



Kunjungi situs

Your submission entitled Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students - [EMID:72a82db9b2350f0f] 2 Yahoo/Terkirim ★

**LEARN** <em@editorialmanager.com> Kepada: Daflizar Daflizar Min, 22 Agu 2021 jam 21:32 ★

Dear Mr. Daflizar,

Your submission entitled "Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students" has been received. We would like to inform you that the manuscript is now being reviewed and you will be informed of the review result within 6-8 weeks from now unless more review time is required.

Thank you for submitting your work to our journal.

Kind regards,

Supakorn Phoocharoensil  
Chief Editor  
LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/learn/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



**Supakorn Phoocharoensil** <supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th>  
Kepada: dafiziar@yahoo.com

Sab, 18 Sep 2021 jam 23:31 ★

Dear Dafiziar

Thank you for the submitted manuscript entitled 'Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students'.

Upon our rigorous peer review process, the reviewer decision is "Accept with Minor Revision".

Please follow the directions below:

1. revise your manuscript based on the reviewers' feedback attached and resubmit the revised manuscript by October 7, 2021.
  2. include in a separate sheet of paper a table summarizing all the revisions made in response to both reviewers' feedback.
  3. make sure the revised manuscript has been thoroughly edited by a native speaker of English.
  4. use the new journal template attached. ***This is the most updated one.***
  5. adjust the APA 7th Edition as well as the paragraph spacing as stated in the template.
- Please consult the Purdue website as a quick reference for the APA style.

[https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research\\_and\\_citation/apa\\_style/apa\\_formatting\\_and\\_style\\_guide/general\\_format.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html)

Any manuscript that does NOT strictly conform to the above criteria will not be considered for publication. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you  
Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor

--  
Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Editor-in-Chief  
LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network

Unduh semua lampiran sebagai file zip

For Author_... .pdf 726.9kB	For Author_... .pdf 739.4kB	LEARN Jou... .docx 58.3kB	LEARN Jou... .docx 22.5kB

**Reviewer's Form**

<b>Manuscript title:</b>	Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students
<b>Manuscript ID:</b>	014-2022
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Reviewer 1

**I. Overall comments:** *Please provide your overall comments and impression of the article e.g. originality, scholarly interest/timeliness and contribution to existing knowledge in the field.*

<p>1. The quality of writing in this article is standard. The objectives are stated clearly. The scope of the literature review was relevant to the issues under investigation. Introduction Part and Discussion Part are appropriate.</p> <p>2. Data collection process is also appropriate to answer the research questions. However, the analyses and some parts of the results are needed to be revised.</p>
--

**II. Critical evaluation of the main content:** *Please evaluate the submission based on the criteria provided on this form. Indicate your judgment by choosing 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 (with 5 signifying 'excellent' and 1 'extremely weak') in the rating column:*

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
1. Title accuracy					X	
2. Theoretical/ Conceptual framework				X		
3. Statement of the problem				X		
4. Significance of research			X			
5. Literature review				X		
6. Methodology				X		
7. Quality of data				X		
8. Results and conclusion			X			
9. Implications of the study			X			
10. Readability and writing style					X	

**III. Specific reviewer comments or suggestions:** For items which are rated ‘3’ and below in section II, please provide specific comments and suggestions on how this article can be improved, for example, title, theoretical/ conceptual framework, research methodology, presentation of findings, discussion, etc.

#### Comments

##### 1. Introduction:

- 1.1 The writing style in this part is standard. However, it is recommended that all of the objectives of the study should be stated more clearly in the last paragraph of this part/ before research questions.
- 1.2 In Research Question 1, it should be adapted into “What types of learning strategies do Indonesian tertiary EFL students use **most and least** in English language learning? Or “**In what level** of types of learning strategies do Indonesian tertiary EFL students use in English language learning?”

##### 2. Literature Review

- 2.1 It is noticeable that in-text citation (narrative citation) in this article is not consistent. For example, in the first paragraph of this part, the page number was used after the quotation.

*Wenden (1987) viewed learning strategies as “the various operations that learners use in order to make sense of their learning” (pp. 7-8).*

However, in Discussion Part, it was found that the page number was used after the researcher’s name.

*Grow (1991, p. 127) stated that “Self-direction, .... is partly a personal trait analogous to maturity.”*

It is recommended that in-text citation in this article should be revised to be consistent according to APA 7 Style.

##### 3. Method

- 3.1 In the topic of 3.3 Data Collection and Analysis, apart from Pearson Correlation , other kinds of statistics used to analyze data such as Percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation should be informed in this part.

#### 4. Results

- 4.1 It is recommended that in Table 2 and 3, Standard Deviation and Rank should be added in the Table.
- 4.2 The topic for 4.2 in this part should be adapted into “Perceptions of Students’ Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning”.
- 4.3 In Table 4, in order to answer Research question 2, it is unclear what kinds of statistics were used to analyze the data (percentage or **mean or S.D**). If the percent was used, why percents in the descriptive paragraph could not be found in the Table. Where did those percents come from? It is recommended that this part should be revised to make the result more understandable. Also, the rank should be added in the Table.
- 4.4 The topic for 4.3 in this part should be adapted into “Students’ Engagement in Autonomous English Language Learning Activities Inside and Outside the Classroom”.
- 4.5 In Table 5, in order to answer Research Question 3, it is unclear what kinds of statistics were used to analyze the data (percentage, **mean or S.D**). If the percent was used, why percents in the descriptive paragraph could not be found in the Table. Where did those percents come from? It is recommended that this part should be revised to make the result clearer. Also, the rank should be added in the Table.
- 4.6 It is recommended that topic 4.4 in this part should be separated into two topics instead:

**4.4 “Correlations between Students’ Language Learning Strategy Use and Their Perceptions of Their Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning.** This is for answering Research Question 4.

**4.5 “Correlations between Students’ Language Learning Strategy Use and the Practice of Autonomous English Language Learning outside the Classroom”.** This is for answering Research Question 5.

Table 6 should be under topic 4.4 and Table 7 should be under topic 4.5.

- 4.7 In the descriptive paragraph of Table 6 and Table 7, it is recommended that value of Pearson’s  $r$  should be reported to provide understanding of the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables

Example:

There was a positive correlation between students' language learning strategies use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning ( $r=0.235$ ,  $N= 76$ ). Moreover, the relationship was significant ( $p= .041$ ).

#### 5. Conclusion and Implications

It is recommended that the last paragraph of this part should not be presented in the part of Conclusion and Implication. It should be separated into the next part (7. Limitation of the Study).

---

**IV. Decision:** Please indicate your final decision by writing 'YES' after one of the options listed below:

<b>1. Accept Manuscript without revision:</b>	
<b>2. Accept Manuscript with minor revisions:</b>	YES
<b>3. Accept Manuscript with major revisions:</b>	
<b>4. Resubmit with major revisions:</b>	
<b>5. <i>Reject:</i></b>	

*----- Thank you very much for your contribution -----*

**Reviewer's Form**

<b>Manuscript title:</b>	Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students
<b>Manuscript ID:</b>	014-2022
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Reviewer 2

**I. Overall comments:** *Please provide your overall comments and impression of the article e.g. originality, scholarly interest/timeliness and contribution to existing knowledge in the field.*

- The topic of the research is interesting. It can make a good contribution to teaching and learning English in the EFL context. The article is well-written; however, the author's voice is not clearly presented.

**II. Critical evaluation of the main content:** *Please evaluate the submission based on the criteria provided on this form. Indicate your judgment by choosing 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 (with 5 signifying 'excellent' and 1 'extremely weak') in the rating column:*

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>
1. Title accuracy				/		
2. Theoretical/ Conceptual framework				/		
3. Statement of the problem			/			
4. Significance of research			/			
5. Literature review			/			
6. Methodology				/		
7. Quality of data				/		
8. Results and conclusion			/			
9. Implications of the study			/			
10. Readability and writing style				/		

**III. Specific reviewer comments or suggestions:** *For items which are rated '3' and below in section II, please provide specific comments and suggestions on how this article can be improved, for example, title, theoretical/ conceptual framework, research methodology, presentation of findings, discussion, etc.*

- Statement of the problem and significance of research were not strong, but the rationale of the study can be understood.
- Many of the references are quite old. The author should try to find more up-to-date ones (e.g., the references regarding language learning strategies and learner autonomy).
- The link between the language learning strategies and learner autonomy was mentioned



but more substantial detail should be provided, especially in relation to EFL contexts. The references regarding this aspect are also old.

- Research studies on students' learning strategies and autonomy were included, but they were just a summary, not a synthesis. The points that the author would like to illustrate must be clearly presented and should be supported by the studies.
- More information about the participants should be added so that the readers can have a clear picture of what the participants were like. This might affect the results of the study as well. For example, if they are high proficiency level students, the use of strategies and their learner autonomy might be different from lower proficiency level students.
- The explanation of each learning strategy should be given to make it clear for the readers.
- There is no need to mention which program and which version of SPSS were used. Just identify which statistics were used would be enough.
- The discussion part should be revised. It is an important part, but it seems that not many interesting points were presented and discussed. The points that the author would like to make is not clear at all. The discussion points in the first two paragraphs were not convincing. The author, for example, didn't explain what the results meant and why the results turned out the way they were. Were there other factors influencing the results?, etc. The author just mentioned that the results were in line or not in line with the past studies. His/her voice can't be clearly seen.
- In the last paragraph of the discussion part, although there were significant relationships between both pairs of variables, the correlations were not all strong. Discussion in this point would make the research more interesting and meaningful.
- In the same way, the conclusion part also needs to be made clear. The author mentioned at the very beginning and also at the end that the research in the area has not been widely conducted. However, it still cannot be clearly seen how this study can contribute to EFL teaching and learning. The discussion and the implications of the research results should show that the study makes a great contribution to teaching and learning in EFL contexts. That's why revision is needed for the discussion and the conclusion/implications parts.

**IV. Decision:** Please indicate your final decision by writing 'YES' after one of the options listed below:

<b>1. Accept Manuscript without revision:</b>	
---	--

<b>2. Accept Manuscript with minor revisions:</b>	YES
<b>3. Accept Manuscript with major revisions:</b>	
<b>4. Resubmit with major revisions:</b>	
<b>5. <i>Reject:</i></b>	

*----- Thank you very much for your contribution -----*

## Revision Table

Article Title : **Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students**

Authors : Daflizar, Urip Sulistiyo, and Dairabi Kamil



No.	Reviewer 1's Comments	Responses
<b>1. Introduction</b>		
	1.1 The writing style in this part is standard. However, it is recommended that all of the objectives of the study should be stated more clearly in the last paragraph of this part/ before research questions.	Identified and edited
	1.2 In Research Question 1, it should be adapted into “What types of learning strategies do Indonesian tertiary EFL students use most and least in English language learning? Or “In what level of types of learning strategies do Indonesian tertiary EFL students use in English language learning?”	Identified and edited
<b>2. Literature Review</b>		
	<p>2.1 It is noticeable that in-text citation (narrative citation) in this article is not consistent. For example, in the first paragraph of this part, the page number was used after the quotation.</p> <p><i>Wenden (1987) viewed learning strategies as “the various operations that learners use in order to make sense of their learning” (pp. 7-8).</i></p> <p>However, in Discussion Part, it was found that the page number was used after the researcher's name.</p> <p><i>Grow (1991, p. 127) stated that “Self-direction, .... is partly a personal trait analogous to maturity.”</i></p> <p>It is recommended that in-text citation in this article should be revised to be consistent according to APA 7 Style.</p>	Identified and edited
<b>3. Method</b>		

	3.1 In the topic of 3.3 Data Collection and Analysis, apart from Pearson Correlation, other kinds of statistics used to analyze data such as Percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation should be informed in this part.	Information about Percentage, Mean, and Standard Deviation has been added
<b>4. Results</b>		
	4.1 It is recommended that in Table 2 and 3, Standard Deviation and Rank should be added in the Table.	Standard Deviation and Rank have been added in the tables.
	4.2 The topic for 4.2 in this part should be adapted into “Perceptions of Students’ Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning”.	Edited
	4.3 In Table 4, in order to answer Research question 2, it is unclear what kinds of statistics were used to analyze the data (percentage or mean or S.D). If the percent was used, why percents in the descriptive paragraph could not be found in the Table. Where did those percents come from? It is recommended that this part should be revised to make the result more understandable. Also, the rank should be added in the Table.	Identified and edited
	4.4 The topic for 4.3 in this part should be adapted into “Students’ Engagement in Autonomous English Language Learning Activities Inside and Outside the Classroom”.	Edited
	4.5 In Table 5, in order to answer Research Question 3, it is unclear what kinds of statistics were used to analyze the data (percentage, mean or S.D). If the percent was used, why percents in the descriptive paragraph could not be found in the Table. Where did those percents come from? It is recommended that this part should be revised to make the result clearer. Also, the rank should be added in the Table.	Identified and edited
	4.6 It is recommended that topic 4.4 in this part should be separated into two topics instead: 4.4 “Correlations between Students’	Adjusted

	<p>Language Learning Strategy Use and Their Perceptions of Their Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning. This is for answering Research Question 4.</p> <p>4.5 “Correlations between Students’ Language Learning Strategy Use and the Practice of Autonomous English Language Learning outside the Classroom”. This is for answering Research Question 5.</p> <p>Table 6 should be under topic 4.4 and Table 7 should be under topic 4.5.</p>	
	<p>4.7 In the descriptive paragraph of Table 6 and Table 7, it is recommended that value of Pearson’s <math>r</math> should be reported to provide understanding of the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables</p> <p>Example: There was a positive correlation between students’ language learning strategies use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning (<math>r=0.235</math>, <math>N= 76</math>). Moreover, the relationship was significant (<math>p= .041</math>).</p>	<p>Edited</p>
<p><b>5. Conclusion and Implications</b></p>		
	<p>It is recommended that the last paragraph of this part should not be presented in the part of Conclusion and Implication. It should be separated into the next part (7. Limitation of the Study).</p>	<p>Adjusted</p>

No.	Reviewer 2's Comments	Responses
1	- Statement of the problem and significance of research were not strong, but the rationale of the study can be understood.	Information about the significance of the research has been added.
2	- Many of the references are quite old. The author should try to find more up-to-date ones (e.g., the references regarding language learning strategies and learner autonomy).	Several newer references on LLS have been added.
3	- The link between the language learning strategies and learner autonomy was mentioned but more substantial detail should be provided, especially in relation to EFL contexts. The references regarding this aspect are also old.	This comment has been addressed and a recent reference has been added.
4	- Research studies on students' learning strategies and autonomy were included, but they were just a summary, not a synthesis. The points that the author would like to illustrate must be clearly presented and should be supported by the studies.	A synthesis of the research studies has been added.
5	- More information about the participants should be added so that the readers can have a clear picture of what the participants were like. This might affect the results of the study as well. For example, if they are high proficiency level students, the use of strategies and their learner autonomy might be different from lower proficiency level students.	Information about participants' English proficiency has been added.
6	- The explanation of each learning strategy should be given to make it clear for the readers.	The explanation of each learning strategy has been given.
7	- There is no need to mention which program and which version of SPSS were used. Just identify which statistics were used would be enough.	Edited
8	- The discussion part should be revised. It is an important part, but it seems that not many interesting points were presented and discussed. The points that the author would like to make is not clear at all. The discussion points in the first two paragraphs were not convincing. The author, for example, didn't explain what the results meant and why the results turned out the	This comment has been addressed.

	<p>way they were. Were there other factors influencing the results?, etc. The author just mentioned that the results were in line or not in line with the past studies. His/her voice can't be clearly seen.</p>	
9	<p>- In the last paragraph of the discussion part, although there were significant relationships between both pairs of variables, the correlations were not all strong. Discussion in this point would make the research more interesting and meaningful.</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed.</p>
10	<p>- In the same way, the conclusion part also needs to be made clear. The author mentioned at the very beginning and also at the end that the research in the area has not been widely conducted. However, it still cannot be clearly seen how this study can contribute to EFL teaching and learning. The discussion and the implications of the research results should show that the study makes a great contribution to teaching and learning in EFL contexts. That's why revision is needed for the discussion and the conclusion/implications parts.</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed and the section has been revised.</p>





# Language Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy: The Case of Indonesian Tertiary EFL Students

Daflizar<sup>a,\*</sup>, Urip Sulistiyo<sup>b</sup>, Dairabi Kamil<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> daflizar@yahoo.com, English Education Department, Education and Teacher Training Faculty, State Islamic Institute of Kerinci, Indonesia

<sup>b</sup> urip.sulistiyo@unja.ac.id, English Education Department, Education and Teacher Training Faculty, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

<sup>c</sup> drbkml@gmail.com, English Education Department, Education and Teacher Training Faculty, State Islamic Institute of Kerinci, Indonesia

\* Corresponding author, daflizar@yahoo.com

## APA Citation:

(Cambria, 10)

Received  
DD/MM/YYYY

Received in  
revised form  
DD/MM/YYYY

Accepted  
DD/MM/YYYY  
(Cambria, 9)

## Keywords

Language learning strategies; learner autonomy; autonomous learning abilities; inside and outside the class autonomous language learning

## Abstract

This study aimed at investigating the language learning strategies and autonomy of 76 Indonesian EFL university students and examining the correlations between the two. The Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) for ESL/EFL learners was used to collect the data on students' language learning strategy use and an adapted questionnaire developed by Chan et al. (2002) was used to assess students' autonomy. The results revealed that the Indonesian EFL students were medium users of memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies but high users of metacognitive strategies. The participants also had positive perceptions of their autonomous learning abilities and did engage in several autonomous activities both inside and beyond the classroom. However, many of the most preferred out-of-class activities are more receptive rather than productive language use. Significant correlations were found between

	students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities, and between their strategy use and the practices of autonomous English language learning outside the class. Practical implications for English language teaching in the Indonesian context are put forward.
--	--

## 1. Introduction

Language learning strategies and learner autonomy are two different terms that have always attracted notable research attention over the past few decades. The escalating interest in learner-centered approaches to language teaching, coupled with the progressing use of the technology-based approaches during the recent Covid-19 pandemic, emphasizes the recognition of the learners' active role in their learning and effective strategies they use in learning a new language. In the context of second or foreign language learning, learning strategies refer to "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferrable to new situations" (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989, p. 8). Meanwhile, learner autonomy is defined as the capacity to take control or take charge of one's own learning (Benson, 2013), which is manifested in how they go about their learning and transfer what they have learned to wider contexts (Little, 1991). Research has demonstrated that language learning strategies help students become more effective learners and boost the improvement of the target language (Oxford, 2016; Wong & Nunan, 2011), and that learner autonomy increases student motivation (Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998), active participation in learning activities (Dincer et al., 2012), and improves language proficiency (Dafei, 2007; Mohamadpour, 2013).

In a country where English is taught as a foreign language like Indonesia, classroom instruction may be the only venue where students have contact with English. Once they leave the classroom, opportunities to use English are scarce as they are totally engrossed in their first language surroundings. Coupled with other unsupportive factors for successful language learning such as large class sizes, limited time allocation for English instruction, and lack of teacher's encouragement for students' participation in the classroom activities (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Nur, 2004), promoting autonomous learning and effective learning

strategies becomes more important if students are to achieve an appropriate level of communicative proficiency and become successful language learners.

The interest in both language learning strategies and learner autonomy is mainly driven by a desire to understand the characteristics of good language learners because good language learners are supposed to take conscious actions to improve and control their language learning (Oxford et al., 2014). Thus, understanding the characteristics of good language learners is important because once the characteristics are understood, teachers can explore the potential for learner training and approach their students with helpful well-designed tasks to help their students become better language learners (Sewell, 2003).

It has long been suggested in the literature that there is a close link between learning strategies and learner autonomy. Dickinson (1987), for example, maintains that learning strategies are central factors in the promotion and development of learner autonomy because appropriate strategy use allows learners to take more responsibility for their learning. According to Rubin (1987), students who use effective learning strategies have a better capacity to work beyond the classroom on their own when the teacher is not available to give directions input for their learning. In a similar vein, Oxford et al. (2014) stated that the use of language learning strategies promotes language learning as a cognitive process whereby learners take full control of their learning process. Cotterall (1999) asserted that if learners lack learning strategies training, they will have difficulties in the classroom that foster autonomous learning. In an EFL context, Wang (2016) found that after strategy training, the learners increasingly become conscious that they should be responsible for their learning and know how to perform autonomous learning. Thus, understanding learners' strategy use and autonomy is of great importance as it could provide teachers with fruitful information before any interventions to develop students' language learning strategies and to foster learner autonomy are carried out.

A number of studies on either language learning strategies or learner autonomy have been conducted over the world. However, many of the studies have focused on other variables that may affect both of the concepts such as gender, proficiency, self-efficacy, and majors of study. Little empirical research has been conducted to investigate the relationship between the two. Additionally, research on this issue in the

Indonesian context is limited. Thus, this study attempted to fill the gaps by investigating the use of language learning strategies and learner autonomy among Indonesian tertiary students.

The purposes of this study were to identify the types of learning strategies used most and least by Indonesian tertiary EFL students and to investigate students' perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning and the extent to which the students engage in such learning activities inside and outside the classroom. The study also examined the correlation between students' language learning strategy and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous language learning, and the correlation between students' language learning strategy and the practice of autonomous language learning outside the classroom. Thus, the following research questions were formulated to guide this study:

1. What types of learning strategies do Indonesian tertiary EFL students use most and least in English language learning?
2. How do the students perceive their abilities in autonomous English language learning?
3. To what extent do the students engage in autonomous English language learning activities inside and outside the classroom?
4. Is there any correlation between students' language learning strategy and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning?
5. Is there any correlation between students' language learning strategy and the practice of autonomous English language learning outside the classroom?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Language Learning Strategies

Strategies in language learning have been mainly associated with those used to make effective language learning. Wenden (1987) viewed learning strategies as "the various operations that learners use in order to make sense of their learning" (pp. 7-8). Oxford and Nyikos (1989) regard the concept as "operations used by learners to aid the acquisition, storage, and retrieval and use of information" (p. 291). This definition was further elaborated as "specific actions taken by the learner to make

learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferrable to new situations” (p. 8). O’Malley and Chamot (1990) defined learning strategies as specific actions employed by the learner to facilitate learning, comprehending, and retaining new knowledge. In a similar vein, Oxford (1990) defined the concept as specific actions that the learners use in order to learn faster, easier, more self-directed, more enjoyable, more effective, and more transferable to the new settings. More recently, Ortega (2009) regards learning strategies as conscious perceptual and behavioral actions taken by learners for the purpose of gaining control over their learning. For Griffiths (2008), learning strategies are actions that learners deliberately select to control their learning. Oxford (2017) further elaborated the definition where language learning strategies are regarded as complex, dynamic actions learners select and employ in particular situations to accomplish language tasks and increase their language learning development.

Besides differing views on the definition, learning strategies have also been classified in several ways. Rubin (1981), for example, divided learning strategies into direct strategies and indirect strategies. The direct strategies consist of clarification or verification, memorization, monitoring, guessing, practice, and deductive reasoning. The indirect strategies include seeking opportunities and practices. Chamot and Kupper (1989) classified learning strategies into three main categories, i.e. cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective. Cognitive strategies refer to behaviors, actions, or techniques used by learners to facilitate them in acquiring knowledge. Metacognitive strategies are techniques employed to control the learning process through planning, monitoring, evaluating, and modifying. Socio-affective strategies are techniques used by learners such as by asking for clarification, cooperating, imitating, and repeating. Oxford (1990) classified language learning strategies into two major types, i.e. *direct* strategies and *indirect* strategies. Direct strategies are strategies that require mental processing of the language. These include memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. Meanwhile, indirect strategies refer to strategies that support and manage language learning without directly involving the target language, which include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (pp. 12-17). In Oxford’s system, memory strategies are strategies used for remembering and retrieving new information. Examples of these strategies are using new

English words in a sentence, using flashcards, and physically acting new English words. Cognitive strategies are mental strategies that learners use to understand and produce the language, such as reading for pleasure in English and watching English TV shows, while compensation strategies are those that help learners overcome knowledge gaps to continue the communication, for example using gestures and using synonyms. Metacognitive strategies refer to the strategies used for coordinating the learning process. Examples of these strategies include planning a schedule for learning and practicing English, looking for people to talk to in English, and thinking about progress in learning English. Affective strategies have to do with regulating emotion, such as rewarding oneself when doing well in English and writing down feelings in a language learning diary. Lastly, social strategies are strategies for learning the target language with others, for example practicing English with other students and learning about the culture of English speakers.

## 2.2 Learner Autonomy

Learner autonomy has so far been defined in many ways. This is because the concept is multifaceted (Benson, 2007; Smith, 2008) and there are diverse perspectives on what it constitutes (Palfreyman, 2003). Holec (1981) defined learner autonomy as “the ability to take charge of one’s learning” (p. 3). Little (1991) viewed the concept as “a *capacity* – for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action” (p. 4), which is actualized in how learners perform their learning and transfer what they have learned to broader environments. Dickinson (1987) defined learner autonomy as “the situation in which the learner is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those decisions” (p. 11). For him, autonomy means learners’ total responsibility for their learning performed without the investment of a teacher, institution, or specifically prepared materials. Benson (2001) defined the concept as “the capacity to take control of one’s own learning” (p. 47). Learners are decision-makers who practice different levels of control over learning management, learning content, and cognitive processes. Despite the numerous perspectives, there is a compromise that learner autonomy is best conceptualized as the capacity to take control or take charge of one’s own learning (Benson, 2013).

### 2.3 Research on Students' Learning Strategies and Autonomy

While a number of studies have been conducted on language learning strategies and learner autonomy, most of the studies have investigated the two separately (e.g. Alfian, 2021; Gani et al., 2018) or in relation to other variables (e.g. Bećirović et al., 2021; Yusnimar, 2019). Scarce research has been done to investigate the relationship between the two. Among the few studies that sought to investigate the relationship between learner autonomy and language learning strategies are presented below.

Chen and Pan (2015) conducted a study with 130 ninth graders of a junior high school in central Taiwan to determine the language learning strategies preferred by the students, their level of English learning autonomy, and the relationship between English learning autonomy and language learning strategies. The findings showed that the participants had a medium level of English learning autonomy and infrequent use of language learning strategies. The students tended to use memory strategies the most and affective strategies the least. In addition, a correlation was found between learners' learning autonomy levels and the use of language learning strategies.

Iamudom and Tangkiengsirisin (2020) investigated the learner autonomy level and language learning strategies use among 200 Thai EFL learners comparing international school students and Thai public-school students in a tutorial school. Employing mix-method research, the study used questionnaires and interviews to collect the data. The findings revealed that Thai public school students had a higher level of learner autonomy and employed language learning strategies more than the international school students. The Thai public school students mostly used compensation strategies whereas the international school students widely used cognitive strategies.

Samaie et al. (2015) investigated the autonomy level and gender differences in language learning strategies and the relationship between autonomy and learning strategy use among 150 Iranian university EFL students at three different universities. The instruments used to gather data were Learner Autonomy questionnaire (Spratt et al., 2002) and Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, 1990). The results showed that the students had autonomy in language learning and believed that they were able to take responsibility for their own learning.

A statistically significant difference was found between males and females in their learning strategy use in favor of female students. The results also showed that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between students' autonomy and their language learning strategy use.

Although the three studies cited above were conducted in three different contexts, they appeared to share similar results, i.e. that the use of language learning strategy has a positive relationship with learner autonomy. However, considering a wide range of EFL contexts around the world and the importance of language learning strategies and learner autonomy in language learning, the above-mentioned studies embody very few studies and the results still need to be validated. To address the gap, this research attempted to provide a better understanding of Indonesian students' use of language learning strategies and their learner autonomy as well as the connection between the two. The results of the present study are hoped to validate and complement the results obtained in the previous studies and assist in offering suitable recommendations to teachers in the Indonesian context.

### 3. Methods

#### 3.1 Participants

A total of 76 English department students of a higher education institution in Indonesia were recruited as the participants of this study. They comprised 65 females and 11 males, aged between 18 and 21 years old, and from three different years of study, i.e. year 1, year 2, and year 3, and with Intermediate English language proficiency on average. To select the participants, a convenience sampling technique was used.

#### 3.2 Research Instruments

Two different questionnaires were employed in this study. To collect the data on students' language learning strategy use, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) for ESL/EFL learners was used. The SILL is a self-reporting questionnaire aimed to assess the frequency of students' language learning strategy use with 5-point Likert scale options, i.e. 'never true of me', 'usually not true of me', 'somewhat true of me', 'usually true of me', and 'always true of me'. The



SILL consists of 50 items that are divided into six major categories of strategy, i.e. memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. This questionnaire was chosen because it is a standardized language learning strategy measurement tool that has been used in many studies around the world. In addition, the questionnaire is applicable to various foreign languages and has a high consistency of reliability, with 0.91 to 0.94 (Cronbach's Alpha) (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Ardasheva & Tretter, 2013). To assess students' learner autonomy, an adapted questionnaire developed by Chan et al. (2002) was employed. For the purpose of this study, two of three sections of the original questionnaire were used. The first section consisted of 11 items focusing on students' perceptions of their abilities in several areas of English language learning both inside and outside the classroom. The participants rated their answers on a five-point scale, i.e. 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = OK, 4 = good, and 5 = very good. The second section consists of 27 items that assess students' English language learning activities inside or outside the class, which could be considered as manifestations of autonomous language learning behavior. In this section of the questionnaire, students rated their answers on a four-point scale, i.e. 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, and 4 = often. The rationale for choosing this questionnaire was that it integrated several concepts of LA suggested in the literature (Chan et al., 2002) and had been used in many previous research studies (e.g. Daflizar, 2017; Farahani, 2014; Razeq, 2014; Yıldırım, 2008).

### 3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The students who agreed to participate in this study were given two sets of questionnaires to complete. Before the administration of the questionnaires, the participants were informed of the purpose of the study and were requested to complete the questionnaires as honestly as possible so that the results of the study would provide a better understanding of students' use of language learning strategies and autonomous language learning.

The data obtained through the questionnaires were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics with the help of SPSS. Specifically, mean scores, percentages, and standard deviations were used where appropriate for the descriptive data, and the Pearson

Correlation was used to examine the correlation between students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous learning and between their learning strategy use and the practice of autonomous English language learning outside the class.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Students' Usage of Language Learning Strategies

Table 1 shows the overall usage of language learning strategies among the participants. Oxford (1990) classified the strategy usage frequency into three levels: high (3.5-5.0), medium (2.5-3.4), and low (1.0-2.4).

Table 1

#### *Overall Usage of Language Learning Strategies*

Strategies	Mean	SD	Rank
<i>Direct Strategies</i>	3.33		
Memory Strategies	3.41	.42	2
Cognitive Strategies	3.23	.46	5
Compensation Strategies	3.35	.67	3
<i>Indirect Strategies</i>	3.38		
Metacognitive Strategies	3.97	.54	1
Affective Strategies	3.26	.57	4
Social Strategies	2.91	.64	6

As shown in Table 1, the participants were generally found to be medium users of memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies but high users of metacognitive strategies. With a mean score of 3.97, metacognitive strategies were ranked the highest, followed by memory strategies (M=3.41), and compensation strategies (M=3.35) at the second and third place respectively. Meanwhile, social strategies were ranked the lowest, with a mean score of 2.91.

Looking closely at the metacognitive strategies (See Table 2), 'I try to find out how to be a better learner of English' was scored the highest (M=4.39), followed by 'I pay attention when someone is speaking English' in the second place (M=4.38), and 'I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better' in the third (M=4.26).

Regarding social strategies (See Table 3), there were three strategies in the medium frequency category and two in the low-frequency category. These two least used strategies were 'I ask for help from English speakers' (M=2.29) and 'I try to learn about the culture of English speakers' (M=2.39). Meanwhile, only one strategy was in the high-frequency category, i.e. 'If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again' (M=3.87).

**Table 2**

*Students' Usage of Metacognitive Strategies*

Metacognitive Strategies	Mean	SD	Rank
I try to find as many ways I can to use my English.	4.05	.78	5
I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4.26	.71	3
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.38	.73	2
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.39	.65	1
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.64	.93	7
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.53	.80	8
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3.18	.85	9
I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.99	1.02	6
I think about my progress in learning English.	4.25	.73	4

**Table 3**

*Students' Usage of Social Strategies*

Social Strategies	Mean	SD	Rank
If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.87	.89	1
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.55	1.30	4
I practice English with other students.	3.14	1.00	3
I ask for help from English speakers.	2.29	1.19	6
I ask questions in English.	3.22	.84	2
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	2.39	1.13	5

## 4.2 Students' Perceptions of their Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning

Table 4 presents the percentages of students' responses concerning their perceptions of their abilities in several English language learning activities. As shown in the table, the students' responses clustered in the 'OK' and 'Good' categories of the scale, in which more than 40% of the students chose ten items in the 'OK' category and four items in the 'Good' category. The four activities in which students rated their abilities as 'good' are: choosing learning activities outside class (47.37%), choosing learning objectives in class (46.05%), choosing learning material in class (46.05%), and evaluating their learning (42.11%). The top five activities in which students rated their abilities as 'OK' are: deciding how long to spend on each activity (61.84%), choosing learning activities in class (53.95%), choosing learning materials outside class (52.63%), deciding what they should learn next in their English lesson (51.32%), choosing learning objectives outside the class (47.37%). Also, some students rated their abilities as 'very good' in identifying their weakness in English (22.37%). Only small percentages of the students rated their abilities as 'poor' or 'very poor' in any of the activities.

Table 4

### *Students' Perceptions of Their Abilities in Autonomous Learning*

Learning areas	Very poor (%)	Poor (%)	OK (%)	Good (%)	Very good (%)
Choosing learning activities in class	0	3.95	53.95	36.84	5.26
Choosing learning activities outside class	0	1.32	44.74	47.37	6.58
Choosing learning objectives in class	0	3.95	42.11	46.05	7.89
Choosing learning objectives outside class	0	5.26	47.37	32.89	14.47
Choosing learning materials in class	0	1.32	43.42	46.05	9.21
Choosing learning materials outside class	0	2.63	52.63	31.58	13.16
Evaluating your learning	0	6.58	43.42	42.11	7.89
Evaluating your course	1.32	5.26	47.37	38.16	7.89
Identifying your weakness in English	0	6.58	38.16	32.89	22.37
Deciding what you should learn next in your English lesson	0	0	51.32	35.53	13.16
Deciding how long to spend on each activity	0	5.26	61.84	26.32	6.58

### 4.3 Students' Engagement in Autonomous English Language Learning Activities Inside and Outside the Classroom

Table 5 shows the percentages of the students' responses for items probing their engagement in autonomous English language learning activities both inside and outside the classroom. Regarding outside classroom activities, there were 8 out of 22 activities that were practiced the most frequently (often or sometimes) by the majority (more than 70%) of the students, as listed in the order of frequency below:

- Listening to English songs (92.10%)
- Watching English movies (89.47%)
- Practicing using English with friends (88.16%)
- Noting down new words and their meanings (85.52%)
- Watching videos/DVDs/VCDs (84.21%)
- Watching English TV programs (82.89%)
- Using the internet in English (75.00%)
- Reading English notices around them (73.69%)
- Reading grammar books on your own (73.68%)

Table 5

#### *Students' Autonomous English Language Learning Activities*

No.	Activities	Least frequently practiced (Never + Rarely) (%)	Most frequently practiced (Often + Sometimes) (%)	Rank
Outside the class				
1.	Reading grammar books on your own	26.31	73.68	9
2.	Doing exercises which are not compulsory	39.48	60.53	12
3.	Noting down new words and their meanings	14.48	85.52	4
4.	Reading English notices around you	26.32	73.69	8
5.	Reading newspapers in English	59.21	40.79	20
6.	Sending e-mails in English	65.79	34.21	19
7.	Reading books or magazines in English	44.74	55.26	13

*Table 5 continued*

8.	Watching English TV programs	17.11	82.89	6
9.	Listening to English radio	64.47	35.53	18
10.	Listening to English songs	7.89	92.10	1
11.	Talking to foreigners in English	53.95	46.05	16
12.	Practicing using English with friends	11.85	88.16	3
13.	Doing English self-study in a group	32.90	67.11	10
14.	Watching English movies	10.53	89.47	2
15.	Writing a diary in English	71.06	28.95	21
16.	Using the internet in English	25.00	75.00	7
17.	Doing revision not required by the teacher	48.68	51.31	14
18.	Collecting texts in English (e.g. articles, brochures, labels, etc.)	44.73	55.26	13
19.	Going to see the teacher about your work	50.00	50.00	15
20.	Attending meetings in English	56.58	43.42	17
21.	Watching videos/DVDs/VCDs	15.79	84.21	5
22.	Reading English news online	35.53	64.48	11
Inside the Class				
23.	asked the teacher questions when you don't understand?	7.90	92.11	1
24.	noted down new information?	7.89	92.11	1
25.	made suggestions to the teacher?	69.73	30.26	4
26.	taken opportunities to speak in English?	13.15	86.84	2
27.	discussed learning problems with classmates?	14.47	85.52	3

In contrast, there were several activities infrequently (never or rarely) practiced by a considerable number of the students. They are:

- Writing a diary in English (71.06%)
- Sending e-mails in English (65.79%)
- Listening to English radio (64.47%)
- Reading newspapers in English (59.21%)

Regarding inside the classroom activities, four out of five learning activities were claimed to be frequently practiced by a vast majority of the students, including:

- asking the teacher questions when they don't understand (92.11%)
- noting down new information (92.11%)

- taking opportunities to speak in English (86.84%)
- discussing learning problems with classmates (85.52%)

On the contrary, a small number of the students (30.26%) indicated that they 'made suggestions to the teacher'.

#### 4.4 Correlations between Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and Their Perceptions of Their Abilities in Autonomous English Language Learning

A Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous learning. The results showed that there was a positive correlation between students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning ( $r=0.235$ ,  $N=76$ ). Moreover, the relationship was significant ( $p=.041$ ) (Table 6).

Table 6

##### *Learning Strategy Use and Abilities in Autonomous Learning*

		Strategy use	Abilities
Strategy use	Pearson Correlation	1	.235*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.041
	N	76	76
Abilities	Pearson Correlation	.235*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	
	N	76	76

#### 4.5 Correlations between Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and the Practice of Autonomous English Language Learning outside the Classroom

Another Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between students' language learning strategy use and their practice of autonomous English language learning outside the classroom. The results showed that there was a positive correlation between students' strategy use and their practice of autonomous English language learning outside the class ( $r=0.631$ ,  $N=76$ ) and the correlation was also significant ( $p=.000$ ) (Table 7).

Table 7

*Language Learning Strategy Use and the Practice of Autonomous English Language Learning Outside the Class*

		LLS	Autonomous Activities
LLS	Pearson Correlation	1	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	76	76
Autonomous Activities	Pearson Correlation	.631**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	76	76

## 5. Discussion

The findings of the current study showed that the most common strategies used by Indonesian tertiary students were metacognitive strategies. According to Oxford (1990), metacognitive strategies are “actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process” (p. 136). These findings are consistent with the findings of Rianto’s (2020) study in a similar context. However, the findings are different from the results reported in Chen and Pan’s (2015) study in the Taiwan context where the participants mostly used memory strategies, and those found in lamudom and Tangkiengsirisin’s (2020) study in the Thailand context, in which compensation strategies and cognitive strategies were mainly used by Thai public school students and international school students respectively. The high usage of metacognitive strategies may be due to students’ high underlying motivation to learn English since they were doing English major and the recognition of the importance of coordinating their language learning. Moreover, the dissimilarities of findings in different contexts confirm the theories and research findings suggesting that language learning strategy use is conditioned by the different cultural backgrounds of the learners (e.g. Habók et al., 2021; Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Gkonou, 2018).

The findings also showed that the participants of this study had positive views about their autonomous learning abilities concerning their English learning activities both inside and outside the classroom. These findings are in line with the findings achieved in several studies



undertaken in ESL or EFL contexts (e.g. Chan et al., 2002; Razeq, 2014; Üstünlüoğlu, 2009; Yıldırım, 2008). These positive views about their abilities could be attributed to students' age and maturity so that they feel confident to exercise these autonomy-related activities. Grow (1991) stated that "Self-direction,... is partly a personal trait analogous to maturity" (p. 127). With this understanding, the teacher should underpin these abilities by engaging students in more autonomy-related activities in the classroom.

The third question attempted to find out the extent to which the students engaged in autonomous English language learning activities inside and outside the class. The results showed that, out of 22 activities outside the classroom, there were 8 activities that were most frequently by the majority of the students. The top five activities were listening to English songs, watching English movies, practicing using English with friends, noting down new words and their meanings, and watching videos/DVDs/VCDs. These patterns of activities are similar to those revealed in several other studies undertaken in different contexts (e.g. Chan et al., 2002; Razeq, 2014; Tamer, 2013). It is apparent that some of these preferred activities involve the use of technology. This suggests that current technological advancements have facilitated students' engagement in language learning without the investment of a teacher. The literature has highlighted the advantages of technology use for autonomous language learning. Technology provides opportunities for students to use language in authentic settings (Kessler, 2009, p. 79), increases the exposure to the target language (Lai et al., 2015), fosters learners' control over their learning, and allows learners to choose the most up to date, beneficial and appropriate materials (Yumuk, 2002). Despite these apparent advantages, however, teachers still need to support and guide students on how to use technological resources for effective English learning. The support could be in the forms of motivation and recommendations on which technological resources to use, and advice on how to use the resources. It may be interesting to note that although most of the most frequently practiced activities involve receptive activities, '*practicing using English with friends*' and '*noting down new words and their meanings*' are linked with more productive language use. This indicates deliberate efforts made by the students to engage in activities for English language learning. On the contrary, the results of this study also showed that some activities were

'never' or 'rarely' practiced, namely 'writing a diary in English', sending e-mails in English, listening to English radio, and reading newspapers in English. These results confirm the results obtained in Daflizar's study (2020) in a similar context. This suggests that these activities are not common practices of students' learning in this context.

As for the inside-of-class activities, the majority of the participants claimed that they frequently engaged in four out of the five activities listed in the questionnaire. The activities were *asking the teacher questions when you don't understand*, *noting down new information*, *taking opportunities to speak in English*, and *discussing learning problems with classmates*. These findings indicate that the students do take some initiative in most of the inside the class activities. However, these behaviors may be best labeled as *reactive autonomy* (Littlewood, 1999). Unlike *proactive autonomy* where learners are able to take control of their own learning, reactive autonomy is the kind where learners would take control of their learning once the direction has been initiated by the teacher or the curriculum. However, reactive autonomy is important to take into account since it may be either a beginning phase to proactive autonomy or even a goal in its own right (Littlewood, 1999). On the other hand, the majority of the students claimed that they rarely or never made suggestions to the teacher. This is not unexpected since the cultural values in this context do not commonly encourage students to articulate their ideas. Students' reluctance in articulating their views such as making suggestions or asking argumentative questions to the teacher may be caused by their refusal to be considered deliberately critical, which may be considered culturally inappropriate conduct (Wachidah, 2001).

The statistical analyses of the data revealed that there were significant correlations between students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous learning, and between their strategy use and the practices of autonomous English language learning outside the class. These results are in line with those found by Chen and Pan (2015) and Samaie et al. (2015) in different contexts which found a correlation between students' use of language learning strategies and their autonomy in a positive way. In other words, the more language learning strategies the students use, the higher their level of autonomy. These results confirm the supposition put forwarded by Rubin (1987) that effective learning strategies use leads to students'

better capacity to work beyond the classroom on their own without the presence of the teacher. However, it is important to note that while the correlation between language learning strategy use and the practice of autonomous English language learning outside the classroom was moderate, the correlation between learning strategy use and students' perceptions of their abilities in autonomous English language learning was weak, which may indicate an unsubstantial connection between these two variables.

## 6. Conclusion and Implications

This study is one of the very few studies that investigated the use of language learning strategies and learner autonomy among Indonesian EFL university students. This study also elaborated on the relationship between these two concepts, which has not received much research attention. The results revealed that the Indonesian EFL students were medium users of memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies but high users of metacognitive strategies. The participants of this study were also found to have positive perceptions of their autonomous learning abilities regarding their English learning activities both inside and outside the classroom, and engage in many autonomous activities both inside and beyond the classroom. However, many of the most preferred out-of-class activities are more receptive rather than productive language use. The results also showed significant correlations between students' language learning strategy use and their perceptions of their abilities in autonomous learning, and between their strategy use and the practices of autonomous English language learning outside the classroom. These findings contribute to the existing body of literature particularly on the issue of language learning strategies and the level of learner autonomy among EFL students and validate previous research findings on the relationship between language learning strategies and learner autonomy.

The findings of the present study have some practical educational implications in EFL teaching and learning. Teachers should encourage students to engage in various English learning activities and use various language learning strategies to promote their self-confidence. The teachers should also design classroom activities that allow learner

involvement and self-reflection, and the use of the target language. Their role should be more as a facilitator who provide support and guidance than as an authority who control all language learning processes. Explicit strategy training may be needed as a transitional phase during which control is gradually shifted from the teacher to students and to make them recognize their abilities in the process as well as allow them to take responsibilities.

## 7. Limitations of the Study

As with any research, the present study has some limitations. First, it involved only a small number of participants from one higher education institution in a province in Indonesia. Further research should involve a bigger number of participants from a range of higher education institutions in order to increase the representativeness of the study and provide a more comprehensive portrait of the topic under investigation. Second, the data were collected only through self-report questionnaires. Further research should employ other data collection methods such as interviews, learning diaries, observations, etc. to enhance the richness of the data and yield a more comprehensive picture of students' actual practices of language learning strategies and autonomous learning.

## About the Authors

Daflizar: a senior lecturer at the English Education Department of the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic Institute of Kerinci, Indonesia. He obtained his Master's degree in TESOL and Ph.D. degree in Education (TESOL) from the University of Canberra, Australia. His research interests include learner autonomy, language learning strategies, language teaching and learning, technology-based language learning, and language learning motivation.

Urip Sulistiyo: a senior lecturer at the English Department of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Jambi University. His research interest is in the areas of language learning, curriculum and material development, teacher education, and teacher professional development.

Dairabi Kamil: a senior lecturer at the English Education Department of the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic Institute of Kerinci. He holds a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from the Faculty of Education, International Islamic University, Malaysia, an M.Ed. in TESOL from Monash University, Australia, and a B.Ed. from Jambi University, Indonesia. His research interests include English teacher professional development, curriculum and instruction, and teaching materials development.

## References

- Alfian. (2021). The Favored Language Learning Strategies of Islamic University EFL Learners. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 47-64. <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/SiELE/article/view/17844/13337>
- Ardasheva, Y., & Tretter, T. (2013). Strategy inventory for language learning-ELL student form: Testing for factorial validity. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 472-487.
- Bećirović, S., Brdarević-Čeljo, A., & Polz, E. (2021). Exploring the relationship between language learning strategies, academic achievement, grade level, and gender. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(2), 93-106. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.10771>
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Longman.
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(1), 21-40.
- Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and researching autonomy* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(1), 13-22.
- Chan, V., Spratt M., and Humphreys, G. (2002). Autonomous language learning: Hong Kong tertiary students' attitudes and behaviours. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 16(1), 1-18.
- Chen, H. I., & Pan, H. H. (2015). Learner autonomy and the use of language learning strategies in a Taiwanese junior high school. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 5(1), 52-64.
- Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about them? *System*, 27, 493-513.

- Dafei, D. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 24, 1-23.
- Daflizar. (2017). *Readiness for learner autonomy: An investigation into beliefs and practices on Indonesian tertiary EFL students* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Canberra). <https://researchsystem.canberra.edu.au/ws/portalfiles/portal/33682791/file>
- Daflizar. (2020). Autonomous English language learning beyond the classroom: Indonesian tertiary students' practices and constraints. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(10), 194-213. <http://ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/2705/pdf>
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *English Australia Journal*, 18(1), 21-30.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., & Takkac, M. (2012). The effect of autonomy supportive climates on EFL learners' engagement, achievement and competence in English speaking classrooms. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 3890-3894.
- Dörnyei, Z., and Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 203-29.
- Farahani, M. (2014). From spoon feeding to self-feeding: Are Iranian EFL learners ready to take charge of their own learning? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 11(1), 98-115.
- Gani, A., S., Khairisman, & Samad, I. A. (2018). Investigating rural students' strategies in English learning. *International Journal of Education*, 11(1), 68-77. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ije.v11i1.12836>
- Griffiths, C. (2008). Strategies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 83-98). Cambridge University Press.
- Grow, G. O. (1991). Teaching learners to be self-directed. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41(3), 125-149. <http://thinkteaching.pbworks.com/f/Grow01.pdf>

- Habók, A., Kong, Y., Ragchaa, J., & Magyar, A. (2021). Cross-cultural differences in foreign language learning strategy preferences among Hungarian, Chinese and Mongolian university students. *Heliyon*, 7, 1-7.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon Press.
- Iamudom, T., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2020). A comparison study of learner autonomy and language learning strategies among Thai EFL learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 199-212.
- Kessler, G. (2009). Student-initiated attention to form in wiki-based collaborative writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 79-95. <http://llt.msu.edu/vol13num1/kessler.pdf>
- Lai, C., Yeung, Y., & Hu, J. (2015). University student and teacher perceptions of teacher roles in promoting autonomous language learning with technology outside the classroom. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(4), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2015.1016441>
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Authentik.
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguists*, 20(1), 71-94.
- Mohamadpour, P. (2013). Realization of autonomy and English language proficiency among Iranian high school students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(7), 1187-1193.
- Nur, C. (2004). English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practices. In H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 178-186). Eastern University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, L. (2009). Sequences and processes in language learning. In Long, M. H., & Doughty, C. J. (eds.), *Handbook of language teaching* (pp. 81-105). Blackwell.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. University of Hawaii Press.

- Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.
- Oxford, R. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context (2nd edition)*. Routledge.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Oxford, R. L., & Gkonou, C. (2018). Interwoven: Culture, language, and learning strategies. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 403-426.
- Oxford, R. L., Griffiths, C., Longhini, A., Cohen, A. D., Macaro, E., & Harris, V. (2014). Experts' personal metaphors and similes about language learning strategies. *System*, 43(2), 11-29.
- Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300.
- Oxford, R. L., Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Schramm, K., Lavine, R., Gunning, P., & Nel, C. (2014). The learning strategy prism: Perspectives of learning strategy experts. *System*, 43(3), 30-49.
- Palfreyman, D. (2003). Introduction: Culture and learner autonomy. In D. Palfreyman & R. C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 1-19). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Razeq, A. A. A. (2014). University EFL learners' perceptions of their autonomous learning responsibilities and abilities. *RELC Journal*, 45(3), 321-326.
- Rianto, A. (2020). A study of language learning strategy use among Indonesian EFL university students. *Register Journal*, 13(02), 231-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v13i2.231-256>
- Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 117-131.
- Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology*. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-30). Prentice Hall.
- Samaie, M., Khany, R., & Habibi, N. (2015). On the relationship between learner autonomy and language learning strategies among Iranian



- EFL students. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2(6), 96-109.
- Sewell, H. D. (2003). The good language learner: Second language acquisition. Question PG/03/09. <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/secondlanguage/SewellSLA.pdf>
- Smith, R. (2008). The history of learner autonomy. In L. Dam (Ed.), *9th Nordic conference on developing learner autonomy in language learning and teaching: status and ways ahead after twenty years*, 2006. CVU.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr106oa>
- Tamer, O. (2013). *A Dissertation on students' readiness for autonomous learning of English as a foreign language* (Master's dissertation, The University of Sunderland). <http://www.awej.org/images/Theseanddissertation/OmerTamer/109thesis.pdf>
- Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2009). Autonomy in language learning: Do students take responsibility for their learning? *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5(2), 148-169.
- Wachidah, S. (2001). *EFL learning autonomy and output planning: A case in a Javanese-dominated general high school (Sekolah Menengah Umum) in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sydney).
- Wang, X. (2016). *Cultivation of learners' autonomy through strategy training*. 2nd Annual International Conference on Social Science and Contemporary Humanity Development. <https://www.atlantispress.com/article/25860626.pdf>
- Wenden, A. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 103-117.
- Wong, L. L. C., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, 39(2), 144-163.
- Yıldırım, Ö. (2008). Turkish EFL learners' readiness for learner autonomy. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(1), 65-80.
- Yumuk, A. (2002). Letting go of control to the learners: the role of the Internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an

academic translation course. *Educational Research*, 44(2), 141-156.

Yusnimar. (2018). Autonomous learning and teacher guidance: Towards the improvement of EFL students' prepared talk in speaking practice. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1), 97-107. <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/SiELE/article/view/10080/10162>



**Supakorn Phoocharoensil** <supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th>  
Kepada: dafizar dafizar

🖨️ Kam, 6 Jan jam 15:31 ★


Dear Dafizar

We are in the process of preparing your article for publication. Can you please confirm your first and last names as now there appears only one name in the article?

Please contact me by replying to this email as soon as you can.

Thank you.  
Editor  
LEARN Journal

Supakorn Phoocharoensil, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Editor-in-Chief  
LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network



**Supakorn Phoocharoensil** <supakorn.p@litu.tu.ac.th>  
Kepada: dafizar dafizar

🖨️ Kam, 6 Jan jam 16:48 ★

Dear Dafizar

Thank you for the prompt reply. Once the article is published, you will be informed.

Thank you