

Addressing Ambiguities Surrounding the Concept of Learner Autonomy in Language Education

Hamdi Ahmad, Dissertation Supervisor in English Language Education, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh, UK, Email:hahmad@ed.ac.uk

Although the shift towards the centrality of the learner in language education has placed much emphasis on the concept of *learner autonomy*, viewpoints are still very controversial on its definition, significance, and feasibility in the language classroom. As such, this paper is aimed at demystifying the concept of learner autonomy in the realm of English language teaching (ELT). The qualitative research method was adopted in writing this paper, represented in a critical review of the most relevant and credible sources, aiming to define and justify the promotion of autonomy in language learners. The findings from the review revealed: 1) the main ambiguity surrounding the term of learner autonomy is more ideological in nature than semantic; 2) learner autonomy is a double process, including learning inside the classroom with the support of the teacher besides learning beyond the classroom context by using external resources; and 3) learner autonomy should not be perceived as synonymous with self-instruction or independence, referring to situations where learners work without the guidance of their teachers. The findings from the review imply that formal school systems, which compel students to follow a particular national EFL syllabi, are geared towards passing public examinations, and neglecting the communicative nature of language, and this impede the development of learner autonomy.

Keywords: *Autonomy, Definitions, Ambiguities, Significance, Constraints, Language education.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of language *learner autonomy* dates to the philosopher, Socrates, whose ideas received an advocacy in the history of language education, and paved the way to a sophisticated pedagogic approach. According to Socrates' didactic method, the teacher was responsible for activating learners' thoughts to enable them to gain knowledge in the long run by acting on their own. Socrates' philosophy found its entire realisation in the late nineteen-sixties, when the industrially advanced Western world encountered a political turmoil that called for respect for the individual, and the enhancement of life quality (Benson, 2001, p. 8). The advances included the growth of multinational corporations, and improvements in transportation facilities, as well as the promotion of tourism activities. All these developments increased the demand for foreign language learning and teaching in a non-scholastic manner. Thus, adopting more informal and flexible approaches to language education encompassing learner-centredness, and self-direction proved to be an indispensable procedure in the realm of language education (Gremmo & Riley, 1995, p. 154).

In the nineteen-seventies, the Council of Europe's Modern Languages project introduced the approach of learner autonomy for the first time, and in the realm of English language teaching (ELT). The premise of the project was to promote the notion of lifelong learning, namely the development of the individual's freedom through the acquisition of skills and capabilities that would support the student to behave and think independently. The development of learner autonomy was then the natural outcome of this approach to language education (Benson, 2007). In virtue of this approach, two dimensions of research were developed. The first mainly originated in Europe and viewed learner autonomy as a requirement to learning beyond formal educational organisations. On the other hand, the second emerged in North America, and aimed to solve the 'secret' of the good language learner by underscoring the idea of training to learn (Oxford, 2016).

Arguably, although the shift towards the centrality of the learner in language education has placed much emphasis on the concept of learner autonomy, viewpoints are still very controversial on its definition, significance, and feasibility in formal school systems. As such, this paper was aimed at demystifying the concept of learner autonomy in theory, and practice. Four principal research questions are raised: first, how can the concept of learner autonomy be best interpreted? Second, why is learner autonomy a desirable goal in language education? Third, how are teacher-student roles different in autonomous learning classrooms? Fourth, what are the major obstacles to the promotion of language learner autonomy in the classroom context?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definitions of Learner Autonomy

By surveying the sources which aim to define what learner autonomy means, it has been found that this concept has received multiple interpretations. Holec (1981, p. 3) defines autonomy as “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning”. This meaning implies learners’ ability to acquire a particular amount of knowledge, and a particular set of skills necessary for self-learning, such as the ability to determine learning objectives, choose learning materials, select appropriate methods, perform self-assessment, and evaluate learning outcomes (Crabbe, 2007). Subject to scrutiny, this definition covers the organisational dimension of the language learner and tends to associate the particular concept with the notions of individualisation and learner-centredness. The former focusses on the preferred learning styles of students, and the latter emphasises learning rather than teaching methods and processes (Benson, 2007).

Little (1991, p. 4) corroborates and adds a psychological dimension by defining autonomy as “the learner’s capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision making and independent action”. This definition lays greater emphasis on the cognitive processes necessary for learning. Oxford (2003) emphasises that the capacity to “take responsibility of learning” involves an attitude of willingness determined in the light of the student’s motivation, and confidence. Benson (1997) argues for the social dimension, stating that learner autonomy is not an individualistic action according to one’s choices, but a collective decision-making. He defines autonomy as “the capacity to take control of one’s own learning including the learning management, the cognitive processes and the learning content” (Benson, 2001, p. 50).

Teacher-student Roles in Autonomous Learning

There has been much consensus in the ELT literature that the promotion of learner autonomy in language classrooms has given rise to a shift from the teacher-directed learning environment to a new paradigm of a learner-directed one. The former paradigm views the teacher as the authoritative figure who selects and passes on the content of syllabi, and the student is a passive recipient and is dependent totally upon the teacher. However, teachers in autonomous learning are required to assume a considerable number of different roles and responsibilities from traditional ones (Little et al., 2003). Voller (1997) attributes four significant roles to the teacher: *facilitator*, *counsellor*, *resource*, and *negotiator*. The role of *facilitator* comprises psycho-social and technical support. Dam (2003, p. 140) argues in favour of this role, pointing out that the teacher is responsible for increasing students’ motivation, and self-awareness. The role of ‘counsellor’ highlights face-to-face interactions for consultations. This interpretation concurs with Nunan (1993), who perceives the teacher as an active participant; helping students to define their goals, giving them feedback, and guiding them towards better learning techniques and strategies. The role of ‘resource’ implies that the teacher becomes a reference of

knowledge, and expertise (Carter, 2001, p. 26). The teacher, as ‘negotiator’, discusses with students and other involved members about syllabi, and classroom procedures.

In addition, Cotterall and Crabbe (1992, p. 16) stress the role of the teacher as an *expert problem-solver*. Huttunen (2003) adds the role of *reflection* upon the teaching-learning process and methods used in planning and implementing the curriculum. In line with previous scholars, Kohonen (2003, p. 147) underlines the teachers’ responsibilities towards their own professional and career development and proposes a “collegial school culture”, where teachers are encouraged to exchange and debate their ideas and concerns. Collaboration and collegiality are strongly recommended by Kennedy and Pinter (2008, p. 209). Dam (2003, p. 2) recommends that teachers’ development be accompanied by appropriate training, which aims to help them reflect on students’ various degrees of autonomy and the methods to increasing their confidence in taking on new roles of responsibilities.

Regarding the learner’s roles, numerous qualities attributed to them are mainly related to the capacity and desire to actively involve and control over what and how they learn. Dam defines this ability as “a learner four step” development towards autonomy, namely the steps of “experience”, “awareness”, “influence on and participation in decision making”, and “responsibility” (2003, p. 139). In parallel, Ridley (2003, p. 78) and Little (1991, p. 52) stress the importance of learners’ ability to reflect on their learning at a “cognitive”, “metacognitive”, and “motivational” level. It is important to acknowledge the value of learner training in terms of metalinguistic and metacognitive skills, which are thought to help students become the “key agents” of the teaching-learning process. Subject to scrutiny, these roles overlap with teachers’ responsibilities. As a result, they cannot be dealt as separate entities. Further, they infer a psychological transformation in teachers’ and learners’ beliefs, perceptions, and expectations.

Significance of Learner Autonomy in Language Education

The development of learner autonomy has long been a desirable goal in language education for ideological, economical, and psychological justifications. From an ideological perspective, Cotterall (1995) and Little (1994) state that a democratic society should foster its members’ capacity “to think and act as free and self-determining individuals”. In a sense, educational institutions need to allow learners to exercise freedom of choice in their learning. As such, autonomy within the ‘microcosm’ of the institution can prepare individuals for their effective living in society (Crabbe, 1993). Benson (1997) corroborates and contends that the learner should have the right not only to think independently, but also to question the nature of education by exploring alternative sources of knowledge. On economic grounds, the need for the development of learner autonomy stems from the argument that no societies can cater for the quantity and quality of instruction for all its members for life. Therefore, promoting learner autonomy is essential for lifelong education. Trim (1977) makes it more explicit, stating that the development of learner autonomy is necessary because “no school, or even university can

provide its pupils or students with all types of knowledge and skills they will need in their active adult lives”.

Moreover, the rationale behind learner autonomy has been justified on psychological grounds and particularly on the effectiveness of language learning (Dickinson, 1995). This emphasises the impending need for a more humanistic approach to language education, aiming to reckon issues such as students’ needs, styles, and motivation (McDevitt, 1997, p. 35). Intuitively, when feeling responsible, learners become more interested in their learning. Knowles makes it more explicit and claims: “... there is convincing evidence that people who take the initiative in learning (proactive learners) learn more things and learn better than do people who sit at the feet of teachers, passively waiting to be taught (reactive learners) They enter into learning more purposefully and with greater motivation” (1975: p. 14). Based on empirical research, Sakrak-Ekin and Balçıkanlı (2019) concluded that motivation, success, and autonomy are closely related variables since the autonomous students taking part in the study proved to be characterised by a higher level of motivation and efficiency in their academic work. This can be attributed to the employment of learning strategies that help students overcome a potential lack of success (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991).

Interestingly, learners, who are interested in outcomes that result from the experience of learning rather than the product of learning and potential rewards, present an increased motivation. This argument is supported by the extrinsic and intrinsic theory of motivation, according to which the former reveals students are extrinsically motivated to receive an extrinsic reward. On the other hand, the latter reveals learners who await internal rewards (Dörnyei, 2001). Extrinsic, and intrinsic motivation is advocated by the ‘self-determination theory’, which means learners increase their motivation when gaining and exercising freedom to choose, and are not being forced by others’ desires (Deci & Ryan, 2008). In addition, learner autonomy is enhanced by ‘group dynamics’, according to which individuals are highly motivated when they take responsibility in the group (Ushioda, 2011).

Concerning learners’ preferred styles, research has shown that they are subject to change after learner training (Skehan, 1998). Watkins et al. (2007, p. 51) recommend that learners be “adaptive in order to help teachers who want to promote various learning approaches”. Developing autonomy in students helps cater for their different learning styles. However, despite coming to the language classroom with different needs, styles, and interests, most students are not aware of their learning needs. They follow course syllabi imposed by their particular ministries of education, without complaining.

It can be argued, formal school systems which compel students to follow particular national syllabi and that are geared towards passing exams, appear to be at fault and have misled the authentic mission of language education: producing graduates with not only communicative proficiency in language, but also with a strong sense of citizenship, social relationship, and

morality. The suggestion made here is that teachers should use a system of needs analysis to help learners perceive their needs (Ahmad & Millar, 2020). More importantly, action research, if undertaken collaboratively among school teachers, supervisors, and syllabus writers, can successfully facilitate this professional task (Ellis, & Loughland, 2016).

Constraints of Learner Autonomy in Language Education

Despite numerous arguments advocating the promotion of language learner autonomy, the suitability of this mode of learning for some certain educational contexts has been questioned due to a considerable number of hindrances (Pennycook, 1997). The first hindrance is the learners' cultural backgrounds. A characteristic example that reflects this belief is such a comparison frequently made between European, and Eastern educational contexts (Benson, 2013). The latter is criticised for being characterised by an approval of teachers' authority and superiority that necessarily impedes students' autonomy, curiosity, and search for alternative sources of knowledge (Palfreyman & Smith, 2003, p. 5). Benson (2001, p. 56) states that in the event the concept of learner autonomy promotes values that are not compatible with non-European philosophies, its development in non-European cultures cannot be successful. Arguably, no empirical evidence exists to justify this assumption. The second factor is teachers' negative attitudes towards autonomous modes of learning. Presenting a lack of pedagogical flexibility, sometimes language teachers refuse to change their traditional role and adopt new classroom practices, serving the demands of learner autonomy. Benson (2011, p. 119) points out that "although a large number of teachers would prescribe to learner autonomy in theory, in practice they find it to be somewhat idealistic". This is exacerbated by the stereotypical views teachers express about autonomous learning, which may increase their passivity.

Arguably, not only teachers', but also learners' attitudes can impede the development of their autonomy. For some learners, autonomy may not be a desirable goal; they demonstrate reluctance and unwillingness to take charge of their learning. They view the tutor as the transmitter of knowledge; they compromise with their passivity. As Oxford (2008, p. 48) points out, "independent L2 learning can open the doors to control or responsibility by learners, but learners must actually want that control for responsibility and actively take it".

The situation is magnified with learners whose main interest is only to pass exams, and the teachers' role is restricted to prepare them for this target. Little (2007, p. 17) argues that students accustomed to traditional teacher-centred approaches may find it distrustful when being asked to set, select, and evaluate their learning goals, methods, materials, and assessment. In such cases, learners are viewed as products of the educational system and the communicative nature of language learning is exclusively neglected (Barfield & Brown, 2008). The suggestion made here, is that teachers should estimate their students' willingness towards autonomy before they intervene and change their methods and strategies of teaching. The path towards autonomy is easier if learners are gradually given the opportunity to gain a successful learning experience.

METHODOLOGY

As aforementioned, this paper was intended to review and address the ambiguities surrounding the concept of language learner autonomy. The review was drawn upon the qualitative research method. The framework for the review comprised five stages: developing an inclusion criteria of the target sources; identifying most relevant and credible sources; subjecting the sources to criticism; synthesising the evidence from the literature; and the last, but not the least, refining and discussing the findings with several practitioners in the field. The review was mainly centred on four issues: the definitional ambiguities surrounding the concept of learner autonomy, reappraisal of teacher-student roles in autonomous learning, pedagogical significance, and constraints of the promotion of language learner autonomy.

DISCUSSION ON FINDINGS

Demystifying the Concept of Learner Autonomy

Subject to analysis, unlike other authors, Holec's (1981, p.3) definition states "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" is feasible by describing the concept of 'learner autonomy' by the 'capacity' of the student rather than a 'situation'. Describing autonomy as a learning situation causes a conceptual confusion in the field of language education because this means that to develop autonomy, students must have freedom from the control and direction of teachers and institutions. Arguably, sometimes learners studying languages in isolation, either by choice or under certain circumstances, would not necessarily embrace autonomy (Oxford, 2003). This emphasises that the concept suffers from a crisis of identity characterised by controversial ideologies. A characteristic example is found in the various interpretations that Holec (1981), Little (1991), and Benson (2001) used for defining this concept. Additionally, the concept of learner autonomy encompasses a lot of ambiguities due to misapprehensions about the "nature of the concept and its implementation" (Benson, 2001, p. 1). One of the most prevalent misconceptions emanates from the belief that autonomy functions as self-instruction and independence, meaning the situations in which learners work without the guidance of their teachers. Another serious misconception is the perception that autonomous learners are characterized by easily identified characteristics. As Benson (2007) explains, "autonomy is an attribute of learners rather than as a matter of degree". However, saying "autonomy is a matter of degree" is true because autonomy takes several forms and levels (Little, 1991, p 4). As a result, the main ambiguity surrounding the concept autonomy needs to be understood as more ideological in nature than semantic.

To conclude, the concept of learner autonomy is so complex and intricate that Nunan states: "autonomy is difficult to be defined since it is not an absolute concept" (Nunan, 1997, p. 193). Benson (2001) advocates this view and argues: "it is not necessary for everybody to mean the same thing when referring to autonomy because of its complexity". However, to remove ambiguities, autonomy should be understood as the students' capacity to study on their own

after they are instructed a repertoire of learning skills and strategies necessary for accomplishing self-direct learning. This concurs with Remmert, who contends that “autonomy in language learning is a process in which learners acquire the skills to take over more and more responsibility whilst the teacher’s task is to facilitate this process” (Remmert 1997, p. 14).

Re-evaluating the Teacher’s Responsibilities in Learner Autonomy

Having identified the roles and responsibilities of the teacher and learner in autonomy, it has become evident that the topic of the teacher’s roles in autonomous learning has been given less attention than that of the student’s roles. This is due to the misconception of the learner’s role in autonomy, as being the only one responsible. Thus, the relationship between learners and teachers should be re-evaluated. The teacher’s role should not be authoritative, controlling or managerial to instruct, control, and assess students. At the same time, the learner’s role should not be viewed as passive in absorbing and receiving the teacher’s input (Hedge, 2000, p. 83). Since the fundamental principle of autonomy theory is that “learners are responsible for their own learning” (Holec, 1981), the teacher’s power is supposed to be reduced while the student’s power is concomitantly increased (Yusnimar, 2019). An especially important approach, which enables students to reach a stage from which they become able to comprehend and define their own goals, is known as ‘syllabus negotiation’ (Masrizal, 2014). One reason to follow this approach is that it considers the desires and abilities of the learners and extends their awareness of what is necessary and worth learning. Since it is centred upon the needs of the students, it can successfully establish an agreement regarding what is feasible and desirable. Viewed in this light, this approach can function as a joint exploration of targets and possibilities.

Alongside this, developing learner autonomy should not be understood as the student’s total responsibility. However, it is a reciprocal and complementary task that needs to be collaboratively performed by the student and the teacher. It is important that any reduction or increase in the learner’s or teacher’s authority be based upon the principle of interdependence (Benson, 2001, p. 14). This occurs on the grounds that learners can establish a successful relationship of collaboration and cooperation with their teacher and other classmates to solve any possible conflicts. Hence, interdependence needs to be an essential element of autonomy, a level of development which transcends the idea of independence, since the latter implies a definite dependence upon authorities for guidance, and information (Benson, 1997, p. 109).

Pedagogical Significance of Learner Autonomy

All justifications made in favour of the promotion of learner autonomy arguably function the concept as a means to restructure and reshuffle the philosophy of language pedagogy, namely the teacher-centred approach. It can be rightly argued that a distinction between the teacher- and learner-centred approaches causes much confusion. In a sense, successful teaching needs

to be characterised by a wide range of styles to promote learning. Admittedly, the teacher-centred approach may be suitable for certain teaching settings that demand explicit teaching, such as grammar skills. To this end, lessons should be formal with clear boundaries, be prescheduled events, have clear lesson formats across groups, and comprise turns that are allocated by the teacher to students. This justifies why many teaching practices are still teacher-centred, especially in English as a first language (EFL) contexts. To assume that either approach is automatically superior or more suitable, basically necessitates classroom-based research studies that can reveal effects of the teacher's various roles on the learner variables, namely, motivation, achievement, and autonomy.

From an SLA perspective, the necessity for promoting learner autonomy should be advocated by the theory of multilingualism, which has become one of the most influential defining characteristics of our contemporary world (Cummins, 1993). Multilingualism has much to do with lifelong learning. Under such linguistic diversity, English holds a unifying, as well as dominant role in the world of information communications technology (ICT), business, and mass media. Realising the significance of multilingualism, ministries of education all over the world have introduced English as a compulsory school subject in their foreign language curriculums and at all stages of education. One of the principal objectives of such curriculums is the learner's cognitive development, which emphasises the development of learner autonomy (Davies, 2006). Particularly for English language teaching, the importance attributed to learner autonomy has been examined in relation to the cross curricular, cross cultural, and learner-centred dimensions (Tudor, 1996). Since English is the first language, it functions as a vehicle of communication between various cultures, and the Internet is currently the medium that most students use to self-direct their learning (Matsubara & Yoshida, 2018). Smith (2003, p. 235) asserts that the amendment of any national curriculum should emphasise the intercultural competence, cross cultural understanding, and learner autonomy that has paramount importance for the achievement of the main aim.

Following this direction, the Common European Framework Reference (CEFR), characterised as a pivotal educational publication in Europe, has encompassed learner autonomy in the ELP (Little, 2005, p. 351). The ELP's structure includes a 'language passport', 'language biography', and 'dossier' work (Little, 2005). Drawing from the description of the ELP's components, the reader easily detects their close relationship with learner autonomy. This correlation is established on the goal setting, self-assessment, and learners' self-report with their learning accomplishments. Based on research, Little (2003) undertook a case study in the Greek context and concluded that the ELP developed the students' autonomy through encouraging them to reflect on their learning, develop important strategies to acquiring effective communication skills, and determine their learning needs. As a result, influenced by these findings, most of the ELT textbook writers have aligned their publications with the guidelines of the CEFR and developed coursebooks mistakenly thought to be equally appropriate for all students, irrespectively of discrepancies in needs, abilities, interests, and

styles. It can be argued that ELT coursebooks, which are designed for a global use, encounter a challenge in relation to learner autonomy. This is mainly because textbooks limit the learner's choices and provide a scarcity of texts, tasks, methods, and strategies. This limitation can impede students from gaining an awareness of their learning process and progression.

Pedagogical Obstacles to Learner Autonomy in Language Education

To claim that students' cultural backgrounds are obstacles to developing learner autonomy, seems rather narrow for one reason: cultures are unfixed and subject to ongoing transformation. Research emphasises that whatever learners' cultural backgrounds, every student has the capacity to embrace a certain degree of autonomy (Little, 2009). The suggestion made here is that attention should be paid not to the question of appropriateness of culture to autonomy, however, to negotiated versions of this mode of learning that can promote different approaches adopted by diverse educational contexts. In a sense, it is important that autonomy be differently interpreted in miscellaneous cultural environments. As such, the ethnic specific characteristics of learners necessarily affect the promotion of autonomy (Palfreyman, 2003).

The truth is that the principal barrier to facilitating learner autonomy is the discrepancy between the approach of communicative language teaching (CLT), and its actual implementation (Swarbrick, 1994). The research demonstrates that although many teachers declare their commitment to the principles of the CLT approach, they are actually following more structural approaches in their classrooms, such as the grammar translation method (Little, 2009). The underlying reasons for such a disparity are teachers' unfavourable attitudes towards the CLT approach; the lack of training in, and understanding of the approach; and the limited support and cooperation between teachers and syllabi developers. Breen and Mann (1997, p. 143) discuss the dynamics of autonomy in the classroom context and warn that students and the teacher may experience a certain amount of tension during the transcendence from one level of autonomy to the other. Brookfield (1995, p. 15) rightly argues that "the most hallowed rule of business – that the customer is always right – is often pedagogically wrong. Equating good teaching with how many students feel you have done what they wanted ignores the dynamics of teaching and prevents significant learning". Thus, it is strongly recommended that teachers estimate their learners' willingness towards autonomy before they intervene and change their way of teaching. In cases when a mismatch between teachers' and learners' attitudes exists, serious obstacles for the promotion of autonomy are encountered. Such a discrepancy can be attributed to teachers' different pedagogical goals from the learners (Cotterall, 2000). This emphasises that the path towards autonomy is easier if learners are gradually given the opportunity to actively participate in the decisions involved in the teaching-learning process. However, teachers' willingness to exploit individual students' potential is a major prerequisite to this development.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

In light of the findings reported, a number of implications deserve mention. First, the main barrier likely impeding the promotion of language learner autonomy is teachers' insufficient understanding of, training in, and commitment to the principles the CLT approach. The reason is that both the CLT approach, and learner autonomy, encourage the use of the target language, the employment of a variety of authentic texts and tasks, the reliance upon group dynamics, and most importantly, the enhancement of learner engagement as a communicator (Ahmad & Millar, 2020). Second, the principle of negotiation needs to be practically adopted in autonomous learning and functioned as a joint exploration of targets and possibilities. Therefore, it can establish a teacher-student agreement regarding what is feasible and desirable. Adopting this principle can lead to extending students' awareness of what is necessary, as well as worth learning, and this in turn may raise their interest and responsibility towards their learning. Admittedly, since the transformation of interaction roles is necessary in the teacher-student relationship, the teacher should stop being authoritative, controlling or managerial to instruct, control, and assess students. If negotiation is effectively administered and implemented, the student is likely to become more responsible for their learning (Benson & Voller, 1997).

Third, autonomous learning takes place both inside the classroom, with the support of the teacher and a coursebook, and beyond the classroom context using external resources, apart from the support of the teacher and a coursebook. The latter is a step towards life-long learning, encompassing a constant development of awareness. This concurs with the Social Constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1991), which implies, when drawing on their previous learning experiences and prior knowledge, students can have a sense of the world around them. Fourth, ELT coursebooks, which are designed for a global use, are more likely to fail to develop autonomy in learners because they exclusively limit the learner's choices concerning learning styles, materials, tasks, and methods. To overcome this shortcoming, teacher training courses must aim to train language teachers in the successful employment of the CLT approach in the language classroom, as well as the selection, evaluation, and adaptation of coursebooks.

In the final analysis, this review paper was aimed at demystifying the notion of learner autonomy from a pedagogical perspective. The discussion mainly addressed four major issues: 1) multiple definitions are given of the construct of learner autonomy; 2) there are various teacher-student roles, as well as responsibilities in autonomous learning; 3) the significance of the promotion of language learner autonomy; and 4) a number of contextual constraints of the promotion of learner autonomy. However, for the purpose of practicality, the data associated with the multilingualism theory, the CEFR, the CLT approach, and the teacher-centred approach were also discussed. This paper contributes to raising language teachers' pedagogical awareness and developing their practices in terms of autonomous autonomy.



LIMITATIONS AND STUDY FORWARD

Regardless of the significant results concluded in this paper, there are several limitations that may direct future investigations. The main limitation is that the paper was merely based upon a theoretical strategy. Thus, empirical evidence from classroom-based research is needed to support the findings reported. It is important that researchers examine the assumption that ELT coursebooks encounter a challenge associated with the promotion of language learner autonomy. This necessitates further studies to expand upon other constraints, namely, the role of learning materials in promoting learner autonomy. It is also important to research the relationship between the teacher's professional development, and the promotion of learner autonomy. Interestingly, research may expand upon the role of parental involvement in facilitating the development of language learner autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, H. & McColl Millar, R. (2020). REVIEWING DEFINITIONAL AMBIGUITIES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF TEXT AUTHENTICITY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING. *Humanities & Social Science Reviews*. 8 (4),1-9. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.841>
- Barfield, A. & Brown, S.H. (2008). *Reconstructing Autonomy in Language Education: Inquiry and Innovation*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596443>
- Benson, P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.18-34). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. Longman.
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 40 (1) 21-40 <https://doi:10.1017/S0261444806003958>
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833767>
- Benson, P. (2013). Learner Autonomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), 839-843. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.134>
- Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). Introduction: Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning. In P. Benson, & P. Voller, (eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning* (PP. 1-12). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Breen, M. P. & Mann, S. (1997). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson. & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.132-149). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Brookfield, S. (1995). The Getting of Wisdom: What Critically Reflective Teaching is and Why It's Important. In S. Brookfield (eds.), *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (pp.1-28). Jossey-Bass
- Carter, B. A. (2001). From awareness to counseling in learner autonomy. *The AILA Review*, 15, 26-33.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course Strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, 49 (3), 219-227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.3.219>

- Cotterall, S. (2000). Promoting learning autonomy through the curriculum: principles for designing language courses. *ELT Journal*, 54, (2), 109-117. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.109>
- Cotterall, S. & Crabbe, D. (1992). Fostering autonomy in the language classroom: Implications for teacher education. *Guidelines*, 14 (2), 11-22.
- Crabbe, D. (1993). Fostering autonomy from within the classroom: The teacher's responsibility. *System*, 21 (4), 443-452. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(93\)90056-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(93)90056-M)
- Crabbe, D. (2007). Learning Opportunities: adding learning value to tasks. *ELT Journal*, 61 (2), 17-125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm004>
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. W (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00690.x>
- Cummins, J. (1993). Bilingualism and second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, 51-70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002397>
- Dam, L. (2003). Developing learner autonomy: The teacher's responsibility. In D. Little, J. Ridley & E. Ushioda (eds.), *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 126-150). Authentik.
- Davies, T. (2006). Creative teaching and learning in Europe: promoting a new paradigm, *The Curriculum Journal*, 17, (1), 37-57. [10.1080/09585170600682574](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170600682574)
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182-185. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801>
- Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System*, 23 (2), 165-174. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00005-5)
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667343>
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00002-2)
- Ellis, N. & Loughland, T. (2016). The challenges of practitioner research: A comparative study of Singapore and NSW. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.8>

- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Pergamon.
- Huttunen, I. (2003). Planning learning: the role of teacher reflection. In D. Little, J. Ridley, J., & E. Ushioda, (eds.), *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 122-134). Authentik.
- Kennedy, J. & Pinter, A. (2008). Developing Teacher Autonomy through Teamwork. In A. Barfield & S.H. Brown (eds.), *Reconstructing Autonomy in Language Education: Inquiry and Innovation* (pp. 209-221). Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596443_17
- Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers*. Follett Publishing Company.
- Kohonen, V. (2003). Student autonomy and teachers' professional growth: Fostering a collegial culture in language teacher education. In D. Little, J. Ridley & E. Ushioda (eds.), *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 147-163). Authentik. <http://www.authentik.com/books/books-for-teachers/...>
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Authentik.
- Little, D. (1994). Autonomy in Language Learning: Some theoretical and practical considerations. In A. Swarbrick (eds.), *Teaching Modern Languages* (pp.81-87). Routledge.
- Little, D. (2003). Autonomy and public examinations. In D. Little, J. Ridley & E. Ushioda (eds.), *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp.223-237). Authentik.
- Little, D. (2005). The common European Framework and the European Language Portfolio: involving learners and their judgements in the assessment process. *Language Testing*, 22(3), <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt311oa>
- Little, D. (2007). Language Learner Autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 14-29.
<https://doi.org/10.2167/illt040.0>



- Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European language portfolio: two L2 English examples. *Language Teaching*, 42, (2), 222 – 233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005636>
- Little, D., Ridley, J. & Ushioda, E. (2003). *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment*. Authentik.
- Masrizal. (2014). The role of negotiation of meaning in L2 interactions: An analysis from the perspective of Long's interaction hypothesis. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 1(2), 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v1i2.1829>
- Matsubara, M., & Yoshida, H. (2018). Fostering autonomous learners of vocabulary acquisition using content-based ICT methods. *Humanities & Social Science Reviews*, 6(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2018.617>
- McDevitt, B. (1997) Learner autonomy and the need for learner training, *The Language Learning Journal*, 16 (1), 34-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571739785200251>
- Nunan, D. (1993). From learning centeredness to learner centeredness. *Applied language learning* 4, 1-18.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp.192-203). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Oxford, R.L. (2003). Towards a more Systematic Model of L2 Learner Autonomy. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp.79-91). Palgrave Macmillan. 1 <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504684>
- Oxford, R. L. (2008). Hero with a thousand faces: Learning autonomy, learning strategies and learning tactics in independent language learning. In S. Hurd & T. Lewis (eds.), *Language learning strategies in independent settings* (pp. 25-41) Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690999-005>
- Oxford, R. (2016). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315719146>
- Palfreyman, D. (2003). Introduction: culture and learner autonomy. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (eds.), *Learner Autonomy across Cultures: Language Education Perspectives* (pp. 1-19). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504684>

- Palfreyman, D. & Smith, R.C. (2003) *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504684>
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural Alternatives and Autonomy. In P. Benson and P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning* (pp. 35-53). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Remmert, D. (1997). Introducing autonomous learning in a low ability set. *The Language Learning Journal*, 15, (1) 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571739785200041>
- Ridley, J. (2003). Learners' ability to reflect on language and their learning. In D. Little, J. Ridley & E. Ushioda (eds.), *Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment* (pp. 78-89). Authentik.
- Şakrak-Ekin, G., & Balçıkanlı, C. (2019). Does Autonomy Really Matter in Language Learning? *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(4), 98-111. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.8762>
- Skehan, P. (1998). A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, 54, (4), 398–399. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.4.398>
- Smith, R. C. (2003). Pedagogy for autonomy as (becoming-) appropriate methodology. In D. Palfreyman & R.C. Smith (eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp.192-146). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230504684>
- Swarbrick, A. (1994). *Teaching Modern Languages*. Open University Press.
- Trim, J. L.M. (1977). Some possibilities and limitations of learner autonomy. In E. Harding-Esch (eds.), *Self-Directed Learning and Autonomy* (pp. 1-11). Report of a Seminar held at Cambridge, 13-15 December 1976. University of Cambridge, Department of Linguistics and CRAPEL.
- Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centeredness as Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ushioda, E. (2011). Why autonomy? Insights from motivation theory and research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5, (2), 221-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2011.577536>



- Voller, P. (1997). Does the teacher have a role in autonomous language learning? In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 98-113). Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842172>
- Vygotsky, L. (1991). *Thought and Language*. MIT Press
- Watkins, C., Carnell, E. & Lodge, C. (2007). *Effective Learning in Classrooms*. Paul Chapman. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446211472.n2>
- Yusnimar. (2019). Autonomous learning and teacher guidance: Towards the improvement of EFL students' prepared talk in speaking practice. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(2), 228-238. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i1.10080>