

ISSN 2518-1467 (Online),
ISSN 1991-3494 (Print)

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ҰЛТТЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМ АКАДЕМИЯСЫНЫҢ

Х А Б А Р Ш Ы С Ы

ВЕСТНИК

НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ АКАДЕМИИ НАУК
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН

THE BULLETIN

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

PUBLISHED SINCE 1944

1

JANUARY – FEBRUARY 2020

ALMATY, NAS RK

NAS RK is pleased to announce that Bulletin of NAS RK scientific journal has been accepted for indexing in the Emerging Sources Citation Index, a new edition of Web of Science. Content in this index is under consideration by Clarivate Analytics to be accepted in the Science Citation Index Expanded, the Social Sciences Citation Index, and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index. The quality and depth of content Web of Science offers to researchers, authors, publishers, and institutions sets it apart from other research databases. The inclusion of Bulletin of NAS RK in the Emerging Sources Citation Index demonstrates our dedication to providing the most relevant and influential multidiscipline content to our community.

Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясы "ҚР ҰҒА Хабаршысы" ғылыми журналының Web of Science-тің жаңаланған нұсқасы Emerging Sources Citation Index-те индекстелуге қабылданғанын хабарлайды. Бұл индекстелу барысында Clarivate Analytics компаниясы журналды одан әрі the Science Citation Index Expanded, the Social Sciences Citation Index және the Arts & Humanities Citation Index-ке қабылдау мәселесін қарастыруда. Web of Science зерттеушілер, авторлар, баспашылар мен мекемелерге контент тереңдігі мен сапасын ұсынады. ҚР ҰҒА Хабаршысының Emerging Sources Citation Index-ке енуі біздің қоғамдастық үшін ең өзекті және беделді мультидисциплинарлы контентке адалдығымызды білдіреді.

НАН РК сообщает, что научный журнал «Вестник НАН РК» был принят для индексирования в Emerging Sources Citation Index, обновленной версии Web of Science. Содержание в этом индексировании находится в стадии рассмотрения компанией Clarivate Analytics для дальнейшего принятия журнала в the Science Citation Index Expanded, the Social Sciences Citation Index и the Arts & Humanities Citation Index. Web of Science предлагает качество и глубину контента для исследователей, авторов, издателей и учреждений. Включение Вестника НАН РК в Emerging Sources Citation Index демонстрирует нашу приверженность к наиболее актуальному и влиятельному мультидисциплинарному контенту для нашего сообщества.

Б а с р е д а к т о р ы

х.ғ.д., проф., ҚР ҰҒА академигі

М.Ж. Жұрынов

Р е д а к ц и я а л қ а с ы:

Абиев Р.Ш. проф. (Ресей)
Абишев М.Е. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Аврамов К.В. проф. (Украина)
Аппель Юрген проф. (Германия)
Баймуқанов Д.А. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Байтулин И.О. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Банас Иозеф проф. (Польша)
Берсимбаев Р.И. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Велесько С. проф. (Германия)
Велихов Е.П. проф., РҒА академигі (Ресей)
Гашимзаде Ф. проф., академик (Әзірбайжан)
Гончарук В.В. проф., академик (Украина)
Давлетов А.Е. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Джрбашян Р.Т. проф., академик (Армения)
Қалимолдаев М.Н. проф., академик (Қазақстан), бас ред. орынбасары
Лаверов Н.П. проф., академик РАН (Россия)
Лунашку Ф. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Молдова)
Мохд Хасан Селамат проф. (Малайзия)
Мырхалықов Ж.У. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Новак Изабелла проф. (Польша)
Огарь Н.П. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Полещук О.Х. проф. (Ресей)
Поняев А.И. проф. (Ресей)
Сагиян А.С. проф., академик (Армения)
Сатубалдин С.С. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Таткеева Г.Г. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Умбетаев И. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Хрипунов Г.С. проф. (Украина)
Юлдашбаев Ю.А. проф., РҒА академигі (Ресей)
Якубова М.М. проф., академик (Тәжікстан)

«Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының Хабаршысы».

ISSN 2518-1467 (Online),

ISSN 1991-3494 (Print)

Меншіктенуші: «Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы»РҚБ (Алматы қ.).

Қазақстан республикасының Мәдениет пен ақпарат министрлігінің Ақпарат және мұрағат комитетінде
01.06.2006 ж. берілген №5551-Ж мерзімдік басылым тіркеуіне қойылу туралы куәлік.

Мерзімділігі: жылына 6 рет.

Тиражы: 2000 дана.

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 050010, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28, 219 бөл., 220, тел.: 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
<http://www.bulletin-science.kz/index.php/en/>

© Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы, 2020

Типографияның мекенжайы: «NurNaz GRACE», Алматы қ., Рысқұлов көш., 103.

Г л а в н ы й р е д а к т о р
д.х.н., проф. академик НАН РК
М.Ж. Журинов

Р е д а к ц и о н н а я к о л л е г и я:

Абиев Р.Ш. проф. (Россия)
Абишев М.Е. проф., член-корр. (Казахстан)
Аврамов К.В. проф. (Украина)
Апель Юрген проф. (Германия)
Баймуканов Д.А. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Байтулин И.О. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Банас Иозеф проф. (Польша)
Берсимбаев Р.И. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Велеско С. проф. (Германия)
Велихов Е.П. проф., академик РАН (Россия)
Гашимзаде Ф. проф., академик (Азербайджан)
Гончарук В.В. проф., академик (Украина)
Давлетов А.Е. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Джрбашян Р.Т. проф., академик (Армения)
Калимолдаев М.Н. академик (Казахстан), зам. гл. ред.
Лаверов Н.П. проф., академик РАН (Россия)
Лунашку Ф. проф., чл.-корр. (Молдова)
Мохд Хасан Селамат проф. (Малайзия)
Мырхалыков Ж.У. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Новак Изабелла проф. (Польша)
Огарь Н.П. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Полещук О.Х. проф. (Россия)
Поняев А.И. проф. (Россия)
Сагян А.С. проф., академик (Армения)
Сатубалдин С.С. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Таткеева Г.Г. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Умбетаев И. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Хрипунов Г.С. проф. (Украина)
Юлдашбаев Ю.А. проф., академик РАН (Россия)
Якубова М.М. проф., академик (Таджикистан)

«Вестник Национальной академии наук Республики Казахстан».

ISSN 2518-1467 (Online),

ISSN 1991-3494 (Print)

Собственник: РОО «Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан» (г. Алматы).

Свидетельство о постановке на учет периодического печатного издания в Комитете информации и архивов
Министерства культуры и информации Республики Казахстан №5551-Ж, выданное 01.06.2006 г.

Периодичность: 6 раз в год.

Тираж: 2000 экземпляров.

Адрес редакции: 050010, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, 28, ком. 219, 220, тел. 272-13-19, 272-13-18.

www: nauka-nanrk.kz, bulletin-science.kz

© Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан, 2020

Адрес типографии: «NurNazGRACE», г. Алматы, ул. Рыскулова, 103.

Editor in chief

doctor of chemistry, professor, academician of NAS RK

M.Zh. Zhurinov

Editorial board:

Abiyev R.Sh. prof. (Russia)
Abishev M.Ye. prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)
Avramov K.V. prof. (Ukraine)
Appel Jurgen, prof. (Germany)
Baimukanov D.A. prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)
Baitullin I.O. prof., academician (Kazakhstan)
Joseph Banas, prof. (Poland)
Bersimbayev R.I. prof., academician (Kazakhstan)
Velesco S., prof. (Germany)
Velikhov Ye.P. prof., academician of RAS (Russia)
Gashimzade F. prof., academician (Azerbaijan)
Goncharuk V.V. prof., academician (Ukraine)
Davletov A.Ye. prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)
Dzhrbashian R.T. prof., academician (Armenia)
Kalimoldayev M.N. prof., academician (Kazakhstan), deputy editor in chief
Laverov N.P. prof., academician of RAS (Russia)
Lupashku F. prof., corr. member. (Moldova)
Mohd Hassan Selamat, prof. (Malaysia)
Myrkhalykov Zh.U. prof., academician (Kazakhstan)
Nowak Isabella, prof. (Poland)
Ogar N.P. prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)
Poleshchuk O.Kh. prof. (Russia)
Ponyaev A.I. prof. (Russia)
Sagiyani A.S. prof., academician (Armenia)
Satubaldin S.S. prof., academician (Kazakhstan)
Tatkeyeva G.G. prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)
Umbetayev I. prof., academician (Kazakhstan)
Khripunov G.S. prof. (Ukraine)
Yuldashbayev Y.A., prof., academician of RAS (Russia)
Yakubova M.M. prof., academician (Tadjikistan)

Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

ISSN 2518-1467 (Online),

ISSN 1991-3494 (Print)

Owner: RPA "National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan" (Almaty).

The certificate of registration of a periodic printed publication in the Committee of Information and Archives of the Ministry of Culture and Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan N 5551-Ж, issued 01.06.2006.

Periodicity: 6 times a year.

Circulation: 2000 copies.

Editorial address: 28, Shevchenko str., of. 219, 220, Almaty, 050010, tel. 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
<http://nauka-nanrk.kz/>, <http://bulletin-science.kz>

© National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2020

Address of printing house: «NurNaz GRACE», 103, Ryskulov str, Almaty.

C. Fauzi¹, Basikin¹, Sh. Duisenbayeva², G. Kassymova^{1,3}

¹Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia;

²Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan;

³Satbayev University; Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

E-mail: acengpolo94@gmail.com

EXPLORING EFL STUDENT TEACHERS READINESS AND GENDER DIFFERENCES OF LEARNER AUTONOMY

Abstract. Despite its importance for successful English as a Foreign Language (EFL) language learning and the abundance of scientific works of learner autonomy, this construct has not received decent attention in the Indonesian context. Further, gender differences in learner autonomy as an essential variable that has not been well-researched were also included in this study. The authors conducted a mix-method study to explore the fourth-year student teachers' conceptualization, attitudes, and readiness for learning autonomy by employing a 43 items questionnaire survey adapted from Karabiyik (2008) to a total of 120 participants (156 male and 164 female) and interview questions to 6 volunteers. The qualitative data implied that the participants had an insufficient understanding of learner autonomy even though they exhibited a positive attitude towards this construct. The overall results of quantitative data suggested that the student teachers were not ready for learner autonomy indicated by the tendency to teacher-centered teaching which might be accounted for by low proficiency in English reflected by low engagement virtually in the majority of the autonomous learning activities. Furthermore, in terms of gender differences in learner autonomy, the t-test results demonstrated that no significant differences between male and female student teachers in terms of the responsibilities of autonomous learning, decision-making abilities, and engagement of autonomous learning outside the class. However, a significant difference was found between genders and engagement in autonomous activities in class which favored male students than their female counterparts suggesting that the male students performed more than male students in asking questions to teachers and taking opportunities to practice their English with their peers. The authors concluded that the student teachers were not ready for autonomous learning even though they had a positive attitude. Thus, the authors recommended the teachers to implement teaching methods, for instance, Project-Based Learning which might help to promote learner autonomy in the Indonesian context.

Key words: learner autonomy, student teachers, readiness, autonomous learning, gender.

Introduction. The notion of learner autonomy has attracted considerable attention in language learning and research on foreign language learners over the last four decades (e.g., Holec, 1981, 1988; Dam, 1995; Benson & Voller, 1997; Benson, 2001; Chan et al. 2002; Lamb, 2004; Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012; Borg & Alshumaimeri, 2017; Juan & Yajie, 2018; Cirocki et al. 2019; Kartal & Balcikanli, 2019). Not only learner autonomy is considered as an essential construct in language learning and research, but learner autonomy is also regarded as a desirable goal both in second and foreign language learning and teaching (Al-Busaidi & Al-Maamari, 2014; Benson & Huang, 2008; Borg & Alshumaimeri, 2007; Chan et al. 2002).

Many scholars have attempted to define learner autonomy; nevertheless, no consensus on the definition has arrived until today. However, Holec's (1981) definition is the most cited in the literature. He defines learner autonomy as 'the ability to take charge of one's own learning' translated as to have and hold the responsibilities for deciding on all learning aspects. Similarly, Benson (2011) views learner autonomy as the capacity to take control of one's learning. Meanwhile, other scholars see learner autonomy as ability and willingness to take responsibility for learning (Littlewood, 1996) or an ability for objectivity, critical reflection, decision making, and independent actions (Little, 1991; Atayeva, Basikin, Kassymova, Sydyk, Triyono, Arpentieva, Dossayeva, Klepach, & Kivlenok, 2019).

The importance of learner autonomy is attached on its close relationship with various supportive aspect of language learning such as motivation in learning language (Alkan & Arslan, 2019; Chan et al., 2002),

language proficiency (Myartawan et al. 2013; Jafari et al. 2017), and high engagement of autonomous language learning activities both inside and outside the classroom (Lamb, 2004), and high use of language learning strategies (Oxford, 2015). More importantly, a highly autonomous learner is claimed to be able to set their own goals, identify and develop learning strategies, to select relevant learning sources and appropriately assess his/her learning performance (Chan, 2001).

Numerous studies in different contexts have been conducted on the learner to teachers or students or both of them. Some themes emerged from the studies were student readiness for autonomy (Chan et al. 2002; Chikwa, 2018; Cirocki et al. 2019; Kartal & Balcikanli, 2019; Liu, 2011), gender differences in learner autonomy (Bekleyen & Selimoglu, 2016; Orawiwatnakul & Wichadee, 2017; Raziyeah & Amir, 2013; Yan & Ruimei, 2019;), students' perception of learner autonomy (Yildirim, 2012; Fazarani, 2014; Khalil & Ali, 2018; Tayjasant & Suraratdecha, 2016; Balcikanli, 2010), and the practice of learner autonomy or autonomous language learning (Lamb, 2004; Lin & Reinders, 2019; Neissi & Hussin, 2017). These continuous scientific works have developed the body of literature which strongly suggest that learner autonomy is an essential construct for successful learning and teaching in education.

Regardless, despite the abundance of scientific works and the popularity of learner autonomy, in the Indonesian context, learner autonomy has not received decent attention from scholars. In other words, empirical findings on LA in the Indonesian context are still limited. Some studies of learner autonomy have been conducted to teacher or teachers and students to find out their belief and practice on learner autonomy (Lengkanawati, 2017; Darsih, 2018), to explore teacher understanding of LA (Agustina, 2017), and to reveal learner autonomy practice in Indonesian 2013 curriculum (Ramadhiyanti & Lengkanawati, 2019), teachers and students' perception of autonomous language learning (Khotimah et al. 2019).

Meanwhile, the studies of learner autonomy involving students or learners focused on students' practices of autonomous language learning outside and inside the class (Lamb, 2004), the use of self-access learning center and autonomous language learning (Furaidah & Suharmanto, 2008), correlation between learner autonomy and English proficiency (Myartawan et al. 2013), and learner readiness of learner autonomy (Cirocki et al. 2019).

Prior to limited number of studies of learner autonomy researched on students in the Indonesian context, the authors were motivated to conduct this study. The difference between this study and the previous studies was this study involved student teachers who have not been considered to explore pertaining to their readiness for learner autonomy. Another difference between this study and previous studies on student teachers and learner autonomy, this study explored student teachers' conceptualization and attitude of learner autonomy and gender differences on the readiness of autonomy, which are still left unnoticed and demand more empirical findings.

Method. The participants of this study were 120 fourth-year student teachers consisted of 156 male and 164 female students of a private student-teacher teaching institute in Pontianak, West Kalimantan. All of the student teachers in this study had completed their teaching practice as one of the pre-requisites to pass the semester in which each individual was assigned to a particular area nearby the city or to their hometown to teach English in secondary schools for six months. The reason why the authors only included the student teachers of the fourth year was due to the reason that these students had experienced teaching students in classroom from their teaching practices which could provide more insights based on their practical experience and theoretical knowledge from their actual teaching practice and study during the previous semesters.

This study followed a mix-method design that combined both quantitative and qualitative data. The authors collected quantitative data by administering a questionnaire to the participants and qualitative data through a structured interview. Besides, quantitative data comprised of student teachers' readiness of autonomy covered students' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in autonomous learning, their abilities in decision-making related, activities of autonomous learning in and out of the class. Whereas qualitative data covered students' conceptualization of learner autonomy and their attitudes towards learner autonomy.

The authors deployed two instruments in this study. The first instrument was a questionnaire, Learner Autonomy Readiness Questionnaire, adapted from Karabiyik (2008) which was initially developed by Chan, Spratt and Humphreys (2002) to investigate tertiary EFL student readiness of learner autonomy in Hong Kong. The questionnaire was then adapted in different contexts and translated into different languages. In Karabiyik's (2008) version, no significant changes were made. The questionnaire comprised of 43 items

divided into three sections. The first section comprised 13 items assessing students' perceptions of their responsibilities and their teachers' responsibilities in the language learning process. In the second section, there were 10 items asking students to assess their abilities in making a decision to act autonomously, and the last section consisted of 20 items revolving around students' actual practices of autonomous language learning activities outside the class and in the class.

As for the qualitative data, the authors borrowed two first questions constructed by Chan, Spratt, and Humphreys (2002). The questions were: 1) what is your definition of learner autonomy?; 2) do you consider learner autonomy important? Why? Why not?. Both of the questions were aiming at exploring students' understanding of learner autonomy and attitudes towards learner autonomy.

In collecting the data, the authors conducted two main procedures. In the first step, the authors came to the classroom for two different days. On the first day, the authors distributed the questionnaire to the two classes in the morning time from class A morning to class B morning. The next day, the authors came again to the last two classes of afternoon time, A afternoon class, and B afternoon class. In each class, before administering the questionnaire, the authors briefly explained the purpose of the questionnaire and provided times for the participants to read and ask questions related to the statements in the questionnaire. At the end of each administration, the authors requested some students who would like to volunteer for the interview to provide their phone number.

On the fourth day, the authors invited the volunteers to meet on the campus for the interview. Seven volunteers attended the authors's invitation. However, for acquiring even numbers of male and female students, one student was not involved in the interview session. The interview lasted for 30 minutes for two sessions in which each volunteer was interviewed one by one. The interview was recorded and videotaped for the sake of transcribing and a better understanding of volunteers' answers to the questions.

The data of this study comprised of quantitative (questionnaire) and qualitative (interview) data. Qualitative data gathered through the interview was transcribed and grouped based on two themes, namely students' understanding of learner autonomy and attitudes towards learner autonomy. Meanwhile, quantitative data in the form of questionnaire results were analyzed according to Oxford's (1990) mean classification method. Mean scores that are between 1.0 and 2.4 were categorized as low. Mean scores that ranged from 2.5 and 3.4 were considered as 'medium.' Mean scores that are between 3.5 and 4.0 were considered as 'high.' Moreover, in order to test if significant differences exist between gender and the variables in the questionnaire, the authors performed an independent sample t-test at 0.05 level of confidence ($P = 0.05$). Also, percentages mean scores and standard deviation were also calculated after the raw data had been computed into SPSS.

Result and discussion. The results of this study are presented in three folds: a) the student teachers' perception of learner autonomy (conceptualization and attitude towards learner autonomy), b) student teachers' readiness of learner autonomy (their perception on their own and their teachers' responsibilities, decision-making abilities, and the practice of autonomous activities in and out the classroom), c) differences in terms of student teachers' readiness of learner autonomy and gender. The overall findings suggested that the student teachers are not ready for learner autonomy supported by their limited conception of learner autonomy, low practices of autonomous language learning activities outside the class and in-class in which the majority of the items were at a low level. This low level of readiness might be accounted by the cultural barriers (Sinclair et al. 2000) to learner autonomy in Indonesian context as learner autonomy initially comes from European countries or appears firstly in western context (Pennycook, 1997) which might be still difficult to be adopted (Dardjowidjojo, 2006).

Students' perception of learner autonomy. The following were the results of the interview focusing on two questions to discover student teachers' understanding, familiarity and attitude towards learner autonomy.

a) How do student teachers define learner autonomy?

S1: I think it (learner autonomy) is to learner rights to get what he deserves in learning by the help or guidance by the teacher.

S2: In my opinion, learner autonomy is when students realize that he/she is the one who should be active in learning.

S3: I think it is about learner ability to set out what he needs to learn

S4: learner autonomy is learner rights to be heard by the teacher about his/her needs in learning

S5: learner autonomy, in my opinion, is the dependence of learners on him/herself in achieving their learning goals.

S6: it (learner autonomy) is about students' active involvement in fulfilling his goals in learning and improving his language skills.

b) Do student teachers think learner autonomy is important in language learning? Why? Why not?

S1: yes, it (learner autonomy) is important because it makes learners become active knowledge seekers and will also develop their sense of responsibility for their own study.

S2: I think learner autonomy can be a help teacher to teach what the students need.

S3: I think it (learner autonomy) is quite crucial to reduce students' dependency on teachers which allow the learners to expose him/herself more to the target language by using any resources available both online (internet) or offline (English storybooks or English newspaper)

S4: I think learner autonomy is crucial because not only it helps the learner to be active in learning in the classroom but also outside the class

S5: yes, it (learner autonomy) will enable students to be a warrior for his own improvement by using any means available, and it also will keep them motivated to better their learning.

S6: I consider learner autonomy important because it helps learners to be brave in deciding on what he/she wants to find out in learning language based on his or her needs.

In terms of student-teacher conceptualization of learner autonomy, it seems that most of the student teachers defined learner autonomy as students' active involvement, learning needs, and responsibility of their learning with little guidance from the teachers. This keywords shows that student teachers have a reasonably good understanding of learner autonomy.

Moreover, when asked about their attitude towards learner autonomy, the participants showed a positive attitude towards learner autonomy. They considered learner autonomy beneficial to student progress in learning, which at the same time increase student motivation and sense of learning responsibility. This finding is similar to Chan et al. (2002) and Balcikanli (2010), who found out that the students had a fair understanding and positive views on the prospect of learner autonomy. However, contrary to the findings of Cirocki et al. (2019) which demonstrated that the majority of senior high school students in East Java were not familiar with the concept of learner autonomy. This gap of knowledge might be caused by the level of education and exposure to English language learning between secondary students and student teachers in tertiary education.

Students' perception of their own and teacher responsibility in the classroom. The questionnaire of student readiness of learner autonomy was employed to explore the participants' readiness of autonomy, as mentioned in the outset. The first result, as showcased in table 1, deals with student teachers' perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities in the teaching and learning activities during their study.

Table 1 demonstrates that *making sure the students progress in learning outside class, raising interest in learning the English language, making them more determined and persistent in learning, and deciding what to learn outside class* are mostly students' responsibilities, as mentioned by the participants. On the contrary, *determining learning goals in English courses, deciding what the students should learn next, choosing types of activities in English lessons, choosing the right materials in learning English, setting the time for learning in the classroom, evaluation learning and course* are regarded as teachers' responsibility. Meanwhile, *making sure the students making progress during English lessons and identifying students' weaknesses in learning* are viewed as shared responsibilities between students and teachers.

Regarding the student teachers' perception of their responsibilities of learner autonomy, the participants regarded virtually all responsibilities in classroom belong to the teachers, whereas a few responsibilities outside the class such as making sure to make progress outside the classroom, increasing their interest in language learning, and determining what to learn outside class as the students' responsibilities. These results indicated that in reality, the practice of learner autonomy is not well-fostered in this context which implies teacher domination in the teaching and learning process. This result is similar to those by (Bekleyen and Selimoglu, 2016; Yildirim, 2012; Chan, Spratt and Humphreys, 2002) in which the students regarded their teachers to be responsible for aspects related to methodology or students progress in the classroom. Meanwhile, as for the aspects related to learning outside the classroom, for instance, deciding what to learn and how to assess their learning, the students had a medium degree of beliefs that those aspects were their responsibilities.

Table 1 – Students’ Perceptions of their own and their teachers’ responsibilities

In English lessons, whose responsibility should it be to,	Completely the teacher’s		Mostly the teacher’s partly mine		Half mine, half the teacher’s		Mostly mine, partly the teacher’s		Completely mine		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. make sure you progress during lessons	1	.8	23	19.2	71	59.2	21	17.5	4	3.3	3.03	.733
2. make sure your make progress outside class.	5	4.2	7	5.8	28	23.3	51	42.5	29	24.2	3.77	1.019
3. stimulate your interest in learning English	1	.8	10	8.3	40	33.3	51	42.5	18	15	3.63	.870
4. identify your weaknesses in English	5	4.2	10	8.3	43	35.8	42	35	20	16.7	3.83	1.042
5. make you work harder	1	.8	4	3.3	22	18.3	57	47.5	36	30	4.03	.835
6. decide the objectives of the English course	37	30.8	65	54.2	15	12.5	2	1.7	1	.8	1.88	.751
7. decide what you should learn next	39	32.5	58	48.3	13	10.8	7	5.8	3	2.5	1.98	.948
8. choose what activities to use in your English lessons	39	32.5	59	49.2	15	12.5	5	4.2	2	1.7	1.93	.877
9. decide how long to spend on each activity	33	27.5	56	46.7	19	15.8	7	5.8	5	4.2	2.13	1.017
10. choose what materials to use in your English lessons	28	23.3	62	51.7	17	14.2	7	5.8	6	5	2.18	1.018
11. evaluate your learning	20	16.7	54	45	35	29.2	7	5.8	4	3.3	2.34	.939
12. evaluate your course	37	30.8	46	38.3	25	20.8	6	5	6	5	2.15	1.074
13. decide what you learn outside the class	0	0	3	2.5	17	14.2	52	43.3	48	40	4.21	.777

Students’ perception of their ability in decision-making in the classroom. In terms of student teachers’ abilities in making the decision in the classroom, by looking at the mean scores, the participants rated themselves as ‘very good’ in *choosing learning activities and objectives outside the classroom, evaluating their own learning and course and identifying their own weaknesses in learning English*. The authors presented the result in more detail in table 2.

Table 2 – Students’ Decision-Making Abilities

How do you think you would be at:	Very Poor		Poor		OK		Good		Very Good		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
14. choosing learning activities in class?	0	0	12	10	53	44.2	47	39.2	8	6.7	3.43	.763
15. choosing learning activities outside class?	0	0	2	1.7	27	22.5	58	48.3	33	27.5	4.02	.756
16. choosing learning objectives in the class?	20	16.7	64	53.3	25	20.8	7	5.8	4	3.3	2.26	.921
17. choosing learning objectives outside the class	1	.8	3	2.5	31	25.8	55	45.8	30	25.0	3.92	.826
18. choosing learning materials in the class?	23	19.2	72	60	19	15.8	5	4.2	1	.8	2.08	7.69
19. choosing learning materials outside the class?	0	0	3	2.5	64	53.3	43	35.8	10	8.3	3.50	.686
20. evaluating your learning	1	.8	0	0	33	27.5	68	56.7	18	15	3.85	.694
21. evaluating your course	0	0	0	0	35	29.2	67	55.8	18	15	3.86	.652
22. identifying your weaknesses in learning English	0	0	0	0	37	30.8	68	56.7	15	12.5	3.82	.635
23. deciding what you should learn next in your English lessons	0	0	16	13.3	39	32.5	63	52.5	2	1.7	3.43	.741

The result above suggested that the student teachers perceived themselves to be very good at choosing learning activities and objectives outside classrooms, in evaluating their own learning and course, and at identifying their weaknesses. The confidence of the abilities to make decisions related to learner autonomy in class seems to be hindered by the actual situation where the students still regard their teachers as most responsible for all classroom-related autonomous learning activities. In other words, the student teachers were sure of their abilities to make decision-related to learner autonomy, but they put the teachers as more capable and had higher authorities in making decision-related to learner autonomy practices in the classroom. Another factors which contributed to this situation might arise from the lack of experience and knowledge of learner autonomy by the students (Faharani, 2014 & Atayeva, Putro, Kassymova, & Kosbay, 2019) and students low engagement of autonomous activities indicating medium or even low English language proficiency. Thus, the teachers might prefer to make all the decisions than sharing chances to students whose English proficiency were not sufficient enough to help deciding what needs to be done in the classroom.

Students autonomous language learning activities outside and inside the classroom. The next part of the questionnaire is related to the autonomous language learning activities performed by the students outside the classroom. According to the mean scores in table 3 indicates that most of the activities were practiced rarely, for instance, *sending letters to pen-friends* ($M=1.22$) *speaking with native English speakers* ($M=1.3$), *attending a self-study center* (2.13), except for *listening to music and watching English movies* which were attended or engaged by students quite frequently.

Table 3 – Students' Engagement in Autonomous Activities outside the Class

In your last academic term, outside of class, without having been assigned to do so, how often did you:	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
24. read grammar books on your own?	37	30.8	50	41.7	22	18.3	11	9.2	2.06	.929
25. note down new words and their meanings?	10	8.3	56	46.7	39	32.5	15	12.5	2.49	.820
26. send letters to your pen-friends?	94	78.3	26	21.7	0	0	0	0	1.22	.414
27. read newspapers in English?	38	31.7	61	50.8	20	16.7	1	.8	1.87	.709
28. send e-mails in English	38	31.7	67	55.8	13	10.8	2	1.7	1.83	.682
29. read books or magazines in English?	1	.8	71	59.2	40	33.3	8	6.7	2.46	.634
30. watch English TV programs	12	10	73	60.8	29	24.2	6	5	2.24	.698
31. listen to English radio?	12	10	70	58.3	33	27.5	5	4.2	2.26	.692
32. listen to English songs?	0	0	0	0	48	35.6	72	60	3.69	.492
33. speak English with native speakers?	82	68.3	38	31.7	0	0	0	0	1.32	.467
34. practice using English with friends?	0	0	75	62.5	40	33.3	5	4.2	2.42	.574
35. watch English movies?	0	0	0	0	29	24.2	91	75.8	3.76	.430
36. write a diary in English?	11	9.2	73	60.8	30	25	6	5	2.26	.692
37. use the internet in English?	0	0	7	5.8	83	69.2	30	25	3.19	.523
38. review your written work on your own?	4	3.3	60	50	46	38.3	10	8.3	2.52	.698
39. attend a self-study centre?	12	10	81	67.5	27	22.5	0	0	2.13	.559
40. talk about your teacher about your work?	20	16.7	75	62.5	22	18.3	3	2.5	2.07	.670

Table 4 – Students' engagement in autonomous activities in the class

In your last academic term, in class, how often did you:	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
41. ask the teacher questions when you do not understand?	1	.8	85	70.8	22	18.3	12	10	2.83	6.74
42. make suggestions to the teachers?	34	28.3	78	65	8	6.7	0	0	1.78	55.3
43. take opportunities to speak English?	0	0	48	40	60	50	12	10	2.70	.643

Table 4 presents the student teachers’ engagement in autonomous activities in their classes in the last academic term. The findings reveal that *asking questions to the teacher when confusing arises* and *taking a chance to speak English in the class* are neither highly or poorly engaged but only sometimes performed by the students, meanwhile, *making suggestions to the teacher* is rarely done by the students.

A myriad of autonomous language learning activities inside and outside the class are aiming at developing learner autonomy and their proficiency in the English language. Regarding the activities outside the classroom, the student teachers only frequently engaged in two activities, which were listening to English songs and watching English movies. Meanwhile, the rest of the activities seems to be less attractive or considered useful or might not be feasible to be conducted by the students. Their practices of autonomous language learning outside the class might imply their low level of English proficiency. This result was similar to those work of Kartal & Balcikanli (2019) , Faharani (2014), and Atayeva, Ciptaningrum, Hidayah, Kassymova, Dossayeva, and Akmal, (2019) who also discovered that only watching English movies and listening to English songs as the most frequently engaged by the learners.

Regarding in-class activities of learner autonomy, all of the three activities were not well-engaged by the participants. The lowest level among the three activities was to make suggestions to the teacher, which virtually had never been done by the students. This could be accounted for the low practice of autonomous activities in almost all items or perhaps the cultural situation, which views this activity to be less polite for students to do so since the teachers were perceived as having more authority and knowledge than the students.

Autonomous Learning Responsibilities and Gender. According to the results presented in table 5 below, the discrepancies of perceptions on the responsibilities related to autonomous learning among female and male student teachers were nearly absent except a few, which was salient in items 6, 10 and 12. Even though both sex opposites agreed that deciding the learning objectives, making the decision on materials to use for learning, and evaluating the course were teachers’ responsibility, male students ultimately gave up them to teachers and female students, though small, still viewed that they had a small portion of responsibilities to participate.

Table 5 – Responsibilities Related to Autonomous Learning of English and Gender

In English lessons, whose responsibility should it be to	Gender	Responsibility		
		Yours	Your Teacher	Both
1. make sure you make progress during lessons	Males	14,1%	25%	45.1%
	Females	23,5%	15,7%	60.9%
2. make sure your make progress outside class.	Males	75%	5,4%	19.6%
	Females	59,4%	14,1%	26.6%
3. stimulate your interest in learning English	Males	59,4%	1,8%	28.6%
	Females	73,5%	6,3%	20.3%
4. identify your weaknesses in English	Males	69,6%	3,6%	26.8%
	Females	51,6%	12,5%	35.9%
5. make you work harder	Males	92,8%	0%	7.1%
	Females	64,1%	7,9%	28.1%
6. decide the objectives of the English course	Males	0%	89,3%	10.7%
	Females	4,7%	81,2%	14.1%
7. decide what you should learn next	Males	7,2%	82,9%	8.9%
	Females	9,4%	88,2%	12.5%
8. choose what activities to use in your English lessons	Males	5,4%	94,2%	10.7%
	Females	6,3%	76,8%	14.1%
9. decide how long to spend on each activity	Males	10,7%	70,3%	16.1%
	Females	9,4%	72,6%	15.6%
10. choose what materials to use in your English lessons	Males	0%	85,1%	5.4%
	Females	21,8 %	65,4%	21.9%
11. evaluate your learning	Males	10,7%	64,9%	26.8%
	Females	7,8%	78,4%	31.3%
12. evaluate your course	Males	1,8%	85,2%	12.5%
	Females	17,2%	61,7%	28.1%
13. decide what you learn outside the class	Males	92,9%	46,9%	5.6%

As for the rest of the items, both view most of the responsibilities as the teachers' and only *making sure to make progress in the class* was seen as a shared responsibility between the students and the teachers. In other words, the results displayed in table 6 suggests that both genders perceived themselves as having more or less similar responsibilities in autonomous learning of English.

Decision-making abilities and gender. Based on the results demonstrated in table 6 ($\alpha = 0.997 \geq 0.05$), there was no statistically significant differences found in the student teachers' abilities to decide in the classrooms in terms of gender. In other words, both opposite-sex regards themselves as having similar abilities to make decision-related to autonomous learning in the classroom.

Table 6 – Decision-Making Abilities and Gender

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	Significance
Decision-Making Abilities	Male	56	3.45	0.23	0.0310	0.997
	Female	64	3.38	0.24	0.0311	

Engagement in autonomous activities outside the class and gender. According to the table below, the results of the t-test showed that both male and female student teachers engage similarly in various activities of autonomous learning outside the class ($\alpha = 0.939 \geq 0.05$). This result means that no statistically significant difference existed between the opposite gender's practices of autonomous activities outside their classrooms.

Table 7 – Engagement in Autonomous Activities outside the Class

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	Significance
Autonomous activities outside the class	Male	56	2.29	0.16	0.0214	0.939
	Female	64	2.38	0.18	0.0226	

Engagement in autonomous activities in class and gender. Looking at the results of the t-test in table 8 above, statistically, significant differences were exhibited by male and female student teachers ($\text{sig} = 0.02 \leq 0.05$) in terms of their practices or engagements in autonomous practices in the class. In other words, male students seemed to be more frequently in asking teachers when they were confused, making suggestions to teachers, and taking more chances than female students to speak in the target language compared to female students.

Table 8 – Engagement in Autonomous Activities in Class

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	Significance
Autonomous activities in class	Male	56	2.31	0.32	0.042	0.02
	Female	64	2.26	0.39	0.049	

In terms of gender differences of learner autonomy readiness, a significant difference only exists in class autonomous activities, whereas in terms of responsibilities and abilities to make decision-related to learner autonomy, both opposite sex regarded themselves to be quite similar. Further, even though asking a question to the teacher, making a suggestion, and taking a chance were rarely performed by student teachers, male students seem to dominate these activities. This result might be due to the level of confidence or bravery of the students in which generally, in this context, male students to be more active than female students in the classroom. similar finding was also yielded by the study conducted by Yan & Ruimei (2019) where their male participants had more active participation in making suggestion to their teachers compared to female students.

Additionally, pertaining to gender and learner autonomy readiness of LA, except for autonomous learning inside the class, several previous studies supported that no significant difference in terms of gender and autonomous learning (Cirocki et al. 2019; Razeq, 2014; Razieyeh and Amir, 2013). They discovered

that no significant differences between male and female students in terms of their practices of autonomous language learning activities outside the class. However, contrary the result above, other studies which were carried out to highly proficient and motivated learners showed that female students tended to performed better in autonomous learning compared to their male counterparts (Jafari, Ketabi, and Tavakoli, 2017; Alkan and Arslan, 2019). The reason why no difference existed to between genders and learner readiness of autonomy in this context might be due to their low engagement of autonomous learning or low English proficiency or perhaps cultural barriers where students still viewed their teachers as having higher authorities or more responsibilities for the learning.

Conclusion. This study explored the fourth-year student teachers at a private teaching institute in Pontianak, West Kalimantan of their conceptualization and attitude of learner autonomy, the readiness of learner autonomy, and gender differences related to LA readiness. Even though the participants had a fair understanding and attitude of learner autonomy; however, they were not ready for learner autonomy indicated by the perception, which still supports teacher domination in the classroom. Moreover, the low engagement in autonomous language learning activities both in class and outside the class might be due to their low proficiency in English.

This situation should be taken into account by the institution to re-examine the teaching practice to support student teachers' development of learner autonomy by encouraging students to practice more autonomous activities outside the classroom to enhance their language proficiency. Moreover, the teachers or lecturers should be able to come up with strategies that support more involvement from the students, for instance, providing students chances to involve in the decision-making process and be more responsible for their progress by using project-based learning.

As for the future study, investigating the readiness of learner autonomy might provide better insights on how poor and good students engage in a myriad of autonomous language learning activities. Besides, a further qualitative study is in need to shed light on the factors causing a low level of readiness for learner autonomy in the Indonesian context.

Acknowledgment. The researchers would like to express their gratitude and appreciation for the chairman of English Study Program of the private teacher education institution at Pontianak and all the fourth-year student teachers who took part in this study.

С. Фаузи¹, Басикин¹, Ш. Дуйсенбаева², Г. Касымова^{1,3}

¹Ягьякарта мемлекеттік университеті, Индонезия;

²Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан;

³Satbayev University; Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

EFL БОЛАШАҚ ОҚЫТУШЫЛАРЫН ЖӘНЕ АВТОНОМДЫ ТҮРҒЫДА ОҚИТЫН СТУДЕНТТЕРДІҢ ГЕНДЕРДІК АЙЫРМАШЫЛЫҒЫ ЗЕРТТЕУ

Аннотация. Шет тілі (EFL) ретінде ағылшын тілін ойдағыдай меңгерудің маңыздылығына және оқушылардың автономиясының ғылыми еңбектерінің көптігіне қарамастан, бұл зерттеу Индонезия контекстінде лайықты назар аударған жоқ. Сонымен қатар, оқушылардың автономиясындағы гендерлік айырмашылықтар маңызды зерттелмеген айнымалы болып табылады. Зерттеуде үш негізгі бөліктің айналасында үш мақсат қойылды: 1) оқушы автономиясының тұжырымдамасы мен қатынасы, 2) оқушы автономиясының дайындығы және 3) оқушы автономиясының гендерлік айырмашылықтары. Нақтырақ айтсақ, авторлар жоғарыдағы мақсаттарды көрсететін келесі сұрақтарды тұжырымдады:

1. Оқушылардың оқушы дербестігі туралы түсінігі нені білдіреді:

а) олардың оқушы дербестігі туралы тұжырымдамасы

б) оқушылардың дербестігі маңыздылығы туралы олардың пікірі

2. Оқушылардың автономдылыққа дайындығы дегеніміз не?

а) олардың жауапкершілікті түсінуі және мұғалімдердің оқушылардың дербестігі алдындағы жауапкершілігі?

б) олардың сыныпта шешім қабылдау қабілетін олардың қабылдауы.

в) Сабақтан тыс уақытта автономды тілдік оқу іс-әрекеттері.

г) сыныптағы автономды тілдік оқу іс-әрекеті.

3. Студенттер оқытушыларының оқушылардың дербестігі мен жынысы арасында айтарлықтай айырмашылықтар бар ма?

Авторлар төртінші курс студенттерінің мұғалімдерінің концептуализациясын, көзқарастарын және автономияны үйренуге дайындығын зерттеу үшін «Карабийік» (2008) 43 қатысушыдан (156 ер адам және 164 әйел адам) бейімделген 43 сұрақтан тұратын анкеталық сауалнаманы қолдана отырып, 6 еріктіге сұхбат сұрақтарын беру әдісі арқылы зерттеу жүргізілді. Сапалық мәліметтер қатысушылардың бұл құрылысқа оң көзқарасын білдірсе де, оқушылардың дербестігі туралы жеткіліксіз түсініктерін көрсетті. Сандық мәліметтердің жалпы нәтижелері студенттердің оқытушылары автономды оқу іс-әрекетінің көпшілігінде ағылшын тілінің төмен деңгейімен түсіндірілетін, мұғалімге негізделген оқытуға бейімділігімен оқушылардың автономиясына дайын емес екендігін көрсетті. Сонымен қатар, оқушылардың автономиясындағы гендерлік айырмашылықтар тұрғысынан, t-тестілеу нәтижелері ерлер мен әйел мұғалімдері арасында автономды оқытудың, шешім қабылдау қабілетінің және сабақтан тыс уақыттағы автономды оқытудың міндеттеріне қатысты айтарлықтай айырмашылықтар жоқ екенін көрсетті. Алайда, гендерлер мен сыныптағы автономды жұмыстарға қатысу арасында айтарлықтай айырмашылық анықталды, бұл ер балаларға қарағанда, мұғалімдерге сұрақ қою және құрдастарымен бірге ағылшын тілін үйренуге мүмкіндік беру кезінде ер студенттер әйел студенттерге қарағанда көбірек болды. Авторларда студенттік мұғалімдерге деген жағымды көзқараста болса да, дербес оқуға дайын емес деген қорытындыға келді. Осылайша, авторлар мұғалімдерге оқыту әдістерін, мысалы, Индонезия контекстінде оқушылардың автономиясын ілгерілетуге көмектесетін жобалық-негізделген оқытуды қолдануға кеңес берді.

Түйін сөздер: оқушы дербестігі, студенттер оқытушылары, дайындық, дербес оқыту, жыныс.

С. Фаузи¹, Басикие¹, Ш. Дуйсенбаева, Г. Касымова^{1,3}

¹Джокьякартский государственный университет, Индонезия;

² Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан;

³Satbayev University; Казахский Национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан

ИЗУЧЕНИЕ УЧИТЕЛЯ СТУДЕНТОВ EFL ГОТОВНОСТИ И ГЕНДЕРНЫХ РАЗЛИЧИЙ АВТОНОМНОСТИ УЧАЩЕГОСЯ

Аннотация. Несмотря на свою важность для успешного изучения английского языка как иностранного (EFL) и обилие научных работ в автономии учащихся, исследуемая тема не получила достойного внимания в индонезийском контексте. Кроме того, гендерные различия в автономии учащегося как важной переменной, которая не была хорошо изучена, также были включены в данное исследование. В этом исследовании были три цели, вращающиеся вокруг трех основных частей: 1) концептуализация и отношение автономии учащегося, 2) готовность автономии учащегося и 3) гендерные различия автономии учащегося. В частности, авторы сформулировали следующие вопросы, отражающие цели, следующим образом:

1. Как студенты воспринимают самостоятельность учащихся с точки зрения:

- а) их концептуализации автономии учащихся;
- б) их мнения о важности автономии учащихся.

2. Какова готовность учащихся к автономии учащихся с точки зрения:

- а) их восприятия личной ответственности и ответственности учителей за автономию учащихся;
- б) их восприятия способности принимать решения в классе;
- в) самостоятельного изучения языка вне класса;
- г) самостоятельного изучения языка в классе.

3. Существуют ли существенные различия между готовностью учителей к самостоятельности учащихся и их полом?

Для изучения концептуализации авторы провели исследование смешанного метода, которое заключается в отношении и готовности учителей четвертого курса к самостоятельности в обучении, используя анкетный опрос из 43 предметов, адаптированный из Карабийика (2008 г.) для 120 участников (156 мужчин и 164 женщин) и вопросы интервью для 6 добровольцев. Качественные данные подразумевали, что участники не имели достаточного понимания к самостоятельности в обучении, хотя они демонстрировали позитивное отношение к этой конструкции. Общие результаты количественных данных свидетельствуют о том, что учащиеся-преподаватели не были готовы к автономии учащихся, о чем свидетельствует склонность к преподавательскому обучению, которое может объясняться низким уровнем владения английским языком, что отражается на низком уровне участия практически в большинстве самостоятельных учебных мероприятий. Кроме того, с точки зрения гендерных различий в автономии учащихся, результаты t-теста продемонстрировали отсутствие

значительных различий между учителями-учениками мужского и женского пола с точки зрения ответственности за автономное обучение, способности принимать решения и вовлечение автономного обучения вне класса. Тем не менее, была обнаружена значительная разница между полами и вовлечением в самостоятельную деятельность в классе, которая отдает предпочтение ученикам мужского пола, а не их коллегам-женщинам, что говорит о том, что ученики мужского пола показали больше результатов, чем ученики женского пола, задавая вопросы учителям и используя возможности попрактиковаться в английском со своими сверстниками. Авторы пришли к выводу, что учащиеся-преподаватели не были готовы к самостоятельному обучению, хотя у них был позитивный настрой. Таким образом, авторы рекомендовали учителям применять методы обучения, например, проектное обучение, которое могло бы способствовать продвижению автономии учащихся в индонезийском контексте.

Ключевые слова: автономия учащегося, учитель студентов, готовность, автономное обучение, пол.

Information about authors:

Fauzi C., a student of graduate school of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia Majoring in English Language Education / Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia; acengpolo94@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7631-1559>

Basikin, M. Ed., Senior Lecturer at Graduate School of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta / Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia; basikin@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3743-4254>

Duisenbayeva Sh., M. Ed., Senior Lecturer at a Faculty of Philology and World Languages, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan; duisenbayeva.sh@kaznu.kz; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0475-0912>

Kassymova, G., PhD doctoral candidate, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia; Senior lecturer at Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University; Satbayev University, Almaty, the Republic of Kazakhstan; g.kassymova@satbayev.university; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7004-3864>

REFERENCES

- [1] Agustina D. (2017). Teachers' Understanding of Learner Autonomy in Indonesian Contexts: Findings From High Schools and Their Implications. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 20(2), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2017.200206>
- [2] Al-Busaidi S.S. (2014). Exploring University Teachers' Understanding of Learner Autonomy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2051–2060. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.10.2051-2060>
- [3] Alkan M. F., Arslan M. (2019). Learner autonomy of pre-service teachers and its associations with academic motivation and self-efficacy. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 16(2), 75-96.
- [4] Atayeva M., Basikin, Kassymova G.K., Sydyk L., Triyono M.B., Arpentieva M.R., Dossayeva S.K., Klepach Y.V., Kivlenok T.V. Improving students' self efficacy in speaking english by using group-presentation. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.165>
- [5] Atayeva M., Ciptaningrum D.S., Hidayah R., Kassymova G.K., Dossayeva S.K. & Akmal A. Cultivating junior high school students' critical thinking skills by using a short-video in english language classroom. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.124>
- [6] Atayeva M., Putro N.H.P.S., Kassymova G. & Kosbay S. (2019). Impact of reading on students' writing ability. In *Materials of International Practical Internet Conference "Challenges of Science (P. 5-13)*. <https://doi.org/10.31643/2019.001>
- [7] Balçıklı C. (2010). Learner Autonomy in Language Learning : Student Teachers' Beliefs. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(1), 90–103. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.8>
- [8] Bekleyen N., & Selimoglu F. (2016). Learner Behaviors and Perceptions of Autonomous Language Learning. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 20(3), 1–20.
- [9] Benson P. & Huang J. (2008). Autonomy in the transition from foreign language learning to foreign language teaching. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 24(1), 421-439. DOI: 10.1590/S0102-44502008000300003
- [10] Benson P., & Voller P., editors, (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. Longman: London.
- [11] Benson P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Essex: Longman.
- [12] Benson P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy (2nd ed.)*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [13] Borg S. & Al-Busaidi S. (2011). Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding learner autonomy. *ELT Journal Advance Access*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr065>
- [14] Borg S. & Alshumaimeri Y. (2017). Language learner autonomy in a tertiary context: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-30.
- [15] Chan V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teach. in HE.*, 6(4), 505-518.
- [16] Chan V., Spratt M. & Humphreys G. (2002). Autonomous language learning: Hong Kong tertiary students' attitudes and behaviours. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 16(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790208667003>
- [17] Chikwa G.C., Al-damen T. & Mathew P. (2018). Readiness for autonomy among EFL students in Oman. *English Language Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0265-7_13
- [18] Cirocki A., Anam S., & Retnaningdyah P. (2019). Readiness for autonomy in English language learning: The case of Indonesian high school students. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(2), 1–18.

- [19] Dam L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy 3: from theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- [20] Dardjowidjojo S. (2006). The implementation of western approaches in eastern societies. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 1-9. DOI: 10.25170%2Fijelt.v2i1.110
- [21] 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.
- [22] Furaidah & Suharmanto. (2008). Patterns of SAC Utilization and The Sine Qua Non of The Self-propelled Development Of Students' English Proficiency. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 27–41.
- [23] Holec H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- [24] Holec H. (1988). *Autonomy and Self-directed Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- [25] Jafari S., Ketabi S. & Tavakoli M. (2017). Advanced and intermediate EFL learners' perceptions and practices of autonomous learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 168(1). DOI: 10.1075/itl.168.1.03jaf
- [26] Juan L. & Yajie C. (2018). EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Concerning Learner Autonomy: A Narrative Inquiry. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 6(6), 196-201.
- [27] Karabiyik A. (2008). The relationship between the culture of learning and Turkish university preparatory students' readiness for learner autonomy (Unpublished master thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey)
- [28] Kartal G., & Balçıklı C. (2019). Tracking the culture of learning and readiness for learner autonomy in a Turkish context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 30(1), 22–46. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i1/22-46>
- [29] Khalil S.M., & Ali A.D. (2018). Exploring EFL Teachers and Students Perceptions of Learner Autonomy in Egyptian Technical Schools. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 6(2), 1-25. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v6i2.13408>
- [30] Kenzhaliyev B.K., et. al. (2019). Production of Very Fine, Spherical, Particles of Ferriferous Pigments from the Diatomaceous Raw Material of Kazakhstan. *Glass and Ceramics*, 76(5-6), 194–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10717-019-00163-w>
- [31] Kenzhaliyev B.K. (2019). Innovative technologies providing enhancement of non-ferrous, precious, rare and rare earth metals extraction. *Complex Use of Mineral Resources (Kompleksnoe Ispol'zovanie Mineral'nogo Syr'a)*. 3(310), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.31643/2019/6445.30>
- [32] Kassymova G.K., Yurkova M.G., Zhdanko T.A., Gerasimova J.R., Kravtsov A.Yu. ... Arpentieva, M. R. (2019). Personal self-development in the context of global education: the transformation of values and identityweb of science // *Bulletin of the National Academy of Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Vol. 6, Issue 382, P. 195-207, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.162>
- [33] Khotimah K., Widiati U., Mustofa M., Ubaidillah M.F. (2019). Autonomous English Learning: Teachers' and Students' perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 371-381. DOI: 10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20234
- [34] Lamb M. (2004). It depends on the students themselves': Independent language learning in an Indonesian state schools. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 17(3), 229-245.
- [35] Lengkanawati N.S. (2017). Learner Autonomy in the Indonesian EFL Settings. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 222–231. <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4847>
- [36] Lin L., & Reinders H. (2019). Students' and teachers' readiness for autonomy: beliefs and practices in developing autonomy in the Chinese context. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(1), 69–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-018-9564-3>
- [37] Little D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- [38] Littlewood W. (1996). 'Autonomy': an anatomy and a framework. *System* 24(4), 427–35.
- [39] Liu Y. (2011). A study on learners' beliefs about learner autonomy in English language learning. *Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing*, 108, 725–732. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24775-0_113
- [40] Myartawan I.P.N.W., Latief M.A., & Suharmanto. (2013). The Correlation between Learner Autonomy and English Proficiency of Indonesia EFL College Learners. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(1), 63–81.
- [41] Nakata Y. (2011). Teachers' readiness for promoting learner autonomy: A study of Japanese EFL high school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 900–910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.001>
- [42] Neissi S., & Hussin H. (2017). Beyond Expectations: Autonomy and the Iranian Postgraduate Students in Malaysian Public Universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(7), 353. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.7p.353>
- [43] Pertiwi F.D. et al. (2019). Gender equality in feminism // *Bulletin of the National Academy of Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Vol. 5, Issue 381, P. 112-121, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.130>
- [44] Yan J. & Ruimei S. (2019). Gender Difference in Freshmen's English Autonomous Learning Activities. *Proceeding paper in the 5th Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 319, 56-59.

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice in the journals of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan

For information on Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication see <http://www.elsevier.com/publishingethics> and <http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/ethics>.

Submission of an article to the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan implies that the described work has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis or as an electronic preprint, see <http://www.elsevier.com/postingpolicy>), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. In particular, translations into English of papers already published in another language are not accepted.

No other forms of scientific misconduct are allowed, such as plagiarism, falsification, fraudulent data, incorrect interpretation of other works, incorrect citations, etc. The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan follows the Code of Conduct of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), and follows the COPE Flowcharts for Resolving Cases of Suspected Misconduct (http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf). To verify originality, your article may be checked by the Cross Check originality detection service <http://www.elsevier.com/editors/plagdetect>.

The authors are obliged to participate in peer review process and be ready to provide corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. All authors of a paper should have significantly contributed to the research.

The reviewers should provide objective judgments and should point out relevant published works which are not yet cited. Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially. The reviewers will be chosen in such a way that there is no conflict of interests with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders.

The editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject or accept a paper, and they will only accept a paper when reasonably certain. They will preserve anonymity of reviewers and promote publication of corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. The acceptance of a paper automatically implies the copyright transfer to the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The Editorial Board of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan will monitor and safeguard publishing ethics.

Правила оформления статьи для публикации в журнале смотреть на сайте:

www.nauka-nanrk.kz

ISSN 2518-1467 (Online), ISSN 1991-3494 (Print)

<http://www.bulletin-science.kz/index.php/en/>

Редакторы *М. С. Ахметова, Т. А. Апендиев, Д. С. Аленов*
Верстка на компьютере *Д. А. Абдрахимовой*

Подписано в печать 10.02.2020.
Формат 60x881/8. Бумага офсетная. Печать – ризограф.
19,5 п.л. Тираж 500. Заказ 1.