygotsky (1978, 1981) introduces a social-constructivist hypothesis of formative phases of inner self-guideline. Learning happens by the student's arrangements with an increasingly proficient individual, who 'intervenes' the learning. Self-guideline can be accomplished by traveling through three phases: (1) social discourse – association with the more competent individual, that gives model higher-request thinking aptitudes; (2) egocentric discourse – clearly giving oneself directions to apply such abilities; and (3) inward discourse mental self-direction, a sign which the student has completely disguised such aptitudes. This hypothesis infers a cozy connection amid the more skilled individual with the student. Nonetheless, in the autonomous unknown dialect learning circumstance, such a relationship is troublesome in light of the fact that the coach (on the off chance that one exists) is a good ways off and doesn't work always with the student. Learning in autonomous unknown dialect circumstances is intervened principally by PC programs, reading material, handbooks, recordings, sites.

b) Nunan's (1997, In. Oxford 2008:p.115) hypothesis focuses upon study hall based students of second languages, students autonomy develops and alters via five phases: (1) mindfulness – the student is the beneficiary of data; (2) inclusion – student is the analyst and selector amid available choices; (3) mediation – student adjusts formal objectives; (4) creation – student is the designer, originator and maker of his very own objectives; (5) greatness – student distinguish their own advantages and make objectives applicable to that.

2. Autonomy as a component of a spiral created by Little (2000:p.442)

expands Vygotsky's hypothesis of stages and the idea of association referenced previously. It depicts autonomy as a major aspect of a learning spiral. The student advances higher than ever of freedom by first traveling through extra periods of association (with an educator or others). This proposes autonomy is anything but a direct issue of stages or degrees yet part of the bending development of the spiral.



3. Autonomy as degree/level speaks to the possibility that student autonomy isn't won big or bust and it fills in as an unpleasant substitution for the significantly more muddled reality. Littlewood (1996:p.75) talks about degrees of conduct at which an individual settles on free decisions or choices. The pecking order moves from low-level decisions that master the particular tasks by which the action can be completed to significant level decisions that master the general action. In the middle of, he recognizes each number of levels.

Components of Autonomy and Decision-making

Littlewood (1996:p411) looks at the parts which constitute autonomy within languages learning. The researcher characterizes (on the same page. p. 427) an autonomous individual as "one that has an autonomous ability to settle on and do the decisions that administer their activities". As indicated by Littlewood (in the same place. p. 428) such limit relies upon two fundamental segments: capacity and eagerness. This implies, in other words, an individual may be able to settle on autonomous decisions however no ability to do as such. Then again, an individual might be happy to settle on free decisions yet not be able to do as such. Capacity and eagerness can additionally be isolated into two parts. Capacity relies upon having information about the choices from which decisions must be made and abilities for completing whatever decisions appear to be generally suitable. Eagerness relies upon having both the inspiration and the certainty to assume liability for the decisions required. To be effective in acting independently, these four segments should be available together.

Clearly the making decision and taking choices represent the center of the student autonomy. Holec's (1981, p.3) remarks the scope of the autonomous student's controlling as far as settling on the accompanying choices: deciding goals, characterizing the substance and movements, choosing strategies and methods, observing techniques of obtaining and assessing what has been procured". Oxford (2008:p.225) broadens the rundown of potential choices identified with: (1) the language to get educated; (2) the reason, general substance, subjects, and explicit undertakings of the second language learning; (3) the sum and sort of directions the student requires; (4) the sorts of learning techniques to be utilized; (5) the nature, recurrence,



and detailing arrangement of evaluation; (6) custom or casualness of the learning; (7) timing; and (8) area (for example by a auto accessing focus, on the telephone or PC at home, or somewhere else).

Instructor and student Roles

The move-in charge from instructor to student is pivotal to an autonomy methodology paying little mind to the specific hierarchical structure. This includes an adjustment within roles, and can bring sentiments of uneasiness, vulnerability or distress (Little, 1995;p.430). Instructors in every single instructive setting are the human interface among students and assets. They could just assist their students with developing a limit with regards to basic reflection on the off chance that they have this limit themselves. It is firmly contended within the area of second language instruction that student autonomy relies upon instructor autonomy.

Student autonomous learning doesn't imply that the educator gets excess in the learning procedure. Instructors alter their job from wellspring of data to advocate and chief of learning assets. New jobs for educators likewise involve (Yang, 1998:p.128) a helper, facilitator, counsels, guide, dynamic members, as well as specialists.

With regards to applying self-sufficiency inside study hall learning and planning courses dependent on student autonomous learning, which will be tended to later, one more job of the educator ought to be referenced. As per Benson (2000:p.89) and Huang (2006;p.62) the instructor's job is to intervene between the students' entitlement to autonomy and the limitations that repress the activity of this privilege just as to clarify and legitimize these imperatives to their students. Omaggio (1978, refered to in Thanasoul as pp. 117-118) provides seven primary traits of autonomy student that:

has insight in his learning style and strategy; takes an dynamic method for the available learning mission , has a will to take risks –for communicating in the objective language at any cost; is an outstanding guesser; attends to forms and to contents, in other words, places significance upon accurateness and appropriateness; develops the objective language to a



distinct reference system and has a will to reread as well as discard any hypothesis and rule which has no application; has a tolerant plus resigning method to the objective language.

For the purpose of relating instructor jobs in encouraging student autonomy to the unknown dialect adapting, Little (n. d.) records the accompanying advances the instructor has to take:

- utilize the objective language as the favored vehicle of study hall correspondence and require the equivalent of the students;
- include the students in a constant mission for correct learning exercises, that can be shared, examined, investigated and assessed with the entire study hall;
- assist the students to fix the objectives of their very own learning and pick their own learning exercises, exposing them to talk, examination and assessment;
- need from the students to distinguish singular objectives however seek after them through cooperative work in little gatherings;
- Need from the students to maintain composed records for their learning – plans of exercises and tasks, arrangements of helpful jargon, whatsoever writings the students themselves make;
- involve the students to the standard assessment of their advancement as separate students along with as group in study hall.

With respect to student and his autonomy second language learning, Littlewood (1996, pp. 429–430) defines the accompanying capacities:

- a student can settle on his own decisions in punctuation and jargon (for example in controlled pretends and basic errands including data trade). This is the underlying advance towards "autonomy communicating";
- a student picks the implications they need to express and the correspondence systems they will use so as to accomplish their open objectives;



- a students can settle on progressively sweeping choices about objectives, implications and procedures (for example in inventive pretending, critical thinking and discussing);
- a student starts to pick and shape their very own learning settings, for example in autonomy learning and task work;
- a student becomes ready to settle on choices in areas having generally had a place with the educator, for example about materials and learning assignments;
- a student take an interest in deciding the nature and movement of his own prospectus;
- a student can utilize language (for correspondence and adapting) freely in circumstances of his decision outside the class.

Autonomous learning speaks to the reshaping of educator and student jobs and move of duty from instructors to students because of an adjustment in the dispersion of intensity and authority. Since self-governance includes an exchange of command overtaking in choices from the educator to the students, Huang (2006:p.21) sees student self-sufficiency as a procedure worried about the arrangement among instructor and student in an environment of certified discourse and collegiality.

DESIGNING COURSE BASED ON LEARNER AUTONOMY

Autonomy within Independent Learning and Classroom Learning

Little (1994:p.45), Oxford (2008:p.89) as well as Reinders (2010:p.35) separate amid two differentiating learning settings: autonomous learning(outside the full-time instructive framework) and class learning(within the instructive framework). Autonomy interfaces these two kinds of learning, in spite of the fact that it is connected more with autonomous learning than with study hall learning. Self-rule ought to be utilized both in autonomous and class learning. In any case, the number and sorts of choices made by the student vary in the two circumstances.



As indicated by Oxford (2008:p.112) autonomous language learning is the learning of a language without the inclusion of an educator. Such learning can happen alone or with different students; it tends to be formal or casual. Structures intended to advance autonomous language learning depend on a blend of learning resources (available in print, internet (Learning Management Systems), minimal plate, TV, radio, video (for example VHS, DVD), telephone or a mix) and student advising

A self-accessing place, a coach through email or face to face, a student bolster gathering, a visit room, a printed or Web-put together manual with respect to how to learn and other media help).

Class learning inside the framework possesses more confinements over which students (with instructors) have no control. Benson (2000, p. 116) condenses four classifications of impediments on the advancement of student self-governance inside a given instructive setting: a) strategy imperatives on language in training, b) institutional constraints(rules, guidelines, accreditation, assessments, educational programs, the physical and social association of the school and study hall rehearses, c) originations of language(what the objective language is, the manners by which it is sorted out and address use) and d) language encouraging methodologies(assumptions about how dialects are found out, and applicable learning assets and exercises).

Reinders (2010, p. 44) talks inside these two learning settings planned for encouraging autonomy about pro and general methodologies. Authority approaches incorporate the purposeful projects that don't frame some portion of normal study hall educating, and have the improvement of self-rule as one of their essential points (student preparing, procedure guidance, self-accessing to, language prompting or language directing, explicit devices). General methodologies take a gander at manners by which educators can empower self-sufficiency in the class.

Frameworks to Implement Autonomous learning in Class

As proposed at the research beginning with the idea of autonomy is that it is as yet vague what precisely the term implies. It involves different thoughts, for example, inspiration,



mindfulness, association, reflecting, assessment and self-assessment, system use, metacognition and so on in this way a few researchers question that it very well may be separated into segment parts to be estimated. Reinders (2010, p.42) states that "as result, scarcely any reasonable models or structures exist that could deliberately direct educators in executing autonomy in the class".

Regardless of the constraints that can thwart an instructor in making a course planned for supporting student autonomy, in this area a few standards, course procedures, and ways to deal with structuring a course dependent on cultivating student autonomy can be presented by Cotterall (1995 and 2000), Mariani (1997) and Reinders(2010:p.38). The structures were created both to a scope of students in any instructive setting and the setting of language training.

Course strategy for learner autonomy

Cotterall (1995:p.217) says that autonomy isn't something that could be added to existing learning programs, however that it must be inferred all through the whole educational program. As per her it is critical to advance self-governance inside the general language program and not only that of the study hall. Self-sufficiency as an objective can't be acknowledged until it is coordinated into the structure of the program. She presents a general structure of independence based English for Academic Purposes course just as its alterations in the wake of running it for a long time. The course depends on these components (ibid. pp. 221-222):

- Learner/educator discourse

Toward the start of the course it is planned for building up an individual relationship and setting and destinations, at the mid-point at surveying and talking about the student's advancement and toward the finish of the course at prompting students on their future investigation. The discourse among students and the class instructor is key to the cultivating of autonomous learning.



Learning a Language study theme

This segment provides key ideas in language learning, and urges students to investigate the sum and kind of language info, and its utilization in masterminding sufficient practice openings. It likewise gives a prologue to an essential meta-language to discuss their language learning and fuses open exchange of destinations, techniques, and desires.

- Classroom task as well as material

The task plan to emulate those which students experience in 'genuine world' circumstances and to fuse language support. Students' troubles are talked through a while later, and diverse follow-up study hall exercises are given. Assignments contain cognizance raising components for building up the connection between study hall practices and adapting needs and helping students to see the 'out-of-class measurement of undertakings which occur inside the study hall. The materials urge students to step up to the plate in their language learning by unequivocally indicating the connection between study hall language learning exercises and students' creating language ability.

-Students recording booklet

This segment incorporates the part of checking the learning procedure. Every student gets his duplicate of the understudy recording booklet toward the beginning of the course. This booklet involves two areas. The principal segment contains a progression of self-evaluation scales and a spot to record individual destinations. The subsequent area is worried about observing learning action through diagrams and outlines on which students record their exercises and progress. The general point is to urge students to record significant minutes as far as they can tell of the course and to play a functioning job in communicating their learning destinations and evaluating whether, how and to what degree these are met.

- Self-accessing center

The last part speaks to the arrangement of free investigation offices in type of self-study material for students who have distinguished needs and have wish to address them



voluntarily at their own pace. Particularly, listening assets can be viewed as vital since listening aptitude improvement is undeniably fit to autonomous practice. Nonetheless, two things must be referenced: oneself access focus is viewed as just a single asset among others for taking care of issues connected to a language and giving an enormous number of alluring self-studying assets doesn't consequently transform subordinate a student into autonomous one.

So the aim of this research project has therefore been to try to examine learner autonomy in the writing skills of university of Technology students' and their teachers' perspectives. This objective is iexpectedd to provideea inclusive analysisi on the instructional processes of being aautonomous learners in iwriting .

To achievei the aim of tthe study, the ifollowing rresearch iquestions were addressed:

1. What are istudents' perception towered their iaunonomy in language ilearning ?
2. What are students' perception towered their iaunonomy in iwriting ?
3. What are teachers' perception towered their students' autonomy in language ilearning and iwriting in iEnglish?

Thei used method

The paper begins by casee study to iexamine the idata through aquantitative andiqualitative way (Brymann , 2004). Collecting data was vvvia a questionnaireie, to examinee istudents' perceptions towered being autonomous , and conducted an interview with English teachers, to get accurate datai about their iperceptions related ito having iaunonomous learningi and instruction in learning English.

iSample of the study

The questionnairei was iadministered to 200 istudents, and six of language teachers participated in the study by making an interview with them.

Instrument and Procedure



To date, various methods have been developed and introduced to measure two types or means of collecting data which are a student questionnaire and a teacher interview . The first part of items in the questionnaire are based on a five-point Likert scale (5 = exactly, 4 = a lot, 3 = moderately, 2 = a little, 1 = no response at all). The first part (1-18) items made to collect information about students. The second part (19-54) items was to collect information about students perception of their level of autonomy in language learning. This group of items was adapted it from Egel's Autonomy Learner Questionnaire (ALQ) for the study (Karagöl, 2008). The last part (55- 78) items collected information on the students' perceptions of their autonomy concerning their writing skills in English.

For the study, the interview was administered to teachers to collect detailed data on their own replication of learner autonomy concept and their views of how to promote autonomy of the writing skills. The interview questions were developed through areas related to the aim of the study .

The time allotted to the questionnaire, was 25 minutes to complete, and was administered to the university students in their classrooms by their own teachers. The interviews were made with English language teachers, those that teach the same students since the beginning of the year, and were done in their office. The time allotted to each interview was 60 minutes and was recorded after taking permission of the teacher. All necessary permission for the study was established before the beginning the implementation of data collection instruments.

Validity of the instrument

Prior to beginning of the study , two experts' opinions were sought to improve the content and face validity of student questionnaire. Once having their comments and suggestions, adjustments were done accordingly to the instrument before administering .



Data Analysisi

By using the SPSS (18.0) program , the quantitative data were analyzed to answer the three research questions. After collection of answers , descriptivei statistisci were conductedi to had thei resolution of ifrequency, meani, and the istandard ideviation of the data gatheredi. T- testiwaso conducted to measure ostudents' autonomy in ilanguage olearning and writing skills, besides was used to evaluatei whether their]mean was significantlyyi differentdfrom the average of 3, which is theuaccepted imeanovalue on aafive–point Likert iscale. Sincei the acceptedumean valuekis 3 , which is iconsidered thekmoderate levelnof comparison, theh oitems in thehquestionnaire were examined ithrough a five–point Likertu scale (5 =ueactly, 4 = ia lot, 3 = imoderately, 2 = ja little, and 1 = no response iat all).

As far as thei qualitativei data , the researcher does afterkallkinterviews wereptranscribed, exposed to contenti analysisk by collecting themes which were chosen according to the research questions.

Results and discussions

students' autonomy in language learning

Thei average scoreishowed thatithe imean ofustudents'iperception of theirion autonomyoin languageklearning was 2.77, and theustandard ideviation of 0.48. Thiskwasostatisticallyilower than the irating of the five–point scale, which is 3, and the $t = -6.6, ip < 0.001$, asi shown iniTable 1 below. Iniother words, when the calculated t is lowerthan tabulated t , this showothatostudentsohavemlowerolevelmofoautonomyiminilanguage learningothan the average level.

Table 1

T–testufor thekStudents' PerceptionsjofiAutonomy injLanguage Learning

N	M	S	df	t
		D		



2	2.	0.	1	6.
00	77	48	99	621

Considering qualitative findings, it was found that all students are not autonomous in language learning. Because autonomy is significant to the success of learning, and it is a skill that can be the lifestyle of a person in his life. It was also illustrated that all of the teachers must give importance to adapt autonomy in their classes as far as they can because they think that being an autonomous learner is important in language learning.

Students' autonomy in writing

The second research question represents students' autonomy in writing, the mean was found 3.2, and the standard deviation was 76. This was statistically significantly appeared to be higher than a rating of 3 on the five-point scale, and t score appeared to be 3.8, $p < 0.001$, as shown in Table 2 below. This result shows that the calculated t appeared to be less than the tabulated t which shows that students slightly above the average level of perceiving themselves as autonomous in writing in English.

Table 2 Student's perception of autonomy in writing skills

N	M	SD	df	T
---	---	----	----	---

Also qualitative data showed that not all the teachers reflect about their students' autonomy in writing and that all those teachers admit that their students mostly depend on the teacher and on the course book. Few of those teachers stressed that their students' dependence on the model used in writing. Half of the teachers admit that the most



important reason for the students' lack of autonomy happen because of the students dependence on their teacher . Also some said that the educational system in high school was the reason behind the students not being autonomous, also those students get fused into the memorization process and that's goes mostly because of the curriculum in educational system.

The most important problems , as all of the teachers emphasized , that inhibiting students' autonomy in language learning and writing are the unsuitability of the instructional environment which came from the fixed tables and chairs in the classroom which established problems for collaborative work and pair work . The collected qualitative data showed the physical environment was not suitable to move chairs, and the sitting arrangements of chairs that are helpful for group works could not be designed. Together these results provides an evidence that the curriculum was considered the second major problem that inhibiting students' autonomy . It is evident that materials used does not encourage students to be autonomous, also the methodology adopted in class is not satisfactory enough to develop students' autonomy. Besides, teachers responses showed that they were not able to develop students' autonomy through using strategies because of something which is considered important which is time constraints. As another major problem in language learning, the passiveness of students came from the educational system they had gone through till now. So, all teachers should support their students to develop their skills in becoming responsible for their learning because they are not used to such responsibility , particularly those that are in high schools. There, students seem to be not used to be responsible for their learning and teachers are only giving lectures .

The gathered qualitative data shows that the reason behind the major problem that prevent learner autonomy in writing skill is the students' problems faced in language, including vocabulary problems and sentence structure problems . Some teachers asserted that their students had problems in language use because they do not use it outside classroom and they mainly depend too much on the teacher and the course book. Also, because students



did not use dictionaries to find ambiguous words so, they will not be able to solve writing exercises or problems.

Becoming independent in writing are rare in most students. Those students should have adopted some good skills of writing like criticizing, questioning, and looking for hidden meaning ie, between lines . The curriculum was considered a problem as reported by teachers and sincey the materialused by the iteachers was notused iproperly, learnerh autonomyi was not developed.

Conclusion

Thei most obvious finding to emerge from this study is thatustudentsulack autonomyoin languagelearningh; howeveri, learneruautonomy ireveals thati it is a vitalopart of thelearningprocess. Thisostudy has gone some way that reveals the importance of oautonomy in ilanguageulearning , so, being able to developpautonomy, students can becomeibetter ilanguage learnersi. And the keyoconceptsof learner oautonomy is to centeruthe focusoon learningorather than teachingibecause the whole process is student–center .

The moving of roles from focusing on teacher to learner requires a good organization by emphasizing the role of collaboration between learnersytaking into iaccount bothimaterials andumethods jrathergthan focusing on the instructional material and the teacher. The present study give additional evidence with respect to teachers' role in the students' learning process. This process of being autonomous doinotibecome automaticallyjin theiclassroom but theuteachersjare those whojprovide learnerskwith the appropriatemtools and jopportunities to their student to practiceusingithemy. Despite this, thektotaljdependence on theteacher is not correct. Teachersitake their roleskin their classroom to enhance autonomy and this is not an easy task because they have to balance the relationshippbetweenkteacherand studentsjin orderjto makehstudents autonomous, and becoming independenthfrom theteacher. Teacher should take the role of assistant not a manger of the class.

Taken together , these obtained results suggestedmthat the teachersi do notjsee their studentskas autonomous . Althoughj some teachersshstated thatj it is important to stimulate



student jautonomy, they complain about the time limitation and insufficientlymqualified materialyin promotinguautonomyj in theucurriculum. The writinguskilljareawas also foundutombejinsufficientmingpromotingglearnergautonomy. Students'ulacknofuconfidence and inability to relay on themselves waskconsideredi thehmain reasonjbehind inhibitingi learner jautonomy in writing and how this promotemher/his jdependency on theyteacher. So, if theicurriculum that thei teacher follow doesjnot promotehautonomyg, teachersjhaveto findhanother concrete waysito implement autonomy insteadhof just followingj it as it is.

Problemshtat hinder students'j autonomyg in languageg learninggg and writingggare mostly the physicalienviromenth – asgsupportive circumstances andhcontexts , are the maini elementshfacilitatingh effectivehlearningh process and promotinghlearnerg autonomyh. When the hinstructional environment is jnot proper, jit makes collaborative learninghdifficultj. Howeverj, collaborativeworkj is veryhimportantth to foster autonomyi. Vygotsky in hishconstructivism theory, highlights the activeuand collaborativelh processj of learning in constructingj knowledgej. The problem of curriculum is another considerable problem that must find solution to it . To effectively implement learnerh autonomyj in thejclassroomk, the focus must be moved fromkteachersj to students.

References

- Benson, P. and P. Voller. 1997. *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*. London: Longman.
- Cotterall, S. 1995. 'Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy'. *ELT Journal* 49/3: 219–27.
- Candy, (1991). *Self-direction for Lifelong Learning*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Holec, H. 1981. *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.



Huang, J. (2006, December). Fostering learner autonomy within constraints: Negotiation and mediation in an atmosphere of collegiality. 38 Prospect.21(3).

Little, D.(n.d.) Learner autonomy: drawing together the threads of self–assessment, goal–setting and reflection.Retrieved form:
[http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/Elp_tt/Results/DM_layout/00_10/06/06%20Supplementary%20text.p
df](http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/Elp_tt/Results/DM_layout/00_10/06/06%20Supplementary%20text.pdf)

Littlewood, W. 1999. ‘Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts’. Applied Linguistics, 20/1: 71–94.

Little, D. (1994). Learner autonomy: A theoretical construct and its practical application. Die Neuere Sprache, 93(5), 430–442.

Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European Language Portfolio: Two L2 English examples. Language Teaching, 42, 222–233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005636>

Mariani, L.n. d. Support vs. Challenge in Classroom Interaction –A Sample Questionnaire Retrieved from<http://www.learningpaths.org/questionnaires/supchquest/supchquest.htm>

Nunan, D., Lai, J., & Keobke, K. (1999). Towards autonomous language learning: Strategies, reflection and navigation. In S. Cotterall & D. Crabbe (Eds.), Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change (pp. 69–77). Frankfurt am Main, DE: Peter Lang.

Oxford, R. 1990. Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R.L., & Leaver, B.L. (1996). A synthesis of strategy instruction for language learners. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), Language learning strategies around the world: Cross–cultural perspectives (pp. 227–246). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.

Posner, G. J. 1992. Analyzing the Curriculum. New York: McGraw–Hill Inc.



Reinders, H. (2010). Towards a Classroom Pedagogy for Learner Autonomy: A Framework of Independent Language Learning Skills. Australian Journal of Teacher Education. 35(5). Article 4.

Reinders, H. and Balcikanli C. (2011). Learning to foster autonomy: The role of teacher education materials. Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal. 2(1).15-25.

Reinders, H., & White, C. (2016). 20 years of autonomy and technology: How far have we come and where to next? Language Learning & Technology, 20(2), 143- 154.

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is Learner Autonomy and how can it be fostered?The Internet TESL Journal.6 (11).

van Lier, L. (1996). Interaction in the Language Curriculum. Awareness, Autonomy & Authenticity. Harlow: Longman.

Vygotsky L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yuan, L. & Powell, S. (2013). MOOCs and open education: Implications for higher education.

Centre for educational technology & interoperability standards (Cetis).

Yang, N.-D.(1998). Exploring a new role for teachers: promoting learner autonomy. System,26/1998. 127-135