Development and implementation of the learning autonomy scale in teaching Turkish as a foreign language

Nurcay Özkaya[1]

Berker Kurt[2*]

[1] Akdeniz University, School of Foreign Languages, 07058, Antalya, Turkey
[2] Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, 07058, Antalya, Turkey

Development and implementation of the learning autonomy scale in teaching Turkish as a foreign language

[1] Akdeniz University, School of Foreign Languages, 07058, Antalya, Turkey

[2] Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, 07058, Antalya, Turkey

[*]Corresponding Author

Email;nurcayozkaya@akdeniz.edu.tr[1], berkerakdeniz@gmail.com[2]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to develop learner autonomy scale in teaching Turkish as a foreign language and to analyze learner autonomy in terms of some variables. In this study, these dimensions were taken as the basis for scale development and examined in detail. We wanted to analyze the relationship between learner autonomy and gender, place of residence, desire to learn a language other than Turkish, purpose of learning Turkish, employment status, education level and academic field variables. Survey design methodology was used for this study. The universe of the study consisted of people who learned Turkish as a foreign language in Turkish Education Application and Research Centers (TÖMER) in Turkey and abroad and 370 people from 55 countries voluntarily participated in the study. Within the scope of the study, the "Learner Autonomy Scale for Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language", consisting of 6 factors and 25 items with necessary psychometric properties such as validity and reliability, was developed. According to the findings obtained with the application of the scale, it was seen that female participants had higher self-efficacy in the attitude factor towards foreign language learning than male participants. It was determined that among the participants, those who use foreign language learning strategies are more willing to learn a foreign language other than Turkish, compared to those who do not. In addition, it was seen that the participants who wanted to learn another foreign language other than Turkish had lower foreign language learning anxiety.

Keywords: Teaching Turkish as a foreign language, learner autonomy, scale development, foreign language teaching

INTRODUCTION

Learner autonomy, which means that the student takes responsibility for learning a foreign language, is based on the concept of "learning to learn", which is seen as an important part of learning a foreign language. Learner autonomy is the learner's ability to take responsibility for learning (Holec, 1981). In this way, students become more conscious of their own learning styles and learner autonomy paves the way for students to learn more effectively and permanently (Council of Europe, 2001:141) Autonomous learner is the type of student who takes an active approach according to the subject to be learned, takes risks and has strong predictive skills (Keegan, 1996). It is accepted that autonomous learners, with the help of their teachers at a certain level; can set realistic and achievable goals for themselves, choose appropriate methods and techniques to be adapted, observe their own learning processes, and evaluate their own learning progress (Benson, 2007; Dam, 1995; Holec, 1981; Little, 1991; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Wenden 1991). Considering learner autonomy while preparing a lesson, lessons turn into a collaborative effort, a joint production of all participants in a class (Allwright, 1984).

Learner autonomy can be thought of as a personality trait, a political criterion, or an educational movement. This is because autonomy is seen as a means of education, its endpoint, or both. According to Candy (1991); being organized and disciplined, being logical and analytical, being reflective (thoughtful) and self-aware, being able to display curiosity, being flexible, determined and responsible, being assertive and creative, being self-confident and having a positive self-perception being an independent and self-directed individual, developing skills to access information, having knowledge about the learning process, developing and using evaluation criteria are the common characteristics of autonomous learners.

According to Deci and Ryan (2000), there are three basic principles of autonomy: self-determination, competence, and relatedness. Self-determination is important for a healthy functioning psychology. As in psychology, this healthy functioning is a requirement in educational settings as well and it's not just an act, it's a basic understanding of freedom. Little (2012) grounds learner autonomy as accepting responsibility for one's own learning and bases learner autonomy on the concept of "universal cognition". It also argues that autonomy

is the psychological link between the learner and the process and learning. According to Littlewood (1999), responsibility is the basic dimension of learner autonomy.

The concept of autonomous learning is closely related to motivation. Motivation can be defined as the force that pushes people to act (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Motivation is an important area that affects the direction, determination and strength of student actions and activities in the learning process. In many definitions, self-regulation is seen as a process in which people organize and manage their own learning, including learners' own thoughts (for example, their own efficacy beliefs), emotions (for example, anxiety during learning), behaviors (for example, how they handle a task), and control over the learning environment (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 1998).

Sense of autonomy; can bring many positive results, such as reduced sensitivity to negative influences from peers, increased popularity among peers, and more engagement with school and academia (O'Donnell, Chang, & Miller, 2013). It is important to examine how learners form their thoughts about autonomy and learning because these thoughts affect learning outcomes. Interpretations can be positive or negative; the form of interpretation carried by the learner-positive or negative - will have certain effects on learning. Negative interpretations can lead to learned helplessness, which can lead to further failures, but positive interpretations result in increased achievement and learner autonomy.

Learner autonomy, which started to take its place in the field of language education and teaching since the mid-1970s, has been the focal point of the Council of Europe since 1979 (Little and Dam 1998), especially since the beginning of the 21st century, has become an important issue. Holec (1981) defines learner autonomy as "the ability to take responsibility for one's own learning".

In formal language learning, the extent of learner autonomy is always limited to what the learner can do in the target language; in other words, the extent of their autonomy as language learners depends on three basic pedagogical principles:

• **Learner engagement** – keeping learners active so that they can share responsibility for the learning process (affective and metacognitive dimensions),

• **Learner reflection** – helping learners think critically when planning, observing, and assessing their own learning (metacognitive dimension),

• **Appropriate target language use** – using the target language as the main tool for language learning (communicative and metacognitive dimensions) (Little & Dam 1998).

When the literature is scanned, there are many studies (Abadi & Baradaran, 2013; Alonazi, 2017; Balçıkanlı, 2008; Bandura, 1977; Bei, Mavroidis, & Giossos, 2019; Benson, 2007; Candy, 1991; Cotterall, 1995; Doğan & Mirici, 2017; Holec, 1981; Kohonen, 2012; Little, 1991; Liu, 2015; Macaskill & Taylor, 2010; Mohammadi & Mahdivand, 2019; Nguyen, 2009; Nunan, 1996; Sarı, 2020; Thanasoulas, 2000; Zimmerman, 1998) analysing learner autonomy in teaching languages other than Turkish. The number of studies on learner autonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign language is quite low. In the study conducted by Biçer (2015), the opinions of foreign students and lecturers about autonomy were consulted; it has been determined that students tend to behave autonomously while learning Turkish and they exhibit these behaviors to a large extent, while the instructors have a positive view of learner autonomy, but they exhibit some behaviors that are not suitable for this.

Studies on learner autonomy are needed to increase success in language teaching and learning. Within this need, with this study, which is thought to have contributions to the field, it is aimed to develop a scale that will describe learner autonomy in teaching Turkish as a foreign language and, by applying this scale, to reveal the learner autonomy levels of the participants with different variables. In this context, the researchers aimed to find answers to the following research question "Do the learner autonomy scores of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language differ in terms of gender, objectives for Turkish learning, employment status, education level, desire to learn a foreign language other than Turkish, place of residence, and occupation?"

METHOD

This study was structured using a hatching pattern. The purpose of the scanning design is to reveal and describe the existing situation related to the research subject (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017). The population of the study consists of people who learn Turkish as a foreign language in Turkish Education Application and Research Centers (TÖMER) in Turkey and abroad. In the study, which used e-mail list sampling, one of the online sampling methods, the participants were asked to answer the online data collection tool which was sent to them via e-mail between 01 February 2021 and 30 March 2021 through their universities.

370 people from 55 countries participated in the study voluntarily. Of the participants, 170 (46.1%) were female and 199 (53.9%) were male. Of the participants, 19 (5.2%) were from the Americas, 59 (16%) were from the Asian continent (excluding the Turkic Republics), 157 (15.5%) were from the Turkic Republics, 49 (13.3%) were from the European continent, 131 (35.6% are from the African continent, 53 (14.4%) are from the Middle East. The years of participants to start learning Turkish vary between 2013 and 2021, with the most participants starting in 2020 (36.1%).

Those who speak a foreign language other than Turkish are 353 (95.4%) and 17 (4.6%) who do not. While 293 (80.3%) of the participants learn Turkish for educational purposes, 72 (19.7%) learn it for other purposes. While 123 (33.9%) of the participants in the study were working in a job, 240 (66.1%) stated that they did not work in a job. While 75.5% of the participants are continuing their undergraduate program, 24.5% are in a graduate program. Participants mostly studied in Social Sciences (52.4%), followed by Engineering/Architecture (34%) and Medicine (13.6%), respectively. The Turkish level of the participants was 56 (15.3%) A1, 57 (15.5%) A2, 59 (16.1%) B1, 45 (12.3%) B2 and 150 (40.9) C1 levels. 81.1% of the participants stated that they wanted to learn another foreign language, while 18.9% stated that they did not want to.

Developing the Scale as a Data Collection Tool
The data about learner autonomy of the learners of Turkish as a foreign language were obtained by using the "Learner Autonomy Scale of the Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language" developed within the scope of the study.
The scale draft was created by the researchers to determine the learner autonomy behaviors of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language by scanning the relevant literature (Balçıkanlı, 2008; Benson, 2007; Biçer, 2017; Council of Europe, 2001; Holec, 1981; Little,1991; Nunan, 1996). The content validity study of the scale was completed with the opinions of 2 volunteer experts working in the field of measurement and education. After this process, the draft scale was written as 44 items and was created as a 10-point Likert scale, graded from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 10 (Totally Agree).
The data in the study were obtained by applying the draft scale to those who learn Turkish as a foreign language. Participants first marked the first part of the questionnaire consisting of demographic information questions, and then their degree of agreement with the items in the scale. Completing the scales is optional, and permission of the Research Ethics Board of Akdeniz University and the relevant universities were obtained for the application of the scales. In the study, scale items; (i) item discrimination, (ii) construct validity and (iii) reliability analyzes were conducted on data obtained from 370 students. In this context, Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was performed to determine the item-total values of the scale, and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was performed to get an idea about the structure of the draft scale. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was used to determine the reliability level of the scale and the heterogeneity of the items.

Item Discrimination
By using the data obtained, scales that were given the same score for all items and were not thought to be filled in sincerely were excluded from the scope of the study. The data, which were determined to be entered incorrectly because of the frequency analysis, were determined as missing data and a complete data set was created by assigning the serial averages to the missing data. Second, the data was checked for normality and outliers were extracted using z-scores. The z-score for each item was examined and data with a z-score greater than $|3.29|$ were not included in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the third stage, item-total correlations were calculated on the data obtained from 370 participants to determine how adequate the item criteria in the draft scale were in distinguishing individuals in terms of characteristics. Although the correlation coefficients obtained in item-total correlations varied between .053 and .68, all items were statistically significant except for only one item (Item 21). In this case, an item with insignificant item-total correlation was removed from the draft scale before factor analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis
To determine the factor number of the scale after item discrimination analysis,
▪ In the first step, principal component analysis and Horn's parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) were used together.
▪ In the second step, exploratory factor analysis was performed using the principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation. The rationale for using the Varimax rotation is the assumption that the scale factors may be weakly correlated with each other.
▪ In the third stage, factor loadings were examined to assign items to factors and theoretical suitability was considered. However, items with factor loadings below $|.40|$ or with factor loadings above $|.40|$ for at least two factors were not assigned to the factors.
It was understood that exploratory factor analysis could be performed with the results of KMO=.981, X2= 3294.97 and Bartlet's (p<.001) test analyzes of the firstly collected data. Then, because of principal component analysis and Horn parallel analysis in factor analysis, it was seen that a six (6) factor structure with an eigenvalue greater than 1, which explains 61.22% of the variance, was suggested for the scale.
When exploratory factor analysis was performed with Varimax rotation of the principal axis, it was determined that 25 items out of 43 were loaded on only one factor above $|.50|$. While 10 of the removed items (Item 12, Item 15, Item 25, Item 3, Item 31, Item 35, Item 37, Item 39, Item 4 and Item 43) have factor loadings below $|.40|$, 8 of them (Item 5, Item 6, Item 10, Item 11, Item 13, Item 17, Item 18, Item 27) have factor loadings above

|.40| in more than one factor. As presented in Table 3, the sum of the eigenvalues in the scale factors is 15.26, the sum of the explained variance percentage is 61.22 and the factor loadings of the items vary between |0.53| with |0.77|. In addition, when factor analysis was repeated for 25 items, it was observed that the factor loads of the items were high in only one factor (Table 1).

Table 1. Explanatory Factor Analysis Results of the Scale

Factors	Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies	Motivation for Learning a Foreign Langauge	Attitudes Towards Learning a Foreign Language	Self-Direction in Learning	Anxiety of Learning a Foreign Langauge	Expectations from the Teacher
Item	Factor Loadings	Factor Loadings	Factor Loadings	Factor Loadings	Factor Loadings	Factor Loadings
Item 23	.751					
Item 26	.724					
Item 24	.706					
Item 28	.705					
Item 29	.694					
Item 30	.674					
Item 19		.679				
Item 8		.674				
Item 36		.563				
Item 14		.552				
Item 16		.536				
Item 33			.764			
Item 34			.723			
Item 32			.715			
Item 2				.703		
Item 9				.686		
Item 1				.675		
Item 7				.538		
Item 20					.768	
Item 38					.752	
Item 22					.741	
Item 44					.557	
Item 41						.775
Item 40						.766
Item 42						.701
Eigenvalue	**9.599**	**2.376**	**1.576**	**1.378**	**1.316**	**1.060**
Explained Variance	**15.268**	**10.521**	**9.084**	**9.034**	**8.774**	**8.540**

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Based on the factors obtained because of the EFA, the LISREL 8.51 program was used to conduct confirmatory factor analysis with the data obtained from the second participant group. Before the confirmatory factor analysis, procedures like those in the exploratory factor analysis were carried out. After the exploratory factor analysis by controlling the normality in the data set, the z-score for each remaining item was examined and the determined extreme values were removed from the data set. For confirmatory factor analysis, fit statistics were analyzed using the maximum likelihood method.

The confirmatory factor analysis study carried out to determine the construct validity of the scale was conducted in two stages. First, it was determined whether the predicted values of the factors obtained because of the

exploratory factor analysis regarding the scale, before the confirmatory factor analysis results were evaluated, exceeded the theoretical limits. According to the result obtained, the value that did not exceed the theoretical limits was determined. Chi-square ($\chi2$) value and statistical significance levels were determined for confirmatory factor analysis [$\chi2$=560.88; sd=237, p<.01]. The low Chi-square ($\chi2$) value depending on the degrees of freedom showed that the proposed model was suitable for the collected data. In addition, other goodness-of-fit indices of the models [GFI=0.89, AGFI=0.86, PGFI=0.89, RMSEA= 0.06, CFI=0.90] showed that the proposed model for the scale was suitable. According to this result, when the values obtained regarding the study model within the scope of standard fit indices are examined, it can be said that the modeled factor structure is confirmed (Table 2). According to this result, when the values obtained for the study model are examined within the scope of standard fit values, it shows that the modeled factor structure is confirmed. When the PATH diagram of the model obtained by confirmatory factor analysis was examined, it was found that the standardized coefficients obtained in CFA, showing the relationship between factors and items, ranged from 0.48 to 0.81 (Table 2).

Table 2. Fit Parameters of the Draft Scale Regarding the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model

Fit Parameter	Coefficient
GFI	0.89
AGFI	0.86
PGFI	0.89
CFI	0.90
RMSEA	0.06
Sd	237
χ^2	560.88
χ^2/sd	2.36

As a result of the construct validity, the Learner Autonomy Scale of the Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language; it consisted of a total of 25 items and in ten point (10) Likert type Scale, including answers ranging from strongly disagree (1) to completely agree (10) and 6 factors (i) Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies (UFLLS), (ii) Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language (MLFL), (iii) Attitudes Towards Learning a Foreign Language (ATLFL), (iv) Self-Direction in Learning (SDL), (v) Foreign Language Learning Anxiety (FLLA), and (vi) Expectations from the Teacher (ET).

Process

At the beginning of the study, the Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board approved the study protocol (Akdeniz University, dated 08.01.2021 and numbered 21). A research package including demographic questions and scale items was created, and those learning Turkish as a foreign language were contacted. First, the purpose of the research was explained to the participants, informed consent forms were collected, and the participants were informed about the confidentiality of the data, the voluntariness and anonymity of participation. Those who declared that they would be participants were asked to answer the data collection tools. It took approximately 25-30 minutes for the participants to complete the research package.

In the study, the Learner Autonomy Scale scores of the participants' differences in terms of gender, the country they live in, the year they started learning Turkish, whether they know a foreign language other than Turkish, their purpose of learning Turkish, their working status, university levels, academic fields, Turkish levels, different language learning desires were analyzed by independent group t-test and ANOVA method.

FINDINGS

1. General Findings Regarding Learner Autonomy Scores of Those Who Learn Turkish as a Foreign Language

Responses of the participants to the learner autonomy questionnaire of learners of Turkish as a foreign language were described. "Attitude towards Learning a Foreign Language" scores of the participants in the study (X=7.69, SD=2.10), "Self-Orientation in Learning" (X=7.10, SD=1.86) and "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies" (X=6.96, SD=2.02) scores above average; "Expectation from the Teacher" (X=6.90, SD=2.19) scores are at medium level. On the other hand, "Foreign Language Learning Motivation" (X=6.62, SD=2.08) and "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" (X=4.78, SD=2.16) are at moderate-low level. The correlation coefficients of the relationships between the variable scores were analyzed (Table 3). The results showed that there was a positive significant correlation between the variable scores. The highest correlation was between the "Foreign Language Learning Motivation" score and the "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies" score (r=.59); the lowest correlation was found between the "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" score and the

"Attitude towards Foreign Language Learning" score (r=.00). There was also a negative correlation between foreign language learning anxiety and self-direction in learning.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients of the Learner Autonomy Scale of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language

	X	SS	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-UFLLS	6.96	2.02	-					
2-MLFL	6.62	2.08	.59*	-				
3-ATLFL	7.70	2.11	.50*	.52*	-			
4-SDL	7.11	1,.87	.54*	.52*	.39*	-		
5-FLLA	4.79	2.17	.02*	.03*	-.00*	-.11*	-	
6-ET	9.91	2.19	.44*	.42*	.42*	.35*	.17*	-
Total	**6.91**	**1.33**	**.78***	**.77***	**.73***	**.74***	**-.24***	**.64***

*p<.001

2. Findings on Gender Differences

The differences in learner autonomy of learners of Turkish as a foreign language in terms of gender were analyzed using the independent group t-test method (Table 4). The results showed that women's mean (8.01) was higher than men's (7.42) in the attitude factor of learner autonomy scale of learner autonomy scale of female academicians who learn Turkish as a foreign language (p<.01); in other words, it showed that females had higher self-efficacy than male participants. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between men and women in the other factors and total score of the learner autonomy scale (p>.05).

Table 4. T-test Results by Gender Variable

	Women (n=170)		Men (n=199)		t	p
	X	SS	X	SS		
1-UFLLS	6.97	2.04	6.97	2.01	-.026	979
2-MLFL	6.61	2.04	6.63	2.13	-.103	919
3-ATLFL	8.01	1.89	7.42	2.25	2.66	008
4-SDL	7.19	1.83	7.04	1.91	776	438
5-FLLA	4.87	2.12	4.73	2.21	620	535
6-ET	6.94	2.18	6.89	2.20	186	853
Total	**6.97**	**1.30**	**6.87**	**1.37**	**725**	**469**

3. Findings Regarding the Purpose of Learning Turkish

The differences between the learner autonomy of the participants in learning Turkish as a foreign language and the learning objectives of Turkish were analyzed using the independent group t-test method (Table 5). According to this, it was seen that those who learned Turkish for educational purposes (7.23) were higher in using a foreign language learning strategy than those who learned it for other purposes (6.02), those who learned Turkish for educational purposes (7.28) were higher than those who learned Turkish for other purposes (6.55) in self-direction in learning. At the same time, it was seen that those who learned Turkish for educational purposes (7.05) were higher than those who learned Turkish for other purposes (6.49) in the total score. On the other hand, no significant difference was found in the other factors of the learner autonomy scale according to the purpose of learning Turkish (p>.05).

Table 5. T-test Results According to the Variable of Purpose of Learning Turkish

	Other (n=72)		Educational Purposes (n=293)		t	p
	X	SS	X	SS		
1-UFLLS	6.02	2.30	7.23	1.86	-4.69	000
2-MLFL	6.25	2.39	6.74	1.98	-1.80	073
3-ATLFL	7.31	2.38	7.83	2.00	-1.90	058
4-SDL	6.55	2.00	7.28	1.78	-3.07	002

5-FLLA	4.91	2.23	4.75	2.17	0.58	565
6-ET	6.71	2.32	6.98	2.15	.94	351
Total	**6.49**	**1.45**	**7.05**	**1.26**	**3.29**	**001**

4. Findings Regarding Working Status

The differences in learning Turkish as a foreign language and learner autonomy of the participants in terms of their working status were analyzed using the independent group t-test method (Table 6). At the end of the examination, it was seen that the learner autonomy scores of the participants did not differ according to the working situation.

Table 6. T-test Results by Working Status Variable

	No (n=240)		Yes (n=123)		t	p
	X	SS	X	SS		
1-UFLLS	7.01	1.93	6.98	2.10	130	896
2-MLFL	6.73	2.02	6.45	2.21	1.21	229
3-ATLFL	7.67	2.08	7.79	2.10	-.514	608
4-SDL	7.21	1.79	7.00	1.96	1.04	298
5-FLLA	4.77	2.13	4.68	2.22	367	714
6-ET	6.80	2.22	7.22	2.13	-1.73	085
Total	**6.94**	**1.28**	**6.96**	**1.38**	**-.121**	**904**

5. Findings Regarding Education Levels

The differences between participants' learning Turkish as a foreign language, learner autonomy, and learning levels were analyzed with the independent group t-test (Table 7). At the end of the analysis, it was seen that the learner autonomy scores of the participants did not differ according to the level of education.

Table 7. T-test Results by Education Level Variable

	Bachelors Degree (n=188)		Graduate (n=61)		t	p
	X	SS	X	SS		
1-UFLLS	7.06	2.00	7.33	1.89	-.926	355
2-MLFL	6.71	2.12	6.63	1.96	264	792
3-ATLFL	7.83	2.21	7.38	1.92	1.438	152
4-SDL	7.06	1.97	7.37	1.82	-1.101	272
5-FLLA	4.68	2.24	4.94	2.12	-.799	425
6-ET	6.87	2.23	6.81	2.27	171	865
Total	**6.97**	**1.44**	**6.93**	**1.23**	**219**	**827**

6. Findings Regarding the Desire to Learn a Language Other Than Turkish

The differences between the learners' autonomy of learning Turkish as a foreign language and their willingness to learn different languages were analyzed using the independent group t-test method (Table 8). Accordingly, it was seen that the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish in using a foreign language learning strategy (7.15) were higher than the scores of those who do not want to learn a language other than Turkish (6.17), in the attitude towards learning a foreign language, the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish (7.83) were higher than those who do not want to learn another language other than Turkish (7.12), the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish (7.27) in self-direction in learning the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish (7.27) are higher than those who do not want to learn a language other than Turkish (6.44), in expectation from the teacher the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish (7.03) are higher than the scores of those who do not want to learn a language other than Turkish (6.38) and in the total score, the scores of those who want to learn a language other than Turkish (7.04) are higher than those who do not want to learn a language other than Turkish (6.38).

Table 8. T-test Results by Variable of Desire to Learn a Different Language

	No (n=70)		Yes (n=300)		t	p
	X	SS	X	SS		
1-UFLLS	6.17	2.34	7.15	1.90	-3.719	000
2-MLFL	6.32	2.08	6.69	2.08	-1.347	179
3-ATLFL	7.12	2.43	7.83	2.01	-2.539	012
4-SDL	6.44	1.90	7.27	1.83	-3.389	001

5-FLLA	5.14	2.08	4.71	2.18	1.489	137
6-ET	6.38	2.18	7.03	2.18	-2.261	024
Total	**6.38**	**1.41**	**7.04**	**1.29**	**-3.800**	**000**

7. Findings Concerning the Differences in Settlement

The differences between the learner autonomy of the participants' learning Turkish as a foreign language and the place of residence variable were analyzed using the ANOVA method (Table 9). According to the ANOVA results, "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies", " Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language ", " Attitudes Towards Learning a Foreign Language ", "4- Self-Direction in Learning", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety", "Expectations from the Teacher" factor scores and "Total" score. There was no significant difference according to the place of residence. (p<.001). According to ANOVA results, all sub-dimensions of the scale (Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies, Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language, Attitudes Towards Learning a Foreign Language, Self-Direction in Learning, Foreign Language Learning Anxiety, Expectations from Teacher, and Total sub-dimension) show differences within the group. Participants from Asia use Foreign Language Learning Strategies at a higher rate than those from Europe (p=.033). Participants from the Turkic Republics have higher self-direction scores in learning than those from Europe and Africa. Those who participated in the study from the Americas had higher foreign language learning anxiety scores than those who participated in the study from Asia and the Turkic Republics. In total, participants from Asia have higher scores than those from Europe and Africa.

Table 9. ANOVA Results by Academic Study Area Variable

		Var. K.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p
1-UFLLS	Intergroups	71,704	14,341	3,646	003
	Within the group	1423,727	3,933		
	Total	1495,430			
2- MLFL	Intergroups	58,700	11,740	2.763	018
	Within the group	1538,343	4,250		
	Total	1597,043			
3- ATLFL	Intergroups	65,107	13,021	3,023	011
	Within the group	1559,309	4,307		
	Total	1624,415			
4 SDL	Intergroups	83,376	16,675	5.011	000
	Within the group	1204,741	3,328		
	Total	1288,117			
5-FLLA	Intergroups	158,775	31,755	7.295	000
	Within the group	1575,729	4,353		
	Total	1734,505			
6-ET	Intergroups	75,843	15,169	3,266	007
	Within the group	1681,478	4,645		
	Total	1757,321			
Total	Intergroups	50,804	10,161	5,088	000
	Within the group	604,131	1,669		
	Total	654,935			

8. Findings on Occupational Differences

The differences between the learner autonomy of the participants in learning Turkish as a foreign language and the occupational field variable were analyzed using the ANOVA method (Table 10). According to the ANOVA results, "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies", " Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language ", "Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning", "Self- Direction in Learning", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety", "Expectations from the Teacher" factor scores and "Total" score did not show a significant difference according to occupational differences (p<.001). According to the ANOVA results, it was seen that the attitudes

of those studying in medicine towards learning a foreign language were higher than those studying in Engineering/Architecture departments.

Table 10. ANOVA Results by Occupational Field Variable

	Var. K.	S.S.	M.S.	F	p
1-UFLLS	Intergroups	6,651	3,325	878	417
	Within the group	934,979	3,785		
	Total	941,629			
2-MLFL	Intergroups	6,284	3,142	4.378	486
	Within the group	1072,427	4,342		
	Total	1078,711			
3-ATLFL	Intergroups	40,273	20,137	4.378	014
	Within the group	1136,009	4,599		
	Total	1176,283			
4-SDL	Intergroups	4,346	2,173	608	545
	Within the group	883,334	3,576		
	Total	887,680			
5-FLLA	Intergroups	7,914	3,957	787	457
	Within the group	1242,457	5,030		
	Total	1250,371			
6-ET	Intergroups	3,237	1,618	320	726
	Within the group	1247,654	5,051		
	Total	1250,891			
Total	Intergroups	3,031	1,515	820	442
	Within the group	456,366	1,848		
	Total	459,397			

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Conclusion and Discussion

In the study, the learner autonomy scale was developed within the scope of teaching Turkish as a foreign language and the learner autonomy of the participants was analyzed considering some variables. In the scale development phase of the research, the scale items on the data obtained from 370 students; (i) item discrimination, (ii) construct validity and (iii) reliability analyzes were conducted. Although the correlation coefficients obtained in item-total correlations varied between .053 and .68, all items were statistically significant except for only one item (Item 21). An item with insignificant item-total correlation was removed from the draft scale before factor analysis. As a result of the construct validity, the Learner Autonomy Scale of the Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language; Ten points (10) Likert-type 25 items in total and (i) Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies, (ii) Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language, (iii) Attitudes Towards Learning a Foreign Language, (iv) Self-Direction in Learning, (v) Foreign Language Learning Anxiety and (vi) Expectations from the Teacher. With these features, this scale differs from the scale developed by Biçer (2017) in the literature in terms of the number of factors and items.

When the answers given by the study participants to the Questionnaire of Learner Autonomy of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language were examined, it was found that the scores of "Attitudes towards Learning a Foreign Language", "Directing Oneself in Learning" and "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies" were above average; the scores of "Expectations from the Teacher" were moderate, whereas the scores of " Motivation for Learning a Foreign Language " and "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" were at moderate-low level. When the correlation coefficients of the relations between the variable scores were examined, it was seen that there was a positive significant correlation between the variable scores. It was seen that the highest correlation was between "Foreign Language Learning Motivation" score and "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies" score, while the lowest correlation was between "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" score and "Attitude towards Foreign Language Learning" score. It was observed that there was a negative correlation between foreign language learning anxiety and self-direction in learning.

When the differences in learner autonomy of Turkish as a foreign language were examined in terms of gender variable, it was seen that female participants had higher self-efficacy than male participants in the attitude factor of learner autonomy scale of learner autonomy scale of those learning Turkish as a foreign language. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between men and women in the other factors and total score of the learner autonomy scale. These results are parallel with Bei, Mavroidis and Giossos (2019). According to the research findings, a significant difference was found in favor of women in the dimension of personal autonomy, especially in the factor of "coping with difficulties".

When the differences in learner autonomy of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language are examined in terms of learning objectives, it is observed that the scores of those who learn Turkish for educational purposes in using a foreign language learning strategy and self-direction in learning, as well as their total scores, are high. On the other hand, no significant difference was observed in the other factors of the learner autonomy scale according to the purpose of learning Turkish. Those who learn Turkish for educational purposes have a higher motivation in learning because the language they will use in their education is Turkish, and with this motivation, their ability to use foreign language learning strategies and self-direction is higher. For example, this situation may not be observed in those people whose spouses are Turkish and for this reason they want to learn Turkish; or who come to Turkey for work or for other purposes and are learning Turkish for this reason. Higher total scores indicate that those who learn Turkish for educational purposes have a higher level of autonomy.

When the differences in learner autonomy of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language are examined in terms of their working status, it is seen that the learner autonomy scores of the participants do not differ according to their working status. This situation shows that whether the learner is actively working in a job or not does not affect the foreign language learning autonomy.

When the differences in learner autonomy of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language are analyzed in terms of their educational level, it is observed that the learner autonomy scores of the participants do not differ according to the university education level. Nguyen (2009) also stated in his study that the level of autonomy is related to the academic achievement level of the student in the language, but not related to the grade level. This shows that whether the learners receive education at the undergraduate, graduate, or doctoral level does not make a difference in terms of their autonomy.

When the differences in learner autonomy of those who learn Turkish as a foreign language are examined in terms of their desire to learn a different language other than Turkish, it is seen that those with high foreign language learning strategy use scores, attitude towards foreign language learning, self-direction in learning, expectation from the teacher and their total scores have a different language learning desire. It has been observed that those who want to learn a language have lower foreign language learning anxiety. It has been determined that as the language levels of the participants increase, their self-confidence also increases, thus increasing their autonomy.

When the differences in learner autonomy of learners of Turkish as a foreign language are examined in terms of the place of residence variable, "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies", "Foreign Language Learning Motivation", "Attitude towards Learning a Foreign Language", "Self-Orientation in Learning", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" There was no significant difference in "Expectation from Teacher" factor scores and total and "Total" scores according to the place of residence. All sub-dimensions of the scale (Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies, Foreign Language Learning Motivation, Attitudes towards Foreign Language Learning, Self-Orientation in Learning, Foreign Language Learning Anxiety, Expectation from Teacher) and total sub-dimensions differ within the group. Participants from Asia use foreign language learning strategies at a higher rate than those from Europe. Participants from Turkic Republics have higher self-direction scores in learning than those from European and African countries. Those who participated in the study from the Americas had higher foreign language learning anxiety scores than those who participated in the study from Asia and the Turkic Republics. The reason for this may be due to the similarity in the languages of students from the Turkic Republics, while Turkish is structurally very different from the American languages; While difference may increase anxiety, similarity may decrease it. In total, participants from Asia have higher scores than those from Europe and Africa.

When the differences in learner autonomy of learners of Turkish as a foreign language are examined in terms of the occupational field variable, "Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies", "Foreign Language Learning Motivation", "Attitude towards Learning a Foreign Language", "Self-Orientation in Learning", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety", "Foreign Language Learning Anxiety" There was no significant difference in "Expectation from Teacher" factor scores and total and "Total" scores according to occupational differences. It was observed that the attitudes of those studying in health sciences towards learning a foreign language were higher than those studying in engineering/architecture departments.

Considering the findings, the scale developed because of this study has the necessary psychometric properties such as validity and reliability and can be applied in future research. However, studies should be applied to more diverse populations to make stronger analyzes and generalizations. As Benson (2013) said, there is an increasing interest in autonomous learning, but this is not to the desired extent. It is very important to recognize and

support learner autonomy in foreign language classes. There is a consensus in the field that the role of the teacher in autonomous learning cannot be ignored. (Little, 1991). To develop learner autonomy in the classroom, teachers should encourage their students to be independent and cooperate with their peers, keeping a diary of their own learning experiences. The teacher should explain student roles at the beginning, move students step by step from mutual solidarity to independence, give students projects to do outside of the classroom, have students prepare course materials to be used in the classroom, explain how to use some resources, encourage students to use only the target language in the classroom, it is necessary to emphasize fluency rather than accuracy in the language, and to organize sessions so that students can develop an insight into their own learning styles and strategies (Ministry of National Education, 2006).

Unless all stakeholders are familiar with autonomous learning, it is difficult for them to achieve fully autonomous learning. To cope with this, it should be ensured that all stakeholders can raise awareness about autonomous learning through model applications.

2. Suggestions

In this study, it can be said that the target sample size for scale development has been reached. Therefore, this scale can be used in other studies as well. There are few learner autonomy scales in teaching Turkish as a foreign language, but it is the first comprehensive scale that includes factors such as Using Foreign Language Learning Strategies, Foreign Language Learning Motivation, Attitudes towards Foreign Language Learning, Self-Orientation in Learning, Foreign Language Learning Anxiety and Expectation from the Teacher, which have become increasingly important in recent years. It can be said that it is a scale study. Therefore, the use of this developed scale with other data collection tools will contribute to the literature. In addition, the scale can be used as a tool by all stakeholders in the field of Turkish teaching.

This study is about learner autonomy, which is a common feature found in successful learners of a foreign language. As seen in the findings of the study, it has been determined that those who learn the language successfully are autonomous learners. Therefore, improving learner autonomy should be one of the objectives of foreign language teaching. Since this is not a spontaneous feature, the support of teachers is needed. Therefore, it would be beneficial for the teacher to consider the factors that support learner autonomy while preparing the curriculum and plans, creating the course materials, and choosing in-class and out-of-class teaching approaches, methods, and techniques. However, teachers who will support autonomy and encourage students to be autonomous need to be autonomous learners themselves. He should get out of the role of the teacher who gives the classic lecture and adopt the role of the mentor teacher who leads the learning. However, teachers who have not received training on this subject may be somewhat inadequate in terms of supporting autonomy. Therefore, it is thought that working on autonomy in teacher training institutions and/or studying the issue of autonomy in in-service training programs as a separate topic will contribute to this issue.

REFERENCES

1. Abadi, E. A. M., & Baradaran, A. (2013). The relationship between learner autonomy and vocabulary learning strategies in Iranian EFL learners with different language proficiency level. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 2(3), 176-185.
2. Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. Applied linguistics, 5(2), 156-171.
3. Alonazi, S. M. (2017). The Role of Teachers in Promoting Learner Autonomy in Secondary Schools in Saudi Arabia. English Language Teaching, 10(7), 183-202.
4. Balçıkanlı, C. (2008). İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda öğrenen özerkliğini arttırmak [Fostering learner autonomy in EFL classrooms]. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 16(1), 277-284.
5. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.
6. Bei, E., Mavroidis, I., & Giossos, Y. (2019). Development of a scale for measuring the learner autonomy of distance education students. European Journal of Open, Distance and E-learning, 22(2).
7. Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. Language teaching, 40(1), 21-40.
8. Benson, P. (2013). Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning. Routledge.
9. Biçer, N. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde öğrenen özerkliği süreçlerinin incelenmesi [Examining of the learner autonomy' processes in Turkish teaching for foreigners]. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
10. Biçer, N. (2017). "Learner autonomy scale" development study on teaching turkish as a foreign language. Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi, 6(3), 1666-1678.

11. Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]. Ankara: Pegem.

12. Candy, P. C. (1991). Self-Direction for Lifelong Learning. A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice. Jossey-Bass, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104-1310.

13. Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. ELT journal, 49(3), 219-227.

14. Council of Europe. (2001). Common european framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge University Press.

15. Dam, L. (1995). From theory to classroom practice. Authentik.

16. Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227-268.

17. Doğan, G. & Mirici, İ. H. (2017). EFL instructors' perception and practices on learner autonomy in some Turkish universities. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13(1), 166-193.

18. Holec, H. (1981). Autonomy in foreign language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

19. Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 30(2), 179-185.

20. Keegan, D. (1996). Foundations of distance education. Psychology Press.

21. Kohonen, V. (2012). Developing autonomy through ELP-oriented pedagogy: Exploring the interplay of shallow and deep structures in a major change within language education. In Perspectives from the European language portfolio (pp. 32-52). Routledge.

22. Little, D. (1991). Learner autonomy: Definitions. Issues and Problems, 4, 33.

23. Little, D. (2012). The European language portfolio: history, key concerns, prospects. In Perspectives from the European language portfolio (pp. 17-31). Routledge.

24. Little, D., and L. Dam. (1998)." Leaner Autonomy: What and Why?" Paper presented at the JALT Annual International Conference on Language Teaching, Omiya, November, 20-23.

25. Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. Applied linguistics, 20(1), 71-94.

26. Liu, H. J. (2015). Use of learning strategies by EFL learners: A study of how it relates to language proficiency and learner autonomy. International Journal of English Linguistics, 5(2), 21.

27. Macaskill, A., & Taylor, E. (2010). The development of a brief measure of learner autonomy in university students. Studies in higher education, 35(3), 351-359.

28. Ministry of National Education [MoNE] (2006). English course curriculum guide. Ankara: Government Publishing House.

29. Mohammadi, M., & Mahdivand, Z. (2019). Is willingness to communicate a reliable predictor of learner autonomy in an EFL context? CEPS Journal, 9(1), 9-26.

30. Nguyen, T. C. L. (2009). Learner autonomy and EFL learning at the tertiary level in Vietnam.

31. Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: some theoretical, empirical and practical issues (pp. 13-26). Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

32. O'Donnell, S., Chang, K., & Miller, K. (2013). Relations among autonomy, attribution style, and happiness in college students. College Student Journal, 47(1), 228-234.

33. Pintrich, P. R., & de Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 33–40. doi:10.1037//0022-0663.82.1.33

34. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. Contemporary educational psychology, 25(1), 54-67.

35. Sarı, Y. E. (2020). Determining the readiness of German language teacher candidates to learner autonomy in learning German: a scale development study. Diyalog Interkulturelle Zeitschrift Für Germanistik, 9(1), 145-166.

36. Scharle, Á. and Szabó, A. (2000). Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

37. Tabachnick, B.G., and L.S. Fidell. (2007). Experimental Designs using ANOVA. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Brooks/Cole, 724.

38. Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? The Internet TESL Journal, 6(11), 37-48.

39. Wenden, A. (1991). Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners. UK: Prentice Hall International.
40. Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Developing self-fulfilling cycles of academic regulation: An analysis of exemplary instructional models. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice (pp. 1–19). Guilford Publications.