

Language Learning Autonomy among Jordanian EFL University Students

Misarah Zreagat, Sarjit Kaur
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
E-mail address: zreaqatfib@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Autonomy in language learning has gained prominence due to the preference for learner-centred styles. An implementation of autonomy in learning should be preceded by an investigation of learners' readiness for autonomous learning, taking into account the cultural differences of different communities. This article reports findings about the perceived learning autonomy among EFL university students in Yarmouk University in Jordan. 154 students taking English proficiency based courses and five lecturers teaching these courses took part in the research. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to conduct the research. A 43-item questionnaire adapted from Chan, Spratt & Humphreys (2002) was used to collect the quantitative data while semi-structured interviews were conducted with the students and their lecturers. The findings revealed that teaching of English is still highly teacher-centred in Jordanian university classrooms. In relation to the autonomy construct, the results show that although Jordanian EFL university students feel that they are, somehow responsible for autonomous learning, they do not possess the ability to act autonomously nor do they embark on engaging in any autonomous activities. The implications of this study suggest that policy makers in Jordan need to pay more attention to the process of teaching English in Jordanian universities.

Keywords: *ESL/EFL, learning autonomy, autonomous activities, learner-centred styles, self-determination theory*

INTRODUCTION

The language that was once spoken by 50,000 people in the suburbs of London is now a world language spoken by more than 1.5 billion people around the world as a first, second or a foreign language for communication purposes (Graddol, 2006). Graddol goes on to say that over 1.5 billion people use English for communication purposes nowadays. While one fourth of all English users are native speakers, the remaining majority use English as a second or foreign language to communicate with both native and non-native speakers of English.

One of the main factors influencing the process of learning English language, especially in foreign language classrooms is language learning autonomy. Autonomy in language learning is defined as “the ability to take charge of one’s learning” (Holec, 1981, p.3). Gardner & Miller (1999) view learning autonomy as the process of taking personal responsibility for one’s own progress. They further explain that this process requires self-assessment in order to determine one’s level of knowledge and skills. The learner in this process is seen as a decision-maker who is able to select the tools and resources appropriate to the task given. Little (2003) who defines learning autonomy as the extent to which learners demonstrate the ability to take control of their learning believes that learning autonomy is a process that requires insight, a positive attitude, a capacity for reflection and a readiness to be proactive in self-management. This belief is based on the premise that autonomy can increase motivation to learn and consequently, increase learning effectiveness. This is because learner autonomy researchers seem to agree that autonomous learners understand the purpose of the learning programme and tend to accept the responsibility to share the objectives together with planning and executing the learning activities. So, when learners understand the objectives and then take part in the planning process, “it will in turn lead to more effective learning because these learners will be more engaged with their learning process” (Little, 1995, 2003).

Over the past few decades, there has been an extensive body of research on autonomy in language learning where many researchers addressed the importance of this construct in numerous ESL/EFL learning settings (Oxford, 1990; Benson, 2001; Aoki, 2003; Kuen, 2005; 2007; Sidhu, 2009; Sidhu, Kaur & Chan, 2011). The findings of most of these

studies revealed that a positive relationship exists between autonomy and effective language learning where when more autonomy is involved, more effective learning takes place. Moreover, in today's era of globalization and interconnected technology and with people being constantly bombarded with new information and communication technologies, there is a critical need for learners to constantly update and upgrade their skills through self learning. These are essential tools for people to stay relevant in today's increasingly globalised and technological world.

As the field of second and foreign language teaching and learning enters a new century, the idea of helping learners become more autonomous has become increasingly important. Finch (2002) posits two main justifications for promoting learning autonomy. The first one is that if learners are reflectively engaged with their learning, they are more likely to be efficient and effective because when learners are more focused, they are more likely to make use of what they learn and this would in turn serve their wider agendas. The second justification Finch gives is that if learners are proactively committed to their learning, they are more likely to be motivated to learn the language and it is well documented in literature that high motivation, especially intrinsic motivation in learning a language leads to better language performance.

Little (2003) adds another justification for advocating autonomy in language learning; this justification is grounded on the idea that effective communication depends on a complex set of procedural skills which develop only through use and if language learning depends totally on language use, learners who enjoy a high degree of social autonomy in their learning environment should find it easier than others to master the full range of discourse roles on which effective spontaneous communication depends.

LEARNING AUTONOMY: CONTEXT AND FOCUS

The theoretical background of learning autonomy was addressed by Ryan and Deci (2000) based on the Self-Determination theory (SDT hereafter). SDT is a broad meta-theory modified and developed through the work of Ryan and Deci (2000; 2002). The theory was developed on the basis that some individuals tend to become more actively involved in the world around

them than other individuals. These individuals attempt to seize opportunities that would help them develop and grow to become more productive individuals in the environment around them (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

Within the theory of Self-determination, two main postulates have been proposed. The first postulate refers to the idea that individuals possess three basic psychological needs. These needs include: the need for competence, the need for relatedness and finally the need for autonomy. According to Ryan & Deci (2002), competence refers to “feeling effective in one’s ongoing interactions with the social environment and experiencing opportunities to exercise and express one’s capacities” (p. 7). The need for relatedness refers to an individual’s need to feel a sense of belonging and connection with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2002). Finally and as far as psychology is concerned, autonomy refers to an individual’s perception that he has control and is the origin of his own behavior (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

The second postulate within SDT refers to the idea that individuals have a relationship with the environment around them. This relationship is interactive and does not stop but keeps going. When the external environment satisfies individuals’ three basic psychological needs, these individuals are expected to experience good growth, functioning and development. On the other hand, when the external environment does not satisfy the three basic psychological needs of individuals, they are expected to experience less growth and development. In other words, the environment around individuals may either facilitate or inhibit satisfaction of these individuals’ psychological needs. Hence, the concept of the three basic psychological needs together with the interaction of the environment serve as the two underlying premises of SDT.

From the SDT hails the construct of autonomy-support. As mentioned above, the well-being and growth of individuals are influenced by some environmental factors through the impact these factors leave on the psychological needs of individuals. Some of these environmental factors might include the provision of rewards or the provision of positive feedback. However, recent developments with regard to SDT include individuals’ interpersonal styles as factors influencing individuals’ growth, well-being and development (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Two contrasting types of

interpersonal styles have been identified: autonomy-support interpersonal styles and control interpersonal styles.

In the teaching domain, Reeve, Bolt & Cai (1999) give examples of such autonomy-supportive behaviors as when teachers, lecturers or trainers listen to their students, ask about students' wants and needs, respond to students' questions, use little directives, offer perspectives, take statements and reveal answers to problems sparingly. Assor, Kaplan & Roth (2002) address some of these behaviors in the teaching domain stating that teachers, lecturers or trainers are autonomy-supportive when they foster relevance, provide choice, allow for students' criticisms and when they encourage the independent thinking of their learners. Reeve & Jang (2006) point out that teachers are autonomy-supportive when they attend to students by listening, asking them what they want, giving them adequate time to solve a problem in their own way, allowing students to talk, providing information and rationales for activities, giving praise, offering hints and encouragements and responding to students' questions.

In contrast, controlling interpersonal styles refer to the situation where an individual who is in a position of authority like an instructor, a trainer or a coach uses directive language or extrinsic rewards paying no attention to the feelings of others. These authoritative individuals do so in an attempt to get others to follow some already established agendas. As far as the teaching domain is concerned, Reeve & Jang (2006, p.228) are of the opinion that:

"...relatively controlling teachers ask students to adhere to a teacher constructed instructional agenda that alienates students from their inner motivational resources and instead defines what students should or must do. In doing so, controlling teachers offer extrinsic rewards and pressuring language to shape students into compliance with that agenda".

Thus, the idea of integrating teaching and learning styles that support and make use of learning autonomy has been agreed upon by many researchers. However, before designing or adapting activities to promote autonomous language learning, it is crucially important to study learners' readiness for learning autonomy considering that EFL learners come from different places around the world and have diverse cultures.

The issue of cultural differences in learning autonomy is also addressed by Kasworm and Bing (1992) who point out that most of the research on learning autonomy has been done in Western countries and therefore, there is a need to consider the research results in non-Western contexts especially since these countries use different approaches to teaching and learning than those used in the West. This view of learning autonomy is supported by Pennycook (1997) who believes that the notion of learning autonomy is purely a Western construct and has limited applicability to other cultural contexts.

Thus, since autonomy in foreign language learning is context-specific and is perceived differently in different cultures, an examination of Jordanian students' attitudes to learning autonomy is important for Jordan, which is a Middle Eastern country located between the East and the West. Moreover, students in Jordan seem to face a major problem in dealing with English as a foreign language and research studies reveal that their performance in English language is unsatisfactory (Abu Samak, 2006; Werikat, 2009).

METHOD

The study investigated language learning autonomy among Jordanian EFL university students. 154 students from Yarmouk University participated in the study. The students are doing their bachelor degrees in various academic disciplines and taking proficiency-based courses. Five lecturers who teach proficiency-based courses in the same university took part in the study. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used in the study. A 43-item questionnaire adapted from Chan, Spratt & Humphreys (2002) was used with the sample students to conduct the quantitative part of the study (Refer to Appendix A) while semi-structured interviews with the students and their lecturers were used to conduct the qualitative part of the study.

The questionnaire, adapted from Ryan & Deci (2000, 2002), consists of three sections, all of which are related to autonomous learning. The three sections include students' perceptions of their responsibilities, students' perceptions of their own abilities to be autonomous language learners and the actual autonomous activities students engage in whether inside or outside English classrooms. The semi-structured interviews also addressed the three

themes and serve the purpose of data triangulation to validate the findings generated from the questionnaires. In a similar vein, focus group interviews were carried out among 18 students (coded as S1-S18) who volunteered to be interviewed and semi-structured interviews were held with the five lecturers (coded as L1-L5). For the quantitative data, the researchers used a group of analytical statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to provide a descriptive analysis of the respondents' responses to the items in the questionnaires. The means of the respondents' answers were also calculated and described. Preliminary tests were used in an attempt to make sure the data collected for the research was testable using parametric test. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to ascertain that the data was normally distributed. Cronbach's Alpha was used to make sure the data collected for the study was reliable. The One-sample t-Test was used in order to explore the components of learning autonomy.

For the qualitative data of the study, the study's main construct (i.e. autonomy) was divided into themes. Each theme refers to one of the sub-variables of the construct. In principle, the following three themes cover learning autonomy:

1. Students' responsibility about autonomous learning (RES),
2. Their perceptions about being able to act autonomously (ABL), and
3. Their actual autonomous activities whether inside or outside EFL classrooms (ACT).

The themes were addressed and examined throughout the process of interviewing with both sets of interviewees, students and their lecturers. Direct quotes from the transcripts were used to validate the claims and a comparison between the findings generated from interviews and the others generated from the questionnaires were later made in a descriptive narrative style. In selecting respondents for this study, the researchers excluded students who had been in foreign countries for more than six months as their English proficiency was expected to be better than those who had never left the country.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In relation to the first component of language autonomy, the results of the statistical tests regarding the means of the students' answers of this component show that students' responsibility about autonomous learning (RES hereafter) exists among Jordanian EFL university students when the *t* value was reported to be 3.361 and this existence was seen to be statistically significant when the *p* value was reported to be 0.001 (less than 0.05). In other words, Jordanian EFL university students view themselves as being responsible for autonomous learning and that learning autonomy is part of their responsibility and not only the responsibility of their teachers. Table 1 provides a detailed description of the means of students' answers regarding the first component of learning autonomy (RES). The mean values were slightly above 3 and the lowest mean was for one of the items (RES10) concerning students being responsible to choose what materials to use to learn English in their English lessons (mean= 2.84). However, it can be seen that the mean was 3.18 (more than 3) with a relatively low standard deviation .66. This indicates that students do feel responsible for being autonomous learners.

Table 1: Students' Responsibility about Autonomous Learning

Item No.	Statement on Students' Responsibilities (RES)	Mean	Std. Deviation
RES1	Make sure I make progress during lessons	3.25	1.24
RES2	Make sure I make progress outside class	3.30	1.31
RES3	Stimulate interest in learning English	3.59	1.27
RES4	Make sure I work harder	3.41	1.25
RES5	Identify my weaknesses in English	3.37	1.26
RES6	Decide the objectives of my English course	2.91	1.35
RES7	Decide what I should learn next in my English lessons	2.88	1.20
RES8	Choose what activities to use to learn English in my English lessons	2.86	1.28
RES13	Decide how long to spend on each activity	2.90	1.26
RES10	Choose what materials to use to learn English in my English lessons	2.84	1.25
RES11	Evaluate my learning	3.42	1.34

Cont..

RES12	Evaluate my courses	3.13	1.27
RES9	Decide what I learn outside class	3.47	1.36
Total		3.18	0.66

The qualitative findings generated from the focus group interviews with the students are in agreement with those generated from the questionnaires. In relation to the first theme of the autonomy construct, the students' responsibility about autonomous learning (RES), the qualitative findings show that the students believe their roles are influential in the teaching-learning process. They also believe that they share the responsibility of teaching and learning with their lecturers. This means that students feel responsible for engaging in autonomous learning. This corresponds with the findings generated from analysing the questionnaires. The following few quotes were taken from the data collected from the semi-structured interviews with both lecturers and students. In the excerpts below, the letter 'S' represents the student respondent and the letter 'L' represents the lecturer.

"It's not the responsibility of the teacher, it's ours as this is not the first time we study English. So, we're familiar with the topics and the way of studying. That's why it's our responsibilities even to help the teacher choose the activities to be given inside English classes." (S4).

"I think we should share the responsibility with the teachers; we should discuss and bring about ideas together." (S13).

The qualitative findings generated from the lecturers' semi-structured individual interviews show that the teachers believe that it is a shared responsibility between both teachers and their students to be autonomous learners. The following excerpt from a female lecturer addresses this issue:

"Well, it is mutual where students together with their teachers are responsible for autonomous learning. It is even a bad idea if students think that it is the responsibility of the teachers only. If they do, they will not give learning the effort needed from their side and the whole learning process would fall." (L1).

A male lecturer concurred with this view concerning the responsibility in autonomous learning stating that it is the responsibility of both teachers and their students to help students become autonomous learners. However, the respondent said that most students do not think that autonomy is a shared responsibility but rather a responsibility for their teachers. In this context, the respondent said:

“Definitely, the two parties, lecturers and students share this responsibility. But the problem is that our students do not think that it is their responsibility to take part in the learning process. They think it is the responsibility of the teacher to make sure they learn English while students’ sole responsibility is to come to the classroom.” (L3).

In analysing the second component of language autonomy (ABL), the results of the statistical tests regarding the means of the students’ answers concerning this component in which the One-Sample t test was used show that the mean of the students’ answers was below 3 which indicates that ABL does not exist among Jordanian EFL university students. The t value was reported to be -2.625 which is a negative result. The p value of the result was reported to be 0.01 which indicates that the finding was also statistically significant. In other words, although Jordanian EFL university students view themselves as being responsible for autonomous learning, they do not have the ability to be autonomous learners (ABL). A detailed description of the means of the students’ responses regarding this component is provided in Table 2. The table shows that the majority of students’ means were below 3, except for items ABL3 and ABL7 where their means were 3.16 and 3.06 respectively. This indicates that although students feel responsible for autonomous learning in the previous component, they do not possess the ability to become autonomous learners. This is substantiated by the mean value of all the responses for the second component which was 2.84 (less than 3).

Table 2: Students' Abilities to Act Autonomously

Item No.	Statement on Students' Abilities (ABL)	Mean	Std. Deviation
ABL1	Choosing learning objectives in class	2.79	1.02
ABL2	Deciding what I should learn next in your English lessons	2.88	1.02
ABL3	Identifying my weaknesses in English	3.16	1.23
ABL4	Choosing learning activities in class	2.64	1.06
ABL9	Deciding how long to spend on each activity	2.66	1.24
ABL6	Choosing learning materials in class	2.58	1.19
ABL7	Evaluating my learning	3.06	1.21
ABL8	Evaluating my course	2.77	1.19
ABL9	Choosing learning objectives outside class	3.00	1.29
Total		2.84	0.77

Concerning the students' ability to act autonomously (ABL), the qualitative findings of students' semi-structured interviews revealed that the students did not possess the ability to do autonomous activities on their own. This also corresponds with the findings generated from students' questionnaires. The following excerpts were taken from the respondents' focus group interview sessions while addressing the theme of ABL:

"I don't really possess the ability to act autonomously and I still need others to help me do it." (S2).

"No, because I still don't know what we have to study and what is useful for us." (S9).

The qualitative findings generated from the lecturers' semi-structured individual interviews show that the teachers believe that their students do not possess the ability to act autonomously. Some lecturers attributed this to students' poor English language proficiency. This aspect of students' lack of ability to act autonomously corresponds with the findings generated from the questionnaires and also with other findings generated from the interviews with students themselves where most students admit they do not possess the ability to act autonomously. The following quote was taken from one of the female lecturers in addressing her students' ability to act autonomously:

“Out of 60 students inside the classroom, only 3 or 4 show some autonomous ability. The reason why there are only very few people is because our students have very poor English proficiency that a lot cannot perform simple tasks for example like composing a correct simple sentence or having very simple conversations like introducing themselves for example.” (L2).

A male lecturer supported this view by stating that Jordanian EFL students do not engage in autonomous activities as many of them depend on their teachers in almost all the matters concerned with teaching-learning process. The lecturer said:

“For the time being, I do not think that my students have the ability to do autonomous activities, they actually depend on us, the teachers, in almost every single matter that has to do with the process of teaching and learning.” (L5).

In analysing the final component of learning autonomy (ACT), which reflects the real autonomous activities done by students inside and outside EFL classrooms, the One-Sample t test shows that ACT does not exist among Jordanian EFL university students when the t value was reported to be -10.40 and this result was seen to be statistically significant when the p value was reported to be 0.000. In other words, Jordanian EFL university students do not seem to carry out autonomous activities inside and outside their EFL classrooms. A detailed description of the means of the students' answers regarding this component is provided in Table 3. The table shows that the majority of students' means were below 3 except for item ACT16 where the mean was 3.07 with a standard deviation of 1.1. This indicates that Jordanian EFL students do not do autonomous activities inside or outside English classrooms. This is supported by the mean of all the responses for the third component which was 2.50 (less than 3) with a relatively low standard deviation 0.59.

Table 3: Students' Actual Autonomous Activities

Item No.	Statement on Students' Autonomous Activities (ACT)	Mean	Std. Deviation
ACT1	Read grammar books on my own	2.47	1.18
ACT2	Done assignments which are not compulsory	2.08	1.06
ACT3	Noted down new words and their meanings	2.75	1.11
ACT4	Written English letters to pen pals	2.35	1.16
ACT5	Read English notices around me	2.87	1.11
ACT6	Read newspapers in English	2.19	1.18
ACT7	Sent e-mails in English	2.65	1.17
ACT8	Read books or magazines in English	2.46	1.14
ACT9	Watched English TV programs	2.94	1.10
ACT10	Listened to English radio	2.20	1.18
ACT11	Listened to English songs	2.75	1.17
ACT12	Talked to foreigners in English	2.45	1.17
ACT13	Practiced using English with friends	2.51	1.07
ACT14	Done English self-study in a group	2.26	1.13
ACT15	Done grammar exercises	2.91	1.04
ACT16	Watched English movies	3.07	1.10
ACT17	Written a diary in English	2.18	1.16
ACT18	Used the internet in English	2.95	1.03
ACT19	Done revision not required by the teacher	2.06	1.02
ACT20	Collected texts in English	1.97	1.04
ACT21	Gone to see teacher about work	2.46	1.01
	Total	2.50	0.59

For the last theme of the autonomy construct, the students' actual autonomous activities (ACT), the qualitative findings generated from the students' focus group interviews show that the students do not engage in autonomous activities. This makes sense as it has been reported earlier that they do not perceive themselves as being able to act autonomously. In this regard, literature has provided us with evidence that perceived competence is a reflection of actual competence (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide & Shimuzu, 2004). In this study, students' perceived ability to act autonomously (perceived competence) is a reflection of their actual autonomous activities (actual competence). The following excerpts were taken from some of the

student respondents while they were addressing their actual autonomous activities:

“I hardly ever watch TV programs in English, even when I do, I normally stop watching when I find it difficult to understand.”(S3).

“No, I do not read English newspapers or I hardly ever do.” (S11).

“I sometimes listen to English songs and watch English movies on T.V.” (S17).

To summarize, the previous analytical tests concerning the components of the construct learning autonomy (RES, ABL and ACT) show that the two components of ABL and ACT do not exist among Jordanian EFL university students while the component of RES does exist. In other words, although students view themselves as being responsible for autonomous language learning, they do not have the ability to do so nor do they carry out autonomous activities. Furthermore, the findings of this study lend support to the baseline report about education in Jordan in which Neumann (2006) states that teaching in Jordan is viewed as teacher-centred rather than student-centred whereby teachers are seen by their students as representing the ultimate sources for knowledge and information.

CONCLUSION

The current research attempted to investigate Jordanian EFL university students' perceptions of their English language learning autonomy at Yarmouk University. The findings from both the qualitative and the quantitative analysis reveal that teaching of English as a foreign language is still highly teacher-centred in Jordanian university classrooms. For the components of the autonomy construct, the findings reveal that although Jordanian EFL university students feel that they are, somehow, responsible for autonomous learning, they do not possess the ability to act autonomously nor do they embark on carrying out any autonomous activities. Moreover, the findings generated from the quantitative analysis correspond with those generated from the qualitative analysis. In other words, the qualitative data of the study acts as a tool that would help interpret, understand and explain the quantitative data.

The findings of the study have critical importance to the social, economic and political domains of Jordanian society as it implies that more concerted efforts should be taken to make sure Jordanian students get better opportunities to learn and use English effectively. One step that would help in achieving this goal would be by increasing the financial budget assigned for teaching English at schools and universities in Jordan. In this way, effective English language instruction can be provided in EFL classrooms and more EFL teachers can be recruited in Jordan. The Jordanian Ministry of Education also needs to organise more professional development training courses for EFL teachers working in schools. In designing these training courses, autonomy in learning English should be promoted. Providing relevant and effective training courses periodically for EFL teachers are important tools to help ensure teachers cope with the recent English teaching methods among which autonomy constitutes an important tool to achieve better English performance and use (Shinge, 2005; Aliweh, 2011).

The government in Jordan needs to understand that teachers are key players in the teaching-learning process (Banks & Banks, 2005) and that education should be a priority in the whole process of the reform the government has been seeking during the last few years. The findings from the interview sessions with both lecturers and students revealed that the root problem with English language learning in Jordan starts back in schools and the solutions should start from there. The lecturers pointed out that their students come to university with very poor levels of English proficiency and with limited abilities to act autonomously and they find it difficult to deal with them. This suggests that there should be closer cooperation between the Ministry of Education (MOE) which is responsible for primary and secondary education and the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), which is responsible for university education. Both these ministries can work together to bridge the divide between schools and universities in relation to inculcating autonomous learning among EFL learners in Jordan.

REFERENCES

- Abu Samak, Z. T. (2006). An exploration of Jordanian English language teachers' attitudes, skills and access as indicator of information and communication technology (ICT) Integration in Jordan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Florida, USA.
- Aliweh, A. (2011). The effect of electronic portfolios on promoting Egyptian EFL college students' writing competence and autonomy. *Asian EFL Journal* (13), 90-133.
- Aoki, N. (2003). Expanding space for reflection and collaboration. In A. Barfield and M. Nix (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy in Japan 1: Autonomy you ask!* Tokyo: Learner Development Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of Language Teachers.
- Assor, A., Kaplan, H. & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviors predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, (72), 261-278.
- Banks, J. & Banks, C. (2005). *Multicultural education, issues and perspectives*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baumeister, R.F. & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Chan, V., Spratt, M. & Humphreys, G. (2002). Autonomous language learning: Hong Kong tertiary students' attitudes and behaviours. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8, 33-54.
- Finch, A. (2002). Autonomy: Where are we? Where are we going? JALT CUE-SIG Proceedings, 15-42.
- Gardner, D. & Miller, L. (1999). *Establishing self-access: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of English as a FLreign language*. London: The British Council.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon. (First published [1979], Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Kasworm, C. E. & Bing, Y. (1992). *The development of adult learner autonomy and self-directedness in distance education*, (Report No. CE 063 391), Springfield, VA: DYNEDRS. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 453).
- Kuen, N. K. (2005). A collaborative perspective for autonomy in teaching and learning. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 5 (1), 1-17.
- Little, D. (1995). The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, (23), 175-181.
- Little, D. (2003). *Learner autonomy and second/foreign language learning*. Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, Guide to good practice. UK: University of Southampton.
- Neumann, K. (2006). Baseline report - RCE Jordan: Context of RCE development. United Nations University International Leadership Institute, Amman, Jordan.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Pennycook, A. (1997). Cultural alternatives and autonomy. In P. Benson and P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning* (pp. 35-53). London: Longman.
- Reeve, J., Bolt, E., & Cai, Y. (1999). Autonomy-supportive teachers: How they teach and motivate students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 537-548.
- Reeve, J. (2002). Self-determination theory applied to educational setting. In E. L. Deci, & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 183-203). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

- Reeve, J. & Jang, H. (2006, August). Engagement: Autonomy support or structure versus autonomy support and structure. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. New Orleans: LA.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). The paradox of achievement: Harder you push, the worse it gets. In J. Aronson (Ed.). *Improving academic achievement: Contributions of social psychology* (pp. 59 – 85). New York: Academic Press.
- Shinge, M. (2005). Interplay among anxiety, motivation and autonomy in second language learners of French. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Florida, USA.
- Sidhu, G. K. (2009). Empowering learners through strategy training. In S.W. Thang and B. Sinclair (Eds.), *Learner autonomy: Research and practice in Malaysia and Singapore* (pp.106-134). Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysian Sdn. Bhd.
- Sidhu, G. K, Kaur, S. & Chan, Y. F. (2011). Developing learner autonomy in the ESL classroom through the use of learning contracts. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 19 (1), 217–232.
- Werikat, Y. (2009). *An evaluation of Jordanian in-service EFL teachers training programmes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Penang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L. & Shimuzu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and effect on willingness to communicate in second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54 (2), 119-152.

6. Decide the objectives of my English course تحديد اهداف مساق اللغة الانجليزية					
7. Decide what I should learn next in your English lessons ان تقرر ما يجب تعلمه تاليا في دروس اللغة الانجليزية					
8. Choose what activities to use to learn English in my English lessons اختيار النشاطات المستخدمة لتعلم اللغة الانجليزية داخل المحاضرات					
9. Decide how long to spend on each activity ان تقرر الوقت الذي ينبغي عليك قضاءه لكل نشاط					
10. Choose what materials to use to learn English in my English lessons اختيار الادوات والمناهج لاستخدامها في محاضرات اللغة الانجليزية					
11 Evaluate my learning تقييم مستوى تعلمك					
12. Evaluate my courses تقييم مستوى المساق بشكل عام					
13. Decide what I learn outside class ان تقرر ماذا يجب ان تتعلم خارج المحاضرة (في البيت او خارج الجامعة)					

- **Students' perceptions of their own abilities in learning (ABL):** Indicate whether you think you are able to do the following activities. اشر الى مدى قدرتك على القيام بالاعمال التالية.

Items الفقرة	Very Poor ضعيفة جدا	Poor ضعيفة	Ok متوسطة	Good جيدة	Very Good جيدة جدا
14. Choosing learning objectives in class اختيار الاهداف التعليمية داخل المحاضرة					
15. Deciding what I should learn next in your English lessons ان تقرر ما يجب تعلمه تاليا في دروس اللغة الانجليزية					
16. Identify my weaknesses in English تحديد نقاط ضعفك باللغة الانجليزية					
17. Choosing learning activities in class اختيار الانشطة التعليمية داخل المحاضر					
18. Deciding how long to spend on each activity ان تقرر الوقت الذي ينبغي عليك قضاءه لكل نشاط					
19. Choosing learning materials in class اختيار الادوات والمواد لاستخدامها في محاضرات اللغة الانجليزية					
20. Evaluating my learning تقييم مستوى تعلمك					
21. Evaluating my course تقييم مستوى المساق بشكل عام					
22. Choosing learning objectives outside class تحديد الاهداف التعليمية خارج المحاضرة					

- **Students' engagement in / outside class learning activity: Indicate whether you normally do the following activities (ACT).** اشر الى ما اذا كنت تقوم عادة بالنشاطات التالية. (ACT).

Items الفقرة	Often غالباً	Sometimes احياناً	Rarely نادراً	Never ابداً
23. Read grammar books on my own اقرأ كتب خارجية لقواعد اللغة الانجليزية				
24. Do assignments which are not compulsory اعمل واجبات دراسية غير اجبارية				
25. Note down new words and their meanings ادون كلمات جديدة مع معانيها				
26. Write English letters to pen pals اكتب رسائل باللغة الانجليزية الى اصدقائي				
27. Read English notices around me اقرأ ملصقات باللغة الانجليزية حولي				
28. Read newspapers in English اقرأ جرائد باللغة الانجليزية				
29. Send e-mails in English ارسل ايميلات باللغة الانجليزية				
30. Read books or magazines in English اقرأ كتب او مجلات باللغة الانجليزية				
31. Watch English TV programs اشاهد برامج تلفزيونية باللغة الانجليزية				
32. Listen to English radio استمع الى الراديو باللغة الانجليزية				

33. Listen to English songs استمع الى اغاني باللغة الانجليزية				
34. Talk to foreigners in English اتكلم الى اجانب باللغة الانجليزية				
35. Practice using English with friends اتمرس على الكلام باللغة الانجليزية مع اصدقائي				
36. Do English self-study in a group اقوم بدراسة الانجليزية مع اصدقائي بعمل مجموعات دراسية				
37. Do grammar exercises اقوم بحل تمارين لقواعد اللغة الانجليزية				
38. Watch English movies اشاهد افلام باللغة الانجليزية				
39. Write a diary in English اكتب مذكراتي الشخصية باللغة الانجليزية				
40. Use the internet in English استخدم الانترنت باللغة الانجليزية				
41. Do revision not required by the teacher اقوم بمراجعة بعض المواضيع التي لم يطلب مني مدرس المادة مراجعتها				
42. Collect texts in English اجمع بعض المقالات باللغة الانجليزية				
43. Go to see teacher about work اذهب لمقابلة المدرس للسؤال عن المادة				

