

Turnitin Khusnul Khotimah C1

by Khotimah Khusnul C01

Submission date: 23-Jun-2021 09:05AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1610884189

File name: 001 Artikel C1 Khusnul Khotimah.pdf (808.39K)

Word count: 8070

Character count: 44783

Autonomous English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions

Khusnul Khotimah¹, Utami Widiati², Mutmainnah Mustofa³, M. Faruq Ubaidillah^{3*}

¹English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Mataram, Jl. Majapahit No. 62, Mataram, Nusa Tenggara Barat 83115, Indonesia

²Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5, Malang, East Java 65145, Indonesia

³English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Islam Malang, Jl. M.T. Haryono No. 193, Malang, East Java 65144, Indonesia

⁴Center for Scientific Publication, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5, Malang, East Java 65145, Indonesia

1 ABSTRACT

This study aims at investigating teachers' and students' perceptions of autonomous learning in English language teaching and to what extent the teachers foster students' autonomous learning. A set of questionnaire was distributed to 30 English teachers and 283 third-year secondary school students in the provincial part of Indonesia. The participants in this study were randomly selected. Furthermore, to obtain the supplementary data, an interview was conducted to two students from each school. The findings indicate that albeit positive tenets on autonomous learning were held by both teachers and students, they still had inadequate understandings of what autonomous learning concepts are. In terms of exposing students to autonomous learning, the teachers possess highly-driven endeavor. This study ends with suggestions for teachers and teacher education programs.

Keywords: Autonomous learning; teacher; student; perception; English language teaching and learning

First Received:

25 May 2019

Revised:

25 June 2019

Accepted:

30 July 2019

Final Proof Received:

25 September 2019

Published:

30 September 2019

How to cite (in APA style):

Khotimah, K., Widiati, U., Mustofa, M., & Ubaidillah, M. F. (2019). Autonomous English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 371-381. doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20234

INTRODUCTION

Recently, autonomous learning has been one of the most discussed issues in language learning for the last three decades (Tsai, 2019; Yildirim, 2012). A report by Pacific Policy Research Center of Kamehameha Schools (2010) suggests that the 21st century education requires teachers to be able to support students to become autonomous learners. Previously, Benson (2001) emphasized that an ongoing rapid change in the educational system such as the growth of technology in education, language teaching practice, and the information explosion indicate great changes in the functions of knowledge and also the ways of how knowledge is constructed and exchanged. This implies that a successful student is

12

increasingly seen as a person who is able to construct knowledge directly from experiences of the world rather than the one who responds well to instruction.

The concept of learner autonomy is often mistakenly defined merely as independence-out-of-class learning in which learners are in control of all aspects of their learning process (Hafner & Miller, 2011). This view argues that an autonomous learner is the one who is able to learn alone without guidance from a teacher or an instructor. Therefore, many experts (see Dang, 2012; Dickinson, 1987; Holec, 1981; Little, 1991; Ponton Carr, Confessore, 2000 in Macaskill & Taylor, 2010; Scharle & Szabo, 2000;), generate the characteristics of autonomous learners in the education sector.

* Corresponding Author
Email: mfubaidillah@um.ac.id

Much literature has also indicated that many researchers encompass different attributes of learner autonomy; however, they share the belief in one tenet that learner autonomy is learner ability to take control of his or her own learning. Recently, Dang (2012) categorizes the attributes of learner autonomy into three categories, these are, initiating, monitoring, and evaluating. The initiating learning process involves attributes related to understanding personal learning preferences, setting goals, preparing study plans, and creating learning opportunities. The monitoring learning process, which is probably the longest process, where most of the learning takes place, includes attributes related to learning engagement and maintenance such as selecting appropriate strategies, modifying learning paths, and negotiating with others. The evaluating learning process anticipates attributes about the way to review learning outcomes such as proofreading an assignment and appraising a piece of writing.

In relation to the concepts proposed by Dang (2012), the characteristics of autonomous learners presented previously by Dickinson (1987), Holec (1981), Little (1991 as cited in Little, 2003), Scharle and Szabo (2000), and Ponton, et al. (2000 as cited in Macaskill & Taylor, 2010) were synthesized based on initiating process, monitoring, and evaluating processes. Hence, initiating process covers these five attributes, these are, understanding learning goals, having personal goals, planning learning activities, having initiative in looking for resources, and having initiative in looking for opportunities for learning, whereas monitoring process involves eight attributes such as identifying suitable strategies, employing suitable strategies, selecting appropriate materials, showing effort to progress in learning, taking action or implementing the learning activities, concentrating on learning, collaborating, and interacting with others in learning. Finally, evaluating process comprises three attributes, these are, evaluating learning strategies, evaluating learning progress, and evaluating learning outcomes. These attributes were used as the basis for developing the questionnaires to collect the data of the present study.

Interestingly, research on autonomous learning in the Indonesian English language teaching context remains inconclusive (Zamb, 2004). Myartawan's study (2012) demonstrates that learner autonomy and English proficiency are positively correlated in at least two points. First, the concept of autonomous learning is not restricted to a Western context. This supports Wang (2011), who argues that the concept of autonomous learning is not bound with any certain cultures. Thereby, Dardjowidjojo's (2006) idea suggesting that learner autonomy is only appropriate for Western culture is arguable. Second, based on Myartawan's (2012) finding, it can be inferred that learner autonomy significantly correlates to learners' English proficiency. These research findings shed new insights in English language teaching concerning another alternative to enhance learners' English proficiency by developing

autonomous learning, since it potentially raises learners' awareness of their efforts and strategies to sustained language learning.

Furthermore, researchers in Australia (Babae, 2012), China (Genzola, 2010; Naizhao, 2006; Wang, 2011), France (Ding, 2001), Hong Kong (Hafner & Miller, 2011), Iran (Younesi, 2012), and Malaysia (Kaur & Sidhu, 2010) have explored various aspects of learner autonomy. The studies indicate that these countries have many times attempted to promote autonomous language learning. In contrast to this phenomenon, research on autonomous learning in the Indonesian senior high school context is rarely discussed. The studies are limited to finding the impact of Self-Access Center, a language laboratory that students can access in their school, on students' autonomous learning (Furaidah & Ruslan, 2008), and a correlation between autonomous learning and English proficiency (Myartawan, 2012; Suharmanto, 2003). It is Lengkanawati (2017), among other researchers in Indonesia, who investigated teachers' perception and the importance of conducting autonomous learning training for Indonesian teachers' professional development.

It is for this reason that further studies in the area of autonomous learning in schooling sectors are necessary. This present study addresses the fundamental aspect of viewpoints such as from the teachers' and students' perspectives and the practice of this autonomous learning in the classrooms. Investigating teachers' and students' perceptions of autonomous learning is essential although autonomous learning is not bound with any certain learning cultures (Wang, 2011). In addition, teachers' and students' perceptions of autonomous learning are likely to be influenced by cultural and educational contexts (Holliday, 2003; Littlewood, 1999 in Idirim, 2012). It means that teachers and students in different socio-cultural settings may have different perceptions on autonomous learning. Therefore, this present study seeks to construe how teachers and students view autonomous learning and to what extent they engage to develop it in learning context.

METHOD

This survey targeted the population of English teachers and third-year students of secondary schools in East Java province, Indonesia, comprising 10 schools with 54 English teachers and 283 students, based on the data from the Education and Culture Office. The reasons for involving the third-year students were, first, this education level is a final stage before they enroll in university level where autonomous learning is usually implemented, and second, theoretically, students of this level have internal and external motivation and intention to establish immediate and long-term goals and have the need to assume individual responsibility towards their learning process and goal (Pennington, 2009).

Questionnaire and interview were utilized in this study. Although the two instruments asked similar questions, reflected in 35 items, the questionnaire was developed into two versions, these are, one for teachers and the other for students. The questionnaire involves three items to reveal participants' understanding about the definition of autonomous learning, 16 items on the importance of the autonomous English learning attributes, and 16 items on the efforts to foster those attributes. The questionnaire items were validated by three experts, two holding doctoral degree in ELT and one English teacher. They were asked to validate and commented the questionnaire for its appropriateness. The questionnaire was then distributed to all the 54 English teachers and 283 third-year students assisted by the English teacher coordinator in each school. However, eventually, only 32 teachers (59%) were willing to return the questionnaire.

SPSS 15.0 program was utilized to analyze the data quantitatively in addition to descriptive qualitative analysis. Particularly, to analyze the data of the activities carried out to foster students' autonomous learning of English, each attribute was scored based on the Likert scale (score 1 for never, score 2 for sometimes, score 3 for often, and score 4 for always).

FINDINGS

Teachers' perceptions on autonomous learning in English classes

Teachers' perceptions on autonomous learning were indicated by their understanding about the definition of

it. Three definition statements, two of which were not correct, were presented to the teachers. The data, as in Figure 1, indicate that half of the teachers (50%) were able to define autonomous learning, however, many of them (39%) provided incorrect responses, and few (11%) could not distinguish the three statements. The data imply that even though half of the teachers understood the concept, another half still perceived that autonomous learning is the condition in which students learn English independently without teacher's assistance or the condition where students have full responsibility in the learning process, while initiating and evaluation process in learning are teachers' responsibility. In this regard, initiating means students' self-enactment and agency to perform their learning goals. Meanwhile, evaluation means students' awareness to reflect their learning goals. Based on the finding, this two aspects are not held by the teachers.

With regard to teachers' perceptions on autonomous learning attributes such as initiating, monitoring, and evaluating processes, the data show an equivalent result of response proportion. Based on the total calculation in these processes, the score position of teachers' perception on autonomous learning of English is 80%. Almost the same as the previous result, the teachers' perceptions on the importance of autonomous learning of English is 79%, serving as the highest percentage in this section. In distinguishing the three processes of autonomous learning, the data show that monitoring process outperforms initiating and evaluating processes.




Figure 1 Teachers' perceptions about definition of autonomous learning of English

Teachers' efforts to foster students' autonomous learning

This section refers to the efforts that the teachers carried out to foster students' autonomous learning. Table 1 presents activities in initiating process, Table 2 presents activities in monitoring process, and Table 3 presents activities in evaluating process.

In Table 1, all attributes of initiating process (understanding English learning goals, having personal goals in English learning instead of instructional objectives from schools, planning for English learning, having initiatives to look for other resources for English learning, having initiatives to look for new opportunities in English learning) are scored 466 with the index score

of 77.7. This signifies that the efforts carried out to foster students' autonomous learning of English in the initiating process include into Very Good category. Nevertheless, not all attributes are classified into Very Good category. Two of them are classified into Good only, exposing students to make plans for English learning (as the lowest score, 67.5) and having initiatives to look for new opportunities in English learning (74.1).

Table 2 reveals that all attributes in monitoring process (identifying suitable strategies to learn English, using suitable strategies to learn English, selecting appropriate materials, showing effort to progress in English learning, implementing learning activities,

focusing on learning activities, collaborating with others in English learning, interacting with others in English learning) are scored 757 with the index score of 78.8. This suggests that what the teachers have carried out to foster their students' autonomous learning of English is categorized into Very Good effort. However, identical

to the findings in the initiating process is that not all attributes in this monitoring process are in Very Good category. Exposing students to select appropriate materials and implementing the constructed agendas are classified into Good only, with the index scores of 65.8 and 74.1, respectively.

Table 1. Teachers' activities in initiating process

No	Attributes	Responses								Index Score	Category	
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always				
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1.	Understanding English learning goals (what is being taught in the classroom)	0	0.00	0	0.00	16	53.33	14	46.67	86.7	Very Good	
2.	Having personal goals in English learning instead of instructional objectives from schools	0	0.00	4	13.33	21	70.00	5	16.67	75.8	Very Good	
3.	Planning for English learning	2	6.67	9	30.00	15	50.00	4	13.33	67.5	Good	
4.	Having initiatives to look for other resources for English learning	0	0.00	1	3.33	17	56.67	12	40.00	84.1	Very Good	
5.	Having initiatives to look for new opportunities in English learning.	1	3.33	6	20.00	16	53.33	7	23.33	74.1	Good	
Total		3	2.00	20	13.00	85	57.00	42	28.00	77.7	Very Good	
		Mean									93.2	

Table 2. Teachers' activities in monitoring process

No	Attributes	Responses								Index Score	Category
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always			
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Identifying suitable strategies to learn English	0	0.00	1	3.33	25	83.33	4	13.33	77.5	14 Very Good
2.	Using suitable strategies to learn English	0	0.00	2	6.67	24	80.00	4	13.33	76.6	Very Good
3.	Selecting appropriate materials	3	10.00	7	23.33	18	60.00	2	6.67	65.8	Good
4.	Showing effort to progress in English learning	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	56.67	13	43.33	85.8	Very Good
5.	Implementing learning activities	2	6.67	3	10.00	19	63.33	6	20.00	74.1	Good
6.	Focusing on learning activities	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	56.67	13	43.33	85.8	Very Good
7.	Collaborating with others in English learning	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	56.67	13	43.33	85.8	Very Good
8.	Interacting with others in English learning.	0	0.00	3	10.00	19	63.33	8	26.67	79.1	Very Good
Total		5	2.00	16	7.00	156	65.00	63	26.00	78.8	Very Good
		Mean									94.6

Table 3 Teachers' activities in evaluating process

No	Attributes	Responses								Index Score	Category
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always			
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Evaluating learning strategies	1	3.33	8	26.67	20	66.67	1	3.33	67.5	Good
2.	Evaluating progress in English learning	0	0.00	9	30.00	17	56.67	4	13.33	70.8	Good
3.	Evaluating the outcomes of English learning	0	0.00	9	30.00	17	56.67	4	13.33	70.8	Good
Total		1	1.00	26	29.00	54	60.00	9	10.00	69.7	Good
		Mean								83.7	

Finally, as can be seen in Table 3, all attributes in evaluating process (Evaluating learning strategies, Evaluating progress in English learning, Evaluating the outcomes of English learning) are scored 251 with an index score of 69.7. This can be construed that what the teachers have carried out to foster their students' autonomous learning of English is categorized into

Good effort. Compared to the activities in the initiating as well as monitoring processes, those in the evaluating process indicate the lowest score.

Students' perceptions of autonomous learning

Students' perceptions of autonomous learning were obtained through a similar questionnaire item

distributed to the teachers. Figure 2 reveals that 44% of the students showed correct definition of autonomous learning of English, whereas 35% of them failed to define the term properly, and even 16% of them did not

know or could not distinguish whether the definition is correct. These data suggest that 51% of the students had no accurate definition about autonomous learning of English.




Figure 2. Students' perceptions of definition of autonomous learning of English

With reference to the students' perception of autonomous learning of English is 78%. In distinguishing the three processes of autonomous learning of English, the result is identical to the teachers' perceptions in which monitoring process outperforms the initiating and evaluating processes within the score of importance. On the contrary, evaluating process stands in the lowest score of importance.

Students' efforts to foster their autonomous learning

This section comprises the students' efforts to foster their autonomous learning of English. Table 4 reveals activities in the initiating process. Table 5 presents the monitoring process, and Table 6 portrays the evaluating process.

Table 4 indicates that all attributes in the initiating process are scored 2959 with the index score of 52.3. It implies that the activities carried out by students to foster their autonomous learning in the initiating process are categorized at the last spectrum of the Good effort. An interesting finding appears that all attributes in the

initiating process, the result is identical to the teachers' perceptions in which monitoring process outperforms the initiating and evaluating processes within the score of importance.

In Table 5, all attributes in the monitoring process are scored 5683 with the index score of 62.7. This indicates that the students' effort to foster their autonomous learning in the monitoring process is categorized into the Good effort. However, not all attributes are classified into a Good category. One of them, showing the effort to progress in English learning, achieves Very Good category with the index score of 79. The lowest score of all is in implementing learning activities (55.9).

Finally, Table 6 reveals that all attributes in the evaluating process are scored 1886 with the index score of 55.5. This suggests that students' effort to foster their autonomous learning of English in the evaluating process is categorized into a Good category which is almost close to the lowest score. The lowest score of all is in students' effort to evaluate their learning strategies (53.7).

Table 4. Total calculation of students' activities in initiating process

No	Attributes	Responses										Index Score	Category
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always		Score			
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%				
1.	Understanding English learning goal (what is being taught in the classroom)	53	18.73	120	42.40	100	35.34	10	3.53	633	55.9	Good	
2.	Having personal goal in English learning instead of instructional objectives from schools	97	34.28	97	34.28	71	25.09	18	6.36	576	50.8	Good	
3.	Making plans for English learning	98	34.63	141	49.82	38	13.43	6	2.12	518	45.7	Poor	
4.	Having initiative to look for other resources for English learning	69	24.38	115	40.64	77	27.21	22	7.77	618	54.6	Good	
5.	Having initiative to look for new opportunity in English learning.	76	26.86	105	37.10	80	28.27	22	7.77	614	54.2	Good	
Total		393	28.00	578	41.00	366	26.00	78	5.00	2959	52.3	Good	
		Mean								591	52.2		

Table 5. Total calculation of students' activities in monitoring process

No	Attributes	Responses								Score	Index Score	Category
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always				
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1.	Understanding English learning goals (what is being taught in the classroom)	53	18.73	120	42.40	100	35.34	10	3.53	633	55.9	Good
2.	Having personal goals in English learning instead of instructional objectives from schools	97	34.28	97	34.28	71	25.09	18	6.36	576	50.8	Good
3.	Making plans for English learning	98	34.63	141	49.82	38	13.43	6	2.12	518	45.7	Poor
4.	Having initiatives to look for other resources for English learning	69	24.38	115	40.64	77	27.21	22	7.77	618	54.6	Good
5.	Having initiatives to look for new opportunity in English learning.	76	26.86	105	37.10	80	28.27	22	7.77	614	54.2	Good
6.	Focusing on learning activities	16	5.65	92	32.51	144	50.88	31	10.95	756	66.8	Good
7.	Collaborating with others in English learning	22	7.77	101	35.69	118	41.70	42	14.84	746	67.5	Good
8.	Interacting with others in English learning.	26	9.19	133	47.00	84	29.68	40	14.13	704	62.2	Good
Total		269	12.00	884	39.00	798	35.00	313	14.00	5683	62.7	Good
		Mean								710	57.2	

Table 6. Total calculation of students' activities in evaluating process

No	Attributes	Responses								Score	Index Score	Category
		Never		Sometimes		Often		Always				
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1.	Evaluating learning strategies	66	23.32	120	42.40	86	30.39	11	3.89	608	53.7	Good
2.	Evaluating progress in English learning.	65	22.97	112	39.58	74	26.15	32	11.31	639	56.4	Good
3.	Evaluating the outcomes of English learning.	68	24.03	106	37.46	77	27.21	32	11.31	639	56.4	Good
Total		199	23	338	40	237	28	75	9	1886	55.5	Good
		Mean								629	57.2	

DISCUSSION

Teachers' perceptions of autonomous learning of English

The findings of the present study with regard to teachers' perceptions on autonomous learning are in line with what Hafner and Miller (2011) and Lengka (2017) have examined, suggesting that learner autonomy or students' autonomous learning in English language teaching is often mistakenly defined as the condition where one is able to learn alone with no need for support from a teacher or an instructor or the condition where students are mostly in charge of the whole learning process with no more intention on planning and evaluating (Dang, 2012). Such a misconception is possibly held since both teachers and students in this study possess little knowledge or information on the concept of autonomous learning, which is understandable considering that this concept is originally emerged from the European (Western) context (Benson & Huang, 2008). Different ways of understanding autonomous learning atmosphere between the Eastern and the Western countries might add to the reason why this misconception occurs

(Ivanovska, 2015). Besides, it is also possible that the result of this present study may be affected by the reliability score of the instrument (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). The instrument for revealing the data on perceptions on autonomous learning definition achieved 0.709, classified into an adequate category. It is why similar research needs to employ more approaches in the data gathering process such as using observation, interviews, content analysis and focus group discussion (Birmingham, 2003).

In relation to the teachers' perceptions of autonomous learning of English attributes, the findings can be interpreted that their perceptions are fairly good but cannot be claimed as an ultimate understanding of the concept. Moreover, they seem to grasp the concept fairly well. This inadequate awareness is possibly because the concept of autonomous learning of English has not yet expanded widely in the Indonesian context as indicated by a small number of studies in the topic (e.g., Furaidah & Ruslan, 2008; Myartawan, 2012). Some other factors which might also cause this inadequate awareness of autonomous learning of English are teachers' education background and

teachers' age. Based on the demographic data from the questionnaire, 7 of the 30 teachers (23%) held a Master's degree in ELT, whereas 23 of them (77%) graduated from an ELT undergraduate program. They might have graduated when the idea of learning autonomy was rarely discussed in the Indonesian context (Lengkanawati, 2017). This prediction seems to be confirmed with the data concerning the teachers' age. Seventeen of them (57%) were above 45 years old, which supports the general idea that the era teachers are taught affects their current concepts or beliefs on a certain aspect (Bereczki & Kárpáti, 2018; Zhu et al., 2018).

Interestingly, planning process in the learning activities such as selecting appropriate materials and evaluating learning strategies consistently obtained the lowest scores in each process of autonomous learning. Based on the literature review, although the concept of autonomous learning of English is culture free (Wang, 2011), which means that it can be applied in any culture, according to Holliday (2003) and Littlewood (in Yildirim, 2012), the teachers' or students' perception of this concept is influenced by cultural and educational settings. In this context, the teachers might have considered that schools already had a fixed schedule and also textbooks for English learning that probably caused them to perceive that planning in English learning and selecting appropriate materials are not really important for students. In addition, self-evaluation in autonomous learning is likely uncommon in the Indonesian context since local curricula prescribe mostly learning as a rigid activity which has to be assessed through the national exam (Lamb, 2004). The more common things in the evaluating process is related to visible activities such as evaluating learning outcomes (evaluating students' writing product, speaking performance, and the like). It might then affect their perceptions on these attributes.

In sum, the findings also show that the monitoring process has the highest mean score between the other two processes of autonomous learning of English. This might have happened because the teachers had no adequate knowledge or understanding of the correct concept of autonomous learning of English. The teachers seemed to perceive that students have full responsibility in their English learning process, whereas the planning and evaluating processes are more for teachers in charge. Teacher knowledge on the implementation of autonomous learning, from this finding, is inadequate since students are considered the 'full authorities' of their own learning (McEown & Oga-Baldwin, 2019).

Teachers' effort to foster their students' autonomous learning of English

Based on the findings, the teachers claimed that they had performed all the sixteen attributes. More specifically, in the initiating process, the teachers are less frequent in exposing their students to engage independently in English learning. This finding is likely due to teacher low quality in teaching approaches and

unreasonable workload in their profession (Sulisworo, Nasir, & Maryani, 2016). In the monitoring process, the lowest score of the teachers effort to foster their students' autonomous learning of English is in selecting appropriate material and encouraging their students to implement their constructed agendas. In accordance to implementing the learning activities, this seems a logical finding since the teachers have low scores in encouraging their students to make a plan for learning. Based on the data the open-ended questions, what teachers did was to motivate and advise students to implement the learning activities. Thus, it calls for more strategies for teachers to foster this attribute maximally.

In the evaluating process, although the different score among the three attributes is somewhat small, the teachers' effort to develop their students' ability to evaluate learning strategy stands in the lowest score. It is probably due to the teachers' constraint knowledge on the practical ways to foster this attribute. Evidently, the supplementary data on the practical activities show that what the teachers did was to ask students to check the works individually or in groups, show the scores of their tests, ask them to fill out the learning log or learning journal and to make reflection, send them to join an English competition, and ask them to do remedial tasks. Therefore, more activities of exposing skills in evaluating learning strategies are highly needed.

In distinguishing the three processes of autonomous learning, the monitoring process surpasses the other two processes (initiating and evaluating). Such findings support what Dang (2012) previously stated that, in general, students only focus more on the monitoring process as the longest process of autonomous learning. In this case, the local context does not seem to view learning strategies such as to plan and to evaluate learning as something that should be taken into account. This supposition is based on the consideration that the subjects taught in formal education are still restricted to cognitive aspects. The data on teachers' strategies to foster students' autonomous learning of English show that they mostly centered on motivating students rather than giving example to apply and explore. It is evident that more practical ways should be provided instead of merely giving motivation. Besides, it is unnecessary to overact in giving the motivation in learning (Rattray, 2013). Consequently, the more practical ways to promote students' autonomous learning of English are encouraged.

The data also capture teachers' use of internet to increase students' autonomous learning. In terms of it, the data shows that they did not use the internet maximally. The internet was mostly used to encourage students to look for English resources by giving them the web address or simply asking them to explore the intended tasks. This observable fact is quite dissimilar to what teachers have carried out in several other countries. They were more advanced in using technology and internet in exposing students' autonomous learning such as using digital video in

Hong Kong (Hafner & Miller, 2011), weblogs in China (Genzola, 2010), social media (Facebook, pebble pad, web, wiki, and weblog) in Tasmania (Babae, 2012), CALL in Iran (Younesi, 2012), and video film in France (2001). The condition occurred in this present study is due to the fact that facilities are lacking (Lubis, Parsusah, Komaro, & Djohar, 2019) and teachers' limited knowledge on ICT use in classrooms (Mirzajani, Mahmud, Fauzi Mohd Ayub, & Wong, 2016).

Students' perceptions of autonomous learning of English

The students' perception on autonomous learning of English is indistinguishable from teachers' perception on autonomous learning of English which covers three aspects: students' perception on autonomous learning of English definition, autonomous learning of English attributes, and the importance of autonomous learning of English attributes.

In relation to the students' perception on autonomous learning of English definition, the finding indicates that less than half of the students endowed correct definition of autonomous learning of English. On the other hand, more than a half of them had no accurate definition of autonomous learning of English. This percentage signifies that, like the finding in of the teachers' perceptions, a number of third-year senior high school students in this study still have misperception on the definition of autonomous learning. More than half of them still mistakenly perceived autonomous learning of English as the condition where students learn English independently or the condition where students have full responsibility in English learning process, whereas planning and evaluating are subject to teachers' responsibility. With regard to the teachers' perceptions of autonomous learning of English, this conclusion is in agreement with Hafner and Miller's (2011) investigation, contending that learner autonomy or students' autonomous learning of English is often mistakenly defined as the condition where one is able to learn alone with no need for support from a teacher or an instructor or the condition where students mostly in charge of learning process with no more intention on planning and evaluating (Dang, 2012). It is likely to be affected by the lack of knowledge or information on this concept, knowing that this concept is originally emerged in the European context (Benson & Huang, 2008). Therefore, providing more time and adequate professional development programs for teachers is central.

With reference to the students' perceptions of autonomous learning attributes, the result signifies that not all students in this study understand the concept of autonomous learning in their English classes. This condition can be interpreted that students' perception of autonomous learning of English attributes is fairly good while leaving rooms for improvement. Almost identical with perception on the attributes, students' perception on the importance of attributes shows that they have fairly good awareness on the importance of autonomous

learning of English attributes. However, several efforts are also needed to help students define the term clearly. This lack of students' awareness of autonomous learning of English attributes and the importance of those attributes is likely due to the lack of information or knowledge of this concept. As an aforementioned explanation, the concept of autonomous learning of English is not originally from Indonesia but from the European context (Benson & Huang, 2008). Moreover, in the context of worldview and culture in education, the belief and practice of the Eastern context (Indonesia, for instance) enact teaching under the teacher-centered ideas rather than learner-centered learning (Rattray, 2013). In this point, teachers are at the center which play as a core factor. Students are merely receivers rather than initiators. This creative method focuses on learning how to think inventively. The teacher acts as a guide, leading learners to discover and explore, rather than telling them what they ought to know. Educators in this field should realize that the academic culture differences in Indonesia and European countries, where the concept of AL was initially introduced, should not be viewed as an obstacle to enhance the quality of our education. Therefore, the commitment from educators, students, and stakeholders in Indonesia are needed to improve the autonomous learning.

The analysis on the root of the abovementioned finding shows the same result for the perception of attribute and the importance of those attributes in which the lowest scores are planning for English learning, implementing the learning activities, and evaluating learning process. There is a possibility that this evidence is linked with the cultural background. In particular, viewing time allotment more flexible can be one example in this notion (Rattray, 2013; Tiono, 2002). Besides, it is also possible that this low score is due to the reflection of teachers' perception in which teachers also had a low score in their perception and application of those three attributes. This conjecture is based on the pattern analysis of Indonesia learners in which they learn mostly based on imitation, observation, and participation (Rattray, 2013). In this context, it is likely that learners observed and imitated the concept from the teachers in daily learning. The concept handed down from generation to generation.

In the total calculation of the students' perceptions of the importance of autonomous learning of English in all three processes, monitoring process surpasses the initiating and evaluating processes. In other words, the third-year students in this study perceived that monitoring process is more pivotal than the two other processes. This is evidenced inasmuch the students had inadequate knowledge or understanding on the correct concept of autonomous learning of English in which they perceived that they have full responsibility in their English learning process, whereas, the planning and evaluating processes are the teachers' responsibility. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to enact more strategies in order to help students understand the concept well.

Students' efforts to foster their autonomous learning of English

The finding affirms that what students have carried out to foster their autonomous learning is categorized as a good effort and very close to poor category. Marcellino (2008) contended that Indonesian students were dependent on teachers' role as the core source of knowledge.

In the initiating process, all five attributes are categorized as Good effort except one attribute of making a plan for English learning. This attribute is classified into poor. Many factors affect this fact. Students' perceptions rooted from Indonesian culture can be one factor of it inasmuch they also have low score in the perception of the importance of making a plan for English learning. It then supports a belief that what comes in mind would be taken into action (Rottkey, 2013). In addition, it is predicted that this low score on planning for English learning is caused by less exposure from teachers to plan English learning since they also have the low score in exposing students to plan for their English learning. Based on the interview, students were infrequently introduced to a specific plan to learn English. They were mostly dependent on the classroom schedule from school. The finding in monitoring processes shows that all attributes are categorized as good and Very Good effort. The lowest score among them is in implementing the constructed agendas. It is a logical result as they have the lowest score in planning for English learning; consequently, they also have the lowest score in implementing learning activities. This low score is affected by the low score of their perceptions of the importance of these attributes or it also can be due to the less exposure from teachers to implement the learning activities. In evaluating process, all attributes are equally classified as Good effort. However, among the three attributes, students' effort to evaluate learning strategies stands in the lowest score. Practically, what they have done in the evaluating process mainly focuses on evaluating learning outcomes and learning progress. It indicates that they need more knowledge on how to foster their ability in this specific attributes. Besides, this weak point is held due to their little awareness on the importance of evaluating learning strategies or due to the less exposure from the teachers to utilize this attribute. This postulation is under the reason that based on the above mentioned discussion, the teachers achieved a low score in exposing students to evaluate learning strategies. Therefore, in light of the characteristics of Indonesian learners, the third-year students in this study were found to imitate their teachers.

Based on the questionnaire and interview, among three processes of autonomous learning of English, monitoring process outperforms two other processes. It indicates that the students were more frequently did the attributes in the monitoring process than the two others. This finding supports Dang (2012) who contended that generally students only focus more on the monitoring

process as the longest process of autonomous learning of English. This finding is also in line with the fact that teachers much focus on the monitoring process to foster the students' autonomous learning. These two identical findings might be due to the similar factor explained in the previous citation of the teachers' discussion.

With regard to the use of internet in English learning, the finding shows that few students used the internet in English learning. The internet-based activities that the students did were in the circle of downloading articles, listening to music, and watching movies and playing online games. Besides, in term of internet literacy, Rachmawati and Cynthia (2010) give an illustration that senior high school students have the potential to use the internet in facilitating their English learning. Although the use of internet in senior high school level is massive, the use of it in facilitating English learning is under-explored. This might be due to the less exposure from the teachers to use the internet in facilitating sustained English learning. It is given from teachers' rare use of internet in promoting autonomous learning to the students.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that teachers construed the concept of autonomous learning in English language teaching as the condition where students learn English independently without teachers' assistance or the condition where students have full authority in their English learning process. Meanwhile, planning and evaluation processes are subject to teachers' responsibility. On the other hand, they viewed the essence of the autonomous English learning's attributes such as monitoring, initiating and evaluating processes. In addition, teachers have exposed their students to accomplish the sixteen attributes of autonomous learning; their effort is categorized into Very Good for initiating and monitoring processes and Good for evaluating process. Meanwhile, to foster students' autonomous learning, they have accomplished sixteen attributes of it in which they have done more activities in monitoring process rather than in the initiating and evaluating processes. It occurs since monitoring process is deemed crucial in learning activities. The views held by the teachers on autonomous learning are identical with the students' perceptions. However, the students continuously engage to enhance their autonomous learning.

The results of this study offer teachers pedagogic decision to continuously promote students' autonomous learning in the class. It can be done only if they involve in teacher professional development activities focusing on developing approaches to sustained autonomous learning. In this case, teacher education programs need to prepare teachers with practical trainings to promote autonomous learning activities in the class. As this study suggests, in particular, using internet for students' learning should be encouraged to increase their autonomy in learning.

REFERENCES

- Babae, M. (2012). E-portfolio in social media for facilitating language learning. *The Internet Journal of Language, Culture, and Society*, 16(1), 29-35.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Essex: Longman.
- Benson, P. & Huang, J. (2008). Autonomy in the transition from foreign language learning to foreign language teaching. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 24(1), 421-439. doi: 10.1590/S0102-44502008000300003
- Bereczki, E. O., & Kárpáti, A. (2018). Teachers' beliefs about creativity and its nurture: A systematic review of the recent research literature. *Educational Research Review*, 23(1), 25-56. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2017.10.003
- Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers* (1st edn.). Routledge: Routledge Study Guides
- Dang, T. (2012). Learner autonomy: A synthesis of theory and practice. *The Internet Journal of Language, Culture, and Society*, 35(1), 52-67.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2006). The implementation of western approaches in eastern societies. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 1-19. doi: 10.25170%2Fijelt.v2i1.110
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ding, A. (2001). Promoting learner autonomy through video film activities. *INSA de Lyon*, 1(16), (Online), (<http://www.insalyon.fr/Departements/CDRL/promoting.htm>), accessed on January 11, 2013.
- Furaidah, F. & Ruslan, S. (2008). Patterns of SAC utilization and the sine qua non of the self-propelled development of students English proficiency. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 27-41. doi: 10.15639/teflinjournal.v19i1/27-41
- Genzola, A.E. (2010). Learner autonomy through weblogging: An ICT-mediated pedagogy in ELT. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 1(1), 4-19.
- Hafner, C. & Miller, L. (2011). Fostering learner autonomy in English for science: A collaborative digital video project in a technological learning environment. *Language Learning & Technology Journal*, 15(3), 68-86. doi: 10.125/44263
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Holliday, A. (2003). Social autonomy: Addressing the dangers of culturism in TESOL. In D. Palfreyman & R. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 110-126). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ivanovska, B. (2015). Learner autonomy in foreign language education and in cultural context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180(1), 352-356. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.128
- Kaur, R & Sidhu, G. 2010. Learner autonomy via asynchronous online interactions: A Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 6(3), 88-100.
- Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 65(23), 2276-2284. doi: 10.2146/ajhp070364
- Lamb, M. (2004). "It depends on the students themselves": Independent language learning at an Indonesian state school. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(3), 229-245. doi: 10.1080/07908310408666695
- Lengkanawati, N. S. (2017). Learner autonomy in the Indonesian EFL settings. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 222-231. doi: 10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4847
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D. (2003). Learner autonomy and second/foreign language learning. In book, *Subject centre for languages, linguistics and area studies*.
- Lubis, M., Parsusah, M., Komaro, M., & Djohar, A. (2019). Blended learning, implementation strategy: The new era of education. *Proceedings of the 5th UPI International Conference on Technical and Vocational Education and Training (ICTVET 2018)*. Presented at the Proceedings of the 5th UPI International Conference on Technical and Vocational Education and Training (ICTVET 2018), Bandung, Indonesia. doi: 10.2991/ictvet-18.2019.14
- Macaskill, A. & Taylor, E. (2010). The development of a brief measure of learner autonomy in university students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(3), 351-359. doi: 10.1080/03075070903502703
- Marcellino, M. (2008). English language teaching in Indonesia: A continuous challenge in education and cultural diversity. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 57-69. doi: 10.15639/teflinjournal.v19i1/57-69
- McEown, M. S., & Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q. (2019). Self-determination for all language learners: New applications for formal language education. *System*, 1(1), 1-34. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.102124
- Mirzajani, H., Mahmud, R., Fauzi Mohd Ayub, A., & Wong, S. L. (2016). Teachers' acceptance of ICT and its integration in the classroom. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24(1), 26-40. doi: 10.1108/QAE-06-2014-0025
- Myartawan, I. P. (2012). *The relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency* (Unpublished master's thesis). State University of Malang.
- Naizhao, G. (2006). An empirical investigation of cultivating students autonomous learning capacity in college English teaching. *CELEA Journal (Bimonthly)*, 29(3), 45-55.
- Pacific Policy Research Center. (2010). *21st Century skills for students and teachers*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation

- Division. Retrieved from http://www.ksbe.edu/_assets/spi/pdfs/21_century_skills_full.pdf on 14 August, 2019.
- Pennington, M. M. (2009). Characteristics of high school learners. Retrieved from <https://blog.penningtonpublishing.com/reading/characteristics-of-high-school-learners/>
- Rachmawati, Y. & Cynthia, R. J. (2010). *Information and Communication Technology (ICT)-Based Learning in Teaching Secondary School in Indonesia*. Proceeding of the 1st UPI International Conferences on Technology and Vocational Education and Training, 10-11 November 2010, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Rattray, P. (2013). *Bridging cultural divides (text version)*. Australia: ETC Indonesian Language and Business Services.
- Scharle, A. & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: a guide to develop learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suharmanto, S. (2003). Learning autonomy: a way to improve English language teaching (ELT) in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 14(1), 111-122. doi: 10.15639/teflinjournal.v14i1/111-122
- Sulisworo, D., Nasir, R., & Maryani, I. (2016). Identification of teachers' problems in Indonesia on facing global community. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 6(2), 81-90. doi: 10.5861/ijrse.2016.1519
- Tiono, N. I. (2002). Language and culture in relation to intercultural communication in a business context. *Kita Journal*, 4(1), 36-41.
- Tsai, Y. R. (2019). Promotion of learner autonomy within the framework of a flipped EFL instructional model: Perception and perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1(1), 1-32. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2019.1650779
- Wang, H. (2011). Promoting university English majors' learner autonomy in the Chinese context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(2), 408-413. doi: 10.4304/jltr.2.2.408-412
- Yildirim, O. (2012). A study on a group of Indian English as a second language learners' perceptions of autonomous learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(2), 18-29. doi: 10.17569/tojqi.44421
- Younesi, M. (2012). The effect of autonomous call based task on speaking skill. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(2), 201-221.
- Zhu, M., Liu, Q., Fu, Y., Yang, T., Zhang, X., & Shi, J. (2018). The relationship between teacher self-concept, teacher efficacy and burnout. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(7), 788-801. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2018.1483913

Turnitin Khusnul Khotimah C1

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%

SIMILARITY INDEX

11%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

ejournal.upi.edu

Internet Source

2%

2

[Submitted to Universidad de la Amazonia](#)

Student Paper

2%

3

[Submitted to Universitas Indonesia](#)

Student Paper

2%

4

ejournal.ihdn.ac.id

Internet Source

2%

5

www.researchgate.net

Internet Source

1%

6

[Submitted to Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana](#)

Student Paper

<1%

7

www.slideshare.net

Internet Source

<1%

8

pdfs.semanticscholar.org

Internet Source

<1%

9

repository.usd.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

10	riset.unisma.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
11	eprints.uny.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
12	LIZA HELGA D'ARCY HERNÁNDEZ. "Intercultural communication in foreign language learning and retention in online learning", Universitat Politecnica de Valencia, 2016 Publication	<1 %
13	bmcpediatr.biomedcentral.com Internet Source	<1 %
14	www.freepatentsonline.com Internet Source	<1 %
15	Wang, Qiaoying. "Classroom Teaching Strategies of Improving the English Majors' Self-instruction in Newly-promoted University in China", Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2012. Publication	<1 %
16	Submitted to University of Lancaster Student Paper	<1 %
17	digilib.uinsby.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
18	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	<1 %

19	Minh Tuan Phi. "chapter 62 Becoming Autonomous Learners to Become Autonomous Teachers", IGI Global, 2019 Publication	<1 %
20	scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu Internet Source	<1 %
21	zombiedoc.com Internet Source	<1 %
22	Judith Nesamalar Tharumaraj, Kalai Vaani Rajandram, Nallammai Singaram. "chapter 4 Educator-Student Partnership", IGI Global, 2021 Publication	<1 %
23	academypublication.com Internet Source	<1 %
24	ajels.ust.edu.ph Internet Source	<1 %
25	etheses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
26	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	<1 %
27	icsai.org Internet Source	<1 %
28	mjltm.org Internet Source	<1 %

29	pure.roehampton.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
30	repositorio.ufsc.br Internet Source	<1 %
31	www.leia.org Internet Source	<1 %
32	xlinguae.eu Internet Source	<1 %
33	"Education and Educational Technology", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2012 Publication	<1 %
34	Hanoi University Publication	<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 5 words

Exclude bibliography On