

ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNER AUTONOMY AMONG SPANISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Ruth Breeze

Universidad de Navarra

The trend towards learner autonomy in EFL in recent years has run in parallel with the proliferation of self-access centres and the increasing availability of multimedia self-study materials. However, unless the learners themselves are ready for independent modes of learning, they may make poor use of such facilities. It is thus important to ascertain the degree of readiness for learner independence among our students. To this end, a 45-item questionnaire designed and used in a British university was administered to a group of Spanish students studying English at a University language centre. While the Spanish students stated that they took responsibility for their own learning and enjoyed some independent work, they also exhibited a high degree of teacher dependence and felt that they could not improve without a class. It can be concluded that Spanish students value highly the teacher-class framework for language learning. Although a shift towards greater independence in language learning is positive, it would be unwise to promote this aspect at the expense of the traditional teacher-class structure. The ideal solution would be to incorporate aspects of learner training and greater autonomy within the existing structures, or to seek ways of integrating the affective and organizational aspects of the teacher-class system into more independent modes of learning.

1. INTRODUCTION

Learner autonomy has been a central theme in educational debate over the last thirty years. Paradigms in education as a whole have shifted away from teacher-centred learning towards more individualised or participative models of the learning process, and trends in language teaching have mirrored the developments in mainstream educational practice (Ribé 2000). In EFL, moves towards greater learner independence have been advocated for both practical and pedagogical reasons, with a view to offering greater flexibility of timetable and syllabus, while making learning more learner-centred, more motivating and more efficient (Dickinson 1987). The trend towards promoting learner independence in EFL has run parallel with the proliferation of self-access centres and the increasing availability of self-study materials, particularly in multimedia format. However, there is a danger that teachers and managers may assume that provision of facilities for self-study in itself

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 2 (Junio 2002): 23-36.
ISSN 0210-6124

suffices to make learners independent. Such an attitude ignores the real issues at stake, because learner autonomy is a question not of resources but of attitudes and experience. However carefully designed a self-access centre is, if our learners are not ready for independent modes of learning, they may make poor use of the facilities, or treat self-access time as an optional extra they can well dispense with. Moreover, if the training and support provided do not address students' real needs, they may feel alienated and insecure, and be incapable of rising to the challenge to become independent learners (Abraham and Vann 1987). As a result, they may reject programmes which include self-access modes of learning in favour of a traditional classroom-based approach elsewhere. As Little (1990) points out, "autonomy may be the last thing learners want".

In view of this, it is important to find out how our learners feel about moves towards greater autonomy (Wenden 1991: 146, 151). It has long been recognised that even mature learners may experience a conflict between the striving for autonomy which is a normal feature of the adult self-concept, and the attitudes to learning which they acquired in their educational history (at school or at university), which form the frame of reference within which they are accustomed to learning (Wenden 1991: 128). In the words of Horwitz (1987), "teachers are likely to find ... instances of student concern or dissatisfaction whenever instructional activities are inconsistent with students' preconceived beliefs about language learning". The application of methods or systems which run counter to students' expectations is often doomed to end in failure.

With this situation in mind, Broady (1996) developed a questionnaire designed to examine learner attitudes to autonomy, with a view to exploring "the learner's attitudes, knowledge and skill deriving from prior learning experiences" and analysing the implications of these for language pedagogy (216). She developed a 45-item questionnaire to measure readiness for self-direction, beliefs concerning the roles of students and teachers, and attitudes towards the acquisition of specific skills; she administered this questionnaire to a group of 46 British university students of French or German, and analysed the results.

The principal aim of the present paper was to use Broady's questionnaire to provide an initial picture of language learning beliefs relating to learner autonomy within a group of Spanish university EFL students.¹ A second objective was to compare the results obtained in Spain with Broady's results for British university students. Although it may be misleading to "label" students (Spack 1997) by nationality or ethnicity, and although we are now aware that many differences between learners are the result of individual styles and preferences, I felt that it would be useful to consider the student population I work with as a whole for the purposes of this particular study, as these students are heavily influenced by a particular educational culture that differs from that in Britain.

¹ I would like to express my thanks to Elspeth Broady of the University of Brighton for permission to use her questionnaire.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire designed by Broady (1996) was reproduced for use with the group of Spanish students. The questionnaire itself presents various ambiguities, inconsistencies and repetitions, the most serious being a failure to distinguish clearly between the different models of autonomy and classroom learning that have been developed (it is assumed throughout that there is an "autonomous learning" model in which students learn without any support from a teacher, and a "classroom" model in which teachers control most aspects of the learning process). Moreover, studies involving the administration of such questionnaires suffer from the defects inherent in the application of quantitative methodologies in general: the items are liable to misunderstanding or variations in subjective interpretation, and the whole agenda is devised and imposed by the researcher who designs the questionnaire. For this reason, open or semi-structured interviews followed by theme analyses have been felt to be a more appropriate tool for exploring complex issues involving experiences, feelings and attitudes in this area (Wenden 1991: 84). However, for the purposes of the present study, no changes were made to the questionnaire, with a view to facilitating comparison of results with those obtained by Broady with British students. The questionnaire comprises 45 items to be answered using a Likert scale. The questions are divided into eight groups as follows:

Group One: questions concerning general readiness to engage in self-directed learning, based on Guglielmo's Self-Directed Readiness questionnaire (1977).

Group Two: general attitudes to language learning without the presence of a teacher.

Groups Three and Four: evaluations of the teacher's role.

Group Five: beliefs on cooperative work and independent learning in specific areas such as vocabulary, grammar and receptive skills.

Groups Six and Seven: views concerning responsibility for selection of content, setting objectives and self-assessment.

Group Eight: attitudes towards external assessment, which provide a key to whether motivation is intrinsic or extrinsic.

Further discussion of the questionnaire and its design can be found in Broady (1996). The questions themselves are shown in tables 1 to 8, next to the results for each item.

2.2. THE SUBJECTS

The questionnaire was administered to 57 subjects, all of whom were enrolled in upper-intermediate level English language classes at a Spanish university language institute (University of Navarra, Pamplona). It was decided to limit the survey to the upper-intermediate classes in order to provide a fairly homogeneous sample (excluding beginners and false beginners, highly proficient students, and

students who had spent long periods of time abroad). All of the subjects were native speakers of Spanish, and were studying English at the language institute out of personal choice: in no case was the course an obligatory one, and in most cases the students could not obtain university credits for completing the course in question. Most of the students were aged between 18-26, and were studying for a first or higher degree in one of the university's twelve faculties. A small proportion of the students questioned were members of administrative or teaching staff. This sample represents a typical cross-section of the language institute's clientele.

The university language institute in question has a large self-access centre, and teachers actively promote its use by holding introductory sessions, taking groups of students into it to work, assigning homework involving the use of self-access materials, and so on. For students requiring guidance, a set of coordination sheets provides self-access activities tailored to each unit of the coursebooks used. However, students are also encouraged to work more freely, focusing on particular skills, or making use of borrowing facilities. All the students in this study were familiar with the self-access centre, and had been encouraged to use it.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The full results are displayed in tables 1 to 8. The first five columns of numbers show the frequencies of responses from 1 (almost never true of me) to 5 (almost always true of me). The next three columns present percentages of responses reduced to three categories: disagreement (1 and 2), neutral (3) and agreement (4 and 5). All percentages over 30% have been highlighted, as views held by at least one third of a group of learners merit consideration.

Group 1. General readiness for self-directed learning

There was general agreement among the group that the responsibility for learning resides with the learner (57.8% on item 1.1). Around half the group felt that they knew what they wanted to learn (1.4). Moreover, students declared themselves to be undeterred by things they did not understand (66.6% on 1.6), and external assessment was *not* the prime motivating factor in most cases (50.9% on 1.8).

Whereas all these markers would seem to indicate a degree of readiness for learner autonomy, there are also some indications to the contrary. Students were fairly evenly divided on the issue of whether they can learn successfully on their own (1.2), whether they have a hard time dealing with questions that have more than one right answer (1.5), and whether they expect the teacher to tell them exactly what to do (1.7). The most striking response, however, was to the issue of student participation in deciding what is to be learnt and how (1.3): here, 42.1% of students said they did *not* want to have a part in such decisions, while 31.6% felt that they did, and 26.3% were undecided.

Group 2. Independent work in language learning

Most students agreed strongly with the statement that language learning involves a lot of self-study (2.1). Their agreement was more measured when it came to the nature of this experience (2.2): 54.4% found learning on their own enjoyable, 28.1% were undecided, and 17.5% did not enjoy this kind of activity. The response to 2.3 (If the language class is not useful, I will work on my own) shows a degree of class-dependence: nearly half the students (47.4%) said that they would not do so. Furthermore, 64.9% felt that they would not enjoy learning a language completely on their own (2.4). The conclusion from this group of questions would seem to be that the students pay lip service to the idea that self-study is important, but many do not enjoy it, particularly in its extreme forms, and most feel uncertain that they would actually take the initiative in this area.

Group 3. Importance of class and teacher

The majority of students felt they could only improve with a class (3.1). Items 3.2 and 3.4 (A lot of language learning can be done without a class, and I feel I can only improve with a teacher to help me) are very similar, and the slight difference in wording was not reflected in any change in the students' response: 54.4% disagreed with 3.2, and exactly the same proportion agreed with 3.4. The most striking response, however, was to 3.3 (You have to have a teacher to learn a language effectively), which 89.4% of students agreed with—the largest number of agreements for any item. In short, the response to all the items in this group suggests a high degree of teacher dependence among this sample of students.

Group 4. Explanation and supervision by teacher

The majority of students agreed with all the items in this group: they wanted classes where teachers explain grammar and vocabulary (4.1), or indeed, everything (4.2); not surprisingly, they also felt that you cannot learn a language without a teacher's supervision (4.3) and that the best way to learn a language is by a teacher's explanation (4.4). In all four cases, a small but significant percentage of students disagreed (from 12.3% on item 4.4 to 26.3% on item 4.3). Nevertheless, the overall results here would tend to confirm that these students depend heavily on their teachers.

Group 5. Language learning activities

Most students (59.6%) enjoyed collaborative project work (5.1). However, they were more divided on whether grammar can be learnt without a teacher (5.2, 5.3) and on the responsibility for selecting vocabulary (5.5). Item 5.4 (It is important for the teacher to give students vocabulary to learn) produced more definite agreement (57.9%). Interestingly, item 5.6 (Reading and listening work is pointless in classes: it should be done outside the class) produced a high percentage of disagreements (73.7%) and item 5.8 (Cassettes and videos are best used by individuals rather than in a language class) also provoked more disagreement than agreement (54.4% disagreed). Finally, 61.4% of students agreed with item 5.7 (Language classes should be used mainly for speaking practice).

The pattern emerging from these responses is somewhat confused. On the one hand, students are divided as to whether grammar and vocabulary can be learnt without a teacher's guidance. On the other, they felt that reading, listening, cassettes and videos could be used profitably in class. Yet they also felt that classes should be used mainly for speaking. Grammar seems to rank low on these students' list of what should be covered in class, perhaps because of the widely held notion that "English does not have much grammar". However, the students seem to feel that practically everything else is best done in class —leaving little for self-study. Their attitude certainly contradicts the view that learners regard class time spent on listening, reading and video (activities that could easily be carried out in the self-access centre or at home) as wasted. It also indicates an unwillingness on the part of these learners to take responsibility for these activities on their own.

Group 6. Selection of content

Most students opted for teacher control in all four items in this group, the strongest responses being the 71.9% disagreement with 6.2 (I'd like to be able to choose my own material for language classes) and the 78.9% rejection of 6.3 (I know exactly the kind of material I like to work on for language classes).

Group 7. Objectives and evaluation

Students were divided on self-assessment of language work and proficiency (7.1 and 7.2), with a high rate of neutral responses (43.9% and 50.9% respectively). However, they felt more confident about their own perseverance and problem-solving abilities (7.3 and 7.4). A fair proportion (45.6%) felt they could define their objectives (7.5), but a similar proportion (42.1%) thought they did not know what was best for their own language learning (7.6); in both cases, a third of the students felt the opposite. A lot of students (40.4%) felt that others had a higher level of English than they themselves (7.7), and the majority of responses were neutral to the question of confidence (7.8).

In general, the responses to this group of items showed some uncertainty on issues of self-assessment and confidence. Moreover, even though many students felt they could define their own objectives, they seemed uncertain about how to achieve them. In general, the responses here show a certain lack of readiness for autonomy.

Group 8. Attitudes towards external assessment

The responses to this group of items were stable: most students thought that external assessment was *not* the main reasons for doing exercises, studying, and so on. This suggests a high degree of intrinsic motivation in this type of language class (it should be remembered that these student were not studying for credits, and the course was not obligatory).

In contrast to this general pattern, we must note the polarized response to 8.2 (All exercises should be marked by a teacher), in which 43.9% disagreement was

balanced by 38.6% agreement: in other words, over a third of the students felt that exercises *should* be marked by a teacher, an expectation which it may not always be possible to meet.

4. PROFILE OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS AUTONOMY

Various conclusions can be drawn from the above analysis regarding these students' readiness for learner autonomy. First of all, there was a general acknowledgement that learners are responsible for their own learning, and that independent work and project work are valuable. These learners had confidence in their own problem-solving abilities. Moreover, external assessment was not the main motivating factor, suggesting that these learners were to some extent self-directed.

However, these students also seemed to hold many beliefs which might well clash with the move towards greater autonomy. In particular, most students exhibited a high degree of teacher dependence. They rated teacher explanation and supervision highly, and felt that learning a language without a teacher would be neither feasible nor enjoyable. The majority of those questioned felt that they themselves ought not to be allowed to choose their own material for classes, or indeed, that they did not know what they themselves would like. The implication is that teachers should be responsible for deciding class content. Many students also felt that teachers ought also to set the objectives, and a fair proportion thought that teachers should also correct all exercises.

Perhaps the area with the most paradoxical responses was that of language learning activities. Students felt that teachers should direct vocabulary work, and that reading, listening and video should also be done in class. Yet they thought that most of the class should be devoted to speaking practice. When viewed in context, the results from this group of items probably reflect an underlying attitude that class time is what counts, because one cannot trust oneself to study effectively, or indeed study at all, outside class time.

5. COMPARISON WITH DATA FOR BRITISH STUDENTS

Although the pattern of results which emerged using Broady's questionnaire with this sample of Spanish university students was similar in some respects to that obtained with British students in Brighton, with a similar profile of readiness for self-directed learning (Table 1), there were some striking differences in various areas.²

The Spanish students expressed themselves more negatively towards the notion of working alone (2.3, 2.4) than their British counterparts. Along similar lines, the Spanish students were also much more likely to state their dependence on a teacher

² In accord with the design of this study, the results are discussed for the group as a whole. Here, as in Broady's study, cluster analyses to obtain profiles of possible different learner types were not performed. Such an analysis would provide a topic for further research.

(3.2 and 3.3), though far fewer Spanish students agreed with the statement that they wanted teachers to give detailed grammar and vocabulary explanations (4.1). It was also noteworthy that the Spanish felt strongly that language classes should be used mainly for speaking practice (5.7).

The area which as a whole saw the most striking divergence was that of selection of content (Group 6). British students were mainly neutral on this issue, whereas the Spanish students strongly resisted ideas that they should take more responsibility for syllabus content, and even said that they themselves did not know what they enjoyed.

On the other hand, the Spanish expressed themselves in more neutral terms than the British about self-assessment (Group 7), although this may be because this notion is not familiar to them.

The pattern emerging from this comparison highlights the Spanish students' greater dependence on the teacher, accompanied by their reluctance to work alone and to participate in the selection of learning material. It is interesting to speculate whether this was influenced by the nature of the sample. Broady's subjects were studying French or German for a BA in Applied Language; as "language specialists" they might be expected to feel more confident in organizing their own language learning, defining what they need to learn, choosing material, and so on. Their greater specialization might also account for their desire for detailed grammar and vocabulary explanations. The Spanish students were not language majors, and their interest in the language was of a practical nature. In addition to this, most degree courses in Spain have a heavy taught component, which leaves students with little time to devote to self-study of any kind. In this situation, the language class could well be the only time many of them can find for learning English.

Notwithstanding these contextual factors, the contrast in attitudes towards the role of the teacher and the selection of content is considerable. Such differences should be borne in mind when attempts are made to transfer learning systems which work in one context to a situation which differs both culturally and practically.

6. CONCLUSIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY

The attitudes outlined above have several implications for pedagogical practice and curriculum development in the Spanish university context.

First, it is encouraging to note that these learners feel responsible for their own learning, and are motivated by factors other than examinations. It would be interesting to explore the nature of motivation and objectives in this student population more deeply with a view to adapting the curriculum accordingly.

Secondly, the fact that the teacher-class framework is valued so highly by these learners warrants careful examination. The responses indicate that these students still chiefly view their role in the learning process as that of the "consumer of language

courses" (Holec 1987). These students depend on their teacher for guidance, feedback and motivation; they need the class structure to provide discipline, and the social environment to give them opportunities for interaction. Rather than lamenting these learners' apparent teacher dependence, we need to reflect that learner independence is not synonymous with working alone. The teacher/counsellor plays an important role in facilitating the process of re-orientation and personal discovery which is a natural outcome of self-directed learning (Kelly 1996; Esch 1997). Similarly, the social dimension of peer support is built into many independent learning models: far from implying isolation, learner autonomy in language learning has to entail "a capacity and willingness to act independently and in cooperation with others" (Dam 1995: 1), and the interactive dimension of group work has been found to provide a vital stimulus to autonomous learning programmes (Little 1997). We need to look at ways in which the affective and organizational aspects of the teacher-class system can be incorporated into more independent modes of learning (through tutorials, study groups, timetabled assignments, project work, and so on), and ways in which learners can be trained to organize their learning for themselves (through learner training, learner contracts, and so on).

Thirdly, the Spanish students' apparent rejection of the notion that they should be making decisions about their own learning and choosing their own material touches on a key issue in learner autonomy, because developed learner choice is essential if learner autonomy is to thrive. Holec (1981) states that learner autonomy consists of making decisions in learning, including setting objectives, defining contents and progressions, selecting methods and techniques, monitoring the procedure and evaluating the outcome. Autonomous learners need to be helped to develop metacognitive capacities that enable them to step back from what they are doing in order to reflect on it and make decisions about where to go next (Breen and Mann 1997).

In this context, it should be borne in mind that different educational cultures place differing emphases on the cultivation of such skills, and that many students who have passed through a system in which reliance on taught courses is very high may find moves towards learner independence both daunting and confusing. Ryan (1997) reports on a three-stage learner training programme in Japan which had the specific aim of teaching students to exploit self-access resources; his three stages comprised identifying and accessing resources, techniques for using them, and importantly, a third stage in which students reflected on some of the theoretical principles governing the relationship between the resources used and the principles of second language learning. One vital feature of learner training programmes in our own context should be guided decision-making activities in which learners develop practical and metacognitive skills in this area.

Fourthly, the students' non-committal attitude to self-assessment may be indicative of an under-developed understanding of both theory and practice in this area. Clearly, self-assessment is an integral part of the process of becoming more independent, and is implicated in the decision-making process discussed above. Students need to be made more aware of ways in which they can evaluate their own

progress. Above all, however, they also need to develop their notions of assessment from the basic grading concept inculcated by the education system to one that can be used positively to generate more personal and more appropriate learning plans. As Breen and Mann (1997: 139) put it, "the confident affirmation of self through taking responsibility for one's own progress locates the assessment process as a contributory element which actually enhances learning".

Finally, however positive a shift towards greater independence might be, it would be unwise to try to impose it from above onto this particular group of students, at the expense of the traditional teacher-class structure. Their responses to this questionnaire clearly indicate that they expect a traditional teacher-led class, and weakening of this framework could easily prove counter-productive. Students need to be provided with guidelines and guidance —some form of "scaffolding"— to help them to attain greater independence. Ways must be sought to incorporate project work and independent learning into the language class, so that class time can be used to share and evaluate the products of independently conducted projects, or to capitalize on self-access work in a social context. Learner training programmes need to be developed in which we look seriously at where the students are now, and where they could reasonably be expected to develop new skills. As Holec (1987: 154) says, "two courses of action are open to us. Either we take the pessimistic view and decide that this inability of learners to manage their learning is inevitable ... or we acknowledge the fact that learners can acquire the management ability they lack, and decide that it is also part of our responsibility to help them to become better managers". By moving gradually towards greater independence and encouraging conscious reflection on the learning process by all those involved, it is hoped that students will change their representations of their role in the learning process and gradually attain maturity as autonomous learners.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. and R. Vann 1987: "Strategies of Two Language Learners". Wenden and Rubin, eds. 85-102.
- Benson, P. and P. Voller eds 1997: *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*. London: Longman.
- Breen, M. and S. Mann 1997: "Shooting Arrows at the Sun: Perspectives on a Pedagogy for Autonomy". Benson and Voller, eds. 132-49.
- Broady, E. 1996: "Learner Attitudes towards Self-Direction". *Promoting Learner Autonomy in University Language Teaching*. Eds. E. Broady and M.M. Kenning London: CILT. 215-36.
- Dam, L. 1995: *Learner Autonomy 3: From Theory to Classroom Practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Dickinson, L. 1987: *Self-instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Esch, E. 1997: Learner Training for Autonomous Language Learning. Benson and Voller, eds. 164-75.
- Guglielmo, L. 1972: *Development of the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Holec, H. 1981: *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- 1987: "The Learner as Manager: Managing Learning or Managing to Learn?" Wenden and Rubin, eds. 145-57.
- Horwitz, E. 1987: "Surveying Student Beliefs about Language Learning". Wenden and Rubin, eds. 119-29.
- Kelly, R. 1996: "Language Counselling for Learner Autonomy: The Skilled Helper in Self-access Language Learning". *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning*. Eds. R. Pemberton, E. Li, W. Or and H. Pierson. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. 93-113.
- Lee, I. 1998: "Supporting Greater Autonomy in Language Learning". *ELT Journal* Volume 52.4: 282-89.
- Little, D. 1990: "Learner Autonomy in Practice". *Autonomy in Language Learning*. Ed. I. Gathercole. London: CILT. 7-15.
- 1997: "Responding Authentically to Authentic Texts: A Problem for Self-access Language Learning?" Benson and Voller, eds. 225-36.
- Ribé, R. 2000: "Of 'Tramas', Spaces and Creativity". *Developing Learner Autonomy in FL Learning*. Ed. R. Ribé. Barcelona: PPU. 81-107.
- Ryan, S. 1997: "Preparing Learners for Independence: Resources Beyond the Classroom". Benson and Voller, eds. 215-24.
- Spack, R. 1998: "The Rhetorical Construction of Multilingual Students". *TESOL Quarterly* 31.4: 765-74.
- Wenden, A. 1991: *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- and J. Rubin 1987: *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TABLES 1 TO 8:

L Language
 LL Language Learning

Note: On Likert scale, respondents identify their degree of agreement or disagreement with a statement by choosing one of five responses. The five options were presented as follows:

1. Almost never true of me.
2. Not often true of me.
3. Sometimes true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Almost always true of me.

Item	No	mean	% disagree	% neutral	% agree
If I don't learn, it's my fault	1.1	3.81	5.3	36.8	57.9
I learn a lot working by myself	1.2	3.19	26.3	35.1	38.6
I prefer classes where I can decide what will be learnt, how	1.3	2.96	42.1	26.3	31.6
I know what I want to learn	1.4	3.63	14.1	33.3	52.6
Dislike questions with not just one right answer	1.5	2.85	29.8	50.9	19.3
When I see something I don't understand, I stay away	1.6	2.38	66.6	12.3	21.1
I expect the teacher to tell me exactly what to do	1.7	3.03	33.3	33.3	33.3
If I get a good mark, I don't worry if I still have questions	1.8	2.66	50.9	15.8	33.3

Table 1: General readiness for self-directed learning.

Item	No	mean	% disagree	% neutral	% agree
LL involves lot of self-study	2.1	4.39	5.3	8.8	85.9
In LL I enjoy tasks where I can learn on my own	2.2	3.42	17.5	28.1	54.4
If L class is not useful, I can learn on my own	2.3	2.77	47.4	28.1	24.5
I would enjoy learning a language on my own	2.4	2.32	64.9	15.8	19.3

Table 2: Independent work in language learning.

Item	No	mean	% disagree	% neutral	% agree
I don't feel I could improve without a class	3.1	3.53	28.1	10.5	61.4
A lot of LL can be done without a teacher	3.2	2.58	54.4	19.3	26.3
You have to have a teacher to learn effectively	3.3	4.39	5.3	5.3	89.4
I feel I can only improve with a teacher to help	3.4	3.53	22.8	22.8	54.4

Table 3: Importance of class and teacher.

Item	No	mean	% disagree	% neutral	% agree
I want teacher to explain grammar and vocabulary in detail	4.1	3.59	19.3	26.3	54.4
In L classes, I like the teacher to explain everything to us	4.2	3.61	14.0	29.8	56.2
You cannot learn a language without supervision of teacher	4.3	3.59	26.3	15.8	57.9
Best way to learn a language is by the teacher's explanations	4.4	3.68	12.3	28.1	59.6

Table 4: Explanation and supervision by teacher.

Item	No	mean	% disagree	% neutral	% agree
I enjoy project work where I can work with other students	5.1	3.89	15.8	24.6	59.6
A lot of grammar can be learnt without a teacher	5.2	3.61	36.8	15.8	47.4
Grammar has to be explained by experts	5.3	2.95	36.8	35.1	28.1
It's important teacher gives students vocabulary to learn	5.4	3.56	24.6	17.5	57.9
Selecting new vocabulary is the students' responsibility	5.5	3.11	29.8	35.1	35.1
Reading/listening is pointless in L class	5.6	1.89	73.7	17.5	8.8
L classes should be used mainly for speaking practice	5.7	3.89	14.0	24.6	61.4
Cassettes and videos are best used by individuals	5.8	2.65	54.4	17.5	28.1

Table 5: Language learning activities.

Item	No	mean	%disagree	%neutral	%agree
Teacher should decide on course content for L classes	6.1	3.59	21.1	21.1	57.8
I want to choose my own material for L classes	6.2	2.12	71.9	17.6	10.5
I know exactly kind of material I like to work on	6.3	1.91	78.9	15.8	5.3
Not students' responsibility to decide on course content	6.4	3.44	26.3	17.5	56.2

Table 6: Selection of content.

Item	No	mean	%dis	%neu	%ag
I feel uncertain if asked to assess my L work	7.1	3.14	22.8	43.9	33.3
I feel I have a good idea of my L proficiency	7.2	2.98	26.3	50.9	22.8
I tend to give up when I experience problems with LL	7.3	2.44	59.6	19.3	21.1
If I have a problem with LL, I am confident I can solve it	7.4	3.51	22.8	21.1	56.1
I feel I can define my own objectives in LL	7.5	3.11	31.6	22.8	45.6
I feel I know what is best for my LL	7.6	2.82	42.1	24.6	33.3
I suspect other students in class have higher level of English	7.7	3.33	19.3	40.4	40.4
I feel confident about my level of English	7.8	2.89	26.3	50.9	22.8

Table 7: Objectives and evaluation.

Item	No	mean	%dis	%neu	%ag
I only work on an exercise if I have to hand it in	8.1	2.59	50.9	21.1	28.0
All exercises should be marked by a teacher	8.2	2.91	43.9	17.5	38.6
Exams are what motivate me to work hard in LL	8.3	2.54	52.6	26.3	21.1
An exercise is only worth doing if it is marked by a teacher	8.4	2.21	64.9	21.1	14.0
A L exercise is only worth doing if it is marked	8.5	2.75	47.4	28.0	24.6

Table 8: Attitudes towards external assessment.