A STUDY ON LEARNERS' READINESS FOR AUTONOMOUS LEARNING
OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

AYFER KOÇAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

SEPTEMBER 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Fersun Paykoç

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Fersun Paykoç _____

Prof. Dr. Füsun Akkök _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu _____

ABSTRACT

A STUDY ON LEARNERS' READINESS FOR AUTONOMOUS LEARNING

OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

KOÇAK, Ayfer

MSc, Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Fersun Paykoç

September 2003, 115 pages

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether, or not, students attending English Language Preparatory School at Başkent University are ready to be involved in autonomous language learning. This study also argues that before any interventions aiming at fostering autonomy are implemented, it is necessary to explore learners' readiness for autonomous learning in four different areas. These areas are 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.

The questionnaire used in the study was administered to 186 students attending Preparatory School of Başkent University.

The data analysis was carried out through quantitative (frequencies, means, standard deviations, t-test and one-way ANOVA) analysis techniques.

The results of the study indicated that majority of the students had high motivation. Another result revealed that the students tended to use some metacognitive strategies like self-monitoring and self-evaluation. The third result showed that the learners considered the teacher as more responsible for most of the tasks during their own learning process. Fourthly, majority of the students tended to be spending quite little time for out-of-class activities to improve their English. The fifth result displayed that females and elementary learners had higher motivation in learning English, but a significant difference was not in the motivation level concerning the learners' major field. The sixth result pointed out that females used more metacognitive strategies in learning English; however, proficiency level and major field of the learners were not found to be significant factors in the use of metacognitive strategies. The seventh result revealed that responsibility perceptions did not show a significant difference regarding the respondents' gender, proficiency level and major field. Finally, the present study indicated that intermediate level language learners tended to do more out-of-class activities in learning English. On the other hand, the frequency of respondents' conducting out-of-class activities in learning English did not show a significant difference concerning the subjects' gender and major field.

Key words: Learner Autonomy, Learner Responsibility, Self-regulated learner.

ÖZ

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCEYİ ÖZERK ÖĞRENME
İÇİN ÖĞRENCİLERİN HAZIR OLMA DURUMU ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

KOÇAK, Ayfer

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Fersun Paykoç

Eylül 2003, 115 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı Başkent Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu'na devam etmekte olan öğrencilerin özerk dil öğrenmeye hazır olma durumlarını araştırmaktır. Bu çalışma aynı zamanda özerkliği geliştirmeyi amaçlayan herhangi bir uygulamadan önce öğrencilerin 4 farklı alanda özerk dil öğrenmeye hazır olma durumlarını araştırmanın gerekli olduğunu savunmaktadır. 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.

Çalışmada kullanılan veri toplama aracı Başkent Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu'na devam etmekte olan 186 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır.

Veri analizi nicel (frekans analizi, ortalamalar, standart sapmalar ve k-kare testleri) analiz teknikleri ile gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Çalışmanın sonuçları öğrencilerin çoğunluğunun yüksek motivasyona sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Diğer bir sonuç öğrencilerin kendi kendilerini gözlem ve değerlendirme yoluyla birtakım stratejileri kullanma eğiliminde olduklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Çıkarılan üçüncü sonuç ise öğrencilerin öğrenme sürecindeki işlerin pek çoğundan öğretmeni sorumlu tutmalarıdır. Dördüncü olarak, öğrencilerin büyük bir kısmının İngilizcelerini geliştirmek için sınıf dışındaki faaliyetlere oldukça az zaman ayırmaya meyilli oldukları saptanmıştır. Beşinci sonuç ise kız öğrencilerin ve başlangıç seviyesindeki öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenirken daha yüksek bir motivasyona sahip olmalarına rağmen öğrencilerin bölümlerinin motivasyonlarında anlamlı farklar yaratmadığını göstermiştir. Altıncı sonuç ise kız öğrencilerin İngilizce öğrenirken daha fazla biliş üstü stratejiler kullandıklarını, ancak öğrencilerin İngilizce yeterlilik seviyelerinin ve bölümlerinin strateji kullanımı açısından anlamlı faktörler olmadıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Yedinci sonuç ise sorumluluk anlayışının öğrencilerin cinsiyet, İngilizce yeterlilik seviyesi ve bölümleri açısından anlamlı farlar göstermediğini saptamıştır. Son olarak, bu çalışma orta seviyedeki dil öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğrenirken sınıf dışı faaliyetlere katılma eğiliminin daha fazla olduğunu ancak öğrencilerin bu tür faaliyetleri gerçekleştirirken cinsiyet ve bölümlerinin anlamlı farlar göstermediğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Öğrenci özerkliği, Öğrenci sorumluluğu, Öz-düzenleyici Öğrenci

To my dear mother

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 5 September, 2003   Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Over the last twenty years and as a consequence of the changed views in the field of English Language Teaching, a great emphasis has been put on the role of learners. That is, language teachers started to put students at the center of classroom organization respecting their needs, strategies and styles.

This resulted in the emergence of the notion of learner-centered education which views language learning as a collaborative process between teachers and learners rather than a set of rules to be transferred to the learners from teachers. According to Tudor (1993) learner-centeredness is not a method, nor may it be decreased to a set of rules. However, it is an approach, which views students to have more active and participatory roles in the learning and teaching process than in traditional approaches. Additionally, this approach requires different classroom activities, the structures of which are decided by students themselves resulting in increases in students' involvement and motivation. There is also a parallel change in the teacher's role in learner-centered classrooms. The teacher is less likely to

dominate classroom events in contrast to traditional classrooms where the learning environment is teacher-centered and teachers are considered as authorities.

In addition to the learners' and teachers' roles, a learner-centered curriculum has some implications. Nunan (1989) states that the main difference will be that information by and from learners will be built into every aspect of the curriculum process. Consequently, teachers and learners will work collaboratively for the curriculum development and learners will be allowed to make decisions on content selection, methodology and evaluation.

Nunan (1996) also discusses the two complementary aims of learner-centered classrooms. One of them focuses on language content, the other focuses on learning process. He adds that throughout the achievement of these aims, learners need to decide what they want to learn and how they want to learn. In this phase, it is the teacher's duty to create such conditions in which they educate students in the skills and knowledge they require while making choices about the process and content of their learning.

Tudor (1993) has suggested that if teachers were to create those conditions, students will be able to benefit most from the teaching and learning process, particularly in the following areas: (a) more relevant goal setting with the contributions of students, (b) more effective learning enriched with students' preferences, (c) more benefit from activities, the content of which decided by students, (d) more efficient study program with more student involvemen

With the introduction of this approach, how to create a learner-centered classroom environment has been the primary concern of many researchers who are dealing with the area of foreign language learning. In their research, Altan and

Trombly (2001) tried to create a learner-centered environment by giving students opportunities to research and choose their content materials through discourse communities outside the classroom. The results of the study revealed that involving students in the teaching process enabled them to understand lesson goals and objectives, value communicative tasks and activities, generate topics, choose materials, and work cooperatively.

Putting an emphasis on the learner in a foreign language learning process has been the greatest possible importance for some approaches. One of them is communicative language teaching (CLT), which emerged with the changed views on the nature of language learning in the 1970s and 1980s. By definition, CLT put the emphasis on the learner engaging them in the pragmatic, functional, and authentic use of language for meaningful purposes (Savignon, 2002). In order to realize this, learners were provided with more opportunities to learn the target language by using it in a linguistic environment, which resembled authentic communicative settings. With these opportunities learners would perform specific tasks such as giving advice, making suggestions, describing, requesting and comparing as part of the real communication (Altan and Trombly 2001).

With the introduction of this new and innovative approach teaching English as a foreign or second language, teaching materials, course descriptions, and curriculum guidelines proclaimed a goal of communicative competence. For instance, as Kumaravadivelu (1993) has stated, curriculum planners dealt with communicative syllabus design, materials producers supplied the textbook market with communicative books, testing experts appeared with different alternatives of

communicative performance tests and teachers identified themselves as communicative teachers.

Secondly, it is the cooperative learning, the techniques of which are closely linked to the learner-centered approach. Crandall (1999) gives a brief definition for cooperative learning by stating that it calls for 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 the others. She adds that there is always a genuine information gap in a well-organized cooperative task. Moreover, Slavin (1983), who has conducted numerous studies of cooperative learning in second language classrooms, mentions that it is an instructional strategy, which enables students to work together in order to achieve a common learning goal. During this collaborative work, students develop social skills as well as language proficiency. What should be emphasized here is that such cooperative activities play an important role in changing the classroom organization so that learners may obtain the benefits of being at the center of the learning process.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, this prominent shift towards learner-centeredness in language education has led to the emergence of the concept of learner autonomy. The concept of autonomy first entered the field of language teaching with adult self-directed learning and autonomy, defined as the capacity to take charge of one's own learning by Holec (1981, cited in Little, 1991), was seen as a natural product of it. In self-directed learning, which was outside the context of formal education, the objectives, progress and evaluation of learning were determined by learners themselves.

On the other hand, in recent years the concept of self-directed learning has been used with other concepts such as self-regulated learning and learner autonomy in the context of institutional education. Each of these concepts are concerned with teaching students how to think, how to learn and to take control of their learning with the help of critical thinking skills, problem solving skills, learning strategies, etc. Therefore, ideas from the field of adult self-directed learning have led to a strong impact on approaches to autonomy in language learning.

The recent literature abounds with studies that focus on promoting the necessary skills required for autonomous or self-regulated learning such as teaching students learning strategies, raising students' awareness on the learning process, increasing student involvement to help them become more self-regulated or autonomous. According to Cole and Chan (1994), whatever the term is used, all these concepts are related to teaching students how to think, how to learn and to take control over their learning. Likewise, the importance of teaching students self-regulated skills is emphasized by Boekaerts (1997) who considers these skills as crucial not only to guide the learner's own learning during the formal education, but also to educate the learner in order to update his or her knowledge after leaving the school.

Autonomy in language learning has been the topic of many researchers and practitioners for a few decades. Although the definitions for autonomy vary (Boud, 1988; Benson and Voller 1997; Little 1991; Dickinson 1993), the main feature of it includes the necessity of learners' taking some significant responsibility for their own learning. Littlewood (1999), who has investigated the

degree of autonomy in East Asian contexts, supports the idea of learners' taking more responsibility in the learning process and gives two reasons for this: learning can only be performed by learners themselves and learners need to gain the ability to carry on learning after formal education. Moreover, Little (1991) highlights that this responsibility involves taking the control in many processes which have traditionally belonged to the teacher such as deciding on learning objectives, selecting learning methods, evaluating and monitoring the learning process, etc.

Learners become active participants accepting responsibility for their own learning. According to Benson and Voller (1997), this responsibility shift requires some changes in teachers' roles. First of all, they are no more suppliers of information, however, 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.

Prior to this responsibility change, most scholars (Cotterall 1995b; Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan 2002; Scharle and Szabo 2000) support the investigation of learners' readiness for this change. In other words, they emphasize the necessity of finding out learners' beliefs, study habits, motivation levels, responsibility attitudes, use of metacognitive strategies, performance of outside class activities in learning a language before any implementation for promoting learner autonomy in classroom environments.

Ushioda (1996) explicitly states that 'autonomous learners are by definition motivated learners'. In line with this belief the relationship between motivation and autonomy has been investigated by some researchers for several years. In their study Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002) tried to assess students'

readiness for learner autonomy, and the results revealed that motivation had a strong impact in this readiness. Moreover, Sharp (2002), who has conducted a study to assess the benefits of study support program-a range of learning activities taking place outside school hours- and the development of self-regulated learners, emphasizes that learners with the sense of autonomy seem to be more motivated intrinsically whereas they are less likely to be motivated by external factors such as rewards or threats. She adds that such study support programs assist learners to commit their free time to outside the class activities and also to the improvement of their metacognitive skills.

According to Lee (1998), students need to be assisted to gain awareness of independent learning outside the classroom. He adds that promoting independence in learners will help them to continue their language development and take increasing responsibility for their learning. The main aim of the classroom-based self-directed learning program he designed for the first year students taking English Communication Skills was to help students become more autonomous being armed with necessary skills to take control over their learning. The program required students to get involved in the learning activities such as reading newspapers and magazines, watching English TV programs, films, journal writing, writing film reviews and doing grammar exercises. The data were gathered from the students through interviews. At the end of the program, students responded to this type of learning in different ways. Some, particularly the enthusiastic ones, seemed to benefit more, the less enthusiastic ones; however, seemed to lack determination and self-discipline to carry out the tasks, so the learning for them was not as efficient as those of enthusiastic learners. Lee (1998)

supports that the willingness and capacity to take the control of one's own learning show differences among students.

Some researchers (Wenden 1991; Cotterall 1999; White 1995) mention the crucial role of using metacognitive strategies in autonomous learning. In the cognitive literature on learning, autonomous learning is referred to as self-regulation, and planning, monitoring and evaluating are commonly referred to as the three key strategies required for self-regulation. For instance Zimmerman (1989, cited in Cole and Chan, 1994) portrays a detailed picture of a self-regulated learner by stating that they are metacognitively active participants in their own learning process and they initiate and direct their own efforts to acquire knowledge and skill instead of relying on teachers or others. These strategies are also included in descriptions of autonomous learners. For example, Dickinson (1987) mentions three decisions for which autonomous learners should take responsibility, all of these are entailed in the planning of learning: (1) define the contents and progression of their learning; (2) decide pace and place of learning; (3) assess the time it will take to achieve stated goals and sub-goals. Emerging from these statements, it is evident that the development of effective metacognitive strategies is essential for learners to be able to take control of their own learning; that is, strong metacognitive skills empower autonomous language learners.

In her study, Cotterall (1999) attempted to investigate the language learning beliefs of a group of students with the help of a survey, which identified important factors in autonomous language learning. The study included six variables: the role of the teacher; the role of feedback; the learners' sense of self-

efficacy; important strategies; dimensions of strategies-related behaviour; and the nature of language learning. The result of the fourth part including important learning strategies indicated that the use of two strategies 'monitoring and evaluating', which are key metacognitive strategies in language learning, was quite limited. She also suggests that without training learners, in ways of these strategies, the learners will have difficulties in classrooms promoting autonomous learning.

To sum up, developing autonomous learning is indispensable as the aim of all education is to help people think, act and learn independently in relevant areas of their lives. In this respect, a strategy for developing autonomy in language teaching will require enhanced metacognitive skills, self-awareness to improve motivation and willingness to take charge of learning.

This study was designed to investigate learners' readiness for autonomous learning. It was carried out at the English Language School of Başkent University (ELSBU), Ankara, Turkey. 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 the teacher is in full control of the learning process and they are left with very little or no choice, and control over the content and method of study. In such context of the study, the researcher attempted to find out the readiness of these learners for autonomous language learning and to prepare implications for learner training aiming to promote autonomous learning.

1.2 Purpose of the study

This study intends to see whether, or not, students attending English Language Preparatory School at Başkent University are ready to be involved in autonomous language learning. It argues that before any interventions, which aim at fostering autonomy, are implemented, it is necessary to explore learners' readiness for the changes in different areas which autonomy implies. These areas are as follows:

Learners' motivation level in learning English

Learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English,

Learners' responsibility perception of their own and their teachers' in learning English

Learners' practice of English in the outside class activities.

1.2.1 Research Questions

The general purpose of the study is to investigate the readiness of students, who attended Başkent University English Language Preparatory Programs in the academic year of 2002-2003, for autonomous learning. In more detail, the present study attempted to respond to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Başkent University?

2. To what extent are the metacognitive strategies used in learning English by the learners?

3. How do the learners perceive their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English?

4. To what extent do the learners perform the outside class activities in learning English?

5. Are there any differences in the learners' motivation levels in learning English regarding their proficiency level, major field and gender?

6. Are there any differences in the metacognitive strategies used by the learners in learning English concerning their gender, major field and proficiency level?

7. Are there any differences in the learners' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?

8. Are there any differences in the learners' use of the outside class activities in learning English in terms of their gender, major field and proficiency level?

1.3 Significance of the Study

Most language teachers have experienced the frustration of investing endless amounts of energy in their students and getting very little response. All teachers have all had groups who never did their homework, who were reluctant

to use the target language in pair or group work, who did not learn from their mistakes, who did not listen to each other, who did not use opportunities to learn outside the classroom, and so on.

Learner's over-reliance on the teacher is the main cause of such behavior and it is the autonomous learning, which will help learners change their behavior by encouraging them to take responsibility for their own language learning, to change their attitudes towards the English class, and to deal with their foreign language learning problems.

However, teachers need to see whether their students are ready for autonomous learning or to what extent they are able to learn autonomously, and in what way teachers can help their learners to incorporate a greater degree of learner autonomy in the learning and teaching process. This study provides empirical support for the identification of factors considered to be crucial in the promotion of autonomy in foreign language classrooms and examines the claims made in language learning literature about each of these factors. By exploring them, teachers could construct a shared understanding of the essential foundation of learner autonomy.

1.4 Definitions of the Terms

Autonomy

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

Learner Responsibility

Responsible learners are the ones who accept the idea that their own efforts are crucial to progress in learning, and behave accordingly. Responsible learners consciously monitor their own progress and make an effort to use available opportunities to their benefit including classroom activities and assignments (Scharle and Szabo 2000).

Self-regulated learner

Students can be described as self-regulated if they personally initiate and direct their own efforts to acquire knowledge and skill rather than relying on teachers, parents, or other agents of instruction (Zimmerman 1989, cited in Cole and Chan, 1994).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will deal with the definition of concepts and terms related to learner autonomy in foreign language teaching. It will also refer to the previous research studies conducted abroad and in Turkey on promoting learner autonomy in language classrooms.

2.1 Theoretical Background

The original theory and practice of autonomy in language learning emerged from research on adult self-directed learning which is defined by Knowles (1975) (as cited in Benson, 2001), a leading figure in adult education, as a process in which individuals accept responsibility for all the decisions concerned with their learning. In the 1970s and 1980s the focus on adult self-directed learning tended to be on the learning processes, which are outside the context of formal education.

However, the more recent literature has begun to use the term 'self-directed learning' together with the concept of learner autonomy in the context of institutional education context. No matter what the term is used, both concepts are concerned with teaching students how to think, how to learn and to take control over their own learning. The only distinction between autonomy and self-directed learning is clearly emphasized by Dickinson (1987) who says that in self-direction

learners accept responsibility for all the decisions related to the their learning but not necessarily implement those decisions; on the other hand, in autonomous learning the learners are entirely responsible for all the decisions concerned with their learning and also the implementation of these decisions.

In order to equip learners with the best opportunities for good practice of self-directed learning, first self-access language learning centers were founded via access to a rich collection of second language materials. In recent years, however, self-access learning is often treated as a synonym for autonomous learning. In many institutions, self-access centers have been founded without any strong pedagogical rationale and it is mostly assumed, without strong justification that the autonomy can be automatically gained by self-access work. Nevertheless, there has been an increase in the number of studies conducted to enhance the effectiveness of self-access centers. For instance, Wright and Piper (1995) carried out a project in the Universities of Cambridge, Kent and Southampton and aimed to provide self-access learning materials, which would foster the necessary skills and strategies for students to be effective in the management of their own learning. The materials were designed as topic-based including authentic listening, viewing and reading texts and associated tasks, which would enhance the learners' ability to both, manage their own learning and their specific learning environment.

Like self-access and self-directed learning, individualization was another concept, which was emphasized together with autonomy since both were concerned with the needs of learners. In the early practice of individualization - as part of self-directed learning- learners determined their own needs and acted

accordingly. However, individualization later changed its shape being linked with behavior psychology and transformed into programmed individualized learning in which important decisions were taken by teachers instead of learners themselves and, as Riley (1986) (as cited in Benson, 2001) states, in such learning, learners have lack of freedom of choice that is essential to the development of autonomy. Additionally, many practitioners of autonomy in recent years have emphasized the importance of collaboration and interdependence rather than individualization.

Because the term autonomy focuses attention on independence, autonomous learning may mistakenly be interpreted as solitary learning in which students make progress by studying on their own. This, however, is a mistake. According to Little and Dam (1998) people are social creatures who depend on one another and learn from each other. Therefore, the independence which implies the total freedom of teachers or teaching materials and which is exercised for autonomous behavior is always conditioned and constrained by inescapable interdependence which means working together with teachers and other learners towards shared goals. Similarly, Harmer (1998) (as cited in Murphey & Jacobs, 2000) reports that group tasks help students to build independence since they are working together without continuous teacher control, they take some of the learning decisions and they are working without the pressure of the all class listening to them. He also adds that in such learning decisions are cooperatively taken and responsibilities are shared. This view is also supported by Harris and Noyau (1990) who conducted a project to identify what is involved in setting up collaborative group work by providing extra support for the teachers taking initial steps towards autonomous learning. They have reported that the most obvious

16

advantage of this study was the increase in motivation observed by the teachers and students as well. Also, in a questionnaire carried out at one of the schools, they found out 89% of the pupils reported they found group work easier, and 79% said they enjoyed it more and 65% felt that they learned more.

Another concept, which began life to enhance self-directed learning, is learner training. Benson (2001) has reported that adult learners would need to improve skills such as self-management, self-monitoring and self-assessment so as to perform self-directed learning effectively. Benson (2001) added that learners who were used to teacher-centered education would need to be psychologically prepared for more learner-centered learning.

As learner training became the focus point in the number of research conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, many practitioners began to view the learner training as an important factor in the development of learner autonomy rather than limiting the term 'learner training', into self-directed learning. For instance, McCarthy (1998) points out the relationship between autonomy and learner training by stating that the main aim of learner training is to enhance the effectiveness of learning and effective learning is part of autonomy. Moreover, in her conclusion remarks on the learner autonomy project implemented with language learners, Chan (2001) argues that it is important that learners need guidance to raise their motivation levels and to re-adjust their learning strategies, which have been necessary to learn autonomously. Similarly, Dickinson (1993) mentions the content of learner training for autonomous learners and adds that learner training should aim to help learners develop the ability to take more responsibility for their own learning. Thus, it would be effective to provide learner

training together with the program and make it an integral part of the course so as to help learners become autonomous.

2.2 Definitions of Autonomy

There is broad agreement in the theoretical literature that learner autonomy grows out of the individual learner's acceptance of responsibility for his or her own learning (Benson & Voller, 1997; Little, 1991; Dickinson, 1995). This means that autonomy requires the learner to develop control over his or her own learning and his or her own 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. For instance, the learner who shows a high degree of autonomy in one area can be non-autonomous in another.

Little (1991) argues that it is difficult to define autonomy shortly and prefers discussing the widespread misconceptions about autonomy. The following issues are those Little (1991; p. 3-4) has stated on what autonomy is not:

1. Autonomy is not a synonym for self- instruction; in other words, autonomy is not limited to learning without a teacher.

2. In the classroom context, autonomy does not entail giving up responsibility on the part of teacher; it is not a matter of letting the learners get on with things as best they can.

3. Autonomy is not something that teachers do to learners; that is, it is not another teaching method.

4. Autonomy is not a single, easily described behavior.

5. Autonomy is not a steady state achieved by learners once.

So, what is autonomy? Holec (1995) (as cited in Dickinson, 1995) sees autonomy as a capacity and critical ability to reflect on one's experience and to take charge of one's own learning. Little (1991) makes an addition to this definition by stating that autonomy enables learners to determine their objectives, define the content and process of their own learning, select their methods and techniques, and monitor and evaluate their progress and achievements.

Both definitions emphasize the transfer of responsibility for learning from the teacher to the learner. With such responsibility the learner gains a greater degree of active involvement and better learning.

2.3 Dominant Philosophies Underlying Autonomy

There are three dominant philosophies of learning connecting up with learner autonomy: humanism, constructivism, and experiential learning.

Since the early 1970s classroom teachers and language teaching methodologists have been influenced by insights from humanist psychology which emphasizes the importance of qualities such as self-concept, personal assumption of responsibility, and affective factors in adult learning. According to Tudor (1993), with this perspective, language learners are seen as complex human beings and language teaching is not only expected to exploit students' affective and intellectual resources as much as possible but it is also to be linked into the learners' continuing experience of life. Therefore, the humanistic movement has a

considerable influence on language teaching and communicative activities and drama can be given as examples to indicate its popularity.

Among the objectives of humanistic views, Dubin and Olshtain (1986) (as cited in Wenden, 1991) have stated some of them are directly concerned with the key factors of learner autonomy. For instance; placing high respect and value on the learner, viewing learning as a form of self-realization, giving learners considerable say in the decision making process, and placing teachers in the role of facilitator.

Similarly, for autonomous learners to take responsibility of their own learning, teachers need to trust and respect them by giving value on them. Moreover, autonomous learners are expected to use metacognitive strategies involving self-monitoring, self-evaluation, etc. One of the crucial elements in learner autonomy is to involve learners in the decision-making process and while doing this, teachers' main roles include counseling and facilitating rather than being purveyor of information.

The second philosophy underlying autonomy is constructivism, which is defined by Benson and Voller (1997; p. 21) "as the process of learning helping learners to construct their own version of target language; therefore, learners need to be responsible for their own learning". For this aspect, Candy (1989)(as cited in Benson and Voller, 1997) admits that constructivist approaches support versions of autonomy in terms of individual responsibility for decisions taken throughout the learning process. Additionally, constructivist approaches give value to creativity, interaction and engagement with the target language, which is also encouraged by autonomy. Besides, pedagogical aspects of autonomy putting

emphasis on learners' attitudes and behavior are also endorsed by constructivist approaches, which tend to value learners' freedom to think as they wish. Finally, constructivist approaches encourage and promote self-directed learning as a necessary condition for learner autonomy.

The third philosophy underlying autonomy relates to experiential learning. Kohonen (1992) (as cited in Kenny, 1993), who is a keen advocate of experiential learning, states that as part of autonomous learning, learners need to manage their own learning by taking responsibility and they also should gain self-concept to develop their skills consciously and to organize their tasks. However, he adds that, learners need to be producers rather than consumers of language courses while trying to acquire a self-concept. So, experiential learning, which is basically 'learning-by-doing' via giving learners freedom to use their capacities for independent thought and judgment, is a requirement to facilitate this capacity.

Legutke and Thomas (1991) (as cited in Kenny, 1993) discuss the advantages of project work, a common practice of experiential learning in language learning and they suggest that project work is an effective method of facilitating autonomy. In fact, learners have the opportunity to learn autonomously in project works while they are working towards the project goals such as planning, organizing and carrying out the work, examining the work critically, working and cooperating with others, clarifying ideas in speech or writing, and so on. Furthermore, Dewey's (1916/1966) (as cited in Benson, 2001) view of education which considers the education as social participation, problem solving and classroom organization supports the learners' having more responsibility to

experience in educational activities which requires collaborative work, problem solving method and learning by doing.

2.4 Conditions for the Development of Learner Autonomy

One does not become autonomous; one only works towards autonomy. In view of the belief, which regards the autonomy with this aspect, there are some conditions for the development of learner autonomy.

The first fundamental condition is the notion of responsibility in the hands of the individual learner. Dam (1995) suggests that this responsibility requires a capacity and willingness on the part of the learner to act independently and in cooperation with others as a socially responsible person.

In fact, responsible learners are the ones who accept the idea that their own efforts are crucial to progress in learning and behave accordingly. Responsible learners monitor their own progress and they voluntarily try to do their best to use available opportunities for their own benefit (Scharle & Szabo 2000).

Similarly, Sutton (1999) emphasizes that learners' having locus of control, which enables them to choose the content, method, medium, reward, feedback, pacing, etc., will help them feel confident and comfortable in their learning process.

Autonomy and responsibility are apparently very much interrelated. Holec (1981) (as cited in Little, 1991; p. 7) defines autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning". That is, to have and to hold the responsibility for all the decisions related to all aspects of this learning. For this reason, autonomous

learners are expected to create a personal agenda for learning and set up the planning, pacing, monitoring and evaluation of the learning process in the light of this agenda. Moreover, they must be actively involved in the setting of goals, defining content, establishing evaluation mechanism for assessing the progress.

Holec (1981) (as cited in Little, 1991) adds that learner responsibility to fulfill such activities must be encouraged by formal learning. Traditionally, the teacher is in charge of learning and language learners have the role of doing what to be told. The transfer of responsibility for learning from the teacher to the learner will have many benefits not only in the school but also in the everyday life. First of all, since learners set the agenda, learning will be more purposeful and more effective both immediate and in the longer term. Secondly, because responsibility for the learning process lies with the learner, the barriers between learning and living -which is often found traditional teacher-centered educational structures- will not arise. Thirdly, when there are no barriers between learning and living, learners will have little difficulty in transferring their capacity for autonomous behavior to all other areas of their lives. As a result, they will make choices and decisions regarding their lives by accepting responsibility and learning to do things for themselves. In parallel with this view, Malcolm (1990), who tried to design flexible learning programs at Filton Technical College, reports that moving students from spoon-feeding to autonomy is possible with flexible learning where students are taking responsibilities for the course. Malcolm (1990) also mentions the benefits of his institution's 1989 workshop which mainly aimed to enable students to assume responsibility for their own learning by analyzing

their needs and goals on the course; considering their teacher as an adviser and facilitator; and examining their commitment to and motivation for the course.

As a second condition, motivation plays a key role in the learners' readiness for autonomous learning. Most scholars seem to agree that motivation determines the degree of effort learners put into foreign language learning. In other words, the more motivation they have, the more effort they tend to put into learning the language. It leads to success in language learning. From this point of view, it is very important to motivate learners to learn a foreign language.

A strong link between motivation and autonomy can be perceived in the article of Dickinson (1995) who concludes that enhanced motivation is a conditional on learners taking responsibility for their own learning, noticing that their successes or failures are related to their own efforts rather than to the factors out of their control. This belief gets much support from various researches. For instance; in their study Dörnyei and Csizer (1998), have compiled a concise set of 10 motivational macro strategies from 200 Hungarian teachers of English and in the 7th strategy, they emphasized the importance of promoting learner autonomy and its inevitable existence with autonomy among language learners.

Additionally, a similar relationship appears in the work of Deci and Ryan (1985) (as cited in Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan, 2002) who highlights that intrinsic motivation as a necessary precursor of autonomy. They claim that intrinsic motivation, in which learners are interested in learning tasks and outcomes for their own sake rather than for rewards, needs to be supported for the development of autonomy. In fact, students will act as self-determined learners rather than controlled, if they are provided with such support.

As a third factor, it is inevitable to highlight the unifying role of using metacognitive strategies for promoting learner autonomy. Metacognitive strategies are considered to be crucial in the learning process for various reasons. Oxford (1990) views the metacognitive strategies as actions which enable learners to coordinate their own learning process and she adds that, 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 other words, possessing the metacognitive skills will help language learners build up autonomy whereby they can take the control of their learning.

According to Wenden (1991) metacognitive strategies involve planning of learning, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. Wenden (1991) also states that the planning strategy concerns with discovering the nature of language learning, organizing to learn, establishing aims, considering task purposes, planning tasks and looking for chances to practice. Learners will undoubtedly become better prepared to make conscious decisions about what they can do to improve their learning with the help of this strategy. By monitoring their use of learning strategies, students are better able to keep themselves on track to meet their learning goals. Once they have selected and begun to implement specific strategies, they need to ask themselves periodically whether or not they are still using those strategies as intended. Finally, at the implementation of the evaluation stage, language learners attempt to evaluate whether what they are doing is effective. They evaluate their strategy use by asking themselves to respond to the following questions: (1) What am I trying to accomplish?, (2) What strategies am

I using?, (3) How well am I using them?, (4) What else could I do?. Responding to these four questions integrates all of the previous aspects of metacognition, allowing the language learner to reflect through the cycle of learning.

The current studies investigating the strategy use among language learners emphasize the promoting of learner autonomy and learner training for the enhancement of metacognitive strategies. For instance, Victori and Lockhart (1995) conducted a research to highlight the unifying role of metacognition in all levels of learning training, and their experience in this study indicated that enhanced metacognition leads to more autonomy through the use of more efficient strategies and a variety of resources.

In another research White (1995) compares the level of strategy use between distance learners and classroom learners by investigating the degree of autonomy learners assume under different learning conditions. The results of the study indicated that mode of study is effective on the metacognitive strategy use, ahead of age and level of study. Moreover, the results have represented insights into how learners respond to mode of learning and underlined between strategy use and autonomy in a wider range of contexts.

2.5 Reasons for Autonomy

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in autonomy in language learning, and it has been considered as a desirable goal for three reasons: the psychological, the practical, and the philosophical.

The psychological rationale for promoting learner autonomy in language classrooms, which is the most appealing to educationists, is simply that people learn better when they are in charge of their own learning. Candy (1988, cited in Cotterall 1995a) mentions that when learners-particularly adults- are involved in making choices and decisions about the pace, sequence, mode of instruction, and content of what they are studying, learning is more meaningful and more effective. Moreover, learners who are involved in making choices and decisions about aspects of the program are likely to feel more motivated in their learning, and motivated learners are often successful learners.

The second rationale behind autonomy is practicality, which emerges from the need to provide more available language teaching situations where traditional approaches are not practical according to Tudor (1993). There can be some reasons for this: a teacher may not always be available to assist due to the large number of students in a classroom so that learners need to be able to learn on their own; learners might not have sufficient free time or budget to attend educational institutions; and finally, as Crabbe (1993) has mentioned, a society may not provide the necessary resources to all its members in every area of learning and learners, in such circumstances, learners need to obtain their own learning needs, either individually or cooperatively , so as to get the knowledge and skill they desire.

Thirdly, the philosophical rationale behind autonomy is, as Crabbe (1993) argues, the belief that the individual has the right to be free to make his or her own choices not only in learning a language but also in other areas. He also mentions that societies are happier and healthier with free individuals who have not become

of victims of choices made by social institutions. Additionally, Knowles (1975) (as cited in Cotterall 1995a) has emphasized that it is important to prepare learners for a swiftly changing future, where independence learning will be indispensable for effective functioning in society. With such preparation for independent learning, learners will also maximize their life choices.

2.6 Characteristics of Autonomous Learners

Autonomous learners are the ones who take active roles in the learning process, by finding more learning opportunities for themselves, rather than being the complete pursuer of the teacher.

According to Dickinson (1993) autonomous learners can be characterized in four points. First of all, they can identify what is going on, in other words what is been taught, in their classes. An autonomous student learning English, for example, might think about the relationship between the new grammar rule and the rules she or he has learned previously. Secondly, she adds that, autonomous learners are capable of formulating their own learning objectives, in parallel with or even in addition to their teachers'. Most autonomous language learners make great efforts to improve their language skills outside the classroom. They either read newspapers or watch TV programs in the target language as part of their own learning objectives. The third characteristics is that autonomous learners are able to select and implement appropriate learning strategies. For instance, an autonomous learner will go through the reading text to see whatever available in the text (pictures, diagrams, title, subtitles, etc.) rather than trying to read and

comprehend it immediately. The fourth characteristics, as Dickinson (1993) mentions, are that autonomous learners can monitor the effectiveness of their use of strategies and make necessary changes for them. For example, an autonomous learner, who has not done well on the English test, may first try to find out which structures and points he or she has not understood and then try to find more effective study ways. With these four basic characteristics, it is inevitable for autonomous learners to engage actively in the learning process and to take control of their own learning.

Moreover, Chan (2001), who carried out a study to explore her students' perceptions of learner autonomy reported that her class identified the following characteristic qualities of autonomous learners: highly motivated, goal oriented, well organized, hard working, initiative, enthusiastic about learning, flexible, active, willing to ask questions, making use of every opportunities to improve their learning.

2.7 Teacher's Role in Promoting Learner Autonomy

Tudor (1993) suggests that the main role of the teacher in the traditional modes of teaching is the supplier of knowledge. That is, the teacher is the figure of authority as a source of knowledge, deciding on what will be learned and how will that be learned. Additionally, organizing is another role the teacher takes in setting up the activities, motivating the students and providing authoritative feedback on students' performance. However, in many language programs promoting learner autonomy teachers need to change their role from supplier of

information to counselor so as to help learners to take significant responsibility by setting their own goals, planning practice opportunities, or assessing their progress.

The programs of most language courses, which aim to promote learner autonomy, involve transferring responsibility from the teacher to the learner for the language learning process. Likewise, people working in the curriculum field tend to investigate the learners' attitudes towards the roles of teachers and learners before they design a course for learner autonomy. For instance, Cotterall (1995b) investigated learners' beliefs to measure their readiness for autonomy. One of the six factors in the questionnaire she designed included 'role of the teacher'. Learners who agreed with the items in that factor considered the teacher role as dominant in the learning process, and they did not match with the profile of autonomous learners, who diagnose difficulties, allocate time and establish aims for themselves rather than assigning them to the teacher.

Cotterall (1995a) discusses the content of the English course program they designed at the English Language Institute in order to encourage learners to take more responsibility for their own learning. She claims that one of the crucial components of this program is the learner/teacher dialogue, which fosters learner autonomy. With the help of these dialogues, a direct relationship was achieved between learners and their teachers, which assisted learners to set and clarify their objectives, assess their learning progress and get the advice of their teachers for their future study of English.

According to Gremmo and Riley (1995) a teacher can take the role of counseling in two ways. Firstly, he or she is supposed to assist learners to

establish set of values, ideas and techniques in the language learning process. In other words, the teacher as a counselor is able to raise the awareness of his or her language learning. Secondly, the teacher can establish and manage the resource center or self-access center, which can be described as the role of staff in self-access centers. The task here involves providing information and answers about the available materials in the self-access center.

In order to foster learner autonomy, it would be indispensable to supply learner training together with the program. Little (1995) states that it is difficult for learners in formal education contexts to accept responsibility immediately for their learning and he adds that it is the teachers who will help them to do so by equipping them with sufficient materials and with chances to practice them. Additionally, Esch, Schalkwijk, Elsen and Setz (2000) support that future teachers need to be prepared practically and academically in teacher training in order to tackle the influences of autonomous learning on teaching methodology and the role of language teachers and learners. They also report that they have integrated the principles and phases underlying autonomous learning into their teacher-training curriculum after long discussions and research. Next, they have written a research program including four research projects, which mainly aim to help teachers develop specific tasks to train the autonomy of foreign language learners in comprehension, production and (self) assessment.

2.8 Research Studies Conducted in Turkey on Learner Autonomy in Language Teaching

Kennedy (2002) conducted a case study with 23 students at the Institute of Business Administration. The study aimed to see what extent learner autonomy can be encouraged among a group of Turkish students. Firstly, the researcher carried out some practical activities to foster independence among students. These activities involved diary writing, use of monolingual dictionary, use of grammar reference books with answer keys, joke telling, writing summaries and conducting research. After seven months, the researcher asked 23 students to write a detailed evaluation of the course. Students' main criticism focused on more grammar practice although some expressed their enthusiasm in writing diaries. The researcher has concluded that it is not surprising that learner autonomy has much importance to the students. He adds that promoting learner autonomy in the EFL classroom in Turkey is not an easy struggle and it would be a mistake to expect too much too soon from Turkish learners who have traditional experiences prior to entering English language classrooms.

In her study, Yumuk (2002) aimed to design and evaluate a program to promote a change in students' attitudes from a traditional, recitation-based view of learning to a more autonomous view of learning. As part of the program, the students were encouraged to use Internet for selection, analysis, evaluation and application of relevant information so that they could improve the accuracy of their translations. The researcher stated that the use of searching and application of Internet-based information helped students to think and reflect critically on

their learning. The evaluation of the program was conducted with pre and post-course questionnaires, post-course interviews and information recorded weekly in a diary by the teacher as a researcher. The results revealed that the program promoted a change in the view of learning towards more autonomy. The researcher concluded that the majority of the students reported that the translation process required more responsibility from them, and they also viewed learning more meaningfully.

Çoban (2002) conducted a comparative study to investigate the attitudes towards learner autonomy in Gazi University and Yıldız Technical University. The researcher designed a-26-item questionnaire, which has three dimensions: teacher-learner roles, definitions of autonomy, and ways of developing learner autonomy. The questionnaire was employed to 35 English language teachers, 16 were from Gazi University and 19 were from Yıldız Technical University Modern Languages Department. The study revealed that language teachers in both institutions tended to favor encouraging learners to take active roles in the language learning process. However, they seemed to be unwilling to let students make some decisions concerning the lesson, e.g. selecting the content of the course or choosing methods and techniques. Another finding drawn from the study was that language teachers in Yıldız Teknik University were more likely to support ways of developing learner autonomy, particularly in giving choice to learners, self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

Kucuroğlu (2000) aimed to assess the role of a learner-centered approach in language teaching in the development of learner autonomy by means of examining the principles and design features of a freshman year English course,

namely English-2 offered at Doğuş University. In her study, the researcher discussed the design of the model course which has five main features: assessment of learners' needs, allowing learners choices in learning, authenticity of textual materials, learners in change and the roles of teachers. The researcher argued that this course with the characteristics mentioned above could take students through the stages of conducting academic research and help them increase their confidence in working on their own as well as learning to take the responsibility for their own learning. Finally, the researcher concluded that the model course promoted learner autonomy as it was designed with the principles of communicative language teaching and learner-centeredness in language education.

Gündoğdu (1997) carried out a descriptive case study of autonomous learning in a primary school in England, which has been applying a child-centered approach. The researcher investigated the relationship between teacher, pupil and learning environment in terms of developing autonomy in pupils' learning process. The data were collected via observation, questionnaire and looking at he school documents. It was concluded that autonomous learning could occur when teachers assumed the role of facilitator of knowledge, became a supporter of helping pupil build self-responsibility, self-confidence and self-direction, and created a child-centered classroom enabling children to be independent. From the findings, some lessons were revealed for Turkey and its primary school teaching system. In his conclusion remarks the researcher discussed the current educational situation in Turkey. He hoped that this study would provide an example of

promoting pupil autonomy and would also be useful in helping those who wish to change Turkish educational understanding.

The review of literature indicates that autonomous learning is indispensable for effective language learning which will enable language learners to develop more responsibilities for their own learning. Therefore, most of the relevant research studies highlight the importance of promoting learner autonomy in language classrooms. Some of them, which have investigated the language learners' beliefs about autonomous language learning, have revealed that the results would be regarded as the reflections of learners' readiness for autonomy. Moreover, some studies have found out direct relationship between autonomy and motivation, learner strategies, out-of-class learning, etc. In addition to them, the number of case studies, which have tried to implement different aspects of autonomous learning in various contexts, is quite high. No matter what kind of research it is, most of the autonomy studies emphasize the importance of changing teacher-dependent learning habits, increasing learners' motivation, and use of effective learner strategies throughout the development of learner autonomy in language classrooms.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

In this chapter, methodological details of the study are presented. The first section presents the overall research design of the study. The second section discusses the research questions of the study, while the third section presents the sample of the study. In the fourth section, the details regarding the data collection instrument are addressed. The procedure followed in the study is documented in the fifth section. The sixth section documents the data analysis employed to the data. Finally, the seventh section acknowledges the limitations of the study data.

3.1 Overall Research Design

This descriptive case study, which employed quantitative data, was designed to see whether, or not, preparatory students learning English at Başkent University are ready to be involved in autonomous learning regarding four aspects: learners' motivation level in learning English, learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English, learners' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English, and learners' practice of autonomous language learning in the form of outside class activities. The sample of the present study consisted of 186 students attending Preparatory School of

Başkent University. Participants were presented with a questionnaire constructed by the researcher and a demographic data sheet. SPSS software program was used for analysis (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 *Overall Research Design*

1. Research Questions	Literature Review, Previous studies
2. Sampling	Simple Random Sampling
3. Research Design	Descriptive Case Study
4. Instrument	Questionnaire Construction by the researcher
5. Data collection procedure	Administration of the questionnaire to 186 preparatory students at Başkent University in their classroom settings within 25 minutes
6. Data analysis procedure	SPSS software program for descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test and one way ANOVA
7. Interpreting Results	Relevant literature and the context of the present study

3.2 Research Questions

The general purpose of the study is to investigate the readiness of students, who attend Başkent University English Language Preparatory Programs in the

academic year of 2002-2003, for autonomous learning. In more detail, the present study will attempt to respond to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Başkent University?

2. To what extent are the metacognitive strategies used in learning English by the learners?

3. How do the learners perceive their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English?

4. To what extent do the learners perform the outside class activities in learning English?

5. Are there any differences in the learners' motivation levels in learning English regarding their proficiency level, major field and gender?

6. Are there any differences in the metacognitive strategies used by the learners in learning English concerning their gender , major field and proficiency level?

7. Are there any differences in the learners' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?

8. Are there any differences in the learners' use of the outside class activities in learning English in terms of their gender, major field and proficiency level?

3.3 Sample of the Study

The sample of the present study consisted of 186 preparatory school students at Başkent University.

In the selection of the sample one third of the elementary level (C-level) and intermediate level (B-level) classes were selected randomly. In other words, students enrolled in 10 elementary classes (out of 30) and four intermediate classes (out of 12) constituted the sample of the present study. The subjects displayed variety in gender, major field, proficiency level of English and foreign language background.

The characteristics of the sample participated in the present study were as follows: Out of 186 students, 99 were males and 87 were females. Regarding the major field of these 186 students, 19 of them were from four different engineering departments, and 144 of them were from 23 different social sciences departments, and 23 of them were from eight different science departments. That the majority of students were from social sciences departments can be explained by the nature of Foundation Universities, which have much more social science departments compared to engineering and science departments. Therefore, it is in line with the composition of the students. In terms of the proficiency level of the students, 118 of them were attending elementary level classes (C-level), and 68 of them were attending intermediate level classes (B-level). Considering the type of high school they graduated, 32 students were from Anatolian high schools, 28 of them were from super high schools, 13 were from technical high schools, 30 were from

private high schools, 72 were from regular high schools, and 11 were from other

types of high schools (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 *Characteristics of the Sample*

Sex	Number of participants
Males	99
Females	87
Total	186
Proficiency level	
Elementary	118
Intermediate	68
Total	186
Major field	
Social sciences	144
Science	23
Engineering	19
Total	186
High school background	
Anatolian high schools	32
Super high schools	28
Technical high schools	13
Private high schools	30
Regular high schools	72
Other high schools	11
Total	186

3.4 Data Collection Instrument

In the present study, 'Learner Autonomy Readiness Instrument' (LARI) was employed as the data collection instrument, which aimed to investigate the readiness of preparatory school students at Başkent University for autonomous learning. LARI consisted of four separate parts: (1) Motivation; (2) Metacognitive Strategies; (3) Responsibilities; (4) Outside Class Activities. Throughout the development process of LARI, several steps were followed (Table 3.4). The following section deals with each step in detail.

3.4.1 Construction of the Questionnaire

Prior to the construction of the questionnaire, a substantial literature review was carried out. Firstly, a learner autonomy expert who had already worked together with Leni Dam, a distinguished figure in learner autonomy, was visited at Bilkent University. In the light of this expert's recommendations and references, different libraries such as Bilkent, M.E.T.U, and British Council were searched for the books, periodicals and theses regarding learner autonomy in language learning. Moreover, websites on the Internet, EBSCOHOST and ERIC databases were used so as to explore the recent studies conducted on the readiness of language learners for autonomous learning. In this research, only a few instruments that were specifically designed aiming to assess the readiness of language learners for autonomous learning were found. However, administering one of them would not be feasible since each of them had some deficiencies. For

instance, one of them was much more appropriate for an experimental study, another one had been completely designed for a qualitative study, the other one included extensive variables. Therefore, LARI, the data collection instrument used in this study, was constructed by the researcher by making use of two different instruments in the related field with some modifications in the light of the review of literature.

Instrument 1 constructed by Schmidt, Boraie, and Kassabgy (1996) was used to measure the relationship between components of motivation and preferred classroom learning activities and to identify the relationship between the components of motivation and learning strategies. It is a 97-item instrument; the first 50 items concern motivation (α: 0.80); the next set of 22 items concerns preferences for classroom instructional activities (α: 0.59); and the final 25 items concern learning strategies (α: 0.86). Respondents are asked to indicate their agreements or disagreements with various statement on six-point Likert scales ranging from 6 indicating "strongly agree", 5 indicating "agree", 4 indicating "slightly agree", 3 indicating "slightly disagree", 2 indicating "disagree", and 1 indicating "strongly disagree".

Instrument 2 developed by Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002) aimed to assess students' readiness for learner autonomy in language learning. The instrument has four sections. The first section focuses on examining the students' views of their responsibilities and those of their teachers'; the second section explores the students' confidence in their ability to operate autonomously; the third section aims to gauge the levels of student motivation to learn English. Finally, the fourth section investigates the students' practice of autonomous

Table 3.4 *Steps followed in the design of LARI*

Step 1
Literature Review
↓
Step 2
Combination of two instruments
(Motivation questionnaire + Autonomy questionnaire)
↓
Step 3
Expert opinion
(n= 3)
↓
Step 4
Revision of the questionnaire according to
The feedback received
↓
Step 5
Translation fidelity
↓
Step 6
Expert opinion for overall evaluation
↓
Step 7
Revision of the questionnaire regarding
The feedback obtained
↓
Step 8
Pilot study
↓
Step 9
Administration of the questionnaire

learning in the form of both inside and outside class activities. Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree on a 5-point Likert scale for Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3, and on a 4-point Likert scale for Section 4. The reliability of the instrument has been empowered with literature, brainstorming sessions and pilot study.

In the light of the review of literature, two sections from Instrument 1, which are motivation and metacognitive learner strategies, and two sections from Instrument 2, which are responsibilities, and outside class activities were selected without making any changes. The rationale behind this compilation was that each section could be thought of as manifestations of autonomous language learning behaviour. That is, when the relevant literature was searched for, it was inevitable to come across the relationship between learner autonomy and the areas mentioned above. For instance, Littlewood (1996) states that learners' willingness to assume responsibility is the center of the notion of autonomy and he adds that this willingness depends on motivation. Furthermore, Crabbe (1993) states the necessity of learners' using opportunities inside and outside the classroom to attain success, and adds that formal classroom activities alone do not guarantee language learning. Finally, in the cognitive literature on learning, autonomous learning is referred to as self-regulation, which requires students' use of three strategies: planning, monitoring, and evaluation. Zimmerman (1989) (as cited in Cole & Chan, 1994) portrays a detailed picture of a self-regulated learners by stating that they are metacognitively active participants in their own learning process and they initiate and direct their own efforts to acquire knowledge and skill instead of relying on teachers or others. Moreover, it would be possible to

draw much more information from respondents since the chosen sections contained detailed items.

3.4.2 Expert Opinion

The first draft of LARI was given to three academicians who were actively working at METU, Department of Educational Sciences. Two of these experts were in the field of Curriculum and Instruction, and one of them was in the field of Psychological Counseling and Guidance. They were requested to evaluate the items in the questionnaire critically in terms of the content validity, face validity and clarity of the items. They were also asked to think of other items that may be added to the data collection instrument. In the light of these criticisms, LARI was revised and necessary changes were made on the following areas: double-barreled questions, unclear instructions, ambiguous items, inadequate scale, and vocabulary and complex design of one section.

3.4.3 Translation Fidelity

After the expert opinion was taken and the appropriate correction was completed according to the feedback given by the experts, the items of LARI were translated into Turkish by the researcher. Next, the Turkish version of it was given to three colleagues who have had experience in Translation and Interpretation, and they were asked to back-translate the instrument to English. Finally, the two versions of LARI were compared by the translation experts and the researcher and

it was agreed that some items needed a few changes on word order, vocabulary, clause types, conjunctions and active-passive form.

3.4.4 Expert Opinion for Overall Evaluation

As soon as the translation process was completed, the Turkish version of LARI was given to two experts, one of them was from the field of Curriculum and Instruction and another one was from the field of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, so as to assess the items regarding the content and clarity. Their main criticism focused on the length of the instrument and it was recommended that the number of items be decreased. With the help of an expert, 33 items were extracted from LARI. Throughout the extraction, the factor analysis conducted for the Instrument 1 was particularly taken into consideration. In other words, the items with low loadings (less than .50) were extracted.

3.4.5 Second Draft

The second form of LARI included four different sections with 49 items in total. 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. Additionally, factor analysis was conducted for two sections: Motivation and Metacognitive Strategies. For motivation section, two factors were identified: Determination and

Anxiety and for metacognitive strategies section only one factor was found: Organizing learning. Therefore, both sections were considered as a whole and neither was divided into subgroups.

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; "strongly agree", "agree", "slightly agree", "slightly disagree", "disagree", "strongly disagree". 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, as in the Instrument 2; "always", "often", "sometimes", "rarely" and "never". The weight for every response varies between 5 and 1, in the direction from most positive to most negative.

3.4.6 Pilot Study

LARI was piloted with 4% of the preparatory school students. That is, the pilot study was conducted with 43 preparatory school students as compared to the 186 preparatory students that made up the sample of the study. The subjects involved in the pilot study were not included in the sample during the administration of the final form of LARI.

The preparatory school students involved in the pilot study were selected randomly. 63% of the participants were studying at different elementary level (C-level) classrooms as compared to 37% attending different intermediate level (B-level) classrooms. In addition, nearly 60% of the respondents were females while 40% of them were male participants. Finally, out of 43 respondents 30 of them from social sciences, nine of them were from applied sciences and four of them were from different engineering departments.

The pilot study was carried out in the first week of March 2003. The administration and collection of the instrument and the analysis of the results took about two weeks. For the statistical analyses, Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to examine the internal consistency of LARI. The Cronbach's alpha for each section was as follows: Motivation (0.65), Metacognitive strategies (0.65), Outside Class Activities (0.79) and for the overall instrument Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.82, which indicated that there was a high internal consistency between the items.

3.4.7 Final Draft

After the pilot study and checking the reliability of the instrument, a final expert's opinion was needed for the construction of the last version of LARI. Based on the expert's criticism, it was agreed that a small modification in Responsibility section be actualized.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The final draft of LARI was administered to 186 (99 males and 87 females) preparatory school students at Başkent University in the first two weeks of April.

Prior to the implementation of the data collection instrument, the permission of the Head of Başkent University School of Foreign Language was taken via submitting the proposal of the study, which included the aim of the study, the method to be followed during the study with the sample instrument and the contributions of the study for Başkent University.

The questionnaire was administered to the students in their classroom settings, which took approximately 25 minutes for each class. The classroom teachers, who were informed about the aim of the study and the administration procedure, carried out the administration. Also, the respondents were explained the purpose of the study before requesting them to answer the questions. Subjects' confidentiality was guaranteed.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The statistical analyses were conducted by using SPSS software program. In the present study, descriptive statistics t-test for independent samples, one-way ANOVA and chi-square were used to analyze the data.

3.7 Limitations of the Study

The nature of this study is limited to the data collected from 186 students studying at the English preparatory school of Başkent University. For this reason, it can be said that the study is limited to a small group of preparatory school students, which makes it hard to generalize the results in different groups of students in other educational settings.

Moreover, the areas of autonomous learning, that were investigated in this study, were limited to the motivation level of students, metacognitive strategies used by students, responsibility perceptions of students and their outside class activities. However, according to Little (1990) learner autonomy is not easy to achieve since it can manifest itself in a great variety of ways. For instance, the freedom which autonomous learning needs might be conditional or limited by some factors that determine the context in which it emerges. Accordingly, such conditions or limitations need to be taken into consideration prior to the development of learner autonomy. Therefore, the four areas of autonomy investigated in this study may have some limitations regarding the various learning contexts.

Another limitation is that the results of the present study were based on the quantitative data collected from participants through questionnaires. Interviews might have been conducted to gather more detailed information from the respondents.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results obtained from the statistical analyses. In the first section, the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the dependent and independent variables, included in the study, are illustrated. The second section represents the results regarding the respondents' readiness for autonomous language learning in terms of their gender, proficiency level of English and major field.

4.1 Results of the Study Regarding the Research Questions

In the present study, eight research questions were explained regarding the readiness of preparatory school English learners at Başkent University for autonomous learning. The results will be presented in the same order with the research questions produced for the study.

4.1.1 Findings Concerning the Motivation Level

The first research question aimed to investigate the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Başkent University. The data concerning this question were collected by Section 2, which consisted of 20 items

on six-point likert scale, in the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to present the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items.

Table 4.1.1 displays the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of subjects' responses to various aspects of motivation in learning English. As can be drawn from the data, the majority of the subjects indicated their enjoyment in the process of learning English (Item 13) whereas only about one fifth of them reported their disagreement to the opportunities of learning English without going to school (Item 14). Furthermore, subjects' responses to items 15 and 17 reflected great high determination in learning English. Drawn from the responses of 'strongly agree' and 'agree', it is almost certain that half of the respondents were doing their best to improve their English (Item 15). Slightly over three fourth of the students reported their willingness to continue studying English as long as possible (Item 17). Additionally, a marginally larger than half of the students (58%) showed their positive attitudes towards attending the English course regularly by stating that attendance requirement was not an effective factor in learning English (Item 16).

Responses to item 18 displayed a high expectation of success in students. Only 14% of the students indicated their disagreement to the belief of being successful in the English class. Also, nearly one fourth of the students reported that they strongly agreed with the idea of struggling to be the best in the English class (item 20). In addition to the success, another external factor increasing the students' motivation is the opportunity to be able to find a better and well-paid job(Item 19). Almost exactly 90% of the respondents (n=167) indicated their

Table 4.1.1 *Motivation Level of the Respondents*

ITEM	Strongly agree		Agree		Slightly agree		Slightly disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		mean	stand dev.
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**M**	**SD**
13. Learning English is enjoyable for me.	26	14	46	24.7	58	31.2	17	9.1	16	8.6	23	12.4	**3.89**	**1.53**
14. I wish I could learn English in an easier way, without going to school.	87	46.8	40	21.5	24	12.9	9	4.8	19	10.2	7	3.8	**4.78**	**1.51**
15. I am trying to do my best to learn English.	36	19.4	59	31.7	44	23.7	13	7	23	12.4	11	5.9	**4.21**	**1.74**
16. Even if there is no attendance requirement in the English course, my attendance would be high.	37	19.9	46	24.7	26	14	25	13.4	24	12.9	28	15.1	**3.8**	**1.49**
17. I want to continue studying English for as long as possible.	61	32.8	43	23.1	44	23.7	14	7.5	12	6.5	12	6.5	**4.49**	**1.21**
18. I believe that I will be successful in the English class.	46	24.7	69	37.1	45	24.2	13	7	8	4.3	5	2.7	**4.63**	**1.23**
19. If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better and well-paid job.	103	55.4	48	25.8	16	8.6	8	4.3	6	3.2	5	2.7	**5.18**	**1.58**
20. I want to be the best in the English class.	44	23.7	49	26.3	42	22.6	15	8.1	19	10.2	17	9.1	**4.18**	**1.8**
21. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in the English class.	39	21	43	23.1	28	15.1	13	7	33	17.7	30	16.1	**3.74**	**1.63**
22. I can not concentrate easily on the English class.	20	10.8	31	16.7	34	18.3	22	11.8	50	26.9	29	15.6	**3.26**	**1.69**
23. I am afraid I will not succeed in the English exams.	49	26.3	36	19.4	33	17.7	21	11.3	30	16.1	17	9.1	**4.01**	**1.66**

Table 4.1.1 *Motivation Level of the Respondents (Continued)*

ITEM	Strongly agree		Agree		Slightly agree		Slightly disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		mean	stand dev.
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**M**	**SD**
24. I like working in pairs in the English class.	41	22	5	26.9	40	21.5	13	7	19	10.2	23	12.4	**4.06**	**1.79**
25. I prefer individual work in the English class.	36	19.4	29	15.6	28	15.1	26	14	32	17.2	35	18.8	**3.49**	**1.47**
26. Group activities in the English class are not efficient.	38	20.4	61	32.8	38	20.4	20	10.8	17	9.1	12	6.5	**4.25**	**1.66**
27. In the English class, the teacher should be the one who talks more.	35	18.8	26	14	41	22	25	13.4	37	19.9	22	11.8	**3.63**	**1.1**
28. In an English class, I like activities that allow me to participate actively.	84	45.2	56	30.1	29	15.6	11	5.9	4	2.2	2	1.1	**5.07**	**1.02**
29. The teacher should encourage students to make contributions in the English lesson.	99	53.2	57	30.6	22	11.8	3	1.6	1	0.5	4	2.2	**5.28**	**1.64**
30. If I do well in this course, it will be because I have the ability for learning English.	53	28.5	45	24.2	36	19.4	17	9.1	16	8.6	19	10.2	4.24	1.52
31. If I do not do well in this course, it will be because I have not tried hard enough.	13	7	15	8.1	39	21	35	18.8	41	22	43	23.1	2.90	1.30
32. If I do not do well in this course, it will be because of the teacher.	45	24.2	59	31.7	46	24.7	18	9.7	13	7	5	2.7	4.48	1.51

agreement to the necessity of English so as to find a better and well-paid job.

Responses to the items 21 and 23 reflected considerable anxiety in subjects during the English learning process. For instance, more than half of the respondents (n= 110) seemed to feel uncomfortable when they had to speak English (Item 21). Additionally, nearly one fourth of the subjects (45,7%) indicated certain agreements (overall responses of strongly agree and agree) to having test anxiety in themselves (Item 23). On the other hand, not many students reported lack of concentration in the English class. Only about 10% (n=20) of the subjects stated their strong agreement to having concentration problems during the English class (Item 22).

As for the collective work, majority of students valued pair work and group work activities (Items 24 and 26). For instance, approximately three fourth of the subjects (with the mean of 4,06) appeared to be fond of working in pairs in the English class (Item 24). Moreover, slightly over 50% of the respondents agreed with the idea of efficiency of group activities by indicating 'strongly agree' and 'agree' for the item 26. On the other hand, slightly smaller one third of the students were likely to be undecided as to their preference for working individually in the English class (Item 25). For instance, 28 out of 186 subjects reported their slightly agreement while 26 out of 186 respondents reported their slightly disagreement to the item 25 which asked for respondents' preferences for working alone in carrying out the tasks in the English class.

Students' responses to items 27 and 29, which concerned active involvement in the English class, showed clearly that the majority of the respondents perceived the teacher's role as an authority speaking more than the

students and a helper creating opportunities for them to involve in the tasks. Approximately one third of the subjects agreed with the idea that the teacher should talk more than themselves (Item 27) based on their indications as 'strongly agree' and 'agree'. Although nearly half of the students (45%) reported their strong agreements to item 28, which concerned willingness to participate actively in the class, almost all of the students (n=178) stated that they needed the teacher's encouragement for active participation (Item 29).

Responses to items 30, 31 and 32 indicated that majority of students tend to attribute their failure and success to themselves. For instance, it is almost certain that not trying hard enough caused failure according to nearly half of the respondents (n=98) who agreed or strongly agreed with the item 30. Additionally, respondents did not seem to consider the teacher as an important factor in their failure. Only 28 out of 186 subjects attributed their failure to the teacher by indicating 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to item 31. Finally, approximately three fourth of the respondents (n=150) agreed with the idea of attributing their success to their own great efforts.

4.1.2 Findings Regarding the Metacognitive Strategies

In the second research question, the aim was to find out the extent of metacognitive strategies used by preparatory students in learning English at Başkent University. The data regarding this question were gathered by Section 3, which contained eight items on a six-point Likert scale, in the questionnaire.

Descriptive statistics was used to portray the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items.

Table 4.1.2 illustrates the percentages and frequencies of students' responses to the usage of metacognitive strategies in learning English. As can be seen from the data, more than three fourth of students (n=169) indicated their agreement for self-evaluation by stating that they learned better when they tried to figure out the reasons of their own mistakes (Item 39). However, nearly two third of the respondents disagreed with the idea of arranging time to prepare before every English class (Item 40). Furthermore, subjects' responses to the items which reflect organizing learning (Items 33, 34, 35, 36) reveal small distinctions. For instance, almost exactly 75 % of the respondents tended to think about the new grammar rule's relationship to the rules they had learned before (Item 33). Moreover, it is almost certain that one fourth of the subjects (n=47) indicated their strong agreement on making summaries, diagrams or tables of important points while they were studying English. On the other hand, students' responses to items 35 and 36 reflected weaker organisation of vocabulary learning. In fact, a bit more than one fourth of the subjects showed certain disagreement (with a mean of 3.74 for item 35 and 3.66 for item 36) on using different strategies in learning a new word such as dividing the new vocabulary into parts or using the new word in a sentence. Finally, responses to items 37 and 38 indicate that the majority of the students considered the importance of using self-evaluation and self-monitoring strategies in the language learning process. In other words, more than one third of the students displayed their strong agreements by stating that they had the habit of identifying their problems prior to English exams (Item 38). Also, only 14 % of

Table 4.1.2 *Metacognitive Strategies used by the Respondents*

ITEM	Strongly agree		Agree		Slightly agree		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		mean	stand dev.
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**M**	**SD**
33. When I am learning a new grammar rule, I think about its relationship to the rules I have learned.	52	28	75	40.3	31	16.7	13	7	11	5.9	4	2.2	**4.71**	**1.24**
34. When I study for my English course, I pick out the most important points and make diagrams or tables for myself.	47	25.3	53	28.5	39	21	14	7.5	18	9.7	15	8.1	**4.28**	**1.56**
35. I try to find the meaning of a word by dividing it into parts that I can understand.	27	14.5	41	22	44	23.7	22	11.8	35	18.8	17	9.1	**3.74**	**1.56**
36. I use new English words in a sentence in order to remember them easily.	24	12.9	37	19.9	50	26.9	24	12.9	29	15.6	22	11.8	**3.66**	**1.56**
37. I always try to evaluate my progress in learning English.	27	14.5	58	31.2	55	29.6	20	10.8	18	9.7	8	4.3	**4.17**	**1.32**
38. When studying for my English exam, I try to find out which structures and terms I do not understand well.	66	35.5	72	38.7	25	13.4	11	5.9	4	2.2	8	4.3	**4.87**	**1.26**
39. I learn better when I try to understand the reasons of my mistakes I have done in English.	70	37.6	73	39.2	26	14	4	2.2	9	4.8	4	2.2	**4.96**	**1.18**
40. I arrange time to prepare before every English class.	16	8.6	18	9.7	38	20.4	23	12.4	47	25.3	44	23.7	**2.93**	**1.60**

the respondents refused to evaluate their progress in learning English by reporting their strong disagreement and disagreement (Item 37).

4.1.3 Findings Regarding the Responsibility Perceptions

The third research question aimed to explore Başkent University preparatory school students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities in learning English. The data concerned with this question were gathered by Section 4, which consisted of twelve items in the questionnaire. With the help of descriptive statistics, the percentages and frequencies of the items will be presented.

Table 4.1.3 reveals the percentages and frequencies of students' responses to the perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities. As displayed by the data, in four out of twelve items students were giving more responsibility to their teacher rather than to themselves. These items concern the decisions to be taken on the content of English lessons (Item 44), the activities or tasks to be carried out in the English lessons (Item 45), the time limit to be spent on each activity or task (Item 46) and the materials to be used in the English lessons (Item 47). Responses to each of these items indicate that approximately 75 % of the subjects considered the teacher as more responsible for decisions relating to formal language instruction. However, these students also appeared to have a notion of shared responsibility, particularly in five areas. For instance, slightly over two third of the respondents agreed to share the responsibility with their teacher in stimulating their interest in learning English (Item 41). Similarly,

students' responses to item 42 reflected great willingness to share the responsibility in identifying the students' weaknesses and strengths in learning English. Furthermore, more than half of the respondents viewed the notion of shared responsibility as indispensable in evaluating their learning performance (Item 48), evaluating the English lesson (Item 49) and making sure they make progress during English lessons (Item 51). On the other hand, in the two cases (Item 50 and Item 52) students gave themselves more responsibility than the teacher. Almost exactly two third of the respondents reported that they were able to hand responsibility in decisions related to what will be learnt outside the English class (Item 50). In addition to this, approximately 70 % of the subjects stated their willingness to take responsibility to make sure that they made progress outside the English class.

Table 4.1.3 *Responsibility Perceptions of the Respondents*

ITEM	Teacher's Responsibility		Both Teacher's and my own responsibility		My own responsibility	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	37	19.9	126	67.7	23	12.4
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	24	12.9	106	57	56	30.1
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	65	34.9	69	37.1	52	28
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	140	75.3	39	21	7	3.8
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	138	74.2	39	21	7	3.8
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	140	75.3	44	23.7	2	1.1
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	145	78	35	18.8	6	3.2
48. evaluating my learning performance	47	25.3	110	59.1	29	15.6
49. evaluating the English course	41	22	106	57	39	21
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	8	4.3	54	29	124	66.7
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	22	11.8	116	62.4	48	25.8
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	9	4.8	45	24.2	132	71

4.1.4 Findings Concerning the Outside Class Activity Performances

The fourth research question aimed to identify the preparatory school students' the outside class activity performances in learning English. In order to investigate the response to this question, the data were gathered by Section 5, which included nine items on a five-point Likert scale, in the questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to portray the percentages, frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items.

Table 4.1.4 presents 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 shown by the data, more than half of the respondents (n=131) preferred listening to English songs, the frequency of which changes between always and often (Item 61). Additionally, nearly 70 % of the subjects claimed that they were trying to improve their English via watching English movies and TV programs (Item 57). Similarly, responses to item 55 indicate that approximately three fourth of students were making great efforts to learn new words in English by committing extensive time, changing from always to sometimes, as part of their outside class activities. On the other hand, students' responses to item 59 displayed low percentage on making use of the self-access center to study English. Almost exactly two third of the students indicated that they either never used or seldom used the self-access center so as to study English. Although the majority of students preferred watching movies and TV programs in English, fewer of them reported that they were reading books, magazines or newspapers in English (Item 58). In fact, less than one fourth of

students indicated that they were spending their free time regularly (always or often) on reading written materials such as books, magazines or papers in English. Likewise, a marginally small percentage of respondents (11.3 %) stated that they always tried to talk to foreigners in order to improve their spoken English (Item 61). Another area, which showed respondents' unwillingness was the use of Internet in English since approximately 40% of the subjects, reported that they seldom or never used Internet for search, chat, etc. (Item 56). Finally, subjects' responses to items 53 and 54 reflected unwillingness to do optional tasks or extra exercises outside the class in order to improve English. Slightly fewer than half of the respondents did not seem to have the habit of doing extra grammar exercises (Item 53) and only 8 % of the students reported that they always tried to do assignments, which were not compulsory.

Table 4.1.4 *The Outside Class Activities Performed by the Respondents*

ITEM	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never		Mean	Stand Dev.
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	M	SD
53. I do grammar exercises though it is not homework.	14	7.5	22	11.8	65	34.9	55	29.6	30	16.1	2.65	1.12
54. I do assignments, which are not compulsory.	15	8.1	26	14	50	26.9	45	24.2	50	26.9	2.52	1.25
55. I try to learn new words in English.	27	14.5	54	29	65	34.9	25	13.4	15	8.1	3.28	1.12
56. I use internet in English. (for chat, search…)	30	16.1	32	17.2	50	26.9	42	22.6	32	17.2	2.92	1.32
57. I watch English movies or TV programs.	32	17.2	39	21	58	31.2	34	18.3	23	12.4	3.12	1.25
58. I read English written materials. (magazines, books, newspapers…)	10	5.4	33	17.7	67	36	50	26.9	26	14	2.74	1.08
59. I make use of the self-access center to study English.	9	4.8	20	10.8	35	18.8	59	31.7	63	33.9	2.21	1.16
60. I talk to foreigners in English.	21	11.3	27	14.5	53	28.5	54	29	31	16.7	2.75	1.22
61. I listen to English songs.	69	37.1	62	33.5	22	11.8	21	11.3	12	6.5	3.83	1.23

4.1.5 Findings Regarding the Motivation Level in terms of Gender, Proficiency Level and Major Field

The fifth research question was stated, as 'Are there any differences in the learners' motivation level in learning English regarding their gender, proficiency level, and major field?'

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted to investigate whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' motivation level in learning English in terms of their gender. There was a significant difference between the means of female students (M= 4.13, SD= .50) and male students (M= 3.98, SD= .52) at the Preparatory School of Başkent University. In other words female students did have higher level of motivation in learning English than male students at the Preparatory School of Başkent University (Table 4.1.5a).

Table 4.1.5a *Independent Samples t-test for Motivation Level Concerning Gender*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances Assumed	2,060	183	, 041
Equal variances Not assumed	2,063	181,501	, 041

Another independent-samples *t* test was carried out to see whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' motivation level

in learning English regarding their proficiency level. There was a significant difference between the means of Elementary students (M= 4.14, SD= .46) at the C-level classes and Intermediate students (M= 3.9, SD= .58) at the B-level classes of Preparatory School of Başkent University. That is, Elementary students did have higher level of motivation in learning English than Intermediate students in the same formal institution (Table 4.1.5b).

Table 4.1.5b *Independent Samples t-test for Motivation Level Regarding Proficiency Level*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances Assumed	-3,188	184	, 002
Equal variances not assumed	-3,002	116,190	, 003

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the preparatory students' motivation level in learning English and their major field. The independent variable, students' major field, included three dimensions: social sciences (M= 4.09 SD= .51), engineering departments (M= 3.8 SD= .57) and science departments (M= 4.01 SD= .50). Motivation level of the respondents did not differ significantly in relation to the major field. (F= 2,67, p= .072) (Table 4.1.5c)

Table 4.1.5c *One-way ANOVA for Motivation Level Regarding Major*
Field

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1,399	2	, 699	2,671	, 072
Within Groups	47,929	183	, 262		
Total	49,327	185			

4.1.6 Findings Regarding the Use of Metacognitive Strategies in terms of Gender, Proficiency Level and Major Field

The sixth research question was stated, as 'Are there any differences in the metacognitive strategies used by the learners in learning English concerning their gender, major field and proficiency level?'

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted to investigate whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English in terms of their gender. There was a significant difference between the means of female students (M= 4.38, SD= .73) and male students (M= 3.97, SD= .96) at the Preparatory School of Başkent University. Female students tended to use much more metacognitive strategies in learning English than male students at the same institution (Table 4.1.6a).

Table 4.1.6a *Independent Samples t-test for the Use of Metacognitive Strategies Concerning Gender*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	T	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances Assumed	3,236	183	, 001
Equal variances Not assumed	3,287	179,141	, 001

Another independent-samples *t* test was carried out to see whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English concerning their proficiency level. There was not a significant difference between the means of elementary students (M= 4.22, SD= .86) at the C-level classes and intermediate students (M= 4.06, SD= .90) at the B-level classes of Preparatory School of Başkent University (Table 4.1.6b).

Table 4.1.6b *Independent Samples t-test for the Use of Metacognitive Strategies Regarding Proficiency Level*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances assumed	-1,189	184	,236
Equal variances not assumed	-1,175	134,793	,242

A one-way ANOVA was carried out to evaluate the relationship between the preparatory students' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English and their major field. The independent variable, students' major field, included three dimensions: social sciences (M= 4.23 SD= .87), engineering departments (M= 3.85 SD= .98) and science departments (M= 4.03 SD= .82). The metacognitive strategies used by the respondents did not differ significantly regarding the major field (F= 1,94, p=, 146) (Table 4.1.6c).

Table 4.1.6c *One-way ANOVA for Motivation Level Regarding Major Field*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2,983	2	1,492	1,945	, 146
Within Groups	140,340	183	, 767		
Total	143,323	185			

4.1.7 Findings Concerning the Responsibility Perceptions in terms of Gender, Proficiency Level and Major Field

The seventh research question was stated as 'Are there any differences in the learners' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English regarding their gender, proficiency level and major field?'

Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and chi-square tests were conducted to investigate whether the respondents' responsibility perceptions in learning English differ in terms of their gender, proficiency level and major

field (Table 4.1.7a, Table 4.1.7b, Table 4.1.7c, Table 4.1.7d, Table 4.1.7e, Table 4.1.7f).

The results of descriptive statistics and chi-square comparison tests regarding the seventh research question revealed that respondents' gender was not an important factor in their responsibility perceptions. In other words, both males and females gave the teacher more responsibility for items 44, 45, 46 and 47. Moreover, they both believed shared responsibility for items 41, 42, 48, 49 and 51. Finally, both groups gave responsibility to themselves for items 50 and 52. However, only for item 43, which is deciding the objectives of the English course, majority of males, gave the responsibility to the teacher, whereas, majority of females agreed the shared responsibility for this item (Table 4.1.7a and Table 4.1.7d).

Another finding that can be drawn from this data was that the respondents' proficiency level did not play a crucial role their responsibility perceptions. That is, both elementary and intermediate level respondents indicated their agreement for shared responsibility for items 41, 42, 48, 49 and 51. Additionally, both groups gave responsibility to the teacher for items 44, 45, 46 and 47. Lastly, for items 50 and 52 both elementary and intermediate group respondents gave more responsibility to themselves. Nevertheless, for item 43, which is deciding the objectives of the English course, intermediate group tended to give more responsibility to the teacher, while majority of elementary learners agreed the shared responsibility for this item (Table 4.1.7b and Table 4.1.7e).

The final result drawn from this data was that the major field of the respondents did not differ considering their responsibility perceptions. Respondents from the three of the group (science, engineering and social science) gave more responsibility to the teacher for items 43, 44, 45, 46 and 47. They also reported their agreement for shared responsibility for items 41, 42, 48, 49, and 51. Finally, they gave the responsibility to themselves for item 50 and 52 (Table 4.1.7c and Table 4.1.7e).

Table 4.1.7a *Descriptive Statistics for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding Gender*

ITEM	Teacher's responsibility				Both Teacher's and my own responsibility				My own responsibility			
	female (n=87)		male (n=98)		female (n=87)		male (n=98)		female (n=87)		male (n=98)	
	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	21	24.1	16	16.3	59	67.8	66	67.3	7	8.05	16	16.3
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	7	8.05	17	17.3	54	62.1	52	53.1	26	29.9	29	29.6
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	28	32.2	37	37.8	38	43.7	30	30.6	21	24.1	31	31.6
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	65	74.7	74	75.5	20	23	19	19.4	2	2.3	5	5.1
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	60	69	77	78.6	24	27.6	15	15.3	3	3.44	6	6.1
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	64	73.6	75	76.5	22	25.3	22	22.4	1	1.15	1	1.02
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	64	73.6	80	81.6	20	23	15	15.3	3	3.44	3	3.06
48. evaluating my learning performance	21	24.1	26	26.5	54	62.1	56	57.1	12	13.8	16	16.3
49. evaluating the English course	18	20.7	23	23.5	48	55.2	57	58.2	21	24.1	18	18.4
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	3	3.4	5	5.1	23	26.4	31	31.6	61	70.1	62	63.3
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	11	12.6	11	11.2	53	61	62	63.3	23	26.4	25	25.5
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	2	2.3	7	7.1	17	19.5	28	28.6	68	78.2	63	64.3

Table 4.1.7b *Descriptive Statistics for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding Proficiency Level*

ITEM	Teacher's responsibility (f)				Both Teacher's and my own responsibility (f)				My own responsibility (f)			
	intermediate (n=68)		elementary (n=118)		intermediate (n=68)		elementary (n=118)		Intermediate (n=68)		elementary (n=118)	
	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	12	17.6	25	21.2	46	67.6	80	67.8	10	14.7	13	11.01
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	7	10.3	17	14.4	42	61.8	64	54.2	19	28	37	31.3
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	30	44.1	35	30	25	36.8	44	37.3	13	19.1	39	33.05
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	54	79.4	86	72.9	11	16.2	28	23.7	3	4.4	4	3.4
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	51	75	87	73.7	13	19.1	26	22	4	5.9	5	4.2
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	52	76.5	88	74.6	15	22.06	29	24.6	1	1.5	1	0.8
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	57	83.8	88	74.6	8	11.8	27	22.9	3	4.4	3	2.5
48. evaluating my learning performance	11	16.2	36	30.5	46	67.6	64	54.2	11	16.2	18	15.2
49. evaluating the English course	15	22.1	26	22	44	64.7	62	52.5	9	13.2	30	25.4
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	3	4.4	5	4.2	23	33.8	31	26.3	42	61.8	82	69.5
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	5	7.3	17	14.4	41	60.3	75	63.5	22	32.3	26	22.03
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	3	4.4	6	5.1	16	23.5	29	24.6	49	72.1	83	70.3

Table 4.1.7c *Descriptive Statistics for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding Major Field*

ITEM	Teacher's responsibility (f)						Both Teacher's and my own responsibility (f)						My own responsibility (f)					
	science (n=24)		eng. (n=19)		soc.sci. (n=143)		science (n=24)		eng. (n=19)		soc.sci. (n=143)		science (n=24)		eng. (n=19)		soc.sci. (n=143)	
	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	5	20.8	4	21	28	19.6	15	62.5	11	57.9	100	70	4	16.7	4	21	15	10,5
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	5	20.8	3	15.8	16	11.2	12	50	9	47.4	83	58	7	29.2	7	36.9	42	29,4
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	10	41.6	9	47.4	46	32.2	7	29.2	7	36.9	55	38.5	7	29.2	3	15.8	42	29,4
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	18	75	16	84.2	106	74.1	4	16.7	3	15.8	32	22.4	2	8.3	-	-	5	3,5
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	14	58.3	14	73.7	110	77	6	25	5	26.3	28	19.6	4	16.7	-	-	5	3,5
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	19	79.2	15	79	106	74.1	4	16.7	4	21	36	25.2	1	4.2	-	-	1	0,7
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	20	83.3	16	84.2	109	76.2	3	12.5	2	10.5	30	21	1	4.2	1	5.3	4	2,8
48. evaluating my learning performance	6	25	1	5.3	40	28	11	45.6	17	89.5	82	57.3	7	29.2	1	5.3	21	14,7
49. evaluating the English course	3	12.5	5	26.3	33	23.1	15	62.5	12	63.1	79	55.2	6	25	2	10.5	31	21,7
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	2	8.3	2	10.5	4	2.8	11	45.6	8	42.1	35	24.5	11	46	9	47.4	104	72,7
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	5	20.8	1	5.3	16	11.2	13	54.2	14	73.7	89	62.2	6	25	4	21	38	26,6
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	1	4.2	2	10.5	6	4.2	4	16.7	4	21	37	25.9	19	79.2	13	68.4	100	70

Table 4.1.7d *Chi-square comparison for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding Gender*

	Chi-square*	
	χ2	p
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	3.49	.139
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	3.727	.155
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	3.469	.177
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	1.244	.537
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	4.548	.103
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	.217	.897
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	1.845	.398
48. evaluating my learning performance	.487	.784
49. evaluating the English course	.961	.618
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	1.043	.594
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	.134	.935
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	5.021	.081

* α: 0.05

Table 4.1.7e Chi-square Comparison for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding
Proficiency Level

	Chi-square*	
	χ^2	p
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	.747	.688
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	1.161	.559
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	5.579	.061
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	1.538	.464
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	.426	.808
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	.292	.864
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	3.774	.152
48. evaluating my learning performance	4.842	.089
49. evaluating the English course	4.176	.124
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	1.237	.539
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	3.669	.160
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	.078	.962

* α: 0.05

Table 4.1.7f Chi-square Comparison for Responsibility Perceptions Regarding Major Field

	Chi-square*	
	χ^2	p
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	64.055	.545
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	68.495	.393
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	59.783	.692
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	58.714	.726
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	68.397	.396
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	56.729	.785
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	71.913	.289
48. evaluating my learning performance	77.948	.149
49. evaluating the English course	63.984	.547
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	77.950	.126
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	72.731	.266
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	79.140	.130

* α: 0.05

4.1.8 Findings Concerning the Outside Class Activity Performances in terms of Gender, Proficiency Level and Major Field

The eighth research question was stated as 'Are there any differences in the outside class activities that the preparatory students of Başkent University perform in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted to investigate whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' performing the outside class activities in learning English in terms of their gender. There was not a significant difference between the means of female students (M= 2.97, SD= .60) and male students (M= 2.83, SD= .73) at the Preparatory School of Başkent University (Table 4.1.8a).

Table 4.1.8a *Independent Samples t-test for the Outside Class Activities Concerning Gender*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances assumed	1,309	183	, 192
Equal variances not assumed	1,323	182,227	, 188

Another independent-samples *t* test was carried out to see whether there were any statistical differences between the preparatory students' performing the outside class activities in learning English concerning their proficiency level.

There was a significant difference between the means of Elementary students (M= 2.81, SD= .66) at the C-level classes and Intermediate students (M= 3.04, SD= .67) at the B-level classes of Preparatory School of Başkent University. In other words, Intermediate students seemed to conduct more outside class activities in learning English than Elementary students at the Preparatory School of Başkent University (Table 4.1.8b).

Table 4.1.8b *Independent Samples t-test for the Outside Class Activities Regarding Proficiency Level*

	t-test for Equality of Means		
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
SUM Equal variances Assumed	2,292	184	, 023
Equal variances not assumed	2,275	136,870	, 024

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the preparatory students' performing the outside class activities in learning English and their major field. The independent variable, students' major field, included three dimensions: social sciences (M= 2.91, SD= .66), engineering departments (M= 2.81, SD= .62) and science departments (M= 2.82 SD= .76). The outside class activities performed by the subjects did not differ significantly concerning the major field (*F*=, 33, p=, 72) (Table 4.1.8c)**.**

Table 4.1.8c *One-way ANOVA for the Outside Class Activities*
Regarding Major Field

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	, 302	2	, 151	, 334	, 717
Within Groups	82,881	183	, 453		
Total	83,183	185			

4.2 Summary

The summary of the analyses conducted and the results of the study are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 *A Summary of the Results of the Study*

Research Question	Data Analysis Conducted	Results
1. What is the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Başkent University?	Descriptive Statistics	high determination, high expectation of success, high extrinsic motivation, unwillingness to speak English, test anxiety, enjoyment for group activities, need for teacher's encouragement to participate, attribution of success and failure to themselves
2. To what extent are the metacognitive strategies used in learning English by preparatory students at Başkent University?	Descriptive Statistics	-ability for self-evaluation -no desire for time-arrangement -willing to organize learning except for vocabulary -having the habit of self-monitoring
3. How are the responsibilities perceived in learning English by preparatory students at Başkent University?	Descriptive Statistics	-considering the teacher as more responsible throughout the learning process -shared responsibility for evaluation and monitoring process -giving more responsibility to themselves in activities conducted outside the English class
4. How often do preparatory students at Başkent University perform outside the class activities in learning English?	Descriptive Statistics	-giving more time to listening songs, watching TV programs and movies in English -not willing to read book, papers, etc in English -not having the habit of using self-access -no desire to talk to foreigners in English -not willing to do optional tasks

Table 4.2 *A Summary of the Results of the Study (Continued)*

Research Question	Data Analysis Conducted	Results
5. Are there any differences in the students' motivation levels in learning English regarding their proficiency level, major field and gender?	t-test one-way ANOVA	-females seemed to have higher motivation in learning English -elementary level learners tended to have higher motivation in learning English -no significant difference in terms of respondents' major field
6. Are there any differences in the metacognitive strategies the preparatory students at Başkent University use in learning English in relation to their gender, major field and proficiency level?	t-test one-way ANOVA	-females appeared to use more metacognitive strategies in learning English -no significant difference between proficiency level -no significant difference regarding the respondents' major field
7. How are the responsibilities perceived by the students in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?	Descriptive Statistics Chi-square comparison tests	-both females and males perceived the responsibilities in the same way -similar responsibilities were perceived by elementary and intermediate group learners in the same way -respondents with different major field perceived the responsibilities in the same way
8. Are there any differences in the outside the class activities the students perform in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?	t-test one-way ANOVA	-no significant difference between gender -intermediate level learners tended to do more outside class activities in learning English -no significant difference concerning respondents' major field

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions of the results that were reported in the previous chapter and their implications for practice and further research.

5.1 Conclusions

The main area of investigation in the present study was to explore whether, or not, students learning English are ready to be involved in autonomous learning regarding four areas: learners' motivation level in learning English, learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English, learners' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in learning English, learners' actual practice of autonomous language learning in the outside class activities.

In the present study, eight research questions were asked concerning the readiness of English learners at the preparatory school of Başkent University for autonomous learning. The inferences that can be drawn from the results of the study will be presented in the same order with the research questions produced for the study.

5.1.1 Conclusions on Motivation Level

The first research question aimed to find out the level of motivation in learning English for preparatory students at Başkent University. The data regarding this question were gathered in Section 2. Respondents appeared to have high motivation in most of the cases. In other words, these respondents were likely to be engaged in autonomous learning regarding their level of motivation. These results seem to be consistent with previous findings indicating that high level of motivation promotes learner autonomy (Dörnyei & Csizer, 1998) and motivation is a key factor that enables learners to learn autonomously (Spratt, Humphreys and Chan, 2002).

Obviously, the majority of the respondents in this study indicated a strong desire not only to learn English but also to improve it as much as they could. This result can be considered as an important indicator of the subjects' high determination and willingness to continue studying English. It is also encouraging not only for teachers but also for curriculum developers to have such an English learner profile since the medium of instruction of the university the subjects are attending is Turkish, not English. This finding is parallel with Deci and Ryan's belief (1985) (as cited in Spratt, Humphreys and Chan, 2002) that supports the relationship between autonomy and intrinsic motivation. Additionally, the respondents scored high on extrinsic motivation items. This might arise from their awareness of competition in the job market. Also, the opportunity to get scholarship from the institution encourages most students to make effort to be the best in their classroom.

Although the subjects did not mention any concentration problems during the learning process, most of them pointed out having test anxiety and uncomfortable feeling while speaking English in front of the other class members. The former one can be explained by the pressure, which obliges preparatory students to pass the proficiency exam before starting their own departments. The latter one might not directly be related to learning a foreign language since there are some people feeling uncomfortable and having difficulties in expressing themselves and social skills even communicating in their mother tongue. As Ho and Crookall (1995) have suggested, learners can cope with such stress as long as they learn to be self-motivated or autonomous learners.

Significantly, a high number of the subjects indicated their enjoyment to do tasks or activities in pairs or group work. However, these participants appeared to be undecided when their opinions about individual work were asked. The long hours that the respondents have to spend in the preparatory classrooms might cause them to do tasks together in order to enjoy themselves in the learning process. Or, the teachers who tend to design communicative tasks in which students work together can be effective in that the respondents may be used to such kind of learning. Yet, when we look at the literature, we come across Little and Dam's (1998) definition of autonomy, which focuses attention on individuality and independence as well as collaborative work.

When the responses given to the items regarding active involvement were considered, it is likely to say that participants see the teacher as an authority speaking more in the classroom. However, the autonomous learners are expected to decrease their dependence on their teachers and take initiative role in many

aspects of the learning process, e.g. choosing their own materials (Victori & Lockhart, 1995). Another finding drawn from these items is that subjects tended to expect teacher's encouragement particularly in the activities, which require students' participation. This tendency of students might be either related to traditional educational methods in which the teacher is the dominant authority who controls learning or caused by cultural factors such as having authoritarian parents who consider themselves as totally responsible for their children's learning.

Findings of this section also revealed that respondents appeared to perceive their failures and successes and more importantly attribute them to their own efforts or laziness rather than to outside factors such as teachers. A possible explanation for this finding might be that all of the participants in the present study were young learners of English trying to raise their awareness of effective language learning. This result can also be considered as reflections of classroom practice habits of respondents. For instance, in the context of the present study, preparatory students are always supported to see and correct their own mistakes via regular feedback and revision materials, which may help learners perceive the cause of their failures and successes. According to Dickinson (1995), attribution theory is directly related to learner autonomy displaying that learners can take the control of their own learning.

5.1.2 Conclusions on the Use of Metacognitive Strategies

In the second research question, the aim was to investigate the extent of metacognitive strategies used by preparatory students in learning English at Başkent University. The data regarding this question were collected in Section 3 in four dimension factors: organizing learning, organizing time, self-monitoring and self-evaluation. Respondents tended to use certain metacognitive strategies in order to facilitate their learning process. As mentioned earlier, the frequent use of metacognitive strategies is closely tied to autonomous learning. For instance, Victori and Lockhart (1995) have reported that the use of effective metacognitive strategies help students to develop more active and autonomous attitude enabling them to take the control of their own learning.

In this study, the majority of students were likely to be aware of the importance of self-evaluation and self-monitoring strategies such as evaluating their progress, trying to find out which structures they do not understand and attempting to understand the reasons of their mistakes. This result might arise from the teachers' frequent use of workbook activities and revision materials. Also, the opportunity to be able to see their exam paper may help the subjects to get the habit of focusing on their mistakes. In her comparative study, White (1995) has found out that self-management strategies like self-evaluation and self-monitoring are used distinctively by distance language learners who tend to be more autonomous learners than classroom learners.

Unfortunately, for organizing time to make necessary preparations prior to English lesson, fewer students reported their willingness to use certain strategies.

This finding can be explained by the long hours students have to exposed to learning English in a day, which might cause them to be bored with getting involved in the same subject. Or, traditional educational system, which promotes teacher-dependent learning habits of Turkish students, might prevent learners from arranging time to prepare the lesson since it is not a compulsory task. Nevertheless, some research have emphasized the importance of managing time in the development of learner autonomy, one of which conducted by McClure (2001) aimed to design tasks for students with a time schedule of the tasks and deadlines. Also, Ho and Crookall (1995) state that time management is one of the strongest indicators of autonomy.

Moreover, the frequency can be easily observed in the use of strategies regarding organization of learning, particularly in picking out the important points and establishing relationships between the rules. This can be explained by the teacher' style, which guides learners to highlight the important aspects of the teaching point and encourages them to think about the rules, which have been learnt before. Contrary to this, in the present study relatively fewer metacognitive strategies concerning the organization of vocabulary learning were reported to be used by preparatory students of Başkent University.

5.1.3 Conclusions on Responsibility Perceptions

The third research question aimed to explore Başkent University preparatory school students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities for different aspects of their English learning. The data concerned

with this question were gathered by Section 4. The results emphasized that the respondents saw the teacher as more responsible in the learning /teaching process, particularly in the following four areas: deciding the content of the English course, choosing the relevant tasks and activities, selecting the materials and limiting the time for each activity. These results are consistent with those found by Yumuk (2002) who concludes that Turkish students need to take more responsibility when selecting, analyzing, evaluating and applying information for their purpose. Therefore, participants' reluctance to take responsibility for these cases might result from their teacher-dependent learning characteristics. However, it is impossible to promote autonomous learning via ignoring the conditions suggested by Little (1991, p.7) who lists the major components of autonomy as follows: "(a) determining the objectives, (b) defining the contents, (c) selecting the methods and techniques to be used, (d) monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, place, etc.), (d) evaluating what has been required".

Another finding drawn from the present study is that respondents were likely to share the responsibility between themselves and the teacher in five cases such as stimulating their interest, identifying weakness and strengths, evaluating learning performance, evaluating English lesson, making sure they make progress during English lesson. Although some researchers like Ho and Crookall (1995) support that being autonomous requires not only students' working independently of the teacher but also shared decision-making, the areas mentioned above need learner's own responsibility rather than that of both. When the five items have been analyzed carefully, it is inevitable to regard each of them as part of the

89

metacognitive strategies which foster autonomous learning. In fact, these items appear to be the examples of monitoring and evaluating strategies in the relevant literature. Additionally, Cotterall (1999), who conducted a study to investigate the learners' beliefs about key variables in language learning, has also used similar items and referred them as the proponents of learner autonomy.

For one item, which is deciding the objectives of the lesson, respondents seemed unsure where to place responsibility. On the other hand, many researchers such as Little (1991), Lee (1998), Cotterall (2000), Holec (1981, cited in Lee, 1998) have emphasized the crucial role of setting objectives in autonomous learning. For instance, Lee (1998) suggests that flexibility is an important factor for developing autonomy, which gives students options to change objectives, contents, etc. according to their needs and interests. Likewise, Cotterall (2000) points out that time should be devoted to raising learners' awareness of identifying goals, specifying objectives, etc. throughout the learner training program aiming to promote learner autonomy.

Finally, in two items, 'deciding what will be learnt outside class' and 'making sure I make progress outside class', the respondents gave themselves more responsibility than the teacher. These results were consistent with those provided in Section 4-outside class activities. In other words, it can be inferred that respondents tend to make efforts to perform some outside class activities since they perceive themselves as responsible for these activities.

5.1.4 Conclusions on the Outside Class Activity Performance

In the fourth research question, the aim was to identify the frequency of outside class activities carried out by preparatory school students at Başkent University in learning English. In order to investigate the response to this question the data were gathered by Section 5. The results pointed out that of the nine activities, there were three that appeared to be widely practiced. In fact, the majority of subjects reported they were always or often seeking opportunities to watch English TV programs or films, listen to English songs, and learn new English words. These results were consistent with those of the research study done by Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002) who highlighted the similar outside activities in which students were engaged widely.

It is interesting, however, that the respondents in this study did show neither a willingness nor a desire to do some extracurricular activities such as reading newspapers or magazines, using Internet in English, talking to foreigners, doing extra grammar exercises or completing optional assignments. Yet, in Victori and Lockhart's (1995) study, which focused on the students' attitude towards autonomy, belief and expectations about language learning, etc., the subjects indicated the importance of using the language with all four skills extensively both in class and outside class and added their enjoyment to read stories in English in their free time.

When the frequency use of self-access center was considered, the results revealed that the subjects were unlikely to utilize this center throughout their language learning process. As Victori and Lockhart (1995) suggested, this should

not be surprising since learners consider this place as a resource for materials rather than a place where they can improve their language skills. This wrong use of self-access has led to the emergence of some projects and research. One of them conducted in Malasia by Lin (1995) aimed to establish self-access centers and more importantly provide facilities for teachers to encourage learner autonomy. In another project carried out by Voller (2000), a 45-minute video and guide book were produced to help teachers develop necessary skills to be successful self-access language consultants guiding learners to be autonomous learners.

5.1.5 Conclusions on Motivation Level in terms of Gender, Proficiency level and Major field

The fifth research question was stated as 'Are there any differences in the preparatory students' motivation level in learning English regarding their gender, proficiency level, and major field?'

The present study also showed that female learners of English had higher level of motivation than male learners of English. In their study, Schmidt, Boraie, and Kassabgy (1996) indicate that scores on the dimensions of motivation are related to gender and proficiency level and add that females and more proficient learners of English enjoy language learning more. However, the researcher of this study found out that elementary learners of English seemed to have higher level of motivation than intermediate learners of English. The proficiency exam ahead of the respondents and the necessity to catch up the level of more proficient learners

might be considered as effective factors for such finding. Finally, the researcher did not find any significant differences between the participants' level of motivation and their major field. The data collection method used with this independent variable may affect this result.

5.1.6 Conclusions on the use of Metacognitive Strategies concerning Gender, Proficiency level and Major field

The sixth research question was stated, as 'Are there any differences in the metacognitive strategies the preparatory students at Başkent University use in learning English in relation to their gender, major field and proficiency level?'

This study also revealed that female learners of English clearly outscored male learners of English in the frequency of metacognitive strategy use. Similarly, Okada, Oxford and Abo (1996) who conducted an exploratory study of learning strategy use and motivation in foreign language learning have also stated that across many research, females are the ones who use more strategies at higher levels than males paying no attention to their cultural background.

Although O'Malley and Chamot (1990) have reported that more proficient learners use more strategies employing them in a more arranged way, the researcher of this study could not find any differences between Elementary Level Students and Intermediate Level Students in the use of metacognitive strategies. This finding might arise from the consistency between the relevant curriculum programs in which teachers encourage learners to use similar metacognitive strategies. Or, the pace and contents of the program may not be challenging

enough for intermediate level students, which prevent them to use much more strategies in their learning process.

Additionally, the present study did not reveal significant differences in the metacognitive strategy use regarding the students' major field. This finding can be explained by the deficiency in the data analysis of this study. The independent variable- major field- might include wide range of dimensions.

5.1.7 Conclusion on Responsibility Perceptions regarding Gender, Proficiency level and Major field

The seventh research question was stated as 'How are the responsibilities perceived by the preparatory students at Başkent University in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?'

The data drawn from the descriptive statistics revealed that responsibilities in learning English were perceived by the respondents in the similar ways when their gender, proficiency level and major field were considered. The similar educational contexts in which students have been exposed to before can be the indicator of this finding. In other words, majority of the respondents might be used to teacher dependent classes in which they give most of the responsibility to their teacher rather than themselves.

5.1.8 Conclusions on the Outside Class Activity Performances in terms of Gender, Proficiency level and Major field

The eighth research question was stated as 'Are there any differences in the outside the class activities that the preparatory students of Başkent University perform in learning English regarding their gender, major field and proficiency level?

When the subjects' performance of outside class activities was analyzed concerning their gender, the results did not reveal a statistically significant difference. Different finding can be found if the analysis is done in a more detailed way. For instance, both males and females use outside class activities in the similar frequency; however, the kind of activities can vary between the two groups. Similarly, the analysis of the results regarding the participants' outside class activity performance in terms of their major field did not indicate a statistically significant difference. Another finding of the study was that when the respondents' proficiency level of English increases, they perform outside class activities more frequently. In other words, more Intermediate level participants in the present study reported that they were using English extracurricular activities outside the class than Elementary level participants. This can be explained by more proficient learners' being more self-confident or having more free time to commit themselves to such activities. However, in Yap's study (1998) (as cited in Benson, 2001), which aimed to explore the out-of-class use of English by secondary school students, no correlation was found between out-of-class use of English and proficiency level. That is, low-proficiency level students and high

proficiency level students used English outside the class to similar degrees and in similar ways.

To sum up, the present study indicated that majority of the respondents seemed to have high motivation, which is necessary for promoting learner autonomy in language learning classrooms. However, they needed some training for some areas such as test anxiety and speaking English in public. Moreover, the respondents tended to use metacognitive strategies like self-monitoring and self-evaluation, which are considered as important by many practitioners of autonomy. Additionally, the respondents considered the teacher as more responsible for most of the tasks during their own learning process, which can be explained by the traditional education system these students have been exposed to before. Also, majority of the students appeared to be spending quite little time for out-of-class activities to improve their English, which can be related to the learners' teacher-dependent learning habits. Nevertheless, such activities are seen as indispensable in developing autonomy in language learning classrooms.

In addition to the conclusions mentioned in the previous paragraph, the present study indicated that females and elementary learners tended to have higher motivation in learning English, but the motivation did not show significant difference concerning the respondents' major field. Moreover, females appeared to use more metacognitive strategies in learning English; however, proficiency level and major field of the respondents were not found to be significant factors in the use of metacognitive strategies. Additionally, responsibility perceptions did not show significant difference regarding the respondents' gender, proficiency level and major field. Finally, intermediate level language learners tended to do

more out-of-class activities in learning English. On the other hand, the frequency of respondents' conducting out-of-class activities in learning English did not show significant difference concerning the subjects' gender and major field.

5.2 Implications for Practice

The design of the study made it possible for the researcher to consider two main implications for practice: learner training for autonomous learning and changes in curriculum to promote autonomous learning.

5.2.1 Learner Training

According to Sinclair (1997), learner training helps learners think about the factors that affect their learning and find out the learning strategies that suit them best in order that learners may become more effective learners and take more responsibility for their own learning.

As mentioned in the previous chapters, in the promotion of learner autonomy, learner choice is essential. Thus, creating a learning environment, which provides students with opportunities to make decisions, must be considered to be an important method for learner training. Various projects and simulations aiming to help learners work at their own pace, make decisions on the objectives and content of the lesson, plan, evaluate, monitor and assess their learning process can be used throughout the promotion of learner autonomy. For instance, Kjisik (1997), who has been applying the autonomous learning modules (ALMS) at Helsinky University Language Center since 1994, suggest that learner awareness

is one of the compulsory requirements of this module. Kjisik (1997, p.141) points out the content of six-hour meeting aiming to develop awareness in their program (Table 5.2.1).

Secondly, enhanced motivation is conditional to the promotion of learner autonomy. The motivation of learners can be increased with some training programs which aim to help students reduce their dependence on their teachers and take responsibility for their own learning, be able to control their own learning and attribute their successes and failures to their own efforts rather than outside factors, develop abilities for goal-setting and planning and build feelings of self-confidence. Several researchers have emphasized the effectiveness of out-of-class learning.

Table 5.2.1 *Agenda of initial orientation meeting*

> Reflections about language learning

> Consciousness-raising of language learning strategies

> Analysis of students' own strategies

> Analysis of language needs, present and future

> The students' own objectives

> Making preliminary plans and thinking about areas of interest

projects. For instance, Villani (1995), who have tried student-generated exercises such as summer workbook project, states that such exercises have proved to be quite motivating and encouraged a lot of talking, negotiating and decision-making involving most students. Moreover, Kjisik (1997) admits the benefits of project works in which students set their own objectives and make a plan for their

achievement. Also, Sharp (2002), who carried out a qualitative study of study support in 12 schools, presents evidence from interview with students by emphasizing that this type of activities enable students to be self-motivated and self-regulated learners taking responsibility for their own learning.

Effective use of metacognitive skills is another shortcut through autonomous learning. Dickinson (1993) explains the framework she has developed for metacognitive strategies. It is a checklist for learners to use throughout the lesson and the acronym 'GOAL' is used for it. G stands for "What am I supposed to learn from this?", O stands for "What is the specific objective of the task?", A is Act "How am I going to do it?" and L stands for Look to look at (monitor) the strategy and self-assessment "How have I done?".

Different projects and case studies could be implemented in order to develop students' metacognitive strategies. For instance, in one project, Fowler (1997) (as cited in Benson, 2001) aimed to apply and evaluate the usefulness of organization, self-management and monitoring strategies by using portfolio, self-study tapes, and independent learning plan. Fowler (1997) (as cited in Benson, 2001) concluded that portfolio system and independent learning plan were positive, however, self-study tapes were less effective. Additionally, Thanasoulas (2000) reports that retrospective self-reports can be used to gather information on how students are learning and help them develop effective learning strategies. Thanasoulas (2000) adds that the use of diaries and evaluation sheets are other ways of offering students opportunities to plan, monitor and evaluate their learning.

5.2.2 Changes in Curriculum

Autonomous learning is a new approach to foreign language learning and foreign language teaching. In this approach, the primary focus is on the learners' individual awareness of the learning process. Consequently, the Curriculum Unit will need to go over the course objectives and design tasks or materials in order to enhance autonomous learning. Firstly, discussions will be held to determine what could be done in accordance with the data obtained from students. Next, research will be conducted to find out the basic principles and aspects of autonomous learning. These phases will be integrated into curriculum development. For instance, teachers will be encouraged to conduct action research in their classrooms, or students will be provided with compulsory tasks like project works, portfolio, journal writing which will enable them to take more responsibilities.

5.3 Implications for Further Research

In this part recommendations for future researchers are presented.

1. In the present study the data were gathered only from students learning English, a further study can be carried out via collecting data from language teachers, which might give a better idea for the curriculum members when designing new programs to develop autonomous learning.

2. A further research can be conducted as a case study in which researchers can gather data from various data sources such as action meetings, needs analysis, biographical and end-of-course questionnaires, learner diaries and portfolios. This way, a more detailed picture of how learners use metacognitive strategies and develop their decision-making skills can be examined.

3. A further research can be carried out as a survey study to investigate the language teachers' readiness for autonomous learning. Such research may provide teacher training curriculum with new implications for methodology and the role of the teacher in practical autonomous learning settings.

4. A further research can be carried out to investigate the extent of learner control throughout language learning process. The data collected via locus of control questionnaire may provide the researcher with detailed information about the dimensions of students' control over their own learning.

REFERENCES

Altan, M.Z. and Trombly, C. (2001). Creating a Learner-Centered Teacher Education Program. *ELT Forum, 39* (3), 28-34.

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning.* Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning.* London: Longman.

Boekaerts, M.(1997). Self-Regulated Learning: A new concept embraced by Researchers, policy makers, educators, teachers, and students. *Learning and Instruction, 7* (2), 161-186.

Boud, D. (Ed). (1988). *Developing Student Autonomy in Language Learning.* NewYork: Kogan Page.

Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for Learner Autonomy: what do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education, 6* (4), 505-518.

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

Cotterall, S. (1995b). Readiness for Autonomy: Investigating Learner Beliefs. *System, 23* (2), 195-205.

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

Crandall, J. (1999). Cooperative Language Learning and Affective Factors. In J. Arnold (Eds.), *Affect in Language Learning.* (pp 226-245). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Çoban, Z. (2002). *Attitudes Towards Learner Autonomy in Gazi University and Yıldız Teknik University.* Paper presented at the International INGED Conference on Interchanges and Exchanges: Current Trends in ELT, Metu, Ankara, Turkey.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy: From Theory to Classroom Practice.* Dublin: Authentic Ltd.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and Motivation: A literature review. *System, 23* (2), 165-174.

Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking shop: Aspects of autonomous learning, An interview with Leslie Dickinson. *ELT Journal, 47* (1), 330-341.

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

Dörnyei, Z. and Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2* (3), 203-229.

Esch, K., Schalkwijk, E., Elsen, A. and Setz, W. (2000). Autonomous Learning in
Foreign Language Teacher Training. In L. Dam (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy
Project Inventory.* Retrieved January 10, 2003 from
http://lc.ust.hk/ailasc/lapi2000.html.

Gremmo, M.J. & Riley, P. (1995). Autonomy, Self-Direction and Self-Access in
Language Teaching and Learning: The History of an Idea. *System, 23* (2),
151-164.

Gündoğdu, K. (1997). *Supporting pupil autonomy in one primary school applying
the child-centered ethos: A case study.* Unpublished master's thesis.
University of Newcastle. Newcastle, England.

Harris, V. and Noyau, G. (1990). Collaborative Learning: Taking the first steps.
In I. Gathercole (Eds.), *Autonomy in Language Learning.* (pp.55-64).
Great Britain: Bourne Press.

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

Kennedy, J.(2002). Learner Autonomy: A Realistic Proposition for Turkish
Students. In M. Monty and M. Godfrey (Eds.). *Global Problems and Local
Solutions.* Proceedings of ELT Conference (pp.118-122). İstanbul: Işık
University.

Kenny, B. (1993). For More Autonomy. *System, 21* (4), 431-442.

Kjisik, F. (1997). Integrating Autonomous Learning into Higher Education: A Helsinki University Language Center Project. In J. Spring and B. Gilroy (Eds.). *Quality Learning in English Medium Higher Education-The Challenge of Content, Skills and Language.* Proceedings of the Thirds International ELT Conference (pp.138-144). Ankara: Bilkent University.

Kucuroğlu, Ç. (2000). The Role of a Learner-Centered Approach in Language Teaching on the Development of Learner Autonomy: A Model Course Design. *Doğuş University Journal, 1,* 193-200.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal, 47* (1), 12-21.

Lee, I. (1998). Supporting greater autonomy in language learning. *ELT Journal, 52* (4), 282-290.

Lin, L. Y. (1995). Self-Access Programme in Specialist Teacher Training Institute. In A. L. Wenden (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy Project Inventory 1.* Retrieved January 10, 2003 from http://ac.hku.hk/autonomy/lapi1,html.

Little, D. (1995). Learning 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. (1990). Autonomy in language learning: Some theoretical and practical considerations in I. Gathercole (Eds.), *Autonomy in Language Learning.* (pp.7-15). Great Britain: Bourne Press.

Little, D.and Dam, L. (1998). Learner Autonomy: What and Why? *The JALT Journal, 22* (10), 273-279. Retrieved December 20, 2002, from http://langue.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/98/MON/index.html.

Littlewood, W.(1996). Autonomy: An Anatomy and a Framework. *System, 24* (4), 427-435.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and Developing Autonomy in East Asian Contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 20* (1), 71-94.

Malcolm, V. (1990). Responsibility and Resources. In I. Gathercole (Eds.), *Autonomy in Language Learning.* pp.77-84. Great Britain: Bourne Press.

McCarthy, C. P.(1998). *Learner Training for Learner Autonomy on Summer Language Courses.* Celbridge: The Salestian English Language Center. Retrieved February 21, 2003, from http://www.homepage.tinet.ie/ciaranmac19/training.html.

McClure, J. (2001). Developing language skills and learner autonomy in international postgraduates. *ELT Journal, 55* (2), 142-148.

Murphey, T. and Jacobs, G. M. (2000). Encouraging Critical Collaborative Autonomy. *JALT Journal, 22* (2), 228-244.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. In R. Pemberton et al. (Eds), *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning.* pp. 14-15. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Okada, M., Oxford, R. and Abo, S. (1996). Not All Alike: Motivation and Learning Strategies Among Students of Japanese and Spanish in An Exploratory Study. In R. Oxford (Eds.), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century. (Technical Report 11).* (pp. 105-119). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

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

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

Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative Curriculum Design for the 21st Century. *ELT Forum, 40* (1), 2-7.

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

Schmidt, R., Boraie, D. and Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign Language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Eds.), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century. (Technical Report 11).* (pp.9-70). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Sharp, C. (2002). Study support and the development of the self-regulated learner. *Educational Research, 44* (1), 29-41.

Sinclair, B. (1997). Learner Autonomy: The cross-cultural question. *IATEFL Newsletter,* Oct 1997, 12-13.

Slavin, R. E. (1983). *Cooperative Learning.* New York: Longman

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

Leah A. Sutton, L. A. (1999). Learner Control. Retrieved September 24, 2003

from   http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/~mcisaac/emc703/leah6.html

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). *Learner Autonomy.* Retrieved March 17, 2003 from

http://www.eltnewsletter.com/com/back/september2000/art322000.html

Tudor, I. (1993). Teacher roles in the learner-centered classroom. *ELT Journal, 47*

(1), 23-24.

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

Authentic Ltd.

Victori, M. and Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing Metacognition in Self-Directed

Language Learning. *System, 23* (2), 223-234.

Villani, D. (1995). Summer Workbook Project: A Purposeful Way to Exploit

Student-Generated Exercises. *ELT Forum, 33* (1), 33-35.

Voller, P. (2000). Self-Access Consultation: A Teacher Development Video. In L.

Dam (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy Project Inventory.* Retrieved January 10,

2003 from http://lc.ust.hk/ailasc/lapi2000.html.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy.* Hertfordshire:

Prentice Hall International Ltd.

White, C. (1995). Autonomy and Strategy Use in Distance Foreign Language

Learning: Research Findings. *System, 23* (2), 207-221.

Wright, V. and Piper, A. (1995). Materials for Self-Access in Foreign Languages.

In A. L. Wenden (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy Project Inventory 1*. Retrieved

January 10, 2003 from http://ac.hku.hk/autonomy/lapi1,html.

Yumuk, A. (2002). Letting go of control to the learners: the role of the Internet in

promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation

course. *Educational Research, 44* (2), 141-156.

APPENDIX A

ÖĞRENCİ ANKETİ

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.**

Yardımlarınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Ayfer Koçak-ODTÜ Yüksek

Lisans Öğrencisi

Bölüm 1

Bu bölümde kişisel bilgiler içeren bir dizi soru vardır. Lütfen herbirini dikkatle okuyarak size en uygun gelen yanıtı yuvarlak içine alınız, ya da boşlukları doldurunuz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz :   a) Kadın   b) Erkek

2. İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu'nda hangi kur'a devam etmektesiniz?   a) B

    b) C

3. Kayıtlı olduğunuz bölüm, lütfen belirtiniz : ………………………..

4. Hangi orta öğretim kurumundan mezun oldunuz?

    a) Genel lise   b) Yabancı dilde öğretim yapan özel lise

    c) Anadolu lisesi   d) Süper lise

    e) Meslek lisesi   f) Diğer, lütfen belirtiniz : ……………..

5. Başkent Üniversitesi'ne başlamadan önce kaç yıl İngilizce dersi aldınız?

    a) Hiç   b) 1-3 yıl   c) 4-6 yıl   d) 7 veya daha çok

6. Burslu musunuz?

    a) Evet   b) Hayır

7. Babanızın eğitim düzeyi nedir?

    a) Y. Lisans/Doktora   b) Üniversite   c) Lise

    d) Ortaokul   e) İlkokul   f) Okur yazar değil

8. Annenizin eğitim düzeyi nedir?

    a) Y. Lisans/Doktora   b) Üniversite   c) Lise

    d) Ortaokul   e) İlkokul   f) Okur yazar değil

9. Ailede kaçıncı çocuksunuz?

a) En büyük   b) Ortanca   c) En küçük   d) Tek çocuk   e) Diğer, lütfen

belirtiniz:..........

10. Aileniz nerede yaşıyor?   a) İl (lütfen belirtiniz ....)   b) Kasaba

c) Köy

11. Ankara'da nasıl ikamet etmektesiniz?

a) Ailemin yanında   b) Yanız başıma kirada   c) Kendi evimde

d) Özel yurtta   e) Devlet yurdunda   f) Arkadaşlarımla kirada

g) Diğer, lütfen belirtiniz: ....

12. İngilizce ders çalışmaya ve ödevlere her gün ortalama ne kadar vakit ayırıyorsunuz?

a) Hemen hemen hiç   b) 1 saat ve daha az   c) 2-3 saat

d) 4-5 saat   e) 6 saat ve daha fazla

Bölüm 2

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

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

Bölüm 3

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

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

Bölüm 4

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 (✕) işareti koyarak belirtiniz. Lütfen her soruda yalnızca 1 işaretleme yapınız.

Sorumluluk	Kimin Sorumluluğu		
	TAMAMEN ÖĞRETİM ELEMANI'NIN 1	KISMEN BENİM KISMEN ÖĞRETİM ELEMANI'NIN 2	TAMAMEN BENİM 3
41. İngilizce öğrenmeye olan ilgimi artırmak			
42. İngilizce öğrenmedeki zayıf ve güçlü yönlerimi tespit etmek			
43. İngilizce dersinin amaçlarına karar vermek			
44. Bir sonraki İngilizce dersinde ne öğrenileceğine karar vermek			
45. İngilizce dersinde kullanılacak aktiviteleri seçmek			
46. Her aktivitenin ne kadar sürede tamamlanacağına karar vermek			
47. İngilizce dersinde kullanılacak materyalleri seçmek			
48. Öğrenmedeki performansımı değerlendirmek			
49. İngilizce dersini değerlendirmek			
50. Ders dışında İngilizce ile ilgili ne öğreneceğime karar vermek			
51. İngilizce dersinde gelişme kaydetmemi sağlamak			
52. Ders dışında İngilizce'de gelişme kaydetmemi sağlamak			

Bölüm 5

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 (✕) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

	Her zaman 5	Sık sık 4	Bazen 3	Nadiren 2	Asla 1
53. Ödev olmasa da dilbilgisi (grammar) alıştırmaları yaparım.					
54. Zorunlu olmayan ödevleri yaparım.					
55. İngilizce yeni kelimeler öğrenmeye çalışırım.					
56. İnternet'te İngilizce'mi kullanırım. (sohbet, araştırma, vs. için)					
57. İngilizce film ya da TV programlarını seyrederim					
58. İngilizce yazılı materyaller okurum. (magazin, kitap, gazete gibi)					
59. İngilizce çalışmak için bağımsız çalışma odasını (self-access) kullanırım.					
60. Yabancılarla İngilizce konuşurum.					
61. İngilizce şarkılar dinlerim.					