REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

A STUDY ON COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING AND THE
DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNER AUTONOMY

THESIS BY

SEDA ZONTURLU

SUPERVISOR

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN, JANUARY 2014

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that thesis under the title of "**A STUDY ON COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNER AUTONOMY**" is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Teaching**.

....

Supervisor- Head of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

....

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

....

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN

I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

....

17 / 01 / 2014

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ÖZET

BİLGİSAYAR DESTEKLİ DİL ÖĞRENİMİ VE ÖĞRENCİ ÖZERKLİĞİ GELİŞİMİ

Seda Zonturlu

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

Ocak 2014, 86 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı öğrencilerin özerklik gelişimi algıları hakkında iç görü kazanmak ve öğrencilerin Bilgisayar Destekli Dil Öğrenimi ortamında İngilizce öğrenme algılarını araştırmaktır. Öğrencilerin özerklik gelişimi hakkındaki algıları hakkında fikir sahibi olabilmek için, öğrenci özerkliğinin dört farklı alanı incelenmiştir. Bu alanlar şunlardır: (a) Öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenmeye ilişkin motivasyon düzeyleri, (b) Öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenmede biliş üstü stratejilerin kullanımı, (c) Öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenmede kendilerine ve öğretmenlerine yükledikleri sorumluluk anlayışları, (d) Öğrencilerin sınıf dışı faaliyetlerindeki İngilizce uygulamaları.

Yukarıda belirtilen hedeflere ulaşmak için, bir anket, yüz yüze yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, kullanılarak nitel ve nicel veri toplanmıştır. Anket ile toplanan veri nicel analiz tekniğine ve görüşmelerden toplanan veri ise nitel analiz tekniğine tabi tutulmuştur.

Bulgular öğrencilerin çoğunluğunun yüksek bir motivasyona sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, sonuçlar öğrencilerin kendi kendilerini gözlem ve değerlendirme yoluyla birtakım stratejileri kullanma eğiliminde olduklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Diğer taraftan, öğrencilerin çoğunun öğrenme sürecindeki işlerin pek çoğundan öğretmenlerini sorumlu tuttuğu ve İngilizcelerini geliştirmek için sınıf dışı aktivitelere çok az zaman ayırdıkları saptanmıştır. Çalışma boyunca, öğrencilerin motivasyonlarını artırabilmeleri, dil öğrenme tekniklerini kullanabilmeleri, kendi

öğrenmelerinin sorumluluğunu alabilmeleri ve sınıf dışı aktivitelere katılabilmeleri için Bilgisayar Destekli Dil Öğrenimi derslerine katılmaları desteklenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bilgisayar Destekli Dil Öğrenimi, Öğrenci özerkliği.

ABSTRACT

A STUDY ON COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNER AUTONOMY

Seda Zonturlu

Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

January 2014, 86 Pages

The purpose of this study is to gain insights into students' perception of learner autonomy development and to explore learners' perceptions of learning English within a CALL environment. In order to gain insights about the students' perceptions of learner autonomy development, four areas of learner autonomy were examined. These areas were as follows: (a) Learners' motivation level in learning English, (b) Learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English, (c) Learners' responsibility perception of their own and their teachers' in learning English and (d) Learners' practice of English in the outside class activities.

In order to reach the goals mentioned above, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected by the help of questionnaires, semi-structured face-to-face interviews. The data collected from the questionnaire were subjected to descriptive analysis and the data collected from interviews were subjected to content analysis.

The findings indicated that the majority of the students had a high motivation. Also, the results showed that most of them tended to use some metacognitive strategies like self-monitoring and self-evaluation. On the other hand, the findings revealed that most of the students considered the teacher as more responsible for most of the tasks during their own learning process, and tended to spend a little time for outside activities to improve their English. During the study, the students were encouraged to take an active involvement to the CALL classes to increase their motivation, use language learning strategies, take responsibility for their own learning and engage in outside class activities.

Keywords: Computer assisted language learning, Learner autonomy.

ABBREVIATIONS

CALL : Computer Assisted Language Learning

CAI **:** Computer Assisted Instruction

CBI **:** Computer-Based Instruction

CLT **:** Communicative Language Teaching

ELT **:** English Language Teaching

EFL **:** English as a Foreign Language

ESL **:** English as a Second Language

SPSS **:** Statistical Package for Social Sciences

WWW: World Wide Web

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, and significance of the problem and definition of the terms used in the research.

1.1. Background of the Study

The field of English Language Teaching has encountered with many innovations over the last twenty years (Brandl, 2008). Among these changes, a great emphasis has been put on the role of the learners. In that sense, the language teachers started to take the learners' needs, strategies and styles into consideration by putting them at the center of classroom organization (Henson, 2003). In contrast to the traditional language teaching, this new view resulted in the emergence of the concept of learner-centered rather than teacher-centered education. Learner-centered education is defined as a collaborative effort between teachers and learners, and it differs from traditional language teaching in which the teachers transfer some set of the rules to the students (Nunan, 1988).

The learner-centered teaching process gained importance with the introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Nunan, 1988). CLT has become widespread in English language teaching since its emergence in the 1970s. It has also been implemented quickly in both ESL and EFL contexts. The national language education policies have increased CLT use since 1990, in order to increase the numbers of learners who can effectively communicate in English (Littlewood, 2007). Communicative language teaching emphasizes the fact "learners must learn not only to make grammatically correct, propositional statements about the experiential world, but must also develop the ability to use language to get things done" (Nunan, 1988, p. 25). The emerging of this new and innovative approach declared a goal for the communicative competence which is a general ability to use language in everyday situations (Littlewood, 1981). As a result, cooperative and collaborative teaching that is closely linked to the learner-centered approach has

gained importance. Crandall (1999) defines cooperative teaching as a social interaction and negotiation of meaning among group members who are involved in-group activities requiring all group members to try to contribute and learn from others.

Most importantly, this outstanding changeover towards learner-centeredness has led to the emergence of the concept of learner autonomy, which has significant contributions to the development of learner-centered education in language classrooms. However, to put the learners at the center of the language process, communicative language teaching, learner-centeredness and autonomy are utilized. Most educators agree that autonomy should be taken as a desirable educational goal in order for students to master the new language (Sinclair & Ellis 1985; Dickinson 1987). In this respect, there are many conceptions proposed, and many educators have tried to define and explain learner autonomy. Holec (1981) defines it as the 'ability to take charge of one's own learning' (p.3). Little (1991) also defines learner autonomy as well as the learners' psychological relation to the process and content of learning, a capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making and independent action. In addition, Littlewood (1981) defines it as learners' ability and willingness to make choices independently.

Learner autonomy is related to the other concepts such as self-regulated learning, self-directed learning, and self-access resource centers. According to Cole & Chan (1994), these terms are all related enabling students to learn how to think, learn, and take control of their learning (cited in Koçak, 2003).

According to the concept of learner autonomy learners become active participants who accept responsibility for their own learning. In this respect, this change of responsibility requires some changes in teachers' roles (Carver 1982; Littlejohn 1985, p.595; Dickinson 1987; Hunt, Gow & Barnes 1989; Kelly 1996). First of all, they are no more suppliers of information, but they act as counselors raising learners' awareness of learning and language, and as facilitators motivating learners and helping them to acquire the skills and knowledge needed for autonomous learning (Benson and Voller, 1997).

Beyond the responsibility change, motivation is one of the most important elements to become autonomous in the learning process. According to Ushioda (1996), autonomous learners are motivated learners. Spratt, Humphreys & Chan (2002) emphasized the role of motivation in enhancing autonomous learning. They claimed motivation influence learners' readiness for autonomy; therefore, teachers should focus on motivation before training their students to be more autonomous.

Awareness of independent learning outside the classroom is another significant gain of learner autonomy (Cotterall, 1995; Little, 1991). In this respect, learners are responsible for finding the opportunities and activities they can use to learn the target language outside the classroom. It is critical for learners to take advantage of as many opportunities as they can to learn and use the target language. That is to say, these learners should be autonomous. Autonomous learners are those who seek opportunities to learn outside classroom setting and create their own instructional settings free from the teacher (Breen & Mann, 1997).

According to Field (2007), with the help of learners' independent learning outside the classroom, their learning process will continue and they will take increasing responsibility for their learning. According to Omaggio (as cited in Wenden, 1991), good language learners are the ones who are aware of their learning styles and strategies and how to adapt them for different learning conditions; know about their strengths and weaknesses; to use every opportunity to communicate in the target language. In that sense, Wenden (1991), Cotterall (1999), and White (1995) highlight the crucial role of using metacognitive strategies in autonomous learning. Autonomy refers to self-regulation in the cognitive literature which depicts the three key strategies required for self regulation as planning, monitoring and evaluating. In this respect, development of effective metacognitive strategies is essential for learners to be able to take control of their own learning; that is, knowledge about when and how to use strategies for learning or problem solving that enables independent language learning.

To sum up, developing autonomous learning is indispensable as the aim of education is to assist people with thinking, acting and learning independent in all

aspects of their lives. Therefore, to develop autonomy in language teaching requires using metacognitive and self awareness skills that can improve the learners' motivation to take control of their learning (Koçak, 2003).

Although interest in autonomy has grown considerably, teachers within the normal context of a classroom do not find opportunities to promote learner autonomy (Liu, Moore, Graham, & Lee, 2002). Holden and Usuki (1999) point out that students should be encouraged to study in an atmosphere in which they are free to express themselves, speak with and question others and contribute to the management of others all of which are not supported in traditional teacher-centered classes.

However, According to Murray (as cited in Mutlu, 2008), advancements in technology enable educators to foster learner autonomy by encouraging agency and providing learners with the tools they need in order to make decisions and take action in harmony with their personal identity.

According to Lee at al. (2005), English language teaching can become more effective with new technology by using a sense of novelty, humor and mystery, which strengthen the students' intrinsic motivation. Moreover, they claim that technology has great potential to make lessons relevant to students' experience by matching interests and connecting them to the objectives of the lessons. Finally, they state that students will be led to develop their confidence and competence by the help of available technology to take personal responsibility for their learning.

In order to become autonomous, learners need an appropriate environment where they have the opportunities to develop language-learning skills, increase their motivation, take the responsibility of their own learning and utilize the activities and materials outside the classroom. Dolan (2002) points out that technology can create such a learning environment by encouraging and fostering learner autonomy in the sense of learner differences, taking responsibility and control.

Technology including computers and the internet seems to establish the desired environment to develop learner autonomy (Chun & Plass, 2000; Warschauer

& Kern, 2000). Learners benefit from working at their own pace where and when they want to study. Besides, computers and internet increase learners' motivation towards language education in the sense that it offers learners something of their interest and brings a variety both inside and outside the classroom. Furthermore, they help learners' language learning strategies develop by offering them rich authentic language input in a social environment. Lastly, allowing students to work on their own at their own pace, computers and internet motivate learners to take responsibility for their own learning both inside and outside the classroom (Dlaska, 2002).

When English Language Education in Turkey is considered, it is a fact that the development of learner autonomy is not supported because most of the schools do not provide the appropriate environment to promote learner autonomy (Koçak, 2003). Turkey is a developing country, but it has increasing tendency to buy more computers for schools. However, almost all of the private universities have already equipped their classrooms with computers along with computer labs. Besides, some private universities donate laptops to instructors and students. Despite the investments and changing visions, the integration of technology is not at same levels of developed countries.

Although the computers and Internet are not very common at schools in Turkey, it is necessary to investigate the potential effects of technology use on learner autonomy and learners' perceptions of integration of technology both inside and outside the classroom for further implementation.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

This study intends to gain insights into students' perception of autonomy development and explore their perceptions of learning English within a CALL environment. In order to gain insights about the students' perception of development of learner autonomy, four aspects of learner autonomy are going to be examined. These are students'

- Language learning strategy use,
- Motivation
- Taking responsibility for their own learning and
- Out-of-class activity use.

All of these four aspects are regarded as indicators of learner autonomy development in related literature.

1.3. Research Questions

The general purpose of the study is to investigate the students' perceptions of CALL and the effectiveness of CALL on learner autonomy in the academic year of 2012-2013. In more detail, the present study attempted to respond to the following research questions:

1. What are Hasan Kalyoncu University Preparatory Students' perceived levels of their own autonomy development in language learning?
2. What are Hasan Kalyoncu University Preparatory Students' perceptions of the effects of computer-assisted language learning on learner autonomy development in language education?

1.4. Significance of the Study

Among the approaches that language educators have advocated the instruction of language skills, teaching a language with computers and the internet is presently the most innovative area in the practice of foreign or second language teaching and learning. Therefore, it has attracted many researchers' attention recently. Although computers and the internet have been available in language teaching and learning for little more than twenty years, there has been a dramatic change in the number of options open to language teachers and learners. Therefore, a lot of different types of studies have been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of using computers and internet while learning a language. However, most studies have focused on finding out about the students' and teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards computers and internet or their effects on the students' achievement level of understanding foreign cultural values.

It is a fact that most of the language teachers spend endless effort to make the students participate in the lessons, do their homework, cooperate with their friends, and listen to the teacher, but the teachers get little response from the students. The main reason of such behaviors is the learners' over reliance on the teacher, so the learners do not develop a sense of responsibility for their own learning. In that sense, the notion of learner autonomy becomes more of an issue which will help learners understand their roles in a language classroom. After the learners gain autonomy, they will become independent learners who are motivated to take their responsibility for their own language learning and make use of opportunities to learn outside the classroom.

With the advancing in technology, CALL has started to take a significant part in language education to foster learner autonomy. However, it is a new arena both for instructors and the learners, and there is not enough data about the effects of CALL on learner autonomy. This study provides empirical support for the identification of factors considered being crucial in the promotion of autonomy in a foreign language classrooms and helping language learners to become more autonomous by the help of CALL lessons. Thus, this study will contribute to the future implementation of CALL into language education in order to help students become more autonomous in their language learning process.

1.5. Definition of Terms

Autonomy: "Autonomy is the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (Holec, 1981; cited in Little, 1991; p.7).

Autonomous Learner: Autonomous learners are both cognitively and meta-cognitively aware of their role in the learning process, seek to create opportunities to learn, and attempt to manage their learning in and out of the classroom (Holden & Usuki, 1999).

Computer-assisted instruction (CAI): CAI is an instruction in which "the student directly interacts with instructional materials, such as drills and tutorials, presented on the computer. The student responds to these materials. The computer

evaluates the responses and directs the student to further study materials" (Mandell & Mandell, 1989, p. 46). CAI is sometimes called after computer-aided instruction (CAI) or computer-based instruction (CBI).

Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL): "The use of tutorials to present concepts, describe examples, measure performance, and present feedback to the learner, and simulations that require the learner to apply constructs to a language learning process in order to solve problems and make decisions" (Bax, 2003, p.17). Also, CALL consists of one language laboratory where learners will work alone on a computer and learn at their own pace. The teacher will not participate in the teaching/learning process, but s/he will make sure that learners are working alone on their computers.

Internet: The internet is a very large computer network that is made up from other smaller networks of computers.

World Wide Web (WWW): The visible face of the Internet is the interface between users and the network of computers where many millions of websites with their many millions of items of information are to be found.

Traditional instruction: "It is the process in which the teacher presents the materials to the learners" (Brown, 1994, p.45). The teacher describes examples, measures performance, and presents feedback to the learners.

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.Introduction

This chapter is mainly divided into three sections, and each section has related sub-sections. In the first section, the definitions of learner autonomy, its connection with the philosophies of learning, fundamental conditions for the development learner autonomy, characteristics of autonomous learners and the importance of learner autonomy are discussed. The next section focuses on what CALL is, history of CALL, types of CALL activities and advantages and disadvantages of CALL. Finally, the theoretical framework of this study, constructivism, is presented.

2.2.Learner Autonomy in Language Learning

There has been a growing interest in learner autonomy in language teaching and learning over the past 30 years (Benson 2006), and much has been written in this area with the aim of coming to a better understanding of learner autonomy in language learning. In this respect, this section will explain the learner autonomy in detail.

2.2.1. Defining Autonomy

There are as many different definitions of the concept of autonomy as there are linguists and researchers talking about them because of the rapid evolution of this area of research (Little 2002; Finch 2002). However, there is a common agreement in the related literature that learner autonomy comes out of the individual learners' acceptance of the responsibility for his or her learning (Little 2004; Benson 2006; Field 2007). This shows that the learner has to take control over his or her learning or his or her role in that process. According to Benson (2001), this control might take various forms for different individuals and even different forms for the same individual depending on the contexts or times. In other words, the learner who shows a high degree of autonomy in one area can be non-autonomous in another (as cited in Koçak, 2003).

As it is difficult to define autonomy shortly, Little (1991) points out what learner autonomy is not. Learner autonomy is not self-instruction and does not mean the teacher relinquishes all control. Successful experience shows that learner autonomy does not mean only leaving learners on their own. Helping the students set up their work agendas, and giving assistance and advice made available throughout the learning process is essential elements for success.

Having defined what autonomy is not, Little (1991) defines autonomy as "a capacity that enables learners to determine their objectives, define the content and the process of their own learning, select their methods and techniques, and monitor and evaluate their progress and achievements" (p.4). Additionally, Holec (1985) defines autonomy as the capacity and critical ability to reflect upon a learner's experience and take control of their individual learning. Accordingly, Macaro (1997) defines autonomy as an ability learnt by knowing and also being allowed to make decisions about one's self. For example, being able to take responsibility for one's own language learning in terms their own objectives, content, progress, method and techniques and recognizing benefits. It is also an ability to be responsible for the pace and rhythm of learning and evaluation of the learning process.

The definitions highlight the main point of autonomy whereby learners take responsibility for learning and not the teacher. In other words, learner becomes an active participant who accepts responsibility for his or her own learning.

2.2.2. Learner Autonomy and Philosophies of Learning

Learner autonomy is considered in relation to three philosophies of learning: positivism, constructivism and critical theory.

Positivism, which reigned supreme in the twentieth century, is premised upon the assumption that knowledge reflects objective reality, that is, knowledge exists, in spite of if it is known or to be discovered (Benson & Voller, 1997: 20). Thus, on one hand learning occurs simply in the transmission of knowledge and, on the other hand, the knowledge to be acquired is predetermined, but withheld from the learners in the belief it will be discovered (Benson, 1997). Benson (2001) states that positivist views

of learning would view autonomous learning as something which exists outside of formal learning institutions, where learners take charge of the direction of their learning, without intervention from the teacher or institution, leaving the classroom as the scene for the transmission of knowledge from the teacher to the learner. Besides, learner autonomy has been connected to the concept and practice of self-access, where an institution provides resources for learners to access voluntarily, based on their individual learning needs and goals. Such resources include language laboratories, libraries of learning materials etc. The main of these self-access arrangements have been to provide "opportunities for varied exposure and problem solving" (Littlewood, 1997).

Additionally, Positivist view supports the notion that learner autonomy can be promoted within the context of the language classroom, whether it be to equip learners with training and strategies needed to manage to learn outside the classroom or the promotion of learner responsibility for decisions about what is to be learnt and how it is to be learnt (Benson, 2001). Knowledge of these skills, including strategies and responsibilities is transmitted from the teacher to the learner. Benson (1997) categorizes this as a "technical" version of learner autonomy because it calls for the learning of a new set of skills required to manage the learning, such as learning strategies and learner training.

On the other hand, constructivist philosophies of education claim that knowledge is represented as the construction of meaning. Knowledge cannot be taught. It is constructed by the learner as experience is filtered through this personal meaning system (Little, 1991, cited in Benson and Voller, 1997). A constructivist view of learning assumes that learning consists of the reorganization and restructuring of experience, rather than the internalization or discovery of predetermined knowledge (Benson, 1997). Thus, language learning does not involve the internalization of structures and forms, nor does it set ways of learning such structures and forms. Learners construct their own version of the target language and are responsible for their own learning and their interaction and engagement in the target language (Benson, 1997).

Constructivist approaches view the development of autonomy as an innate capacity of the individual and supports versions of autonomy which promote individual responsibility for decisions about what to learn and how to learn it, focusing on the individual's learning behavior, attitudes and personality (Benson, 1997).

Finally, critical theory shares with constructivism the view that knowledge is constructed rather than discovered or learned. Moreover, it places emphasis on the social context and constraints in which such construction of knowledge takes place. In this view of learning, different social groups have different views of reality and autonomy is characterized by relationships of power and control between these different social groups, which themselves can be characterized as the dominant and the dominated. Autonomy is manifested in control over the content and process of one's own learning and increases as learners become more critically aware of the social contexts in which learning takes place.

2.2.3. Fundamental Conditions to Develop Autonomy

Developing learner autonomy is a gradual process. It is a process in which both teacher and learner are involved, and it must move at a pace that both can manage (Camilleri 1997). According to Smith (2003), there is no single 'one size fits all' method to learner autonomy. Learners are different in their opinions and beliefs about the process of learning. They also differ in their readiness for, and interpretations of, learner autonomy. In this respect, autonomous learning is not a product readymade for use or merely a personal quality or trait, and it is achieved once certain conditions are met (Thanasoulas, 2007).

Firstly, as it can be understood from the definition of Holec (1981) that autonomy is the ability to take charge of one's own learning; both autonomy and responsibility are interrelated. In that sense, learners take responsibility for all decisions relating to their learning process. Autonomous learners can, therefore, create their own individual agenda for learning, including establishing a plan, pace and monitoring and evaluating their own learning using the agenda. Besides, they should be actively involved in the setting of goals, defining content, establishing

evaluation mechanism for evaluating the progress. In other words, responsible learners are those who accept that their own efforts are crucial for effective learning, who are willing to co-operate with the teacher and other learners, and who consciously monitor their own progress and make an effort to use all available opportunities to engage in the target language and in learning activities (Scharle and Szabo, 2000).

Responsibility comes with the acceptance that success in learning depends as much on individual learner efforts as it does the teacher. With promoting the autonomy in the classrooms, most of the responsibilities of teachers who mainly control and dominate the learners have shifted from teacher to students. When learners are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning process, the teacher's main responsibility is to ensure that learners have effective strategies for planning, performing and monitoring their learning. The transmission of responsibility form teacher to student provides many benefits for the learners both in the school and outside the school. For example, if the learners set the agenda, the learning will be more effective in the longer term. Also, there will be no barriers between the learner and the living which is seen mostly in the teacher-centered system. As a result of this, the learners will not have difficulty while transferring their capacity for autonomous behavior to all other areas of their lives.

An autonomous learner should be able to decide on what is to be learned, how and when to do it. This will make the learners take much more responsibility for their own learning process. Accordingly, Sutton (1999) suggests that learners' having the control on choosing the content, method, medium, reward, feedback, pacing, etc., will make them feel confident and comfortable during their learning process.

Secondly, metacognitive strategies play a key role to promote learner autonomy. Metacognitive strategies are considered to be crucial in the learning process for various reasons. According to Hedge, metacognitive strategies involve critical analysis, such as planning and analyzing the effectiveness of learning, self monitoring and evaluating of achievements after studying language (Hedge, 2008). In addition, Wenden (1991:34) states "metacognitive knowledge includes all facts

learners acquire about their own cognitive processes as they are applied and used to gain knowledge and acquire skills in varied situations". Therefore, when learners preview the next unit of their course book, read carefully through the teacher's comments on their written work, or review the notes they have made during class, they are using metacognitive strategies. Generally, it is a skill used for planning, monitoring and evaluating the learning activity; some of these strategies are:

•**Planning**: previewing the organizing concept or principle of an anticipated learning task (advance organization); proposing strategies for handling an upcoming task; generating a plan for the parts, sequence, main ideas, or language functions to be used in handling a task (organizational planning).

•**Directed attention**: deciding in advance to attend in general to a learning task and to ignore irrelevant destructors; maintaining attention during task execution.

•**Selective attention:** deciding in advance to attend to particular aspects of language input or situational details that assist in performance of a task; attending to particular aspects of language input during task execution.

•**Self-management:** understanding the conditions that help one successfully accomplish language tasks, and arranging for the presence of those conditions controlling one's language performance to maximize the use of what is already known.

•**Self-monitoring**: checking, verifying or correcting one's comprehension or performance in the course of a language task.

•**Problem identification:** Explicitly identifying the central point needing resolution in a task or identifying an aspect of the task that hinders its successful completion.

•**Self-evaluation:** checking the outcomes of one's own language performance against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy; checking one's

language repertoire, strategy use, or ability to perform the task (Tudor, 1996:205-206).

In this respect, metacognitive strategies are seen as actions which enable learners to coordinate their own process. For example, foreign language learners are often exposed to a lot of new vocabulary, confusing grammar rules and different writing system; therefore they need to get accustomed to using metacognitive strategies in order not to lose their control over their own learning. In that sense, having the metacognitive strategies will help language learners gain autonomy whereby they can take control of their learning (Oxford, 1990).

Language learning is not simply a cognitive task. Learners do not only reflect on their learning in terms of the language input to which they are exposed, or the optimal strategies they need in order to achieve the goals they set. Rather, the success of a learning activity is, to some extent, dependent up on learners' carriage towards the world and the learning activity in particular, their sense of self, and their desire to learn (Benson and Voller, 1997). In this regard, it is curial to highlight the significant role of motivation for promoting learner autonomy.

2.2.4. Characteristics of Autonomous Learners

Autonomous learners are the ones who are responsible for all decisions that they have to make in their own learning. In other words, they are self-directed in the sense that they act independently of the teacher without remaining passive or waiting to be told what to do from teachers (Dickinson, 1987).

Scharle and Szabô (2000) define autonomous learners as the ones who accept the idea that their own efforts are crucial to progress in learning a language and behave accordingly. They do not aspire to please the teacher or get good marks when completing homework or answering questions in class. They cooperate with other learners and teachers for everyone's benefit in order to learn something. However, this does not mean instructions are always followed obediently; they may ask about the purpose of the activity first or they may even come up with suggestions on how to improve an activity.

Hedge (2000) claims that an autonomous learner is one who is self motivated, one who takes the initiative, one who has a clear idea of what he/she wants to learn and one who has his/her own plan for pursuing and achieving his goal. She also characterized autonomous learners as those who:

- know their needs and work productively with the teacher towards the achievement of their objectives,
- learn both inside and outside the classroom,
- can take classroom based material and can build on it,
- know how to use resources independently,
- learn with active thinking,
- adjust their learning strategies when necessary to improve learning,
- manage and divide the time in learning properly,
- do not think the teacher is a god who can give them ability to master the language (Hedge, 2000:76).

Wenden (1991) also characterized autonomous learners as those who:

- are willing and have the capacity to control or supervise learning,
- are motivated to learn,
- are good guessers,
- choose material, methods and tasks,
- exercise choice and purpose in organizing and carrying out the chosen task,
- select the criteria for evaluation,
- take an active approach to the task,
- make and rejecting hypothesis,
- pay attention to both form and content,
- are willing to take risks (Wenden 1991:41-42).

According to Dickinson (1995), autonomous learners can be characterized as those who have the capacity for being active and independent in the learning process. She also adds that autonomous learners can identify goals, formulate their own goals, and can change goals to suit their own learning needs and interests because they are

able to use learning strategies, and monitor their own learning. In this respect, the key characteristics of autonomous learners are to take responsibility for learning language. These are ability to define one's own objectives; awareness of how to use language materials effectively; careful organization of time for learning and active development of learning strategies (Hedge, 2000).

2.2.5. The Importance of Learner Autonomy

In language teaching, a teacher can provide all the necessary circumstances and input, but learning can only happen if learners are willing to contribute (Scharle and Szabô, 2000). In other words, in order for learners to be actively involved in the learning process, they first need to realize and accept that success in learning depends as much on the student as on the teacher. That is, they share responsibility for the outcome. Furthermore, Scharle and Szabô (2000, p.4) point out "success in learning very much depends on learners having a responsible attitude".

Little (1991) claims that if language learners are to be efficient communicators in their target language, they must be autonomous having enough independence, self reliance and confidence to accomplish a variety of social, psychological and discursive functions. Additionally, in order to highlight the importance of learner autonomy, Barnes (1976) claims that school knowledge is the knowledge which is presented by someone else. The learners partly grasp it, enough to answer the teacher's question, to do exercises, or to answer examination questions, but it remains someone else's knowledge, not learners'. If learners never use this knowledge, they probably forget it. As far as the learners use knowledge for their purposes and use parts of it to cope with the exigencies of living, they can integrate it into their view of the world. In that sense, practicing the knowledge to a greater responsibility on the part of the learner in planning and in conducting learning activities will lead to a greater degree of active involvement and better learning.

According to Little (1995), learner autonomy is important for two reasons. Firstly, if learners are themselves engaged in planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning, it should follow that their learning will be more successful than otherwise because it is more sharply focused; and the same reflective engagement

should help to make what they learn a fully integrated part of what they are, so that they can use the knowledge and skills acquired in the classroom and the world beyond it. This means that the target language must be used as the channel through which teaching and learning take place including the reflective processes of planning, monitoring and evaluation.

As a conclusion, greater responsibility on the part of the learner in planning; conducting learning activities will lead to a greater degree of active involvement, and better learning in the actual teaching learning situation, which again will influence the learners' potential for evaluating the process (Dam, 1995). In addition, Roberts, et al (1992) point out that autonomy is a process, which needs to develop with all levels of language learners. That is why autonomous learning is a concept attracting increasing attention in language education (Cotterall and Crabbe, 1999).

The next part will briefly focus on learner autonomy and its development in CALL.

2.3. Learner Autonomy and Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)

After reviewing the learner autonomy in detail, it can be concluded that in order to become autonomous, learners need an appropriate environment where they have the opportunities to develop language learning skills, increase their motivation, take the responsibility of their own learning and utilize the activities and materials outside the classroom. However, expecting learners to develop autonomy in the traditional classrooms where teachers control and dominate learners allowing them to take no responsibility for their own learning does not seem possible (Little, 1991:4). On the other hand, Dolan (2002) points out that technology can create such a learning environment by encouraging and fostering learner autonomy in the sense of learner differences, taking responsibility and control. In this respect, due to the fact that new technological advances such as computers and the Internet offer an appropriate environment where learners can develop autonomy technology has gained significant popularity among language educators.

There has been a disagreement about whether autonomy is "independence" which means taking responsibility for one's own learning, setting goals and making decisions and self evaluation of one's own progress in the learning process or "interdependence" which means implies working together with teachers and other learners towards shared goals (Blin, 2005). Most of the researchers believe that autonomy does not imply interdependence. However, Benson (2001) claims that learners perform their independence within a specific socio-cultural context where independence, through socialization and interaction with teachers and peers will impact on the levels of control they exercise and develop. Accordingly, Little (1995) asserts that learner autonomy is the product of interdependence rather than independence because learners will not develop their capacity for autonomous learning within formal contexts by only being told that they are independent. The learners need help to achieve autonomy by processes of interaction. Additionally, Candy (1988) points out that the teacher and the learner can work towards autonomy by creating a friendly atmosphere characterized by low threat, unconditional positive regard, honest and open feedback, respect for the ideas and opinions of others, collaborating instead of completing and acknowledging self-improvement as a goal.

Although there have been many arguments on the learner autonomy, new technological advances including computers and the internet has helped learner autonomy expand. Shetzer and Warschauer (2000, cited in Mutlu, 2008) connect the concept of learner autonomy and technology as in the following;

> Autonomous learners know how to formulate research questions and devise plans to answer them. They answer their own questions through accessing learning tools and resources on-line and off-line. Moreover, autonomous learners are able to take charge of their own learning by working on individual and collaborative projects that result in communication opportunities in the form of presentations, Web sites, and traditional publications, accessible to local and global audiences. Language professionals who have access to an Internet computer classroom are in a position to teach students valuable lifelong learning skills and strategies for becoming autonomous learners (p. 379).

According to Shetzer and Warschauer (cited in Mutlu, 2010), working cooperatively and collaboratively not only with the teacher but also with other

learners is important in order to become autonomous learners. In that sense, it is believed that computers and the Internet and tools that they offer such as emails, discussion forums and online chats provide the language learners with a sociable and collaborative authentic environment where learners develop autonomy and take increasing responsibility for their own learning.

As a result, language educators have started to use the computer and the Internet to provide additional learning material to develop autonomy. In recent years, advances in technology have motivated teachers to reexamine the role of computer in second language learning. In the last few years, more teachers are using CALL and numerous articles have been written about the role of computer in language learning. Though the potential of computer use has not been fully explored and the average school still makes limited use of computers, it is apparent that a new information age has begun for language learning in which technology will play a more important role (Kung, 2002).

In this study, the potential of CALL as a tool in promoting autonomy in language education will be explored. In that sense, the next section will focus on CALL and its development in language learning.

2.3.1. What is CALL?

CALL is defined as using the Internet software programs and computers for language teaching, which has two important aspects; bidirectional learning and individualized learning (Navaruttanaporn, 2010). It is a process of applying computers as an effective teaching and learning tool in the language classrooms. CALL materials are used in teaching to facilitate the language learning process. Lesson presentation, graphical movement, animation, sound, immediate feedback and students' achievement scores are included in the computer programs (Teeranitigul, 2000). According to Almekhlafi (2006), CALL refers to a technique for using technology in the field of language learning. In addition, Levy (1997) defines CALL as the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning. Also, Beatty (2003) defines CALL as a process in which a learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her language.

Beatty claims that CALL can corporate issues of material design, pedagogical theories and modes of teaching through technology. Those materials include those specifically designed for language learning and existing computer-based materials have been adapted.

Therefore, computer-assisted language learning refers to language lesson program that use a computer as the tool or medium. Students are able to learn new content, review their lessons, or test their language learning proficiency through a computer. Characteristic of the language program is an emphasis on the individual and provides the students opportunities to participate and decide on their lessons themselves (Brannigan & Lee, 2001).

2.3.2. History of CALL

Computers have been used for second language teaching since the l95O's. Warschauer & Healey (1998) divides the history of CALL into three main developmental stages: behaviorist CALL, communicative CALL, and integrative CALL. The different kinds of CALL reflect the prevailing pedagogical theories and also the technology of the time.

2.3.2.1. Behaviorist CALL

The first form of CALL emerged in the 1950's, which features a lot of drill-and-practice exercises. CALL programs of that time reflect the behavioristic learning models and described by Warschauer (1998) as 'drill and kill' modes. The computer is viewed as an indefatigable tutor. Behaviorist CALL was first designed and implemented in the era of the mainframe.

2.3.2.2. Communicative CALL

In the 1970's and 1980's, communicative CALL programs were predominant. Proponents of communicative CALL reject behaviorist approaches to language learning. The design of CALL programs reflects cognitive theories, in which learning is regarded as a creative process of discovery and development. Communicative CALL programs enable learners to learn in a more interactive manner. Grammar is to

be taught implicitly, and students should be encouraged to generate their original statements (Warschauer 1998).

2.3.2.3.Integrative CALL

Many programs that reflect the above instructional theories are still widely used today. However, none of them can correct learners' input grammatically and semantically as pointed out by Davies and Williamson (1998). These deficiencies led to the development of integrative CALL. Socio-cognitive view is reflected in courseware design, which emphasizes language use in an authentic context. Integrative CALL aims to integrate the various skills of language learning, for examples, listening, speaking, writing, and reading. (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). In line with the trend of this CALL is the development of the networked computer with full multimedia capabilities.

2.3.3. Types of CALL Activities

CALL activities or computer based activities can be divided into six types as follows;

1. Tutorial Programs are responsible for collecting information, presenting and guiding information, teaching rules, as well as teaching problem-solving techniques to students. It presents information in small units with sentences, graphics, and sound. Students can learn content through questions. When students answer, they receive immediate feedback. If their answers are correct, they can move on to the next part. On the other hand, if students answer incorrectly, they will be helped with corrective teaching tutorials. Tutorial instruction is suitable for all courses. It is very popular for students and teachers because it provides exercises and tests in the same module.

2. Drill and Practice are combined with tutorials and other methodologies, but it is not intended to tech. This kind of program does not present the content but has only questions and answers.

The questions are repeated many times. There will be an explanation on why the answer is correct or incorrect. The function of drill and practice is to provide appropriate practice, and students can use their background knowledge of the lesson in order to answer questions as well as solve problems efficiently.

3. Simulation is aimed to help students by using real life situations in order to make the learning content more realistic. The goal is to help students deal with real life situations.

4. Games are kind of instructional programs that are used to provide a rich learning and teaching environment. The definition of simulations and games are similar. Simulations imitate reality while games may or may not simulate reality. Students are able to gain knowledge about rules, processes, as well as other skills from the games. The major characteristics of games are as follows: first every game has a goal that is attained through either direct or indirect ways, for instance, some games use different methods of scoring points. Second, the rules define what actions are allowed within a game and what limitations are enforced. Third is competition and challenge, which is what a student has to accomplish to reach the goal. Fourth is fantasy for motivation. Fifth is safety so that students are able to learn and gain points without being in dangerous challenge or unsafe situations. Finally, games are entertaining, which are enjoyable as well as encouraging and helpful for students to practice their skills.

5. Testing is an assessment method to determine what the student knows and does not know. It can take the form of an informal quiz or formal examination. There are various computer-based tests. In order to help students learn, teachers should select the type of test that is appropriate for their students and related to the objective of each lesson. Students, thus, will enjoy learning and succeed in their studying. Therefore, testing is not used for improving the test scores, but for helping students feel independent while doing tests.

6.   Demonstration teaching and learning through computer based instruction is very helpful with self-directed learning. Recently, self-directed learning has also become associated with the increasing role technology in educational fields. Self-directed learning approaches encourage students to learn by themselves. In particular, students gain more experience in meaningful contexts. It is important that the teacher provides wide opportunities and a rich learning environment for students to develop their abilities to think independently, and self-manage their own activities in order to construct knowledge. (Braganorte, 2005; Alessi and Trollip (as cited in Chaimonkol, 2000)).

2.3.4. Advantages and Disadvantages of CALL

The use of CALL is becoming popular in teaching and learning language. The purpose of CALL is to help the process of teaching and learning, so the process can be more efficient and effective. Moreover, CALL lessons provide more individual instruction, greater variation, resulting in higher motivation with less boredom, increasing the learning objectives. However, CALL has advantages and disadvantages.

2.3.4.1.Advantages of CALL

In most of the studies, CALL is found to improve students' performance in language learning than traditional instructions (Kung, 2002; Chun, 2006). The advantages of the computer in language learning include individualized instructions, drawing and maintaining attention, authentic materials and situations for language study, multimedia information and supporting different language activities.

Firstly, one of the problems in teaching English is that students usually have diverse interests and English proficiency. Their learning speeds and learning styles also vary. CALL programs can accommodate different students as they allow students to study what they need or are interested in, and also work at their own pace (Hannaford & Taber 1982). In short, they take control of their learning process. The less able students can spend more study time for comprehension while the more

capable students can challenge themselves with difficult tasks (Murray, 2000). Computers can record students' learning progress and analyze individual problems, and the teacher can help them based on the analysis (Kitao, 1994). With this information, teachers can tailor the instruction to suit individual needs of students. The sense of control is found to be especially important for language learning and teaching (Murray, 2000). In a setting with much learner autonomy, students are required to exercise control and take more personal responsibility of their learning by making choices in the process.

Secondly, CALL programs are very effective for motivating students to study English. Many students are tired of traditional English classes. Learning with a computer is inherently more interesting, and students do not get bored as easily. CALL programs are most popular among students either because there are a variety of activities such as games or because they are considered to be novel. Students think materials are novel if they are presented on computers. They are willing to spend more time and do more exercises on a computer (Kitao, 1993).

CALL can enhance language learning because the extensive use of multimedia features such as graphics, sound, animation and game helps to hold the attention of students on the task (Murray, 1999).

Thirdly, the use of computers can offer more opportunities for authentic examples of English language in use and more opportunities for realistic communication, both of which can facilitate language 1earning (Kataoka, 2000). The World Wide Web has a lot of resourceful information that can be accessed easily by any students with a computer at home or at school. If someone wants to read or listen to the news, there are a number of sources offering the latest news, which include many on-line newspapers, magazines, radios and TV channels. There is a wide range of on-line applications used in the language class, which include chat-rooms, pronunciation tutors, quizzes, games, puzzles, and on-line dictionaries. Students can read articles and write a report using the information they find. A foreign language is best studied in a cultural context. Students have access to the web can practice communication with native speakers by various ways. For example, by sending E-

mail and joining newsgroups, students can communicate with people they have never met.

Another advantage is that computers can present information in various media such as text, sound, pictures, animation and video. Students prefer and also believe multimedia materials assist them to learn (Khalili & Shashaani, 1994; Kozma, 1991). It is found that learning was more effective when the information was presented in multimedia format than the traditional way. When multimedia was used in instruction, students usually take less time to learn the same material. Additionally, through simulation, computers can present abstract language concepts in a concrete and easily understood way.

Lastly, with the advance of technology, teachers can devise a number of different language activities. Students cannot just passively listen to the teacher as they do in a teacher directed class. They must think and learn on their own with the assistance of a computer. One way to use computers in the classroom is for the teacher to present pictures, videos, and written text with sound. Computers make it easier to make slide presentations. The presentation can be programmed before a lesson. Several media can be combined in the same presentation (Levie & Lentz, 1982).

The other way to use computers is to have students use the computers themselves. They can work individually on tutorials, games, and simulations. They can also work collaboratively with other classmates. A network-based language activity could be project writing. Interaction between students is as important as that with a computer in learning (Scardamalia, Bereiter, McLean, Swallow & Woodruff, 1989).

Computer enables students to learn at anywhere and anytime. Students can work at a computer preparing for the class, during the class, doing revision after the class. The World Wide Web as discussed before can provide a lot of authentic information. Students can be asked to do a research using the information and publish their project work in a format of newsletter or a home page so that other classmates can read. With authentic readers or audiences, it makes them feel more

responsible for the final product and thus makes them work with more effort. Teachers can arrange two language classes from different countries to send e-mail to one another or to join a chat-room. Students learn language naturally by talking with native speakers (Peeck, 1974; Nugent, 1982; Mayer & Gallini, 1990).

2.3.4.2.Disadvantages of CALL

Using software often requires time; in spite of how user-friendly it is, before students start to benefit from using them in the class. Usually students respond questions from a keyboard, so they need to learn to type fairly well before they can use computers efficiently. Some students are not confident in using computers, and these students often come from a lower socio-economic class with fewer opportunities to access computers. Inequity in the accessibility to computers causes unequal opportunities for success in different genders and socio-economic classes (Gips, DiMattia, & Gips, 2004; Wang & Heffernan 2010).

CALL is not efficiently used for traditional curriculum and pedagogy (Wang, 2008; Roblyer, 2003). New teaching methods are necessary for using the programs efficiently. It is also necessary to train teachers for a new educational setting. They need to understand the instructional design of CALL as well as how to use computers. The assessment methods must be prepared to correspond to the CALL software or teaching style (Warschauer, 2004).

In a traditional classroom, student-teacher interaction helps in shaping personality of students. Such pedagogy provides an emotional foundation to cognitive growth. In a computerized classroom, students working with computers alone lose time for direct and sustained contact with teachers. Mechanical learning in a computer laboratory such as tutoring and drilling can dry up their emotional life (Wang & Smith, 20013).

The next section will present the theoretical framework on which this thesis study is based.

2.4. Theoretical Framework

The present theoretical framework, which explores Constructivism that supports this study, is organized as follows; the definition of Constructivism, types of Constructivism (Cognitive and Social Constructivism) and the relationship between Constructivism and Computer Based Learning.

2.4.1. Constructivism

Constructivism is an important theory that has been widely studied over the last century (Hoagland, 2000; Van Berkel and Schmidt, 2000). During the 1960s and early 1970s, Piaget's constructivist theory was the dominant theory of cognitive development in the fields of developmental psychology and education. Constructivism can be divided into two aspects: Cognitive Constructivism and Social Constructivism.

1. Cognitive Constructivism or Radical Constructivism put forth by Jean Piaget, a Swiss psychologist, believes that a child invents his own understanding via many channels: reading, listening, exploring and interacting with their environment. This theory focuses on a form of mental exploration in which children create, reflection, and work out their understanding in their own learning environment. The child is the subject of the study, and individual cognitive development is the emphasis. Cognitive Constructivists believe that learners come to class with ideas, beliefs, opinions, and goals that need to be changed or modified by a teacher who acts as a facilitator (Braganorte, 2005; Matusevich, 1999; Strommen & Lincoln, 1992). Interestingly, Byrnes (1996) states three aspects in his view of Cognitive Constructivism. Firstly, knowledge has personal meaning, created by individual students. Secondly, learners construct their own knowledge by looking for meaning and order; they interpret what they hear, read, and see based on their previous learning and habits. Finally, learning is successful when students can demonstrate conceptual understanding.

2.   Social Constructivism was proposed by Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist and philosopher. Vygotsky emphasized the effects of cultural and social contexts in the learning environment. This theory focuses on a form of experimentation in the development of the individual mind, when learners share the process of constructing their ideas with their peers. Social Constructivists believe that theory and practice are shaped by cultural ideas (Braganorte, 2005; Krauss, 1996; Matusevich, 1999; Strommen & Lincoln, 1992). The focus is on the relationship between the individual and the social and cultural settings. Social Constructivism can be divided into three main beliefs: (a) Making meaning, which refers to the community taking a central role and the people around the learner significantly affecting the way the learner sees the world, (b) Tools for cognitive development, which refers to the type and quality of leaning tools to establish the pattern and degree of development, and (c) The Zone of Proximal Development which refers to learner's problem solving skills on tasks. The problem solving skills on tasks can be divided into three aspects: (a) problem solving skills on tasks that can be done by the learner, (b) the problem solving skills on tasks that cannot be done even with help, and (c) the problem solving skills on tasks that can be done with the help from others (as cited in Navaruttanaporn, 2010, p.71).

Piagetian constructivist theory focuses on the role of self-discovery and peer collaboration, whereas Vygotskian constructivist theory emphasizes the role of the interaction between learners and teachers or experts. It is not only knowledge and skills about the task that are acquired, but competence in self-regulation, in which the process of instruction becomes meaningful and important. With reference to Piagetian theory, teaching plays a less important role; active and self-construction in learning are more crucial aspects. Interestingly, applying technology in classrooms is

helpful to encourage learners to construct their own knowledge and support a collaborative learning environment (Hampel, 2003).

In short, constructivism is being applied in different educational fields, one of which is in technology rich classrooms (Almekhlafi, 2006). Many instructors or educators have applied a constructivist approach in their teaching and learning processes. It is recommended that instructors use a variety of concrete experiences to help students learn. Bruner (as cited in Lutz and Huitt, 2004), divides constructivist learning into three principles: (a) instruction must be concerned with the experiences and contexts that make the student willing and able to learn, (b) instruction must be structured so that it can be easily understood by the student, and (c) instruction should be designed to facilitate classroom learning and fill in the gaps (as cited in Navaruttanaporn, 2010, p.70-72).

2.4.2. Constructivism and Computer Based Learning

The constructivist-learning environment differs significantly from the traditional learning environment (Applebee, 1993). In the constructivist classroom, the teacher acts as a facilitator or a guide for learners. The teacher provides bridging or scaffolding and helps to extend the learners' zone of proximal development. Learners are encouraged and motivated to develop, create, and generate their own knowledge (Katic, 2008; Matusevich, 2005; Strommen & Lincoln, 1992). Modern technology, such as the computer, facilitates the process of learning; therefore, there is a relationship between the use of the computer and the constructivist approach. A computer network provides information instantly between the classroom and individual learners; it allows instant access to databases and online information services and provides multimedia resources. Various instant educational materials can be presented. Thus, finding the most appropriate instructional materials for integrating technology into the learning environment is the crucial path to success (Peter, 1996; Strommen & Lincoln, 1992). According to Peter (1996), computers are the new tools of education and are proficient peers in the learning environment, enhancing the zone of proximal development, and providing learners with opportunities to a culturally rich learning environment. Additionally, Matusevich

(1999) points out that using the computer as a language tool facilitates and supports learners in a language learning environment.

In a constructivist-learning environment, the focus of the learning process is the learners, not the teachers. The constructivist approach encourages students to learn by building upon their prior knowledge, and learn how to obtain new knowledge from their previous experiences. In other words, principles of constructivism place emphasis on the learning process and not the teaching process. The constructivist approach provides opportunities for students to think independently; it allows students to take responsibility for their own learning and encourages students to be autonomous learners as well as to be self- involved in learning environments (Boulton-Lewis, Wills and Mutch, 1996).

The aim of constructivist theory is to "create social environments that induce students to construct their own understanding" (Liaw, 2002, p. 2) and to provide opportunities for independent thinking, and allowing students to take responsibility for their own learning. The focus of constructivism is on the students, not the teachers. Using constructivism in a language classroom encourages autonomous learning, as students are responsible for their own studies. Teachers will only be responsible for selecting and adapting learning materials for use in the classrooms. Activities provided in constructivist language classroom must encourage students to think and learn the target language by themselves with some help from the teacher (Braganorte, 2005). Computers help students become more creative and active learners, not just receivers of knowledge, so they are a suitable tool in language learning and teaching (Lee, 1999).

2.5. Summary of the Chapter

The review of the literature points out that the concept of learner autonomy has gained a significant importance in the field of language teaching, for over two decades. Leaner autonomy is seen as an inseparable part of effective language learning in which learners are expected to take charge of their own learning process. However, being an autonomous learner does not mean that there is no need for a teacher. Teachers are expected to be counselors and facilitators to help learners get

necessary learning strategies, increase motivation, take responsibility for their learning and engage in out of class study, all of which provide learners a ground to develop their autonomy in their learning process.

With advances in technology, language educators have started to search ways to apply their teaching practices and the design of online language learning environments. According to Dolan (2002), technology fosters and encourages learner autonomy in the sense that learner differences, learner responsibility and control.

Accordingly, creating online materials along with constructivist principles provides an important and sound theoretical framework to promote learner autonomy. Problem-solving or situational tasks incorporated within materials by the help of online tools such as blogs, discussion forums, e-mail encourage interaction among students and instruction in a manner needs more student involvement and control on their part over their learning. In addition, this provides many opportunities for learners to work collaboratively.

As a result, in the light of the information presented in the literature review section, this study aims to explore the research questions stated in Chapter 1. This study tries to investigate the four significant aspects of learner autonomy, which are using language learning strategies, motivation, taking responsibility, and out of class study in CALL environments.

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

This study investigated the students' perceptions of CALL and the effects of CALL on the development of learner autonomy at the English Preparatory School of Hasan Kalyoncu University.

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the setting and participants of the study, the instruments used for data collection and procedures of data collection and data analysis.

3.2. Research Design

This study aims to gain insights into students' perception of learner autonomy development in regarding four aspects: learners' motivational level in English, learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English, learners' perception of their and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English, and learners' practice of autonomous language learning in the form of outside class activities with the help of CALL classes. This study also aims to investigate learners' perceptions of learning English within a CALL environment. This study explored its research questions through a questionnaire (adapted from Koçak, 2003) and semi structured face to face interviews.

According to Netemeyer, Bearden, Sharma (2003), questionnaires are accepted as an instrument to analyze the abstract features and the numbers in a scale stand for differentiate the levels of the answers. Additionally, items are put in a group according to the constructs that are meant to be measured. Number of items in the same set is evaluated as a whole. O'Maley & Chammot (1990) asserts that questionnaires are an easy and practical method to gather data from a large population when compared to other data collection instruments. Accordingly, Oppenheim (1993) claims that using a questionnaire as an instrument requires a little time. There is no need for extended writing, in that sense it is easy to process, and it

is useful to test a specific hypothesis. In addition, Turner (1993) defines Likert-scale items as effective mean of analyzing the opinions.

The questionnaire used in this study consists of 4 different sections with 48 questions. To answer the first research question, data was collected through the questionnaire. The data collected through the questionnaire was subject to descriptive analysis through Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). The rationale behind the use of descriptive statistics in the study was to obtain complete and detailed perceptions of students in regard to learner autonomy development.

Furthermore, semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted to explore the learners' perceptions of learning English supported by CALL environment. According to Bernard (1988), the semi-structured interview guide provides a clear set of instructions for interviewers and can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data. Accordingly, McNamara points out that interview are particularly useful for getting the story behind a participant's experiences. The interviewer can pursue in-depth information around the topic. Interviews may be useful as follow-up to certain respondents to questionnaires, e.g., to further investigate their responses (1999).

As a result, in this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect and analyze the data. Miles & Huberman (1994) claims that with the combination of both qualitative and quantitative data, "we have a very powerful mix" (p.42). The use of the mixed method design helps provide "a complete picture of a research problem" (Creswell, J.W. 2002). In that sense, the data collected from the questionnaire were subjected to descriptive analysis and the data collected from interviews were subjected to content analysis.

3.3. Setting and the Participants

This study was conducted with the upper-intermediate students at Hasan Kalyoncu University. The students have to take English preparatory program in their first year. The Department of Foreign Languages offers an intensive program for students at four different levels. At the beginning of the academic year, a placement

test is done and according to their scores, the students are separated into four levels (from A- the lowest- to D- the highest).

The university where the study was carried out is well-equipped with technology. It offers anything that a language teacher and learner might need in this teaching and learning process. The university donates a personal laptop to each of the students enrolled in the university and to the instructors. Also, there is wireless internet access at the university. Each classroom has an overhead projector. However, it is a matter of fact that students are not guided well enough to use the internet for the benefit of their language learning process. Most of them waste their time in front of their laptops talking with their friends on some common social networks such as facebook and twitter or playing computer games instead of studying. Another main and common problem of the students at the university is that they do not know how to study and what to study when learning a language. Students get lost outside the classroom, due to depending on teacher too much in the classroom, and they start to get worried about their low level of English. Accordingly, they lose their motivation and stop studying. Like many learners in Turkey, they experienced the process of learning through traditional educational methods, which reinforced didactic and teacher-centered modes. Therefore, these learners prefer learning in which teacher is in full control of the learning process.

In order to help students develop their own language learning strategies, increase their motivational level, take responsibility for their own learning and engage in outside classroom activities, CALL lessons are integrated into the curriculum for each level. CALL syllabus consists of 7/24 software and web-based activities correlated to their levels. Students are supposed to buy the access code to use the software anywhere, and anytime they want.

The teacher researcher attempted to conduct a study to explore the effects of CALL on the students' development of learner autonomy to have a better understanding of the teaching context and if necessary to improve the language-teaching context and resources used to promote learner autonomy. The questionnaire was administered in two upper-intermediate classes and semi structured face-to-face

interview was done with fifteen students on 23th and 24th May in 2013. There were not any predetermined exclusion criteria, so forty of students from two upper-intermediate classes participated in the study.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

In this study, a four-section questionnaire was administered in order to collect data for the first research question. The questionnaire (Koçak, 2003) included four different sections with 48 items. These sections were motivation, metacognitive strategies, responsibilities and the outside class activities. The number of items in each section was as follows: 20 items in motivation, eight items in metacognitive strategies, 12 items in responsibilities and nine items in outside class activities.

Students were instructed to rate the items in two sections (Motivation and Metacognitive strategies) on a 6-point Likert scale, as in the Instrument 1; the weight for every answer changes between 6 and 1, in the direction from most positive to most negative. For the 'Responsibilities' section, students were asked to put a tick in the appropriate box. The first box indicated the students' perceptions of their teachers' responsibilities, the second box indicated the students' perceptions of not only their own but also their teachers' responsibilities, and the third box indicated the students' perceptions of their own responsibilities. For the 'Outside class activities' section, students were instructed to rate each item on a 5-point Likert type scale. The response options were from always (5) to never (1), in the direction from most positive to most negative. To enrich the data obtained through questionnaire, semi structured face-to-face interviews were also employed to conduct this study. Fifteen interviewees answered ten questions related to each other about their perception of CALL lesson and its effects on their autonomy development.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

Prior to the implementation of the questionnaire and interview, the permission of the Head of Hasan Kalyoncu University School of Foreign Language was taken by submitting the proposal of the study, which included the aim and the method of the

study, the sample instruments and the contributions of study for Hasan Kalyoncu University.

After taking the permission, the questionnaire was administered to the students in their classroom settings on 23th and 24th May in 2013. Both the instructions and the questionnaire were given in Turkish in order to prevent comprehension problems and reduce anxiety by the instructor.

Having collected the questionnaire, face to face interviews were done with the 15 students to support the data of questionnaire. Interview was done in Turkish and tape recorder was used to record the interview for each student. After that, records were transcribed on the paper by the researcher.

3.6.Data Analysis Procedure

For the data collected from the questionnaire, the statistical analyses were conducted by using SPSS software program. As a result, the data was subjected to 'descriptive analyses'. Additionally, the data collected from interviews were subjected to 'content analyses'.

CHAPTER IV

4. **DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

In this chapter, data was collected to investigate the students' perceptions of their own learner autonomy development and the effects of CALl on their autonomy development. We analyzed the data and presented the research findings. This chapter describes the results of the study that answer following research questions:

1. What are Hasan Kalyoncu University Preparatory Students' perceived levels of their own autonomy development in language learning?

2. What are Hasan Kalyoncu University Preparatory Students' perceptions of the effects of computer-assisted language learning on learner autonomy development in language education?

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the results obtained from statistical analysis of the questionnaire, which was analyzed through descriptive statistics by using SPSS. In the first section, the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of variables are illustrated. In the second section, the data gathered from interviews is presented. While the data obtained from the questionnaire explained the overall tendency of the participants, the data obtained from interviews were used to support and gain deeper insight about the findings of questionnaire.

4.2. Analysis of the Questionnaire

This study intended to gain insights into students' perceptions of their own learner autonomy development. In order to gather data about learner autonomy development, the questionnaire (adapted from Koçak, 2003), including four aspects of learner autonomy, which are regarded as indicators of learner autonomy development in related literature, was administered to forty students. These indicators included Motivation level, Language learning strategy use, Taking responsibility for their own learning and Out-of-class activity use.

4.2.1. Motivational Level of Participants

As one of the most significant indicators of learner autonomy, the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Hasan Kalyoncu University was investigated. The data concerning the motivation was collected by

Section 1, which consisted of 20 items on a six-point Likert type rating scale, in the questionnaire.

Table 1. **Motivational Level of the Participants**

ITEM	Strongly Agree		Agree		Slightly Agree		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std. Dev
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	M	SD
1. Learning English is enjoyable for me.	19	47,5	11	27,5	7	17,5	0	0	2	5	1	2,5	5,05	1,23
2. I wish I could learn English in an easier way, without going to school.	17	42,5	12	30	4	10	3	7,5	2	5	2	5	4,82	1,44
3. I am trying to do my best to learn English.	9	22,5	9	22,5	16	40	5	12,5	1	2,5	0	0	4,50	1,06
4. Even if there is no attendance requirement in the English course, my attendance would be high.	12	30	7	17,5	15	37,5	3	7,5	1	2,5	2	5	4,50	1,33
5. I want to continue studying English for as long as possible.	19	47,5	11	27,5	7	17,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	5,07	1,18
6. I believe that I will be successful in the English class.	16	40	19	47,5	5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,27	0,67
7. If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better and well-paid job.	33	82,5	7	17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,82	0,38
8. I want to be the best in the English class.	12	30	13	32,5	10	25	4	10	0	0	1	2,5	4,75	1,14
9. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in the English class.	6	15	13	32,5	8	20	3	7,5	4	10	6	15,5	3,90	1,67
10. I cannot concentrate easily on the English class.	2	5	4	10	11	27,5	7	17,5	9	22,5	7	17,5	3,05	1,44
11. I am afraid I will not succeed in the English exams.	3	7,5	13	32,5	7	17,5	8	20	4	10	5	12,5	3,70	1,52
12. I like working in pairs in the English class.	5	12,5	11	27,5	8	20	7	17,5	5	12,5	4	10	3,80	1,53
13. I prefer individual work in the English class.	9	22,5	13	32,5	6	15	3	7,5	6	15	3	7,5	4,17	1,61
14. Group activities in the English class are not efficient.	6	15	8	20	12	30	7	17,5	5	12,5	2	5	3,92	1,40
15. In the English class, the teacher should be the one who talks more.	9	22,5	10	25	7	17,5	7	17,5	4	10	3	7,5	4,10	1,56
16. In an English class, I like activities that allow me to participate actively.	19	47,5	11	27,5	8	20	1	2,5	1	2,5	0	0	5,15	1,00
17. The teacher should encourage students to make contributions in the English lesson.	19	47,5	15	37,5	15	37,5	3	7,5	2	5	1	2,5	5,22	0,97
18. If I do well in this course, it will be because I have the ability for learning English.	11	27,5	14	35	12	30	1	2,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	4,75	1,1
19. If I do not do well in this course, it will be because I have not tried hard enough.	2	5	7	17,5	8	20	8	20	10	25	5	12,5	3,20	1,45
20. If I do not do well in this course, it will be because of the teacher.	8	20	17	42,5	13	32,5	2	5	0	0	0	0	4,77	0,83

Descriptive statistics were used to present the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items. Table 1 presents the percentages,

frequencies, means and standard deviations of the participants' responses to various aspects of motivation in learning English.

As can be seen from the data, the majority of the students stated their enjoyment in the process of learning English (Item 1). However, only 4 out of 40 students indicated their disagreements to the opportunities of learning English without going to school (Item 2).

Moreover, Items 3 and 5 show that the students were really eager to learn English and they wanted to continue to study English for a long time. As seen in Item 3, almost half of the students indicated that they were doing their best to improve their English. Additionally, 85% of the students showed their positive attitudes towards attending the English course regularly by stating that attendance was not an effective factor in learning English (Item 4).

Almost all of the students indicated their wish to be successful in the English class (Item 6). Only 5 students stated their disagreement to the belief of being successful in the English class. Additionally, 85% of the students indicated their agreement to the idea of struggling to be the best in the English class (Item 8). Besides being successful in the English class, all of the students reported that if they learn English better, they will be able to find better and well-paid jobs (Item7). In that sense, all of the students indicated their agreement to the necessity of English to find a better and well-paid job.

However, the data from the items 9 and 11 reflected considerable anxiety in students during the English learning process. For instance, 77.5% of the students seemed to feel uncomfortable when they had to speak in the English class (Item 9). In addition to this, 40% of the students indicated certain agreements (overall responses of strongly agree and agree) to having test anxiety in themselves and to the belief of being unsuccessful in the English exams (Item 11). However, not many students reported lack of concentration in the English class. Only 6 of the students (overall responses of strongly agree and agree) reported their certain agreement to having concentration problems in the English class (Item 10).

Responses to the items 12 and 14 reflected more than half of the students valued pair work and group work activities during the English learning process. For instance, 60% of the students seemed to be fond of working in pairs in the English class (Item 12). Additionally, %65 of the students showed their agreement to the idea of efficiency of group activities (Item 14). However, 70% of the students indicated their preferences to work individually in the English class (Item 13).

As for the active involvement in the English class, students' responses showed clearly that the majority of the students believed that the teacher is the one who has the role as an authority speaking more than the students and a helper creating opportunities for them to involve in the tasks (Items 15 and 17). For instance, 47.5% of students reported their agreement to the idea that the teacher should talk more than the students in the English class by indicating 'strongly agree' and 'agree' for the item 15. Although, 75% of the students reported that they like activities that allow them to participate actively (Item 16), almost all of the students (90%) stated that they needed the teacher's encouragement to make contributions in the English class (Item 17).

Responses to items 18, 19 and 20 displayed that the majority of the students had a tendency to attribute their failure and success to themselves. For instance, more than half of the students (62%) reported that if they do not do well in the English class, it would be because they have not tried hard enough (Item 19). Also, the students did not seem to consider the teacher as a significant factor in their failure. Only 8 out of 40 students believed that the teacher is the one who is responsible for their failure by indicating 'slightly agree' (Item 20). Finally, 62.5% of the students showed their agreement to the idea of attributing their success to their own ability for learning English by indicating 'strongly agree' and 'agree' to the item 18.

4.2.2. Language Learning Strategy Use by the Participants

The second part of the questionnaire aimed to explore the language learning strategies used by the students during the English learning process. The data was gathered from eight items on a six-point Likert type rating scale in the questionnaire. To display the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items,

descriptive statistics were used. Table 2 portrays the percentages and frequencies of students' responses to the usage of metacognitive strategies during learning English.

Table 2. **Language Learning Strategies Used by the Participants**

ITEM	Strongly Agree		Agree		Slightly Agree		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std. Dev.
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	M	SD
21. When I am learning a new grammar rule, I think about its relationship to the rules I have learned.	21	52,5	9	22,5	8	20	1	2,5	0	0	1	2,5	5,2	1,10
22. When I study for my English course, I pick out the most important points and make diagrams or tables for myself.	8	20	12	30	13	32,5	2	5	3	7,5	2	5	4,4	1,4
23. I try to find the meaning of a word by dividing it into parts that I can understand.	9	22,5	11	27,5	11	27,5	1	2,5	5	12,5	3	7,5	4,22	1,5
24. I use new English words in a sentence in order to remember them easily.	8	20	12	30	9	22,5	7	17,5	2	5	2	5	4,27	1,4
25. I always try to evaluate my progress in learning English.	6	15	11	27,5	14	35	6	15	2	5	1	2,5	4,25	1,2
26. When studying for my English exam, I try to find out which structures and terms I do not understand well.	12	30	18	45	7	17,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	1	2,5	4,90	1,1
27. I learn better when I try to understand the reasons of my mistakes I have done in English.	10	25	19	47,5	9	22,5	2	5	0	0	0	0	4,9	0,8
28. I arrange time to prepare before every English class.	3	7,5	5	12,5	6	15	11	27,5	9	22,5	6	15	3,1	1,5

Responses from to item 27 displayed almost all of the students (95%) believed they learned better when they tried to find out the reasons of their own mistakes. On the other hand, only 20% of the students showed their agreement to the idea of arranging time to prepare before every English class (Item 28).

Responses to the items 21, 22, 23 and 24 all of which reflect organizing learning are quite similar. For instance, item 21 revealed that almost all of the students (95%) had a tendency to find out the relationship of the new grammar rule to the rules they have learned before. Also, 82.5% of the students showed their

agreement on making diagrams, summaries or tables of important points while they were studying English (Item 22).

As for vocabulary learning strategies, the students' responses are quite consistent. For instance, 77.5% of the students indicated that they tried to find out the meaning of a word by dividing into parts (Item 23). Additionally, 72.5% of the students indicated their agreement to using new English words in a sentence to remember them easily.

Also, for the self-monitoring and self-evaluation, most of the students considered they were significant strategies during learning English. For instance, 92.5% of the students indicated their agreement by stating they tried to identify the structures and terms they did not understand well before English exams (Item 26). In addition, 77.5% of the students indicated their agreement by stating they always tried to evaluate their progress during English learning process (Item 28).

4.2.3. Responsibility Perceptions of the Participants

The third part of the questionnaire aimed to investigate students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities in learning English. The data was gathered from twelve items in the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to present the frequencies and percentages of the items. Table 3 displays the percentages and frequencies of students' responses to the perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities.

As can be seen from the data, in four out of twelve items students gave more responsibility to their teacher rather than to themselves. These items consisted of concerns on deciding the content of English lessons to be learned, choosing the activities to be used during the English lessons, deciding time to be spent on each activity and choosing the materials to be used in the English lessons.

Table 3. Responsibility Perceptions of the Participants

ITEM	Teacher's Responsibility		Both Teacher's and my own Responsibility		My own Responsibility	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
29. stimulating my interest in learning English	2	5	36	90	2	5
30. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	4	10	27	68	9	23
31. deciding the objectives of the English course	8	20	21	52	11	28
32. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	24	60	14	35	2	5
33. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	19	47,5	19	48	2	5
34. deciding how long to spend on each activity	26	65	10	25	4	10
35. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	22	55	16	40	2	5
36. evaluating my learning performance	16	40	22	55	2	5
37. evaluating the English course	7	17,5	27	68	6	15
38. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	1	2,5	14	35	25	63
39. making sure I make progress during English lessons	6	15	28	70	6	15
40. making sure I make progress outside the English class	2	5	19	48	19	48

Responses to each of these items reveal small distinctions. For instance, 60% of the students were thinking the teacher was the one who is responsible for deciding what they will learn in the English lesson (Item 32). Also, almost 50% of the students indicated their agreement to giving the responsibility of choosing activities to be used during the learning process to the teacher (Item 33). Responses from items 34 and 35 display that most of the students considered the teacher as the responsible for deciding the time limit to be spent on each task or activity and materials to be used in the English lessons. As a result, most of the students gave more responsibility to the teacher for formal language instruction.

As for sharing responsibility with the teacher, students seemed to have a notion of shared responsibility. For instance, responses to item 29 displays almost all of the students agreed to share the responsibility with their teacher in stimulating their interest in learning English.

Additionally, almost 70% of the students reflected their willingness to share responsibility in identifying their weaknesses and strengths in learning English (Item 30). Similarly, responses from items 36 and 37 indicated more than half of the students had the notion of shared responsibility in evaluating their learning performance (Item 36), evaluating the English lessons (Item 37) and making sure they make progress during English lessons (Item 39). However, the responses to item 40 divided the class in two. Almost half of the class agreed on sharing responsibility with the teacher in making sure they make progress outside the English class while the other half of the students showed their beliefs stating that it was their own responsibility. On the other hand, the responses to item 38 shows that students gave themselves more responsibility than the teacher, and 62.5% of the students reported that they were able to take responsibility in decisions related to what will be learnt outside the English class.

4.2.4. Outside Class Activity Performance of the Participants

The last part of the questionnaire aimed to explore the students' out-of-class activity performances in learning English. The data were gathered from eight items on a five-point Likert type rating scale in the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to display the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items.

Table 4 displays the percentages and frequencies (with means and standard deviations for each item) of students' responses to the performance of outside class activities in learning English. As displayed by the data, more than half the respondents (62%) strongly stated they listened to English songs, by indicating 'always' and 'often' in the questionnaire (Item 48).

Similarly, 75% of students preferred to watch English movies or TV programs to improve their English (Item 45). Additionally, more than half of the students reported that they tried to learn a new word English by indicating 'always' and 'often' in the questionnaire (Item 43). Item 46 shows that more than half of the students preferred reading English written materials by indicating 'often' and

'sometimes' in the questionnaire. When compared the items 45 and 46, most of the students preferred watching movies and TV programs in English rather than reading.

Table 4. The Outside Class Activities Performed by the Participants

ITEM	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never		**Mean**	**Stand**
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**M**	**SD**
41. I do grammar exercises though it is not homework.	3	7,5	7	17,5	17	42,5	10	25	3	7,5	**2,92**	**1,02**
42. I do assignments, which are not compulsory.	4	10	6	15	11	27,5	15	37,5	4	10	**2,77**	**1,14**
43. I try to learn new words in English.	12	30	15	37,5	12	30	1	2,5	0	0	**4**	**0,84**
44. I use internet in English. (for chat, search…)	13	32,5	12	30	9	22,5	5	12,5	1	2,5	**3,77**	**1,12**
45. I watch English movies or TV programs.	17	42,5	13	32,5	8	20	1	2,5	1	2,5	**4,10**	**0,98**
46. I read English written materials. (magazines, books, newspapers…)	3	7,5	16	40	13	32,5	6	15	2	5	**3,30**	**0,99**
47. I talk to foreigners in English.	12	30	10	25	8	20	10	25	0	0	**3,60**	**1,17**
48. I listen to English songs.	18	45	7	17,5	10	25	5	12,5	0	0	**3,95**	**1,10**

Moreover, over half of the students indicated that they tried to talk to foreigners in English to improve their speaking skills as an outside class activity (Item 47). Accordingly, 62.5% of the students reported that they preferred using the Internet to improve their English for chat and search (Item 44). Finally, the responses to items 41 and 42 presented students' unwillingness to do extra exercises outside the class. For instance, only 25% of the students seemed to have a habit of doing extra grammar exercises (Item 41), and doing optional assignments (Item 42).

4.3. Analysis of the Interview

After two days following the questionnaire distribution, fifteen participants were interviewed one by one to elicit their opinion about CALL and its effects on autonomy development. The interview took place in the office of the researcher without a time limit, but took approximately, 7-10 minutes. The interviews with the students were tape recorded, and the researcher took notes. The students were asked 8 questions, and they were interviewed in Turkish to prevent any misunderstanding and anxiety.

First, the students were asked how long they had been learning English. On the whole, most of the students (10 out of 15 participants) claimed that they have been learning English since the 4th grade at primary school. However, 5 out of 15 students said that they have been learning English since 6th at secondary school. Although they have been learning English for 12-15 years, they claimed that it was only a lesson, which they had to pass.

Next, the students were asked what they think about using computers and Internet to learn English. Almost all of the students (14) claimed that using computer to learn English really work. One of the students stated:

> *Of course, it works. It is really easy to access. I can find any information at any time I want. For instance, I watch different TV series, movies, and I listen to songs on the Internet to improve my English. Also, I can search any kind of English topics that I do not understand or to learn about English in general. I believe the Internet provides a good resource and improves my understanding of English.*

Most of the students claimed that there are many websites that they can practice their English. Also, they declared that using Internet and computer was better than using the books. They declared that they could search, watch, listen, write and speak in English easily, and to them, it was more enjoyable than being in the class. One of the students stated:

> *I have been using the internet for a year. I improved my English by checking and following the foreign websites, news sites and magazines. I tried to understand how they use the language in their daily life, to how they reflect to the situations. I believed I improved my English by listening songs, watching videos in English and following some English-teaching websites. In that sense, I can say that it certainly works.*

Although the Internet presents so many opportunities to study English, there might be some distractive things for learners. It may cause some concentration problems. Accordingly, one student stated:

> *In fact, the answer depends on the person. To me, I do not think using computers and Internet was very useful to improve my English. There are so many things to distract the concentration on the Internet. It caused so much focusing problems for me. I could not use affectively*

because when I started to study on the computer, I wanted to use many other social media websites such as Facebook, Twitter, etc. Also, I think studying with the teacher in the class is more useful than studying on the computer.

In response to the question, "*What did you most like about using computers and Internet to study English both inside and outside the classroom?*" Almost all of the students mentioned they liked the activities and the software used in the class. They said they liked different online activities they did during the CALL classes. They also added they had fun while learning. For instance, most of them stated that they liked online-interactive activities done in the class, such as preparing a Facebook profile of a celebrity. Almost all of them mentioned they liked the video-making activities. They claimed while they were preparing videos, or writing subtitles for videos, they had fun and learnt better, because they felt that they produced something real. The students also added the activities in CALL lessons were different from the activities they did in the class. However, they mentioned that the activities in CALL classes were better because they involved in the activities actively. For instance, one of the students stated:

> *First of all, I liked the software we used in the CALL classes. The activities in the software were helping me reinforce the things I learnt in the other classes. Apart from that, making presentations was very enjoyable for me. I thought that I knew and learnt something when I produced something during the learning process. I can say that I fondly participated in all of the activities we did in CALL classes such as preparing posters, videos, comics and CV in English.*

In response to the fourth question, "*Did you like individual or group work? Which one was better*" 12 of the students stated they like group work rather than working alone. They said it was easier to work with their friends, and they supported one another during the learning process. Also, they added that they produced better things in the CALL classes while working together. Although the majority believes that working in groups was better and more useful, 3 of the students mentioned that they preferred both working individually and in-group. They mentioned that while working in groups, they shared their knowledge with each other and improved

themselves with the help of their friends. However, they added while working individually, they could measure what they knew and did.

In response to the fifth question, *"How did you feel in general while studying on the Internet?"* All of the students mentioned they felt relax and safe while working on the Internet. They said that they were alone with the computer and they were trying to do something. They claimed when they saw they could do and produce something alone or with their friends, they felt better and more self-confident. Also, they added they felt free and comfortable while working on the Internet. They said that there were no boundaries; they were able to search any kind of information to improve their English and only the book while working on the Internet did not limit them.

In response to the question, *"Do you think this process helped you to develop language learning strategies and your English language?"* All of the students had an agreement to developing a language learning strategy during this process. These are some language learning strategies the students developed:

- Using internet effectively for reading, speaking and listening,
- Trying to make connections among the grammar subjects,
- Keeping an online diary and dictionary,
- Making reviews and searching some tests on the internet,
- Using English in daily life,

Additionally, they stated that they developed some strategies to memorize the words. For instance, one of the students said:

> *First of all, I started to use English every time and every where even at home. I started to use every technological thing such as mobile phone, pc, etc. I have in English. I developed some methods to memorize the words. I have two jars at home. I put some unknown words in one of them. Then, I pick one word from that jar and try to remember its meaning and to make a sentence including it and if I am successful I put that word into the other jar. Now, I am doing this with the new words I learn in the class.*

Then, the students were asked, *"Do you think you can effectively use Internet and computer to learn a language different from English?"* Responses to that

question showed that most of the students (11 out of 15) believed that they could use the Internet and computer to learn any other language effectively. Also, they emphasized some languages they wanted to learn in future such as Russian, Korean, Japanese, French, Italian, Arabic and German. They stated they wanted to learn these languages because of their department. They thought if they learn these languages, they would be successful businessman in future. They mentioned that after CALL classes, they know how to use the Internet to learn a language so that they can use the Internet for their purposes. One of the students said:

> *I believe that I can use the Internet to learn Arabic from now on. If you asked this question seven months ago, I would say just I could use it to search for the meanings of the words. However, thanks to CALL classes, now I know that the internet is much more than a dictionary, I can use it to learn a language in many ways.*

On the other hand, 4 students stated that they couldn't use the Internet to learn any other language they wanted to learn. They mentioned that they would be in need of a guide to use the Internet. Also, they stated that there are so many websites for language learning, but they do not know how to choose the correct one to help them learn the target language. Additionally, they said that they could use it for a while until they learn some basic words and structures, but then they will need a teacher to show them how to go further.

Ten out of fifteen students thought that they couldn't organize their learning without a teacher as regards the question *"Can you regulate you learning process on your own without a teacher?"* They explained that they would need a professional support to learn a language better. They stated that there are many opportunities on the Internet, but they can use them just to start to learn a language. To be an advanced learner, they mentioned they needed help from a teacher. Some of them explained that they needed a teacher who motivates and disciplines them during the learning process. On the other hand, 5 of them explained that they could organize their learning program without a teacher. They stated that they could search the language and a learning program to learn it on the Internet. They thought that they could find online tutors. They also added that there were many language-learning videos online.

Finally, the students were asked, *"Do you have any suggestions to improve the process?"* All of the students stated that they liked CALL classes, and they provided several suggestions to improve the learning process in CALL lessons. According to them there should:

- be more speaking activities,
- be more hours allocated to CALL,
- be more different activities used in the class,
- give more importance to group –work,
- more outside class activities, and
- fewer students in the class for immediate feedback from the teacher.

CHAPTER V

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter starts with the presentation of a summary of the study. Then, the results obtained are reviewed and discussed with reference to the research questions. In addition, the limitation of the study, the implications for practice and further research are provided in this chapter.

5.2. Summary of the Study

The aim of the study was to gain insights into students' perception of learner autonomy development regarding four aspects: Learners' motivational level in English, Learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English, Learners' perception of their and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English, and Learners' practice of autonomous language learning in the form of outside class activities with the help of CALL classes. The second aim of the study was to investigate learners' perceptions of learning English within a CALL environment. The participants in the study were 40 students in the School of Foreign Languages at Hasan Kalyoncu University. The study was conducted at the end of their first year at the School of Foreign Languages (May, 2013).

In order to address the research questions in the study, two data collection tools were utilized: questionnaires and interviews. Therefore, the data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data gathered from the questionnaires and content analysis was used to analyze the interviews conducted with the participants.

5.3. The Findings

There were two research questions in the study. The first one aimed to identify the students' perceived levels of their own autonomy development and the second one aimed to explore the students' perceptions of the effects of CALL on their learner autonomy development during the English learning process. Therefore,

this section presents the findings of the study using the research questions and the relevant literature review as a basis.

5.3.1. Students' Motivation Level and CALL

The data regarding the motivation level of the students were gathered by the first section of the questionnaire, and supported by interviews done with the participants. The data indicated that the students seemed to have a high motivation level. Since the motivation is one of the most significant elements in order to become an autonomous learner, it can be said that the students in the study likely had enough level of motivation to be autonomous learners. Accordingly, it seems that there is a consistency with previous findings, which point out that autonomous learners are motivated learners (Ushido, 1996), and motivation has a significant role to enhance autonomous learning (Spratt, Humphery and Chan, 2002).

The majority of the students reported they liked English classes and they wanted to improve their English as much as possible. In other words, most of the students had a high determination and willingness to learn English and to be the best in the English class. This result shows how important intrinsic motivation is to become an autonomous learner. According to Ushioda (2000), there is a significant relationship between learners' intrinsic motivation and learner autonomy. She adds that the interests and needs of learners and having freedom of control and choice identify intrinsic motivation. In that sense, it could be argued in the context of this study that the participants had the chance to practice the features of intrinsic motivation while using computers and the Internet to study English. Throughout the CALL classes the learners had the opportunity to regulate their process of learning and to match the content of the learning to their interests. In other words, they could control their learning process according to their needs. Therefore, motivating the students intrinsically provided an appropriate environment to promote autonomy. Additionally, most of the students stated that they wanted to learn English better to get a good and well-paid job. It showed that extrinsic motivation was also important for the students.

Furthermore, it seems that there were no significant concentration problems during the learning process. However, most of the participants mentioned that they have test anxiety and uncomfortable feelings while speaking in the class. However, if learners learn to be self-motivated or autonomous, they can easily overcome such kind of difficulties (Ho & Crookall, 1995).

Moreover, Little and Dam (1998) claim that autonomy focuses on attention, individuality and independence as well as collaborative work. Although some of the participants indicated they enjoyed pair and group work, some of them indicated their enjoyment to work individually. Throughout the learning process, there were different activities to do both individually and collaboratively for each week. However, interviews done with the participants show that almost all of the students stated that they enjoyed much more while working with friends in CALL classes. Also, they indicated that they liked to follow their process studying with computer and the Internet, individually.

As for the active involvement, the participants see the teacher as an authority who dominates the classroom. However, the autonomous learners are expected to take initiative role in many aspects and decrease the dependence on the teacher in the class (Victori & Lochart, 1995). When the interviews are taken into consideration, it becomes clear that the teacher is the one who guides them and shows them the way they should follow in the learning process.

When compared the results of questionnaire and interviews, it can be concluded that using computers and the Internet in the learning process increased learners' intrinsic motivation. Also, it made them aware of their effectiveness in the learning process. Moreover, it is believed that as the students had higher motivation, they were closer to become an autonomous learner in their learning process.

5.3.2. Language Learning Strategy Use and CALL

The data regarding language learning strategy used by the participants were collected in Section 2 of the questionnaire in four dimension factors: *Organizing learning, Organizing time, Self-monitoring and self-evaluation,* and supported by the

interviews done with the students. As mentioned earlier, there has always been a correlation between language learning strategy use (metacognitive strategies) and learner autonomy (Wenden, 1987, Cohen, 1998). Accordingly, using language learning strategies help students develop more active and autonomous attitude, which enable them to take the control of their learning (Victori & Lockart, 1995).

For self-evaluation and self-monitoring strategies, the participants seemed they were aware of the importance of evaluating their progress and trying to find out the structures they do not understand, understand the reasons of their mistakes. However, for organizing time, more than half of the participants indicated that they did not organize their time to make preparations for the upcoming English lessons. Nevertheless, time management is one of the significant indicators of autonomy (Ho & Crookall, 1995).

According to Rivers (2001), use of effective language learning strategies to control language-learning process and learning environment is a characteristic of autonomous learner. In that sense, learners are expected to know what they need and they should have the freedom to take action to meet their needs in order to create such a learning environment for them. In this study, such environment was created with the help of CALL classes. The learners had a wide range of choices to use while studying English. They had the opportunities to use the language learning strategies appropriate to their learning styles.

As a result, it is hard to claim that the participants used all of the language learning strategies during the learning process. However, the results of the study showed that the participants increased their awareness of using these strategies while learning the target language. Also, they gained more awareness of the fact that these strategies helped them to meet their needs both inside and outside the classroom.

5.3.3. Responsibility Perceptions and CALL

The data regarding responsibility perceptions were collected in Section 3 of the questionnaire and supported by the interviews done with the participants. Taking

responsibility in the language learning process is one of the most significant elements to promote learner autonomy (Wenden, 1991).

The results of the questionnaire showed that most of the participants saw the teacher as the one who has more responsibility in deciding the content of the English course, choosing relevant activities and tasks, selecting the materials and time limit for each activity during the language learning and teaching process. On the other hand, the results of interviews showed that the students believed in themselves while deciding how they organize their learning process, but they emphasized their needs for a guide to show the way that they can go on further while learning the target language. When the characteristics of an autonomous learner suggested by Little (1997) are taken into consideration, it is hard to say the participants are totally autonomous. Little (1997, p.7) states that determining the objectives, defining the contents, selecting the methods and techniques to be used, monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, place, etc.) and evaluating what has been required are the major components of learner autonomy. Ho and Crookall (1995) claim that being autonomous does not mean working independently, but learners should share some areas such as decision making. Stimulating their interests, identifying their weaknesses and strengths, evaluating their learning performance, evaluating English lesson and making sure they make progress during English lesson are the ones which require only learner's own responsibility. Besides, the participants showed their willingness to share these areas with the teacher. In addition, these five items are regarded as part of language learning strategies, which foster learner autonomy (Cotterall, 1999).

Furthermore, during the learning process the computers and the Internet offered different language learning materials to the participants and they gained the awareness of the importance of taking responsibility for their own learning. Throughout the study, the students were willing to complete the tasks they were assigned to, both during the classes and outside the classroom. Also, they all submitted their assignments on time. In that sense, the computers and the Internet helped the learners in the study develop responsibility for their language learning. In addition, it is believed the teacher-researcher raised the learners' awareness and

encouraged them to take more responsibility for their own learning, by showing the required steps to use computers and the Internet to develop their language and strategy use during learning language process.

5.3.4. Outside Class Activity Performance and CALL

The data regarding learners' participation to outside class activities that is related to development of autonomous learning were collected in Section 4 of the questionnaire and supported with the interviews done with the participants.

The teacher-researcher in this study tried to provide different out-of-class activities, which would help the participants, develop autonomy, using mainly the computers and the Internet. The participants seemed willing to do the out-of-class assignments. In addition, the learners wanted to involve in the activities done through CALL and submitted their works on time, regularly. It might result from the fact that the assignments were compulsory to get the marks from CALL classes. However, the students declared that they used the computer and the Internet to watch movies and TV programs in English, to read English books and magazines, to listen to English songs and to talk to native speakers outside the class. In addition, they stated that they used the Internet effectively to study grammar before exams.

During the study, the teacher-researcher showed the learners how to use the computers and the Internet on the behalf of learning English outside the class to promote learner autonomy. According to the results of the study conducted by Sharp, Pocklington and Weindling (2002), outside class activities helped the learner develop their language learning strategies and have intrinsic motivation both of which are the significant components of learner autonomy development. Accordingly, the results of this study displayed that as the participants willingly took part in outside class activities, they took a further step in becoming autonomous in their language learning process.

5.4. Pedagogical Implications

One of the most important outcomes of educational research in the last two decades has been the enhancement of the learner's role in the language learning process as well as a growing awareness of the need to develop the ability to learn autonomously (Gewehr, 1998). Learning in the new millennium should be autonomous, active and learner-centered. Learners should be trained to exercise a high degree of autonomy in learning in order to meet the needs of the fast changing, information-loaded world.

The primary focus of learner autonomy is on the learners' individual awareness of the learning process, which distinguishes it from a traditional classroom. In order to enhance autonomous learning, the Curriculum Unit needs to design the course objectives and design the materials accordingly.

The results of the study showed that integrating CALL classes into the Curriculum increased the learners' awareness of the importance of learner autonomy. However, it would be better if both the instructors and the learners were given a training to have the necessary computer skills in order to prevent the learning process from being frustrating for both sides.

5.5. Implications for Further Research

In this study, the aim was to explore the autonomy development of the students and the effects of CALL on promoting learner autonomy. During the study, it was aimed to increase the students' motivation, develop their language learning strategies, encourage them to take responsibilities for their own learning and involve them in out-of-class activities. All of them are seen as the indicators of learner autonomy in the related literature (Ushioda, 1996; Wenden, 1991; Little, 1991).

This study was designed to explore only whether the students increased their motivation, developed the necessary language learning strategies, took responsibility for their own learning and took part in out-of-class activities by the help of the computers and the Internet to be an autonomous learner when learning English. In the light of the findings in this study, a further study could be conducted in order to examine whether the students could increase their levels of achievement after becoming autonomous by using computers and the Internet.

Additionally, the data were collected only from the students learning English, but a further study could also be conducted by collecting data from language teachers. It might give a better data for the Curriculum Unit when designing the objectives and materials to promote autonomous learning.

Also, in this study, the students studied with language learning software (7/24) and additional online resources. A further study could be conducted whether software or other online tasks are more beneficial to promote learner autonomy when learning a language.

Furthermore, the findings of this study might be beneficial for the institutions and language teacher that would like to integrate CALL lessons into their curriculum to promote autonomous learning in the language learning process.

5.6. Limitations of the Study

1. This study is limited to the data collected from 40 students studying at English preparatory class of Hasan Kalyoncu University. Therefore, it can be said that the study is limited to a small number of students, which makes it hard to generalize the findings in different groups of students in other educational settings.

2. In this study, the four areas of autonomous learning were explored: motivation, language learning strategies, taking responsibility and out-of-class activities. However, according to Little (1990), learner autonomy is not easy to achieve as it can show itself in a great variety of ways (as cited in Koçak, 2003). In that sense, the four areas of autonomy investigated in this study might have some limitations and these limitations should have been taken into consideration prior to the development of learner autonomy.

3. The learners had some technological problems with their computers and the Internet connection during the CALL classes as all of the activities were carried out on the computers and the Internet. Some of the students submitted their assignments late because they did not have the Internet connection at home.

4. Another limitation was the number of the students in the class. There were 40 students in each class. Therefore, it was so hard to control the students in the class and train them during the language learning process. Also, it affected

the speed of the Internet connection. Most of the students had to wait for a long time in order to do the activities and it affected their motivation during the class time.

6.   REFERENCES

Almekhlafi, A.G. (2006). The Effect of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) on United Arab Emirates English as a Foreign Language (EFL) School Students' Achievement and Attitude. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 17*(2), 121-142. Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved December 26, 2013 from http://www.editlib.org/p/6218.

Barnes, D. (1976). *From Communication to Curriculum*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bax, S. (2003). CALL-past, present and future. *System, 31* (1), 13-28.

Beatty, K. (2003). Teaching and Researching Computer Assisted Language Learning,New York: Longman.

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

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. Essex,Harlow: Longman.

Benson P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller(eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning,* London: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd, pp. 18-34.

Benson P., & Voller P. (1997). Introduction. In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning,* London: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd, pp. 1-12.

Bernard, H. Research *Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.

Blin, F. (2005). CALL and development of learner autonomy: Towards an activity theoretical perspective. *ReCALL* 16[2]: 377-395.

Boulton-Lewis, G.M., Wilss, L., & Mutch, S. (1996). *Teachers as adult learners: Their knowledge of their own learning and implications for teaching*. Higher Education, 32, 89-106.

Braganorte, M. (2005). *Self-Access Study and Cooperative Foreign Language Learning through Computers*. Linguem and Ensino, 8, 2. Pp. 145-169.

Brandl, K. (2008). *Communicative language teaching in action: Putting principles to work.* NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Branigan, C. (2008, March 21). Schools respond to iPhone's popularity. *ESchool News*. Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.eschoolnews.com/news/topnews/?i=53170;_hbguid=3105ad73-79ea-4f2f-96fc-66fa7dc83048&d=top-news

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: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* USA: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Camilleri A. (1997). *Awareness for Autonomy: an introduction to learner autonomy.* In Byram M. (ed.) Report on Workshop 3/97 Language and culture awareness in language/learning teaching for the development of learner autonomy. Graz, European Centre for Modern Languages.

Candy P. (1988), On the attainment of subject-matter autonomy. In D. Boud (ed.), *Developing student autonomy in learning,* 2nd edition, London: Kogan Page, pp. 59-76.

Carver, D. (1982). *Introduction to "The selection and training of helpers".* In W.D. Cousin, (Ed.) Report of the workshops in the role and training of helpers for self access language learning systems. Moray House (mimeo).

Chaimonkol, U. (2000). *Development of reading skills for English "Business News" through computer assisted instruction CAI.* Unpublished master's thesis, Khan Kean University, Khan Kean.

Chun, D. (2006) *'CALL technologies for L2 reading'*, in L. Ducate and N. Arnold (eds) Calling on CALL: From Theory and Research to New Directions in Foreign Language Teaching, San Marcos, Tex.: CALICO, pp. 69–98.

Chun, D. M., & Plass, J. L. (2000). Networked multimedia environments for second language acquisition. In M. Warshauer & R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based*

language teaching: Concepts and practice (pp. 151-170). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Cole, P. G. and Chan L. K.S. (1994). *Teaching Principles and Practice.* Australia: Prentice Hall.

Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them? *System, 27*, 493-513.

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

Crabbe, D. (1993). Fostering Autonomy From Within the Classroom: The Teacher's Responsibility. *System, 21* (4), 443-452.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative approaches to research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Pearson Education.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy 3: from Theory to Classroom Practice.* Dublin: Authentik.

Davies, T. & Williamson, R. (1998). The ghost in the machine: Are 'teacherless' CALL programs really possible? *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes,* 55(1), 7-18.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-Instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Dickinson, L. & Wenden, A. (Eds.). (1995). Autonomy, self-direction and self access in language teaching and learning. Special issue of *System,* 23/2.

Dlaska, Andrea. (2002). *Sites of construction: language learning, multimedia, and the international engineer. Computers and Education* vol. 39 issue 2 September, 2002. p.129-143.

Dolan, D. (2002). *Learner autonomy and technology: An integrated language learning environment.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Computers in Education.

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

Finch, A. (2001). "Autonomy: Where Are We? Where Are We Going?" *Presentation at the JALT CUE Conference on Autonomy.* http://www.finchpark.com/arts/autonomy

Gips, A., DiMattia, P., & Gips, J. (2004) The effect of assistive technology on educational   costs: Two case studies. In K. Miesenberger, J. Klaus, W.

Zagler,D. Burger (eds.), Computers Helping People with Special Needs, Springer, 2004, pp. 206-213.

Hampel, Regine (2003). Theoretical perspectives and new practices in audio-graphic conferencing for language learning. *ReCall, 15(1),* pp. 21–36.

Hannaford, A. E., & Taber, F. M, (1982), Microcomputer Software for the Handicapped: Development and Evaluation. *Exceptional Children*, 49, 137-141.

Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Henson, K. T. (2003). *Foundations for learner-centered education: A knowledge base.* Retrieved July 27, 2008, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200310/ai_n9332038

Ho, J. and Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese Cultural Traditions: Learner Autonomy in English Language Teaching. *System, 23* (2), 235-243.

Holden, B., & Usuki, M. (1999). Learner autonomy in language learning: A preliminary investigation: *Bulletin of Hokuriku University,* Vol.23.

Holec, H. (1985). On autonomy: some elementary concepts. In P. Riley (Ed.). *Discourse and Learning*. London: Longman. 173-90.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford:Pergamon (First published [1979], Strasbourgh: Council of Europe).

Hunt, J., Gow, L. & Barnes, P. (1989). Learner self-evaluation and assessment – a tool for autonomy in the language learning classroom, in V. Bickley (Ed.). *Language Teaching and Learning Styles Within and Across Cultures.* Hong Kong: Institute of   Language in   Education, Education Department, 207-17.

Kataoka, Ko.(2000). *Computers for English Language Learning in Japanese Schools*. [Washington, D.C.] : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse,

http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED43960

Katic, E.K. (2008). Pre-service teachers' conceptions about computers: An ongoing search for transformative appropriations of modern technologies. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(2), 157-179.

Kelly, R. (1996). Language counseling for learner autonomy: the skilled helper in self access language learning. In R. Pemberton, S.L. Edward, W.W.F. Or, and

H.D.   Pierson (Eds.). *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. 93-114.

Khalili, A_ & Shashaani, L. (1994). The effectiveness of computer applications: A meta analysis. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 27*, 48-6.

Kitao, Kenji. (1994). *Starting CAI English Classes*. [Washington, D.C.] : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse,

http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED379943

Koçak, Ayfer. (2003). *A study on learners' readiness for autonomous learning of English as a   foreign language.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kozma, R.B. (1991). Learning with media. Review of Educational Research, 61,179 -211

Kung, S. C. 2002. A framework for successful key pal programs in language learning. *CALL EJ Online*, 3(2). Retrieved May 1, 2007, from
http://www.clec.ritsumei.ac.jp/english/callejonline/6-2/SCKung.htm

Lee, O. (1999). Science knowledge, worldviews, and information sources in social and cultural contexts: Making sense after a natural disaster. *American Educational   Research Journal, 36* (2), 187–220.

Lee, C., Jor, G., & Lai, E. (2005). *Web-based teaching and English language teaching*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Levie, W.H., & Lentz, R. (1982). Effects of text illustrations: A review of research. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 30, 195-232.

Levy, M. (1997). *Computer-assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Liaw, S. S. (2002). An internet survey for perceptions of computer and world wide web: relationship, prediction, and difference. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 18(1), 17-35.

Little, D. (2004) Learner autonomy, Teacher autonomy and European Language Portfolio. Retrived January 20, 2007, from
http://www.utc.fr/~untele/2004ppt/handouts/little.pdf

Little, D. (2002). *Learner autonomy and second/foreign language learning*. In The guide to good practice for learning and teaching in languages, linguistics and area studies. LTSN Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton.

Little, D. (1995). Leaning as dialogue: the dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System* 23/2, 175-181.

Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy: Definitions, Issues and Problems.* Authentic Ltd. Dublin.

Little, D., & Dam, L. (1998). *Learner autonomy: What and why?* Retrieved June 21, 2008, from http://www.jaltpublications.org/tlt/files/98/oct/littledam.html.

Littlejohn, A. (1985). Learner choice in language study. *English Language Teaching Journal,* 39/4, 253-61.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40,* 243-249.

Littlewood W. (1997), Self-access: why do we want it and what can it do?. In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning,* Essex: Longman Applied Linguistic and Language Study, pp.79-91.

Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liu, M., Moore, Z., Graham, L., & Lee, S. (2002). A look at the research on computer based technology use in second language learning: A review of the literature from 1990-2000. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 34(3), 250-273.

Lutz, S., & Huitt, W. (2004). Connecting cognitive development and constructivism: Implications from theory for instruction and assessment. *Constructivism in the Human Sciences, 9* (1), 67-90.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mandell, C.J., & Mandell, S. L. (1989). *Computers in education today.* USA: West Publishing Company.

Matusevich, M. (1995). School reform: What role can technology play in a constructivist setting? Retrieved May 10, 2006, from http://0-pixel.cs.vt.edu.innopac.up.ac.za/edu/fis/techcons.html

Mayer, R.E., & Gallini, J.K. (1990). When is an illustration worth ten thousand words?*Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 715-726.

McNamara, C. (1999) General Guidelines for Conducting Interviews. Retrieved from, http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/intrview.htm

Miles, M. B, and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis,* 2nd Ed., p. 10 12. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Murray, D. (2000). Protean communications: The language of computer-mediated communication. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 397-422.

Mutlu, Arzu. (2008). *The role of CALL in promoting learner autonomy.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Navaruttanaporn. (2010). *Computer assisted language learning to improve English for hotel at university in the Northeastern region of Thailand.* Doctoral Dissertation Doctor of Philosophy. Bangkok : Srinakarinwirot University.

Netemeyer, R.G., Bearden, W.O., Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling Procedures Issues and Applications.* California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nugent, G. (1982). Pictures, audio, and print: Symbolic representation and effect on learning. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal,* 30, 163-174.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Oppenheim, A. N. (1993). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement.* London: Pinter Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies. What Every Teacher Should Know.* New York: Newburry House Publishers.

Peeck, J. (1974). Retention of pictorial and verbal content of a text with illustrations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66, 980-888.

Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *Modern Language Journal,* 85(2), 279-290.

Roberts, L.P. (1992). Attitudes of entering university freshmen toward foreign language study: A descriptive analysis. *Modern Language Journal,* 76(3), 275-283.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., McLean, R., Swallow, J., & Woodruff, E. (1989). Computer supported intentional learning environments. *Journal of Educational Computing Research,* 5, 51-68.

Scharle, A. and Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner Autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharp, C., Pocklington, K., & Weindling, D. (2002). Study support and the development of the self regulated learner. *Educational Research, 44,* 29-41.

Sinclair, B. & Ellis, G. (1985). *Learner training: preparation for learner autonomy.* Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, New York.

Smith, R. C. 2003. *'Pedagogy for autonomy as (becoming) appropriate methodology'* in D. Palfreyman and R. C. Smith (eds.).

Smith R. M. 1983. *Learning How to Learn.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research, 6*(3), 245-266.

Strommen, E. & Lincoln, B. (1992). A framework for educational reform: constructivism.

http://www.ilt.columbia.edu.edu/k12/livetext/docs/construct.html

Sutton, L. A. (2000). *Vicarious interaction in a course enhanced through the use of computer mediated communication.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

Teeranitigul, C. (2000). *A development of the multimedia computer assisted instruction lesson entitled "Greenouse Effect" for senior high school Students.* Unpublished master's thesis, Srinakharinwirot, Bangkok.

Thanasoulas, D. (2007). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal,* 6(11). Retrieved May 28, 2007, from

http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html

Tudor I. (1996), *Learner-centredness as Language Education,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J. (1993). Using likert-scales in L2 research. *TESOL Quarterly. 27(4)*, 736-739.

Ushioda, E. (2000). Tandem language learning via e-mail: From motivation to autonomy. *ReCALL,* 12(2), 121-128.

Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner Autonomy: The Role of Motivation.* Dublin: Authentic Ltd.

Van Berkel, H. J. M., & Schmidt, H. G. (2000). Motivation to commit oneself as a determinant of achievement in problem-based learning. *Higher Education*, 40, 231-242.

Victori, M. and Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing Metacognition in Self-Directed Language Learning. *System, 23* (2), 223-234.

Wang, S., & Heffernan, N. (2010). Ethical issues in Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Perception should be in places of teachers and learners. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), 796–813.

Wang, S., & Smith, S. (2013). Reading and grammar learning through mobile phones.Language Learning & Technology, 17(3), 117–134. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/issues/october2013/wangsmith.pdf

Warschauer, M. (2004). The rhetoric and reality of aid: Promoting educational technology in Egypt. *Globalisation, Societies & Education*, 2(3), 377-390.

Warschauer, M. and Healey, D. (1998) 'Computers and language learning: an overview'.*Language teaching* 31: 57–71.

Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Applied Linguistics Series.

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

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* NY: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

White, C. (1995). Autonomy and Strategy Use in Distance Foreign Language Learning: Research Findings. *System, 23* (2), 207-221.

7. APPENDIX

<div align="center">

ÖĞRENCİ ANKETİ

</div>

Bu anket okulumuzdaki öğrencilerin İngilizce'ye yönelik duygu ve düşüncelerini, İngilizce öğrenirken kullandıkları stratejileri, İngilizce öğrenirken üstlendikleri sorumlulukları ve ders dışındaki İngilizce faaliyetlerine katılımlarını anlamak için araştırma aracı olarak hazırlanmıştır. Vereceğiniz doğru cevaplar ile elde edilen bilgiler okulumuzdaki İngilizce öğretim etkinliklerine verimli bir şekilde yansıyacaktır. **Bu nedenle her bir soruyu dikkatle okuyarak eksiksiz yanıtlamaya ve atlanmış soru bırakmamaya özen gösteriniz. Ankete verdiğiniz bilgiler araştırmacı tarafından kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır.**

<div align="center">

Yardımlarınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

</div>

Seda Zonturlu

Bölüm 1

Aşağıda İngilizce öğrenmeye yönelik ifadeler vardır. Lütfen ifadelerin her birini dikkatle okuyarak size en uygun gelen seçeneğe (×) işareti koyunuz.

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum 6	Katılıyorum	Katılma eğilimindeyim 4	Katılmama eğilimindeyim 3	Katılmıyorum 2	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1
1. İngilizce öğrenmek benim için zevklidir.						
2. Keşke İngilizce'yi okula gitmeden daha kolay bir şekilde öğrenebilsem.						
3. İngilizce öğrenmek için elimden gelenin en iyisini yapmaya çalışıyorum.						
4. İngilizce dersinde devam zorunluluğu olmasa bile bu derse katılımım yüksek olur.						
5. Mümkün olduğu müddetçe İngilizce öğrenmeye devam etmek istiyorum.						
6. İngilizce dersinde başarılı olacağıma inanıyorum.						
7. Eğer İngilizce'yi daha iyi öğrenirsem daha iyi ve daha kazançlı bir iş bulabileceğim.						
8. İngilizce dersinde en iyi olmak istiyorum.						
9. İngilizce dersinde konuşmak zorunda kaldığımda kendimi rahat hissetmiyorum.						
10. İngilizce dersinde kolay konsantre olamam.						
11. İngilizce sınavlarında başarılı olamayacağımdan korkuyorum						
12. İngilizce dersinde ikili gruplar halinde çalışmayı severim.						
13. İngilizce dersinde bireysel çalışmayı tercih ederim.						
14. İngilizce dersindeki grup çalışmaları verimlidir.						
15. İngilizce dersinde daha çok konuşan öğretmen olmalıdır.						
16. İngilizce dersinde aktif olarak katılımımı sağlayan aktiviteler hoşuma gider.						
17. İngilizce dersinde öğretmen öğrencileri derse katkıda bulunmaya teşvik etmelidir.						
18. Eğer İngilizce dersinde başarısız olursam, bu yeterince çalışmadığımdan kaynaklanacaktır.						
19. Eğer İngilizce dersinde başarısız olursam, bu İngilizce Öğretmen'inin eksikliğinden kaynaklanacaktır.						
20. Eğer İngilizce dersinde başarılı olursam, bu benim çok çaba sarf etmem sayesinde olacaktır.						

Bölüm 2

Bu bölümde İngilizce öğrenmeye yönelik stratejileri (taktikleri) içeren bir dizi cümle vardır. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi dikkatle okuyarak size en uygun gelen seçeneğe (x) işareti koyunuz.

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum 6	Katılıyorum 5	Katılma eğilimindeyim 4	Katılmama eğilimindeyim 3	Katılmıyorum 2	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1
21. Yeni bir dilbilgisi kuralı öğrenirken, bunun öğrendiğim kurallarla bağlantısını düşünürüm.						
22. İngilizce dersine çalışırken en önemli noktaları seçerek özet, tablo ya da şema çıkarırım.						
23. Bir sözcüğün anlamını, o sözcüğü anlayabildiğim parçalara ayırarak bulmaya çalışırım.						
24. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri kolayca hatırlamak için cümlede kullanırım.						
25. İngilizce öğrenirken gelişimimi sürekli değerlendirmeye çalışırım.						
26. İngilizce sınavıma çalışırken hangi yapıları ve ifadeleri iyi anlamadığımı saptamaya çalışırım.						
27. İngilizce de yaptığım hataların sebeplerini anlamaya çalıştığımda daha iyi öğrenirim.						
28. Her İngilizce dersinden önce derse hazırlanmak için vakit ayırırım.						

Bölüm 3

Bu bölümde İngilizce dersleri ile ilgili bazı sorumluluklar verilmiştir. Lütfen ifadeleri dikkatle okuyarak her bir sorumluluğun kime ait olduğunu "Tamamen Benim", "Tamamen Öğretim Elemanı'nın" veya "Kısmen Benim Kısmen Öğretim Elemanı'nın"yanındaki uygun seçeneklere **(ˣ)** işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

Lütfen her soruda yalnızca 1 işaretleme yapınız.

Sorumluluk	Kimin	Sorumluluğu	
	TAMAMEN ÖĞRETİM ELEMANI'NIN	KISMEN BENİM KISMEN ÖĞRETİM ELEMANI'NIN	TAMAMEN BENİM
29. İngilizce öğrenmeye olan ilgimi artırmak			
30. İngilizce öğrenmedeki zayıf ve güçlü yönlerimi tespit etmek			
31. İngilizce dersinin amaçlarına karar vermek			
32. Bir sonraki İngilizce dersinde ne öğrenileceğine karar vermek			
33. İngilizce dersinde kullanılacak aktiviteleri seçmek			
34. Her aktivitenin ne kadar sürede tamamlanacağına karar vermek			
35. İngilizce dersinde kullanılacak materyalleri seçmek			
36. Öğrenmedeki performansımı değerlendirmek			
37. İngilizce dersini değerlendirmek			
38. Ders dışında İngilizce ile ilgili ne öğreneceğime karar vermek			
39. İngilizce dersinde gelişme kaydetmemi sağlamak			
40. Ders dışında İngilizce'de gelişme kaydetmemi sağlamak			

Bölüm 4

Bu bölümde ders dışında İngilizce öğrenmeye yönelik etkinlikleri içeren bir dizi cümle vardır. Lütfen her bir etkinliği hangi sıklıkta yaptığınızı size en uygun gelen seçeneğe

(ˣ) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

	Her zaman 5	Sık sık 4	Bazen 3	Nadiren 2	Asla 1
41. Ödev olmasa da dilbilgisi (grammar) alıştırmaları yaparım.					
42. Zorunlu olmayan ödevleri yaparım.					
43. İngilizce yeni kelimeler öğrenmeye çalışırım.					
44. İnternet'te İngilizce'mi kullanırım. (sohbet, araştırma, vs. için)					
45. İngilizce film ya da TV programlarını seyrederim.					
46. İngilizce yazılı materyaller okurum. (magazin, kitap, gazete gibi)					
47. Yabancılarla İngilizce konuşurum.					
48. İngilizce şarkılar dinlerim.					