ความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเองของนักเรียนมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6

Learner Autonomy on English Learning of Mattayom Suksa 6 Students

รสสุคนธ์ เสวตเวชากุล[1]
Rosukhon Swatevacharkul

บทคัดย่อ

วัตถุประสงค์ของงานวิจัยนี้คือเพื่อ 1) ตรวจสอบความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเองของนักเรียนมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6 และ 2) ศึกษาความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างความสามารถฯ กับเพศ เกรดเฉลี่ยสะสม วิธีเรียนเชิงลึกและผิวเผิน เป็นงานวิจัยเชิงสำรวจใช้แบบสอบถามเก็บข้อมูลกับนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6 จำนวน 178 คน วิเคราะห์ข้อมูลด้วยสถิติเชิงพรรณนาและการวิเคราะห์ถดถอยพหุเชิงเส้น ผลการวิจัยตามวัตถุประสงค์ข้อ 1 พบว่า โดยเฉลี่ย นักเรียนมีความสามารถฯ ในระดับสูง (ค่าเฉลี่ย 3.57, ค่าเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน .41) ส่วนวัตถุประสงค์ข้อ 2 พบว่าตัวแปรอิสระที่มีผลต่อความสามารถฯ อย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .05 และ .01 คือ เกรดเฉลี่ยสะสม (β = .14, p = .03) วิธีเรียนเชิงลึก (β = .63, p = .00), วิธีเรียนเชิงผิวเผิน (β = -.19, p = .01) ส่วนตัวแปรเพศไม่มีผลต่อความสามารถฯ (β = -.11, p = .09) ตัวแปรอิสระทั้งหมดมีค่าความสัมพันธ์กับความสามารถฯ ในระดับปานกลาง (R= .60) และอธิบายความสามารถฯ ได้ร้อยละ 35.6 (R2= .36) เมื่อพิจารณาลำดับความสำคัญของตัวแปรอิสระที่มีผลต่อความสามารถฯ พบว่า วิธีเรียนเชิงลึกมีผลมากที่สุด รองลงมาคือวิธีเรียนเชิงผิวเผิน ซึ่งมีความสัมพันธ์ในทางลบ และเกรดเฉลี่ยสะสมมีผลน้อยที่สุด

คำสำคัญ: ความสามารถการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเอง/ การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ/ นักเรียนมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6

Abstract

This study aimed to 1) investigate learner autonomy of Mattayom Suksa 6 or Grade 12 students, and 2) examine the relationship between learner autonomy and gender, GPA, deep and surface learning approaches. It took the form of survey research employing questionnaires to gather data from 178 Mattayom Suksa 6 students. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis. In response to research objective 1, it was found that, on average, learner autonomy of students was at a high level (M = 3.57, SD = .41). The findings of research objective 2 revealed that the independent variables that had the effects on learner autonomy at significant levels of .05 and 0.01 were GPA (β = .14, p = .03) a deep learning approach (β = .63, p = .00), and a surface learning approach (β = -.19, p = .01). Gender had no effect (β = -.11, p = .09) on autonomy. All of the independent variables had a moderate correlation with learner autonomy (R = .60) and collectively could explain a learner autonomy level with 35.6% (R2= .36). Considering the effect of each independent variable on autonomy in a ranking order, it was found that a deep approach was the most influential factor, followed by a surface learning approach with a negative relationship, and GPA.

Key words: Learner autonomy/ English learning/ Mattayom Suksa 6 students

---

[1] Assistant Professor Dr., English Department, Faculty of Arts, Dhurakij Pundit University

Introduction

Learner autonomy

Holec (1981:3) defines autonomy as 'the ability to take charge of one's own learning'. He further elaborates that the ability is not the innate ability, but it can be obtained by formal learning in a systematic manner. Dickinson (1987:11) defines autonomy as 'the situation in which the learner is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those decisions'. This signifies full learner autonomy. Benson (2001:110) describes autonomy as 'the capacity to control over one's own learning', and it is a precondition of effective learning. Autonomous learners are better language learners who develop more learning responsibility and critical thinking.

Learner autonomy can be considered in terms of degrees. Littlewood (1996) maintains that there are levels of autonomy which can be considered from the level that learners behave when they make independent choices in their own learning. To illustrate the point, high-level choices are at the top, and learners can control the activity – they can decide whether to employ that activity or how to determine its direction. In contrast, at the bottom are low-level choices that control some specific performances of the activity. In this instance the level of autonomy is less than the former one. Considering the degrees of autonomy, the concept of proactive and reactive autonomy is, therefore, proposed by Littlewood (1999). Proactive autonomy signifies full autonomy. Learners are capable of taking charge of their own learning, determining their learning objectives, selecting methods and techniques and evaluating what has been acquired. Proactive autonomy is, therefore, similar to the concept proposed by Holec (1981) and Dickinson (1987). Learners have self-regulation for the direction of activity and regulate the activity. Reactive autonomy does not create its own directions but enables learners to organize their resources autonomously in order to achieve the goal, once a direction has been set.

Pertaining to components of autonomy, Littlewood (1996) and Wenden (1991) agree that autonomy is composed of ability and willingness. Ability depends on knowledge about choices that have to be made from the alternatives, and necessary skills for exercising appropriate choices. Willingness depends on having both motivation and the confidence to take responsibility for the choices required. This clearly links autonomy to learning motivation.

A link between learner autonomy and learning motivation is the concept strongly supported by Dickinson who maintains that motivation shares some concepts of autonomy, i.e. learner choice, learner independence and learner responsibility (Dickinson, 1995). Ushioda (1996) argues that by definition autonomous learners are motivated learners. According to Dickinson (1995), active and independent involvement of learners in their own learning increases motivation to learn, and this leads to an increase in learning effectiveness. Motivation to learn and learning effectiveness can be increased in learners who take responsibility for their own learning, who understand and accept that their learning success is a consequence of their effort.

Individual learners are different, and so is their level of autonomy. Degrees of learner autonomy depend on various factors. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate relationships between learner autonomy and gender, grade point average (GPA), and approaches to learning which are deep and surface approaches.

Learning Approaches

Learners can take different approaches to learning, and these approaches are not static in each individual student. Some learners may adopt a deep learning approach while others are likely to

take a surface approach (Biggs, 1999). An emphasis has, therefore, been placed on learners' learning, rather than teaching. What a learner does has become more important for his or her learning than what the teacher does; consequently, teaching has been redefined as a facilitation of learners' learning (Lublin, 2003). Research reveals that approaches to learning somewhat influence a quality of learning outcomes (Saljo, 1982; Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983; Marton, 1988; Trigwell and Prosser, 1991 and Prosser, 1994).

There are two major types of approaches to learning, that is, deep and surface approaches. A deep approach to learning signifies an intention of learners to understand, engage with, operate in and value the content area or subject (Lublin, 2003). As well, they try to relate their previous knowledge or learning experience, and attempt to establish their own meaning by paying attention to the evidence and arguments to draw a conclusion. Deep learners are also seen as intrinsically motivated by interest in learning materials and tend to read beyond course requirements (Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983; Beckwith, 1991; Lublin, 2003). Learners who take a deep learning approach are critical and able to utilize metacognitive strategies that provide a way for learners to co-ordinate their own learning process. A relationship between autonomous learning and a deep learning approach clearly exists. As argued by Entwistle (1987), autonomous or self-regulated learners are likely to take a deep learning approach.

A surface learning approach, in contrast, signifies that learners have a tendency towards memorization and over learning without thinking. They are prone not to reveal their intention of becoming interested in and of understanding the subject or content. Rather, they are inclined to be interested in rote learning and reproduction of essential information. Extrinsic motivation, such as marks, grades or qualification, is seen important (Beckwith, 1991; Lublin, 2003).

Briefly, approaches to learning differ in terms of meaning orientation and reproducing orientation. The former is regarded as a deep approach which is seen as a desirable characteristic of autonomous learners, while the latter a surface approach. Sub-scales and meanings of each approach are illustrated in Table 1 (Ramsden and Entwistle, 1981).

Table 1: Sub-Scales of Learning Approaches

Sub-scale	Meaning
LEARNING APPROACHES	
Meaning Orientation	
Deep Approaches	Active questioning in learning
Inter-Relating Ideas	Relating to other parts of the -course
Use of Evidence	Relating evidence to conclusions
Intrinsic Motivation	Interest in learning for -learning's sake
Reproducing Orientation	
Surface Approach	Preoccupation with -memorization
Syllabus-Boundness	Relying on staff to define -learning tasks
Fear of Failure	Pessimism and anxiety about -academic outcomes
Extrinsic Motivation	Interest in courses for the -qualifications they offer

Research Objectives

1. To investigate learner autonomy of Mattayom Suksa 6 students.

2. To examine a relationship between learner autonomy and gender, GPA, and deep and surface learning approaches.

Research Methodology

Population and Subjects

The population consisted of Mattayom Suksa 6 or Grade 12 students at a public school offering both normal (using Thai as a medium of instruction) and English programmes or EP (mainly using English for instruction) in Bangkok and Nontaburi province. In total, there are 9 schools in Bangkok and 3 schools in Nontaburi, offering the normal programme and EP until Grade 12. A 'cluster sampling' technique was utilized to randomly select two schools: one in Bangkok and another one in Nontaburi. The EP students of both schools were used as the subjects. Simple random sampling was used to select students from the normal or Thai programme in order to obtain equal number of students from both programmes. Then, questionnaires were distributed to the selected students: 96 of each programme. However, only 178 students were considered as the subjects of this present study due to the completeness of the returned questionnaires. Among them, 84 students (47.19%) were in the EP, while 94 (52.81%) belonged to the normal programme. In terms of gender, 75 (42.10%) were males, and 102 (57.30%) were females (One was missing).

Research Design

This research was quantitative, taking the form of a cross-sectional survey study design.

Research Instruments

The 5-point Likert scale questionnaire in Thai which consisted of three parts was employed to collect data. Part one concerned personal data; namely, gender and programme of study (EP or normal programme). Part two dealt with learner autonomy on English learning, which refers to students' ability to take responsibility for their own English learning. This part of the questionnaire was taken from the work of Swatevacharkul (2009), which comprised four main components of learner autonomy with 34 items, that is, 1) Students' willingness to take learning responsibility, 2) Students' self-confidence to learn autonomously, 3) Students' motivation to learn English, and 4) Students' capacity to learn English autonomously. The content validity was reported 0.84, and the Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.90. The evaluation criteria of the questionnaire were as follows: 0.00 – 1.50 means learner autonomy was 'very low', 1.51 – 2.50 was 'low', 2.51 – 3.50 was 'moderate', 3.51 – 4.50 was 'high', and 4.51 – 5.00 was 'very high'.

Part three adapted and utilized the Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) (Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983) to gather data on deep and surface approaches. It has been widely used, and it consists of two major approaches, which are 'deep' and 'surface' learning approaches. Each approach includes 10 statements, making 20 statements in total. Under the deep learning approach, there are four components, that is, 1) Deep approach, 2) Relating ideas, 3) Use of evidence, and 4) Intrinsic motivation. The surface approach includes 1) Surface approach, 2) Syllabus boundness, 3) Fear of failure, and 4) Extrinsic motivation. However, the extrinsic motivation domain was decided to be excluded for data collection in this present study as the two statements (I chose my present courses mainly to give me a chance of a really good job afterwards, and I suppose I am more interested in the qualifications I'll get than in the courses I'm taking.) were obviously more appropriate for higher education students than high school students. Therefore, only

18 statements (10 for the deep learning approach and 8 for the surface learning approach) were included for data collection (Appendices). The same evaluation criteria utilized for the learner autonomy were applied.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics; namely, a mean score and standard deviations (SD) were calculated to analyze data for the first research objective. For the second research objective, a multiple regression analysis with the enter method was utilized to investigate the relationship between learner autonomy and the independent variables that were gender, GPA, deep learning, and surface learning approaches. For the gender variable, a dummy code was used; males were coded as 1 and females as 0 as a reference variable.

Findings

1. In response to research objective 1, the data analysis showed that the mean (M) was 3.57 and standard deviation (SD) was .41. This means that, on average, learner autonomy of students was at a high level. A further analysis of each domain of learner autonomy revealed the results as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Mean Scores of Learner Autonomy

Learner Autonomy	Mean	SD	Meaning
1. Willingness	3.66	.49	High
2. Self-confidence	3.25	.46	Moderate
3. Motivation	3.75	.68	High
4. Capacity	3.52	.51	High

According to Table 2, motivation to learn English, willingness to take learning responsibility, and capacity to learn autonomously were the three domains reflecting students' high level for learner autonomy, whereas the self-confidence was the only one domain being reported at a moderate level.

2. In regard to research objective 2, the findings were presented in relation to the five variables which the questionnaire statements had been designed to investigate. Table 3 shows the test of correlation coefficients among variables studied, and Table 4 presents the results on factors associated with learner autonomy.

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients among Variables

Variables	Gender	GPA	Deep learning	Surface learning	*Learner autonomy*
1. Gender	1	-.10	.11	-.03	*-.04*
2. GPA		1	.07	.03	*.19(*)*
3. Deep learning			1	.46(**)	*.55(**)*
4. Surface learning				1	*.11*
5. Learner autonomy					*1*

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As can be seen from Table 3, it was found that the dependent variable (learner autonomy) had a relationship with the two independent variables, that is, GPA and deep learning at a significant level of .05 and .01 respectively with correlation magnitudes of .19 and .55 respectively. However, there was no relationship with gender and surface learning. In terms of the relationships among the independent variables, it was found that the correlation magnitudes were from -.10 to .46, which means that the values were not higher than 0.75 (Prasith-rathsint, 2008). Therefore, a multicollinearity problem did not exist, and multiple regression analysis could be performed. It should be noted that skewness and kurtosis were acceptable, that is, their values were not higher than -2 to +2 (Baagozzi, 1981).

Table 4: Factors Associated with Learner Autonomy

Independent variables	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.85	.27		6.78	.00
1. Gender	-.09	.05	-.11	-1.72	.09
2. GPA	.14	.06	.14	2.24	.03
3. Deep learning	.48	.05	.63	9.03	.00
4. Surface learning	-.13	.05	-.19	-2.76	.01
R = .60, R^2 = .36, Adjusted R^2 = .34, SE E = .34, F = 23.38, Sig of F = .00					

Table 4 displays the results pertaining to the regression coefficients. The independent variables that had the effects on learner autonomy at significant levels of .05 and .01 were GPA (β = .14, p = .03) a deep learning approach (β = .63, p = .00), and a surface learning approach (β = -.19, p = .01). Gender had no effect (β = -.11, p = .09) on learner autonomy. All of the independent variables had a moderate correlation with learner autonomy (R = .60) and collectively could explain a level of learner autonomy with 35.6% (R^2= .36).

Considering each independent variable, it was found that gender was not a significant predictor of learner autonomy (β = -.11, p = .09). However, GPA (β = .14, p = .03), deep learning (β = .63, p = .00), and surface learning (β = -.19, p = .01) were all significant predictors of learner autonomy.

The deep learning variable was the strongest predictor of learner autonomy. The surface learning variable was the second, having a negative relationship with learner autonomy. This means that the more students adopt a surface learning approach, the less they will be autonomous. GPA came next, as the least potential predictor. Mean scores of approaches to learning are presented in Appendices.

Discussion and Implications

1. Level of Learner Autonomy

The findings revealed that Grade 12 students participating in this study held a high level of learner autonomy. This is consistent with the finding of previous research carried out with Thai tertiary students (Swatevacharkul, 2010a). Some possible explanations might be as follows.

First, learning motivation plays a crucial role in helping students become autonomous learner. Learning motivation of the students in this study was at a high level, and this domain was, in fact, ranked the highest. This finding corroborates the view that by definition autonomous learners are motivated learners (Ushioda, 1996). Students appeared to be intrinsically motivated in learning English for purposes of use and communication, as statement 18 (*Studying English can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse*

with more and varied people.) obtained the highest mean score (4.05). English learning motivation can be increased by an opportunity to use English for authentic communication. This makes English learning meaningful and motivating. Statement 20 (*Studying English can be important for me because I will need it for my future education*.) also remarkably reflects students' intrinsic motivation to learning. Generally, students in a formal education programme will further their study at a tertiary education level, which normally requires independent learning and reading English textbooks.

Second, it might be because of a considerable extent of exposure to English. Almost half of them (47.19%) were students in the EP, of which an instructional nature of using English as a medium of instruction exposes students to English at a great extent. As shown by research (Swatevacharkul, 2013), exposure to English and opportunities to use English both inside and outside class are important factors that contribute to positive attitudes towards English, and this will definitely lead to learning motivation.

The point of self-confidence is also worth discussing. It is the only single domain showing that students were moderately self-confident in regards to assuming responsibility for their own learning of English. This finding is paralleled with the research result revealing that Thai university students were highly ready for autonomous learning, but they somewhat lacked self-confidence to take responsibility for their own learning (Swatevacharkul, 2006; 2010a). These findings may reflect that Thai students at both secondary and tertiary education levels somewhat have a characteristic of teacher-dependence, although they perceive that their autonomy was high in terms of willingness to take learning responsibility and capacity to learn autonomously on English. However, students appeared to rely on a learning direction created by their teacher and appreciate supportive roles of teachers in enhancing learner autonomy. Reactive autonomy (Littlewood, 1999) may be more appropriate for high school students.

Pedagogical implications of the findings suggest that teachers find ways foster autonomy and support students' autonomous learning as well as increase students' more confidence in learning English autonomously. According to the recent research finding (Okazaki, 2012), students with learner autonomy support perform better and more motivated than those without a receipt of learning support. Also, autonomy support is essential for increased and more self-motivational development. Teacher's support for learner autonomy is specially needed for students with poor or low English proficiency (Swatevacharkul, 2006). They need more help and support than good or high English proficiency students do. Teachers, therefore, have a supportive role to play.

2. Relationship between Learner Autonomy and Gender

The findings on gender indicated no relationship with learner autonomy. This is consistent with the research carried out with Korean tertiary students (Cho, Ellinger and Hezlett, 2006), Iranian EFL students (Nematipour, 2012), and high school, university, and adult students (Reio and Davis, 2005). The possible explanation of the similar findings on gender might be because students in this present study exhibited the high intrinsic learning motivation that is a focal requisite for autonomy. As strongly argued by Ushioda (1996, p. 40), without motivation there is no autonomy. As discussed earlier, the major causes of their high motivation to learn English, which possibly gives rise to their learner autonomy, are students' awareness of the importance of English for communication and future education at a university level.

However, the present findings are inconsistent with the work of Varol and Yilmaz (2010) who found that grade 7 female and male learners in a public school differed in terms of autonomous language learning activities they adopted both in and out of class. Female learners were likely to behave more autonomously in and out of a class room. Female students were, also, more intrinsically motivated to learn English and more willing to assume language learning responsibility. The different findings on gender may be due to a beginner-level of the subjects of Varol and Yilmaz's study.

3. Relationship between Learner Autonomy and GPA

As seen from the results, GPA had a correlation with learner autonomy despite of a small correlation magnitude. This finding was supported by Cho, Ellinger and Hezlett (2006) and Edmondson, Boyer and Artis (2012) who performed a meta-analytic study of which the result showed that self-directed learning was significantly and positively related to academic performance or GPA. In this study, the focus was placed on autonomy for English learning, but GPA includes grades of every subject, not only English subjects. This might be the reason why GPA has a small correlation with learner autonomy. Existing research results show that English proficiency of EFL learners is significantly, strongly and positively related to their autonomy (Swatevacharkul, 2006; Dafei, 2007; Myartawan et. al, 2013).

4. Relationship between Learner Autonomy and Deep Learning Approach

The findings revealed that there was a very highly positive correlation between learner autonomy and a deep learning approach. The present results are congruent with previous research (Peters, Jones and Peters, 2007; Kek, Darmawan and Chen, 2007; Swatevacharkul, 2010b). In terms of theoretical concepts, learner autonomy strongly associates with a deep learning approach. Autonomous learners are very likely to adopt a deep learning approach. As argued by Kek, Darmawan and Chen (2007), a deep learning approach is related to high quality learning processes and learning outcomes. Supported by Kreber (2003 cited in Peters, Jones and Peters, 2007), deep-level learning, notably motivation to seek meaning, understanding of underlying principles and identification of relationship between ideas and concepts, is the basic requirement for self-directed or autonomous learning. The mean score of every statement concerning a deep learning approach of this present study was "high", except statement 10 (I find that studying academic topics can often be really exciting and interesting.), which was at a "moderate" level and thus definitely warrants teachers' attention. This clearly supports a strong relationship between learner autonomy and an adoption of a deep learning approach. According to Kek, Darmawan and Chen (2007), a deep learning approach is related to high quality learning processes and learning outcomes, whereas a surface learning approach is associated with poor quality processes and outcomes of students' learning.

5. Relationship between Learner Autonomy and Surface Learning Approach

A negative relationship between learner autonomy and a surface learning approach showed that if students adopt a surface learning approach, it is possible that they are not ready to be autonomous. Theoretically and practically, autonomous learners are deep learners. The surface learning approach that involves memorization and over learning without thinking does not promote learner autonomy.

Students in this present study appeared to rely on memorization, to a certain extent. However, memorization is seen to be unavoidable in foreign

language learning. As argued by Lublin (2003), students may employ rote learning when learning a foreign language. They may need to memorize grammatical rules and structures, for instance. This leads to an implication that rote learning should be applied intelligently in preparation for higher-level learning objectives. As a consequence, learning strategies that aim at acquiring an understanding of learning materials should be taught by a teacher and applied by students.

In addition, the findings on syllabus boundness indicated a sign of teacher-reliance. This is may be the reason why statement 15 under the surface learning approach (I like to be told precisely what to do in essays or other assignments.) was ranked the highest. This also reflects and reinforces a level of students' moderate self-confidence in their learning and a crucial role of teachers as authoritative figures in a classroom in a formal education system. Teachers are expected to exercise their authority, and students are likely to respect and rely on their teachers. Some explanations that might explain a characteristic of teacher reliance of grade 12 students are as follows:

First, culture might play an important role in this matter. Culture is considered as one of the potential factors influencing learner autonomy development and approaches to learning. Thailand is categorized as a collectivist culture (Hofstede, 1986). When applied to the teacher-student and student-student interaction, the collectivist dimension is influenced by a power distance. In large power distance societies like Thailand, the less powerful people in a society accept inequality in power and consider this as normal (Hofstede, 1986).

Second, maturity of the students may explain a characteristic of teacher reliance that relates to an adoption of a surface learning approach. Research reveals that mature students are prone to adopt a higher deep learning approach and demonstrated significantly lower surface learning orientation than non-mature students (Peters, Jones and Peters, 2007). The subjects of this present study are secondary school students, and their maturity is believed to be lower than tertiary students. Therefore, the findings of this study corroborate the existing research findings in this aspect. However, to strengthen the discussion on maturity, further research should carefully study maturity since this study considered maturity of the students in terms of their age only.

Recommendations

1. Although highly disposed towards learner autonomy, students are not always likely to take a deep learning approach. This finding supports the fact that students can adopt both deep and surface learning approaches in any learning contexts. Approaches to learning of students are not stable and not a static trait of each individual learner. Therefore, pedagogical approaches that enhance an adoption of a deep learning approach and learner autonomy but minimize surface learning orientation which hinders a development of learner autonomy must be employed.

2. Pertaining to the finding of the last statement under the deep learning approach, which is "I find that studying academic topics can often be really exciting and interesting"., it revealed a moderate level in the perception of the students, and this deserves pedagogical attention. Therefore, it is suggested that curriculum developers, course designers, and teachers pay more attention on selecting more interesting and exciting contents and topics. Students should be engaged, to the most possible extent, in making decisions on learning materials and course contents. By so doing, individual difference of each learner is cared for, and their wants and needs as far as learning contents are concerned can be catered for. As such, intrinsic

learning motivation that is a prerequisite for learner autonomy development can be improved to a greater extent, and this will guarantee a reduction of adopting a surface learning approach.

3. In terms of research, further studies may consider a comparative study on learner autonomy for English learning of EP and non-EP students. An investigation of a level of autonomy of students in these two different study programmes should bring a clearer understanding of their learner autonomy and autonomous learning, taking into account different learning contexts of the EP and non-EP programmes. Exposure to and use of English of students in a different study programme is seen to be of different degrees, for instance. Therefore, more effective pedagogical methods to best foster learner autonomy for students of each particular study programme will be appropriately designed.

4. To improve the model of variables or factors that have relationships with learner autonomy, more independent variables should be included, such as English proficiency score, programme of study (EP or non-EP), learning style, maturity, or age of students.

References

Baagozzi, R.P. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: a comment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 375-381.

Beckwith, J.B. (1991). Approaches to learning, their context and relationship to assessment performance. *Higher Education*, 22, 17-30.

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning*. London: Longman.

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Cho, I., Ellinger, A.D., and Hezlett, S.A. (2006). *An investigation of the relationship between the Barlett-Kotrlik inventory of self-learning score and demographic variables in the Korean context.* Retrieved January 2, 2013, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492805.pdf

Dafei, D. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency. *Asian EFL* Journal, 24, 1-23.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Introduction. In *Proceedings of seminar on self-access learning and learner independence: a South East Asean perspective*. Bangkok: KMITT, 1- 10.

Edmondson, D.R., Boyer, S.L., and Artis, A.B. (2012). *Self-directed learning: a meta-analytic review of adult learning constructs*. Retrieved from http://www.aabri.com/oc2012Manuscripts/oc12058.pdf

Entwistle, N. J. (1987). Motivation to learn: conceptualisations and practicalities. *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 35 (2), 129.

Entwistle, N. J. and Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London: Croom Helm.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 301-320.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kek, M.A.Y.C., Darmawan, I.G.N., and Chen, Y.S. (2007). Family, learning environments, learning approaches, and student outcomes in a Malaysian private university. *International Education Journal*, 8(2), 318-336. Retrieved January 2, 2013, from http://iej.com.au

Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": an anatomy and a framework. *System*, 24(4), 427-435.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian context. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 71-94.

Lublin, J. (2003). *Deep, surface and strategic approaches to learning*. Retrieved January 2, 2013, from http://www.ucd.ie/teaching/printableDoc

Marton, F. (1988). "What does it take to learn?" In N. J. Entwistle (Ed). *How Students Learn*. Lancaster University: Institute for Research and Development in Post-Compulsory Education.

Myartawan, I.P.N.W, Latief, M.A. and Suharmanto. (2013). The correlation between learner autonomy and English proficiency of Indonesian EFL college learners. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(1), 63-81.

Nematipour, M. (2012). A study of Iranian EFL learners' autonomy level and its relationship with learning style. *English Linguistics Research*, 1(1), 126-136. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from www.sciedu.ca/elr

Okazaki, M. (2012). *An investigation into the relationship between learner autonomy support and motivational in the Japanese university setting*. Doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/3261

Peters, D., Jones, G., and Peters, J. (2007). Approaches to studying, academic achievement and autonomy, in higher education sports students. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 6(2), 16-28.*

Prasith-rathsint, S. (2008). *Multiple variable analysis techniques for research in social sciences and behavioural sciences*. (6th edition). Bangkok: Samlada. (In Thai)

Prosser, M. (1994). A phenomenographic study of students' intuitive and conceptual understanding of certain electrical phenomena. *Instructional Science,* 22, 189-205.

Ramsden, P. and Entwistle, N. J. (1981). Effectiveness of academic departments on students' approaches to studying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 51, 368-383.

Reio, T.G. and Davis, W. (2005). Age and gender differences in self-directed learning readiness: a developmental perspective. *International Journal of Self-directed Learning*, 2(1), 40-49.

Saljo, R. (1982). *Learning and understanding; a study of differences in constructing meaning from a text.* Göteborg, Sweden: ACTA Universitatis.

Swatevacharkul, R. (2006). *The effects of degrees of support for learner independence through web-based instruction and levels of general English proficiency on English reading comprehension ability of second year undergraduate learners*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University.

Swatevacharkul, R. (2010a). Are tertiary students ready for learner autonomy? *Suthiparithat,* 74: 39-60.

Swatevacharkul, R. (2010b). An investigation on learning approaches and learning autonomy for English learning of Thai tertiary students. *The New English Teacher*, 4.2, 30-45.

Swatevacharkul, R. (2013). A comparison of English learning strategies used by Chinese students in private universities in Thailand. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Administration and Management 8: Administration and Management in a Dynamic World*. Bangkok: Dhurakij Pundit University, 793-805. (In Thai)

Trigwell, K. and Prosser, M. (1991). Improving the quality of student learning: the influence of learning context and student approaches to learning on learning context. *Higher Education*, 22, 251-266.

Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*. Dublin: Authentik.

Varol, B. and Yilmaz, S. (2010). Similarities and differences between female and male learners: inside and outside class autonomous language learning activities. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 237-244.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: planning and implementing learner training for language learners*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Mean of Deep Learning Approach

Domain	Mean	SD	Meaning
Deep Approach	**3.77**	**0.67**	**High**
1. I usually set out to understand thoroughly the meaning of what I am asked to learn.	3.92	0.78	High
2. I often find myself questioning things that I hear in lectures or read in books.	3.62	0.88	High
3. I generally put a lot of effort into trying to understand things which initially seem difficult.	3.77	0.87	High
Relating Ideas	**3.65**	**0.70**	**High**
4. I try to relate ideas in one subject to those in others.	3.62	0.87	High
5. I need to read around a subject pretty widely before I'm ready to put my ideas down on paper.	3.67	0.93	High
6. I find it helpful to "map out" a new topic for myself by seeing how the ideas fit together.	3.65	0.90	High
Use of Evidence	**3.59**	**0.75**	**High**
7. When I'm reading an article, I generally examine the evidence carefully to decide whether the conclusion is justified.	3.62	0.88	High
8. I am usually cautious in drawing conclusions if they are not well supported by evidence.	3.57	0.91	High
Intrinsic Motivation	**3.58**	**0.71**	**High**
9. My main reason for being here is that I can learn more about the subjects which really interest me.	3.69	0.81	High
10. I find that studying academic topics can often be really exciting and interesting.	3.48	0.86	Moderate

Appendix 2: Mean of Surface Learning Approach

Domain	Mean	SD	Meaning
Surface Approach	**3.46**	**0.59**	**Moderate**
11. I usually don't have time to think about the implications of what I have read.	3.17	0.97	High
12. When I'm reading, I try to memorize important facts which may come in useful later.	3.62	0.88	High
13. Often I tend to read things without having a chance to really understand them.	3.51	0.91	High
14. I find I have to concentrate on memorizing a good deal of what we have to learn.	3.52	0.92	High
Syllabus Boundness	**3.58**	**0.79**	**High**
15. I like to be told precisely what to do in essays or other assignments.	3.74	0.99	High
16. I tend to read very little beyond what's required for completing assignments.	3.42	0.91	Moderate
Fear of Failure	**3.48**	**0.92**	**Moderate**
17. The continual pressure of work assignments, deadlines and competition often makes me tense and depressed.	3.43	1.07	Moderate
18. A poor first answer in an exam makes me panic and competition often makes me tense and depressed.	3.53	1.11	High