

Contribution of Writing Autonomy to the Writing Performance of EFL Learners Based on CEFR

Mahboubeh Taghizadeh*

Assistant Professor, University of Science and Technolog

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate (a) EFL learners' beliefs about writing autonomy and their autonomous writing practices and (b) the contribution of writing autonomy to writing performance in terms of level specific tasks. The participants of this study were 138 Iranian students at BA and MA levels in Alborz Institute of Higher Education. Three writing tasks at B1, B2, and C1 levels as well as the adapted version of the autonomy questionnaire developed by Chan, Spratt, and Humphreys (2002) were administered in this research. The results showed that the majority of both BA and MA students were found to be at B1 level, and only 17.3% of MA students were placed at C1 level. In addition, both BA and MA students held themselves more responsible for 'Making sure they make progress during writing lessons'. Concerning writing abilities, BA students reported to be more capable of 'Choosing writing objectives in writing class', while MA students were more able to 'Identify their weaknesses in English writing' and to 'Decide how long to spend on each activity'. Considering writing activities, in both BA and MA students' responses, 'Listening and taking notes about what they have been taught', was the most frequent activity, whereas 'Writing an informal review for a website' and 'Writing a personal blog' were the least frequent activities. The results of ordinal regression analysis also revealed that only writing activities and group (BA and MA) were related to the rated performance.

Keywords: common European framework of reference; proactive autonomy; reactive autonomy; writing autonomy; writing task

* University of Science and Technolog, Iran

-Received on:30/07/2015

Email: mah_taghizadeh@ut.ac.ir

Accepted on: 28/09/2015

1. Introduction

As Little (2008) states, the concept of learner autonomy was first introduced into the ongoing debate about L2 teaching and learning by Holec (1981) in a report published by the Council of Europe in 1979. According to Holec, learner autonomy is defined as the "ability to take charge of one's own learning" (p. 3). A number of researchers (e.g., Benson, 2001, 2011; Benson & Voller, 1997; Dickinson, 1992; Little, 1991; Littlewood, 1996) have also defined learner autonomy, but Holec's definition is the most cited definition in the literature of the field (Benson, 2009; Little, 2009; Snodin, 2013) and is considered as universally agreed definition (Little, 2009). According to Holec (1981), autonomous learners are able to determine the objectives of their own learning, define the contents and progressions of learning, select techniques and methods to be used, monitor the procedure of learning properly, and evaluate what has been acquired. The present study has adopted Holec's (1981) and Littlewood's (1999) definitions of autonomy.

As Hsieh (2010) notes, learner autonomy has been identified as a complex capacity that potentially has a great effect on achievement and personal growth. It is argued that autonomy can increase learning engagement (Dam, 1990; Little, 1991; Miller, Hopkins, & Tsang, 2005) and knowledge retention and motivation (Ellis, 1994; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991; Holec, 1987; Rivers, 2001). In addition, it is considered as an ultimate purpose of education for a long time (Benson, 2001, 2009; Waterhouse, 1990), particularly in the second language learning, the concept has been suggested to be very complex (Little, 2003) and socially driven (Smith & Ushioda, 2009).

Writing as a productive skill also requires much practice among the learners, and class activities and sessions may not be enough for learners to practice and apply the various skills of writing and achieve a lifelong achievement. As a consequence, learning to write independently and autonomously has now become a necessity, particularly for university students. Given autonomy in English language writing, autonomous writers are aware of their individual error patterns (Ferris, 2002) and gains organizational skills and efficiency, becoming more agentic at accepting responsibility to become a competent and autonomous writer (Dion, 2011).

The great value of autonomy in the fields of second and foreign language writing has been recently acknowledged (Foroutan, Noordin, Hamzah, 2013). However, few studies (e.g., Dion, 2011; Moussaoui, 2012; Park, 2012) have been conducted on the effect of writing autonomy on the

writing ability of EFL learners. In addition, there seems to be no study examining the contribution of writing autonomy to writing performance in terms of level specific writing tasks based on CEFR.

The purposes of this study were thus to investigate (a) EFL learners' views of their writing autonomy in terms of responsibilities and decision making abilities in learning writing skill, their writing motivation level, and the actual writing activities they perform inside and outside the classroom and (b) the contribution of writing autonomy to their writing performance in the level specific writing tasks in terms of CEFR. The research questions formulated in this study were:

- 1) Is there any significant difference between BA and MA students of English in their writing autonomy?
- 2) Is there any significant difference in the predictability of writing autonomy in the BA and MA students' writing performance in the level specific writing tasks?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Learner Autonomy

Summarizing studies on autonomy in language learning, Snodin (2013) argues that consensus is found on the fundamental principles of learner autonomy: (a) students take charge of, and are responsible for their learning; (b) they learn how to make their own decisions on what and how to learn; (c) they understand their language needs; (d) they think on their learning critically; and (e) they maximize the learning opportunities to practice English outside or inside the classroom (Benson, 2001; Dickinson, 1987; Holec, 1981; Little, 1991).

As Najeeb (2013) notes, learning a foreign language is a social, interactive process. This aspect of language learning, however, is not taken into account in Holec's definition. This belief in the value of interdependent learning in language classrooms and beyond led leading practitioners to consider learner autonomy as a willingness and capacity to act independently and in interaction with others, as a responsible, social person (Dam, 1990). In a similar vein, Illés (2012) argues that the scope of the concept needs to be expanded and should include the preparation of students for language use in the international contexts as well. Therefore, the emphasis should shift from the learning process to the communication processes, and the essential concern should be fostering the language user's autonomy. In this light, Illés (2012) states that learner autonomy can be defined as the capacity to become competent and independent speakers of the target language, being able to

exploit the linguistic and other resources at their disposal creatively and effectively.

As Little (2008) states, when learner autonomy is a declared pedagogical objective, the learner's reflective capacities and learner self-management play a pivotal and necessarily explicit role. According to Najeeb (2013), the three basic pedagogical principles underlying autonomy in language learning is (a) learner involvement (engaging learners to share responsibility for their learning process), (b) learner reflection (helping learners to reflect critically when they plan, monitor and evaluate their learning), and (c) appropriate use of target language (using the target language as the principal medium of language learning). Allwright (1990), Holec (1981), and Little (1991) argue that autonomous learners are capable of reflecting on their own learning using their knowledge about learning and (b) are willing to learn in cooperation with others, (c) understand the goals of their learning program, (d) explicitly accept responsibility for their own learning, (e) share in the determining the learning goals, (f) take initiatives in planning and performing learning activities, and (g) regularly review their learning process and evaluate its effectiveness. There is a consensus that the practice of learner autonomy requires a capacity for reflection, an insight, a positive attitude, and a readiness to be proactive in interaction with others and in self-management (Najeeb, 2013).

According to Littlewood (1999), there are two types of autonomy: proactive and reactive. Proactive learners accept responsibility for their own learning, set their own learning objectives, choose techniques and methods and evaluate what has been acquired, while reactive learners do not create their own directions. But once a direction has been made, they organize the learning resources autonomously in order to achieve their goals (Littlewood, 1999). Littlewood (1996) further argues that although for most of autonomy researchers, proactive autonomy is the only kind that counts, with regard to education it is useful to also consider reactive autonomy either as a preliminary step towards proactive autonomy or as an objective in its own right.

As Little (1995) states, autonomous learners can "transcend the barriers between learning and living" (p. 175); that is, they can transfer what has been learned in teacher-led educational structures to wider contexts (Little, 1991). Thanasoulas (2000) suggests that autonomous learners are aware of their learning styles and strategies; have an active approach to learning the task at hand, are good guessers; are willing to take risks (i.e., to communicate in the target language at all costs); attend to form as well as to content, develop the target language into a separate

reference system; have an outgoing and tolerant approach to the target language; and are willing to revise and reject rules and hypotheses that do not apply. Illés (2012) also notes that autonomous learners are independent language users capable of online decision making and problem solving. Bagheri and Aeen (2011) also argue that autonomous learners are highly motivated, and autonomy leads to better and more effective work. In other words, an extremely motivated learner is more creative and initiative in learning and makes the classroom instruction more useful.

Holec (1981) also notes that the ability to accept responsibility for learning is not "inborn but must be acquired either by 'natural' means or (as most often happens) by formal learning, i.e., in a systematic, deliberate way" (p. 3). Similarly, Candy (1991) states that autonomy can be learned at least partly through interventions and educational experiences. Khaferi and Khaferi (2011) also argue that it is the teachers' responsibility to provide students with best practices. In a similar vein, Najeeb (2013) also notes that the teacher's role is to create and maintain a learning environment in which learners can be autonomous. In this light, Scharle and Szabo (2000) argue that becoming an autonomous learner is a process, which consists of three stages: raising student insight, modifying attitudes, and transferring roles. Cohen (2000) suggests that teachers should act as change agents in the classroom – shifting the responsibility for learning more onto the shoulders of the students themselves, and taking on a number of roles such as learner trainers, diagnosticians, coordinators, coaches, researchers, and language learners.

Dornyei (2001) argues that learner autonomy can be fostered using five types of practices: (a) resource-based approaches, which emphasize independent interaction with learning materials; (b) technology-based approaches, which emphasize independent interaction with educational technologies; (c) learner-based approaches, which emphasize the direct production of behavioral and psychological changes in the learner; (d) classroom-based approaches, which emphasize changes in the relationship between learners and teachers in the classroom; and (e) curriculum-based approaches, which extend the idea of learner control over the planning and evaluation of learning to the curriculum as a whole (p. 131).

Najeeb (2013) suggests that strategies for successful autonomization include the use of target language as the preferred medium of teaching and learning from the very beginning; learners' gradual development of a repertoire of useful language learning activities; and constant evaluation of the learning process, obtained by a

combination of teacher, peer and self-assessment. Illés (2012) also suggests that computer-assisted language learning tasks and projects such as designing blogs or websites seem to be particularly suitable for creating an integrated approach to the development of autonomy.

2.2. Common European Framework

The CEFR was developed by an international team of experts working under the aegis of the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe (Little, 2007), and it has its origin in over 40 years of work on modern languages in various projects of the Council of Europe (Heyworth, 2006). The CEFR, as Barenfanger and Tschirner (2008) suggest, has changed how foreign languages are taught, learned, and evaluated in Europe in a substantial way and is considered to be “one of the most important documents in the fields of language learning and teaching in Europe” (Schmenk, 2004, p. 9). North (2004) also asserts that the CEFR draws on theories of communicative competence and language use in order to describe what a language user has to know and do in order to communicate effectively. Considering CEFR as a comprehensive description of language use, Alderson et al. (2009) also argue that the CEFR can be considered, implicitly at least, as a theory of language development.

According to Alderson (2005), the CEFR defines L2 proficiency in the form of 'can do' statements at six levels arranged in three bands: basic user (A1, A2), independent user (B1, B2), proficient user (C1, C2); and in relation to five communicative activities (i.e., listening, reading, writing, spoken interaction, spoken production). The six proficiency levels are summarized in the so-called self-assessment grid (Council of Europe, 2001) and elaborated in 34 illustrative scales.

From a language education policy point of view, the CEFR has been praised for its potential to facilitate a convergence of differing systems worldwide (Mocket, Byrnes, & Slater, 2006). In addition, it offers a comprehensive and systematic overview of exactly what foreign language learners need to learn and how they need to learn it (Barenfanger & Tschirner, 2008). As North (2007) suggests, the CEFR aims to (a) establish a common metalanguage to talk about objectives and assessment; (b) encourage practitioners to reflect on their current practice, particularly in relation to analyzing practical language learning needs, setting objectives, and tracking progress; and (c) agree on common reference points. Little (2007) states that CEFR is an extremely useful and influential instrument that has given and will continue to give

valuable impulses for innovations in the teaching and learning of languages.

According to Little (2007), CEFR was designed to assist the development of L2 curricula, the design and implementation of L2 teaching programs, and the assessment of L2 learning outcomes. Moreover, as Heyworth (2006) argues, the CEFR attempts to bring together, under a single umbrella, a comprehensive tool for enabling syllabus designers, materials writers, teachers, learners, examination bodies, and others to locate their various types of involvement in modern language teaching in relation to an overall, unified, descriptive frame of reference. The CEFR, as Little (2005) notes, is considered as a tool for designing not only L2 curricula but also individual learning programs. This reflects the Council of Europe's long-standing commitment to learner autonomy as a prerequisite for effective lifelong learning (Holec, 1979).

CEFR levels were validated in both quantitative and qualitative studies (Alderson, 2002; Hasselgreen, 2003). According to North (2007), the descriptors used in the scales were all empirically validated, though not with the forms of validation to which Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research generally accords high value, but in terms of teachers' perceptions of how one might best and consistently describe different levels of actual learner performance. Similarly, Weir (2005) asserts that CEFR describes six levels of proficiency largely with regard to empirically derived difficulty estimates based on stakeholder perceptions of what language functions expressed by 'can-do' statements can be successfully performed at each level.

While the CEFR was developed to serve the language policy goals of Europe, it has been used for the instruction and assessment of foreign languages in many countries (North, 2007). Van Houten (2005), for instance, describes pilot programs using the CEFR in Canada, Japan, and South America. Van Houten argues that the CEFR may also be used in the United States to "facilitate mobility among levels and institutions, as well as among nations" (p. 15). One significant reason for the worldwide attention the CEFR has achieved, as Barenfanger and Tschirner (2008) state, may be the fact that CEFR offers a more comprehensive and detailed system of level descriptions than most other systems. Another reason may be that the CEFR was developed on the basis of research in SLA, foreign language education, and test research (Barenfanger & Tschirner, 2008).

Alderson et al. (2009) identify four practical problems with the use of CEFR scales for test specification: (a) inconsistencies, where a

feature might be mentioned at one level but not at another, where the same feature might occur at two different levels, or where at the same level a feature might be described differently in different scales; (b) terminology problems: synonymy or not?; (c) lack of definition, where terms might be given, but are not defined; and (d) gaps, where a concept or feature needed for test specification or construct definition is simply missing. However, as Weir notes, "the CEFR is not seen as a prescriptive device but rather a heuristic, which can be refined and developed by language testers to better meet their needs" (p. 298).

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 138 Iranian students at BA ($f = 86$) and MA ($f = 52$) levels in Alborz Institute of Higher Education. The participants' majors were Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), English Literature, and Translation Studies. They were both male (20.3%) and female (79.9%) students who ranged in age from 18 to 28. In addition, seven expert raters, who were experienced language teachers or experienced test developers, were asked to rate the participants' productions. Additionally, a rater trainer, who had a Ph.D. in TEFL and had extensive experience in teaching writing courses at BA and MA levels, were asked to train the raters.

3.2. Instruments and Materials

Three writing tasks at three adjacent levels (B1, B2, and C1) were used in this study. The first task was chosen from the Real Writing 2 (Palmer, 2008, p. 28) and asked respondents to write a message to a friend, describing the process of using washing machine. The second task was chosen from the Real Writing 3 (Gower, 2008, p. 60), which required the students to write a report on environmental issues. The third task in which the students were asked to write a report on a survey of supermarket customers was selected from the Real Writing 4 (Haines, 2008, p. 42).

The writing autonomy questionnaire consisted of 61 items, which were divided into four main sections, namely, (a) responsibilities, (b) abilities, (c) writing motivation, and (d) activities. The subcategories of the writing autonomy survey are presented in Table 1.

The first three sections of the writing autonomy questionnaire were adopted and adapted from the questionnaire on learning autonomy developed by Chan et al. (2002). They developed their questionnaire

based on the ideas on autonomy presented by Deci (1995), Deci and Ryan (1985), Holec (1981), and Littlewood (1999).

Table 1
Four Sections of Writing Autonomy Questionnaire

| Sections | Categories | Number of Items |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Responsibilities | Writing Objectives | 2 |
| | Writing Process (in class) | 6 |
| | Writing Process (outside class) | 3 |
| | Outcome | 2 |
| Abilities | In class | 5 |
| | Outside class | 3 |
| | Evaluation | 2 |
| | Others | 1 |
| Activities | Outside Class | 10 |
| | Inside Class | 13 |
| Motivation | | 1 |

The motivation section of the questionnaire was also based on Deci and Ryan's (1985) notion that autonomy is a key component for intrinsic motivation. In addition, their survey was developed based on Littlewood's (1999) distinction between proactive and reactive autonomy. The last section of the survey explored the actual writing tasks students perform inside and outside the writing class. It was developed based on the results of the piloting phase in which the participants were asked to report the writing tasks which helped them learn writing in English autonomously.

A rating scale encompassing three levels (B1-C1) with four major criteria (i.e., task fulfillment, organization, vocabulary, and grammar) which was developed based on descriptors of the CEFR was also the material used in this study.

3.3. Procedure

This investigation was carried out at the beginning of the fall semester in 2013, and the data were collected over a period of three weeks. Initially, three writing tasks at B1, B2, and C1 levels were selected from the Real Writing (2008) series (for the detailed description of the selection of writing tasks, the rating procedure, and the rater training see Taghizadeh (2014). After piloting the selected tasks, in order to control the working time and the possible illegal help (e.g., dictionaries, the internet, other persons, etc.), the tasks were administered in the class. The students were

asked to perform the three tasks in 75 minutes; that is, 20 minutes for the B1 level task, 25 minutes for the B2 task, and 30 minutes for the C1 level task.

Moreover, they were asked to rank their replies on a Likert scale in four sections of the writing autonomy questionnaire and complete it in 15 minutes. In other words, the learners were required to provide (a) their beliefs of writing teachers' responsibilities and their own; (b) their views on decision making abilities; (c) their motivation in English writing; and (d) their autonomous writing activities in and outside the writing class.

3.4. Statistical Analyses

To answer the research questions addressed in this study, the following statistical analyses were used. Descriptive statistics and chi-square test were conducted to determine each student's writing level based on their performance on the three adjacent writing tasks. Descriptive statistics were used to examine the students' responses to the four sections of the questionnaire. Additionally, ordinal logistic regression was used to determine the contribution of each section of the autonomy questionnaire to the students' writing performance.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Students' Performance on Writing Tasks

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage of BA and MA Students' Writing Performance in Terms of CEFR Levels

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Level</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>Chi-Square</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| BA | Below B1 | 26 | 30.2 | 22.977 | .000 |
| | B1 | 48 | 55.8 | | |
| | B2 | 12 | 14.0 | | |
| | Total | 86 | 100.0 | | |
| MA | Below B1 | 6 | 11.5 | 22.977 | .005 |
| | B1 | 23 | 44.2 | | |
| | B2 | 14 | 26.9 | | |
| | C1 | 9 | 17.3 | | |
| | Total | 52 | 100.0 | | |

As shown in Table 2, more than half of the BA students (55.8%) were found to be at B1 level, and no one could reach the C1 level of proficiency. The BA students' writing ability can be hierarchically ranked as B1, Below B1,

and B2. However, unlike BA students, 17.3% of MA students were at C1 level. Table 2 also shows that a small number ($f = 6$) of MA students was considered at 'Below B1' level, while the majority was found to be at B1 level. It is important to note that BA participants were mostly considered 'Below B1' compared to MA students. The writing proficiency level of MA students could be reported at B1, B2, C1, and Below B1, respectively. Finally, it is important to note that the majority of students of both groups were placed at B1 level as they appeared to perform better at B1 task (i.e., message writing) than the other tasks. Table 2 also indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the participants of both levels in terms of performance on the three writing tasks.

4.2. Students' Opinions of Their Writing Teacher's Responsibility and Their Own

The first section of the questionnaire explored the students' views about their own and their instructors' responsibilities in learning writing in English. Results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. It is important to note that in this section the combined results for the 'mainly' and 'completely' categories and the 'not at all' and 'a little' categories are reported.

As Table 3 shows, BA students held themselves more responsible for the following areas compared to other areas: '*Make sure you make progress during writing lessons*' (85.1%); '*Make sure you make progress outside writing class*' (69.7%); '*Decide what you learn outside writing class*' (61.7%); and '*Make you work harder in writing*' (56.9%), respectively. On the other hand, they considered themselves less responsible for the following activities: '*Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons*' (38.4%); '*Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons*' (30.3%); '*Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons*' (25.6%); '*Decide how long to spend on each writing activity*' (25.5%); '*Evaluate your writing course*' (24.4%); '*Decide the objectives of your writing course*' (24.4%); and '*Evaluate your learning in writing*' (23.2%), respectively.

Table 3 also indicates that MA students reported that there were more responsible for the following areas: '*Make sure you make progress outside writing class*' (82.7%); '*Stimulate your interest in learning writing in English*' (80.8%); '*Make you work harder in writing*' (76.9%); '*Make sure you make progress during writing lessons*' (71.1%); '*Identify your weaknesses in English writing*' (59.6%); '*Decide what you learn outside writing class*' (57.7%); '*Decide the objectives of your writing course*' (52%); and '*Decide how long to spend on each writing activity*' (51.9%). Whereas they regarded themselves less responsible for the

following areas,: 'Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons' (38.4%); 'Evaluate your writing course' (25%); and 'Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons' (23%), respectively.

Table 3

The Percentage of Students' Viewpoints about Their Own Responsibility

| | | <i>Not at all</i> | <i>A little</i> | <i>Some</i> | <i>Mainly</i> | <i>Complete ly</i> | <i>Chi- square</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---|----|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Writing Objectives | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Decide the objectives of your writing course | BA | 5.8 | 18.6 | 33.7 | 24.4 | 17.4 | 17.953 | .001 |
| | MA | | 9.6 | 38.5 | 30.8 | 21.2 | 9.692 | .021 |
| 2. Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons | BA | 3.5 | 22.1 | 47.7 | 9.3 | 17.4 | 50.047 | .000 |
| | MA | 5.8 | 9.6 | 44.2 | 23.1 | 17.3 | 23.769 | .000 |
| Writing Process (In class) | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons | BA | 15.1 | 23.3 | 37.2 | 17.4 | 7.0 | 21.791 | .000 |
| | MA | 9.6 | 28.8 | 36.5 | 11.5 | 13.5 | 14.923 | .005 |
| 4. Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons | BA | 7.0 | 23.3 | 40.7 | 14.0 | 15.1 | 28.767 | .000 |
| | MA | 11.5 | 11.5 | 36.5 | 28.8 | 11.5 | 14.731 | .005 |
| 5. Decide how long to spend on each writing activity | BA | 8.1 | 17.4 | 33.7 | 26.7 | 14.0 | 17.953 | .001 |
| | MA | 5.8 | 13.5 | 28.8 | 34.6 | 17.3 | 14.154 | .007 |
| 6. Stimulate your interest in learning writing in English | BA | 4.7 | 14.0 | 27.9 | 24.9 | 18.6 | 24.000 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 3.8 | 13.5 | 32.7 | 48.1 | 41.077 | .000 |
| 7. Make sure you make progress during writing lessons | BA | 2.3 | 4.7 | 27.9 | 39.5 | 25.6 | 44.000 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 3.8 | 23.1 | 26.9 | 44.2 | 32.038 | .000 |
| 8. Make you work harder in writing | BA | 5.8 | 9.3 | 27.9 | 36.0 | 20.9 | 27.372 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | | 21.2 | 44.2 | 32.7 | 20.308 | .000 |
| Writing Process (Outside Class) | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Decide what you learn outside writing class? | BA | 4.7 | 14.0 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 41.9 | 32.256 | .000 |
| | MA | 7.7 | | 34.6 | 30.8 | 26.9 | 8.923 | .003 |
| 10. Identify your weaknesses in English writing | BA | 2.3 | 16.3 | 32.6 | 29.1 | 19.8 | 24.349 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 5.8 | 32.7 | 40.4 | 19.2 | 28.769 | .000 |
| 11. Make sure you make progress outside writing class | BA | 12 | 9.3 | 19.3 | 33.7 | 36 | 39.349 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 1.9 | 13.5 | 32.7 | 50.0 | 45.692 | .000 |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Evaluate your learning in writing | BA | 5.8 | 17.4 | 27.9 | 26.7 | 22.1 | 13.767 | .008 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 13.5 | 36.5 | 28.8 | 17.3 | 17.231 | .002 |
| 13. Evaluate your writing course | BA | 8.1 | 16.3 | 34.9 | 29.1 | 11.6 | 22.721 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 23.1 | 36.5 | 21.2 | 17.3 | 16.077 | .003 |

As indicated in Table 4, BA students considered writing teacher more responsible for the following activities, respectively: 'Evaluate your learning in writing' (87.2%); 'Identify your weaknesses in English writing' (86%); 'Stimulate your interest in learning writing in English' (83.7%); 'Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons' (81.4%); 'Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons' (80.2%); 'Decide how long to spend on each writing activity' (80.2%); 'Evaluate your writing course' (77.9%); 'Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons' (76.7%); 'Make you work harder in writing' (73.2%); and 'Make sure you make progress during writing lessons' (70.9%). However, they reported that the writing teacher was less responsible for these two areas: 'Make sure you make progress outside writing class' (34.9%) and 'Decide what you learn outside writing class' (27.9%).

As shown in Table 4, there were six areas that the majority of MA students thought teachers should take responsibility for. These areas were (in descending order): 'Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons' (98.1%); 'Evaluate your writing course' (94.3%); 'Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons' (94.3%); 'Evaluate your learning in writing' (92.3%); 'Identify your weaknesses in English writing' (90.4%); and 'Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons' (90.3%). On the other hand, 'Make sure you make progress outside writing class' received the least percentage (28.8%) among students' responses, indicating that teachers were found to be less responsible for students' progress outside writing class.

4.3. Students' Viewpoints about Their Decision Making Abilities

The second section of the survey asked students to report their decision making abilities with regard to a number of processes and activities. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5. It is important to note that the combined results for the 'very good/good' and 'very poor/poor' categories are presented here.

Table 4
The Percentage of Students' Responses about Teacher's Responsibility

| | | <i>Not at all</i> | <i>A little</i> | <i>Some</i> | <i>Mainly</i> | <i>Completely</i> | <i>Chi-square</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---|----|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Writing Objectives | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Decide the objectives of your writing course | BA | 3.5 | 7.0 | 19.8 | 20.9 | 48.8 | 54.814 | .000 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 1.9 | 23.1 | 28.8 | 42.3 | 30.500 | .000 |
| 2. Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons | BA | 5.8 | 4.7 | 12.8 | 15.1 | 61.6 | 96.558 | .000 |
| | MA | | | 5.8 | 30.8 | 63.5 | 26.115 | .000 |
| Writing Process (In class) | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons | BA | 3.5 | 3.5 | 11.6 | 17.4 | 64.0 | 109.84 | .000 |
| | MA | | | 1.9 | 23.1 | 75.0 | 44.115 | .000 |
| 4. Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons | BA | 2.3 | 8.1 | 9.3 | 17.4 | 62.8 | 103.49 | .000 |
| | MA | | | 9.6 | 36.5 | 53.8 | 15.500 | .000 |
| 5. Decide how long to spend on each writing activity | BA | 1.2 | 3.5 | 15.1 | 33.7 | 46.5 | 66.326 | .000 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 5.8 | 13.5 | 32.7 | 44.2 | 32.615 | .000 |
| 6. Stimulate your interest in learning writing in English | BA | 1.2 | 4.7 | 10.5 | 31.4 | 52.3 | 79.814 | .000 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 1.9 | 23.1 | 30.8 | 40.4 | 29.346 | .000 |
| 7. Make sure you make progress during writing lessons1 | BA | | 2.3 | 26.7 | 30.2 | 40.7 | 27.209 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 3.8 | 26.9 | 40.4 | 26.9 | 28.577 | .000 |
| 8. Make you work harder in writing | BA | 1.2 | 9.3 | 16.3 | 27.9 | 45.3 | 51.093 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 1.9 | 28.8 | 36.5 | 30.8 | 29.154 | .000 |
| Writing Process (Outside Class) | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Decide what you learn outside writing class? | BA | 11.6 | 16.3 | 27.9 | 23.3 | 20.9 | 6.791 | .147 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 28.8 | 44.2 | 27.808 | .000 |
| 10. Identify your weaknesses in English writing4 | BA | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 26.7 | 59.3 | 98.767 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 1.9 | 5.8 | 44.2 | 46.2 | 55.308 | .000 |
| 11. Make sure you make progress outside writing class | BA | 20.9 | 14.0 | 33.7 | 17.4 | 14.0 | 11.558 | .021 |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Evaluate your learning in writing | BA | 5.8 | 17.4 | 27.9 | 26.7 | 22.1 | 13.767 | .008 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 13.5 | 36.5 | 28.8 | 17.3 | 17.231 | .002 |
| 13. Evaluate your writing course | BA | 8.1 | 16.3 | 34.9 | 29.1 | 11.6 | 22.721 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 23.1 | 36.5 | 21.2 | 17.3 | 16.077 | .003 |

Table 5
The Percentage of Students' Opinions about Their Decision Making Abilities

| Activities | | Abilities | | | | | | |
|--|----|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|------------|----------|
| | | Very poor | Poor | Ok | Good | Very good | Chi-square | <i>p</i> |
| In class | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Choosing writing objectives in writing class | BA | 3.5 | 9.3 | 34.9 | 41.9 | 10.5 | 50.628 | .000 |
| | MA | | 7.7 | 48.1 | 28.8 | 15.4 | 19.538 | .000 |
| 2. Choosing writing materials in writing class | BA | 5.8 | 19.8 | 33.7 | 24.4 | 16.3 | 18.186 | .001 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 28.8 | 32.7 | 17.3 | 19.2 | 14.923 | .005 |
| 3. Choosing writing activities in writing class | BA | 1.2 | 20.9 | 39.5 | 29.1 | 9.3 | 40.163 | .000 |
| | MA | | 19.2 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 15.4 | 5.077 | .166 |
| 4. Deciding how long to spend on each activity | BA | 3.5 | 8.1 | 43.0 | 29.1 | 16.3 | 44.698 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 11.5 | 28.8 | 34.6 | 23.1 | 18.192 | .001 |
| 5. Deciding what you should learn next in your writing lessons | BA | 1.2 | 16.3 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 15.1 | 33.186 | .000 |
| | MA | | 23.1 | 26.9 | 34.6 | 15.4 | 4.000 | .261 |
| Outside Class | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Choosing objectives of writing skill outside writing class | BA | 2.3 | 20.9 | 41.9 | 23.3 | 11.6 | 37.488 | .000 |
| | MA | | 23.1 | 30.8 | 32.7 | 13.5 | 4.769 | .189 |
| 7. Choosing writing materials outside writing class | BA | 8.1 | 29.1 | 32.6 | 16.3 | 14.0 | 18.535 | .001 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 28.8 | 40.4 | 21.2 | 5.8 | 24.923 | .000 |
| 8. Choosing writing activities outside writing class | BA | 5.8 | 20.9 | 38.4 | 24.4 | 10.5 | 27.953 | .000 |
| | MA | | 17.3 | 30.8 | 34.6 | 17.3 | 5.077 | .166 |
| Evaluation | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Evaluating your learning in writing | BA | | 12.8 | 46.5 | 25.6 | 15.1 | 24.419 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 13.5 | 38.5 | 28.8 | 17.3 | 20.692 | .000 |
| 10. Evaluating your writing course | BA | 1.2 | 9.3 | 41.9 | 38.4 | 9.3 | 60.163 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 15.4 | 26.9 | 36.5 | 19.2 | 17.423 | .002 |
| Others | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Identifying your weaknesses in English writing | BA | 2.3 | 12.8 | 38.4 | 34.9 | 11.6 | 24.721 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 11.5 | 28.8 | 34.6 | 23.1 | 23.677 | .000 |
| Activities | | Abilities | | | | | | |
| | | Very poor | Poor | Ok | Good | Very good | Chi-square | <i>p</i> |
| In class | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Choosing writing objectives in writing class | BA | 3.5 | 9.3 | 34.9 | 41.9 | 10.5 | 50.628 | .000 |
| | MA | | 7.7 | 48.1 | 28.8 | 15.4 | 19.538 | .000 |
| 2. Choosing writing materials in writing class | BA | 5.8 | 19.8 | 33.7 | 24.4 | 16.3 | 18.186 | .001 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 28.8 | 32.7 | 17.3 | 19.2 | 14.923 | .005 |
| 3. Choosing writing activities in writing class | BA | 1.2 | 20.9 | 39.5 | 29.1 | 9.3 | 40.163 | .000 |
| | MA | | 19.2 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 15.4 | 5.077 | .166 |
| 4. Deciding how long to spend on each activity | BA | 3.5 | 8.1 | 43.0 | 29.1 | 16.3 | 44.698 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 11.5 | 28.8 | 34.6 | 23.1 | 18.192 | .001 |
| 5. Deciding what you should learn next in your writing lessons | BA | 1.2 | 16.3 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 15.1 | 33.186 | .000 |
| | MA | | 23.1 | 26.9 | 34.6 | 15.4 | 4.000 | .261 |
| Outside Class | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Choosing objectives of writing skill outside writing class | BA | 2.3 | 20.9 | 41.9 | 23.3 | 11.6 | 37.488 | .000 |
| | MA | | 23.1 | 30.8 | 32.7 | 13.5 | 4.769 | .189 |
| 7. Choosing writing materials outside writing class | BA | 8.1 | 29.1 | 32.6 | 16.3 | 14.0 | 18.535 | .001 |
| | MA | 3.8 | 28.8 | 40.4 | 21.2 | 5.8 | 24.923 | .000 |
| 8. Choosing writing activities outside writing class | BA | 5.8 | 20.9 | 38.4 | 24.4 | 10.5 | 27.953 | .000 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| writing class | MA | | 17.3 | 30.8 | 34.6 | 17.3 | 5.077 | .166 |
| Evaluation | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Evaluating your learning in writing | BA | | 12.8 | 46.5 | 25.6 | 15.1 | 24.419 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 13.5 | 38.5 | 28.8 | 17.3 | 20.692 | .000 |
| 10. Evaluating your writing course | BA | 1.2 | 9.3 | 41.9 | 38.4 | 9.3 | 60.163 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 15.4 | 26.9 | 36.5 | 19.2 | 17.423 | .002 |
| Others | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Identifying your weaknesses in English writing | BA | 2.3 | 12.8 | 38.4 | 34.9 | 11.6 | 24.721 | .000 |
| | MA | 1.9 | 11.5 | 28.8 | 34.6 | 23.1 | 23.677 | .000 |

As Table 5 indicates, most participants' responses clustered in the 'ok' option of the questionnaire. Regarding BA students' responses, only one ability, 'Choosing writing objectives in writing class', received the percentage above 50 % for 'very good/good' categories (52.4%). Additionally, BA students rated to be 'very poor/poor' in the following abilities, respectively: 'Choosing writing materials outside writing class' (37.2%); 'Choosing writing activities outside writing class' (26.7%); 'Choosing writing materials in writing class' (25.6%); 'Choosing objectives of writing skill outside writing class' (23.2%); and 'Choosing writing activities in writing class' (22.1%).

Concerning MA students' responses, four abilities gained the percentage above 50% for the 'very good/good' categories, respectively: 'Identifying your weaknesses in English writing' (57.7%); 'Deciding how long to spend on each activity' (57.7%); 'Evaluating your writing course' (55.7%); and 'Choosing writing activities outside writing class' (51.9%). However, they rated themselves to be 'very poor/poor' at 'Choosing writing materials outside writing class' (32.6%); 'Choosing writing materials in writing class' (30.7%); 'Deciding what you should learn next in your writing lessons' (23.1%); and 'Choosing objectives of writing skill outside writing class' (23.1%), respectively.

4.4. Students' Opinion about Their Level of Motivation

The third section of the questionnaire required the language students to determine their level of writing motivation. Table 6 summarizes the students' responses.

The results obtained for both groups regarding their motivation level were quite encouraging. As shown in Table 6, the majority (94.2%) of MA students considered themselves 'highly motivated', 'well motivated', and 'motivated', and only few (5.8%) reported to be 'slightly motivated'. Table 6 also indicates that 79% of BA students found to be 'highly motivated', 'well motivated', and 'motivated', while some (21%)

thought they were 'slightly motivated' or 'not at all motivated' in English writing.

Table 6

The Percentage of Students' Views of Their Motivation Level

| Categories | <i>f</i> | | <i>%</i> | | <i>Chi-Square</i> | | <i>p</i> | |
|----------------------|----------|------|----------|------|-------------------|--------|----------|------|
| | BA | MA | BA | MA | BA | MA | BA | MA |
| Not at all motivated | 4 | | 4.7 | | 19.698 | 10.615 | .001 | .014 |
| Slightly motivated | 14 | 3 | 16.3 | 5.8 | | | | |
| Motivated | 29 | 15 | 33.7 | 28.8 | | | | |
| Well motivated | 21 | 16 | 24.4 | 30.8 | | | | |
| Highly motivated | 18 | 18 | 20.9 | 34.6 | | | | |

4.5. Writing Activities Inside and Outside Classroom

The last part of the survey consisted of two parts, exploring the writing activities carried out by language learners inside and outside the writing class. The results showed that concerning BA students' responses, only four activities gained the percentage above 50% for 'often' and 'always' categories. These activities are 'Listening and taking notes about what they have been taught' (75.6%); 'Writing personal SMS (text messages)' (58.2%); 'Writing slides for a presentation' (54.7%); and 'Making notes of key information in a written text, e.g. from the internet, books, or magazines' (54.6%). In addition, the least frequent writing activities reported by BA students were 'Writing an informal review for a website' (89.5%); 'Writing a personal blog' (89.5%); 'Doing revision not required by the teacher' (72%); 'Writing a report describing information in charts' (69.7%); 'Making suggestion to the teacher' (67.4%); 'Writing a clearly argued and well-balanced essay' (64%); and 'Doing writing assignments which are not compulsory' (53.5%), respectively.

Regarding MA students' writing activities, 'Listening and taking notes about what they have been taught' (71.2%); 'Making notes of key information in a written text, e.g. from the internet, books, or magazines' (61.5%); 'Writing a handout to accompany presentation' (50%); and 'Writing personal SMS (text messages)' (50%) received the highest percentage for 'always/often' categories, respectively, whereas 'Writing an informal review for a website' (90.4%); 'Writing a personal blog' (82.7%); 'Making suggestion to the teacher' (75%); 'Doing revision not required by the teacher' (57.7%); 'Writing a clearly argued and well-balanced essay' (55.8%); and 'Adding comments to a blog' (53.8%)

activities received the highest percentage for 'rarely/never' categories, indicating that MA students 'rarely' or 'never' carried out these activities during their last academic year.

It is worth noting that in both BA and MA students' responses, 'Listening and taking notes about what they have been taught' was the most frequent activity, while 'Writing an informal review for a website' and 'Writing a personal blog' were the least frequent activities.

4.6. Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis

Before conducting ordinal logistic model, the frequency of the response and predictor variables was checked. Since some cells for the writing motivation were found with small expected values or with zero frequencies, the researcher had to run the model without writing motivation variable. In this statistical technique, rated performance was the dependent variable, while ability, responsibility, activities, and group variables were the predictor variables. In what follows the results of the ordinal logistic regression are presented.

As shown in Table 7, the difference between the two log-likelihoods—the chi square—had an observed significance level of less than .05. This means that we can reject the null hypothesis that the model without predictors was as good as the model with predictors.

Table 7

Model Fitting Information

| Model | -2 Log Likelihood | Chi-Square | df | p |
|----------------|-------------------|------------|----|------|
| Intercept Only | 322.457 | | | |
| Final | 282.226 | 40.232 | 4 | .000 |

Table 8

Goodness-of-Fit Statistics

| | Chi-Square | df | p |
|----------|------------|-----|-------|
| Pearson | 350.010 | 401 | .969 |
| Deviance | 280.839 | 401 | 1.000 |

As Table 8 indicates, the goodness-of-fit measures showed large observed significance levels; therefore, it appears that the model fits. To measure the strength of association between the dependent variable (rated performance) and the predictor variables (group, responsibility, ability, and activities), Cox and Snell, Nagelkerke, and McFadden were calculated. The results showed that the values of these pseudo R-square statistics were .253, .280, .124, respectively.

As shown in Table 9, given the observed significance levels, writing activities and group (BA and MA) were related to the rated performance. Group had negative coefficients, suggesting that BA students did not perform well on the writing tasks compared to MA students. Writing activities had positive coefficient, indicating that BA and MA students' writing activities were significantly different. Table 9 also shows that responsibilities and abilities were not related to the rated performance, indicating that both groups of students did not differ in terms of writing responsibilities and abilities.

As Table 10 shows, since the observed significance level ($p = .229$) was large, sufficient evidence was not found to reject the parallelism hypothesis. It means that the assumption that the regression coefficients were the same for all five categories was met.

Table 9
Parameter Estimates

| | | Estimate | Std. Error | Wald | df | p | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------|------------|--------|----|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Threshold | [Rating = Below B1] | 2.769 | 1.358 | 4.154 | 1 | .042 | .106 | 5.431 |
| | [Rating = B1] | 5.579 | 1.417 | 15.504 | 1 | .000 | 2.802 | 8.355 |
| | [Rating = B2] | 7.503 | 1.500 | 25.027 | 1 | .000 | 4.564 | 10.443 |
| Location | Responsibility | .042 | .022 | 3.558 | 1 | .059 | -.002 | .085 |
| | Ability | .018 | .024 | .561 | 1 | .454 | -.030 | .066 |
| | Activities | .041 | .012 | 11.924 | 1 | .001 | .018 | .065 |
| | [Group=BA] | -1.485 | .373 | 15.813 | 1 | .000 | -2.216 | -.753 |
| | [Group=MA] | 0 ^a | . | . | 0 | . | . | . |

Table 10
Test of Parallel Lines

| Model | -2 Log Likelihood | Chi-Square | df | P |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|----|------|
| Null Hypothesis | 282.226 | | | |
| General | 271.677 | 10.548 | 8 | .229 |

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories. a. Link function: Logit.

The students in this study did not perform well on the writing tasks despite passing many English language courses. It is believed that this result is probably due to a few reasons. First, before entering university, students' previous English language courses are mostly reading focused, and no systematic instruction is offered for the writing skill. Moreover,

the lack of standards for the writing proficiency, the lack of predetermined, concrete writing outcomes, large class size, time constraints, and traditional teacher-centered teaching methods can account for the problems in the writing courses offered in this center.

With regard to the writing autonomy, the results of the first section of the autonomy questionnaire (i.e., responsibilities) revealed that both BA and MA students held themselves less responsible for their progress in the writing class, particularly regarding choosing writing materials, activities, and evaluation in the writing class. This might be due to the fact that students think teachers have the required expertise and knowledge, and they themselves do not have the experience to identify and determine what they need to learn, how or in what order. As a consequence, they expect their writing instructor who has the knowledge and expertise to decide.

Additionally, they showed reluctance in choosing their own learning materials and found it difficult to choose the right materials at the right level. It is also believed that one important factor which has apparently influenced the students' decisions is the lack of awareness of their own responsibility in the learning process. The lack of prior autonomous learning experience is also another important factor in the development of writing autonomy at tertiary level.

Given their writing autonomous behavior, BA students did not report high ability with regard to writing activities in the writing class, and they appeared to exhibit only the kind of autonomous behavior which helped them to cope with their studies and assignments in the writing class. It is believed that some factors have influenced students' views of their decision-making abilities. First, students did not have the opportunity to learn writing autonomously. Second, they did not have any prior autonomous learning experiences. Third, they were not confident about capacity in the autonomous learning process.

Concerning autonomous writing activities outside the writing class, language major students, who had chosen to study English, revealed little inclination of engagement in carrying out the autonomous practices outside the classroom and showed little motivation to pursue their progress in writing skill beyond the writing class. It is believed that they showed a general reluctance to work alone and to write blogs or review for a website. This can be attributed to the infrequent autonomous writing practice and to the general lack of time mainly due to the heavy workload of their subject discipline.

Students in the present study preferred the responsibilities for writing activities to be taken mainly by the teacher. This indicated a

strong preference for a dominant teacher role and thus a relatively less autonomous role for students. In this light, the findings of this research are in line with those of Chan et al. (2002) and Littlewood (1999) in which students were oriented towards acceptance of power and authority.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The purpose of this research was to investigate learners' views of their writing autonomy in terms of responsibilities and decision making abilities in learning writing skill, their writing motivation level, and the actual writing activities they performed inside and outside the classroom. In addition, it was aimed to determine the contribution of writing autonomy to the writing ability of EFL learners. The results revealed that both BA and MA students held themselves more responsible for 'Making sure they make progress during writing lessons', whereas BA students considered writing teachers more responsible for 'Evaluating their learning in writing', and MA students thought that teachers should take more responsibility for 'Choosing what materials to use to learn writing in writing lessons'. Concerning writing abilities, BA students reported to be more capable of 'Choosing writing objectives in writing class', while MA students were more able to 'Identify their weaknesses in English writing' and to 'Decide how long to spend on each activity'.

With regard to the autonomous writing tasks, students in both groups reported that they mostly do the following activities: 'listening and taking notes about what they have been taught' and 'making notes of key information in a written text, e.g., from the internet, books, or magazines', which are writing activities they have to do inside their writing classes. However, both reported that they do not do activities such as 'writing a personal blog', 'writing an informal review for a website', and 'doing revision not required by the teacher'. The results of the ordinal logistic regression also revealed that only autonomous writing activities contributed to the writing performance of the participants.

There is a need for L2 writers to take responsibility for all decisions of the learning in writing classes. Instructors should improve students' autonomous writing behavior and help them to ask for less teacher support in writing classes and operate more autonomously in performing their writing tasks. Teachers are suggested to familiarize language learners with various methods and techniques for achieving writing autonomy and offer them a wide repertoire of the writing strategies, which help them develop their autonomy. To promote learners' writing autonomy, materials developers can develop teaching materials

and textbooks in which awareness about autonomy is presented and also different techniques, strategies, and writing tasks are introduced in order to help learners to learn writing in English autonomously.

It is believed that more research is required into the roles that autonomy plays in the improvement of writing skill. First, considering that this study did not taken into account the gender variable, it is suggested that similar study be conducted investigating if male and female differ in terms of their viewpoints about their writing autonomy. In future study, students can receive training and instruction on writing autonomy and then research can be conducted to investigate the impact of this instruction on students' writing development. The relationship between writing autonomy and factors such as personality traits, learning anxiety, locus of control, and the cognitive style merits further inquiry. Future researchers can also use more qualitative and in-depth interview with learners and instructors about learners' autonomy in writing classes. In addition, factors such as age, sociocultural background, language proficiency level of L2 learners were not taken into account; therefore, future studies can take these variables into consideration.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Case studies in the use of the Common European Framework*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Alderson, J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: The Interface between learning and assessment*. London: Continuum.
- Alderson, J. C., Figueras, N., Kuijper, H., Nold, G., akala, S., & Tardieu, C. (2009). Analyzing tests of reading and listening in relation to the Common European Framework of reference: The experience of the Dutch CEFR construct project. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(1), 3-30.
- Bagheri, M. S., & Aeen, L. (2011). The impact of practicing autonomy on the writing proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 1-13.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Benson, P. (2009). Making sense of autonomy in language learning. In S. Toogood, R. Pemberton & A. Barfield (Eds.), *Maintaining control: Autonomy and language learning* (pp. 13-26). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and researching autonomy*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Benson, P., & Voller, P. (Eds.) (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Brantmeier, C., & Vanderplank, R. (2008). Descriptive and criterion-referenced self-assessment with L2 readers. *System*, 36(4), 456-477.
- Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. D. (2000). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Dam, L. (1990). Learner autonomy in practice: An experiment in learning and teaching. In I. Gathercole (Ed.), *Autonomy in language learning: Papers from a conference held in January 1990* (pp. 16-37). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching & Research.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickinson, L. (1992). *Learner autonomy 2: Learner training for language learning*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Dion, Ch. M. (2011). Tools to enhance second language writing autonomy: Can we do things better? In D. Gardner (Ed.), *Fostering autonomy in language learning* (pp. 64-75). Gaziantep: Zirve University. Retrieved from <http://ilac2010.zirve.edu.tr>
- Dorney, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language learner writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gardner, R., & MacIntyre, P. (1991). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(1), 57-72.
- Hasselgreen, A. (2003). *Bergen "Can do" Project*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Heyworth, F. (2006). The common European framework. *ELT Journal*, 60(1), 181-183.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon (first published 1979, Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Illés, E. (2012). Learner autonomy revisited. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 505-513.

- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D. (2005). The common European framework and the European language portfolio: Involving learners and their judgments in the assessment process. *Language Testing*, 22(3), 321-336.
- Little, D. (2007). The common European framework of reference for languages: Perspectives on the making of supranational language education policy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 645-653.
- Little, D. (2008). Knowledge about language and learner autonomy. In J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (Eds), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 247-258), Springer Science + Business Media LLC.
- Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European Language Portfolio: Two L2 English examples. *Language Teaching*, 42(2), 222-33.
- Littlewood, W. (1996). Autonomy: An anatomy and a framework. *System*, 24(4), 427-435.
- Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 71-94.
- Miller, L., Hopkins, M., & Tsang, E. (2005). *Self-access language learning in Hong Kong secondary schools*. Paper presented at the 2nd Independent Learning Association Oceania Conference, Manukau Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Mocket, A., Byrnes, H., Q., & Slater, R. (2006). The power of language: "U.S. language policy five years after 9/11". Plenary session panel at ACTFL 2006, Nashville, TN. Retrieved from <http://www3.georgetown.edu/departments/german/faculty/byrnes/Byrnes.ACTFL.11-06.pdf>
- Najeeb, S. S. R. (2013). Learner autonomy in language learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1238-1242.
- North, B. (2004). Relating assessments, examinations, and courses to the CEE. In K. Morrow (Ed.), *Insights from the common European framework* (pp. 77-90). Oxford: UK: Oxford University Press.
- North, B. (2007). The CEFR illustrative descriptor scales. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 656-659.
- Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self-assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 279-290.
- Scharle, A., & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schmenk, B. (2004). Drama in the margins? The common European framework of reference and its implications for drama pedagogy in the foreign language classroom. *German as a Foreign Language, 1*, 6-23.
- Smith, R., & Ushioda, E. (2009). Autonomy: Under whose control? In R. Pemberton, S. Toogood & A. Barfield (Eds.), *Maintaining control: Autonomy and language learning* (pp. 241-253). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Snodin, N. S. (2013). The effects of blended learning with a CMS on the development of autonomous learning: A case study of different degrees of autonomy achieved by individual learners. *Computers & Education, 61*, 209-216.
- Taghizadeh, M. (2014). *Diagnosing L2 learners' writing ability in level-specific approach (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. University of Tehran, Tehran.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how it can be fostered? *The Internet TESLJ Journal, 6*(11), 1-14.
- Van Houtan, J. B. (2005). Achieving articulation through assessment. In M. H. Rosenbusch, *New visions in action: National assessment summit papers* (pp. 9-17). Iowa: Iowa State University.
- Waterhouse, P. (1990). Supported self-study across the curriculum. In I. Gathercole (Ed.), *Autonomy in language learning: Papers from a conference held in January 1990* (pp. 4-6). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching & Research.
- Weir, C. J. (2005). Limitations of the Common European Framework for developing comparable examinations and tests. *Language Testing, 22*(2), 281-300.
- Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2011). Developing learner autonomy in higher education in Macedonia. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 11*(1), 150-154.

Questionnaire:

We're interested in your views of the roles of learners and teachers in language learning. Could you please give us your opinions as indicated below? We hope the information provided by this questionnaire will enable us to design effective learning programs.

Section 1-**Writing Responsibilities** (Please fill both "Yours & Your instructor's section)

| | | completely | mainly | some | A little | Not at all |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Make sure you make progress during writing lessons? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Make sure you make progress outside writing class? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Stimulate your interest in learning writing in English? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Identify your weaknesses in English writing? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Make you work harder in writing? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Decide the objectives of your writing course? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Decide what you should learn next in your writing lessons? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Choose what activities to use to learn English writing in your writing lessons? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Choose what materials to use to learn writing in your writing lessons? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Decide how long to spend on each writing activity? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Evaluate your learning in writing? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Evaluate your writing course? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Decide what you learn outside writing class? | Your Your instructor's | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |

Section 2- Writing Abilities

If you have the opportunity how good do you think you would be at:

| | very good | good | ok | poor | very poor |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 14. Choosing writing activities in writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. Choosing writing activities outside writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Choosing writing objectives in writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Choosing objectives of writing skill outside writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Choosing writing materials in writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Choosing writing materials outside writing class? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Evaluating your learning in writing? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. Evaluating your writing course? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. Identifying your weaknesses in English writing? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Deciding what you should learn next in your writing lessons? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Deciding how long to spend on each activity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Section 3- Writing Motivation (Please fill the appropriate part)

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 25. How would you describe yourself? | |
| Highly motivated to learn writing in English | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| well motivated to learn writing | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| motivated to learn writing | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| slightly motivated to learn writing | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| not at all motivated to learn writing | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Section 4- **Writing Activities**

In this last academic year, in English, how often have you:

| Outside class | never | rarely | sometimes | often | always |
|--|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| Write an informal review for a website? | | | | | |
| Write personal SMS (text messages)? | | | | | |
| Write IM (instant messages)? | | | | | |
| Write personal emails in English? | | | | | |
| Write English letters? | | | | | |
| Write a personal blog? | | | | | |
| Add comments to a blog? | | | | | |
| Do writing assignments which are not compulsory? | | | | | |
| Write a diary in English? | | | | | |
| Done revision not required by the teacher? | | | | | |
| Inside class | | | | | |
| Listen and take notes about what you have taught | | | | | |
| Write notes for a presentation | | | | | |
| Write a handout to accompany presentation | | | | | |
| Write slides for a presentation | | | | | |
| Make notes of key information in a written text, e.g. from the internet, books, or magazines | | | | | |
| Make notes while participating in a meeting or seminar | | | | | |
| Make a summary of key information for review/revision purposes | | | | | |
| Express ideas and opinions formally in writing. | | | | | |
| Write a clearly argued and well-balanced essay | | | | | |
| Make suggestion to the teacher | | | | | |
| Discuss the writing problems with class | | | | | |
| Ask the teacher questions when you don't understand | | | | | |
| Write a report describing information in charts | | | | | |