

Developing Learner Autonomy in English as a Foreign Language Classes: Teachers' Perceptions on Its Feasibility

Silih Warni

(silihwarni@uhamka.ac.id)

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA (UHAMKA)
Jakarta, Indonesia

Nurhandayani Supraptiningsih

(nurhandayani@uhamka.ac.id)

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA (UHAMKA)
Jakarta, Indonesia

Roslaini

(nroslaini@yahoo.co.id)

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA (UHAMKA)
Jakarta, Indonesia

This study examined English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' perceptions toward how feasible it is to develop learner autonomy in secondary school context in Jakarta. 106 EFL teachers teaching in senior high schools in Jakarta took part and responded questionnaires concerning feasibility for developing learner autonomy in EFL context. The first part of the questionnaire explored the teachers' perceptions on the feasibility of involving learners in a range of language course decisions associated with learner autonomy. In this regard, teachers perceived that it is most feasible for students to get involved in decision making related to tasks and activities, topics, materials, and classroom management. The least feasible areas of choice are those related to teaching methodology and objectives. The second part of the questionnaire revealed how feasible it was, according to the teachers, for their students to develop a range of abilities associated with the capacity of learner autonomy. The discussion of the findings suggests that teachers' professional development program needs to take into account the teachers' understandings of the learner autonomy and the pedagogical aspects concerning how to promote this capacity on students.

Key words: learner autonomy, perception, teachers' professional development.

Studi ini menguji persepsi guru bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Asing (EFL) terhadap seberapa layak mengembangkan otonomi pelajar dalam konteks sekolah menengah di Jakarta. 106 guru EFL yang mengajar di sekolah menengah atas di Jakarta mengambil bagian dan menjawab kuesioner tentang kelayakan untuk mengembangkan otonomi pelajar dalam konteks EFL. Bagian pertama dari kuesioner menjelaskan persepsi guru tentang kelayakan melibatkan peserta didik dalam berbagai keputusan pada kegiatan pembelajaran yang terkait dengan otonomi pelajar. Dalam hal ini, guru berpandangan bahwa yang paling mungkin bagi siswa untuk terlibat dalam pengambilan keputusan adalah yang terkait dengan materi, topik pembelajaran, manajemen kelas, aktifitas kelas, dan penilaian. Area pilihan yang dianggap paling tidak mungkin adalah yang terkait dengan metodologi dan tujuan pengajaran. Bagian kedua dari kuesioner mengungkapkan seberapa mungkin bagi siswa mereka untuk mengembangkan berbagai kemampuan sebagai indikator otonomi pelajar. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa program pengembangan profesionalisme guru perlu mempertimbangkan pemahaman guru tentang otonomi pelajar dan aspek pedagogis mengenai bagaimana meningkatkan kapasitas ini pada siswa.

INTRODUCTION

The growing need to promote a learning community which is ready and responsive to the constant society changes such as progressive globalisation the unstoppable growth of knowledge has made the notion of autonomy an essential element in educational policy, for both learners and teachers (Manzano Vázquez, 2018). In the context of language education, learner autonomy as the capacity to take control of one's own learning (Phil Benson, 2013) is widely acknowledged as a prominent capacity contributing to the success of foreign language learning (Dincer, Yesilyurt, & Takkac, 2012; Ghorbandordinejad & Ahmadabad, 2016). The concern on the pedagogical components of language learning needs to focus not only on the teaching materials but also on the way language learning should happen (Ahmadianzadeh, Seifoori, & Hadidi Tamjid, 2018).

Recent developments in the field of learner autonomy in language learning have led to a renewed interest in how to develop this capacity among students in different social and cultural contexts, including Asian context. Some studies have explored the teachers' understandings of learner autonomy capacity and their beliefs on the feasibility for developing the capacity on foreign language learners (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018; Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012; Borg & Alshumaimeri, 2019; Lengkanawati, 2017; Nguyen & Walkinshaw, 2018).

Teachers' instructional practices in the classroom influence how students learn, and teachers' beliefs have an impact on how they behave (Skott, 2014). How teachers perceive learner autonomy will thus influence how much and how teachers promote it. In turn, it will determine the opportunities that learners have to become autonomous (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018; Borg & Alshumaimeri, 2019).

Benson (201, p.58) defined autonomy as "the capacity to take control over one's own learning". The dimensions of 'control' involve "control over learning management, control over cognitive processes and control over learning content" (P Benson, 2011, p. 92). Control over learning management is "described in terms of behaviours involved in the planning, organisation

and evaluation of learning” (Benson, 2011, p.92). While learning management refers to observable behaviours, control over learning management refers to cognitive competences underlying the observable behaviours (Phil Benson, 2011). The focus of control over learning management is mainly on the cognitive and attitudinal aspects underlying learning management. Learning strategies that are classified as indirect strategies involving metacognitive, social and affective strategies (Oxford, 1990) were identified as an important component shaping the control over learning management (Phil Benson, 2011). Metacognitive strategies include “thinking about the learning process, planning for the learning, monitoring the learning task, and evaluating how well one has learned” (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990, p.137). In an extensive taxonomy of social and affective strategies, Oxford (1990) defines social strategies as actions taken in relation to others, while affective strategies are actions taken in relation to self. Social strategies are behavioural, and a learning task that is intended to enhance the social strategies must give students opportunities to interact and cooperate with others.

Control over cognitive processing is purely cognitive as it does not focus on the direct control of behaviour, but rather on “the control over the cognitive processes through which management and content are processed” (Benson, 2011, p.100). He asserted that the capacity that links to this dimension of control includes metacognitive knowledge, defined as “stable, storable and sometimes fallible knowledge learners acquire about themselves as learners and the learning process” (Wenden, 1995, p.185). This knowledge is a prominent dimension to the understanding of control over cognitive processing (Wenden, 1998). Task knowledge, as part of metacognitive knowledge (Flavell, 1987; Flavell, 1979; Jiménez Raya, Lamb, & Vieira, 2007) is the most relevant to the idea of control over learning process (Wenden, 1995). This type of knowledge is also defined as “what learners need to know about (i) the purpose of a task, (ii) the task's demands, and (iii) implicit in these considerations, a determination of the kind of task” (Wenden, 1995, p.185). In the language learning context, a task can be “as narrow as learning a new word or as broad as the entire process of learning a target language” (Benson, 2011, p.110).

Control over learning content is concerned with materials and reasons of language learning, instead of place, time and strategies (Benson, 2011, p.112). Language learning is generally enhanced by interaction with others; therefore, social aspect to control over learning content involves learners’ ability to negotiate with others the goals, purposes, content and resources (Benson, 2011, p.60). Taking control over learning content in the institutional context could be problematic due to potential conflicts students may have with teachers and institutions implementing a particular curricula. Regarding this matter, control over learning content frequently involves control over the collective situation of students’ learning and the use of capacities for social interaction which differ from those needed in managing learning methods individually (Macaro, 2008, pp. 58-59). Regarding the issue of individual freedom of choice, Reinders (2010) highlights the political aspect of learner autonomy. He stated that at a practical level in the institutional contexts, the learner autonomy development might be hindered by government policies, school curricula and textbooks implemented in the institution.

Dealing with the cultural aspect of the learner autonomy concept, Littlewood (1999) introduced the terms of proactive and reactive autonomy. The form of autonomy discussed in the West is referred to as proactive autonomy, indicated by learners' capacity to take charge of their own learning; determining their learning objectives, selecting their learning methods and techniques and evaluating their learning achievement (Holec, 1981; Littlewood, 1999). Reactive autonomy refers to the type of autonomy that "does not create its own directions but, once a direction has been initiated, enables learners to organise their resources autonomously in order to reach their goal"(Littlewood, 1999 p.75).

Although there are various definition of learner autonomy suggested by different experts, the essential aspects of learner autonomy involve attitudes, ability and behaviours associated with taking charge of one's learning (Lin & Reinders, 2019).

Teacher knowledge of learner autonomy components and their readiness for autonomy are considered crucial factor for successful implementation of autonomy-based programs (Lin & Reinders, 2019). With regards to the effort for developing learner autonomy outside western context, teachers' perceptions on its feasibility need to be more particularly and comprehensively investigated. This will give insight on aspects of learning and teaching that could be developed in specific cultural contexts. Baring in mind the theories of autonomy with the political and cultural aspects, this current study is intended to explore the Indonesian EFL teachers' perceptions on the feasibility for developing learner autonomy in the particular context and discuss them with regards to the existing theories of learner autonomy.

The findings of this research are expected to be the basis for teachers professional development with a concern on learner autonomy development. It is important to understand how the EFL teachers perceive the feasibility to promote learner autonomy. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the teachers' perceptions on the feasibility for promoting learner autonomy inform the policy makers the necessary program for promoting learner autonomy and where it should start from.

METHODS

This study involved 105 EFL teachers teaching in senior high school in Jakarta. There were 22 male and 83 female teachers. Of those 105 participants, 61 work in private school and 44 teachers teach in state schools. As for their educational background, 18 teachers hold master degree, 86 teachers have bachelor degree, and two teachers have dipoloma degree. The lengths of the respondents' teaching experiences are quite various; 24 teachers have 0-4 years of teaching experience, 20 teachers with 5-9 years, 40 teachers with 10-14 years, 11 teachers with 15-19 year teaching experience, five teachers with 20-25 years, and one respondent has taught for more than 25 years.

For collecting the data, this study applied slightly modified version of the questionnaire designed by Borg and Al-Busaidi (2012). While the Borg's questionnaire covers four aspects of teachers' perceptions on learner autonomy, the questionnaire used in this study focuses on the feasibility for developing learner autonomy. It consisted of two sections in which teachers were

asked seven items each. Through four scales, they stated their views on the feasibility of learner autonomy in their context; the feasibility of decisions related to language learning in the classroom learners might be involved in, and abilities that learners might have. The quantitative responses from the questionnaires were then input into Winstep version 4.4.6 software for data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and discusses the findings of the current study concerning teachers' perceptions towards the feasibility for promoting learner autonomy in an EFL classes. As mentioned previously, the teachers' perceptions on the feasibility of promoting learner autonomy consists of two components. The first feasibility is concerned with involving students in making decision regarding the classroom management, teaching methods, assessment, topics, activities, materials and objectives. The second deals with the feasibility for students to have the ability to learn independently, learn co-operatively, evaluate their own learning, monitor their progress, identify their own weaknesses, identify their own strengths and identify their own needs. The following table describes the percentages of the teachers' responses on 14 items dealing with the feasibility.

Table 1: Teachers' perceptions on the feasibility for promoting learner autonomy

| Involving learners in making decision regarding: | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------|-------------------|-------|----------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| | Unfeasible | | Slightly feasible | | Quite feasible | | Very feasible | |
| 1) Learning Objectives | 12 | 11.3% | 20 | 18.9% | 44 | 41.5% | 40 | 28.3% |
| 2) Learning Materials | 7 | 6.6% | 20 | 18.9% | 43 | 40.6% | 36 | 34% |
| 3) Learning Tasks and Activities | 2 | 1.9% | 16 | 15.1% | 46 | 43.4% | 42 | 39.6% |
| 4) Learning topics | 3 | 2.8% | 18 | 17% | 46 | 43.4% | 39 | 36.8% |
| 5) How learning is assessed | 8 | 7.5% | 19 | 17.9% | 44 | 41.5% | 35 | 33% |
| 6) Teaching methods | 6 | 5.7% | 24 | 22.6% | 42 | 39.6% | 34 | 32.1% |
| 7) Classroom management | 12 | 11.3% | 16 | 15.1% | 37 | 34.9% | 41 | 38.7% |
| Learners have the ability to | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Identify their own needs | 3 | 2.8% | 14 | 13.2% | 42 | 39.6% | 47 | 44.3% |
| 2) Identify their own strengths. | 2 | 1.9% | 9 | 8.5% | 47 | 44.3% | 48 | 45.3% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|
| 3) Identify their own weaknesses. | 1 | 0.9% | 7 | 6.6% | 53 | 50% | 45 | 42.5% |
| 4) Monitor their progress. | 4 | 3.8% | 19 | 17.9% | 42 | 39.6% | 41 | 38.7% |
| 5) Evaluate their own learning | 5 | 4.7% | 17 | 16% | 44 | 41.5% | 40 | 47.7% |
| 6) Learn co-operatively. | 1 | 0.9% | 2 | 1.9% | 47 | 44.3% | 56 | 52.8% |
| 7) Learn independently. | 3 | 2.8% | 10 | 9.4% | 40 | 37.7% | 53 | 50% |

As can be seen in the table, majority of the teachers are quite positif on the feasibility of involving students in a various decisions related to the course. Most respondents viewed that involving students in making decision about different aspects of classroom learning as feasible with different degrees of feasibility. Involving students in determining course objectives is pereceived as very visible by 40 respondents (28.3%) and quite feasible by 44 respondents (41.5%). 20 respondents (18.9%) perceived it as slightly feasible, and 12 teachers (11.3%) perceived it as unfeasible. As for involving students in making decisions on learning materials, 7 respondents (6.6%) thought it was unfeasible, 20 respondents (18.9%) perceived that it is slightly feasible, 43 respondents (40.6%) viewed that as quite feasible and 36 respondents (34%) stated that it is very feasible.

With regards to involving students in deciding learning tasks and activities, almost half of the respondents (43.3%) claimed that it is quite visible to do, 39.6% (42 respondents) perceived as very feasible, 15.1% (16 respondents) stated it is slightly possible, and 1.9 % (2 respondents) viewed that as unfeasible.

In order to measure the degree of feasibility among items discussed in this study, the data of the teachers' responses were then analyzed for the items measure using Winstep software version 4.4.6. Table 2 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 2: Items statistics: Measure order.

| ENTRY NUMBER | TOTAL SCORE | TOTAL COUNT | MEASURE | MODEL S.E. | INFIT MNSQ | ZSTD | OUTFIT MNSQ | ZSTD | PTMEASUR-CORR. | AL-EXP. | EXACT OBS% | MATCH EXP% | Item |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------|------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------------|---------|------------|------------|------|
| 1 | 304 | 106 | .89 | .16 | 1.51 | 3.15 | 1.66 | 3.83 | .64 | .74 | 48.9 | 54.7 | D1 |
| 6 | 316 | 106 | .58 | .16 | 1.10 | .72 | 1.12 | .82 | .70 | .73 | 62.2 | 58.0 | D6 |
| 5 | 318 | 106 | .52 | .17 | 1.05 | .37 | 1.08 | .53 | .72 | .73 | 57.8 | 58.2 | D5 |
| 7 | 319 | 106 | .50 | .17 | 1.36 | 2.18 | 1.37 | 2.20 | .69 | .72 | 54.4 | 58.4 | D7 |
| 2 | 320 | 106 | .47 | .17 | .94 | -.36 | .94 | -.35 | .74 | .72 | 64.4 | 59.1 | D2 |
| 12 | 331 | 106 | .15 | .17 | .84 | -1.02 | .83 | -1.04 | .74 | .71 | 68.9 | 61.1 | A5 |
| 11 | 332 | 106 | .12 | .17 | .78 | -1.48 | .77 | -1.44 | .75 | .70 | 66.7 | 61.2 | A4 |
| 4 | 333 | 106 | .09 | .17 | .91 | -.54 | .91 | -.53 | .71 | .70 | 58.9 | 61.3 | D4 |
| 3 | 340 | 106 | -.12 | .18 | 1.24 | 1.48 | 1.24 | 1.34 | .63 | .69 | 60.0 | 62.8 | D3 |
| 8 | 345 | 106 | -.28 | .18 | .90 | -.58 | .86 | -.77 | .70 | .68 | 65.6 | 63.5 | A1 |
| 9 | 353 | 106 | -.55 | .19 | .64 | -2.55 | .58 | -2.60 | .74 | .66 | 74.4 | 63.9 | A2 |
| 10 | 354 | 106 | -.58 | .19 | .56 | -3.20 | .60 | -2.47 | .75 | .66 | 77.8 | 63.9 | A3 |
| 14 | 355 | 106 | -.62 | .19 | 1.05 | .39 | 1.01 | .13 | .66 | .66 | 64.4 | 63.9 | A7 |
| 13 | 370 | 106 | -1.18 | .20 | .85 | -.94 | 1.27 | 1.20 | .62 | .61 | 68.9 | 66.7 | A6 |

The Item column (column 4) shows the items of the questionnaire which were analyzed to see the degree of feasibility. The item dealing with the feasibility of involving students in decision making related to learning objectives is labeled with D1, learning materials with D2, learning tasks and activities with D3, learning topics with D4, how learning is assessed with D5, teaching methods with D6 and classroom management with D7. The item indicates the feasibility for students to have the ability to identify their own needs is labeled with A1, to identify their own strengths with A2, to identify their own weaknesses with A3, to monitor their progress with A4, to evaluate their own learning with A5, to learn co-operatively with A6, and to learn independently with A7.

The measure order (column 4 in the table) shows the degree of feasibility for all items in the questionnaire. According to the data analysis output of item measure using Winstep software, the item with the lowest logit (see column 4) is the item of the questionnaire with the highest feasibility. As can be seen in the table, student involvement in decision making was perceived to be most feasible in relation to learning tasks and activities, learning topics, learning materials, and classroom management. The least feasible items are the decision making in relation to assessment, teaching methods and learning objectives.

As for the feasibility for students to have a range of abilities associated with learner autonomy, the data analysis shows that the most feasible element is for students to have the ability to learn cooperatively. It is then followed with ability to learn independently, identify their own weaknesses, identify their own strengths, identify their own needs, and monitor their own progress. The least feasible item is for students to have the ability to evaluate their own learning.

These teachers' perceptions show the teachers' thoughts, beliefs, and feelings about the the feasibility for promoting learner autonomy in their own context. As perceptions are viewed as factors that are influenced by personal attributes and situational aspects affecting one's own behaviours and how he/she perceives the actions of others in the environment (Schunk, D., & Meece, 1992), the teachers' perceptions on the feasibility for promoting learner autonomy are subject to changes. The perceptions are relational and responsive to context. The understanding of how the feasibility for developing learner autonomy should be perceived by the teachers is important in a teaching and learning situation as it reinforces teachers' decision-making on how to handle classroom situations so that it is supportive to the development of learner autonomy.

In this study, involving students in decision making related to learning objectives and students having the ability to evaluate their own learning are perceived by the teachers as the least feasible with regards to fostering learner autonomy. In fact, the concept of learners' decision making in formal education in Indonesia, can be considered feasible when the teachers have good understanding of the implemented curriculum, their institution and their students' situations. The curriculum implemented in secondary schools in Indonesia has given space for teachers to develop classroom situations which are supposed to raise students' creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking. These components are associated with the capacity of learner autonomy (Dam, 1995;

Jiménez Raya, M., Lamb, T., & Vieira, 2007). The findings of this study showing the feasibility to involve students in making decisions related to aspects of classroom learning, could be due to the curriculum which has been supportive with the promotion of learner autonomy. However, as teachers' perceptions are influenced by their personal attributes such as knowledge and experiences, the feasibility are also perceived variously by different teachers.

Even though involving students in decision making related to learning objectives was perceived as the least feasible compared to other aspects of learning, still a big number of respondents (69.8%) perceived it as quite feasible and very feasible. In order for learning to be more meaningful for students, the objectives need to be relevant with students' needs. If the objectives of learning have been prescribed in the curriculum, the teachers then could work on encouraging students to organize their resources autonomously to achieve the objectives. The concept of reactive learner autonomy as suggested by Littlewood (1999) becomes relevant in this situation. They are supposed to be mediators between theory and practice as well as between curriculum designers and learners. If there is a need for modification and changes in the curriculum, it should start from teachers (Azin, Biria, & Golestan, 2018).

Regarding the feasibility for students to have abilities associated with learner autonomy, it was quite surprising that abilities to monitor and evaluate learning were the least feasible ability perceived by the teachers. These two abilities are considered as prominent components of learner autonomy particularly in relation to control over learning management (Phil Benson, 2011). This findings indicate a necessity for enriching teachers' perspectives of the various strategies to help learners monitor and evaluate their own learning. Overall, the data showed a misconception in some participants' responses dealing with both the feasibility for involving students in decisions making related to classroom learning and feasibility for students to have abilities associated with learner autonomy. Though majority of teachers perceived those feasibilities positively, still some thought that they were not feasible.

A factor that can influence teachers' perceptions toward feasibility for promoting learner autonomy is teacher's role which is gradually shifted from transmitting information to facilitating learning (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018; Ciekanski, 2007; Little, 1995). Teachers who facilitate learning in the classroom have learned how they should share control with their students (Feryok, 2013). As the results of this study show, teachers believed that it is possible to involve students in making decisions with different degrees of feasibility. In regards to sharing control with students, Nunan (2003) stated that teachers could share control of the classroom learning by engaging learners in the process of decision making related to learning goals and objectives, the teaching content, methodology and evaluation (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018). However, the teachers' perceptions toward the feasibility for involving students in making decisions of some classroom learning aspects (objectives, materials, tasks, topic, assessment and classroom management) as revealed in this study, should be negotiated with the government policy and curriculum implemented in the institution. The promotion of learner autonomy should take into account the political aspects as suggested by Reinders (2010). Any effort to promote learner autonomy is not to ignore the existing power or educational regulation. Rather, it should be negotiated with the

circumstances or context. The concept of reactive autonomy (Littlewood, 1999) becomes relevant in this situation as it enables the promotion of learner autonomy in the contexts in which learning objectives have been determined. It indicates a necessity for the teachers to be equipped with sufficient knowledge of learner autonomy concept if teaching is about to integrate the promotion of learner autonomy. Teachers' knowledge will in turn shape their perceptions on this capacity. Though teachers' perceptions on learner autonomy are not necessarily in line with their teaching practices, the perceptions which are based on the right understandings of the concept will be supportive to the promotion of learner autonomy.

The research findings indicate that the concepts of learner autonomy should be viewed as closely linked to the political aspect influence the teachers' freedom to share control of various learning elements to the students. Moreover, language teachers themselves play significant roles in the promotion of learner autonomy. One of the teacher-related variables that could be associated with their beliefs and practices is experience (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018). However, whether or not years of teaching experience can have significant difference on teachers' perceptions toward the feasibility of learner autonomy has not part of the analysis in this study yet.

Teachers' understandings of the curriculum with all its components is another concern that should be taken into account by policy makers. Teachers are mediators for the promotion of learner autonomy practice in diverse context (Benson, 2016). Existing curriculum and useful theories of learning will not be beneficial if they are not applied in the classroom by the teachers.

If teaching is about to promote learner autonomy, teachers are expected to be autonomous in the first place (Little, 1995). They are supposed to be active and considerate decision-makers who can provide instructional choices by taking into account "complex, practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs" (Borg, 2003, p.81).

How teachers perceive the learner autonomy is very important as it deals with their feeling in the context they work. Their perceptions show whether they feel that they teach in a context encouraging a positive professional identity in which they are given opportunities to take control of their own teaching, or in a context in which they have to teach materials that have been prescribed. The necessity of systematic professional development programs with the orientation on shaping teachers' understanding of teacher and learner autonomy is undeniable. With such programs, teachers may get better understanding of the learner autonomy concept and strategies to promote it in real classrooms.

CONCLUSION

Learner autonomy as the capacity to take control of one's own learning (Benson, 2013) has been acknowledged as an important attribute of students associated with the success of foreign language learning. The developments of learner autonomy in language learning research have been concerned with how to develop this capacity among students in different social and cultural contexts including Asian context. As part of the effort to promote learner autonomy, this study is conducted to explore the Indonesian EFL teachers' perceptions toward the feasibility for developing learner autonomy in the Indonesian context, particularly in Jakarta.

As stated previously, how students learn in the classroom is influenced by teachers' instructional practices, and how the teachers teach is influenced by their beliefs (Skott, 2014). In relation to learner autonomy, how teachers perceive learner autonomy will influence how much and how they provide opportunities for students to become autonomous (Ahmadianzadeh et al., 2018; Borg & Alshumaimeri, 2019).

Data of teachers' perceptions was gathered from 106 EFL teachers in Jakarta with a set of questionnaire modified from (Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012). The questionnaire comprises teachers' perceptions on the feasibility to involve students in decision making related to various aspects of classroom learning and feasibility for students to have abilities associated with the capacity for learner autonomy. The results of data analysis show that student involvement in decision making was perceived to be most feasible in relation to learning tasks and activities, learning topics, learning materials, and classroom management. The least feasible items are the decision making dealing with assessment, teaching methods and learning objectives. With regards to the feasibility for students to have various abilities associated with the capacity of learner autonomy, this study reveals that the most feasible element is students' ability to learn cooperatively. It is then followed with ability to learn independently, identify their own weaknesses, identify their own strengths, identify their own needs, and monitor their own progress. The least feasible item is the ability to evaluate their own learning.

Teachers' perceptions toward feasibility for promoting learner autonomy could be due to their role which is gradually changed from transferring information to facilitating learning. Teachers who facilitate learning in the classroom have learned how they should share control with their students (Feryok, 2013). As this study reveals, teachers perceived that it is possible to involve students in making decisions of some aspects related to classroom learning with different degrees of feasibility. With regards to the existing theories of the learner autonomy, the findings of this study indicated a necessity for continuous professional development program for EFL English teachers with the concern on the understandings of the learner autonomy and how to promote it in different context. The feasibility for involving students in making decisions related to objectives, materials, tasks, topic, assessment and classroom management should be negotiated with the government policy and curriculum implemented in the institution in which the teachers teach. Moreover, the teachers' perceptions toward the feasibility for students to have a range of abilities associated with learner autonomy would be supportive to the promotion of learner autonomy when teachers have sufficient knowledge of what learner autonomy is and how to develop students' abilities which support their capacity of autonomy. Any effort to promote learner autonomy could be negotiated with the existing educational regulation.

REFERENCES:

- Ahmadianzadeh, B., Seifoori, Z., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2018). Exploring EFL teachers' beliefs about and practices of learner autonomy across experience and licensure. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 0(0), 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1501694>

- Azin, N., Biria, R., & Golestan, A. A. (2018). Iranian EFL Instructors' Perceptions and Practices Concerning Learner Autonomy. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 5(3), 73–97. <https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2019.10530.1318>
- Benson, P. (2016). Language Learner Autonomy: Exploring Teachers' Perspectives on Theory and Practice. In L. R., Barnard, & J. (Ed.), *Language learner autonomy: Teachers' beliefs and practices in Asian contexts* (pp. xxxiii–xliii). Phnom Penh: IDP Education.
- Benson, Phil. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Longman, Harlow.
- Benson, Phil. (2013). Learner autonomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), 839–843.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). *Learner autonomy: English language teachers' beliefs and practices*. *ELT Journal* (Vol. 12).
- Borg, S., & Alshumaimeri, Y. (2019). Language learner autonomy in a tertiary context: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(1), 9–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817725759>
- Ciekanski, M. (2007). Fostering learner autonomy: Power and reciprocity in the relationship between language learner and language learning adviser. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(1), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640601179442>
- Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy: From theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., & Takkac, M. (2012). The Effects of Autonomy-Supportive Climates on EFL Learner's Engagement, Achievement and Competence in English Speaking Classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 3890–3894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.167>
- Feryok, A. (2013). Teaching for learner autonomy: The teacher's role and sociocultural theory. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(3), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.836203>
- Flavell, J. H. (1987). Metacognition, Motivation and Understanding. In & K. R. H. Weinert, F.E. (Ed.) (pp. 21–29). Hillside.
- Flavell, John H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906–911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- Ghorbandordinejad, F., & Ahmadabad, R. M. (2016). Examination of the relationship between autonomy and english achievement as mediated by foreign language classroom anxiety. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 45(3), 739–752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-015-9371-5>

- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Jiménez Raya, M., Lamb, T., & Vieira, F. (2007). *Pedagogy for autonomy in language education in Europe: Towards a framework for learner and teacher development*. Dublin: Authentic.
- Lengkanawati, N. S. (2017). Learner autonomy in the Indonesian EFL settings. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 222–231. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4847>
- Lin, L., & Reinders, H. (2019). Students' and teachers' readiness for autonomy: beliefs and practices in developing autonomy in the Chinese context. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(1), 69–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-018-9564-3>
- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175–181. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00006-6)
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 71–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.71>
- Macaro, E. (2008). Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses. In H. Lamb, T. Reinders (Ed.) (pp. 47–62).
- Manzano Vázquez, B. (2018). Teacher development for autonomy: an exploratory review of language teacher education for learner and teacher autonomy. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 387–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1235171>
- Nguyen, X. N. C. M., & Walkinshaw, I. (2018). Autonomy in teaching practice: Insights from Vietnamese English language teachers trained in Inner-Circle countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 69, 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.08.015>
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Malley, J.M; Chamot, A. . (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. University of Alabama. Boston. Heinle & Heinle Publications.
- Reinders, H. (2010). Towards a classroom pedagogy for learner autonomy: A framework of independent language learning skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5), 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n5.4>
- Schunk, D., & Meece, J. (Ed.). (1992). No Title. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Skott, J. (2014). The promises, problems and prospects of research on teachers' beliefs. In H. & M. G. G. Fives (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 13–30). London: Routledge.
- Wenden, A. L. (1995). Learner training in context: A knowledge-based approach. *System*, 23(2), 183–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00007-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00007-7)
- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.515>