

## Online learning and learner autonomy: a comparative study of Turkish and Indonesian EFL students' perspectives

Pelin Derinalp<sup>1</sup>, Clara Herlina Karjo<sup>2</sup>, Wiwik Andreani<sup>2</sup>, Yi Ying<sup>3</sup>, Agnes Herawati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Education, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Chinese, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Jan 12, 2024

Revised Jul 9, 2024

Accepted Aug 28, 2024

#### Keywords:

English as a foreign language

Learner autonomy

Online learning

Planning of learning ability

TESOL

### ABSTRACT

Advancements in technology has affected almost all aspects of life all around the world. The education sector is not an exception. As in many other countries, in Turkey and Indonesia, learning activities have been switched from face-to-face to online mode for several reasons such as the COVID-19 pandemic or the destructive earthquake in Turkey. Online learning has brought some challenges with it. As online learning requires learner autonomy, it is crucial to investigate learners' perspectives regarding how this shift from traditional face-to-face teaching to online mode has affected the learners. Hence, the current study aims to investigate and compare Turkish and Indonesian English as a foreign language (EFL) students' learner autonomy level. A quantitative study has been conducted among undergraduate students from Turkey (100) and Indonesia (120). Data was collected through a 30-item questionnaire and distributed online. The analysis was done quantitatively using descriptive statistical computation. The results show that both Indonesian and Turkish EFL students have high learner autonomy levels. However, some differences were identified in terms of their planning of learning ability (PLA), monitoring of learning, and evaluation of learning abilities. In light of this study's findings, educational institutions are encouraged to promote strategies to assist students to be autonomous learners.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



### Corresponding Author:

Yi Ying

Department of Chinese, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University

Kemanggisan Ilir III Street, No. 45, Kemanggisan, Palmerah, West Jakarta 11480, Indonesia

Email: [yi\\_ying@binus.ac.id](mailto:yi_ying@binus.ac.id)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Not only technological advancements but also widespread disasters with significant impact on a large population, such as COVID-19 or earthquakes, have led to the shift from traditional education to online methods. Most of the countries and schools have acted rapidly and switched their learning mode from face-to-face to online during the pandemic. Various challenges arose in the process of online teaching and learning. The problems were faced by teachers who teach in Indonesia higher education like the rest of the world. They have faced technical problems, namely connectivity, using and teaching how to use technology and switching between activities. Indonesian university students perceive a lack of diversity in the E-learning course materials, which, in turn, appeared to undermine their motivation to engage with the E-learning platform for educational purposes. Learning is considered less interactive compared to face-to-face learning [1], [2]. Even though there are problems encountered in the tertiary environment, it seems that elementary school students hold positive feedback to online learning [3]. This is because foreign language learning which is usually based only on textbooks becomes more varied so that students become motivated to learn, especially in learning Mandarin

[3], [4]. Ying *et al.* [3] conducted a survey investigating elementary school students' use of a descriptive-analytical method. Researchers designed questionnaires to collect students' feedback about E-learning. The questionnaires were filled out by 34 students from the fifth grade in Bina Kusuma Elementary School, Jakarta. The research finds the positive impacts of E-learning in the school regarding Mandarin learning. The survey results suggested that the discussion material became more interesting and easier to understand because a YouTube content was used as a teaching material which took the students' interests. Thanks to online learning, students can also become more independent in learning and learn anywhere and anytime. Through E-learning students are more motivated because new learning methods are more innovative [3], [5]. However, the weakness of E-learning in the learning process is internet speed. To illustrate, the delivery of material in class by the teacher through the Zoom application is not smooth because of unstable internet quality [3], [6], [7].

The case is not very different for Turkey. Due to the catastrophic impact of the severe earthquake that occurred in the southeastern region of Turkey in February 2023, all universities in the 11 affected provinces switched to online education. However, this unexpected change brought with it a number of challenges. The transition to online education was plagued by technical problems and technological challenges, such as internet connection outages for most of the students and lecturers. Educators were faced with the challenge of developing new pedagogical strategies to effectively educate students on online platforms. At the same time, educational materials had to be adapted to online platforms. In their comprehensive study, Elhaty and Elhadary [8] critically review the pros and cons of online education in Turkey after the pandemic and earthquake. Although they list several advantages of online education, the cons seem to outweigh the pros.

The use of technology has a long history in the educational field. Technology, especially E-learning technology, is being increasingly employed in instruction to enhance teaching and learning [9], [10]. Using technology in education "is not an issue anymore but it is like a dream coming true" [11]. However, the shift on learning mode has brought its own challenges, one of which is obliging students to take responsibility for their own learning. Learners' playing a great role in their own learning process is often associated with learner autonomy [12], [13]. Learner independence demands learner involvement and such involvement may lead to a deeper and better learning. The concepts of autonomy and responsibility are two crucial requirements in learning and both of them require active practices [14], [15].

Over the last four decades, considerable literature has grown up around the theme of learner autonomy due to the shift from teacher-led to student-led approaches in the educational field. Several definitions have been offered to describe what autonomy entails. Most widely accepted definitions see autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" [16], "a capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action" [17], or "the capacity to control one's own learning" [18]. Despite not agreeing on whether autonomy is an ability or a capacity, many agree that autonomy denotes learning to learn [19]–[21]. Hence, an autonomous learner can be described as the one who can make their own decision in terms of what and how to learn.

The term autonomy has been understood from several aspects such as psychological [18], [22]–[26], technical [27], [28], and socio-cultural [29]–[32]. The latest aspect of the concept has triggered several debates. In this regard, how cultures affect learner autonomy is much investigated. As Chirkov [29] stresses, that cultures "assign meaning to people's autonomous experience, interpreting it either as positive and desirable, which needs to be supported and cultivated, or as a negative and undesirable, which needs to be prevented and circumscribed". Hence, the impact of the culture on autonomy cannot be neglected.

As autonomy requires individuality, making one's own decisions and taking responsibility for those decisions, it has been perceived to be a Western concept [28], [33], [34]. To exemplify, in their study, Halstead and Zhu [35] argue that "learner autonomy is currently hardly a reality at all in the classroom ... (due to) traditional Chinese expectations of a teacher". Halstead and Zhu [35] discuss that the concept of autonomy would fit better in the Western context where the independence of individuals is promoted. However, in China, traditionally, collectivism and interdependence of the individual to the group are commonly accepted. Moreover, they discuss that not only the culture but also the educational policies are seen as an obstacle for learner autonomy as the teachers feel that their hands are tied due to the national exam. Similarly, Sonaiya [36] claims that the concept of autonomy is not appropriate to African settings with a similar reason to the Chinese context. Sonaiya [36] states that 'people of western Nigeria have not attained a stage of 'development' where the individual is privileged over the community.' Interpreting the concept from a different angle, she argues that learner autonomy underestimates the communal aspect of learning which she attributes a great value. Nevertheless, some more recent studies suggest that autonomy prevails across cultures [37]. For instance, Sheldon *et al.* [38] conducted a cross-cultural study with the participation of 551 undergraduate students from South Korea, Taiwan, China, and the United States. The participants showed similar results in terms of autonomous motivation. Moreover, the results suggested that the participants felt "more autonomous than controlled in every culture" [38]. More recently, Iamudom and Tangkiengsirisin [39] conducted a study in a Thai context with the participation of 200 students half of whom were international school students while the

other half was attending a public-school. The results of the learner autonomy questionnaire revealed that “Thai public school students have a higher level of learner autonomy” [39].

From the above, it seems that although culture has an impact on learner autonomy, it is difficult if not impossible to claim that autonomy is a concept which would fit in the Western context better. Schmenk [40] argues that “[I]t is possible that autonomy-based pedagogies are appropriated variously in diverse local settings, but they are not represented adequately in TESOL research and scholarship.” Several studies investigating learner autonomy have been conducted in Turkish [32], [41]–[44], and Indonesian [11], [45]–[47] educational contexts which are both considered as teacher-led. To illustrate, in the Turkish context, Balçıklı [41] conducted a study with the participation of 112 student teachers and investigated their beliefs about learner autonomy. He used a questionnaire and focus group interviews. His contradictory findings suggested that although the student teachers held a positive attitude towards learner autonomy, they were reluctant to involve their future students to take part in the decision-making process. The findings showed that the student teachers saw time and place of course could be a hindrance for involving students in the decision-making process which would promote learner autonomy. In the Indonesian context, in turn, Mulyati [11] conducted a study to investigate the students’ perceptions regarding learner autonomy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mulyati [11] used a cross-sectional survey in order to collect data from 78 participants studying at the English Department. The results suggested that the students held a negative attitude towards the learner autonomy concept during the online teaching as they felt they needed more guidance for their learning.

Although the literature includes some studies in Turkish and Indonesian contexts separately, not many—if any studies have been conducted comparing Turkish and Indonesian English as a foreign language (EFL) pre-service teachers’ level of autonomy. Bearing in mind that both countries have switched to online learning mode during the pandemic [48], the current study aims to investigate and compare Turkish and Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers’ learner autonomy levels. The aim of this research is to investigate and compare the level of learner autonomy of Turkish and Indonesian EFL students. Through this comparison, it is hoped that it will be able to map out the problems faced and make the discussion a reference for higher education providers to find solutions to overcome the problems faced in the learning process and become a reference for further research.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Participants

This study was designed to identify how EFL university students in Indonesia and Turkey perceive learner autonomy. Hence, 100 students from Turkey and 120 students from Indonesia were selected to be the participants of this study. They are mostly majoring in English, either pre-service teacher education, literature, or language and linguistics. The demographic data shows that 64.1% of the participants are female while 35.9% of them are male. The participants’ age ranges from 18 to 36 years old with a means of 20.68 and SD=2.42. They are all in their first or second year of college. The reason for choosing the first-year or second-year students is because they were learning under COVID-19 pandemic restrictions which began in 2020. Thus, it is deemed suitable to measure their perception of learners’ autonomy since they have been actually experiencing online learning.

### 2.2. Instrument

A 30-item questionnaire with a five-point scale judgment was applied in this study. The questionnaire was adapted from Karababa *et al.* [49] and Mulyati [11] with a slight modification to adjust to the needs and conditions of the students in Indonesia and in Turkey. The questionnaire consists of three parts: the first part is planning of learning section which consists of eight questions. The second part is monitoring of learning section which consists of 12 questions. The last part is the evaluation of learning section which consists of 10 questions. One sample of the questions is: I set my learning goals (1-never and 5-always). The questionnaire was prepared using Google Form and distributed online by the researchers in both countries.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results are presented in three sections, as specified in the questionnaire, namely the planning of learning, monitoring of learning, and evaluation of learning.

### 3.1. Planning of learning

The questionnaire on the students’ ability in planning of learning consisted of eight questions. Using a Likert scale, the students were given five choices in terms of frequency, namely always, often, sometimes, rarely, and never. The mean and percentage for each question for Indonesian and Turkish students were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Planning of learning ability (PLA)

| No | Statements   | Indonesian |                | Turkish |                |
|----|--|------------|----------------|---------|----------------|
|    |  | Mean       | Percentage (%) | Mean    | Percentage (%) |
| 1  | I set my learning goals                              | 4.01       | 80.17          | 3.89    | 77.80          |
| 2  | I make a learning schedule and apply it              | 3.56       | 71.17          | 3.18    | 63.60          |
| 3  | I plan the activities in learning my courses         | 3.74       | 74.83          | 3.22    | 64.40          |
| 4  | I can choose the exercises that I learn and do       | 3.99       | 79.83          | 4.14    | 82.80          |
| 5  | I am ready to improve the score of exercises I do    | 4.23       | 84.50          | 4.02    | 80.40          |
| 6  | I can choose my learning style                       | 4.25       | 85.00          | 4.29    | 85.80          |
| 7  | I try hard when I know that I can achieve the target | 4.43       | 88.67          | 4.48    | 89.60          |
| 8  | I plan my weekly work in advance                     | 3.92       | 78.33          | 3.11    | 62.20          |
|    | Total mean   | 4.02       | 80.40          | 3.79    | 75.80          |

Table 1 indicates that the students' ability in planning their learning is good, shown by the total mean achieved by Indonesian (4.02) and Turkish (3.79). However, there are some similarities and differences in the statements that are highly rated or lowly rated by the students from both countries. For Indonesian, the highest percentage (88.67%) is given to the statement "I try hard when I know I can achieve the target." Similarly, the Turkish students also gave the highest rate (89.60%) for this statement. Meanwhile the lowest frequency is given to the statement "I make a learning schedule and apply it" by Indonesian (71.17%), while the Turkish students gave the lowest frequency (62.20%) to the statement "I plan my weekly work in advance." This statement also caused the biggest discrepancy between Indonesian and Turkish students, as there is a 16.13% difference. In contrast, the smallest gap occurred for Item 6, "I can choose my learning style," with only a 0.080% difference.

### 3.2. Comparison of PLA ability

In total, the comparison of PLA for the whole participants was shown in Table 2. Based on Levene's test for equality of variances, the p-value is 0.357, with t-value=2.444, and df=218. If the obtained p-value is bigger than  $\alpha=0.05$ , then  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. That means the assumption that there are equal variances among the participants is fulfilled. The significance level for the equality of means is 0.015, which is lower than  $\alpha=0.05$ , thus  $H_0$  is rejected. This result indicates that there is a significant difference between Indonesian students and Turkish students in terms of PLA.

Table 2. Comparison of PLA

| Levene's test for equality of variances |       | T-test for equality of means |         |                 |                 |                       |   |         |
|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| F                                       | Sig.  | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean difference | Std. error difference | 95% confidence interval of the difference |         |
|   |       |                              |         |                 |                 |                       | Lower                                     | Upper   |
| 0.853                                   | 0.357 | 2.444                        | 218     | 0.015           | 0.22438         | 0.09180               | 0.04345                                   | 0.40530 |
|   |       | 2.447                        | 211.734 | 0.015           | 0.22438         | 0.09170               | 0.04361                                   | 0.40514 |

### 3.3. Monitoring and organizing of learning

Overall, the results shown in Table 3 indicate that both Indonesian and Turkish EFL students have relatively high levels of learner autonomy, particularly in monitoring and organizing learning ability, during online learning. The total mean score for Indonesian students is 3.76, indicating that they agree with the statements on average at a rate of 75.20%, while the total mean score for Turkish students is 3.90 indicating an average agreement rate of 78.00%. However, the higher mean for Turkish learners suggest that Turkish learners may be more likely to adopt more positive learning habits and attitude than Indonesian learners.

Looking at the individual statements, it can be observed that Indonesian students show higher levels of learner autonomy than Turkish students in statement 2, 5, 8, and 10. For example, Indonesian students report a mean score of 4.17 (83.40%) for statement 2 ("I make a summary for learning"), while Turkish students only report a mean score of 3.54 (70.83%). Similarly, Indonesian students report a mean score of 4.23 (84.50%) for statement 9 ("I look for various resources to do the task given"), while Turkish students report a mean score of 4.31 (86.20%). These suggest that there may be cultural differences in learning approaches and strategies between Indonesian and Turkish learners.

On the other hand, Turkish students report higher levels of learner autonomy than Indonesian students in statements 4, 5, and 11. For example, Turkish students report a mean score of 3.44 (68.80%) for statement 4 ("I review previous lessons before learning new materials") while Indonesian students report a mean score of 3.29 (65.80%). Similarly, Turkish students report a mean score of 4.38 (87.60%) for statement 11 ("Peer feedback and teacher feedback help me a lot while learning"), while Indonesian students report a mean score of 3.15 (63.00%).

Table 3. Monitoring and organizing of learning ability

| No         | Statements  | Indonesian |                | Turkish |                |
|------------|---|------------|----------------|---------|----------------|
|            |   | Mean       | Percentage (%) | Mean    | Percentage (%) |
| 1          | I can manage the time for doing the tasks and participating in online discussion  | 4.13       | 82.50          | 3.84    | 76.80          |
| 2          | I make a summary for learning   | 3.54       | 70.83          | 4.17    | 83.40          |
| 3          | I am ready to do all the tasks given  | 4.23       | 84.50          | 4.02    | 80.40          |
| 4          | I review previous lessons before learning new materials                           | 3.29       | 65.83          | 3.44    | 68.80          |
| 5          | I can understand the topics independent from the teacher                          | 3.15       | 63.00          | 3.77    | 75.40          |
| 6          | I am aware of my weaknesses while learning  | 4.25       | 85.00          | 4.24    | 84.80          |
| 7          | I can do all the tasks given by the teacher                                       | 4.13       | 82.50          | 4.09    | 81.80          |
| 8          | I only use learning resources from the teacher                                    | 3.54       | 70.83          | 2.67    | 53.40          |
| 9          | I look for various resources to do the tasks given                                | 4.23       | 84.50          | 4.31    | 86.20          |
| 10         | I do some practice/activities on the courses I take independently                 | 3.29       | 65.83          | 3.89    | 77.80          |
| 11         | Peer feedback and teacher feedback help me a lot while learning                   | 3.15       | 63.00          | 4.38    | 87.60          |
| 12         | To monitor my learning progress, I do some exercises that I get from the internet | 4.25       | 85.00          | 3.95    | 79.00          |
| Total mean |   | 3.76       | 75.20          | 3.90    | 78.00          |

Comparatively, two statements are given the highest perception (4.25) by Indonesian students. These are statement 12 (“to monitor my learning progress, I do some exercises that I get from the internet”), and statement 6 (“I am aware of my weaknesses while learning”). Meanwhile, the Turkish students considered peer feedback and teacher feedback useful for learning, as they gave a perception score of 4.38 for statement 11. Interestingly, the same statement 11 (“Peer feedback and teacher feedback help me a lot while learning”) was given the lowest perception score (3.15) by Indonesian students, along with another statement 5 (“I can understand the topic independent from the teacher”). On the contrary, Turkish students negatively perceived statement 8 (“I only use learning resources from the teacher”), by giving it the lowest perception score of 2.67. This statement also produced the biggest gap between Indonesian and Turkish students, as there is a 24.6% (1.23) difference between them. Meanwhile, the lowest gap occurs for statement 6 (“I am aware of my weakness when learning”), which only shows a 0.01 difference or 0.2%. Overall, the results suggest that both Indonesian and Turkish EFL learners have a high level of learner autonomy in monitoring and organizing learning ability. However, there are some differences in specific aspects between the two groups.

**3.4. Comparison of monitoring and organizing learning ability**

Table 4 shows the comparison of the means of PLA. Levene’s test for equality of variances produced a p-value of 0.142, with t-value=-1.774, and df=218. If the obtained p-value is bigger than  $\alpha=0.05$ , then  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. That means the assumption of equal variances can be assumed. The significance level for the equality of means is 0.077, which is bigger than  $\alpha=0.05$ , thus  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. These results suggest that there is no significant difference between EFL students in both countries in terms of monitoring and organizing learning ability. In other words, students in both countries show similar perceptions toward the ability of monitoring and organizing their learning.

Table 4. Comparison of monitoring and organizing learning ability

| Aspect of Learner Autonomy            |                             | Independent samples test                |       |                              |         |                 |                 |                       |   |         |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
|                                       |                             | Levene's test for equality of variances |       | T-test for equality of means |         |                 |                 |                       |   |         |
|                                       |                             | F                                       | Sig.  | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean difference | Std. error difference | 95% confidence interval of the difference |         |
|                                       |                             |   |       |                              |         |                 |                 | Lower                 |   | Upper   |
| Monitoring and Organizing of Learning | Equal variances assumed     | 2.177                                   | 0.142 | -1.774                       | 218     | 0.077           | -0.13361        | 0.07531               | -0.28203                                  | 0.01481 |
|                                       | Equal variances not assumed |   |       | -1.798                       | 217.725 | 0.074           | -0.13361        | 0.07430               | -0.28006                                  | 0.01284 |

**3.5. Evaluation of learning ability**

Table 5 demonstrates that the students’ ability to evaluate their learning is high, as shown by the total mean achieved by Indonesian (3.94) and Turkish (3.78). This suggests that Indonesian learners are more likely to adopt positive learning habits toward learning evaluation than Turkish learners. However, there are some differences in responses by both groups for specific statements. The statement that gained the highest positive

perception by Indonesian students is statement 8 (“It makes me happy when someone observes me and tells me about my mistakes in my learning process”) with the mean score of 4.44 (81.40%), while Turkish students rated statement 6 (“If I fail, I accept it and try to correct it”) the highest with the mean 4.43 (87.50%). On the contrary, the lowest score was given statement 2 (“I don’t care for learning achievement that I have achieved”), by both Indonesian learners (2.52) and Turkish learners (2.16). These results indicate that learners in both countries do care about their learning achievements and do not have an indifferent attitude toward learning. The biggest gap appeared for statement 7 (“I keep the former tasks and assignments in a file”). Indonesian learners report a mean score of 4.11 (82.17%), while Turkish learners report a mean score of 3.45 (69.00%) which produced a difference of 13.17%. This gap suggests that Indonesian learners are more likely to keep track of their previous work and assignments than Turkish learners. The lowest gap, however, occurs for statement 2 (“I monitor my learning strategy to identify my learning success”) which only has a 0.01 difference or 0.13% between both groups. This indicates that learners from both groups are aware of the importance of monitoring their learning strategies to achieve success. One statement that received the same score of 4.31 (86.17%) is statement 9 (“If I don’t understand the learning materials, I contact my friends for discussion”). The result indicates that Indonesian as well as Turkish learners prefer to learn from their friends.

Table 5. Evaluation of learning ability

| No. | Statements   | Indonesian |                | Turkish |                |
|-----|--|------------|----------------|---------|----------------|
|     |  | Mean       | Percentage (%) | Mean    | Percentage (%) |
| 1   | I don't care for learning achievement that I have achieved                                 | 2.52       | 50.33          | 2.16    | 43.20          |
| 2   | I monitor my learning strategy to identify the learning success                            | 3.68       | 73.67          | 3.69    | 73.80          |
| 3   | I check my learning progress at regular interval   | 3.56       | 71.17          | 3.36    | 67.20          |
| 4   | I am happy when the teacher gives me learning score as I can know my learning results      | 4.37       | 87.33          | 4.17    | 83.40          |
| 5   | I am happy when my friend gives me feedback during learning activities                     | 4.31       | 86.17          | 4.29    | 85.80          |
| 6   | If I fail, I accept it and try to correct it   | 4.38       | 87.50          | 4.43    | 88.60          |
| 7   | I keep the former tasks and assignments in a file  | 4.11       | 82.17          | 3.45    | 69.00          |
| 8   | It makes me happy when someone observes me and tells me my mistakes in my learning process | 4.44       | 88.83          | 4.07    | 81.40          |
| 9   | If I don't understand the learning materials, I contact my friend for discussion           | 4.31       | 86.17          | 4.31    | 86.20          |
| 10  | I take note to remember my learning improvement  | 3.66       | 73.17          | 3.82    | 76.40          |
|     | Total mean   | 3.94       | 78.80          | 3.78    | 75.60          |

### 3.6. Comparison of evaluation of learning ability

Table 6 shows the comparison of evaluation of learning ability. Based on Levene’s test for equality of variances, the p-value is 0.105, with t-value=2.039, and df=218, then since the p-value is bigger than  $\alpha=0.05$ ,  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. That means the assumption that there are equal variances is fulfilled. The significance level for the equality of means is 0.043, which is lower than  $\alpha=0.05$ , thus  $H_0$  is rejected. This result indicates a significant difference between Indonesian students and Turkish students in terms of evaluation of learning ability. In other words, students in Indonesia and Turkey have different preferences regarding the assessment of their learning. Students from the two countries need to be able to reflect on their learning because reflection enhances self-awareness [50].

Table 6. Comparison of evaluation of learning ability

| Aspect of Learner Autonomy     |                             | Independent samples test                |       |                              |         |                 |                 |                       |   |         |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
|                                |                             | Levene's test for equality of variances |       | T-test for equality of means |         |                 |                 |                       |   |         |
|                                |                             | F                                       | Sig.  | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean difference | Std. error difference | 95% confidence interval of the difference |         |
|                                |                             |   |       |                              |         |                 |                 | Lower                 | Upper                                     |         |
| Evaluation of Learning Ability | Equal variances assumed     | 2.653                                   | 0.105 | 2.039                        | 218     | 0.043           | 0.16102         | 0.07896               | 0.00540                                   | 0.31664 |
|                                | Equal variances not assumed |   |       | 2.004                        | 191.968 | 0.046           | 0.16102         | 0.08033               | 0.00257                                   | 0.31947 |

#### 4. CONCLUSION

It is undeniable that learner autonomy is essential for the learning process, be it for Indonesian, Turkish learners, or any other learners. It can be concluded from the research that Indonesian and Turkish learners have a high level of learner autonomy. However, some differences exist. The first one lies in their perception of PLA ability. Both agree that planning, especially to set goals, is a must, but it is not followed by the ability to make a learning schedule to achieve the goals. In the Monitoring of Learning aspect, a significant difference is found between Indonesian and Turkish learners. Turkish students seem to be dependent on the teacher and peer feedback during their learning process; 75.40% agreement from Turkish learners, while 63% are from Indonesian participants. For the last aspect, which is the evaluation of learning abilities, students from both countries state that they care about their learning achievement. However, they do not check their progress regularly. Furthermore, a significant gap is found in the organization of learning. Compared to the Turkish participants, Indonesian students are better at compiling the former tasks and assignments.

The study results confirm that the level of autonomy the learners from both countries have been high. The Indonesian and Turkish EFL learners have a positive perception of the planning of the learning process. In contrast, when it comes to learning monitoring, all learners are aware of their weaknesses. Nevertheless, the findings suggested that the Indonesian EFL learners are more independent in their learning than the Turkish participants. Finally, the results showed that they care about their learning achievements, though they might ignore looking into their learning progress.

Based on the results, it is recommended that educational institutions put more extensive attention on the strategies to assist students in improving their soft skills to be more autonomous in their learning. One of the ways to achieve this might be through promoting reflection as reflection enhances self-awareness. The student's ability to set learning goals should also be supported by creating an excellent plan to achieve the goals and checking their progress periodically. In other words, future researchers can investigate the relationship between learner autonomy and academic achievement in online learning contexts. This could involve comparing the performance of autonomous and non-autonomous learners in various tasks and assessments. Moreover, this research could be extended to cover more learners from other countries so that higher institution students would get significant input to increase their autonomy level.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the fruit of an international, independent research collaboration between a scholar from Gaziantep University, Turkey, and four scholars from Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.




#### REFERENCES

- [1] C. H. Karjo, W. Andreani, A. Herawati, Y. Ying, A. P. Yasyfin, and K. Marie, "Technological challenges and strategies in implementing E-learning in higher education," in *2022 10th International Conference on Information and Education Technology (ICIET)*, Apr. 2022, pp. 184–188, doi: 10.1109/ICIET55102.2022.9778948.
- [2] W. Andreani and Y. Ying, "PowPow' interactive game in supporting English vocabulary learning for elementary students," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 157, pp. 473–478, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.005.
- [3] Y. Ying, P. Paulina, Y. R. Mulyadani, and K. M. O. Lim, "Impact of e-learning on learning Mandarin in elementary schools during COVID-19," *CommIT (Communication and Information Technology) Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 19–24, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.21512/commit.v15i1.6643.
- [4] A. W. P. Widuri and U. Z. Fanani, "The impact of E-learning on the learning motivation of Chinese language students during the COVID-19 pandemic (case study on students of the 2019 Chinese language education study program, State University of Surabaya)," *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Mandarin UNESA*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2020.
- [5] E. Elshareif and E. Mohamed, "The effects of e-learning on students' motivation to learn in higher education," *Online Learning*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 128–143, 2021, doi:10.24059/olj.v25i3.2336.
- [6] F. Yahiaoui *et al.*, "The impact of E-learning systems on motivating students and enhancing their outcomes during COVID-19: A mixed-method approach," *Frontier Psychology*, vol. 13, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.874181.
- [7] A. M. Maatuk, A. M. Elberkawi, and E. K. Aljawarneh, "The COVID-19 pandemic and E-learning: challenges and opportunities from the perspective of students and instructors," *Journal of Computer in Higher Education*, 34, 21–38, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s12528-021-09274-2.
- [8] I. A. Elhaty and T. Elhadary, "Online education in Turkish universities after the earthquake: the pros and cons," *Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 4S, pp. 330–340, 2023.
- [9] M. J. Riasatii, N. Allahyar, and K.-E. Tan, "Technology in language education: Benefits and barriers," *Journal of Education and Practice*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 25–30, 2012.
- [10] D. Chun, R. Kern, and B. Smith, "Technology in language use, language teaching, and language learning," *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 100, no. S1, pp. 64–80, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1111/modl.12302.
- [11] T.- Mulyati, "Learners' autonomy in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic," *ELTICS: Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 1, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.31316/eltics.v7i1.2132.
- [12] S. W. Chong and H. Reinders, "Autonomy of English language learners: A scoping review of research and practice," *Language Teaching Research*, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1177/13621688221075812.
- [13] L. Dickinson, *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.




- [14] S. S. R. Najeeb, "Learner autonomy in language learning," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 70, pp. 1238–1242, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.183.
- [15] O. Yagcioglu, "New approaches on learner autonomy in language learning," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 199, pp. 428–435, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.529.
- [16] H. Holec, *Autonomy, and foreign language learning*. Person Education, 2001.
- [17] D. Little, *Definitions, issues, and problems*. Authentik, 1991.
- [18] P. Benson, *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*. Routledge, 2013, doi: 10.4324/9781315833767.
- [19] N. M. Terhune, "Learning to learn digitally," *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 9–24, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.4018/ijcallt.2013100102.
- [20] M. J. Raya, T. Lamb, and F. Vieira, *Pedagogy for autonomy in language education in Europe: towards a framework for learner and teacher development*. Dublin: Authentik, 2007.
- [21] D. Little, "Language learner autonomy: some fundamental considerations revisited," *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–29, Apr. 2007, doi: 10.2167/illt040.0.
- [22] P. Benson, "Autonomy in language teaching and learning," *Language Teaching*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 21–40, Jan. 2007, doi: 10.1017/S0261444806003958.
- [23] P. Benson, *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning*, Routledge, 2015.
- [24] D. Little, *Learner autonomy and second/foreign language learning*. CIEL Language Support network, 2003.
- [25] H. Reinders, *From autonomy to autonomous language learning*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.
- [26] P. Wang, "Constructivism and learner autonomy in foreign language teaching and learning: to what extent does theory inform practice?," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 1, no. 3, Mar. 2011, doi: 10.4304/tpls.1.3.273-277.
- [27] R. L. Oxford, "Toward a more systematic model of L2 learner autonomy," in *Learner Autonomy across Cultures*, London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2003, pp. 75–91, doi: 10.1057/9780230504684\_5.
- [28] A. Pennycook, "Cultural alternatives and autonomy," in *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*, Routledge, 2014, pp. 35–53, doi: 10.4324/9781315842172-4.
- [29] V. I. Chirkov, "A cross-cultural analysis of autonomy in education," *Theory and Research in Education*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 253–262, Jul. 2009, doi: 10.1177/1477878509104330.
- [30] T. T. Dang, "Learner autonomy in EFL studies in Vietnam: a discussion from sociocultural perspective," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 3, no. 2, May 2010, doi: 10.5539/elt.v3n2p3.
- [31] R. Smith and E. Ushioda, "Autonomy: under whose control?," in *Maintaining Control*, Hong Kong University Press, 2009, pp. 240–253, doi: 10.5790/hongkong/9789622099234.003.0013.
- [32] R. Yildirim, "The portfolio effect: enhancing Turkish ELT student-teachers' autonomy," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 38, no. 8, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.14221/ajte.2013v38n8.8.
- [33] W. Littlewood, "Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 71–94, Mar. 1999, doi: 10.1093/applin/20.1.71.
- [34] S. Sakai, A. Takagi, and M.-P. Chu, "Promoting learner autonomy: student perceptions of responsibilities in a language classroom in East Asia," *Educational Perspectives*, vol. 43, no. 1 and 2, pp. 12–27, 2022.
- [35] J. M. Halstead and C. Zhu, "Autonomy as an element in Chinese educational reform: a case study of English lessons in a senior high school in Beijing," *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 443–456, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1080/02188790903308944.
- [36] R. Sonaiya, "Autonomous language learning in Africa: a mismatch of cultural assumptions," *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 106–116, Jul. 2002, doi: 10.1080/07908310208666637.
- [37] F. Gai, "The application of autonomous learning to fostering cross-cultural communication competence," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 4, no. 6, Jun. 2014, doi: 10.4304/tpls.4.6.1291-1295.
- [38] K. M. Sheldon *et al.*, "Self-concordance and subjective well-being in four cultures," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 209–223, Mar. 2004, doi: 10.1177/0022022103262245.
- [39] T. Iamudom and S. Tangkiengsirisin, "A comparison study of learner autonomy and language learning strategies among Thai EFL learners," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 199–212, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.29333/iji.2020.13214a.
- [40] B. Schmenk, "Globalizing learner autonomy," *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 1, Mar. 2005, doi: 10.2307/3588454.
- [41] C. Balçıklı, "Learner autonomy in language learning: student teachers' beliefs," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 35, no. 1, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.8.
- [42] H. Çetin and C. Çakır, "An investigation of Turkish high school EFL teachers' readiness to promote learner autonomy," *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 81–97, 2021.
- [43] D. Cakici, "An investigation of learner autonomy in Turkish EFL context," *International Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.5430/ijhe.v6n2p89.
- [44] İ. P. EGEL, "Learner autonomy in the language classroom: from teacher dependency to learner independency," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 2023–2026, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.355.
- [45] N. S. Lengkanawati, "Learner autonomy in the Indonesian EFL settings," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 6, no. 2, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4847.
- [46] M. Melvina and J. Julia, "Learner autonomy and English proficiency of Indonesian undergraduate students," *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 803–818, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5677.
- [47] D. Daflizar, U. Sulistiyo, and D. Kamil, "Language learning strategies and learner autonomy: the case of Indonesian tertiary EFL students," *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 257–281, 2022.
- [48] M. Mahyoob, "Challenges of e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic experienced by EFL learners," *Arab World English Journal*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 351–362, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.24093/awej/vol11no4.23.
- [49] Z. C. Karababa, D. N. Eker, and R. S. Arik, "Descriptive study of learner's level of autonomy: voices from the Turkish language classes," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 9, pp. 1692–1698, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.386.
- [50] P. Derinalp, "Defining reflective practice from the Indonesian novice EFL teachers' perspective," *Reflective Practice*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 497–508, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1080/14623943.2022.2064445.






**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

**Dr. Pelin Derinalp**    is a lecturer at Gaziantep University. She obtained her master of art degree from the University of Southampton and Ph.D. from the University of York. Her research focused on reflective practice, teacher training, continuous professional development, and lifelong learning. Her research interests also include learner autonomy, teaching and learning English for academic purposes, and transcultural communication. She can be contacted at email: pelinderinalp@gantep.edu.tr.






**Dr. Clara Herlina Karjo**    is a professor at Bina Nusantara University. She obtained her master and doctoral degree in applied english linguistics from Atma Jaya University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests include English language teaching, translation, phonology, and digital discourse. She can be contacted at email: clara2666@binus.ac.id.






**Dra. Wiwik Andreani, M.Hum.**    is a senior faculty member at the Department of English, Bina Nusantara University. She obtained her master's degree in applied english linguistics from Atma Jaya University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests include English language teaching and learning, mobile-assisted learning, and educational psychology. She can be contacted at email: wiwik.wiyanti@binus.ac.id.



**Yi Ying, M.Lit., M.Pd.**    is an associate professor in Curriculum Development at Bina Nusantara University. She obtained her master's degree in applied Chinese linguistics from Xiamen University and education administration from Christian University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. She obtained her Ph.D. in curriculum development from the Indonesia University of Education. Her research interests include Chinese language teaching and learning, mobile-assisted learning, China studies, and tourism. She can be contacted at email: yi\_ying@binus.edu.



**Dr. Agnes Herawati**    is a senior faculty member at the Department of English of Bina Nusantara University and learning solution manager of Bina Nusantara Corporate Learning and Development. She obtained her master and doctoral degree in applied english linguistics from Atma Jaya University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests include English language teaching and professional development programs. She can be contacted at email: aherawati@binus.edu.