T.R.
PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING
MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

PERCEPTIONS OF EFL INSTRUCTORS AND TURKISH EFL STUDENTS AS PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ABOUT LEARNER AUTONOMY AND THE COMPARISON OF THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Gülsün SOFRACI

June, 2016

T.R.
DENİZLİ
PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING
MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

PERCEPTIONS OF EFL INSTRUCTORS AND TURKISH EFL STUDENTS AS PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ABOUT LEARNER AUTONOMY AND THE COMPARISON OF THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Gülsün SOFRACI

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Demet YAYLI

June, 2016
DENİZLİ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ ONAY FORMU

Bu çalışma, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan: Doç. Dr. Demet YAYLI (Danışman)

Üye : Prof. Dr. Ramazan BAŞTÜRK

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kenan DİKİLİTAŞ

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun **01.07.2016** tarih ve **24./.02** sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Ramazan BAŞTÜRK

Enstitü Müdürü

ii

ETİK BEYANNAMESİ

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu tez çalışmasında;

- Tez içindeki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi,

- Görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,

- Başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda ilgili eserlere bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu,

- Atıfta bulunduğum eserlerin tümünü kaynak olarak gösterdiğimi,

- Kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı,

- Bu tezin herhangi bir bölümünü bu üniversitede veya başka bir üniversitede başka bir tez çalışması olarak sunmadığımı beyan ederim.

Gülşan SOFRACI

To my beloved family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜ

İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ VE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYI OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÖĞRENEN ÖZERKLİĞİ KONUSUNDAKİ ALGILARI VE ALGILARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Sofracı, Gülsün
Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Demet YAYLI

Haziran, 2016

Bu araştırma devlet üniversitelerindeki hazırlık programlarında İngilizce eğitimi veren okutmanların ve İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünde eğitim alan geleceğin öğretmenlerinin öğrenen özerkliği konusundaki algılarını öğrenmeyi ve aynı zamanda bu iki grubun konuya bakış açılarını karşılaştırmayı hedeflemiştir. Çalışma toplamda 123 okutmanın ve İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü öğrencisinin katılımıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmada özellikle üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerine yer verilmesinin sebebi bu öğrencilerin ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarında staj yaparak İngilizce öğretimi konusunda birinci ve ikinci sınıf öğrencilere kıyasla daha deneyimli olmalarıdır. Veri toplama aracı olarak iki bölümden oluşan bir anket kullanılmıştır.Kişisel bilgiler ve öğrenen özerkliği algısı adı altında iki bölümden oluşan bu anketin kişisel bilgiler bölümü okutmanlar ve İngilizce öğretmen adayları için farklı hazırlanmış olmakla birlikte öğrenen özerkliği algısı bölümü her iki grup için de aynı soruları içermektedir. Öğrenen özerkliği algısı bölümü katılımcıların öğrenen özerkliği konusundaki algılarını öğrenmeyi amaçlamıştır. Katılımcılar bu bölümdeki her madde için görüşlerini 'hiç dahil edilmemeli', 'az dahil edilmeli', 'kısmen dahil edilmeli', 'çoğunlukla dahil edilmeli ' ve 'tamamen dahil edilmeli' şeklindeki beş derecelik Likert-Ölçeği formatında hazırlanan bir ankette belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca bu bölümde her sorunun altında yer alan 'yorum' kısmında

katılımcıların verdikleri cevapların sebebini belirten görüşleri yazılı olarak alınmıştır. Dolayısıyla elde edilen veriler hem nicel hem nitel özelliktedir.

Elde edilen nicel veriler SPSS 20.0 kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar genel olarak hem okutmanların hem de İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının öğrenen özerkliğine bakış açılarının olumlu yönde olduğunu ve bazı alanların öğrenci özerkliği uygulamasında diğer alanlara göre daha uygun olduğunu düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Ayrıca çalışmaya katılan öğretmen adayları ders yer, zaman ve hızının belirlenmesinde, ödev kontrolü, not kayıtları ve yoklama ilgili kararların alınmasında, ders amaçlarının belirlenmesinde, ders içeriğinin belirlenmesinde, ders materyallerinin belirlenmesinde, aktivitelerin uygulanmasında, sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili kararların alınmasında ve ödevlerle ilgili kararların alınmasında öğrenci özerkliğini okutmanlara göre daha uygulanabilir bulmuşlardır. Elde edilen bazı farklılıklara rağmen, genel anlamda olumlu tutumlar olumsuzlara göre daha ağır basmıştır.Buna ek olarak, toplanan nitel veriler de nicel verileri desteklemiş ve okutmanların ve de İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının öğrenen özerkliğini desteklediğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: öğrenen özerkliği, okutmanların algıları, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının algıları, özerklik algılarının kıyaslanması.

M.A. THESIS ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF EFL INSTRUCTORS AND TURKISH EFL STUDENTS AS PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ABOUT LEARNER AUTONOMY AND THE COMPARISON OF THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Sofracı, Gülsün
MA Thesis in English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Demet YAYLI

June, 2016

The main aim of this study was to investigate the perceptions of EFL instructors and Turkish EFL students as prospective teachers about learner autonomy. The study also aimed to find answers to the question whether the instructors' perceptions differed from the ones of prospective English teachers' by comparing and contrasting the results of the questionnaires. In order to reach those aims, first of all a questionnaire study was designed and administered to a total of 123 participating instructors and ELT students. Third and fourth year ELT students were specifically chosen because the third and fourth year students could be seen as prospective teachers considering that they are having teaching practice sessions and more experienced about how to teach English when compared to first and second year students. A questionnaire consisting of two parts, namely demographic knowledge part and learner autonomy part was given to the participants. Although the demographic knowledge part was differently prepared for the instructors and English language teaching program students, learner autonomy part was the same for both groups. This part aimed at collecting data on participants' perceptions related to learner autonomy. Participants indicated their opinions on a five-point Likert-scale, with 'not at all', 'little', 'partly', 'much', and 'very much' for each item, and they were also asked to state their

reasons for the answers in the comment part after each item. So, the study employed both qualitative and quantitative research techniques.

The quantitative data were analyzed by using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0). The results of the study revealed that the majority of the participants, both instructors and prospective teachers, reported that they were supportive to learner autonomy but the results also indicated that some items were found to be less applicable compared to the other items. The perceptions of instructors and prospective teachers differed in some main items which prospective teachers were more supportive of namely, involving learners in the decision of time, place and pace of the lesson, record keeping, course objectives, course content, selecting course materials, interaction pattern, classroom management and homework tasks. Despite some differences, in general terms positive attitudes outweighted the negative ones. In addition to this, qualitative data obtained supported the results of the quantitative data and revealed that instructors and prospective teachers supported learner autonomy.

Key Words: learner autonomy, instructors' perceptions, prospective English teachers' perceptions, comparison of learner autonomy perceptions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVATIONS

ADU: Adnan Menderes University

BA: Bachelor of Arts

BC: the British Council

CALL: Computer-Assisted Language Learning

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

CoE: Council of Europe

CRAPEL: Centre de Recherches et d' Applications en Langues

ECML: European Centre for Modern Languages

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELP: European Language Portfolio

ELT: English Language Teaching

EU: European Union

GPA: Grade Point Average

HEC: Turkish Higher Education Council

INGED: The English Language Teachers' Association in Turkey

LSP: Language for Specific Purposes

MA: Master of Arts

MONE: The Turkish Ministry of National Education

PAU: Pamukkale University

PhD: Doctor of Philosophy

SALL: Self Access Language Learning

SILL: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

USIA: the United States Information Agency

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

In the field of education, there have been many changes for the recent years. The perception of education, learner and teacher has changed a lot. Language teaching has also been affected by the development of more humanistic approaches to language learning and new teaching methods in education. Over the last two decades, the concepts of learner autonomy and independence have gained momentum, the former becoming a "buzz-word" within the context of language learning (Little, 1991, p. 2). So the concept of learner autonomy has become a central theme in language teaching and learning. It is part of a wider development in education that aims at preparing young people for life-long learning through the ability to organize and direct their own learning inside and outside the school context (Camilleri, 1999). Here comes out two major concepts, communicative language teaching (CLT) and learner centeredness, which emerged from these innovations. They focus on the idea of a learner being at the centre of teaching and learning process. A major impetus to the develop of learner-centered language teaching came with the advent of CLT, and this is more a cluster of approaches than a single methodology, which grew out of the dissatisfaction with structuralism and the situational methods of the 1960s (Nunan, 1988). One of the points that CLT emphasized is the concept of how language is used. Harmer (1997) indicates that a major strand of CLT centres around the essential belief that if students are involved in meaning-focused communicative tasks, then language learning will take care of itself. Also, plentiful exposure to language in use and plenty of opportunities to use it are vitally important for a student's development of knowledge and skill.

As the notion of autonomy has started to gain importance, whole-class grouping gave place to individualized learning, which stresses the idea of students on their own, working in a pattern of individualized learning. Harmer (2007) points out that the notion of individualized learning can range from students doing exercises on their own in class, to situations in which teachers are able to spend time working with individual students, or when students take charge of their own learning in self-access centres or other out-of-class environments. It is apparent that such individualized learning is a vital step in the

development of learner autonomy and Harmer (2007) states the advantages of individualised learning as follows:

> - It allows teachers to respond to individual student differences in terms of pace of learning, learning styles and preferences.
> - It is likely to be less stressful for students than performing in a whole-class setting or talking in pairs or groups.
> - It can develop learner autonomy and promote skills of self-reliance and investigation over teacher-dependence.
> - It can be a way of restoring peace and tranquility to a noisy and chaotic classroom (p. 164).

In fact the notion communicative is an umbrella term which embraces a huge amount of approaches all of which characterize language learning as the development of communication skills (Nunan, 1988). In relation to the development of learner autonomy, Gardner and Miller begin their latest book on Self Access (1999) by defining SALL (Self Access Language Learning). They see SALL as "an approach to learning language" (1999, p. 8), and define it as "learning in which students take more responsibility for their learning than in teacher directed settings" (1999, p. xvii).

Dam (1995) draws attention to the point that a gradual move from teacher-centered teaching to a learner-centered class is required in order to enhance learner autonomy in the classroom. Thus, this causes a design of syllabi promoting the concept of learner-centeredness and learner autonomy in its wake. In the 1960s, it was taken for granted that a structural syllabus, based on widely accepted principles of selection and grading would form the basis of any language teaching materials (White, 1998). However, there has arisen a key difference between learner-centred and traditional curriculum development in that, in the former, the curriculum is a collaborative effort between teachers and learners since learners are closely involved in the decision-making process regarding the content of the curriculum and how it is taught. Nunan (1988) indicates the aims of such curriculum as follows:

> - to provide learners with efficient learning strategies,
> - to assist learners identify their own preferred ways of learning,
> - to develop skills needed to negotiate the curriculum,
> - to encourage learners to set their own objectives
> - to encourage learners to adopt realistic goals and time frame,
> - to develop learners' skills in self-evaluation. (p. 3).

Cotterall (1995) adds that learners have beliefs about teachers and their roles as well as learners themselves and their roles, and these beliefs affect learners' receptiveness to ideas and activities in language classes, especially when they have not experienced

learning a foreign language before. One aspect leaps out in all proposed definitions and approaches of learner autonomy. That is reflection by the learners on their own learning process and setting goals based on these reflections. "Learners are encouraged to reflect on their language learning experiences through employing various strategies such as keeping journals, discussions with the course tutor, or peers, and so on" (İçmez, 2007, p.145).

1.2. Definition of Learner Autonomy

The notion 'autonomy' is an umbrella term that has been popular in different fields recently, and one of its major components is learner autonomy. According to Little (1996), learner autonomy is often regarded as a defining characteristic of all sustained learning that attains long-term success. This means that the learner's full involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluating his or her learning plays an important role in learner autonomy. Little (2004) states that "such involvement in turn requires the development of explicit skills of reflection and analysis and according to this definition learner autonomy entails learning how to learn intentionally" (p. 105).

One of the definitions of learner autonomy which is broadly accepted and adopted most by much research is the one put forward by Holec (1981). The concept of autonomous learning in the field of foreign language teaching was first introduced by him. He defines learner autonomy as follows:

> Learners' ability to manage his learning, that is, a learner is able to make learning strategies appropriate to his personal situation, including: 1. Setting learning objectives and schedule; 2. Deciding the content and procedure of learning; 3. Finding learning methods and techniques; 4. Supervising the whole process of learning, e.g. learning time, place and procedure; and 5. Self-evaluation (Holec, 1981, p.5).

With the great acceptance of communicative approaches in language learning in the last decades, learner centeredness has dominated the learning process and some terms such as self-study, self-development, self-assessment have stood out, which brought the application of the concept 'learner autonomy' in the language teaching process in its wake. Thus, in 1979, the Council of Europe published a report, Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning, prepared by Holec. Holec's arguments were mainly about theories of adult education focusing on the importance of learner self-management, and his definition of learner autonomy described perfectly the skills which a university language learner should possess. In addition to Holec's definition, Zhuang (2010) brings a new perspective to the definition stressing the importance of taking into consideration the cultural and national

differences in the perception of education. In that vein, Jinding (2002, p. 16), for example, from the perspective of Chinese students' characteristics states that learner autonomy has the following five aspects: " 1. Taking responsibility for learning; 2. Having a clear objective; 3. Making schedules; 4. Evaluating the effectiveness of learning; 5. Adjusting learning strategy". However, Benson and Voller (1997) suggested five possible ways of the use of the word 'autonomy' in language education:

-for situations in which learners study entirely on their own;
-for a set of skills which can be learned and applied in self-directed learning;
-for an inborn capacity which is suppressed by institutional education;
-for the exercise of learners' responsibility for their own learning;
-for the right of learners to determine the direction of their own learning (p. 1-2).

Here are some other perceptions and definitions of the concept of autonomy: For example, it is explained by Littlewood (1996, p. 97) as "learners' ability and willingness to make choices independently". Naizhao and Yanling (2004) elaborates this definition by putting emphasis on the issue of willingness which they believe depends on both motivation and confidence to be able to take responsibility for their choices.

As seen above, autonomy has been described in different ways by many researchers, but Littlewood (1999) summarizes two main features of learner autonomy included in the definition proposed by previous researchers:

- Students should take responsibility for their own learning. This is both because all learning can in any case only be carried out by the students themselves and also because they need to develop the ability to continue learning after the end of their formal education.
- 'Taking responsibility' involves learners taking ownership (partial or total) of many processes which have traditionally belonged to the teacher, such as deciding on learning objectives, selecting learning methods, and evaluating process (p.71).

In this study, the concept of learner autonomy is seen as learners' taking part in teaching- learning processes effectively and actively, which results in that "they are likely to be more enthusiastic about learning" (Littlejohn, 1985, p. 258) and this will enable them a more focused and purposeful learning. Learner autonomy is based on the idea that if students are involved in decision making processes, they internalize what they have learnt. They take their own responsibilities both inside and outside the classroom without the total dependency to instructions or tasks imposed by the teachers, which makes the knowledge permanent. In this way, they can find the most proper way of studying or learning techniques suitable for themselves. Therefore, this flexible atmosphere overcomes the prejudice of an understanding that language is only learnt in schools with the help of teachers, and students can't do anything without them. In addition to this, this new concept

gives the idea that learning process does not have to be boring, learners can make it in their ways, which makes the process more meaningful for them. This is also seen as a part of life-long learning process.

1.3. Importance of Learner Autonomy

In time, the perceptions of teachers and learners have changed with new approaches, learners' desires, their wishes and viewpoints about the learning process. All of these have started to replace the teachers' dominance. Teachers aren't in charge of the whole process on their own any more, they have started to share their roles and responsibilities with their students. Learners are given importance and they feel that they are one of the indispensable components of the process, which means they should also have a say in their education. All learner-centered approaches to language education include autonomy and independence among their aims. Yıldırım (2012) certifies this standpoint by stating that the basic ideas of autonomy are in harmony with major innovations in language teaching theory and methodology over the last 35 years, therefore the development of discourse analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics and functional approaches to grammar has supported a shift towards more communicative approaches in language teaching.

Cotterall (1995) states that learner autonomy has gained importance and popularity for philosophical, pedagogical and practical reasons. From the philosophical aspect, he explains that learners have the right to make choices about their own learning, which will better prepare them for a changing future. When we take the issue from the pedagogical point of view, involving learners in decisions about the learning process makes learning more effective and practical, and learners feel more secure in the decision-making process (Tok, 2011). In addition to this, Hadley's (1993) (as cited in Bayat, 2011, p. 108) definition of a good language learner supports arguments characterizing good language learners as "people who are aware of their learning styles and strategies and know how to adapt them for different learning conditions; know about their strengths and weaknesses; and use every opportunity to communicate in the target language". Besides, Esch (1996) supports the natural existence of autonomy in learning process stating that:

> Humans are not only able to adopt to different languages and different learning conditions, but also to progress in their ability to learn, by becoming aware of the processes through which they learn, by conceptualizing their learning experience, by being actively engaged in steering the process and by taking responsibility for organizing their learning experience (pp. 37-8).

Little (2004) agrees with what Esch said about the natural existence of autonomy and importance of learner autonomy expressing that even children have this ability by saying:

> As a parent of some years standing I knew that from birth children are autonomous in the sense that they have a will of their own: we cannot dictate their thoughts or their intentions. I also knew that children are autonomous in the (no doubt related) sense that they develop in interaction with their environment but according to a genetic inheritance and biological programme that the environment cannot alter (p.106).

One of the benefits of being autonomous is that this notion enables students to be more sophisticated and equipped. Charles (1999) (as cited in Dişlen, 2011, p. 127) supported this idea stating "teachers who want to empower students to make decisions and resolve their own problems will give students opportunities to think, act and take responsibility". This ascertains the close connection between learning and autonomy. Little (2007) states that "the development of learner autonomy and the growth of target language proficiency are mutually supporting and fully integrated with each other" (p.14). The development of autonomy in learners is considered as a process for which Scharle and Szabó (2000) (as cited in Dişlen, 2011, p. 13) came up with three stages: "(1) raising awareness, (2) changing attitudes and (3) transferring roles".

Kenny (1993) puts forward a sharper outlook on the discussion of learner autonomy in terms of its importance and desirability as follows:

> Indeed it can be said that only when autonomy is being allowed to function is education taking place at all. For where autonomy is repressed or ignored- in other words where the learner has no say and no being- then what we have is not education but some sort of conditioning procedure; the imposition and reinforcement of dominant opinion. But education as an emancipatory agent empowers a person's autonomy, which allows new interpretations of the world and possibility of change (p. 440).

Therefore, skills of independence in intercultural and interlinguistic interaction need to be acquired in learning to communicate. Camilleri (1999) states the importance of being autonomous by explaining that

> no school or programme can provide its students with all the knowledge they will require later on in life, but it can provide them with a more wholesome understanding of themselves as learners, of the learning process, and of what is involved in communication, as a means for continuing development (p. 5).

As we all know, classroom environment has some limitations and restrictions, which causes some problems. It can't encounter all the learners' needs and is not suitable for all learning styles. Harmer (2001) states that "to compensate for the limits of classroom time and to counter the passivity that is an enemy of true learning, students need to develop their own learning strategies so that as far as possible they become autonomous learners" (p. 335).

1.4. Purpose of the Study

Both in education and language education, the importance of autonomy has risen in recent years, and so have the related studies. This has given researchers a lead to work on teachers' and learners' perception of being autonomous in learning process as well as investigating the other aspects of it. The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of the third and fourth year ELT students in Pamukkale University as prospective teachers and the perceptions of EFL instructors teaching at prep classes of Adnan Menderes University and Pamukkale University about learner autonomy. The study also aimed to find out whether any similarities or differences existed between the third and fourth year PAU ELT students' and EFL instructors' perceptions of learner autonomy.

1.5. Research Questions

Specifically, the study focuses on the following research questions:

1. According to descriptive statistics, what are the perceptions of a group of pre- and in-service teachers about learner autonomy?

2. What are the differences and/or similarities between these pre- and in-service teachers' perceptions of learner autonomy?

3. According to qualitative content analysis on comments, what are these pre- and in-service teachers' views on learner autonomy?

1.6. Significance of the Study

Studies on autonomy deal with it from different perspectives with different aspects. A lot of researchers abroad have laid emphasis on this issue and investigated teachers' and learners' attitudes towards learner autonomy (Camilleri, 1997; Chan, 2001; Chan, 2003; Chiu, 2005; Chu, 2004; Chuk, 2003; Cotterall, 1995; Kiros and Hirotsugu, 2000; Thomson, Mosumi-so and Osho, 200; Reinders, 2000; Vanijdee, 2003; Xiaoli, 2008). There are also different studies in Turkey to find out in-service teachers', pre-service teachers' and learners' perceptions or attitudes towards autonomy in ELT (Baylan, 2007; Dişlen, 2010; Durmuş, 2006; Koçak, 2003; Özdere, 2005; Sabancı, 2007; Sancar, 2001; Sert, 2006; Servi, 2010; Tayar, 2003; Tursun, 2010; Yıldırım, 2005). These studies in Turkey investigated the issue mostly from the perspective of either in-service or pre-service teachers but the studies including both pre- and in-service teachers are quite few. Only Dişlen's (2010) study had similar participants but she included prep-class students, second and third year students in an ELT program without considering whether they had teaching

practice sessions or not. In addition to this, Dişlen (2010) investigated the participants' perceptions on learner autonomy in terms of its relation with psychological well-being with a questionnaire prepared by herself. On the other hand, in her study only the third and fourth year ELT program students were taken as pre-service teachers considering the fact that their practice sessions helped them evaluate the questionnaire more consciously. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the perceptions of both instructors and prospective teachers in terms of 31 different aspects of teaching and learning in detail. In addition to this, the present study aims to find out the similarities or differences between these groups comparing their perceptions in terms of 31 items separately.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations relevant to this study. Having a limited time was one of the major reasons to design this study with a quantitative data collection tool. I failed to include qualitative tools such as interviews or observations because of some time concerns. In addition to this, I couldn't contact with the instructors from other universities, which caused a limited number of participating instructors from only two universities. The other limitation is that to find out the future teachers' perceptions, only the ELT program students of PAU took part in the study and the other ELT program students from other universities couldn't be included. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Pedagogical Background of Learner Autonomy

The concept of education and understanding of education have changed a lot in recent years. The changes in the nature of society and the needs of increasingly globalized world have caused these radical changes in the policy of education system. In the past, the content of education and the result of this period were important ignoring the other factors such as learners' needs, their readiness, psychology and etc. However, with the rise of humanistic movement which stresses the importance of improving the quality of learners' lives, the concept of autonomy gained extensional scope of examination in the 1960s and 1970s. At this juncture, it will be to the point to mention Holec's (1981) project report to the CoE on learner autonomy which aimed at providing lifelong learning by self-directed learning. Additionally, the autonomy that Holec (1981) articulated here did not specifically focus on formal learning environments, but applied to nearly every other area of life (Little, 1991). According to Holec (1981), in democratic societies, the development of learner autonomy is a prerequisite for a lifelong learning beyond schools. He expands this standpoint stating 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 highlights the importance of autonomy in every field of life periods" (Holec, 1981, p.1).

In the following years, these developments paved the way for various socio-linguistic disciplines embracing autonomy and independence of learning such as learner-centered curriculum, negotiated syllabus, learner training and so on (Dokuz, 2009). For instance, Kilpatrick (1922) contributed to the notion of autonomy with the 'project method'. In this method, "students plan and execute their own learning projects mostly in group work, hence, acquiring skills needed for democratic social participation in an autonomous way" (Benson, 2001, as cited in Baylan, 2007, p.6). There are also other methods and/or learning theories such as Carl Rogers' (1969) 'person-centered learning' emerging in 1960's, which allows individual experiences of the learner to stand out. Another example is Paolo Freire's (1972) (as cited in Baylan, 2007, p. 6) theory of education in 1970's in which knowledge is presented by the teacher in the form of

problems with the aim of engaging students in reflection, and making them analyze their social realities.

Because the notion is so broad concerning every aspect of life and education, besides the methods and/or learning theories it is indispensable to mention various words and phrases associated with the term learner autonomy such as "learner independence, independent learning, lifelong learning, or learning to learn" (Köse, 2006, p. 29). 'Self-instruction' is one of these terms to be worth mentioning. Benson (2001) (as cited in Dokuz, 2009, p. 15), describes self-instruction as "a deliberate long-term learning project instigated, planned and carried out by the learner alone, without teacher intervention". In other words, self-instruction paves the way for situations in which learners study without the direct control of a teacher. On the other hand, this doesn't mean that learners are all alone in the whole process. "Such a learning may also be controlled by a teacher who is not physically present, but making all the key decisions, including what will be learned, how it will be learned, and how it will be assessed, in the learning process" (Durmuş, 2006, p. 12).

Another term relevant to the notion of learner autonomy is distance learning. "Distance learning involves a teacher who is separated locally from the students but she/he still controls their learning process" (Dokuz, 2009, p. 15). Individualized instruction, flexible learning and self-access learning are other concepts which are called as the most important components of learner autonomy. Benson (2001) (as cited in Dokuz, 2009, p. 16) states that "self-access refers to the design and organization of resources for self-directed learning". Self-directed learning gives learners complete responsibility for all kinds of decisions relevant to their own learning process. This means that self-directed learners have a chance to make choices in time, location, pace of learning, material and topic selection in their learning process (Durmuş, 2006). In this sense, autonomous learning requires learners to be responsible because "responsible learners are learners who accept the idea that their own efforts are crucial to progress in learning, and behave accordingly" (Scharle and Szabo, 2005, p. 3). Thus, autonomous learners know what is necessary for them, how to access it and use this knowledge by thinking outside the box. Also, when they gain this habit in a learning atmosphere, it is easy for them to apply this perspective in every aspect of life, resulting in permanent learning which can be achieved with the active participation of the students without any dependence on teacher. A Chinese

proverb supports this issue, "give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach him how to fish and you feed him for a lifetime".

In this respect, Dişlen (2010) makes a connection between learner autonomy and the constructivist learning theory which is a theory of the psychology of learning supporting the implementation of autonomy. According to Wulff, Hanor and Buik (2000) (as cited in Baylan, 2007, p. 7), "knowledge cannot be transferred directly from the head of a teacher to the heads of students; rather, students construct their own knowledge by combining new information with prior understanding and previous experience". On the contrary to the emphasis on social interaction on which constructivist tradition focuses, Vygotsky (1978) puts forward the issue 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" (p.88).

In short, it is apparent that with the needs of the changing world the way we teach and the way learners learn have changed. This situation has resulted in that teacher-centered education system has given way to more humanistic approaches with the notion of life-long learning. In other words, learner-centeredness has gained importance.

2.2. Autonomy in Language Education

As said earlier, more humanistic, functional and communicative approaches in language teaching have gained power. These approaches focused on communication in context rather than the acquisition of decontextualized knowledge about target language (Benson, 2001, as cited in Durmuş, 2016, p.19). Notwithstanding the roots of the notion 'autonomous learning' date back to a long time in terms of philosophical and pedagogical background, "theory of autonomy in language learning has a history of approximately three decades" (Benson 2001 as cited in Durmuş, 2006, p. 19). During the constitution and development process of the concept of learner autonomy in language education, various social and political factors acted a part in 1940s to 1960s. Especially political conflicts in 1960s triggered people's interest in the concept of autonomy (Durmuş, 2006). Yıldırım (2005) focuses on the fact that in addition to the political factors, technological developments and the needs of the modern world also made a crucial contribution to the spread of autonomy. "The demand for foreign languages greatly increased as a result of

political development (European Union, the United Nations), the rise of multinational corporations (IBM, Renault, Shell) and easier travel and tourism" (Yıldırım, 2005, p. 18).

The concept of autonomy first gained recognition in language education in 1970s.The establishment of the Council of Europe's Modern Language Project in 1971 gave a ground to the basics of learner autonomy in language learning. In other words, it was the Council of Europe's Modern Languages Project which let the notion of autonomy enter the language teaching arena officially.

> As an outcome of this project, CRAPEL (Centre de Recherches et d' Applications en Langues) was established at the University of Nancy in France. CRAPEL, under the directory of Yves Châlon who is considered to be the father of autonomy in language learning, became the focal point for research and practice in the field of autonomy. After Châlon, Henri Holec became the leader of CRAPEL. He remains as a prominent milestone within the field of autonomy today (Durmuş, 2006, p. 19).

The project report which Holec presented to Council of Europe after heading up to CRAPEL was the first document giving a place to learner autonomy in the field of foreign language learning (Benson, 2001; Little, 1991). In the context of foreign language learning, Holec (1981) defines autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's learning" (p.3). Holec (1981) widens this basic definition as follows:

> To take charge of one's own learning is 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 (p. 3).

Dam (1995) built a model of autonomy for teaching-learning foreign language according to which learners play greater role in the aspects of the learning process over time. This model offers a gradual move from teacher-centered teaching to a learner-centered class. So, this model requires a syllabi which promotes the concept of learner-centeredness and learner autonomy.

To sum up, it is clear that communicative approach to language teaching and learner-centred education justify the use of the concept of autonomy in language learning pedagogically. All these definitions reviewed earlier have contributed to the actual use and popularity of autonomy. Thus, this concept is a complex of different approaches.

2.3. Misconceptions on Learner Autonomy

Learner autonomy is a kind of concept which is difficult to define since it comes from various sources and leads to different implications. Little (1991) supports this idea by stating that autonomy is not "a single easily described behaviour" (p. 3-4) because it may come up in various ways. Gardner and Miller (1999) point out three important issues

causing the misconceptions on the concept of autonomy: one of the reasons stems from writers' different definitions because of the differences on their perceptions about learner autonomy, then comes the existence of some areas which are open to discussion and last of all because of the usage of these concepts in different geographical areas where these concepts have been developed independently using different but often similar terminology.

As stated before, learner autonomy is a problematic term. Because it is widely confused with other concepts such as self-instruction. However, self-instruction is "a deliberate long-term learning project instigated, planned and carried out by the learner alone, without teacher intervention" (Benson, 2001, as cited in Dokuz, 2009, p.15).

All the definitions of learner autonomy lay emphasis on one issue in that they refer to a concept that learners are involved in their own learning process and responsible for the quality of this process. Fenner and Newby (2000) emphasize the fact that the concept of autonomy doesn't merely mean that the learner is self-sufficient and independent. In the perspective of autonomy in foreign language learning, Fenner and Newby (2000) imply that "it is more of an 'attitude' or even a philosophy than a methodology and it is not concerned with one specific method, but allows for any method which the individual leaner finds beneficial to his learning purposes" (p. 78).

To clarify the vagueness of autonomy, Esch (1997) points out three common misconceptions to be avoided related to the concept of learner autonomy. The first one is the reduction of autonomous learning to a set of skills, or to a series of techniques to train language learning skills. Then comes the second misconception which is related to the definition and implementation of learner autonomy as the avoidance of language-learning specific issues. Last of all, in addition to Esch (1997), Benson (2001) also expresses that considering autonomy as learning in isolation without a teacher or learning outside the classroom is another common misconception.

Little (1991) (as cited in Durmuş, 2006) lists some of the common misconceptions about learner autonomy, as well. First one is the disagreement on the definition of learner autonomy which causes the confusion of concepts used synonymously with learner autonomy such as self-access learning, self-instruction, distance learning, individualized instruction, flexible learning or self-directed learning. Although all of these concepts are somehow related to it, none of them equals to the concept of learner autonomy exactly. Other misconception is that most people perceive it as the absolute freedom of learners.

Contrary to this common belief, freedom doesn't mean that learners do whatever they want, there is always a limitation depending upon the social relations or their requirements. Then comes the matter of sharing responsibility. We can say that learners' freedom depends on educators, in other words "only educators can determine the limits of freedom and responsibility of learners" (Durmuş, 2006, p. 14). In other words, the perception of freedom causes another misconception, namely the isolation of learners. In contrast with this perception, learner autonomy predicates on interaction and interdependence among learners.

Another misconception is the pure autonomy in practice. Although achieving complete absolute autonomy is always desirable as stated by Nunan (1997), it is not always possible to make it come true. Still another one is interpreting learner autonomy as a new method. As stated by Benson (2001)(as cited in Durmuş, 2006), the concept of learner autonomy is neither a method, nor an approach but it is a new way of insight in language education, which takes into consideration learners' needs, their facilities or capabilities increasing their involvement in the process of language learning. Last but not least, as stated by Little (1991) and Benson (2001)(as cited in Durmuş, 2006) as well, learner autonomy isn't a fixed state which can be applied to all learning areas once acquired, however, it is a hard-won state which requires to be fostered persistent effort to be maintained.

After specifying and defining the misconceptions relevant to the concept of learner autonomy, it would be better to write what autonomy is 'not' to determine the boundaries of this notion. Little (1991) and Benson (2001) clarified the fact that what autonomy 'is not' in language learning and Yıldırım (2012) listed them as follows:

> Autonomy is not a synonym for self-instruction; that is, autonomy is not limited to learning without a teacher.
> In the classroom context, autonomy does not require the teacher to relinquish all the responsibility and control to the students; it is not a matter of letting the learners get on with things as best they can.
> Autonomy is not something that teachers do to learners, it is not another language teaching method.
> Autonomy is not a single, easily described behavior.
> Autonomy is not a steady state achieved by learners (p. 309).

In summary, it is apparent that the concept of learner autonomy is difficult to define and interpret. This situation stems from the subjective perceptions and the lack of a lot of studies. On the other hand, the ongoing debates may help to meet on a common ground.

2.4. Fostering Learner Autonomy

The concept of learner autonomy has been placed at the heart of the language education system in recent years, which has created the need of improving and fostering this notion. There are some attitudes and skills to be fostered, which are defined as "building blocks of responsibility and autonomy" by Scharle and Szabo (2000) (as cited in Köse, 2006, p.33). These are: "motivation and self-confidence, monitoring and evaluation, learning strategies, cooperation and group cohesion" (p. 34). The key point for the beginning is raising awareness because it is the first phase where students are presented to this idea with new view points and experiences. Then comes the practice part because learners need to practice the skills they were introduced to at the beginning. This is a slow and arduous process because changing attitudes is painful, and it takes time to leave past habits and take up new ones. After all, these students start to take the most important part in accomplishing tasks or giving decisions about their learning. Bertoldi, Kollar and Ricard (1988)(as cited in Yıldırım, 2005, p. 23) agrees with this idea stating that

> When students are introduced to the process of taking more responsibility, there may be surprise, resistance, or confusion, but when they get started, many learners develop original, innovative techniques to approach their own language learning and autonomy develops in a rewarding process.

Littlewood (1997) draws attention to two points students should possess, namely willingness and the ability to act independently. In addition to this, he emphasizes that possessing these characteristics depends on some other factors such as the level of their motivation and confidence and the level of their knowledge and skills.

Nunan (1997) argues that although it is not easy to find fully autonomous learners, encouraging them to move towards autonomy can work to supply it, and it can be best done inside the language classroom. In order to maintain this, language content goals and learning process goals should be incorporated as the sets of complementary goals, and both of these sets should take place in the curriculum harmoniously. Nunan (1997) states that it is not a good solution to support separate lessons developed for learner strategy training, instead teachers need to help learners develop motivation, confidence, knowledge and skills that are essential in order to communicate and learn more independently and be more independent as individuals to develop and place the notion of autonomous learning.

Brajcich (2000) proposes that learners' individual styles and preferences play a crucial role, which means learners should be provided with opportunities according to their

own individual styles and preferences, and in accordance with this suggestion he gives twelve practical tips to develop learner autonomy in language classrooms:

1. Encourage students to be interdependent and to work collectively.
2. Ask students to keep a diary of their learning experiences.
3. Explain teacher/learner roles from the outset.
4. Promote gradually from interdependence to independence.
5. Give students projects to do outside the classroom.
6. Give students non-classroom duties to perform.
7. Have students design lessons or materials to be used in class.
8. Instruct students on how to use school's resource centres.
9. Emphasize the importance of peer editing, correcting and follow-up questioning in the classroom.
10. Encourage students to use only English in classroom.
11. Stress fluency rather than accuracy.
12. Do allow students to use reference books (p. 1-2).

Apart from the points mentioned above, teaching approaches and techniques also play a crucial role in this field. Benson (2001) (as cited in Yıldırım, 2005, p.30) deals with the practices to foster learner autonomy under the title of "Approaches to the Development of Learner Autonomy". He proposes six broad headings related to these approaches to foster autonomy in language classes, namely resource-based approaches, technology-based approaches, learner-based approaches, classroom-based approaches, curriculum-based approaches and teacher-based approaches.

Resource-based approaches give learners the chance of control over learning plans, the selection of learning materials and the evaluation of learning. According to Benson (2001) (as cited in Yıldırım, 2005) in resource-based approaches, learners are expected to develop skills in freedom of choice through experimentation and discovery, and he lists self-access, self-instruction and distance learning as the ways of fostering autonomy in the framework of resource-based approaches. Self-access rooms which provide learners with various learning materials can be shown as the physical examples of this approach to learner autonomy. Because freedom of choice is fundamental in this approach, learners are encouraged to develop skills by trial and error as a result of the process of experimentation. Sheerin (1997) supports this idea stating that in the self-access rooms learners have the opportunity to analyze their needs, set objectives, plan a program of study, choose materials and activities, work without being supervised, and evaluate their own progress.

Technology-based approaches are also used to prompt learner autonomy in education. Technology-based approaches and resource-based approaches are similar except one extra characteristic feature, namely, the former focuses on technologies to access resources. In this respect, we can make a connection between learner autonomy and

educational technology. Motteram (1998) emphasizes this connection stating there has always been a perceived relationship between educational technology and learner autonomy. Cook (2001) also adds that interactive communication has become an important issue in language teaching theory in recent years, which increased the importance of internet use in this process. So, we can say that Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and the Internet are hand in hand to promote learner autonomy as technology-based approaches. This enables learners to self-access the information they need for student-produced videos, computer-enhanced interactive videos, electronic writing environments, concordances, informal CD-ROMs, e-mail language advising, and computer simulations which can be given as examples of technology-based approaches.

Learner-based approaches are handy and popular to foster learner autonomy. The real aim of this approach is to give learners a new lease on their learning process to become better language learners in a learner-centered environment. In this way, it is apparent that integrating the concept of learner autonomy is a part of this goal. Benson (2001) (as cited in Durmuş, 2006, p.28) gives a list of six main categories of approaches to learner development:

> 1. Direct advice on language-learning strategies and techniques, often published in the form of self-study manuals for independent learners.
> 2. Training based on 'good language learner' research and insights from cognitive psychology.
> 3. Training in which learners are encouraged to experiment with strategies and discover which work well for them.
> 4. Synthetic approaches drawing on a range of theoretical sources.
> 5. Integrated approaches treating learner training as a by-product of language learning.
> 6. Self-directed approaches in which learners are encouraged to train themselves through reflection on self-directed learning activities.

Classroom-based approaches give importance to learner involvement in the planning and evaluation of classroom learning. That is because learner control over the classroom activities plays a crucial role to increase autonomy. In addition to this, as mentioned by Özdere (2005) having control over the management of classroom activities may lead to the development of control over both cognitive and content aspects of learning.

Nunan (1999) and Benson (2001) emphasize that learner involvement in planning and assessment has positive effects such as developing the capacity to define the content of their learning through an ongoing cycle of negotiation and evaluation to the extent that curriculum guidelines permit. This type of involvement contributes to the learners in many

ways. So, it is very important to involve learners in decision-making process and day-to-day management of their learning.

Teacher-based approaches should be handled in terms of teacher roles and teacher education in the practice of fostering autonomy among learners. Teacher autonomy is one of the major components of teacher-based approaches (Benson, 2001, as cited in Durmuş, 2006). The importance and effectiveness of teacher-based approaches cannot be denied in that, learner autonomy primarily starts with teacher autonomy in formal teaching environments. Traditional teacher roles give way to more humanistic and friendly ones, such as becoming facilitators, helpers, coordinators, counselors, consultants, advisers, knowers, and resource people. Voller (1997) narrows down all these roles into three in one of his detailed literature review on teacher roles in autonomous learning, which are namely, being a facilitator, being a counsellor, and acting as a resource.

To foster learner autonomy, the ideal curriculum should be flexible, which helps learners and teachers exercise their individuality through negotiation. Curriculum-based approaches draw attention to learner involvement in decisions related to the curriculum issues. The notion of learner involvement is formalized in the idea of process syllabus and negotiated curriculum (Benson, 2001, as cited in Durmuş, 2006). As stated by Littlejohn (1997), process syllabuses focus on negotiation between learners and teachers in terms of what will be done and how it will be done in the classroom during the process. When learners are involved in the decision-making process about their learning, this will support their learning because it is more meaningful and purposeful for them (Benson, 2001; Dam, 1995; Little, 1991; Nunan, 2004; Wenden, 1991).Additionally, learner involvement makes them feel as the owners of their own learning, which helps them to accept undertaking some additional responsibilities for their own learning (Benson, 2001; Chan, 2003; Finch, 2000; Holec, 1981).

Dam (1995) suggests that some other issues such as course content, selection and use of materials, position of desks and seating of students, discipline matters, homework tasks, time, place and pace of the lesson, methodology and types of activities, and assessment should also be taken into consideration in the framework of curriculum-based approaches. In addition to this, Little (2000) mentions three principles that course content should include to foster learner autonomy: learner empowerment, target language use, and reflection. In formal learning environments, the first thing to note is the uniqueness of

learners (Brown, 2000; Dam, 1995). Learners' individual differences and individuality should be paid attention more, which gives learners a sense of belonging and a sense that they are responsible for their own learning (Little, 2004).For this reason, it is very important that the course content should meet the needs and interests of learners to make their learning process more meaningful and purposeful. That is to say, learners should be in the business of learning, should be necessitated to use target language to develop an understanding of the nature of the target language, and they should be conscious of how they learn (Durmuş, 2006).

The notion of learner autonomy suggests that learners are able to develop an understanding and capacity to decide and select the materials which assist them to reach their learning goals. They should be encouraged to use learning materials on their own in accordance with their individual needs and interests (Dam, 1995; Finch, 2000; Little, 1991). Fenner and Newby (2000) claim that in an autonomous learning environment, learners can benefit from all kinds of materials to improve their own learning. The tasks in these materials should be regarded as suggestions or choices which the learner will decide to reject or modify according to his/her needs or learning type. From this point of view, it is clear that learners should be given the freedom of material choice as an individual and a group of learners. It is also very important that they can learn to make appropriate choices which best suit their own personal learning among the rich variety of texts, genres, tasks, approaches, and methods. Materials should offer different choices about subject-matter, text types, levels, amounts, approaches to a text, tasks, approaches to tasks, and progression to foster autonomy. Learner-selected and learner–designed materials such as journals, posters, texts of various kinds, or audio/video recordings help teachers to find out more about learners' preferences, interests, and needs. So, teachers can syllogize a lot about the classroom process from learner products. These materials give learners the chance of monitoring and evaluating their progress. In sum, it is clear that a compromise between learner-selected and teacher-selected materials in foreign language classes is appropriate (Dam, 1995; Little, 1991).

Classroom organization is also important in that, with the traditional teacher-fronted classroom model, sitting in rows learners feel the superiority of the teacher which actually tells that the only authority in class is the teacher, and learners have no rights to say. To foster learner autonomy in classrooms, desks should be placed in such a way that

learners can be involved in the every pace of the lesson actively by expressing and sharing their ideas, communicating with each other while dealing with the task rather than just looking at the teacher, or the board. Desks, if they are movable, can be rearranged in a U shape way so that students do not face the teacher and the blackboard. However, because of the frequent immobility of desks or overcrowded classrooms, teachers and learners may have to accommodate existing physical conditions (Brown, 2001; Dam, 1995; Scharle and Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991). In formal learning environments, teachers make decisions related to the seating of students during the activities requiring pair or group work. Indeed, learners should be encouraged to move their seats/ places, and they should be given the freedom to choose the people they will work with in pairs or groups (Dam, 1995; Nunan, 1999). This will relieve their minds and make them believe that they have control over their own learning and learning environments, and teachers show respect for their decisions.

Discipline is another matter which is to be handled because the concept of learner autonomy has demolished the so to say monarchy of the teacher in the classroom. In this concept, teachers should act as the organizers of negotiation and establishment of rules (Brown, 2001; Dam, 1995). Teachers should encourage learners to participate in decisions related to discipline matters, through which learners can gain the insight of coping with disciplinary problems on their own. Learners should be encouraged to determine classroom and group rules through negotiation, which will make them feel the ownership over their learning contexts. Dörnyei (2001) supports this idea by claiming 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.

Keeping records is another component of the discipline matters. Because learners are given responsibility for most of the paces of their own learning, teachers should also encourage them to keep records concerning their learning progress in such cases as works completed, marks earned, and classes attended. Keeping records both helps learners develop control of the learning process and raise their conscious awareness of the target language (Dam, 1995; Little, 2000). Students' keeping records provides advantages to teachers in that teachers can discover learners' interests, needs, learning styles, favourite learning activities, past experiences, attitudes towards learning the foreign language, their strengths, and weaknesses (Benson, 2001; Scharle and Szabo, 2000; Wenden, 1991).

Homework tasks are considered as out-of-class tasks, and they provide extra practice for learners, which plays an important role in the development of learner autonomy. Because homework tasks are a part of self-study which requires learner autonomy with the help of homework, they can perform the skills they gain and use the target language in extended periods of time outside the classroom. Harmer (1998) points out the fact that the variety of the homework like written exercises, compositions or study is the best way to foster student autonomy. The forms of the homework tasks can change depending on the factors such as learners' age, their proficiency level in the target language, the size of the class, and the availability of technical and other supports. In accordance with the requirements of learner autonomy, these tasks should be parallel to learners' personal interests, their capacity, and capability. Teachers can guide learners by presenting a list of ideas or ask them to find the topics they would like to work on and should give them the freedom of choice (Brown, 2001; Little, 1994). Teachers should be flexible about the quantity, type, and frequency of homework tasks, as well (Brown, 2001; Dam, 1995; Wenden, 1991). Teachers should also be disciplined about following homework performance; teachers should state the details of the task clearly and impose the same rules or deadlines upon themselves as they do on their students.

Learners should have a say in determining time, pace and environment to the amount that their proficiency level lets (Dickinson, 1987). Brown (2001) supports this by claiming in formal settings, learners' share for determining 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. Because they are treated as equal partners, this will help them shape their own learning process and improve taking initiatives.

In formal settings, learners need to be involved as equal partners in the decision making process regarding the methodology of the lesson (Dam, 1995; Little, 1991; Little, 2003). It is indispensable to integrate learners in this process. That is because the concept of learner autonomy requires designing a rich and natural learning medium where learners, with the guidance of teachers, test and investigate new things with the help of the same interactive mechanisms they used in first language acquisition.

The last pace of this process is assessment and evaluation which traditional or alternative, every educational program provides so that learners get feedback, and teachers

know students better (Benson, 2001; Dam, 1995). When we touch the assessment and evaluation issue within the scope of learner autonomy, we come across two key concepts which can facilitate autonomy in language learning, namely self-assessment and self-evaluation. Teachers who believe in the importance of learner autonomy should encourage their students 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). Benson (2001) (as cited in Durmuş, 2006, p.37) also reflects the benefits of self-assessment as follows:

> 1. Self-assessment trains learners to evaluate the effectiveness of their communication, which is beneficial to learning in itself.
> 2. It raises learners' awareness of the learning process and stimulates them to consider course content and assessment critically.
> 3. It enhances their knowledge of the variety of possible goals in language learning, which leaves them in a better position to exercise control over their own learning and to influence the direction of classroom activities.
> 4. It expands the range of assessment criteria to include areas in which learners have special competence, such as the evaluation of their own needs and effective dimensions of the learning process.

There are some alternative assessment tools for learners to self-assess themselves. Brown (1998) lists the most common ones as follows: assessment portfolios, journals, logs, conferences, interviews, discussions, oral reports, project works, checklists of students' behaviours/products (teacher observation data), and video recordings. On the other hand, as Dam (1995) suggests, assessment and evaluation require time, reflection, and honesty on parts of both learners and teachers in an atmosphere of trust and respect. Huerta-Marcias (1995) also points out that the aim of alternative assessment is to get information about how students are approaching, processing, and carrying out real-life like tasks in a particular field. It is apparent that alternative assessment approaches focus on what learners can do on their own, what they are able to recall and produce, and how much they progress when compared to their first performance, rather than focusing on just the results.

2.5. Teacher and Learner Roles in Autonomous Learning and Its Implementation

In an autonomous learning environment, in contrast with the traditional one, both teachers and learners take over different responsibilities for different purposes. Therefore, it is necessary to explain their roles clearly. In other words, we need to designate the implementation of these roles in the process of language learning.

2.5.1. Teacher Roles

Learner autonomy requires student-directed learning environment, but this doesn't mean that teachers' responsibilities are reduced. On the contrary, this concept gives teachers new roles different from the traditional ones such as being facilitators, helpers, coordinators, counselors, consultants, advisers, knowers, and resource people. Teachers need to make greater effort to be caring, supportive, patient, tolerant, empathetic, open, and non-judgmental in order to encourage commitment, disperse uncertainty, help learners overcome obstacles, and convince learners to support learner autonomy. They also need to avoid manipulating, objecting, interfering, and controlling learners to motivate them. Littlewood (1997) explains in detail how the concept of autonomy is internalized by learners and what roles teachers have in an autonomous learning environment below:

> 1. Language teachers aim to develop students' ability to operate independently with the language and use the language to communicate in real, unpredictable situations.
> 2. Language teachers aim to help their students to develop their ability to take responsibility for their own learning and to apply active, personally meaningful strategies to their work both inside and outside the classroom.
> 3. And at last, helping their students to increase their ability to communicate and learn independently, language teachers also try to reach the goal of helping their students to develop greater generalized autonomy as individuals (p. 81-84).

As seen above, teachers have more responsibilities compared to past because they have to take into consideration many factors at the same time. Therefore, the reality that teachers are still valuable figures in the classroom cannot be denied. One of the most crucial tasks for teachers is to raise awareness about the issue of how to become autonomous. In order to clarify the teachers' roles in this term, it is necessary to mention constructivism which, according to Benson (2001) (as cited in Özdere 2005, p.16), is "the key idea that autonomy in language learning has borrowed from the idea that effective learning is 'active' learning". Brooks and Brooks (2001) give a list of several characteristics which constructivist teachers should employ:

> Constructivist teachers encourage and accept student autonomy and initiative,
> Constructivist teachers use raw data and primary sources, along with manipulative, interactive and physical materials,
> When framing tasks, constructivist teachers use cognitive terminology such as classify, analyze, predict, and create,
> Constructivist teachers allow student responses to drive lessons, shift instructional strategies and alter content,
> Constructivist teachers inquire about students' understandings of the concepts before sharing their own understandings of those concepts,
> Constructivist teachers encourage students to engage in dialogue, both with teacher and with one another,

> Constructivist teachers encourage student inquiry by asking thoughtful, open-ended questions and encouraging students to ask questions of each other,
> Constructivist teachers seek elaboration of students' initial responses,
> Constructivist teachers engage students in experiences that might engender contradictions to their initial hypotheses and then encourage discussion,
> Constructivist teachers allow wait time after posing questions,
> Constructivist teachers provide time for students to construct relationships and create metaphors,
> Constructivist teachers nurture students' natural curiosity through frequent use of the learning cycle model (p. 103-118).

Teachers can also raise learners' awareness by giving attention to preconceptions about learner and teacher roles in an explicit way, thereby they help learners perceive the utility of and necessity for autonomous learning (Wright, 1987 as cited in Benson, 2001; Dam, 1995; Little, 2004; Wenden, 1991). In Hedge's study (2000), it is inferred from his definitions of language teachers that teachers have certain roles to offer students the opportunities in order that learners can determine and realize their own intentions. Teachers should also create the awareness about using language materials appropriately and attentively and managing time for their own learning process. All these above prove that teachers are still valuable figures in the classroom, maybe even more valuable compared to their traditional roles.

2.5.2. Learner Roles

In an autonomous learning environment, roles of learners have also been changed as much as teachers' as a requirement of modern and humanist education system. Actually as independent human beings, we need to be autonomous in any situation relevant to ourselves. Moment and Fisher (1975) express that autonomous individuals make their own decisions. This is also true for students who need to make decisions about their lives and careers. As one of the most important components of teaching-learning processes, learners deserve to have a say in this process taking into consideration their own needs and other personal factors. Learners in every context of education may differ from each other in many ways because of the individual factors. This proves the necessity of shaping their lives in order to meet their needs by searching for different but convenient ways.

The concept of autonomy is flexible in definition which can be interpreted and practiced in different ways. For example, Littlewood (1996) defines it by classifying under three types, namely autonomy as a communicator (i.e., learners who use the language creatively with appropriate communicative strategies), as a learner (i.e., learners who engage in independent learning using appropriate learning strategies), and as a person (i.e., learners who express personal meanings and create personal learning contexts).

Besides the classification that Littlewood (1996) made, when it comes to the characteristics of autonomous learners, Dickinson (1993) mentions three outstanding features of them. First of all, autonomous learners are able to identify what has been taught although most of the learners are not aware of what is going on in traditional classes. As the second characteristic, he points out that they are able to formulate their own learning objectives in collaboration with the teacher or as something that is in addition to what the teacher is doing. As the last one, autonomous learners can select and implement appropriate learning strategies consciously, and they can monitor their own use of learning strategies. In other words, those learners are capable of identifying strategies in that whether they are appropriate or not for them and whether they work or do not work. Dickinson (1987) adds that "an autonomous learner is one who is totally responsible for making and implementing all of the decisions concerned with his own learning" (p. 9). His definition is very assertive and open to debates in that it is not realistic to expect every learner to implement his/her decisions regarding their learning process because no learner can be completely autonomous or completely dependent. Therefore, as Köse (2006) states, an autonomous learner can be portrayed across a continuum where we have dependent learners who do not have the opportunity to develop learner independence at one end and, we have the learners who have all the sub-skills such as, self-directedness or self-motivation, needed for autonomy on the other end.

Autonomy-supportive learning climate requires learners to be critical thinkers not to be passive receivers of information during the process. Autonomy has a strong bond with critical thinking which is against passivity. The other components of critical thinking are listed by VanderStoep and Pintrich (2003) below:

> Understanding the problem or issue at hand
> Evaluating the evidence presented, and being curious about evidence not presented
> Considering multiple perspectives that people could have on an issue
> Taking a position in the light of the evidence while recognizing that others may disagree (p. 212).

In addition to the characteristic features of autonomous learners mentioned above Carr (1999) (as cited in Philips, 2004) adds seven factors of behavioural intentions which autonomous learners will display, namely prioritizing learning over other things, deferring gratification, making choices in favour of learning when in conflict with other activities, looking into the future benefits of the learning undertaken now, and solving problems which includes planning, evaluating alternatives, and anticipating consequences.

Autonomous learners also need to possess a set of socio-psychological attributes that distinguish them from the traditional type (Baylan, 2007), and the common features of these learners mentioned by Breen and Mann (1997), Dickinson (1987), and Wenden (1991) can be summarized as one with a sound attitude towards self-direction, a desire to learn, a robust sense of self, independence, a strategic engagement with learning, a capacity for learning, and metacognitive capacity. Ellis (1999) and Sinclair (1999) focus on four important areas of metacognition which autonomous learners are expected to give informed decisions about their learning, namely learner awareness, subject matter awareness of the target language, learning process awareness, and social awareness. Learner awareness means that learners should be aware of themselves especially in terms of attitudes, beliefs, motivation, needs, and learning styles. On the other hand, subject matter awareness refers to learner awareness of the language as a system. When it comes to learning process awareness, we can talk about metacognitive strategies such as, self-assessment, goal setting, monitoring progress, evaluating activities, and organising time and resources. Finally, social awareness represents learner awareness of the presence of others in the classroom and their willingness to cooperate through interaction and collaboration.

From the eyes of teachers, Hedge (2000) specifies some characteristics which autonomous learners should possess and according to teachers' perceptions of autonomous learners, they should be the kind of learners who:

> know their needs and work productively with the teacher towards the achievement of objectives;
> learn both inside and outside the classroom;
> may learn with active thinking;
> adjust their learning strategies when necessary to improve learning;
> manage and divide the time in learning properly;
> know how to use resources independently;
> can take classroom-based material and build on it;
> do not think the teacher is a strict authority who may give them the ability to master language (p. 76-77).

What we urge upon thus far is all about who an autonomous learner is but the characteristics of a dependent learner haven't been discussed yet. In order to differentiate the autonomous learner from the dependent one, we need to know about dependent learners. Mynard and Soerflaten (2003)(as cited in Köse, 2006, p. 32) identify autonomous learners by comparing and contrasting these two groups;

> Dependent learners rely heavily on the teacher while autonomous learners are   self-reliant.

Dependent learners cannot make decisions about their learning but autonomous learners can make informed decisions about their learning.
Dependent learners do not know their own strengths and weaknesses, on the other hand autonomous ones are aware of their strengths and weaknesses.
Although dependent learners do not connect classroom learning with the real world, autonomous learners are able to transfer classroom learning with the real world.
Dependent learners think that the teacher is wholly responsible for their learning, however autonomous learners take responsibility for their own learning.
Dependent learners do not possess metacognitive and metalinguistic awareness, but the autonomous learners are just vice versa.
Dependent learners are not able to plan their learning, on the other hand autonomous learners can.
Dependent learners need extrinsic motivators such as grades or rewards, contrarily autonomous learners are intrinsically motivated by making progress.
Dependent learners do not reflect on how well they are learning and the reasons, although autonomous learners often reflect on the learning process and their own progress.
Dependent learners are not able to assess their learning, on the other hand autonomous learners possess the ability to self-assess.

When we narrow down the scope from the characteristics of autonomous learners to the characteristics of autonomous language learners, Breen and Mann (1997) point out nine outstanding features in that autonomous learners:

see their relationship to what is to be learned, to how they will learn and to the resources available as one in which they are in charge or in control;
are in an authentic relationship to the language;
are learning and have a genuine desire to learn that particular language;
have a robust sense of self that is unlikely to be undermined by any actual or assumed negative assessments of themselves or their work;
are able to step back from what they are doing and reflect upon it in order to make decisions about what they next need to do and experience;
are alert to change and able to change in an adaptable, resourceful and opportunistic way;
have a capacity to learn that is independent of the educational processes in which they are engaged;
are able to make use of the environment they find themselves strategically;
are able to negotiate between the strategic meeting of their own needs and responding to the needs and desires of other group members (p. 134-136).

It is apparent that, learners are given more responsibilities. Therefore, they have to possess many characteristic features to fulfill these responsibilities. So, it is inferred that to be an autonomous learner is not that easy but requires a lot of effort.

2.5.3. Implementation of Autonomy in EFL classes

We have already touched upon teachers' and learners' roles in an autonomous learning environment. Although it is important to specify their roles, we still need to talk about the process in practice. In other words, how to implement autonomy is worth of mention. Of course, we come across a lot of suggestions about the organization of an autonomous class, and as the first step of the transformation from teacher-based style of teaching into more student-centered style of learning, teachers should identify how much prepared or motivated the learners are for this radical change. Students' motivation is very important because there is a strong relationship between autonomy and motivation, that is

to say learners' intrinsic motivation comes into play while undertaking their own learning, identifying their own needs, and gaining self-management in their learning. Dam (1995) emphasizes that teachers should use English as the preferential means of teaching and learning, which requires a considerable need to make the learning environment meaningful for the student. This necessity results in teachers' creating situations for their students to learn by doing and speaking and by collaboratively working with them. So, this kind of meaningful learning quite likely ends up with learners who are intrinsically motivated to learn independently. Dam (1995) also points out the importance of using authentic materials such as posters and learning logbooks which enable learners to receive much of the content of learning. Besides, the implementation of computer technology streamlines interaction among learners, between learners and target language users, and between learners and teachers, which may otherwise be uneasy or may not be always feasible in the classroom (Benson, 2001, as cited in Dokuz, 2009). The other point that Dam (1995) highlights is that teachers should encourage the development of speaking, develop a focus for self-evaluation, and finally evaluation of the learning process should be accomplished by teacher and student together.

Learning strategies and effective learning training are the outstanding terms which are worth of mention in the implementation process of the learner autonomy. This means that teachers need to train learners on the identification and use of appropriate strategies to develop skills necessary for autonomy. Wenden (1991) defines autonomous learners as successful or expert, or intelligent learners, having learned how to learn, acquired the learning strategies, the knowledge about learning, and the attitudes that enable them to use these skills and knowledge confidently, flexibly, appropriately and independently of a teacher. Learners' realization of their own learning strategies and applying these strategies enhance their capacity for autonomous learning. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Wenden (1998), learning strategies are the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information. Wenden (1991) discusses that with the help of these strategies that learners use to understand the nature of a language and the requisites of the language learning process. It is clear that learners need to be provided with training on learning strategies to promote the development of learner autonomy in their learning process.

Learning strategies are classified under the titles of cognitive, metacognitive and social by O'Malley and Chamot (1990). The actions performed directly on the material to be learned are related to cognitive strategies, and metacognitive strategies make use of the knowledge of cognitive progression to regulate the learning process. Metacognitive strategies also include considering the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring the learning task, and self-evaluation. On the other hand, social strategies are explained in terms of the ways through which learners cooperate with others and control themselves in order to improve their learning.

In the light of information above, we can infer that learners gain a wide range of analytical skills, and they learn to monitor and self-evaluate their language learning performance and also transfer successful learning strategies to new learning contexts (Cohen, 1998). Chamot (1998) gives a teaching procedure for strategy training to foster learner autonomy in five steps: as the first step, all learners may be encouraged to realize the learning strategies they are already employing for particular tasks. Then comes the second step, presenting and describing new learning strategies to learners explicitly. As the third one, learning strategies may be modeled to help learners to understand the nature of the language strategy. Fourth, learners need to be given clear and explicit explanations about the strategies in terms of the reason, time, and the ways of using them. As the last step, 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.

Up to now we have talked about the hypotheses supporting the effectiveness of acquiring and applying learning strategies to be successful and autonomous in learning process. However, Miller (1993) stands up to this explaining that there is no experimental evidence presenting a casual link between awareness of strategies and success in language learning. He adds that some behaviours associated with success cannot be attributed to the use of strategies which cannot be taught. It is apparent that implementing the concept of learner autonomy in education is a messy issue. We need to clarify some topics relevant to this issue in order to be more accurate about our actions and go one step further from hypotheses to realities in real teaching environments.

2.6. Learner Autonomy and Culture

To implement the notion of learner autonomy it is crucial to analyze the cultural structure of the society to see how welcoming the culture is to the idea of learner

autonomy. However, the cultural appropriateness of the concept of learner autonomy is open to discussion and does not have certain boundaries. The studies conducted by Sancar (2001) and Egel (2003) investigating the relationship between the culture and promotion of learner autonomy have revealed that cultural setting plays an important role for the promotion of learner autonomy. To clarify, we can give non-western societies such as Turkey, China, and Japan as examples where education systems are "examination-oriented and highly-competitive" (Chan, 2001, p. 507) resulting in "dependent, lacking in intellectual initiative, and incline to favor rote learning over creative learning" (Chan, 2003, p. 34). Here rises the question that whether second/ foreign language users from different cultural backgrounds can be given the same treatment to constitute the perception of learner autonomy or it is developed more easily in Western countries. In other words, it is necessary to clarify whether autonomy is a concept which can only be applied to Western cultures or it can be applied to any educational context ignoring the cultural boundaries. Kojima (2006) emphasizes that autonomy is a term with different interpretations and shouldn't be restricted to only Western societies or permissive valuations. Sinclair (1997) supports this accepting that there are different versions of autonomy, which makes it easy to apply in different cultural settings. He adds that while the Western point of autonomy emphasizes the individual and psychological elements of the notion, the type of autonomy focusing on social aspects of autonomy are seen in cultures having collectivist or Confucian-based nature.

To sum up, it cannot be denied that the notion of learner autonomy may differ depending on the societies and cultures they are implemented in. On the other hand, it is useless to insist on being strict during the process of implementation, and a cultural assimilation cannot be accepted, as well. What we need is just to be flexible while applying it and to take into consideration the social and cultural factors.

2.7. Learner Autonomy and Turkish Education Policy in ELT

English language is increasing its importance day by day in every field of life, all around the world. Because of its becoming a kind of global language, the necessity of learning English has come out in Turkey, too. Although English has been taught as a school subject with German and French since the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923,

> "among the foreign languages offered in the education system, currently English is the only language taught as a compulsory subject at all levels of education, having the status of a Foreign

> Language (EFL), with German and French offered as elective subjects in the curriculum of some schools" (Kirkgöz, 2007, p. 217).

Palfreyman (2001) points out that English is taught as a foreign language in the current educational system of Turkey because of social and economic movements in the society. Ahmad (1993) emphasizes the importance of learning English in Turkey by stating that "English had become the *sine qua non* for a successful career in virtually any field and parents struggled to have their children acquire a working knowledge of the language" (p. 210). Because of these social, economic and also political influences and changes, English language teaching has passed through some stages especially one of which is worth to mention. In 1997, The Turkish Ministry of National Education (MONE), in cooperation with the Turkish Higher Education Council (HEC), decided to make drastic changes in the nation's English language policy in its effort to reform Turkey's ELT practice (Kırkgöz, 2007). So the government has radically revised the curriculum, teaching methods, teacher training, and teacher education institutions. After these renovations English was accepted as one of the compulsory school subjects for the fourth and fifth year students in 1997. Later on, in 2012 by means of certain regulations in our country, MONE declared that teaching English as a foreign language was decided to start at the second year of the primary school and this regulation figured in the weekly course schedule of the 2012-2013 academic year (Küçüktepe, Eminoğlu Küçüktepe and Baykın, 2013). This situation brought out the necessity of a reform at teacher education departments "both to increase the number of methodology courses and to extend the teaching practice time in primary and secondary schools, providing student teachers with hands-on experience in schools" (Kirkgöz, 2005, p. 7). The other outstanding change is that communicative approach was started to be applied which allows student-centered learning and students' playing an active role in the learning process. With the acceptance of communicative approach, the concept of autonomy has also taken its part in the education system. This application has changed the perception about teachers and students in terms of responsibilities and roles. To foster and develop this curriculum reform process, MONE has received some support by working with a local association, The English Language Teachers' Association in Turkey, (INGED) and foreign associations: the British Council (BC) and the United States Information Agency (USIA) (Kırkgöz, 2007).

Further innovations to the changes in 1997 in the ELT policy has risen with Turkey's attempts to join the EU requiring an adaptation of the education system to EU

standards. We can see these innovations in every pace of ELT with the curriculum which lets students be autonomous through giving students projects to complete and strategy training so that learners can have opportunities to learn according to their own individual styles and preferences. This curriculum has also renovated the evaluation device based on the principles of the European Language Portfolio (ELP), which has resulted in the change of traditional 'paper and pencil' tests into performance-based assessment through portfolios.

It is clear that MONE has taken major steps to promote the notion of learner autonomy in Turkish education system, and it tries hard to keep up with the modern and contemporary approaches applied in the world with regular renovations. However, as pointed out by Üstünoğlu (2009), Turkey's educational system does not differ drastically from the ones in other eastern countries. This means that applying this concept in EFL classrooms in Turkey may not be an easy job to be accomplished in a short period of time. What we need is to make progress step by step in order to satisfy all the requirements of the concept.

2.8. Studies on Learner Autonomy

Learner autonomy is a concept which has brought a new breath to the education system, and day by day the importance of this notion in the education system is increasing all around the world. It is a world-wide trend which has started to be applied in every field of education. That is why to handle the issue from both perspectives of teachers and learners with respect to finding out their perceptions about this new concept and to receive their reflections to have feedback have gained importance.

When it comes to the research studies carried out abroad, Cotterall (1995) administered a study and asked a group of adult ESL learners who were enrolled in an intensive English for Academic Purposes course to fill in the questionnaire, which was about learner beliefs about language learning, to gather data. Results revealed that there were six factors which affected the readiness for autonomy, namely role of the teacher, role of feedback, learner independence, learner confidence in study ability, experience of language learning, and approach to studying. Results showed that in the light of the factors mentioned above learner beliefs have a key position in promoting learner autonomy, and both teachers and learners can walk together through the language learning process, which is a necessary awareness.

In another study, Kiros and Hirotsugu (2000) investigated the effects of motivational styles differing in the degree of autonomy on perceived control beliefs and self-regulated learning of English by Japanese undergraduate students in their study. To gather data, a self-report questionnaire consisting of three scales, namely autonomy scale, perceived control scale, and self-regulated learning scale was given to 121 undergraduate students from a university in Kyoto, Japan. Research results brought out four groups of students which differed in the degree of autonomy. The results of structural equation modeling, which aimed to examine the effects of autonomy on English learning processes, confirmed that intrinsic motivation and identified regulation positively affected students' academic performances through adaptive self-regulated learning. It is suggested that the learning process will be more adaptive as long as the degree of autonomy increases.

Chan (2001) administered a study to examine the applicability of learner autonomy in tertiary classrooms, and learners' readiness for learner autonomy by exploring their attitudes and expectations of language learning. This study also tried to find out what the teacher and learner roles, their learning preferences, and perceptions of learner autonomy were. To collect data, a questionnaire with a follow-up interview was administered to 20 tertiary level students in Hong Kong. The results revealed that students gained an initial awareness in terms of the different roles of the teacher and themselves, and realized the existence of various learning preferences and approaches, and the choice over different learning practices and procedures. Two guiding principles for the design of any autonomy-oriented classroom activities came out, namely providing enough space for learner involvement and supplying a variety of learning conditions allowing group activities to promote motivation and interest. The researcher concluded that it is possible to apply learner autonomy to tertiary level students with ease.

Thomson, Mosumi-so and Osho (2001) administered a study to meet the challenges in Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) in terms of the incorporation of sociolinguistics and learner autonomy into course design and found out three major challenges of language teaching professionals, which were multidimensional learner diversity, industry demand for accountability of language programs, and the gap between research and teaching. To design and develop a new course supported by theoretical frameworks in both learner autonomy and sociolinguistics was the solution offered to cope with the problems mentioned above. The results revealed that to create a learning community with a large

amount and variety of social interaction both in target and native language between students, promoting learner autonomy in class can be useful.

In another study, Chan (2003) investigated teachers' views of their roles and responsibilities, their assessments of their students' decision-making abilities, and the autonomous language learning activities that they use to encourage their students. The results of the study which was administered at Hong Kong Polytechnic University in Hong Kong revealed that teachers believe it is them who are more responsible for decision making related to language, and autonomy is essential for students to have the responsibility of assessing and evaluating their learning. On the other hand, teachers perceived themselves less responsible to engage learners in outside class activities and their extra studies out of the class to improve their language. The study underlines the fact that teacher's beliefs constitute one of the most important components of their teaching practices, which means that to promote and encourage learner autonomy, conscient and knowledgeable teachers are needed.

In her study, Chuk (2003) focused on how exploratory practice can be integrated into regular classroom applications to help learners develop a sense of autonomy in their language learning process. To collect data, the researcher made use of group discussions, oral presentations in class, learner diary records, and teacher-researcher's diary records in an EFL classroom in Hong Kong where the use of regular classroom activities was designed to encourage conscious reflection on learning in an ongoing process. The results of the study revealed that the students improved metacognitive awareness, learner awareness, subject matter awareness, learning process awareness and social awareness in different levels. The researcher suggests that exploratory practice is crucial to foster both learner autonomy and teacher autonomy.

Vanijdee (2003) administered a study to find out the degree of autonomy for distance learners of an ESL course in Taiwan. A questionnaire was applied to students all around the country. The results revealed two types of distance learners, namely self-sufficient learners who were able to follow the course but displayed a limited degree of learner autonomy, and dynamic distance learners who were more proactive in their approach to learning. This study offers a model combining learning autonomy with learning strategies, and self-instructional materials in distance learning context to have dynamic and active distance learners.

In his study, Chu (2004) searched Taiwanese students' and teachers' perceptions and expectations on the issue of learner autonomy in EFL conversation classrooms. Students' attitudes towards learner autonomy in learning process was also investigated in terms of their demographic data. To collect data, a questionnaire was administered to 446 students and eight teachers at a university in Taiwan. The results showed that both teachers and students had positive attitudes towards integrating learner autonomy to classes, and it was also revealed that the degree of students' expectations of learner autonomy varied depending on their grade level, hours they spent listening to English music per week, their experience of attending a private language school, and their grade in English course. The study also revealed the factors such as their willingness to take full responsibility, their low motivation, their lack of learning goals of the course, and their lack of learner training on learning strategies affected students' expectations of learner autonomy.

In addition to the studies administered abroad, numerous studies on learner autonomy were administered in Turkey, as well. Yumuk (2002), for instance, investigated how effective an internet information search-based program was in an academic translation course to create the awareness of learner autonomy and to make the learners who were accustomed to traditional system more autonomous learners. The participants of the study were 90 third year university students whose native language was Turkish, and they were enrolled in the English translation and interpreting program. Pre-and-post-course questionnaire, post-course interviews, and a teacher journal kept by the teacher weekly were the data collection tools. The results of the study revealed that this internet information search-based program made it possible for students to develop an understanding of their own learning process and to become more self-confident in questioning their teacher-dependent learning habits, and also through this program the promotion of learner autonomy was observed to be achievable.

Özdere (2005) administered a study to investigate state-supported provincial university instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy and towards sharing instructional responsibilities with learners regarding the aspects of students' own learning. To collect data, a Likert-type questionnaire with the internal validity value of $\alpha \geq 0,80$ developed by Camilleri (1997) was administered to 72 English language instructors teaching at six different universities in Turkey. In addition, 10 participating instructors from these universities were interviewed with a set of questions prepared by the researcher

relevant to their teaching contexts, their expectations from their students, administration, and their students' attitudes towards learning English. Results of the study showed that the attitudes of the participating instructors varied from natural to slightly positive towards learner autonomy in their formal teaching environments. The facilities instructors were provided by their universities and the opportunities for authentic language use in their environments were also revealed as the factors affecting instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy.

Yıldırım (2005) searched the perceptions and behaviours of Turkish English Language Teaching (ELT) students as both learners and future teachers related to learner autonomy in his study. The study also investigated if education received on how to teach English made a difference in their perceptions of learner autonomy. A hundred and seventy nine first and fourth year university students who participated in the study were handled as both learners of English as a foreign language and future teachers of English as a foreign language. To gather data, two questionnaires developed by Chan, Spratt and Humphreys (2002) and SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) (Oxford, 1990) were used. The internal validity of the questionnaire for learners of English was $\alpha= 0,88$ and the internal validity of the questionnaire for future teachers of English was $\alpha= 0,89$. Follow-up interview sessions were conducted with some of the participants to support the quantitative data. The interview questions were about the reasons why the interviewee gave those answers to the questions in the questionnaire. Findings of the study revealed that the participants were ready to take responsibility and control of their own learning as learners of English, and they had positive beliefs related to learner autonomy as future EFL teachers.

Balçıkanlı (2006) administered a study to investigate the effectiveness of activities at Gazi University Preparatory School to foster learner autonomy. Forty one prep-class students at Gazi University participated in the study with an experimental and a control group design. While the experimental group was educated on autonomous way of teaching, control group experienced no new education. To collect data, a questionnaire developed by Balçıkanlı (2006) and Demirel (2002) consisting of three parts, namely demographic form, learner autonomy questionnaire I, learner autonomy II, with the internal validity value of $\alpha\geq 0,80$ was given to both groups before and after the implementation. The results revealed

that students at experimental group had higher scores and higher level of learner autonomy than students at control group.

In his study, Durmuş (2006) investigated EFL instructors' perceptions on learner autonomy at Anadolu University. To collect data, 108 EFL instructors were given a questionnaire with the internal validity of α= 0,90 and asked to state their reasons for their answers in the questionnaire. The results of the study revealed that among 32 areas of classroom experience, majority of instructors were in favour of collaboration and negotiation with students in most of the areas. On the other hand, they expressed resistance against learner autonomy in areas such as textbook selection and time and place of the lesson.

Koyuncu (2006) administered a study to investigate the effect of the ELP on learner autonomy of 27 sixth year students as young learners at a private school. The ELP, which included three parts: biography which covers self-assessment 'I can do' statements, dossier which includes the example tasks showing what the students can do, and passport part which consists of the results of the students' learning like certificate, grades, diplomas, and so on, was used in English and German lessons. Students' portfolios were used to collect data, and at the end of the study, the researcher administered a standardized open-ended interview to the students to find out any possible changes in their becoming autonomous. The results of the study revealed that ELP was effective in both helping students become autonomous and in producing a learner-centered and learning based environment. Another finding was that students improved their self-assessment skills through ELP.

In her study, Köse (2006) investigated the effects of portfolio implementation and assessment on critical reading and learner autonomy of ELT students. Forty three ELT program prep-class students at Çukurova University participated in the study. To collect data, a focus group interview, written documents, and autonomy and critical reading checklists were used as well as reflection sheets and cover letters. In addition to these, semi-structured interviews were administered shortly after the beginning of the study, and a focused group interview was administered at the end of the study. The results of the study revealed that the implementation raised awareness in many areas, which helped learners become autonomous, and this was reflected in their critical reading level.

Baylan (2007) administered a study to investigate how much difference existed between Turkish students' and their teachers' perceptions of learner autonomy as currently

practiced and what their expectations related to the role for learner autonomy in EFL prep classes were. Two hundred and twenty eight EFL students and 27 teachers at three state universities in Turkey were administered questionnaires developed by Camilleri (1997) and Chu (2004) with the internal validity value of α= 0,84. Additionally, teachers were administered to interview questions prepared by the researcher to assess the reasons behind their replies on the questionnaire. The results of the study revealed that students' perceptions were found to be lower, while their expectations as to the implementation of learner autonomy in classroom practices were higher compared to teachers' perceptions and expectations. On the other hand, teachers expressed their resistance towards learner autonomy in certain areas of teaching such as classroom management and methodology. The findings also revealed that students' respect for their teacher as the authority figure, students' lack of learning goals, and students' taking full responsibility for their learning outcomes were the factors affecting the degree of students' expectations of learner autonomy.

In another study, Sabancı (2007) investigated English language teachers' views on learner autonomy at primary and secondary state schools in Eskişehir city centre in her study. A hundred and ninety seven English language teachers working at state schools were given a learner autonomy questionnaire developed by Camilleri (1999) with the internal validity value of α= 0,90. The first part of the questionnaire gathered data about the teachers' general profiles related to type of school they were working in, educational background and knowledge level of learner autonomy and the second part of which consisted of 31 items to collect teachers' views on learner autonomy. The results of the study showed that the majority of the participating teachers were supportive to learner autonomy in terms of 12 aspects of classroom instructional responsibilities: course objectives, course content, course materials, course time-place-pace, interaction pattern, classroom management, record keeping, homework tasks, teaching focus, formulating their own expression, finding their own learning strategies, and self-assessment. The outcomes also revealed that the aspect of record keeping was found to be the least suitable one for the promotion of learner autonomy in the classroom. Instead, an in-service training for teachers and systematic, planned adjustments in the curricula were suggested to promote learner autonomy.

Karabıyık (2008) administered a study to investigate the culture of learning in Turkey and its relation with Turkish university students' readiness level for learner autonomy. Four hundred and eight prep-class students at different universities throughout Turkey received a questionnaire developed by Chan (2002) and SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) (Oxford, 1990) with the internal validity value of α≥ 0,80. The results revealed that there was a positive relationship between students' culture of learning and their view of learning autonomy, which means the experiences and practices they had in their high school could have an impact on their view and attitudes towards learner autonomy.

In a similar study, Dokuz (2009) aimed to investigate tertiary level Turkish EFL students' awareness level of learner autonomy and how learner autonomy was perceived by tertiary level Turkish EFL students. The study also investigated the students' reactions about the main requirements of learner autonomy and their thoughts about the promotion of learner autonomy in their learning setting. Seventy students at Karadeniz Technical University in Western Languages and Literatures Department were distributed a questionnaire developed by the researcher herself with the internal validity value of α≥0,80 to collect data. Six students were selected as well and were administered a semi-structured interview containing seven open-ended questions which was constructed by the researcher in accordance with the current literature on learner autonomy. The findings revealed some outstanding results. There was not a significant difference between the respondents' attitudes towards learner autonomy and their grade of education, and the respondents tended to make practice outside the classroom to develop their autonomy. It was also revealed that the respondents had positive attitudes towards the promotion of learner autonomy in their current educational setting.

Dişlen (2010) administered a study to investigate students' and teachers' perceptions on the relationship between learner autonomy and the psychological well-being in the ELT context. To collect data, a questionnaire developed by the researcher herself with the internal validity value of α≥ 0,80 were administered to 315 students from different grades of the ELT Program of Çukurova University and eight instructors of the same department. Both teachers and students were administered a semi-structured interview constructed by the researcher containing questions which were tried out with some of the interviewees to eliminate confusion and redundancy. The results showed that

participating instructors supported learner autonomy strongly indicating that university students should be autonomous because it was one of the indispensable skills which they need in their career after graduation and emphasized that the university should follow a learner autonomy supportive policy. First and third year students were found to be inclined to learner autonomy less than the second and fourth year students. As for psychological well-being, the results revealed that fourth year students had the most positive self-concepts except for the sense of pressure in life. On the other hand, second year students displayed the least level of negative self-concept. In addition to these, level of positive perceptions appeared to increase among preparatory class, second year, and fourth year students respectively in terms of the interaction between learner autonomy and psychological well-being.

In her study, Servi (2010) investigated the views and perceptions of instructors working at School of Foreign Languages, Selçuk University on learner autonomy and European Language Portfolio (ELP). Sixty nine instructors were asked to answer the questions in the questionnaire and to state their reasons for the answers, which made the study both quantitative and qualitative. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher with the internal validity value of $\alpha \geq 0,80$. The results of the study revealed that the participants had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy except some issues such as the ones concerning classroom management and administration. The instructors were observed not to have enough information on ELP, Language Passport and on how to prepare ELP in class.

In her study, Akbaş (2011) investigated the relationships between learner autonomy, language engagement and academic achievement as measured by Grade Point Average (GPA). Eighty three senior and junior students attending the Department of English Language and Literature at Karadeniz Technical University were selected through purposive sampling and were given a questionnaire designed by Spratt et al. (2002) with the internal validity value of $\alpha = 0,93$ and face-to-face interviews. The researcher designed the interview, and after an expert's evaluation in terms of wording, sequence, format and procedure, the participants were interviewed. The results of the study revealed that there were significant relationships between learner autonomy, language engagement, and academic achievement. Language engagement and learner autonomy had the strongest positive relationship while the relationship between learner autonomy and academic

achievement as measured by their GPAs, and the relationship between language engagement and academic achievement were moderately positive.

In a more recent study, Ok (2016) searched the effects of instructor expectations on the trainee teachers in terms of their becoming autonomous learners in an EFL teacher training context. A hundred and seventy senior teacher trainees attending the ELT Program at Pamukkale University were selected and given a questionnaire designed by the researcher himself with the internal validity value of α= 0,87 and ten participants were asked to answer some open-ended questions related to the study. The result of the study pointed out that there were significant relationship between instructor expectations and teacher trainees' employing autonomy.The studies so far focused on the perceptions of either teachers, ELT students or learners about learner autonomy. None of the studies inspected the differences or similarities between instructors and ELT students in terms of their perceptions on different aspects of teaching and learning. Present study follows an earlier study which was administered in 1999 by Camilleri to fill in this gap. In his study, Camilleri aimed to find out the attitudes of English teachers towards learner autonomy in a project supported by European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML). This project was started with the hypothesis that teachers considered some areas of teaching and learning, such as classroom experience, as more suitable than others for the implementation of learner autonomy. The questionnaire which was designed by Camilleri with the internal validity value of α≥ 0,80 was first presented during Workshop No. 8/97 Aspects of Teaching Methodology in Bilingual Classes at Secondary School Level that took place in Graz in May 1997. It was given to English language teachers from various European countries; Belorussia, Estonia, Malta (two groups), The Netherlands, Poland and Slovenia. The questionnaire was in English, and in case of necessity members of the project were allowed to translate it into their native languages. The questionnaire was a five-point Likert scale, with 'not at all', 'little', 'partly', 'much' and 'very much' options for each item. Options 'not at all' and 'little' were interpreted as expressions of resistance to learner autonomy; 'much' and 'very much' were regarded as expressions of strong support for autonomy; the option 'partly' was not interpreted as an expression of neutral attitude but rather as support of learner autonomy by Camilleri (1999). The results revealed that teachers were willing to change and practice learner autonomy in certain areas of their teaching process. On the other hand, the results also showed that teachers had difficulty in

implementing learner autonomy in the areas which require decision-making by higher authorities. Moreover, it was deduced that addressing the attitudes of the teacher towards learner autonomy is crucial to its successful implementation. Similar to the study conducted by Camilleri, the present study aimed to find out the attitudes of pre- and in-service English language teachers towards learner autonomy and aimed to make a comparison of their perceptions as well.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1. Setting and Participants

The present study was administered at three different institutions of two state universities; Adnan Menderes University School of Foreign Languages, Pamukkale University School of Foreign Languages and Pamukkale University English Language Teaching Program. The study was carried out at the end of the autumn semester of 2012-2013 academic year at both of the universities. Both ADU and PAU School of Foreign Languages provide English preparatory classes to their students from different departments in order to meet student needs in terms of English. ADU School of Foreign Languages had 40 academic staff and three administrative staff, and PAU School of Foreign Languages had 63 academic staff, 46 of whom were instructors and eight administrative staff. In addition, PAU English Language Teaching Program had eight academic staff.

This study was implemented with 123 participants containing instructors from ADU and PAU and students from ELT Program of PAU with the aim of investigating the perceptions of pre- and in-service teachers about learner autonomy. Only third and fourth year students of PAU ELT Program were given the questionnaire because either they were having or have had their teaching practice sessions. They were more experienced about how to teach English compared to first and second year students, and that is why we included third and fourth year students as participants.

Table 3.1

Distribution of Participants According to Their Gender and Their Profession

Variables	level	n	%
Gender	Female	94	76.4
	Male	29	23.6
Participant details	Instructors of ADU	34	27.6
	Instructors of PAU	21	17.1
	3rd grade ELT students of PAU	45	36.6
	4th grade ELT students of PAU	23	18.7

Among the total of 123 participants, 94 (76.4%) of them were female, and 29 (23.6) were male (see Table 3.1). Thirty four (27.6 %) of them were instructors at ADU School of Foreign Languages, 21 (17.1%) were instructors at PAU School of Foreign Languages, 45 (36.6%) of them were third year ELT students of PAU, and 23 (18.7%) of them were fourth year ELT students of PAU.

Table 3.2

Distribution of Instructors According to Their Level of Education, Major Fields, and Years of Teaching Experience

Variables	Level	n	%
Level of Education	BA	36	65.5
	MA	17	30.9
	PhD	2	3.6
Major Field	ELT	38	69.1
	English Language and Literature	10	18.2
	American Culture and Literature	1	1.8
	Translation and Interpreting	5	9.1
	Linguistics	1	1.8
Teaching Experience	0-5 years	27	49.1
	6-9 years	10	18.2
	10-15 years	13	23.6
	16-20 years	1	1.8
	21 and above	4	7.3

In terms of their level of education, among 55 instructors, 36 (65.5%) of them had a BA degree, 17 (30.9%) of them had an MA degree, and two (3.6%) of them had a PhD degree. With reference to the instructors' major fields, 38 (69.1%) of them were graduates of an ELT department, 10 (18.2%) of them were graduates of an English Language and Literature department, one (1.8%) of them was a graduate of American Culture and Literature department, five (9.1%) of them were graduates of Translation and Interpreting department, and one (1.8%) of them was a graduate of Linguistics department (see Table 3.2). In terms of teaching experience, 27 (49.1%) of the instructors had teaching experience between zero and five years; 10 (18.2%) of them had teaching experience between six and nine years; 13 (23.6%) of them had teaching experience between 10 and 15 years; only one (1.8%) of them had teaching experience between 16 and 20 years; and four (7.3%) of them had teaching experience above 21 years.

In the questionnaire both instructors (i.e., in-service teachers) and ELT students (i.e., pre-service teachers) were asked to state their knowledge level of the term 'learner autonomy' by choosing one of the options among 'I have no idea', 'I've heard about it but I don't have enough knowledge', 'I learnt by reading relevant sources', 'I searched for it', and 'other'.

When the pre- and in-service teachers' perceptions were compared in terms of the knowledge level of learner autonomy, it appeared that three (5.4%) in-service teachers had no idea about it, and 29 (52.8%) had heard but didn't have enough knowledge while 20 (29.4%) of the pre-service teachers stated they had heard about it but didn't have enough knowledge (see table 3.3). Only 16 (29.1%) of the in-service teachers learnt by reading

relevant sources while it was 42 (61.8%) for the pre-service teachers. On the other hand, seven (12.7%) in-service teachers stated that they searched for learner autonomy and only

Table 3.3

Distribution of Instructors and ELT Students According to Their Knowledge Level of Learner Autonomy

Variable	Instructors	n	%	ELT Students	n	%
Knowledge Level of Learner Autonomy	I have no idea.	3	5.4	I have no idea.	0	0
	I've heard about it but I don't have enough knowledge.	29	52.8	I've heard about it but I don't have enough knowledge.	20	29.4
	I learnt by reading relevant sources.	16	29.1	I learnt by reading relevant sources.	42	61.8
	I searched for it.	7	12.7	I searched for it.	3	4.4
	Other	0	0	Other	3	4.4

three (4.4%) of the pre-service teachers did research on it. In addition, three of the pre-service teachers stated that they learnt it while surfing on the net and doing a project homework in the option 'other'. It can be concluded that the participants of the present study were somehow aware of the term 'learner autonomy'.

3.2. Instruments (learner autonomy questionnaire for the pre- and in-service teachers)

In the present study, an adapted version of a learner autonomy questionnaire developed by Camilleri (1999), namely 'Learner Autonomy: Teachers' Views' (see Appendix A) was given to the participants as the data collection tool. Both the pre- and in-service teachers were administered the same questionnaire. The second part of the questionnaire was about learner autonomy but the first part of the questionnaire included questions asking for demographic and background information. The in-service teachers were asked to state their gender, level of education (BA, MA, PhD), the department they graduated from, the university they teach, and years of teaching experience. On the other hand, the pre-service teachers were asked to state their gender, age, their grade at university (third or fourth), and the school type where they are having their teaching practice. In addition to these, the first part of the questionnaire for both groups had a common question trying to find out how much they knew about the concept of 'learner autonomy' with the options 'I have no idea', 'I've heard about it but I don't have enough knowledge', 'I learnt by reading relevant sources', 'I did research on it', and 'other'.

The second part of the questionnaire was the same for both groups to find out their perceptions on learner autonomy with respect to a wide range of main items of language

teaching and learning such as course objectives, course content, course materials, course time-place-pace, interaction patterns, classroom management, record keeping, homework tasks, teaching focus, formulating explanations, learning strategies, and self-assessment. This part of the questionnaire employed Camilleri's (1999) 'Learner Autonomy: Teachers' Views' questionnaire with some changes. The questionnaire was in English originally but a Turkish version of the questionnaire which was translated and adapted by Sabancı (2007) was preferred in this present study in case the participants couldn't express themselves clearly because of the technical terms used. With the same concern, Sabancı (2007) translated it into Turkish and this version was translated back into English by five teachers from different universities to compare these two translations to the original questionnaire in terms of any mismatches. Then, seven experts from Anadolu University, Education Faculty were asked to evaluate the Turkish version of the questionnaire in terms of validity and clarity of the items and necessary changes were made. Sabancı (2007) preferred to write all the items successively without stating their titles for each category. As seen on Table 3.4, in the present study titles weren't expressed explicitly instead the relevant sub-items were grouped under the same number but with different letters for each.

In the original questionnaire Camillerie (1999) tried to measure 13 main items of teaching and learning with a total of 32 sub-items. However, Sabancı (2007) included the item about choice of learning tasks, which was given as a separate main item in the original questionnaire, in the course content as a sub-item, with the reason that learning tasks form a part of the course content. Additionally, she eliminated the sub-items of the fifth main item (methodology of the lesson) from four to three as individual work, pair work, and group work. This is because the omitted sub-items, namely *use of materials*, *type of classroom activities*, and *type of homework activities* were already mentioned in the other main items, namely *selecting course materials*, *homework tasks*, and *course content*. The original 13th main item which had three sub-items, namely *assessing himself/ herself weekly, assessing himself/ herself monthly, assessing himself/ herself annually* was added a new sub-item, namely assessing himself/ herself termly. All these changes for both the main items and their sub-items in Sabancı's study were kept intact and employed in this study. Contrary to the fact that Sabancı replaced the '*General Comment on Learner Autonomy*' part in the original questionnaire with a comment part at the end of the questionnaire requiring participants to list first five important factors that affected their

answers to the questionnaire, participants of the present study were asked to write comments for each main item and the last general comment part was omitted (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Construction of the Questionnaire

ITEM NO	ASPECTS OF TEACHING&LEARNING	SUB-ITEMS
1	Course objectives	1-a) long term
		1-b) short term
1) Comment:		
2	Course content	2-a) topics
		2-b) tasks
2) Comment:		
3	Course materials	3-a) course books
		3-b) audio-visual materials
		3-c) realia
3) Comment:		
4	Course time, place, and pace	4-a) time
		4-b) place
		4-c) pace
4) Comment:		
5	Interaction pattern	5-a) individual work
		5-b) pair work
		5-c) group work
5) Comment:		
6	Classroom management	6-a) position of desks
		6-b) seating of students
		6-c) discipline matters
6) Comment:		
7	Record keeping	7-a) work done
		7-b) marks gained
		7-c) attendance
7) Comment:		
8	Homework tasks	8-a) quantity
		8-b) type
		8-c) frequency
8) Comment:		
9	Teaching focus	9-a) texts
		9-b) audio-visual materials
		9-c) realia
9) Comment:		
10	Formulating their own explanations	10-
10) Comment:		
11	Finding their own learning strategies	11-
11) Comment:		
12	Self-assessment	12-a) weekly
		12-b) monthly
		12-c) termly
		12-d) annually
12) Comment:		

The original questionnaire employed a five-point Likert –type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 1 (little), 2 (partly), 3 (much) and 4 (very much) requiring the participants to number their thoughts. On the other hand, in this study numbers were turned into phrases such as '*Hiç dahil edilmemeli'*, '*Az dahil edilmeli'*, '*Kısmen dahil edilmeli'*, '*Çoğunlukla dahil edilmeli'*, '*Tamamen dahil edilmeli'* respectively to make it more clear for the participants.

3.2.1. Reliability of the Questionnaire

In the present study, Camilleri's (1999)'Learner Autonomy: Teachers' Views' questionnaire was used with some changes in the first part including demographic knowledge taking into consideration the aim of the study and the participants it addresses to, page format, and content of some questions arising from the differences in Turkish educational system during the language translation into Turkish. As mentioned before, the validity of the translated questionnaire ($α= 0,90$) was evaluated by Sabancı (2007). In addition to this, five instructors at ADU were excluded from the study to evaluate and pilot the questionnaire in terms of its content validity, face validity and clarity of items. As a result, some items in the first part and the page format were revised, and necessary changes were made taking into consideration these instructors' feedback and suggestions. When it comes to the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach-alpha values of the Likert-type questions appearing in the second part were calculated, and was found to be $α=0,90$. Table 3.5 shows the reliability evaluation criteria for $α$ value below (Özdamar, 1999, p. 522).

Table 3.5

Reliability Evaluation Criteria for α Value

α value	Reliability of the questionnaire
$0.00 \leq α < 0.40$	No reliability
$0.40 \leq α < 0.60$	Low reliability
$0.60 \leq α < 0.80$	Quite reliability
$0.80 \leq α < 1.00$	High reliability

As seen above in Table 3.5 the reliability level of the questionnaire was found high according to the criteria.

3.3. Data Collection

To conduct the study, the adapted questionnaire was handed out to the instructors at ADU first and to the instructors and ELT students of PAU one week later. Before the participants filled out the questionnaires, they were informed about the questionnaire and the purpose of the study. In addition to this, the participants were guaranteed that their

answers to the questionnaire would be confidential and would not be used for other purposes. They were also informed that they didn't need to write their names but it was essential to write comments for each main item.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data of the present study consisted of both quantitative data gathered from the Likert-type questions and qualitative data gathered from the 'comment part' of each main item in the second part of the questionnaire. Both the pre- and in-service teachers' answers for the 'comment part' were analyzed noting down the emerging patterns and themes for each main item, and the relevant responses were grouped together. Then these were interpreted taking into consideration the frequency of ideas embedded.

The quantitative data were analyzed by using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0 version for Windows). Especially in the first part of the questionnaire requiring the demographic knowledge of the participants, descriptive statistics (percentages and mean scores) were calculated. For the second part, items were grouped under relevant titles. To analyze the participants' answers, their answers were graded as Camilleri did in his study. *Not at all* and *Little* were interpreted as a resistance to learner autonomy and *Much* and *Very much* were interpreted as a strong support for the concept. However, the interpretation of *Partly* was accepted as an expression of support instead of expressing a neutral attitude towards learner autonomy. Camilleri (1999) explains the reason as follows:

> When a teacher states that, for example, the positioning of desks should be decided partly by the teacher and partly by the learner, the teacher is not excluding learner autonomy, but rather proposing a process of collaboration or negotiation in which the learner is an active and influential participant in decision-making (p. 28).

The expressions at the questionnaire were given numbers. The scoring for the expressions were as follows: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Little, 3 = Partly, 4 = Much, 5 = Very much. The expressions and their interpretations were presented with their numerical scores in Table 3. 6.

Table 3.6

Interpretation of Expressions with Numerical Scores

Expressions	Score	Interpretation
Not at all	1	Resistance to Learner Autonomy
Little	2	Resistance to Learner Autonomy
Partly	3	Collaborative involvement
Much	4	Strong support of Learner Autonomy
Very much	5	Strong support of Learner Autonomy

In addition to descriptive statistics, One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was run at first to each main item in order to inspect whether they were normally distributed or not (p value was ≤ 0.01). The results of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test revealed that eight of the main items were not normally distributed ($\leq 0,01$), so Mann-Whithey U Test was run to see whether there was a significant difference on the attitudes towards these eight main items between groups (the pre- and in-service teachers). On the other hand, the remaining four main items and the overall results covering all the 12 main items were normally distributed ($\geq 0,01$) so Independent-Samples t-test was run to see whether there was a significant difference on the attitudes towards these four main items and the overall results between groups (the pre- and in-service teachers).

The qualitative data were gathered asking participants to write their comments about each main item. To analyse this part content analysis was applied. As Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) (as cited in Dörnyei, 2007) stated, content analysis employs a generalized sequence of coding for themes, looking for patterns, making interpretations, and building theory. Additionally, Dörnyei (2007) emphasized the importance of selecting the main themes or storylines to elaborate on by stating that "selection is based on the salience of the particular concept/ process and its relationship with other important categories in the domain; ideally, the main theme(s) should serve as a focus or lens through which the whole domain can be presented" (p. 257). In this respect, in the present study at first both the pre- and in-service teachers' comments were noted down for each item and then the emerging patterns and themes were selected. Relevant responses of both pre- and in-service teachers for these themes were presented together.

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The second part of the questionnaire used in the study aimed to find answers to these three research questions: According to descriptive statistics, what are the perceptions of the pre- and in-service teachers about learner autonomy?, What are the differences and/or similarities between the pre- and in-service teachers' perceptions of learner autonomy? According to qualitative content analysis on comments, what are the pre- and in-service teachers' views on learner autonomy? Each research question was analyzed separately by calculating the participants' responses to the second part of the questionnaire and the findings to each research question were presented under separate titles.

4.1. Analysis of the Findings for the Research Question 1

The first research question of the study focuses on the perceptions of PAU ELT students (pre-service teachers) and EFL instructors teaching at prep classes of ADU and PAU (in-service teachers) about learner autonomy. In this respect, pre-service teachers' overall views on learner autonomy were analyzed by looking at the answers they gave to 31 sub-items in total as a whole and their views/perceptions for each of 31 sub-items were analyzed separately. Then the same was applied to the in-service teachers' overall views and views for each sub-item.

4.1.1. Pre-service Teachers' Overall Views on Learner Autonomy

Table 4.1

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Overall Views on Learner Autonomy

Variables	n	%
Not at all	0	0
Little	0	0
Partly	27	39,7
Much	39	57,4
Very much	2	2,9
Total	68	100

In terms of the pre-service teachers' overall views on learner autonomy (see Table 4.1), the results revealed that 27 (39,7%) of the pre-service teachers chose the item *partly*, 39 (57,4%) of them said *much*, and only two (2,9%) of the participants preferred to say *very much*. It is also remarkable that none of the pre-service teachers preferred to choose the options *not at all*, or *little*, which means that all of the pre-service teachers supported the notion of learner autonomy and none of them showed resistance to it. It can also be

inferred that in general the pre-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards the learner autonomy concept.

4.1.2. The Pre-service Teachers' Views on Learner Autonomy Based on Different Aspects of Learner Autonomy

Table 4.2

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decision of the Course Objectives

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Long term course objectives	3	4,4	5	7,4	14	20,6	35	51,5	11	16,2	68	100
Short term course objectives	1	1,5	4	5,9	9	13,2	41	60,3	13	19,1	68	100
Overall views on course objectives	1	1,5	4	5,9	7	10,3	43	63,2	13	19,1	68	100

In terms of involving learners in establishing the long-term objectives of a course of study (see Table 4.2), only three (4,4%) and five (7,4%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 14 (20,6%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 35 (51,5%) and 11 (16,2%) of the participants supported strongly the idea of involving learners by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In conclusion, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in establishing the long-term objectives of a course of study.

In terms of involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study, only one of the participants chose the option *not at all* and four (5,9%) of them resisted learner autonomy by saying *little*. On the other hand, nine (13,2%) of them chose the *partly* option and supported collaborative involvement. Forty one (60,3%) of the participants said *much* and 13 (19,1%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study. In sum, pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study.

When the pre-service teachers' overall views were analyzed, it was clearly seen that only one of the participants preferred to say *not at all* and while four (5,9%) of them showed resistance by choosing the option *little*, seven (10,3%), 43 (63,2%) and 13 (19,1%) of the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy by choosing the options *partly*, *much* and *very much*, respectively. The results for the overall views on course objectives

revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in establishing the long-term and short-term objectives of a course of study.

Table 4.3

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on the Decision of the Course Content

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Topics	0	0	7	10,3	27	39,7	25	36,8	9	13,2	68	100
Tasks	0	0	3	4,4	8	11,8	34	50	23	33,8	68	100
Overall views on course contents	0	0	2	2,9	10	14,7	43	63,2	13	19,1	68	100

In terms of decisions on course content (see Table 4.3), the results showed that only seven (10,3%) of the pre-service teachers resisted against involving learners in the decision of topics by saying *little*. On the other hand, 27 (39,7%) of them supported it by choosing the option *partly*, which means there should be a negotiation between teacher and learner, and 25 (36,8%) and nine (13,2%) of the participants showed strong support of involving learners in the decision of topics by choosing the options *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of topics.

In terms of involving learners in the decision of tasks, the results (see Table 4.3) indicated that only three (4,4%) of the pre-service teachers chose the *little* option and showed resistance to involving learners in the decision of tasks. However, eight (11,8%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*. Moreover, 34 (50%) and 23 (33,8%) of them supported learners' involvement in the decision of tasks strongly by choosing *much* and *very much*, respectively. In brief, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of tasks.

Within the frame of overall views on course contents (see Table 4.3), the results revealed that only two (2,9%) of the pre-service teachers resisted to involving learners in the decision of course contents by choosing *little*. However, 10 (14,7%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 43 (63,2%) of them said *much*, and 13 (19,1%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of course contents. These data also revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of topics and tasks.

Table 4.4

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Selecting Materials

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Textbooks	3	4,4	10	14,7	21	30,9	23	33,8	11	16,2	68	100
Audio-visual materials	0	0	4	5,9	9	13,2	37	54,4	18	26,5	68	100
Realia	0	0	6	8,8	11	16,2	32	47,1	19	27,9	68	100
Overall views on selecting materials	0	0	5	7,4	13	19,1	37	54,4	13	19,1	68	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting textbooks (see Table 4.4), only three (4,4%) and 10 (14,7%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 21 (30,9%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 23 (33,8%) and 11 (16,2%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting textbooks.

In terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials (see Table 4.4), none of the participants chose the option *not at all* and only four (5,9%) of them resisted learner autonomy by saying *little*. On the other hand, nine (13,2%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Thirty seven (54,4%) of the participants chose the option *much* and 18 (26,5%) of them preferred the option *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials.

When the third sub-item, involving learners in the decision of selecting realia (see Table 4.4), was analyzed, the results revealed that none of the participants preferred to choose *not at all* and only six (8,8%) of them showed resistance by choosing the option *little*. However, 11 (16,2%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 32 (47,1%) of them chose *much*, and 19 (27,9%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of selecting realia as a course material. In conclusion, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting realia.

Within the frame of overall views on selecting materials (see Table 4.4), the results showed that only five (7,4%) of the pre-service teachers resisted to involving learners in

the decision of selecting materials by choosing *little.* However, 13 (19,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 37 (54,4%) of them said *much*, and 13 (19,1%) of them preferred to choose *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of selecting materials. In sum, these data revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting materials.

Table 4.5

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on the Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Time	9	13,2	7	10,3	25	36,8	18	26,5	9	13,2	68	100
Place	5	7,4	11	16,2	30	44,1	17	25	5	7,4	68	100
Pace	5	7,4	5	7,4	19	27,9	25	36,8	14	20,6	68	100
Overall views on the time, place and pace of the lesson	4	5,9	8	11,8	24	35,3	28	41,2	4	5,9	68	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision on the time of the lesson (see Table 4.5), only nine (13,2%) and seven (10,3%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 25 (36,8%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 18 (26,5%) and nine (13,2%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the time of the lesson.

When it comes to involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson (see Table 4.5), five (7,4%) of the participants chose the option *not at all* and 11 (16,2%) of them resisted learner autonomy by choosing *little.* On the other hand, 30 (44,1%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Seventeen (25%) of the participants chose *much* and five (7,4%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson.

When it comes to the third sub-item, involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson (see Table 4.5), the results showed that five (7,4%) of the participants preferred to choose *not at all* and five (7,4%) of them showed resistance by choosing the

option *little.* On the other hand, 19 (27,9%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 25 (36,8%) of them chose *much*, and 14 (20,6%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson.

Within the frame of overall views on selecting materials (see Table 4.5), the results revealed that four (5,9%) and eight (11,8%) of the pre-service teachers resisted involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 24 (35,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing the option *partly*, 28 (41,2%) of them said *much*, and four (5,9%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson. These data also revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson.

Table 4.6

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Interaction Patterns

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Individual work	1	1,5	1	1,5	12	17,6	35	51,5	19	27,9	68	100
Pair work	1	1,5	1	1,5	9	13,2	42	61,8	15	22,1	68	100
Group work	1	1,5	0	0	11	16,2	39	57,4	17	25	68	100
Overall views on interaction pattern	1	1,5	0	0	11	16,2	39	57,4	17	25	68	100

In terms of decisions on interaction patterns (see Table 4.6) the data were analyzed with respect to involving learners in the decision on individual work and only one (1,5%) of the participants was observed to choose the option *not at all* and one (1,5%) of them chose the option *little* resisting learner autonomy. Contrarily, 12 (17,6%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 35 (51,5%) and 19 (27,9%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In brief, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on individual work.

In terms of involving learners in the decision on pair work (see Table 4.6), again only one (1,5%) of the participants said *not at all,* and one (1,5%) of them chose the option *little* and resisted learner autonomy. On the other hand, nine (13,2%) of them chose *partly*

and supported collaborative involvement. Forty two (61,8%) of the participants said *much* and 15 (22,1%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on pair work. To sum up, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on pair work.

Involving learners in the decision on group work (see Table 4.6) was the last sub-item of the interaction pattern, the analysis of which revealed that only one (1,5%) of the participants said *not at all* and resisted against involving learners in the decision on group work although none of the participants preferred to choose *little.* On the contrary, 11 (16,2%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 39 (57,4%) of them said *much*, and 17 (25%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on group work. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on group work.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of interaction pattern (see Table 4.6) showed that only one (1,5%) of the participants resisted against learner autonomy in this respect choosing the option *not at all,* and none of the participants preferred to choose *little*. However, 11 (16,2%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 39 (57,4%) of them said *much*, and 17 (25%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of interaction pattern. These data also pointed out that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions of individual, pair and group works.

Table 4.7

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Classroom Management

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Position of desks	2	2,9	8	11,8	17	25	30	44,1	11	16,2	68	100
Seating of students	1	1,5	9	13,2	17	25	26	38,2	15	22,1	68	100
Discipline matters	5	7,4	11	16,2	23	33,8	24	35,3	5	7,4	68	100
Overall views on classroom management	2	2,9	5	7,4	24	35,3	31	45,6	6	8,8	68	100

The data gathered for the pre-service teachers' views on decisions on classroom management (see Table 4.7) showed that in terms of involving learners in the decision on position of desks only two (2,9%) and eight (11,8%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 17 (25%) of them

chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. Additionally, 30 (44,1%) and 11 (16,2%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on position of desks.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on their seating (see Table 4.7), one (1,5%) and nine (13,2%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 17 (25%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Twenty six (38,2%) of the participants chose *much* and 15 (22,1%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on their seating. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on their seating.

Involving learners in the decision on discipline matters (see Table 4.7) was another sub-item and the results revealed that five (7,4%) and 11 (16,2%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 23 (33,8%) of them supported collaborative involvement by stating *partly*, 24 (35,3%) and five (7,4%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on discipline matters preferring *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on discipline matters.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of classroom management (see Table 4.7) pointed out that only two (2,9%) and five (7,4%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect choosing the options *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 24 (35,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 31 (45,6%) of them said *much*, and six (8,8%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about classroom management. These data also revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on the position of desks, their seating and discipline matters.

Table 4.8

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Record Keeping

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Record keeping of work done	6	8,8	16	23,5	22	32,4	18	26,5	6	8,8	68	100
Record keeping of marks gained	12	17,6	19	27,9	18	26,5	15	22,1	4	5,9	68	100
Record keeping of attendance	14	20,6	23	33,8	15	22,1	13	19,1	3	4,4	68	100
Overall views on record keeping	8	11,8	20	29,4	23	33,8	13	19,1	4	5,9	68	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of work done (see Table 4.8), six (8,8%) and 16 (23,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 22 (32,4%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. Additionally, 18 (26,5%) and six (8,8%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of work done.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained (see Table 4.8), 12 (17,6%) and 19 (27,9%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, only 18 (26,5%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Fifteen (22,1%) of the participants said *much,* and four (5,9%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained.

When the third sub-item relevant to involving learners in the decision on record keeping of attendance was analyzed (see Table 4.8), the results pointed out that the majority of the participants, namely, 14 (20,6%) and 23 (33,8%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 15 (22,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, only 13 (19,1%) and three (4,4%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of attendance saying *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, they had negative attitudes towards involving learners in the decisions of attendance record keeping.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of record keeping (see Table 4.8) pointed out that eight (11,8%) and 20 (29,4%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 23 (33,8%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 13 (19,1%) of them said *much*, and only four (5,9%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about record keeping. In sum, these data revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on record keeping.

Table 4.9

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Homework Tasks

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Quantity	2	2,9	7	10,3	28	41,2	27	39,7	4	5,9	68	100
Type	2	2,9	12	17,6	23	33,8	25	36,8	6	8,8	68	100
Frequency	2	2,9	8	11,8	26	38,2	25	36,8	7	10,3	68	100
Overall views on homework tasks	1	1,5	8	11,8	29	42,6	24	35,3	6	8,8	68	100

The data gathered for the pre-service teachers' views on decisions on homework tasks (see Table 4.9) pointed out that in terms of involving learners in the decision on quantity of homework tasks, only two (2,9%) and seven (10,3%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 28 (41,2%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to these, 27 (39,7%) and four (5,9%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in decisions on the quantity of homework tasks.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on type of homework tasks (see Table 4.9), only two (2,9%) and 12 (17,6%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. Besides, 23 (33,8%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Twenty five (36,8%) of the participants said *much,* and six (8,8%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on type of homework tasks. In brief, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in decisions on type of homework tasks.

The third sub-item was related to involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks (see Table 4.9) the results of which pointed out that two (2,9%) and eight (11,8%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 26 (38,2%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*. Additionally, 25 (36,8%) and seven (10,3%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of decisions on frequency of homework tasks.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of homework tasks (see Table 4.9) showed that only one (1,5%) and eight (11,8%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 29 (42,6%) of them supported collaborative involvement by stating *partly*, 24 (35,3%) of them said *much*, and six (8,8%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about homework tasks. In sum, these data revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks.

Table 4.10

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Teaching Focus

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Texts	5	7,4	8	11,8	25	36,8	25	36,8	5	7,4	68	100
Audio-visual materials	5	7,4	7	10,3	24	35,3	24	35,3	8	11,8	68	100
Realia	5	7,4	7	10,3	24	35,3	23	33,8	9	13,2	68	100
Overall views on teaching focus	5	7,4	8	11,8	24	35,3	24	35,3	7	10,3	68	100

When the data were analyzed with respect to involving learners in the decision on texts as teaching focus (see Table 4.10), only five (7,4%) and eight (11,8%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 25 (36,8%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to these, 25 (36,8%) and five (7,4%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes

towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on texts as teaching focus.

In terms of involving learners in the decision on audio-visual materials as teaching focus (see Table 4.10), only five (7,4%) and seven (10,3%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the contrary to these, 24 (35,3%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Additionally, 24 (35,3%) of the participants said *much* and eight (11,8%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on audio-visual materials as teaching focus. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on audio-visual materials as teaching focus.

As the third sub-item, the results for realia as teaching focus (see Table 4.10) pointed out that five (7,4%) and seven (10,3%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 24 (35,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by stating *partly*. In addition to this, 23 (33,8%) and nine (13,2%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on realia as teaching focus preferring *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on realia as teaching focus.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of teaching focus (see Table 4.10) revealed that only five (7,4%) and eight (11,8%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 24 (35,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 24 (35,3%) of them chose *much*, and seven (10,3%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about teaching focus. In sum, these data revealed that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on texts, audio-visual materials and realia as teaching focus.

Table 4.11

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners to Formulate Their Own Explanations

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Overall views on formulating their own explanations	0	0	0	0	1	2,5	35	51,5	32	47,1	68	100

The data gathered for the pre-service teachers' views on encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations (see Table 4.11) revealed that none of the participants chose the options *not at all* and *little* or showed resistance against learner autonomy in this respect. In addition to this, while only one (2,5%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 35 (51,5%) of them said *much*, and 32 (47,1%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations. This also showed that the pre-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations.

Table 4.12

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners to Find Their Own Learning Strategies

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Overall views on finding their own learning strategies	0	0	0	0	2	2,9	29	42,6	37	54,4	68	100

When the pre-service teachers' views on decisions on encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies (see Table 4.12) were examined, there was a similarity with the results of Table 4.11. None of the participants chose the options *not at all* and *little* or showed resistance against learner autonomy in this respect. Additionally, two (2,9%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 29 (42,6%) of them stated *much*, and 37 (54,4%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies. This also revealed that the pre-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies.

Table 4.13

Distributions of the Pre-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners for Self-Assessment

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Weekly	0	0	2	2,9	12	17,6	43	63,2	11	16,2	68	100
Monthly	0	0	1	1,5	11	16,2	43	63,2	13	19,1	68	100
Termly	0	0	5	7,4	13	19,1	38	55,9	12	17,6	68	100
Annually	3	4,4	3	4,4	9	13,2	37	54,4	16	23,5	68	100
Overall views on self-assessment	0	0	0	0	15	22,1	41	60,3	12	17,6	68	100

In terms of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment (see Table 4.13), the results showed that only two (2,9%) of the pre-service teachers showed resistance saying *little*. On the other hand, 12(17,6%) of them supported it by choosing the option *partly* which means there should be a negotiation between teacher and learner, and 43 (63,2%) and 11 (16,2%) of the participants showed strong support of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment.

In terms of encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment (see Table 4.13), the results indicated that only one (1,5%) of the pre-service teachers chose the *little* option and showed resistance. However, 11 (16,2%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*. Moreover, 43 (63,2%) and 13 (19,1%) of them supported encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment strongly by choosing *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment.

When the results for encouraging learners for termly self-assessment (see Table 4.13) were analyzed, it came out that five (7,4%) of the pre-service teachers showed resistance choosing the *little* option. While 13 (19,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly,* 38 (55,9%) and 12 (17,6%) of them supported encouraging learners for termly self-assessment strongly by preferring *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for termly self-assessment.

When it comes to encouraging learners for annually self-assessment (see Table 4.13), the results pointed out that the numbers and the percentages were the same for both of the options *not at all* and *little*. This means only three (4,4%) and three (4,4%) of the

pre-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy in this respect. On the other hand, nine (13,2%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to these, 37 (54,4%) and 16 (23,5%) of the participants supported the idea of encouraging learners for annually self-assessment strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the pre-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for annually self-assessment.

Within the frame of overall views on self-assessment (see Table 4.13), the results revealed that none of the participants chose either *not at all* or *little* options which means a resistance. On the contrary to this fact, 15 (22,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 41 (60,3%) of them said *much*, and 12 (17,6%) of them stated *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners for self-assessment. In sum, these data revealed that the pre-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for weekly, monthly, termly and annually self-assessment.

4.1.3. The In-service Teachers' Overall Views on Learner Autonomy

Table 4.14

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Overall Views on Learner Autonomy

Variables	n	%
Not at all	1	1,8
Little	6	10,9
Partly	25	45,5
Much	22	40
Very much	1	1,8
Total	55	100

In terms of the in-service teachers' overall views on learner autonomy (see Table 4.14), the results revealed that one (1,8%) and six (10,9%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 25 (45,5%) of the in-service teachers chose *partly*, 22 (40%) of them chose *much*, and only one (1,8%) of the participants preferred to say *very much*. It can also be inferred that the majority of the in-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards the learner autonomy concept.

4.1.4. Views of the In-service Teachers on Learner Autonomy Based on Different Aspects of Learner Autonomy

Table 4.15

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decision on the Course Objectives

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Long term course objectives	3	5,5	10	18,2	14	25,5	19	34,5	9	16,4	55	100
Short term course objectives	3	5,5	6	10,9	20	36,4	18	32,7	8	14,5	55	100
Overall views on course objectives	2	3,6	5	9,1	18	32,7	20	36,4	10	18,2	55	100

In terms of involving learners in establishing the long-term objectives of a course of study (see Table 4.15), three (5,5%) and 10 (18,2%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 14 (25,5%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 19 (34,5%) and nine (16,4%) of the participants supported strongly the idea of involving learners by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In conclusion, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in establishing the long-term objectives of a course of study.

When it comes to involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study (see Table 4.15), three (5,5%) and six (10,9%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 20 (36,4%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Eighteen (32,7%) of the participants said *much* and eight (14,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in establishing the short-term objectives of a course of study.

When the in-service teachers' overall views were analyzed (see Table 4.15), it was seen that while two (3,6%) and five (9,1%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively, 18 (32,7%), 20 (36,4%) and 10 (18,2%) of the in-service teachers supported learner autonomy by choosing the options *partly*, *much* and *very much*, respectively. The results for the overall views on course objectives revealed

that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in establishing the long-term and short-term objectives of a course of study.

Table 4.16

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decision on the Course Content

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Topics	2	3,6	8	14,5	22	40	19	34,5	4	7,3	55	100
Tasks	1	1,8	3	5,5	16	29,1	24	43,6	11	20	55	100
Overall views on course content	1	1,8	3	5,5	17	30,9	25	45,5	9	16,4	55	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision of topics (see Table 4.16), the results showed that two (3,6%) and eight (14,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 22 (40%) of them supported it by choosing the option *partly* which means there should be a negotiation between teacher and learner and 19 (34,5%) and four (7,3%) of the participants showed strong support of involving learners in the decision of topics by choosing the options *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in the decision of topics.

In terms of involving learners in the decision of tasks (see Table 4.16), the results indicated that one (1,8%) and three (5,5%) of them showed resistance to involving learners in the decision of tasks by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 16 (29,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*. Moreover, 24 (43,6%) and 11 (20%) of them supported learners' involvement in the decision of tasks strongly by preferring *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in the decision of tasks.

Within the frame of overall views on course contents (see Table 4.16), the results revealed that one (1,8%) and three (5,5%) of them resisted against involving learners in the decision of course contents by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 17(30,9%) of them supported collaborative involvement by stating *partly*, 25 (45,5%) of them choosing *much*, and nine (16,4%) of them preferring *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of course contents. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of topics and tasks.

Table 4.17

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Selecting Materials

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Textbooks	8	14,5	10	18,2	15	27,3	13	23,6	9	16,4	55	100
Audio-visual materials	5	9,1	5	9,1	15	27,3	21	38,2	9	16,4	55	100
Realia	4	7,3	4	7,3	15	27,3	22	40	10	18,2	55	100
Overall views on selecting materials	4	7,3	5	9,1	18	32,7	20	36,4	8	14,5	55	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting textbooks (see Table 4.17), eight (14,5%) and 10 (18,2%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 15 (27,3%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 13 (23,6%) and nine (16,4%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. This means that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting textbooks.

When it comes to involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials (see Table 4.17), five (9,1%) and five (9,1%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*. On the other hand, 15 (27,3%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Twenty one (38,2%) of the participants said *much* and nine (16,4%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials. In other words, the in-service teachers participating in this study had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in the decision of selecting audio-visual materials.

When the third sub-item, involving learners in the decision of selecting realia (see Table 4.17) was analyzed, the results revealed that four (7,3%) and four (7,3%) of them showed resistance by preferring the options *not at all* and *little*. However, 15 (27,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 22 (40%) of them said *much*, and 10 (18,2%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of selecting realia as a course material. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in the decision of selecting realia.

Within the frame of overall views on selecting materials (see Table 4.17), the results showed that four (7,3%) and five (9,1%) of them showed resistance to involving learners in the decision of selecting materials by stating *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 18 (32,7%) of them supported collaborative involvement by preferring *partly*, 20 (36,4%) of them said *much*, and eight (14,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of selecting materials. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision of selecting materials.

Table 4.18

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decision on the Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Time	14	25,5	9	16,4	20	36,4	8	14,5	4	7,3	55	100
Place	19	34,5	10	18,2	15	27,3	9	16,4	2	3,6	55	100
Pace	4	7,3	4	7,3	13	23,6	26	47,3	8	14,5	55	100
Overall views on the time, place and pace of the lesson	3	5,5	17	30,9	23	41,8	9	16,4	3	5,5	55	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision on the time of the lesson (see Table 4.18), 14 (25,5%) and nine (16,4%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 20 (36,4%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, eight (14,5%) and four (7,3%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in respect of involving learners in the decision on the time of the lesson.

When it comes to involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson (see Table 4.18), 19 (34,5%) of the participants chose the option *not at all* and 10 (18,2%) of them resisted learner autonomy by saying *little*. On the other hand, 15 (27,3%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Nine (16,4%) of the participants said *much* and two (3,6%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson. This means that the in-service teachers had negative attitudes towards this item, namely involving learners in the decision on the place of the lesson.

When it comes to the third sub-item, involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson (see Table 4.18), the results showed that four (7,3%) of the participants preferred to say *not at all* and four (7,3%) of them said *little* and showed resistance. On the other hand, 13 (23,6%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 26 (47,3%) of them chose *much*, and eight (14,5%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the pace of the lesson.

Within the frame of overall views on the time, place and pace of the lesson (see Table 4.18), the results revealed that three (5,5%) and 17 (30,9%) of the in-service teachers resisted against learner autonomy by choosing the options *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 23 (41,8%) of them supported collaborative involvement by preferring *partly*, nine (16,4%) of them said *much*, and three (5,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson.

Table 4.19

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Interaction Pattern

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Individual work	0	0	5	9,1	14	25,5	23	41,8	13	23,6	55	100
Pair work	1	1,8	3	5,5	17	30,9	25	45,5	9	16,4	55	100
Group work	1	1,8	4	7,3	16	29,1	24	43,6	10	18,2	55	100
Overall views on interaction pattern	0	0	5	9,1	16	29,1	23	41,8	11	20	55	100

When the data with respect to involving learners in the decision on individual work were analyzed (see Table 4.19), none of the participants chose the option *not at all* and only five (9,1%) of them resisted learner autonomy by saying *little*. Contrarily, 14 (25,5%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 23 (41,8%) and 13 (23,6%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on individual work.

In terms of involving learners in the decision on pair work (see Table 4.19), one (1,8%) of the participants chose the option *not at all* and three (5,5%) of them chose the *little* option showing resistance to learner autonomy. On the other hand, 17 (30,9%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Twenty five (45,5%) of the participants chose *much* and nine (16,4%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on pair work. This means that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on pair work.

Involving learners in the decision on group work was the last sub-item of the interaction pattern (see Table 4.19), the analysis of which revealed that one (1,8%) and four (7,3%) of the in-service teachers resisted against involving learners in the decision on group work by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the contrary, 16 (29,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 24 (43,6%) of them said *much*, and 10 (18,2%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision on group work. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on group work.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of interaction pattern (see Table 4.19) showed that none of the participants chose the option *not at all* and only five (9,1%) of them resisted against learner autonomy by saying *little* in this respect. However, 16 (29,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 23 (41,8%) of them stated *much*, and 11 (20%) of them stated *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decision of interaction pattern. These data pointed out that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions of individual, pair and group works.

Table 4.20

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Classroom Management

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Position of desks	1	1,8	11	20	22	40	16	29,1	5	9,1	55	100
Seating of students	3	5,5	8	14,5	15	27,3	23	41,8	6	10,9	55	100
Discipline matters	18	32,7	9	16,4	15	27,3	8	14,5	5	9,1	55	100
Overall views on classroom management	2	3,6	14	25,5	19	34,5	17	30,9	3	5,5	55	100

The data gathered for the participating the in-service teachers' views on decisions on classroom management showed that in terms of involving learners in the decision on

position of desks (see Table 20), one (1,8%) and 11 (20%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by stating *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 22 (40%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. Additionally, 16 (29,1%) and five (9,1%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on position of desks.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on their seating (see Table 20), three (5,5%) and eight (14,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 15 (27,3%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Twenty three (41,8%) of the participants preferred *much* and six (10,9%) of them preferred *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on their seating. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on their seating.

Involving learners in the decision on discipline matters (see Table 20) was another sub-item and the results revealed that 18 (32,7%) and nine (16,4%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 15 (27,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, eight (14,5%) and five (9,1%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on discipline matters stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the in-service teachers were observed to have slightly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on discipline matters.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of classroom management (see Table 20) pointed out that two (3,6%) and 14 (25,5%) of them said *not at all* and *little* resisting against learner autonomy in this respect. On the other hand, 19 (34,5%) of them supported collaborative involvement by preferring *partly*, 17 (30,9%) of them chose *much*, and three (5,5%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about classroom management. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions of issues about classroom management.

Table 4.21

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Record Keeping

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Record keeping of work done	15	27,3	13	23,6	15	27,3	5	9,1	7	12,7	55	100
Record keeping of marks gained	30	54,5	7	12,7	13	23,6	3	5,5	2	3,6	55	100
Record keeping of attendance	31	56,4	11	20	6	10,9	5	9,1	2	3,6	55	100
Overall views on record keeping	24	43,6	14	25,5	12	21,8	4	7,3	1	1,8	55	100

In terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of work done (see Table 4.21), 15 (27,3%) and 13 (23,6%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 15 (27,3%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. Additionally, five (9,1%) and seven (12,7%) of the participants supported strongly the idea of involving learners by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. These results showed that the in-service teachers had slightly negative attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of work done.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained (see Table 4.21), 30 (54,5%) and seven (12,7%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 13 (23,6%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Three (5,5%) of the participants said *much* and only two (3,6%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained. In sum, the data showed that the in-service teachers had highly negative attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of marks gained.

When the third sub-item relevant to involving learners in the decision on record keeping of attendance was analyzed (see Table 4.21), the results pointed out that the majority of the participants, namely, 31 (56,4%) and 11 (20%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, six (10,9%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, only five (9,1%) and two (3,6%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of attendance saying *much* and *very much*, respectively.

In other words, the in-service teachers had highly negative attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on record keeping of attendance.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of record keeping (see Table 4.21) pointed out that 24 (43,6%) and 14 (25,5%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect preferring the options *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 12 (21,8%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, only four (7,3%) of them said *much*, and one (1,8%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about record keeping. In sum, the in-service teachers were observed to have highly negative attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on record keeping.

Table 4.22

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Homework Tasks

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Quantity	10	18,2	17	30,9	14	25,5	10	18,2	4	7,3	55	100
Type	10	18,2	8	14,5	13	23,6	16	29,1	8	14,5	55	100
Frequency	12	21,8	14	25,5	15	27,3	9	16,4	5	9,1	55	100
Overall views on homework tasks	10	18,2	13	23,6	15	27,3	12	21,8	5	9,1	55	100

The data gathered for the in-service teachers' views on decisions on homework tasks (see Table 4.22) pointed out that in terms of involving learners in the decision on quantity of homework tasks, 10 (18,2%) and 17 (30,9%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 14 (25,5%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to this, 10 (18,2%) and four (7,3%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the in-service teachers had slightly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on quantity of homework tasks.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on type of homework tasks (see Table 4.22), 10 (18,2%) and eight (14,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by choosing *not at all* and *little*, respectively. Besides, 13 (23,6%) of them said *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Sixteen (29,1%) of the participants said *much* and eight (14,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on type of homework tasks. In sum, the in-service teachers were observed

to have positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on type of homework tasks.

The third sub-item was related to involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks (see Table 4.22) the results of which pointed out that 12 (21,8%) and 14 (25,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by preferring *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 15 (27,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*. Additionally, nine (16,4%) and five (9,1%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks choosing *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of homework tasks (see Table 4.22) showed that 10 (18,2%) and 13 (23,6%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect stating *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 15 (27,3%) of them supported collaborative involvement by saying *partly*, 12 (21,8%) of them said *much*, and five (9,1%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about homework tasks. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had slightly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks.

Table 4.23

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Decisions on Teaching Focus

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Texts	6	10,9	14	25,5	17	30,9	11	20	7	12,7	55	100
Audio-visual materials	5	9,1	15	27,3	13	23,6	14	25,5	8	14,5	55	100
Realia	6	10,9	11	20	16	29,1	12	21,8	10	18,2	55	100
Overall views on teaching focus	5	9,1	13	23,6	16	29,1	13	23,6	8	14,5	55	100

When the data were analyzed with respect to involving learners in the decision on texts as teaching focus (see Table 4.23), six (10,9%) and 14 (25,5%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by stating *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 17 (30,9%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to these, 11 (20%) and seven (12,7%) of the participants supported the idea of involving learners strongly by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes

towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on texts as teaching focus.

In terms of involving learners in the decision on audio-visual materials as teaching focus (see Table 4.23), five (9,1%) and 15 (27,3%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the contrary to these, 13 (23,6%) of them chose *partly* and supported collaborative involvement. Additionally, 14 (25,5%) of the participants said *much* and eight (14,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support for involving learners in the decision on audio-visual materials as teaching focus. This means that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on audio-visual materials as teaching focus.

As the third sub-item, the results for realia as teaching focus (see Table 4.23) pointed out that six (10,9%) and 11 (20%) of them showed resistance to learner autonomy by stating *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However, 16 (29,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*. In addition to this, 12 (21,8%) and 10 (18,2%) of them showed their strong support of involving learners in the decision on realia as teaching focus preferring *much* and *very much*, respectively. In sum, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on realia as teaching focus.

The results for the overall views on the main issue of teaching focus (see Table 4.23) revealed that five (9,1%) and 13 (23,6%) of them resisted against learner autonomy in this respect saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, 16 (29,1%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 13 (23,6%) of them stated *much*, and eight (14,5%) of them stated *very much* showing their strong support of involving learners in the decisions of issues about teaching focus. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had highly positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decisions on texts, audio-visual materials and realia as teaching focus.

Table 4.24
Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners to Formulate Their Own Explanations

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Overall views on formulating their own explanations	0	0	1	1,8	7	12,7	23	41,8	24	43,6	55	100

The data gathered for the in-service teachers' views on decisions on encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations (see Table 4.24) revealed that none of the participants chose the option *not at all* and only one (1,8%) of them chose the option *little* and showed resistance to learner autonomy in this respect. In addition to this, while seven (12,7%) of them supported collaborative involvement by preferring *partly*, 23 (41,8%) of them chose *much*, and 24 (43,6%) of them chose *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations. This showed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations.

Table 4.25

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners to Find Their Own Learning Strategies

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Overall views on finding their own learning strategies	0	0	1	1,8	7	12,7	17	30,9	30	54,5	55	100

When the in-service teachers' views on decisions on encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies (see Table 4.25) were examined, the results showed a huge similarity with the results of Table 4.24. None of the participants chose the option *not at all* and only one (1,8%) of them chose the option *little* and showed resistance to learner autonomy in this respect. However, seven (12,7%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 17 (30,9%) of them said *much*, and 30 (54,5%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies. This revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies.

Table 4.26

Distributions of the In-service Teachers' Views on Encouraging Learners for Self-Assessment

Variables	Not at all		Little		Partly		Much		Very much		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Weekly	1	1,8	3	5,5	9	16,4	19	34,5	23	41,8	55	100
Monthly	1	1,8	2	3,6	8	14,5	22	40	22	40	55	100
Termly	1	1,8	3	5,5	9	16,4	19	34,5	23	41,8	55	100
Annually	0	0	3	5,5	6	10,9	21	38,2	25	45,5	55	100
Overall views on self-assessment	0	0	2	3,6	9	16,4	20	36,4	24	43,6	55	100

In terms of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment (see Table 4.26), the results showed that only one (1,8%) and three (5,5%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learner autonomy by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. On the other hand, nine (16,4%) of them supported it by choosing the option *partly* which means there should be a negotiation between teacher and learner, and 19 (34,5%) and 23 (41,8%) of the participants showed strong support of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment by stating *much* and *very much*, respectively. This revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for weekly self-assessment.

In terms of encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment (see Table 4.26), the results indicated that only one (1,8%) and two (3,6%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance by saying *not at all* and *little*, respectively. However eight (14,5%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*. Moreover, 22 (40%) and 22 (40%) of them supported encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment strongly by preferring *much* and *very much*. This means that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for monthly self-assessment.

When the results for encouraging learners for termly self-assessment (see Table 4.26) were inspected, it came out that only one (1,8%) and three (5,5%) of the in-service teachers showed resistance by preferring *not at all* and *little*, respectively. While nine (16,4%) of them supported collaborative involvement by stating *partly,* 19 (34,5%) and 23 (41,8%) of them supported encouraging learners for termly self-assessment strongly by saying *much* and *very much*, respectively. In other words, the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for termly self-assessment.

When it comes to encouraging learners for annually self-assessment (see Table 4.26), only three (5,5%) of the in-service teachers resisted against encouraging learners for annually self-assessment by choosing *little*. On the other hand, six (10,9%) of them chose the *partly* option agreeing on the collaborative involvement of the learners and teachers. In addition to these, 21 (38,2%) and 25 (45,5%) of the participants supported the idea of encouraging learners for annually self-assessment strongly by stating *much* and *very much*,

respectively. This revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for annually self-assessment.

Within the frame of overall views on self-assessment, the results revealed that only two (3,6%) of the in-service teachers resisted by saying *little*. On the contrary to this fact, nine (16,4%) of them supported collaborative involvement by choosing *partly*, 20 (36,4%) of them said *much*, and 24 (43,6%) of them said *very much* showing their strong support of encouraging learners for self-assessment. These data revealed that the in-service teachers had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in terms of encouraging learners for weekly, monthly, termly and annually self-assessment.

4.2. Analysis of the Findings for the Research Question 2

The second research question of the study focuses on the differences and/or similarities between the pre- and in-service teachers' perceptions of learner autonomy. In this respect, both the pre- and in-service teachers' overall views on learner autonomy and their views on 12 main items were analysed via appropriate SPSS programs. To see whether there was a significant difference between the pre-service teachers and the in-service teachers on their perceptions towards the 10 main items in the questionnaire, namely course objectives, course content, course materials, interaction pattern, classroom management, homework tasks, teaching focus, learners' formulating their own explanations, learners' finding their own learning strategies and self-assessment which were not normally distributed, a non-parametric test, Mann-Whitney U Test was run. However, the remaining two main items, namely time, place and pace of the lesson, record keeping and the item titled as overall result, which covers all the 12 main items revealing the participants' perceptions towards learner autonomy in general, were normally distributed (≥0,05). Therefore, a parametric test, independent-samples t-test, was run to see whether there was a significant difference on the perceptions towards these main items between the pre- and in-service teachers.

4.2.1. The Differences and/or Similarities between the Pre- and In-service Teachers' Perceptions of Learner Autonomy in General

Table 4.27 shows the results of independent sample t-test, which was run to figure out whether there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers' support of learner autonomy in general. A significant difference was observed to exist between groups (t=-3,170; p<0,05).

Table 4.27

Overall Results of Independent Sample t-test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in General

Variables	n	Mean	Sd	df	t	p
In-service teachers	55	3,285	0,697	121	-3,170	0,002
Pre-service teachers	68	3,607	0,420			
Total	123					

When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean scores were examined, it was found that the mean value of the pre-service teachers ($X_{\text{pre-service teachers}}$=3,607) was higher than the mean value of the in-service teachers ($X_{\text{in-service teachers}}$=3,285). Therefore, it is concluded that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy more strongly than the in-service teachers.

4.2.2. The Differences and/or Similarities between the Pre- and In-service Teachers' Perceptions of Learner Autonomy Based on Different Aspects

Table 4.28

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Decision of Course Objectives

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	2942	53,50	1402	-2,449	0,014
Pre-service teachers	68	4683	68,88			
Total	123					

It can be seen from the Table 4.28 that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in decision of course objectives (U=1402; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were examined, it was found that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=68,88) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=53,50). In sum, the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in establishing the long-term and short-term course objectives more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.29

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Decision of Course Content

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	2993	54,42	1453	-2,184	0,029
Pre-service teachers	68	4633	68,13			
Total	123					

It can be seen from the Table 4.29 that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in decision on course content (U=1453; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were examined, it was observed that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=68,13) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=54,42). The results revealed that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in establishing the topics and tasks more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.30

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Selecting Course Materials

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	2972	54,04	1432	-2,253	0,024
Pre-service teachers	68	4654	68,13			
Total	123					

Table 4.30 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in decision on selecting course materials (U=1432; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were examined, it was seen that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=68,13) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=54,04). It is concluded that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision on selecting textbooks, audio-visual materials and realia more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.31

Results of Independent Sample t-test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in the Decision of Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson

Variables	n	Mean	Sd	df	t	p
In-service teachers	55	2,842	0,959	121	-2,514	0,013
Pre-service teachers	68	3,269	0,918			
Total	123					

As seen on Table 4.31, the results of an independent sample t-test revealed the existence of a significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers (t=-2,514; p<0,05) in terms of involving learners in the decision of time, place and pace of the lesson. In this respect, when the pre- and in-service teachers' mean scores were examined, it was

found that the mean value of the pre-service teachers ($X_{\text{pre-service teachers}}$=3,269) was higher than the mean value of the in-service teachers ($X_{\text{in-service teachers}}$=2,842). Therefore, it is concluded that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in the decision of time, place and pace of the lesson more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.32

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Interaction Pattern

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	3035,5	55,19	1495,5	-1,973	0,049
Pre-service teachers	68	4590,5	67,51			
Total	123					

Table 4.32 showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in interaction pattern (U=1495,5; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were examined, it was observed that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=67,51) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=55,19). Therefore, it can be said that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision on individual, pair and group work more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.33

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Classroom Management

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	2864,5	52,08	1324,5	-2,797	0,005
Pre-service teachers	68	4761,5	70,02			
Total	123					

Table 4.33 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in classroom management (U=1324,5; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were compared, it was observed that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=70,02) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=52,08). In sum, the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision on position of desks, seating of students and discipline matters more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.34

Results of Independent Sample t-test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Record Keeping

Variables	n	Mean	Sd	df	t	p
In-service teachers	55	2,103	1,071	121	-3,437	0,001
Pre-service teachers	68	2,754	1,024			
Total	123					

As seen on Table 4.34, the results of an independent sample t-test revealed the existence of a significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers (t=-3,437; p<0,05) in terms of involving learners in record keeping. In this respect, when the pre- and in-service teachers' mean scores were compared, it was revealed that the mean of the pre-service teachers ($X_{\text{pre-service teachers}}$=2,754) was higher than the mean of the in-service teachers ($X_{\text{in-service teachers}}$=2,103). Therefore, it is concluded that the pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy in the decision of record keeping of work done, marks gained and attendance more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.35

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Homework Tasks

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	2868	52,15	1328	-2,788	0,005
Pre-service teachers	68	4758	69,97			
Total	123					

Table 4.35 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in homework tasks (U=1328; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were compared, it was observed that the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=69,97) was higher than the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=52,15). In sum, the pre-service teachers were observed to support learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision on quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks more strongly than the in-service teachers.

Table 4.36

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Teaching Focus

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	3157,50	57,41	1617,5	-1,302	0,193
Pre-service teachers	68	4468,50	65,71			
Total	123					

It can be seen from the Table 4.36 that there wasn't a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support of learner autonomy in teaching focus (U=1617,5; p>0,05). In other words, both the pre- and in-service teachers supported learner autonomy equally. As a result, they had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy in decisions on texts, audio-visual materials and realia.

Table 4.37

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Learners' Formulating Their Own Explanations

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	3217	58,49	1677	-1,097	0,273
Pre-service teachers	68	4409	64,84			
Total	123					

It can be seen from the Table 4.37 that there wasn't a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support of learner autonomy in learners' formulating their own explanations (U=1677; p>0,05). In sum, both the pre- and in-service teachers supported learner autonomy equally. As a result, they had positive attitudes towards encouraging learners to formulate their own explanations.

Table 4.38

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Learners' Finding Their Own Learning Strategies

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	3217	60,23	1772,5	-,560	0,576
Pre-service teachers	68	4409	63,43			
Total	123					

Table 4.38 revealed that there wasn't a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support of learner autonomy in learners' finding their own learning strategies (U=1772,5; p>0,05). In sum, both the pre- and in-

service teachers supported learner autonomy equally. As a result, they had positive attitudes towards encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies.

Table 4.39

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test between the Pre- and In-service Teachers on Their Support of Learner Autonomy in Self-Assessment

Variables	n	Sum of ranks	Mean rank	U	Z	p
In-service teachers	55	3808	69,24	1472	-2,085	0,037
Pre-service teachers	68	3818	56,15			
Total	123					

Finally, Table 4.39 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and in-service teachers in terms of their support for learner autonomy in self-assessment (U=1472; p<0,05). When the pre- and in-service teachers' mean ranks were compared, it was observed that the mean rank of the in-service teachers (=69,24) was higher than the mean rank of the pre-service teachers (=56,15). In sum, the in-service teachers supported learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in decision on quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks more strongly than the pre-service teachers.

4.3. Analysis of the Views for the Research Question 3

The third research question of the study focuses on the pre- and in-service teachers' views on learner autonomy reflected in the comment parts of the questionnaire. These comments were gathered by asking the participants to write their reasons for their choices in the questionnaire under the title of 'comment' for each main item of language teaching and learning in terms of learner autonomy. To analyze the pre- and in-service teachers' answers, emerging patterns and themes from their comments for each item were noted down and relevant responses for these patterns and themes were presented in this section.

4.3.1. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in Establishing the Objectives of a Course of Study

The statistical data showed that both of the participating groups, namely, the pre- (see Table 4.2) and in-service teachers (see Table 4.15) had positive attitudes towards learners' involvement in establishing the objectives of a course of study. Here are some of the remarkable comments which all these groups agreed on: In terms of learner involvement in establishing the long term course objectives, the pre-service teachers stated that by this way learners would feel they were important and had a say, which would raise their motivation and interest. The in-service teachers reported that learners' participation

would also help learners become aware of why they were doing the tasks or learning the language which would result in an effective teaching-learning environment. The resisting minority of the in-service teachers converged on the issue that learners weren't knowledgeable enough to have a say in such an important area which requires a professional touch.

When it comes to learners' participation in establishing the short term course objectives, both the pre- and in-service teachers agreed that this would make learners more conscious, which would lead them to express their needs, weaknesses and strengths. In addition to this, the in-service teachers stated that this would shed light to teachers on the syllabus design, and as a result it would increase learners' motivation and effective learning. The reason why a minority of the in-service teachers showed resistance to learners' participation in establishing the short term course objectives is similar to the ones stated for the long term course objectives, namely, they put emphasis on the issue of learners' insufficiency and lack of experience.

4.3.2. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions of the Course Content

SPSS results showed that the pre- (see Table 4.3) and in-service teachers (see Table 4.16) were in support of the learner involvement in the decisions of the course content. the in-service teachers expressed their support for learner involvement in the decisions of the topics stating that it would help instructors analyse the needs and interests of learners better, and the pre-service teachers emphasized that it would also make the classes more enjoyable and interesting for learners increasing the motivation and participation. On the other hand, the in-service teachers who were against learner involvement in the decisions of the topics expressed their rejection stating that learners weren't competent enough to choose the suitable topics, and asking them to decide on topics would lead to a chaos because of the huge amount of individual differences between learners.

In terms of the learner involvement in the decisions of the tasks, both the pre- and in-service teachers agreed with the idea that learners would choose the tasks which were enjoyable because they had the freedom of adding what they wanted and which they needed to learn better. Of course all these contribute to the increase of motivation and learning effectiveness. However, several in-service teachers disagreed with learner involvement in the decisions of tasks and their reasons were similar to the ones stated for

learner involvement in the decisions of the topics. They laid stress on the issue that learners weren't as professional as the instructors to decide on the tasks which suited them most, and this was the duty of the instructors.

4.3.3. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in Selecting Materials

In support of the quantitative data (see Table 4.4 and Table 4.17), participating groups made comments which were in favour of learner involvement in selecting materials. For this section both of the supporting pre- and in-service teachers agreed on the same issues for the sub items, namely selecting coursebooks, selecting audio-visual aids, and selecting realia. They expressed their support for learner involvement in selecting these three types of materials emphasizing that it was the learners who would use them, and their involvement would strengthen their motivation, involvement and interest for the classes. The resisting minority of in-service teachers stated that they were unsure about the learners' lack of professional knowledge to select coursebooks, audio-visual aids or realia, and so they thought it was the duty of the instructors.

4.3.4. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions on the Time, Place and Pace of the Lesson

The statistical data showed that all the participating groups, namely the pre- (see Table 4.5) and in-service teachers (see Table 4.18) had positive attitudes towards learners' involvement in the decision on the time of the lesson. The pre-service teachers declared that it was the learners who knew the best at what time or in which order they could learn courses better, and the in-service teachers added that this would ensure an increase in productivity and motivation. On the other hand, the participating pre- and in-service teachers who were against this idea depicted their hesitations explaining that such an involvement would cause some discipline problems.

In terms of the learners' involvement in the decision on the place of the lesson, the majority of both the pre- and in-service teachers was in favour of the idea that for a student-centered learning environment learners knew best where they could learn better or concentrate better. In addition to this, the pre-service teachers drew attention to the point that letting them participate in the decision on the place of the lesson would make them more motivated and eager with the sense of belonging. However, few of the in-service teachers showed resistance to this by stating that learners would misuse these given rights or that may lead to a chaos because of the variety of suggestions given by the learners.

On the issue of learners' involvement in the decision on the pace of the lesson, the majority of the pre- and in-service teachers stated that learners were one of the indispensable part of this decision process, believing that the notion of pace took shape according the learner group and their individual differences. The in-service teachers emphasized that the pace of the lesson should be in accordance with the learners' learning pace to achieve an effective and productive course. However, the reason why some of the in-service teachers stood against this idea was about the external factors such as the curriculum or the schedule to be followed designated by the administration.

4.3.5. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions on the Interaction Pattern

SPSS results showed that the pre- (see Table 4.6) and in-service teachers (see Table 4.19) were in support of the learner involvement in the decisions on the interaction pattern. For this section a great majority of the pre- and in-service teachers agreed on the same issues for the sub-items of interaction pattern, namely learner involvement in the decisions on individual work, decisions on pair work and decisions on group work. Here are some of the outstanding comments which all these groups focused on. The pre-service teachers expressed that learners were the source to understand in which way they learn best or in which type of activity they feel more comfortable. The in-service teachers pointed out that while choosing the types of activities as an interaction pattern, instructors should bear in mind the individual differences, which was impossible to know without involving learners in the decisions on individual work, pair work and group work. The pre- and in-service teachers also said by that way, learners would feel more comfortable and eager to participate in the tasks with a high motivation. The in-service teachers who were against the learner involvement in such issues explained their reasons stating that learners would abuse this by choosing the easiest way for them without considering the educational benefits and such choices beyond their knowledge.

4.3.6. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions on Classroom Management

In support of the quantitative data (see Table 4.7 and Table 4.20), both of the participating groups made comments which were in favour of learner involvement in the decisions on classroom management which includes learner involvement in the decisions on position of desks, seating of learners and discipline matters. On the subject of learner

involvement in the decisions on position of desks, the pre- and in-service teachers supported the idea that learners would learn better in a relaxing and comfortable atmosphere, which was only possible by including the learners and their suggestions into the process. On the other hand, some pre-service teachers rejected such involvement emphasizing that position of desks should be changed according to the activity types, which means activities should determine this. Another problem stated by the in-service teachers was the learners' possible misuse of this autonomy during exams.

With respect to the learner involvement in the decisions on seating of learners, the majority of the pre- and in-service teachers were in support of the learner involvement. Participants' views for this item were generally similar to the ones stated for the learner involvement in the decisions on position of desks. The pre-service teachers emphasized that it was the learners to decide, the place where they can see better or feel more comfortable, and the in-service teachers stated that it was also the learners to decide the person to sit with for a comfortable and relaxing learning atmosphere. However, the rejecting minority of the pre- and in-service teachers expressed that this autonomy may hinder learners' socializing with the other learners and causes some problems for exercises requiring a partner change.

In terms of the learner involvement in the decisions on discipline matters, the majority of the pre-service teachers supported this idea stating that if learners participate in the decision of the discipline matters, they would be more aware about what they should do or should not do and tend to obey the rules decided together. On the contrary, few of the pre- and in-service teachers didn't agree with the ideas and they gave similar reasons to the ones stated for the previous items. The in-service teachers explained that learners would misuse this autonomy and discipline problems may occur leading to a chaos.

4.3.7. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions about Record Keeping

SPSS results (see Table 4.8 and Table 4.21) showed that for this aspect of learner autonomy, the learner involvement in the decisions about record keeping, there was a split between the participant groups in attitudes towards the sub items, namely learner involvement in the decisions about the work done, the marks gained and attendance. While the pre-service teachers were in support of learner involvement in all these items except attendance, a great majority of the in-service teachers showed resistance against these

items. On the other hand, the participants' reasons for the sub-items were more or less the same. Here are some of the outstanding comments which all these groups agreed on in terms of learner involvement in the decisions about the work done, the marks gained and attendance: The majority of the pre-service teachers and a minority of the in-service teachers showed their support stating that this was one of the most important points to help learners be autonomous and gain an insight of their responsibilities. The pre-service teachers added that by this way students' level of motivation would rise stating that learners would be more conscious about learning process and they would be aware of their deficiencies or proficiencies. However, a great majority of the in-service teachers and a minority of the pre-service teachers argued against this involvement. The in-service teachers pointed out that learners aren't trustworthy enough, and as a result they would misuse their autonomy. In addition to this, the in-service teachers feel that these issues require tremendous responsibility which learners can't possess.

4.3.8. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions on Homework Tasks

In support of the quantitative data (see Table 4.9 and Table 4.22), a great majority of both participating groups made comments which were in favour of learner involvement in the decisions on homework tasks, which allows learners to be involved in the decisions on the quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks. In terms of learner involvement in the decisions on the quantity of homework tasks, both the pre- and in-service teachers drew attention to the point that this concerns learners more because they were the ones who knew their capacity and how much homework they can do. In addition to this, the pre-service teachers stated that instructors may fail to notice the learners' load of assignments or tasks from different classes unless they consult learners and involve them in the decisions on quantity. Therefore, this involvement would result in a reduction on the stress level of learners and an increase on the productivity and willingness of learners. However, a minority of the in-service teachers rejected this involvement pointing out that learners didn't have enough knowledge to be able to decide on the quantity and they would misuse this situation choosing less work because they would want more free time for themselves.

On the subject of learner involvement in the decisions on the type of homework tasks, the majority of the pre- and in-service teachers highlighted the point that instructors should assign homework tasks being aware of the individual differences to increase the

success and efficacy level of learners. The pre-service teachers showed their support explaining that instructors may not recognize each learner's field of interest, and therefore, learner involvement is crucial. Thus, learners would choose the homework types they enjoy, which would lead an increase in their motivation. In addition to this, in-service teachers stated that learners would overcome the general conception of homework as a burden and would realize the reason why they do it. On the other hand, few of the participants disagreed with this point of view and their reasons of rejection were very similar to the ones stated in the quantity of homework tasks. The pre-service teachers stated that learners wouldn't be capable of giving such important decisions by taking into consideration the aims and objectives of the course. Also, the in-service teachers added that learners may abuse this autonomy choosing the easiest ways.

On the issue of learner involvement in the decisions on the frequency of homework tasks, most of the participants were in favour of it and the pre-service teachers stated that learners are actively involved in the homework process, so the frequency of them concerns them, too. The in-service teachers expressed learner involvement would hinder the overloading, overcome learners' negative attitudes and increase the motivation. However, the minority of in-service teachers stated they were afraid of learners' tendency to do little homework ignoring the educational concerns.

4.3.9. Participants' Comments on Learner Involvement in the Decisions on Teaching Focus

In support of the quantitative data (see Table 4.10 and Table 4.23), both participating groups made comments which were in favour of learner involvement in selecting materials. For this section the supporting pre- and in-service teachers positively supported the sub-items, namely selecting coursebooks, selecting audio-visual aids and selecting realia. The pre-service teachers showed their support of learner involvement in the decisions on what is to be learnt from texts pointing out that learners should be allowed to choose the texts and decide what is to be learnt from them. The in-service teachers reported that this would help learners be aware of what is useful for them and develop critical thinking. The in-service teachers who were against learner involvement in this sub-item stated that this was the duty of instructors as professionals.

In terms of learner involvement in the decisions on what is to be learnt from audio-visual materials, the majority of the pre- and in-service teachers agreed on the benefits of it

explaining that this autonomy would help learners feel more confident. In addition to this, the in-service teachers reported that by this way learners would take charge of their learning being aware of the objectives of the course related to audio-visual materials. The reason why the minority of in-service teachers showed resistance to this involvement was mainly about the learners' lack of experience.

With respect to the learner involvement in the decisions on what is to be learnt from realia, both the pre- and in-service teachers showed their support touching on the similar issues stated for the previous two items. In other words, they pointed out that with this, learners would gain a sight of critical thinking with a high level of motivation and a sense of total involvement. However, the resisting minority of pre- and in-service teachers disagreed with this involvement stating that learners would not be capable enough to identify the objectives and uses of realia as a teaching material.

4.3.10. Participants' Comments on Encouraging Learners to Formulate Their Own Explanations

SPSS results (see Table 4.11 and Table 4.24) revealed that none of the participating groups showed resistance to learner encouragement to formulate their own explanations except for only one in-service teacher. They all agreed that learners need to be directed and supported to discover their own way of building explanations, which is one of the main steps of being autonomous in any field. By this way, they would discover themselves, their own way of understanding and analyzing the information and as a result, they would learn how to take the responsibility for their own learning.

4.3.11. Participants' Comments on Encouraging Learners to Find Their Own Learning Strategies

The statistical data for encouraging learners to find their own learning strategies (see Table 4.12 and Table 4.25) showed similarity with the result of the previous item. All the participants but one in-service teacher were positive about this encouragement. All the participants drew attention to the individual differences which is in parallel with different learning styles. They stated that the existence of different learning styles requires learners to discover their own strategies. They pointed out that at this stage instructors should be a guide and direct learners to find their way of learning, which would enable learners to be active and independent out of the class. The participants also believed that this guidance and encouragement would increase motivation, creative thinking and productivity.

4.3.12. Participants' Comments on Encouraging Learners for Self-assessment

The statistical data (see Table 4.13 and Table 4.26) showed that both of the participating groups, namely the pre- and in-service teachers, had positive attitudes towards encouraging learners for self-assessment. Participants evaluated this aspect of learning under four sub items, namely encouragement for weekly self-assessment, monthly self-assessment, termly self-assessment and annually self-assessment. In terms of the encouragement of weekly self-assessment, the participants showed their support stating that it would be easy to identify the missing points or the deficiencies for instructors before it was too late with a chance of compensation, and this would enable them to design their teaching process on a safer ground. On the other hand, the main reason why the minority of the participants showed resistance was that a week was too short as a time period for learners to assess and determine the changes.

On the subject of the encouragement of monthly self-assessment, the issue which most of the participants focused on was that this duration was ideal for assessment. In other words, in this time period students can realize their current position in terms of their success level, how much they have progressed or what they need to do to overcome their deficiencies. However, some of the participants maintained a stance against this encouragement referring to learners' lack of profession.

On the issue of the encouragement of termly self-assessment, the participants showed their support. They explained that it was a good chance for learners to stop and have a look at what they did, what they needed to do or whether they were following the true path for themselves. On the contrary, a resisting minority of in-service teachers disagreed providing similar reasons to the ones stated for the previous sub-item.

In terms of the encouragement of annually self-assessment, participants gave support underlining the issue that this would raise learners' awareness about their learning process in the long run. The resisting minority of in-service teachers, on the other hand, offered similar reasons to the ones they provided for the previous sub-items focusing on the idea that learners weren't qualified enough to decide whether they were successful or not. To them, this would end up subjective results far from the reality.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Discussion on the Results of the Study

The study aimed to find out the perceptions of third and fourth year ELT students as pre-service teachers and instructors of PAU and ADU as in-service teachers towards the notion of learner autonomy in the educational context. Twelve main teaching and learning items on learner involvement in the decisions on long term course objectives, short term course objectives; topics and tasks as course contents; course books, audio-visual materials and realia as course materials; time, place and pace of the lessons; individual work, pair work and group work as interaction patterns; position of desks, seating of students and discipline matters as classroom management; work done, marks gained and attendance as record keeping; quantity, type and frequency of homework tasks; texts, audio-visual materials and realia as teaching focus; encouragement of learners to formulate their own explanations; encouragement of learners to find their own learning strategies and weekly, monthly, termly and annually self-assessment were the main foci. The overall results of the quantitative data revealed that both participant groups gave support to learner autonomy in general terms. Although both groups had positive attitudes in general terms, the pre-service teachers had a strong support of learner autonomy whereas the in-service teachers were much closer to the collaborative involvement. When compared to the results of the similar studies using the same questionnaire, it was observed that some issues supported differed from each other depending on the participating groups. In general terms, it was seen that all participant groups of the similar studies had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy. While the participating teachers of Camilleri's study (1997), the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study and Baylan's (2007) study supported learner autonomy standing for a negotiation between teachers and learners as was the case with the in-service teachers of the present study, the participating instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study, the teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the instructors of Servi's (2010) study supported learners' active involvement strongly as the pre-service teachers of the present study did.

For the first main teaching and learning item of the notion of learner autonomy, namely involving learners in establishing the course objectives of a course of study, it was revealed that the participants of all studies had positive attitudes. When inspected in detail,

except for the participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study and instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, participating teachers or instructors of the other studies showed their strong support in this issue choosing the *much* or *very much* options by a majority.

In terms of involving learners in the decision of course contents of a course of study, it was seen that the results were more or less the same with the results of the previous learner autonomy item. In addition to the participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study and instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, Baylan's (2007) study also showed support for the collaborative involvement of learners and teachers in the decisions of a course content. In other words, although the participants of all studies had positive attitudes, only the participating instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study, the teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the instructors of Servi's (2010) study including the participating the pre- and in-service teachers of the present study preferred to choose the options *much* or *very much* to show their strong support.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision of selecting materials, a difference was observed in previous studies among the sub-items of this main item, namely selecting textbooks, audio-visual materials and realia. Only the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, the teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the pre- and in-service teachers of the present study supported this issue strongly. It was also surprising that although the participating instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study and Servi's (2010) study seemed to have a strong support of learner autonomy in terms of selecting materials in general terms, they stood against the idea of involving learners in selecting textbooks. The participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study maintained a neutral stance supporting the collaborative involvement of learners and teachers. It was revealed that only the participating instructors of Baylan's (2007) study showed resistance to involving learners in selecting materials.

As for involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson, a decrease was observed in the number of groups supporting learner autonomy. In other words, only the participating teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the pre-service teachers of the present study preferred to choose the options *much* or *very much* to show their strong support. The groups supporting a negotiation between teachers and learners were the participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study, the instructors of Baylan's (2007) study and the in-service teachers of the present study. The participating instructors

of Özdere's (2005) study, the instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study and the instructors of Servi's (2010) study resisted against learner autonomy in terms of involving learners in the decision on the time, place and pace of the lesson in general terms. On the other hand, when analyzed item by item it was noteworthy that the participating instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study and Servi's (2010) study had positive attitudes towards learners' participation to the decision on the pace of the lesson.

In terms of involving learners in the decision on interaction pattern, it was seen that the results were the same with the results of the second main item of the learner autonomy questionnaire in the present study, namely involving learners in the decision of course contents. The participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study, the instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, and Baylan's (2007) study revealed support for collaborative involvement of learners and teachers. Although the participants of all these studies had positive attidues, some of the participating groups had more positive attitudes when compared. In other words, the participating instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study, the teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the instructors of Servi's (2010) study and the participating pre- and in-service teachers of the present study preferred to choose the options *much* or *very much* to show their support.

On the issue of involving learners in the decision on classroom management, it was commonly seen that the participants of all studies had positive attitudes. When inspected in detail, except for the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) and Baylan's (2007) studies, the participating teachers or instructors of the other studies showed their strong support in this issue choosing the *much* or *very much* options by a majority. This also means that strong support outnumbered collaborative involvement in this respect.

As for involving learners in the decision on record keeping, the participating groups which supported autonomy strongly were only the participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study, the instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study and Sabancı's (2007) study. The participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, Baylan's (2007) study, Servi's (2010) study and the pre-service teachers of the present study maintained a neutral stance supporting the collaborative involvement of learners and teachers. It was also surprising that there arose a difference between the results of overall views and the results of sub-items for this aspect of learner autonomy. Although the participating instructors of Sabancı's (2007) study and Servi's (2010) study seemed to support learner autonomy in

terms of record keeping in general terms, when evaluated on sub-item basis they stood against the idea of involving learners to the process of keeping attendance. The results revealed that it was only the participating in-service teachers of the present study who showed resistance to involving learners in record keeping in general terms.

In terms of involving learners on the decisions on homework tasks, except the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study, the participating teachers and the instructors of the other similar studies supported learner autonomy. In other words, only the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study resisted against learner involvement. When inspected in detail, it was seen that the participants supporting collaborative involvement outnumbered the participants who supported autonomy strongly. This means that only the participating teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and also the pre- and in-service teachers of the present study chose the options *much* or *very much* to show their support. Among the participants taking a neutral stand on learner autonomy for this item, the participating instructors of Servi's (2010) study exhibited negative attitudes towards involving learners in the decision on frequency of homework tasks but when evaluated on sub-item basis they were also observed to support learner autonomy in terms of homework tasks in general terms.

As for involving learners in the decision on teaching focus, it was revealed that the results were similar with the results of the previous learner autonomy sub-item mentioned above, namely involving learners in the decisions of homework tasks. While the participating teachers of Sabancı's (2007) study and the present study showed strong support of autonomy, the majority of the remaining participant groups, namely the participating teachers of Camilleri's (1997) study, the instructors of Durmuş's (2006) study, the instructors of Baylan's (2007) study and the instructors of Servi's (2010) study showed a moderate support by choosing the option *partly*. The only group which didn't support learner autonomy and had negative attitudes towards involving learners in the decision on texts, audio-visual materials and realia was the participating instructors of Özdere's (2005) study.

When it comes to the last three main teaching and learning aspects of the notion of learner autonomy which asked participating teachers and instructors whether they should encourage learners to be involved in terms of formulating their own explanations, finding their own learning strategies and self-assessment, it was seen that all studies ended up with

the same result. It was revealed that the participants of all studies had positive attitudes and supported encouraging learners strongly by choosing the options *much* or *very much* by a great majority in terms of formulating their own explanations and finding their own learning strategies. However, there was an exception in the encouragement of self-assessment. Only the participating instructors of Baylan's (2007) study supported encouraging learners for self-assessment moderately. Nonetheless, it is still noteworthy that none of the participants in the relevant studies showed resistance to these sub-items but gave strong support to each sub-item of them. In the present study, the number of the participants choosing the options *little* or *not at all* was too low to be mentioned for these items. Thus, the pre- and in-service teachers supporting these three main items strongly without any hesitation outnumbered the participants supporting collaborative involvement when compared to the other main teaching and learning items of the notion of learner autonomy. It can be inferred from the results that the participating teachers or instructors of all relevant studies tended to encourage and support learners in terms of these three main items.

The studies mentioned above handled the perceptions of the participants about learner autonomy in terms of the same teaching and learning aspects as the present study did. In addition to these studies, there are some other studies which handled the issue of autonomy from different perspectives. For example, in terms of supporting the concept of learner autonomy in language learning classes, Chan's (2003) study revealed that while the participating teachers supported the concept of autonomy in outside activities or extra studies, in areas requiring decision making they kept their traditional stand. In addition to this, Chu (2004) found out that both the participating teachers and learners supported integrating it to the classes and their expectations differed in their demographic information. In Akbaş's (2011) study it was shown that the more successful and engaged the participating English language literature program students were in learning process, the more they supported learner autonomy. In Dokuz's (2009) study, the participating English language literature program students supported learner autonomy on equal terms at whatever grade they were. However, Dişlen (2010) revealed that participating ELT program students' support of autonomy differed depending on their grades and it was found that second and fourth year students supported autonomy strongly stating that psychological well-being was an important factor to be positive about it. Participating

teachers of Dişlen's (2010) study supported learner autonomy strongly, as well. Yıldırım (2005) revealed that the ELT students had positive attitudes towards learners' being autonomous in language learning process. It is clear that learner autonomy was welcomed by most of the participating teachers and learners in studies.

As learner autonomy is a well-accepted concept, the issue of fostering autonomy gained importance and researchers dealt with this issue from various aspects. For instance, participating adult ESL learners of Cotteral's (1995) study expressed that learner beliefs played an important role to foster autonomy, and a collaboration of teachers and learners are crucial. The results of Vanijdee's (2003) study revealed that the learners' educational environment was also an important factor in terms of the applicability of learner autonomy. Vanijdee (2003) found out that most of the participating distance learners of an ESL course had difficulty in applying learner autonomy in their learning process. In addition to the results of Vanijdee's (2003) study, Karabıyık (2008) emphasized the importance of culture factor in learning to promote and apply autonomy, and in her study the results revealed that students' culture of learning which they gained at high school had a strong effect on their readiness level of autonomy. It was seen that the participating learners with a teacher-centered learning background had adaptation problems. On the contrary to the findings of Vanijdee's (2003) study and Karabıyık's (2008) study, some other studies suggested the possibility of applying autonomy by implementing various practices. For example, the results of Chan's (2001) study showed that applying learner autonomy to the tertiary level students was possible by providing enough learner involvement and group activities. In addition to the assistive factor of learner involvement, in her study Chuk (2003) revealed that exploratory practice was an outstanding promoter of learner autonomy by increasing both the teachers' and students' levels of awareness in different fields. The results of Yumuk's (2002) study corroborated the results of Chuk's (2003) study and Chan's (2001) study in terms of the use of appropriate practices to promote autonomy, and it was revealed that internet information search-based program helped learners get used to become autonomous learners. Balçıkanlı (2006), proved how effective the design of classroom activities were to foster autonomy in his study applying learner autonomy-oriented activities to prep-class students with the result of an increase in students' internalizing autonomy. In this respect, Ok (2016) revealed that instructors' in-class and out-of-class expectations of teacher trainees in that, instructors' chosing the relevant tasks, activities

and assignments were directly related to lead the teacher trainees to become autonomous. Among the autonomy-oriented practices, use of ELP was the most popular one which was studied and two of the researchers, namely Koyuncu (2006) and Köse (2006) studying the effect of ELP came up with the similar results in terms of the benefits of ELP implementation. In other words, in her study Koyuncu (2006) revealed that learners became autonomous and improved their self-assessment skills, and use of ELP also formed a learner-centered and learning based environment. In addition to the findings of Koyuncu's (2006) study, the results of Köse's (2006) study showed that implementation of ELP helped learners become autonomous which were clearly observed in their critical reading level. In sum, most of the researchers agreed that learner autonomy is necessary and easy to apply to the learning environment with some renovation in the current education system.

Most of the researchers touched upon the importance and necessity of learner autonomy implementation, and some of them searched how effective it was in the learning process. Kiros and Hirotsugu (2000) revealed that the academic performances of participating students, who were exposed to autonomy-oriented learning process, increased significantly. Additionally, the results of the study carried by Thomson et. al. (2001) showed that learner autonomy was crucial to improve a variety of social interaction in target and native language between learners. It is clear that use of learner autonomy helped learners improve themselves in many different areas.

In the present study, the results of the comment parts ascertained that all participating groups had positive attitudes towards learner autonomy and they were willing to give place to this notion in their contexts. On the other hand, some of the participants who chose the options *partly*, *much*, or *very much*, which statistically means they supported it, stated their reasons together with their hesitations in the comment part. This resulted in some implications which are open to discussion. And here are some of the issues standing out:

1. The participants tended to give a total support to the issues which don't require the confirmation of the administration such as classroom management, encouragement of learners to formulate their own explanations and to find their own learning strategies. Especially two of the teaching and learning aspects were supported without a question.

They were encouragement of learners to formulate their own explanations and encouragement of learners to find their own learning strategies.

2. In the case of the issues which were predetermined such as course objectives or course materials, the participants acted with hesitation. That is because these issues had already been decided or fixed in the curriculum which was established by the administration before learners started their courses. Therefore, the participants considered this as a restriction which limited learner involvement in practice.

3. Another issue which participants touched on was that Turkish education system doesn't follow an autonomous learner oriented schedule. So, learners don't have a concept in their minds about what being autonomous is or having the responsibility of their learning process. The participants suggested that in order to create such awareness in learners, we should lay the foundations from the very beginning of their education lives.

4. All the participants agreed on the issue that learning environment should be learner-centered. Additionally, letting learners be autonomous and encouraging them to be so would be the best way to achieve this. By this way learners could be more motivated and have positive attitudes towards what they are learning.

How well the participants know the notion learner autonomy, whether they are capable and knowledgeable enough to criticize or make comments is an important issue.Little (2000) touched on the subject indicating that a teacher's having a positive view on learner autonomy may not always end up with a successful teacher who is able to foster and apply this notion in his/her teaching context effectively. In this respect when inspected the reasons of why pre-service teachers supported learner autonomy more than the in-service teachers it can be inferred that pre-service teachers were more knowledgable and conscious about this issue. In addition to their high knowledge level of autonomy, pre-service teachers didn't have barriers in their minds about the external factors such as the curriculum or schedule to be followed or some restrictions of administration. However, this also means that the pre-service teachers weren't able to analyze the situation by taking into consideration all factors. The teaching practice they had once a week didn't help them consider every aspects to the core. In-service teachers, on the other hand, were more cautious because they were actively involved in teaching process, they were aware of the restrictions or deficiencies in practice. The in-service teachers can not help being realistic and telling the potential problems. This situation explains why the in-service teachers

tended to choose collaborative involvement of teachers and learners and the pre-service teachers supported learners' total involvement without hesitation. Another prominent issue to be mentioned is that the pre-service teachers' still being in the status of a learner. So, it is difficult to understand from which perspective the pre-service teachers evaluated the issues, whether from a teacher's or a learner's. This affects the results as well. It can be interpreted that the in-service teachers' positive attitudes towards autonomy was because the less experienced instructors outnumbered the instructors who graduated 15 or more years ago. In other words, instructors who were trained with new methods were more welcoming to the innovations. This set forth the necessity of teacher training on learner autonomy in which teachers themselves should grasp the importance of autonomy and learn how to be autonomous.

5.2. Suggestions

The present study was administered to the instructors working at ADU School of Foreign Languages, instructors working at PAU School of Foreign Languages, third and fourth year students of English Language Program at PAU as prospective teachers to investigate their attitudes towards learner autonomy. Learners at School of Foreign Languages and also the administrators in such institutions can participate in further studies so that we can find out their perceptions of learner autonomy, which will enable us to identify the prerequisites and necessities to foster the notion of learner autonomy at state-supported provincial universities. In addition to this, instructors' ways of teaching can be observed and they can be interviewed to reveal the links between what they know about learner autonomy and how they enhance this notion in their actual teaching. This would also help us identify the type of professional training that instructors/teachers need. Additionally, the results of the current study implied that there was a necessity to adapt teaching techniques, methods, and materials in the current education system to apply learner autonomy in courses more effectively. Some in-service teachers stated that the fixed curriculum or some fixed materials to be used in class are decided by the Ministry of Education or the administration, which limits their chances of integrating or enhancing learner autonomy in real teaching. So, what sounds ideal in theory cannot be put into practice in the real teaching contexts of teachers.

In the present study, the perception of autonomy was handled in terms of participants' being pre-service teachers or in-service teachers. However, this may not be

the only factor which affected their perceptions. For example, gender or knowledge level of autonomy may affect participants' perceptions. It is important to state that in-service teachers also varied in terms of their level of education, their major field, the university they taught and teaching experience they had. In addition to this, pre-service teachers were different from each other in terms of their grade, their age and the type of school they had teaching practice. All these variables are noteworthy to handle while searching the differences or similarities between the participants in terms of their autonomy perception. Thus, in further studies all these factors can be taken into consideration to reach more sound results.

A further study to investigate teaching techniques and methods, and materials to promote learner autonomy in the curriculum in accordance with the needs of Turkish EFL students might be beneficial. Similarly, there is a need for a study on how to integrate teaching techniques and methods to promote learner autonomy into existing curricula of universities. This is in line with the concept of "exploratory practice" (Chuk, 2003) needed in educational contexts so that learners can be more aware of their potential as autonomous learners.

Because professional development for administrators and teachers is crucial for the promotion of learner autonomy, such research would help us understand what kind of professional training is necessary. In addition, case studies of instructors applying techniques and methods to promote learner autonomy might be beneficial. 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, and also pre- and post-treatment questionnaires might provide detailed information concerning the advantages and challenges of the promotion of learner autonomy in specific teaching and learning contexts.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, F. (1993). *The making of modern Turkey*. London: Routledge.

Akbaş, R. (2011). *An investigation into the relationships between learner autonomy, language engagement and academic achievement.* Unpublished master's thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.

Balçıkanlı, C. (2006). *Promoting learner autonomy through activities at Gazi University Preparatory School.* Unpublished MA thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

Bayat, Ö. (2011). The effects of out-of-class use of English on autonomy perception. In D. Gardner (Ed.), *Fostering autonomy in language learning* (pp. 107-114). Gaziantep: Zirve University. Retrieved on May 12, 2013 from http://ilac2010.zirve.edu.tr

Baylan, S. (2007).*University students' and their teachers' perceptions and expectations of learner autonomy in EFL prep classes.* Unpublished MA thesis, T.C. Marmara University, İstanbul.

Benson, P. (2006). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, *40*, 21-40.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (Eds.).(1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning.* London: Longman.

Brajcich, J. (2000). Encouraging learner autonomy in your classes. *The Language Teacher Online, 24* (3)*,* retrieved on May 13, 2013 from http://jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/articles/2000/03/brajcich

Breen, M. P., & Mann, S. (1997). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.132-149). London, UK: Longman.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (2001). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

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.

Camilleri, G. (1999). *Introducing learner autonomy in teacher education*. Council of Europe.

Carr, P. (1999). *The measurement of resourcefulness intentions in the adult autonomous learner.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Graduate School of Education and Human Development of the George Washington University, Washington.

Chamot, A.U. (1998). The cognitive academic language learning approach in the foreign language classroom. *The NCLRC Language Resource.* Retrieved on March 18, 2013 from http://www.nclrc.org/caidlr22.htm

Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us?. *Teaching in higher education*, *6*(4), 505-518.

Chan, V. (2003). Autonomous language learning: The teachers' perspectives. *Teaching in higher education*, *8*(1), 33-54.

Chu, M. (2004). *College students' and their teachers' perceptions and expectations of learner autonomy in EFL conversation classrooms in Taiwan.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The College of Graduate Studies of Texas A & M University.

Chuk, J. Y. P. (2003). *Promoting learner autonomy in the EFL classroom: Exploratory practice way.* Paper presented at Independent Learning Association, Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference, September, 2003 at The University of Melbourne. Retrieved on March 14, 2013 from www.independentlearning.org/ila03/ila03_chuk.pdf

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* NY: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Arnold.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for autonomy. *ELT Journal, 49*(3)*, 219-227.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System, 23*(2)*, 195-205.

Cotterall, S. (2000).Promoting learner autonomy through curriculum: Principles for designing in language courses. *ELT Journal 54*(2)*, 109-117.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice.* Dublin: Authentik.

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

Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking shop: Aspects of autonomous learning: An interview with Leslie Dickinson. *ELT Journal, 47*(4)*, 330-336.

Dişlen, G. (2010). *Students' and teachers' perceptions on the relationship between learner autonomy and the psychological well-being in the ELT context.* Unpublished master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Dişlen, G. (2011). Exploration of how students perceive autonomous learning in an EFL context. In D. Gardner (Ed.), *Fostering autonomy in language learning* (pp. 126-136). Gaziantep: Zirve University. Retrieved from http://ilac2010.zirve.edu.tr

Dokuz, Ö. (2009). *An investigation into tertiary level Turkish EFL students' awareness level of learner autonomy and their attitudes.* Unpublished master's thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.

Durmuş, A. (2006). *EFL instructors' perceptions on learner autonomy at Anadolu University.* Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Egel, P. (2003). *The impact of the European language portfolio on the learner autonomy of Turkish primary school students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskisehir.

Ellis, G. (1999). Developing metacognitive awareness- the missing dimension. *The Journal, 10.*Retrieved on July, 11, 2013, from http://www.pt.britishcouncil.org/journal/j1004ge.htm

Esch, E. (1996). Promoting learner autonomy: Criteria for the selection of appropriate methods. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 35-48). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Esch, E. (1997). Learner training for autonomous language learning. In Benson P. &Voller P. (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 164-176). London: Longman.

Fenner, A. B. &Newby, D. (2000). *Approaches to materials design in European textbooks: Implementing principles of authenticity, learner autonomy, cultural awareness.* Austria: Council of Europe.

Field, J. (2007). Looking outwards, not inwards. *ELT Journal, 61*(1)*,* 30-38.

Finch, A. E. (2000). *A formative evaluation of a task-based EFL program for Korean University students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Manchester University, UK. Retrieved on November 14, 2013, from http://www.finchpark.com /arts/autonomy.htm

Fisher, D. & Moment, D. (1975). *Autonomy in organizational life.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Gardner, D. & Miller, L. (1999). *Establishing self-access: from theory to practice.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English.* Malaysia: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching.* Harlow, England : Pearson Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Huerta-Macias A. (1995). Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal, 5*(1), 8-11.

İçmez, S. (2007). Learner autonomy: What we need to foster and how. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(34), 143-152.

Jinding, P. (2002). A research on learner autonomy in College English Teaching [J]. *Foreign Language World*, *3*, 16-20.

Karabıyık, A. (2008). *The relationship between culture of learning and Turkish university preparatory students' readiness for learner autonomy*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.

Kilpatrick, W. H. (1922). *The project method: The use of the purposeful act in the educative process* (No. 3). Teachers college, Columbia university.

Kirkgoz, Y. (2005). English language teaching in Turkey: Challenges for the 21 st Century. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum, and practice* (pp. 159-175).Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English Language Teaching in Turkey Policy Changes and their Implementations. *RELC Journal*, *38*(2), 216-228.

Kojima, H. (2006). Learner Autonomy in Language Education: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Retrieved on July 18, 2013 from http://repostitory.ul.hirosaki-u.ac.jp/dspace/.../1/AN00211590_96_67.

Koyuncu, S. U. (2006). *The effect of the European language portfolio on learner autonomy for young learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.

Köse, N. (2006). *Effects of portfolio implementation and assessment on critical reading and learner autonomy of ELT students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.

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.

Küçüktepe, C., Eminoğlu Küçüktepe, S., & Baykın, Y. (2013). İkinci sınıf İngilizce dersi ve programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*, 55-78.

Little, D. (1994).*Constructing a theory of learner autonomy: Some steps along the way.* Dublin: Centre for Language and Communication Studies Trinity College.

Little, D. (1996). The politics of learner autonomy. *Learning Learning*, *2*(4), 7-10.

Little, D. (1999). Learner autonomy is more than a western cultural construct. *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change*,*8*, 11-18.

Little, D. (2000, September). We're all in it together: Exploring the interdependence of teacher and learner autonomy. In *Proceeding of the 7th Nordic Conference and Workshop on Autonomous Language Learning, Helsinki*.

Little, D. (2003). Learner autonomy and public examinations. In Little, D., Ridley, J. and Ushioda, E. (Eds), *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom. Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 223-233). Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. (2004). Democracy, discourse and learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, *13*(3), 105-126.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1(1),* 14-29.

Littlejohn, A. (1985). Learner choice in language study. *ELT Journal, 39*(4)*,* 253-261.

Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": An anatomy and a framework. *System*, *24*(4), 427-435.

Littlewood, W. (1997). Self-access: why do we want it and what can it do. In Benson, P. and Voller, P. (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.79-92). London: Longman.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied linguistics*, *20*(1), 71-94.

Miller, S. P., & Mercer, C. D. (1993). Using a graduated word problem sequence to promote problem-solving skills. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 8,* 169-174.

Motteram, G. (1998). Learner autonomy and the web. In V. Darleguy, A. Ding & M. Svensson (Eds.), *Educational technology in language learning: Theoretical considerations and practical applications* (pp. 17-24). Lyons: INSA (National Institute of Applied Sciences).

Naizhao, G., & Yanling, Z. (2004). An empirical investigation of learner autonomy in some EFL classes in China. Paper presented at the AARE 2004 Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In Benson, P. and Voller, P. (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 192-203). London: Longman.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning.* Massachusetts: Heinle &Heinle.

Ok, S. (2016). Autonomy in an EFL teacher training context: Trainee teacher perceptions of instructor expectations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(3), 65-86.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990).*Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Özdamar, K. (1999). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel analiz.* Eskisehir: Kaan Kitabevi.

Özdere, M. (2005).*State-supported provincial university English language instructors' attitudes towards learner autonomy.* Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.

Palfreyman, D. (2001). *The socio-cultural construction of learner autonomy and learner independence in a tertiary EFL institution.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Kent, Canterbury.

Jinding, P. (2002). A research on learner autonomy in College English Teaching [J]. *Foreign Language World*, *3*, 16-20.

Reinders, H. (2000). *Do It Yourself ? A Learners' Perspective on Learner Autonomy and Self-Access Language Learning.* Unpublished master's thesis, Groningen.

Rogers, Carl. (1969). *Freedom to Learn: A View of What Education Might Become*. (1st ed.) Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merill.

Sabancı, S. (2007). *EFL teachers views on learner autonomy at primary and secondary state schools in Eskişehir.* Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Sancar, I. (2001). *Learner autonomy: A profile of teacher trainees in pre-service teacher education.* Unpublished master's thesis, Uludag University, Bursa.

Scharle, A. & Szabo, A. (2005). *Learner autonomy, a guide to developing learner responsibility.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Servi, M. (2010). *The attitudes of EFL instructors towards learner autonomy and European language portfolio at Selçuk University.* Unpublished master's thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.

Sheerin, S. (1997). An exploration of the relationship between self-access and independent learning. In Benson, P. and Voller, P. (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 54-65). London: Longman.

Sim, M. S. (2007). Beliefs and autonomy: Encouraging more responsible learning. *Novitas-ROYAL*, *1*(2), 112-136.

Sinclair, B. (1999). More than an act of faith? Evaluating learner autonomy. In Kennedy, C.(Ed.), *Innovation and best practice in British ELT*, (pp. 96–107). Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.

Tanaka, K., & Yamauchi, H. (2000). Influence of autonomy on perceived control beliefs and self-regulated learning in Japanese undergraduate students. *North American Journal of Psychology, 2*(2), 255-272.

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *6*(11), 37-48.

Thomson, C. K., Masumi-So, H., & Osho, F. (2001). Meeting the challenges in language for specific purposes: The incorporation of sociolinguistics and learner autonomy into course design. *Japanese Studies*, *21*(1), 85-98.

Tok, H. (2011). Autonomous language learning: Turkish tertiary students' behaviours. In D. Gardner (Ed.), *Fostering autonomy in language learning* (pp. 137-146). Gaziantep: Zirve University. Retrieved on May 12, 2013 from http://ilac2010.zirve.edu.tr

Üstünoğlu, E. (2009). Autonomy in language learning: Do students take the responsibility for their learning? *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 5*(2), 148-169.

VanderStoep, S.W. & Pintrich, P.R. (2003). *Learning to learn: The skill and the will of college success.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vanijdee, A. (2003). Thai distance English learners and learner autonomy. *Open Learning*, *18*(1), 75-84.

Voller, P. (1997). Does the teacher have a role in autonomous language learning. In: P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 98-113). London: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall International.

Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied linguistics*, *19*(4), 515-537.

White, R. (1998). *The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation and management*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Wulff, S., Hanor, J., & Bulik, R. J. (2000). The roles and interrelationships of presence, reflection, and self-directed learning in effective world wide web-based pedagogy. In R. A. Cole (Ed.), *Issues in web-based pedagogy: A critical primer* (pp. 143-160). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Yıldırım, Ö. (2005). *ELT students' perceptions and behavior related to learner autonomy as learners and future teachers.* Unpublished master's thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Yıldırım, Ö. (2012). Understanding the concept of learner autonomy in the context of second and foreign language learning: Definitions, misconceptions, and applications. *Arab World English Journal*, *3*(2), 305-328.

Yumuk, A. S. (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.

Zhuang, J. (2010). The changing role of teachers in the development of learner autonomy—Based on a survey of "English dorm activity". *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(5), 591-595.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Learner Autonomy Questionnaire (Original Version)

Learner Autonomy: the Teachers' Views

A project supported by the
European Centre for Modern Languages
Graz, Austria

1st October 1997

Dear teacher,

We are members of a project team supported by the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, Austria. The aim of the project is to gather information on teachers' perspectives of Learner Autonomy, so that educational planners will be better informed on what teachers think about this important educational issue. For this purpose, we are distributing this questionnaire among teachers in several European countries. We would therefore like to know your views about *Learner Autonomy*, and we would like to thank you in advance for your contribution.

Kindly fill in the attached questionnaire, and return it to the co-ordinator in your home country.

Years of teaching experience:_____

Type of School: _____
[eg. Lyceum, Secondary, Vocational, State, Private, etc]

Subject/s Taught_____ Age of learners: _____

Questionnaire

✓ Tick the box of your choice

KEY

0	Not at all
1	Little
2	Partly
3	Much
4	Very much

1. How much should the learner be involved in establishing the **objectives** of a course of study?

		0	1	2	3	4
1A	short-term	0	1	2	3	4
1B	long-term	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

2. How much should the learner be involved in deciding the **course content**?

		0	1	2	3	4
2A	topics	0	1	2	3	4
2B	tasks	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

3. How much should the learner be involved in **selecting materials**?

		0	1	2	3	4
3A	textbooks	0	1	2	3	4
3B	AVA's	0	1	2	3	4
3C	Realia	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

4. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on **the time, place and pace** of the lesson?

		0	1	2	3	4
4A	Time	0	1	2	3	4
4B	Place	0	1	2	3	4
4C	Pace	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

5. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on the **methodology** of the lesson?

5A	individual/pair/group work	0	1	2	3	4
5B	use of materials	0	1	2	3	4
5C	type of classroom activities	0	1	2	3	4
5D	type of homework activities	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

6. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on the choice of **learning tasks?**

0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

7. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on **classroom management**?

7A	position of desks	0	1	2	3	4
7B	seating of students	0	1	2	3	4
7C	discipline matters	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

8. How much should the learner be involved in decisions about **record-keeping**?

8A	of work done	0	1	2	3	4
8B	of marks gained	0	1	2	3	4
8C	attendance	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

9. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on **homework tasks**?

9A	quantity	0	1	2	3	4
9B	type	0	1	2	3	4
9C	frequency	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

10. How much should the learner be involved in decisions on **what is to be learned from materials** given by the teacher?

10A	texts	0	1	2	3	4	
10B	AVA's	0	1	2	3	4	
10C	Realia	0	1	2	3	4	

Comment:

11. How much should the learner be encouraged to find his or her own **explanations** to classroom tasks?

0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

12. How much should the learner be encouraged to find out **learning procedures** by himself or herself?

0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

13. How much should the learner be encouraged to **assess** himself or herself, rather than be tested?

13A	weekly	0	1	2	3	4
13B	monthly	0	1	2	3	4
13C	annually	0	1	2	3	4

Comment:

General Comments on Learner Autonomy

End of Questionnaire

Thank you for filling in the questionnaire

APPENDIX B: Learner Autonomy Questionnaire for Instructors (Turkish Version)

ÖĞRENEN ÖZERKLİĞİ (LEARNER AUTONOMY) ANKETİ

Sayın Meslektaşım,

Bu anket Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı'ndaki bir araştırma için hazırlanmıştır. Bu anket İngilizce okutmanlarının 'Öğrenen Özerkliği' konusundaki algıları konusunda bilgi toplamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Vereceğiniz cevaplar sadece ''İngilizce okutmanlarının ve öğretmen adayı olarak İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin 'Öğrenen Özerkliği (Learner Autonomy)' konusundaki algıları ve algılarının karşılaştırılması'' başlıklı araştırmada kullanılacak olmakla birlikte, isimleriniz gizli tutulacaktır ve cevaplarınız kişisel olarak değerlendirilmeyecektir.

Şimdiden ankete verdiğiniz içten cevaplar ve araştırmaya katkınızdan dolayı teşekkür eder, saygılarımı sunarım.

Okt. Gülsün POYRAZ

Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

1. **Cinsiyetiniz:**

   ☐Kadın   ☐Erkek

2. **Eğitim Düzeyiniz:**

   ☐Lisans ☐Yüksek Lisans   ☐Doktora   ☐Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____

3. **Mezun Olduğunuz Program:**

   ☐İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

   ☐İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

   ☐Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı

   ☐Mütercim Tercümanlık

   ☐Dilbilim

   ☐ Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat

   ☐Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____

4. **Öğretmenlikteki Hizmet Yılınız:**

   ☐0-5   ☐6-9   ☐10-15   ☐16-20   ☐21 ve üzeri

5. **Görev Yaptığınız Üniversite:**

   ☐Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi   ☐Pamukkale Üniversitesi

6. **'Öğrenen Özerkliği (Learner Autonomy)' hakkında ne kadar bilgi sahibisiniz?**

   ☐Hiçbir fikrim yok.

   ☐Böyle bir terimin olduğunu biliyorum ama çok fazla bilgim yok.

   ☐İlgili kaynakları okuyarak bilgi edindim.

   ☐Bu konuyla ilgili araştırma yaptım.

   ☐ Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____

ÖĞRENEN ÖZERKLİĞİ (LEARNER AUTONOMY) ANKETİ

Anketin bu bölümünde öğrenen özerkliği konusunda İngilizce okutmanlarının görüşlerini belirlemeyi amaçlayan maddeler yer almaktadır. Her bir maddeye ilişkin kendi görüşünüzü yansıtan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

Öğrenciler;	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
1-a) Yıllık plan amaçlarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1-b) Günlük plan amaçlarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

1)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
2-a) Konuların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2-b) Aktivitelerin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
3-a) Ders kitaplarının seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3-b) İşitsel ve görsel materyallerin seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3-c) Gerçek nesnelerin (realias) seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli

Öğrenciler;

4-a) Dersin zamanının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

4-b) Dersin yerinin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

4-c) Dersin hızının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

4)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

5-a) Bireysel çalışmaların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

5-b) İkili çalışmaların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

5-c) Grup çalışmalarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

5)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

6-a) Sıraların yerleştirilmesi ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

6-b) Oturma düzeni ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

6-c) Disiplin kuralları ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? □ □ □ □ □

6)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli

Öğrenciler;

7-a) Ödevlerin kontrolü ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-b) Sınav notlarının kaydı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-c) Yoklama ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

8-a) Ev ödevlerinin miktarı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8-b) Ev ödevlerinin türü ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8-c) Ev ödevlerinin sıklığı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

9-a) Verilen yazılı materyallerden ne öğrenileceğinin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9-b) Verilen görsel ve işitsel materyallerden ne öğrenileceğinin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9-c) Verilen gerçek nesnelerden (realias) ne öğrenileceğinin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli

Öğrenciler;

10- Sınıf aktivitelerinin amaçlarını anlayıp anlamadıklarını açıklamaları için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

10)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

11- Kendi öğrenme yöntemlerini belirlemeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

12-a) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini haftada bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-b) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini ayda bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-c) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini dönemde bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-d) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini yılda bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

APPENDIX C: Learner Autonomy Questionnaire for Prospective Teachers (Turkish Version)

ÖĞRENEN ÖZERKLİĞİ (LEARNER AUTONOMY) ANKETİ

Sevgili öğretmen adayları,

Bu anket Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı'ndaki bir araştırma için hazırlanmıştır. Bu anket İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının 'Öğrenen Özerkliği' konusundaki algıları konusunda bilgi toplamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Vereceğiniz cevaplar sadece ''İngilizce okutmanlarının ve öğretmen adayı olarak İngilizce öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin 'Öğrenen Özerkliği (Learner Autonomy)' konusundaki algıları ve algılarının karşılaştırılması'' başlıklı araştırmada kullanılacak olmakla birlikte, isimleriniz gizli tutulacaktır ve cevaplarınız kişisel olarak değerlendirilmeyecektir.

Şimdiden ankete verdiğiniz içten cevaplar ve araştırmaya katkınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Okt. Gülsün POYRAZ

Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

1. Cinsiyetiniz:

☐ Kadın   ☐ Erkek

2. Yaşınız:

☐ 19   ☐ 20   ☐ 21   ☐ 22   ☐ 23 ve üzeri

3. Eğitim aldığınız sınıf:

☐ 3. Sınıf ☐ 4. Sınıf

4. Staj yaptığınız okul türü:

☐ İlköğretim okulu   ☐ Ortaöğretim okulu (Lise)

5. 'Öğrenen Özerkliği (Learner Autonomy)' hakkında ne kadar bilgi sahibisiniz?

☐ Hiçbir fikrim yok.

☐ Böyle bir terimin olduğunu biliyorum ama çok fazla bilgim yok.

☐ İlgili kaynakları okuyarak bilgi edindim.

☐ Bu konuyla ilgili araştırma yaptım.

☐ Diğer (Belirtiniz) _____

ÖĞRENEN ÖZERKLİĞİ (LEARNER AUTONOMY) ANKETİ

Anketin bu bölümünde öğrenen özerkliği konusunda İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının görüşlerini belirlemeyi amaçlayan maddeler yer almaktadır. Her bir maddeye ilişkin kendi görüşünüzü yansıtan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

Öğrenciler;	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
1-a) Yıllık plan amaçlarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1-b) Günlük plan amaçlarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

1)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
2-a) Konuların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2-b) Aktivitelerin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
3-a) Ders kitaplarının seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3-b) İşitsel ve görsel materyallerin seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3-c) Gerçek nesnelerin (realias) seçimine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

Öğrenciler;	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
4-a) Dersin zamanının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4-b) Dersin yerinin belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4-c) Dersin hızının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
5-a) Bireysel çalışmaların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5-b) İkili çalışmaların belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5-c) Grup çalışmalarının belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli
6-a) Sıraların yerleştirilmesi ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6-b) Oturma düzeni ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6-c) Disiplin kuralları ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli

Öğrenciler;

7-a) Ödevlerin kontrolü ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-b) Sınav notlarının kaydı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-c) Yoklama ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

8-a) Ev ödevlerinin miktarı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8-b) Ev ödevlerinin türü ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8-c) Ev ödevlerinin sıklığı ile ilgili kararlara ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

9-a) Verilen yazılı materyallerden ne öğrenileceğinin belirlenmesine
ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9-b) Verilen görsel ve işitsel materyallerden ne öğrenileceğinin
belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9-c) Verilen gerçek nesnelerden (realias) ne öğrenileceğinin
belirlenmesine ne ölçüde dahil edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

	Hiç Dahil Edilmemeli	Az Dahil Edilmeli	Kısmen Dahil Edilmeli	Çoğunlukla Dahil Edilmeli	Tamamen Dahil Edilmeli

Öğrenciler;

10- Sınıf aktivitelerinin amaçlarını anlayıp anlamadıklarını açıklamaları için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

10)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

11- Kendi öğrenme yöntemlerini belirlemeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

12-a) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini haftada bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-b) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini ayda bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-c) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini dönemde bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12-d) Sınıf içi sınavlara ek olarak, öğrenme gelişim süreçlerini yılda bir değerlendirmeleri için ne ölçüde teşvik edilmeli? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12)Yorum:_____
_____
_____
_____

CV

Personal Information	
Name	Gülsün
Surname	SOFRACI
Birth Date and Place	29 June 1987 / Beyşehir
Nationality	Turkish
Address and e-mail Address	Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Büro 2, Aydın gulsunpoyraz@hotmail.com
Educational Background	
Primary School	Gazi İlköğretim Okulu
High School	Beyşehir Yabancı Dil Ağırlıklı Lisesi
University (Undergraduate)	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
University (Masters Degree)	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Foreign Languages	
English – YDS – March 2016	91.25
Professional Background	
October 2009 – Ongoing	Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi