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Abstract: The present study aimed at investigating the effects of the presentation, practice, production method (PPP) on Iranian EFL learners’ autonomy in speaking. Therefore, 44 intermediate EFL learners (22 males and 22 females) from Isfahan, Iran were selected through Quick Placement Test (QPT) (Edwards, 2007), and assigned to experimental and control in equal numbers. To collect the data, an Autonomy Questionnaire (Chan, Spratt & Humphreys, 2002) and an interview were conducted two times before and after the treatment as the pretest and posttest. The PPP method was used as a treatment for experimental group. After the data collection, the obtained data from the questionnaire and interview were collected and analyzed through paired and independent samples t-tests. The results of this study indicated that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest in the experimental group and not in the control group. There was also a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the posttest. The results of interview showed that the perception of autonomous learning was improved from the first to the second interview.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, people all around the world are communicating and different options are offered to make it easier by technology improvements. Therefore, the importance of knowing other languages often is being considered more important than before; in addition, the international language is English which seems to be practical in almost all countries. If a person wants to take apart in an international society, he/she should be able to communicate with at least one international language as well as his/her first language (L1) (Şimon, 2014). Even those in which English is a foreign language like Iran. The proof of this claim could be found effortlessly since even young children know English in different levels of proficiency.

Speaking is one of the four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking). It is the means through which learners can communicate with others to achieve certain goals or to express their opinions, intentions, hopes and viewpoints. In addition, people who know a language are referred to as ‘speakers’ of that language. Furthermore, in almost any setting, speaking is the most frequently used language skill. Experts assume that the ability to communicate orally is equal to knowing the
given language in that speaking is the main means of human communication (Lazarton, 2001). As Rivers (1981) argues, speaking is used twice as much as reading and writing in our communication. Developing speaking skills is of vital importance in EFL programs. (j.jalll.2017). As Nunan (1999) argues that success in learning a language is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the (target) language. Therefore, speaking is probably a priority for most learners of English (Florez, 1999).

Moreover, since the concept of learners' autonomy is raised within recent decades, one scheme to be addressed through speaking skills enhancement can be students taking responsibility of their own language learning. To illustrate more, Autonomy is usually defined as the capability to take charge of, or be responsible for, one’s own learning. Dickinson (1987) describes it as “the situation in which the learner is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those decisions.

Where Iranian students are exposed to facing the double concern of a collectivist culture and a test-driven educational culture, a way to experience the joy of a comprehensive process called language learning may be "learner autonomy". Developments of Applied Linguistics and language learning pedagogy, enriched with research into foreign language learning, made an increasing demand on "learner centeredness" and this shift of interest to learners as sources of information for the learning process led to the research body being drawn to autonomy in language learning and teaching (Benson, 2001). The concept of learners' autonomy in teaching speaking skills of a foreign language, has been gaining momentum worldwide from the end of twentieth century. It helps language learners to come out from the shyness, anxiety and fear of a new language as here they are in charge of their own learning.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of learner autonomy in teaching speaking skills of a foreign language, has been gaining momentum worldwide from the end of twentieth century. It helps language learners to come out from the shyness, anxiety and fear of a new language as here they are in charge of their own learning. Smith (2008b) noted that the notion was first developed in the early 1970s by Henri Holec at CRAPEL as —ability to take charge of one’s own education (p. 6). With the development of self-access systems, autonomy-oriented classroom practices such as Leni Dam’s in 1973, and the entry of new-centres' the focus in books and reports seemed to be mainly on self-access learning up to the 1990s. For instance, Kohonen (1992) used the term 'self-direction' as 'an attitude to learning' in varying levels from other-directed to self-directed learning. Smith (2008a) also stated that the beginning of unification around the term 'autonomy' in book and reports was from 1995 onwards. As an example, Benson (2001) proposed learner autonomy (LA) as a pre-condition for effective learning of a foreign or second language.

He defined LA as —the capacity to take control over one’s own learning (p.47). Autonomous learners have acquired “the means to transcend the barrier learning and living”; something that is of great concern to both educational theory and curriculum development. Surely enough, such capacity to take charge of one's own learning at this level is not innate to learners and should be learned and developed. Dickenson (1995) proceeds to state that recognizing autonomy as a capacity or attitude rather than as overt action is essential since what we are after is to have autonomous learners in teacher-directed classroom setting besides the situation where the learner has the opportunity to involve in self-access learning.

For foreign language learning settings, Van Lier (1996) went further and explained that the class hours were the only chance that learners were busy with the language. Van Lier (1996) proposed that the students must be involved with the language amid lessons over and above in lessons. To formulate this context, Larsen-Freeman (2000) proposed teachers to teach how to learn a language that aimed to build autonomy among the learners. When glanced at the literature, building autonomy was considered as a process in which control over and responsibility for the learning situation was gradually shifted from teacher to learner (Littlewood, 1996; Van Esch and St. John, 2003; Van Lier, 1996).

2.1 Since learner autonomy, as a dependent variable in this paper, has to be investigated, a brief background and scholars' perspectives of this approach will be reviewed in this part of the study. The main term which is important to be explained is the definition of autonomy and autonomous learning.
Although different researchers have altered opinions in this field, the common description would be declared as follow: Being capable of taking control of his own education and making all the decisions concerning the learning with which he is or wishes to be involved. (Holec, 1981)

The autonomous learners act according to their own mind and must be free not only from direction by others external to themselves but also from their own inner compulsions and rigidities, (Boud, 1988). Having total responsibility for making and implementing all of the decisions concerned with his own learning. (Dickinson, 1988). Being willingness to take the responsibility for their own learning. Being self-confident learners; autonomous learners believe in their ability to learn and to self-direct or manage their learning. (Wendon, 1991). Having capacity for being active and independent in the learning process, autonomous learners can identify goals, formulate their own goal; and can change goals to suit their own learning needs and interests. (Dickinson, 1996)

Taking active part in social processes of learning. (Dam, 1995). Autonomous learners show awareness of the aims and processes in learning and are aware of traditional pedagogical measures. (Benson, 1996). Being able to accept responsibility for their learning, autonomous learners constantly reflect on what they are learning, why they are learning, how they are learning, and with what degree of success. (Little 1999). The situation in which the student is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those choices’ Dickinson, 1987).

Furthermore, Scharle and Szabo (2000) introduce autonomous learners as students who agree with the idea that their own efforts are vital to growth in their learning, and behave accordingly. This argues points to those students who do their assignments and exercises not to please the teacher or to get suitable marks but to enhance their own language skills.

Joseph Raz (1986: 83) argues, ‘Autonomy is not the natural state that individuals are in when left to exercise free choice. The ideal of individual autonomy is actually a strong theory of the good – that the good life is one in which individuals are the authors of their own lives.

Robert Young (1986: 81) argues similarly that, ‘in exercising autonomy, we shape our own lives’. This understanding of autonomy as a process of ‘authoring’ or ‘shaping’ one’s own life implies that, although the potential for autonomy may be intrinsic the human condition, autonomy itself is something that must be acquired and maintained over the course of a lifetime. (Benson, 2012) meaning that we have to acquire and comprehend the concept of autonomy in our lives including our education. Therefore students also can be trained to become autonomous learners. Some, on the other hand, believe personal autonomy to be a social factor. As Raz (1986: 83) argues, Autonomy is socially defined in that the goals, preferences, and values of individuals, in sum the meanings of individual activities, are derived from the shared social matrix.

Mats Oscarsson, gives six different reasons why self-assessment can be beneficial to language learning. First, he stresses that self-assessment promotes learning, plain and simple. It gives learners training in evaluation which results in benefits to the learning process.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to investigate the effects of the presentation, practice, production method on Iranian EFL learners’ autonomy in speaking. This chapter presents the applied methods and procedures by the researcher to conduct this study. More specifically, the chapter provides a thorough description of the research participants and instruments through which the research procedures were developed.

3.1. Design of the Study

This study used a quasi-experimental method with a pretest-posttest design. Since there was no opportunity for researcher to provide a true experimental research, the mentioned type of research was chosen this is because the participants are not randomly selected, and intact groups/classes are used. Statistical measures, used for analyzing the research data, were presented as well.

3.2. Participants

The participants of this study included 44 male and female intermediate EFL learners whose age ranged between 18 and 27 randomly selected from Novin and Raha institutes, which are located in Isfahan, Iran.
3.3. Materials and Instruments

In order to conduct the data collection procedure, a number of different materials and instruments were employed in this study. They are as follow:

3.3.1. Quick Placement Test (QPT) (Edwards, 2007)
This test was used to make sure students are from the same level of proficiency. The test is a valid and reliable one and a highly effective instrument in grouping students into appropriate levels. It can also be used as a quick measurement of students’ general language proficiency. The test and its criteria for placement were used to appropriately place learners in relevant proficiency levels.

3.3.2. Pretest
This test includes two steps which are the questionnaire and interview.

3.3.2.1. Autonomy Questionnaire
The questionnaire is conducted to specify learners' autonomy. This questionnaire was based on inputs from Deci (1995), and Deci and Ryan (1985). The original 52-item questionnaire contained 4 sections, all of which are related to autonomous learning: students' perception of their responsibilities, students' perception of their abilities, students' perception of their motivation level, and the activities they engage in both inside and outside the classroom.

In order to make sure that the questionnaire was reliable and valid, a pilot study will be conducted. First, the researcher will prepare the items based on available standard questionnaires as well as the purpose of the study. The items will be presented to a group of experts in the field so that the construct and content validity is confirmed. For reliability, the researcher will consult with statisticians to find the most appropriate type of statistical analyses to check the reliability of the questionnaire.

3.3.2.2. Interview Questions
The interview is designed to determine the learners’ perception of autonomous learning. This interview consists of one question which is “which activity do you think can help you with improving speaking skill when you are not in English class?” This interview is conducted before and after the treatment. The answers were recorded and transcribed for further analysis.

It will include both steps of pretest, and also will be conducted in both groups to provide the difference of learners' speaking fluency, if exists, by comparing control and experimental group.

3.3.2.3. Touchstone Book (Intermediate Level)
This book was taught as the material of the research in PPP method.

3.4. Procedures
To accomplish the purpose of the study, the following steps were taken:

3.4.1. Selection of Participants
Before data collection, QPT (Edwards, 2007) placement test was used to homogenize the participants in terms of their language proficiency. Having obtained the proficiency test results, the researchers chose those participants whose score range fell one standard deviation above and below the mean (i.e.mean±1). Accordingly, 44 intermediate EFL learners (22 males and 22 females) were selected. Attempts were made to include an equal number of participants so that gender, as the potential intervening variable, will be controlled. After homogenization, the participants were assigned to experimental and control in equal numbers.

3.4.2. Treatment
This experiment is going to be done in three stages before, during and after the teaching program for both groups. The stages start with a questionnaire in order to obtain learners' autonomy
levels if it exists, and will continue with an oral interview to check students' abilities in English speaking skills.

During this stage, students will be treated as is expected in this study. The desired treatment is providing learner autonomy in learners' acquisition process. Considering the fact that PPP method is the expected teaching program. The last stage includes speaking tests at the end of the course to clarify the results. In addition, another questionnaire will be conducted to declare the learners' perception toward autonomous learning, and if it is changed during the process. Then it will end with an interview to measure the learners' fluency levels. The pretest and posttest is designed to be compared with control group in the same level of English Learning by the same teacher, book and situation.

3.5. Data Analysis

The gathered data were analyzed using independent and paired samples t-tests. All the statistical analyses were conducted using the SPSS version 21. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed by content analysis.

4. RESEARCH RESULT

In the preceding chapter, a description of the methodologies which were exploited in the current study was presented. The present chapter provides the results of the data analysis phase of the study to help come up with answers to the research questions of the study. As was delineated in chapter one, the research questions of this study were:

1) Does the Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) method have a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' autonomy in speaking?
2) What is Iranian EFL learners' perception of autonomous language learning in English language classes?

Therefore, after homogenization, 44 intermediate EFL learners (22 males and 22 females) were selected. Then the participants were assigned to experimental and control in equal numbers: Experimental Group (11 males, 11 females), Control Group (11 males, 11 females).

This experiment was done in three stages before, during and after the teaching program autonomy questionnaires with an oral interview is provided to check students' abilities in English speaking skills. During the experiment, the treatment is done through PPP method.

This section, thus, presents the results of a paired sample T-test used to compare (a) the pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control group, individually, and (b) the posttest scores of the two groups through independent samples t-test.

4.1. The First Research Question

As it was stated above, the first research question of the study was“ Does the Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) method have a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' autonomy in speaking?” This research question clearly wants to find out the possible effects of the PPP method on EFL learners’ autonomy in oral performance. To find the answer of this question, a paired sample T-test were used to compare the pre-test and post-test in experimental group.

4.1.1. Pretest to Posttest: Experimental Group

Table 4.1 shows the differences between pretest (autonomy questionnaire before treatment) and posttest (autonomy questionnaire after treatment) in the experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.86</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87.40</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 shows that the mean score of the pre-test is $M = 50.86$ ($SD = 11.92$) and the mean score of the post-test is $M = 87.40$ ($SD = 12.77$). This result indicated that the mean score of post-test is more than the mean score of the pre-test. This is to say that the treatment improve learners’ autonomy in L2 oral performance. To figure out whether the differences among these mean scores were significant or not, one needs to check the $p$ value under the Sig. column in the paired sample T-test table below.

Table 4.2 Results of Independent Sample T-test for Comparing Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 test1</td>
<td>-36.54</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-46.16</td>
<td>-26.92</td>
<td>-7.901</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is displayed in Table 4.2, there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for experimental group since the $p$ value under the Sig. column is less than the specified level of significance ($p > .000$). This result indicates that the treatment was effective in experimental group, in a way that it improves the states of autonomy in learners.

4.1.2 Pretest to Posttest: Control Group

Table 4.3 shows the differences between pre-test (autonomy questionnaire before treatment) and posttest (autonomy questionnaire after treatment) in the control group.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Pretest and Posttest in Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that the mean score of the pretest is $M = 49.18$ ($SD = 10.12$) and the mean score of the posttest is $M = 52.09$ ($SD = 9.57$). To figure out whether the differences among these mean scores were significant or not, one needs to check the $p$ value under the Sig. column in the paired sample T-test table below.

Table 4.4 Results of Paired Sample T-test for Comparing Pretest and Posttest in Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 test1</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-6.85</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 results indicate that the mean score of post-test is more than the mean score of the pre-test. This is to say that the treatment improve learners’ autonomy in L2 oral performance.
As it is displayed in Table 4.3, there was not a statistically significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores for control group because the p value under the Sig. column is greater than the specified level of significance ($p = .140$). This result indicates that the in control group, the autonomy state of EFL learners wasn’t improved.

### 4.1.3 Posttests: Experimental vs. Control Group

Table 4.5 shows the results of an independent samples T-test descriptive statistics for the comparison of the two groups on the posttest.

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Experimental and Control Group Posttests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87.40</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4.5, the mean scores of the experimental group ($M = 87.40$, $SD = 12.77$) and control group ($M = 52.09$, $SD = 9.57$), were different from each other. To find out whether the differences among these mean scores were of statistical significance or not, one should look down the Sig. column Table 4.6 below.

**Table 4.6 Results of Independent Sample T-test for Comparing Experimental and Control Mean Scores on the posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As could be seen in Table 4.6, there was a statistically significant difference in posttest scores for experimental ($M = 87.40$, $SD = 12.77$) and control group ($M = 52.09$, $SD = 9.57$), since the p value under the Sig. column was less than the specified level of significance ($p < .05$). To sum up, the experimental group outperformed the control group significantly on the posttest.

### 4.2. The Second Research Question

As it was mentioned before, the second research question of the study was” What is Iranian EFL learners’ perception of autonomous language learning in English language classes?”

Clearly, this question wants to find EFL learners’ perception of autonomous language learning after the treatment. To find an answer to this research question, we analyzed the interview question which was asked from the participants in experimental group before and after the treatment. The interview question is: which activity do you think can help you with improving speaking skill when you are not in English class?
Table 4.7. The Results of the Second Interview Question for Experimental Group(Before)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Exp. group</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing the class book</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing assignments</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorize the vocabularies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat with Natives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with friends in English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the output shown above, we know that there are 22 interviewees (all the participants in Experimental group). They mentioned the possible activities that they can do themselves out of class to practice and improve English speaking. These activities are practicing the class book, memorizing the vocabularies, doing assignments, chat with natives and speaking with friends in English. As the table indicated, 45% of the participants didn’t know the activities which they can do out of the class. Table 4.8 shows the results of the same question after the treatment.

Table 4.8. The Results of the Second Interview Question for Experimental Group(after)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Exp. group</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read newspaper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch English movies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Foreigners in English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to English Songs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat with Natives</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak with friends in English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the output shown above, we know that there are 22 interviewees (all the participants in Experimental group). They mentioned the possible activities that they can do themselves out of class to practice and improve English speaking. These activities are: reading English newspaper, watching English movies, talking to foreigners in English, chat with natives, listen to English songs and speaking with friends in English. The frequencies for each activity are shown in the table. The results of the two interviews indicated that the perception of the participants was improved after the treatment.

5. DISCUSSION
5.1 The First Research Question

As stated earlier, the first research question was: “Does the Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) method have a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' autonomy in speaking?” Based on the obtained results in this study, it is found a statistically significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores for experimental group. Also, it is found that the experimental group outperformed the control group significantly on the posttest. It is indicated that the PPP method was found effective in improving learners’ autonomy in speaking. Therefore, the results rejected the first hypothesis.

According to Abghari et. al (2004), the role of teachers in the presentation stage is that of an informant, in the practice stage that of a guide and in the production stage that of an observer. Therefore, we would argue that through the first two stages the teacher’s job is to only provide some degree of dependence and in the final stage he or she is expected to simply give his or her students some degree of independence (autonomy). Therefore, this fact supports our finding that PPP method improves learners’ autonomy in learning.
5.2 The Second Research Question

The second research question was: “What is Iranian EFL learners’ perception of autonomous language learning in English language classes?” Based on the content analysis which was used for analyzing the two interviews, it was found that the perception of the participants was improved after the treatment. It was indicated that the participants’ perception of autonomous learning was in a good level after the treatment. It can be concluded that, they can find ways for learning individually. On the other hand, they can compensate the nonexistence of teachers in their daily life of language learning.

As Benson (2001) points out, the teacher cannot teach students to become autonomous. But, the teacher may create such atmosphere and conditions in which they will be encouraged to develop the autonomy that they already have. He also suggested that autonomy is not “a method of learning, but an attribute of learner’s approach to the learning process.”

6. CONCLUSION

The present study was designed to investigate the effects of the presentation, practice, production method on Iranian EFL learners’ autonomy in speaking. The following results were reached upon the completion of the experiment: (a) the PPP method was found significantly effective in improving learners’ autonomy in speaking, and (b) that the perception of the participants was improved after the treatment. In another word, the PPP method helped learners to improve their level of perception in autonomous learning. Moreover, it should be noted that the autonomy cannot be taught directly. Preparing autonomous atmosphere can maximize the learners’ autonomy.
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8. APPENDIX A

If you have the opportunity, how good do you think you would be at doing the following activities? Please choose from the following rating.

Very poor           Poor         OK             Good              Very good

1. choosing learning activities in class
2. choosing learning activities outside class
3. choosing learning objectives in class
4. choosing learning objectives outside class
5. choosing learning materials in class
6. choosing learning materials outside class
7. deciding what you should learn next in your English lessons
8. deciding how long to spend on each activity
9. identifying your weaknesses in English
10. evaluating your learning

Autonomy in language learning: do students take responsibility for their learning?

9. ACTIVITIES

Last year and in this academic year, how often have you

Always Often Sometimes Rarely Never
1. done assignments which are not compulsory?
2. noted down new words and their meanings?
3. read newspapers in English?
4. visited your teacher about your work?
5. read books or magazines in English?
6. watched English TV programs?
7. listened to English songs?
8. talked to foreigners in English?
9. practiced using English with friends
10. done grammar exercises?
11. done group studies in English lessons?
12. attended the self-study center?
13. asked the teacher questions when you didn’t understand?
14. made suggestions to the teacher?
15. planned your lesson/study?
16. activated your prior knowledge while studying?
17. made inferences about your lesson?
18. done classifications while studying?
19. summarised your studies while studying?
20. taken notes while studying?
21. used resources while studying?
22. worked cooperatively with your friends?