Investigating Tertiary Students' Autonomy in Out-of-Class EFL Learning

Priyatno Ardi

Universitas Siswa Bangsa Internasional (USBI), Indonesia

0282

The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

Abstract

Autonomy in language learning has been a key discussion in the realm of language teaching and learning for more than 30 years. However, to date, a lot of research on autonomy was mainly focused on fostering learner autonomy in the classroom context. Autonomy in out-of-class learning is less paid into attention. According to Benson (2006: 26), out-of-class language learning is "a relatively new area in the literature on autonomy."

This present study srutinizes Indonesian tertiary students' autonomy in learning English beyond the classroom. A survey study was employed in this study. A questionnaire consisting of 19 Likert-scale items was distributed to 192 university students. The quantitative-descriptive analysis revealed that students' autonomy in out-of-class EFL learning was at moderate level.

iafor
The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

1. Introduction

Recent literatures on learner autonomy consider out-of-class language learning to be the manifestation of the idea of learner autonomy. Benson (2001: 62) defines out-of-class language learning as "any kind of learning that takes place outside the classroom and involves self-instruction, naturalistic learning or self-directed naturalistic learning." According to Benson (2006), learners tend to engage in out-of-class learning activities more frequently than their teachers know.

This paper intends to explore students' autonomy in out-of-class English foreign language learning at a private university in Indonesia. The research question addressed is "how is students' autonomy in out-of-class EFL learning best described?"

2. Autonomy in Language Learning and Its Working Definitions

For more than thirty years, autonomy has been a key issue and discussion in the field of EFL teaching and learning. The original notion of autonomy in EFL learning was proposed by Holec (1981: 3). He defined autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning." He states:

> *To take charge of one's learning* is to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all decisions concerning all aspects of this learning, i.e.:
> - determining the objectives;
> - defining the contents and progressions;
> - selecting methods and techniques to be used;
> - monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, place, etc);
> - evaluating what has been acquired

Following Holec's definition, several advocates of learner autonomy in language learning put forward their own definitions. Little (1991), cited in Benson (2001: 49), states "essentially, autonomy is a capacity – for detachment, critical reflection, decision making, and independent action." In this sense, the development of learner autonomy occurs if the learners continuously reflect on what is being learned, why they learn, how they learn and with what degree of success (Little, 1999).

Dickinson makes two versions of the definition of autonomy. The first definition stipulates that autonomy is "the situation in which the learner is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those decisions" (Dickinson, 1987: 11). Later, he defines autonomy as "an attitude to language learning which may not necessarily have any external, observable features" (Dickinson, 1993: 330). It is obvious here that the definition shifts the emphasis, from learning situation to learner attribute.

Benson (2001: 110) asserts that autonomy is "an attribute of the learner rather than the learning situation." He describes learner autonomy as "the capacity to take control

of one's own learning" (p. 47). The notion of controlling over learning is more observable than that of taking charge.

3. Methodology

A survey study was employed in this research. Employing a survey research design was appropriate for this study since it sought to collect and describe EFL learners' characteristics (cf. Brown and Rodger, 2002). It is also worth noting that the information about the research participants in this research was gathered at a single point in time.

3.1 Research Participants
The subjects of the present study were 192 first year non-English major students at a private university in Jakarta, Indonesia. The subjects had been enrolled in English for Academic Purposes I (EAP I) classes during the odd semester of 2010/2011 academic year. They had mixed levels of English proficiency.

3.2 Research Instrument
A close-ended questionnaire was used to elicit and gather information about research respondents. Twenty questionnaire items were generated to gauge students' autonomy in out-of-class English language learning. The items were categorized into two dimensions, namely autonomous behavior and out-of-class autonomous English learning activities (see Appendix 1).

The first dimension was designed to find out students' autonomous behavior for their out-of-class English language learning. It was developed based on Holec's (1981) five requirements for autonomous learners, such as determining learning objectives, determining the content and progressions, selecting the learning methods and techniques, monitoring learning process, and evaluating the process and outcomes of learning.

The second dimension was designed to find out autonomous learning activities the students underwent during their out-of-class English learning. The given activities were as a result of brainstorming possible activities the students may carry out.

4. Research Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Results

It is important to agree upon that along the five-point Likert scale the averages of 3.50 or higher imply high degree of autonomy; the averages of 2.50-3.49 medium imply degree of autonomy; and the averages of 2.49 or lower imply low degree of autonomy (cf. Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). The degree was indicated by the average mean of each dimension or the mean of each item.

Table 4.1: Average Mean of Autonomy in Out-Of-Class English
Language Learning

	N	Mean	SD
Average mean of autonomy in out-of-class English language learning.	192	3.15	0.64
Behavior	192	3.01	0.80
Activities	192	3.29	0.64

In Table 4.1, the mean average of students' autonomy in out-of-class English language learning was 3.15. For this reason, the degree of students' autonomy in out-of-class English language learning was medium. The description of the results of each dimension is presented in the following subsections.

4.1.1 Autonomous Learning Behavior

This was mainly derived from Holec's (1981) categorization of qualities and characteristics of an autonomous learner in five aspects, such as determining objectives of learning, defining the contents and progressions, selecting methods and techniques, monitoring learning process, and evaluating the process and outcomes of learning.

Students' overall autonomous learning behavior in out-of-class English language learning in this research was regarded as medium degree. The mean average of students' autonomous learning behavior was 3.01. This score indicated that the students exhibited moderate frequency of autonomous English learning behavior outside the class.

Table 4.2: Average Mean of Autonomous Learning Behavior Aspects

Aspects	N	Mean	SD
Determining objectives of learning	192	3.39	.98
Defining the contents and progressions	192	2.87	.96
Selecting methods and techniques	192	2.84	1.00
Monitoring learning process	192	2.80	.98
Evaluating the process and outcomes of learning	192	3.13	.96

In the table, none of the five aspects reached the high degree of autonomy. Instead, all the aspects fell within the medium degree of autonomy. The mean scores of students'

responses to determining objectives of learning, defining the contents and progressions, selecting methods and techniques, monitoring learning process, and evaluating the process and outcomes of learning were 3.39, 2.87, 2.84, 2.80, and 3.13 respectively.

4.1.1.1 Determining Objectives of Learning

Among the five aspects, the students reported to pay much attention to the determination of their out-of-class English learning objectives. The mean score was 3.39. Even though the score was the highest among the five aspects of autonomous learning behavior, students' autonomous behavior in setting the objectives of English learning was regarded as medium degree (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Frequencies and Percentages of Determining Objectives of Learning

No item	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	6	3.1	32	16.7	64	33.3	58	30.2	32	16.7	3.41	1.04
2	14	7.3	26	13.5	60	31.3	57	29.7	35	18.2	3.38	1.14

Students' awareness of the objectives of their out-of-class English language learning was moderate (Statement 1, Mean = 3.41). Sixty four (33.3%) students reported that they are sometimes aware of their out-of-class English language learning objectives. Fifty eight students (30.2%) admitted that they are often aware of their out-of-class English language learning objectives, while 32 students (16.7%) reported they are always aware of it. Thirty two students said they are rarely aware of their out-of-class English language learning objectives and six students (3.1%) admitted they are never aware of it.

The second statement also suggested the moderate degree of operation (Mean = 3.38). Sixty (31.3%) students admitted that they sometimes do it. Fifty seven (29.7%) students often and 35 (18.2%) always have targets that they should achieve in out-of-class English learning. In addition, twenty six (13.5%) students rarely have the target, while 14 (7.3%) students never do.

4.1.1.2 Defining the Contents and Progressions

The mean average of students' responses to the aspect of defining the contents and progressions was 2.87. This score indicated the students exhibited relatively moderate autonomous learning behavior in defining the contents and progressions of their English learning outside the class. This aspect was measured by two items of the questionnaire (items 3 and 4).

Table 4.4 Frequencies and Percentages of Defining the Contents and Progressions

No item	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
3	17	8.9	33	17.2	70	36.5	54	28.1	18	9.4	3.12	1.08
4	31	16.1	56	29.2	67	34.9	28	14.6	10	5.2	2.64	1.07

The mean of the third statement was 3.12, which suggested that the students demonstrated moderate frequency of choosing the materials for their own out-of-class English language learning. In their response to the statement, seventy students chose "always". Fifty four (28.1%) students reported that they themselves always choose the learning materials, while eighteen (9.4%) students admitted that they always do as well. Moreover, thirty three (17.2%) students chose "rarely" and 17 (8.9%) students selected "never".

Even though the mean of the statement 4 (Mean = 2.64) was lower than that of the statement 3, it was still medium. The score indicated moderate degree of students' behavior in arranging their daily schedule so that they had much time to learn English outside the class. Responding to the statement, sixty seven (34.9%) students reported that they sometimes arrange their schedule so as to have much time to learn English. Fifty six (29.2%) students reported that they rarely do it, while 31 (16.1%) students revealed that they never do it. Twenty eight (14.6%) students in their response to the statement chose "often" and 10 (5.2%) students selected "always".

4.1.1.3 Selecting Methods and Techniques

Students' degree of autonomous behavior in selecting learning methods and techniques was moderate (Mean = 2.84). The behavior was measured by two items of the questionnaire (items 5 and 6).

Table 4.5 Frequencies and Percentages of Selecting Methods and Techniques

No item	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
5	19	9.9	43	22.4	51	26.6	59	30.7	20	10.4	3.09	1.15
6	34	17.7	56	29.2	65	33.9	28	14.6	9	4.7	2.59	1.08

The mean of 3.09 for the fifth statement implied the students exhibited the medium degree of selecting learning activities for their out-of-class English language learning. Responding to the statement, fifty nine (30.7%) students reported they always select the learning activities, while 20 (10.4 %) students admitted they always do it. Fifty one (26.6%) students reported that they sometimes decide the learning activities. Moreover, forty-three (22.4%) students revealed that they rarely choose the activities, and 19 (17.7%) students admitted that they never choose the activities for their out-of-class English language learning.

Students' degree of choosing learning activities that suit them best was 2.59. Compared to the previous statement, the mean score of the sixth statement was lower. However, the score was still categorized into the medium degree. In their answers to the statement, sixty five (33.9%) students selected "sometimes". Fifty six (29.2%) students admitted that they rarely choose learning activities that suit them best, while 34 (17.7%) students reported that they never do it as well. Meanwhile, twenty eight (14.6%) students chose "often" and 9 (4.7%) students chose "always" in the questionnaire.

4.1.1.4 Monitoring Learning Process

Among the five aspects, the mean average of monitoring learning process is the lowest (Mean = 2.80). This suggested that the students paid less attention to the aspect of monitoring the process of English learning outside the class. This aspect consisted of two items (items 7 and 8).

Table 4.6 Frequencies and Percentages of Monitoring Learning Process

No item m	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
7	20	10.4	51	26.6	64	33.3	42	21.9	15	7.8	2.90	1.10
8	30	15.6	55	28.6	58	30.2	38	19.8	11	5.7	2.71	1.12

Students' behavior in monitoring their learning progress was moderate (Item 7, Mean = 2.90). Responding to the twenty-fifth statement, sixty four (33.3%) students selected "sometimes". Fifty one (26.6 %) students admitted that they rarely monitor their learning progress, while 20 (10.4%) students reported that they never do it. Forty two (21.9%) students chose "often" and 15 (7.8%) students selected "always".

The mean score of the eighth statement was 2.71; thus, it was categorized into medium degree. As seen in Table 4.18, fifty-eight (30.2%) students chose "sometimes" in the questionnaire. Fifty-five (28.6%) students reported that they rarely decide the time and length of their learning, while 30 (15.6%) students admitted that they never do such an activity. Thirty eight (19.8%) students chose "often" and 11 (15.7%) students selected "always" in the questionnaire.

4.1.1.5 Evaluating the Process and Outcomes of Learning
The average mean of students' behavior in evaluating the process and outcomes of their out-of-class English learning was 3.13. This score indicated that the students displayed the moderate degree in the self-evaluation of their learning process and outcomes. The aspect of evaluating the process and outcomes of learning was gauged by two items (items 9 and 10).

Table 4.7 Frequencies and Percentages of Evaluating the Process
and Outcomes of Learning

No item m	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
9	22	11.5	48	25.0	70	36.5	38	19.8	14	7.3	2.86	1.08
10	9	4.7	32	16.7	51	26.6	72	37.5	28	14.6	3.41	1.07

The mean of the ninth statement was 2.86, which means that students' degree of evaluating the process and results of their learning was moderate. Seventy (36.5%) students reported that they sometimes evaluate the process and results of their out-of-class English learning. Forty eight (25%) students selected "rarely" and 22 (11.5%) chose "never" in the questionnaire. Thirty eight (19.8%) students admitted that they often evaluate the process and the results of their learning, while 14 (7.3%) students reported that they always do so.

Students' degree of evaluating the mistakes and using the information to improve their learning was also moderate (Item 10, Mean = 3.41). Fifty one (26.6%) students admitted that they sometimes evaluate their mistakes and use the information to help them learn better. Seventy two (37.5%) students chose "often" and 28 (14.6%) selected "always" in response to the twenty-eighth statement. Meanwhile, thirty two (16.7%) students reported that they rarely evaluate and use the results of the evaluation to improve their learning and nine (4.7%) students admitted that they never do it as well.

4.1.2 Out-of-Class Autonomous English Learning Activities
The mean average of the out-of-class English language learning activities was 3.29. This implied that the degree of students' out-of-class autonomous learning was medium. Ten items of the questionnaire (items 11-20) assessed students' autonomous English learning activities outside the class.

Table 4.8 provides the descriptive results for students' out-of-class autonomous English learning activities. It is obvious that among ten activities, four activities (Items 16, 17, 20, and 14) were considered to have high degree of frequency since their means were higher than 3.50. The other six activities (Items 13, 12, 15, 11, 18, and 19), of which the means ranged from 2.64 to 3.43, were in the medium degree.

Among ten provided activities, learning English by listening to English songs was the first most widely-practiced learning activity (Item 16, Mean = 4.05). In their response to this thirty-fourth statement, eighty nine (46.4%) students admitted that they often listen to English songs to learn English, while 63 (32.8%) students reported that they always do the activity. Twenty eight (14.6%) students admitted that they sometimes learn English through listening to English songs. Ten (5.2%) students reported that they rarely listen to English songs and two (1.0%) students never conduct the learning activity.

Table 4.8 Frequency and Percentage of Students' Engagement in Out-of-Class
Autonomous English Learning Activities

No item	Response Alternatives										Mean	SD
	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
16	2	1.0	10	5.2	28	14.6	89	46.4	63	32.8	4.05	1.090
17	1	0.5	20	10.4	39	20.3	78	40.6	54	28.1	3.85	1.119
20	5	2.6	27	14.1	61	31.8	61	31.8	38	19.8	3.52	1.095
14	6	3.1	23	12.0	62	32.3	71	37.0	30	15.6	3.50	.997
13	6	3.1	35	18.2	59	30.7	54	28.1	38	19.8	3.43	1.013
12	9	4.7	45	23.4	54	28.1	55	28.6	29	15.1	3.26	.882
15	10	5.2	42	21.9	75	39.1	48	25.0	17	8.9	3.10	.965
11	17	8.9	52	27.1	58	30.2	51	26.6	14	7.3	2.96	.979
18	25	13.0	54	28.1	80	41.7	27	14.1	6	3.1	2.66	1.084
19	26	13.5	69	35.9	59	30.7	25	13.0	13	6.8	2.64	1.043

The second most widely-practiced learning activity was watching English movies (Item 17, Mean = 3.85). Seventy eight (40.6%) students often carry out the activity, while 54 (28.1%) students always watch English movies to learn English. Moreover, 39 (20.3%) students sometimes conduct the learning activity outside the class. Twenty (10.4%) students admitted that they rarely watch English movies and 2 (1.0%) students reported that they never do the activity.

Asking friends/lecturers/other people when finding difficulty appeared to be the third most widely-conducted learning activity in out-of-class English language learning (Item 20, Mean = 3.52). Sixty one (31.8%) students chose "often" and 38 (19.8%) students selected "always". Sixty one (31.8%) students admitted that they sometimes

go to friends/lecturers/other people when finding difficulty. Twenty seven (14.1%) students revealed that they rarely do the activity, while five (2.6%) students admitted that they never do the activity.

Nowadays, most students have social networking accounts. The social networking sites may function as the medium for learning English. Updating status in social networking sites became the fourth most widely-practiced activity (Item 14, Mean = 3.50). In their response to the statement, seventy one (37.0%) students selected "often" and 30 (15.6%) students chose "always". Sixty two (32.3%) students admitted that they sometimes update their status in social networks using English. Twenty three (12.0%) students reported that they rarely do the activity and six (3.1%) students revealed that they never update their status using English.

The fifth most widely-practiced activity was assessing English internet sites (Item 13, Mean = 3.43). Responding to the statement, fifty nine (30.7%) students selected "sometimes". Fifty four (28.1%) students admitted that they often do the activity, and thirty eight (19.8%) students reported that they always do the activity. Thirty five (18.2%) students revealed that they rarely assess English sites, while six (3.1%) students reported that they never carry out the activity.

Noting down new words and finding out their meaning in the dictionary became the sixth most widely-carried out activity (Item 12, Mean = 3.26). Responding to the statement, fifty four (28.1%) students selected "sometimes". Fifty five (28.6%) students reported that they often do the activity, while twenty nine (15.1%) students admitted that they often do the activities. Forty five (23.4%) students selected "rarely" and nine (4.7%) students chose "never".

The seventh most widely-exercised learning activity was watching English TV program or listening to English radio program (Item 15, Mean = 3.10). Seventy five (39.1%) students admitted that they sometimes learn English by watching English TV program or listening to English radio program. Forty eight (25.0%) students often do and 17 (8.9%) students always do. Forty two (21.9%) students chose "rarely" and ten (5.2%) students selected "never".

Reading English books, novels, or newspapers appears to be the eighth most widely displayed learning activity (item 11, Mean = 2.96). Fifty eight (30.2%) students revealed that they sometimes read English books, novels, or newspapers to learn English. Fifty one (26.6%) students chose "often", while 14 (7.3%) students selected "always". Fifty two (27.1%) students admitted that they rarely read English books, novels, or newspapers to learn English and seventeen (8.9%) students reported that they never do the activity.

The ninth most-widely displayed activity was doing exercises available in EAP 1 module voluntarily (Item 18, Mean = 2.66). Responding to the questionnaire, eighty (41.7%) students chose "sometimes" in the questionnaire. Twenty seven (14.1%) students admitted that they often do the exercise and six (3.1%) students reported that they always do the exercise. Fifty four (28.1%) students chose "rarely" and twenty six (13.5%) selected "never".

Learning English in groups became the least exercised activity during the out-of-class learning activities (Item 19, Mean = 2.64). Fifty nine (30.7%) students admitted that they sometimes learn English in groups. Twenty five (13.0%) students often do the activity and only 13 (6.8%) students learn English in groups. Sixty nine (35.9%) chose "rarely" and twenty six (13.5%) selected "never".

4.2 Discussion

Autonomy in out-of-class English language learning implied that the students exercised "their responsibilities for all the decisions concerning all aspects of his own learning" (Holec, 1981: 3). From descriptive results of students' responses, it was found that the students exhibited an average degree of autonomy in out-of-class English language learning (Mean = 3.15). In other words, it may be said that students' overall ability to take charge of their own English learning was at a moderate level.

Holec's (1981) argues that autonomous learners should meet five requirements, such as fixing the objectives of learning, defining the contents and progression, selecting the learning methods and techniques, monitoring the learning progress, and evaluating the learning. In the language classroom, the five requirements are usually difficult, if not impossible, to conduct since they are already determined by the institution or the teachers. The students just follow what is already established; hence, they are not autonomous in this regard since they do not exercise an active involvement in their learning process. Different from the language classroom, the out-of-class language learning is argued to provide the students an ample chance to carry out the four requirements (cf. Benson, 2001). Therefore, during the out-of-class language learning, the students are likely to plan, monitor and evaluate their learning by themselves rather than by the teacher, indicating that they are actively involved in their own learning.

Based on the research results, students' autonomous behavior in determining the objectives of learning English outside the class (Mean = 3.39) stayed at moderate degree, even though it appeared to be the highest among the other factors. In addition to Holec (1981), Dickinson (1993) also believes that formulating learning objectives becomes one of the distinctive characteristics of autonomous learners. In this respect, the learning objectives play a crucial role in the process of learning in a way that it provides the direction of their learning. Little (1999) contends that students' awareness of learning goals makes learning more effective. Hence, without having clear objectives, the students would not be able to undergo their learning appropriately.

In order to achieve the defined goal, the students must decide the suitable learning materials and the pace of their learning. In this respect, the students may choose the materials that are suitable to their level of English as well as determine the time and place in order to carry out the learning according to their own schedule. Controlling over learning content is fundamental to autonomy in a sense that the students are free

to choose what they want to learn to achieve the learning objective (Benson, 2001). The results of the analysis suggested that during the out-of-class English language learning, students' ability to decide the suitable learning materials and the pace of their learning was generally at a moderate level even though it was the lowest among the other behaviors (Mean = 2.87). Furthermore, it was found also in the analysis that the students did not really arrange their daily schedule so as to have much time to learn English outside the class (Item 4, Mean = 2.64).

After the goal and material are determined, the students should think about learning methods or techniques supporting them to attain the goal (cf. Holec, 1981). Omaggio (1978), as cited in Wenden (1998), also believes that autonomous learners should have good insights into their learning methods and techniques. The results of the analysis revealed that the students exhibited a moderate degree of choosing learning methods (Item 5, Mean = 3.09). Moreover, Dickinson (1993) argues that autonomous learners are able to identify what strategies fitting them best and what strategies are not appropriate with them as well. However, from the analysis, it was found that the students did not seem to choose the strategies fitting them best (Item 6, Mean = 2.59).

Self-monitoring is crucial for it enables the students to check, verify, or correct while performing the language task (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990, cited in Benson, 2001) so as to judge whether their learning is successful and to decide which parts must be changed and which must be continued. According to Scharle and Szabo (2000), responsible learners consciously keep monitoring their own progress. Nevertheless, the results of the analysis conveyed that the students were less able to monitor their learning process (Item 7, Mean = 2.90). Moreover, the results of this research suggested that the students were less able to decide the length and time of their English learning (Item 8, Mean = 2.71). Students' decision on the length and time of learning is indeed one of the manifestations of students' efforts to monitor their learning process.

Furthermore, self-evaluation was used to judge how well the students are doing in accomplishing the task and how much they have accomplished the learning (Gardner, 2000). An ability to self-evaluate inevitable becomes a defining characteristic of autonomous learners since the students independently judge their learning process and results, instead of conducted by the teachers. The results of this research revealed that the students' ability to evaluate their learning process and outcomes was at a moderate level (Item 9, Mean = 2.86). Without a doubt, the evaluation could be also used to make the further learning better as well (Item 10, Mean = 3.41). Accordingly, regardless of whether the self-assessment is reliable and valid, it is crucial to bear students' autonomy in language learning for the students themselves actively decide how well they carry out the process of learning as well as judge the weaknesses and strengths of the results of their learning (Gardner, 2000).

As to the out-of-class autonomous activities, the analysis revealed that the top activities were those which were related to technology, such as listening English songs, watching English movies, etc. It goes without saying that nowadays the students are technology-literate. As a result, the students made use of the technology as a medium to carry out their out-of-class autonomous English language learning. This may convince that technology and autonomous activities are indeed closely related (Chia, 2007). Additionally, the research findings also countered experts' arguments (e.g. Littlewood, 1999) that Asian learners tended to work together in learning. The results of this research suggested that the students unlikely engaged in the collaborative English learning during the out-of-class learning (Item 19, Mean = 2.64).

5. Conclusion

This research aims at describing students' autonomy in out-of-class English language learning. The descriptive results of students' responses to the autonomy in out-of-class English language learning revealed that the students exhibited average degree of autonomy in out-of-class English language learning. Autonomy in out-of-class English language learning consisted of autonomous behavior and autonomous learning activities. Those two domains stayed at moderate degree as well.

References

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

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

Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chia, C. (2007). *Autonomy in Language Learning: the Use of IT and Internet Resources*. Singapore: MC Graw Hill Education

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

Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking Shop: Aspects of Autonomous learning. *ELT Journal*, *47*, 330-336.

Gardner, D. (2000). Self-Assessment for Autonomous Language Learners. *Links and Letters, 7, 49-60.*

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Little, D. (1999). Learner Autonomy is More than a Western Cultural Construct. In Sara Cotterall and David Crabbe (eds.), *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the Field and Effecting Change* (pp. 11-18). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

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

Oxford, R.L., & Burry-Stock, J.A. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL/EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. System, 23 (2), 153-175.

Scharle, A. and Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner Autonomy: a Guide to Developing Learner Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, B. (2000). Learner Autonomy: the Next Phase? In Barbara Sinclair, Ian McGrath, and Terry Lamb (eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions* (pp. 4-14). London: Longman.

Wenden, A. (1998). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.

Appendix 1 Operazionalization of Learner Autonomy

Variable	Dimension	Aspects	Indicators/Items
Autonomy in Out-of-Class English Language Learning	Autonomous Behavior	Determining Objectives of Learning	1. I am aware of the objectives of my out-of-class English learning. 2. I have targets that I should achieve in out-of-class English learning.
		Defining the contents and progressions	3. I myself choose materials used for learning English outside class. 4. I arrange my daily schedule so that I have much time to learn English outside class.
		Selecting methods and techniques	5. I choose activities for my out-of-class English learning.

		6. I choose learning activities which suit me best.
	Monitoring learning process	7. I monitor my learning progress.
		8. I decide the time and length of out-of-class English learning
	Evaluating the process and outcomes of learning	9. I evaluate the process and results of my out-of-class English learning.
		10. I evaluate my mistakes and use the information to help me learn better.
Out-of-Class Autonomous English Language Learning Activities		11. I read English books, novels, or newspapers.
		12. I note down new words and finding their meaning in the dictionary.
		13. I access English internet sites.
		14. I update status in social networks using English.
		15. I watch English TV program or listening to English radio program.
		16. I listen to English songs.
		17. I watch English movies.
		18. I do exercises in EAP 1 module voluntarily.
		19. I learn English in groups.
		20. I ask friends/lecturer/other people when finding difficulties during out-of-class English language learning.