

Teacher Autonomy and Its Constraints in Higher Education: Implications for Learner-Centred Pedagogy

K. Rajesh¹ & C. Palanivelrajan²

Abstract

Autonomy in education relies on both learner and teacher agency. This study examined how English faculty members in higher education institutions in Theni District, Tamil Nadu, perceive and practice autonomy, and how institutional factors influence their perspectives. Grounded in Self-Determination Theory, 64 faculty members from government, aided, and private colleges were surveyed in 2022–2023 using a validated questionnaire on learner autonomy, motivation, and constraints. Results show that teachers actively motivate students (90.6%), acknowledge achievements (93.8%), and use autonomy-supportive strategies like goal setting and responsibility-sharing (92.2%). Most reported job satisfaction (84.4%) and access to professional development (79.7%), though fewer were satisfied with pay (48.4%). Institutional support was evident, but barriers persisted: burnout from rigid schedules (93.8%), job insecurity (81.3%), and heavy administrative burdens (84.4%). The findings suggest that while teachers promote learner autonomy, structural constraints hinder its full practice, highlighting the need for institutional reforms to strengthen teacher agency.

Keywords: Teacher Autonomy; Learner Autonomy; Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Autonomy in education has emerged as a cornerstone of effective pedagogy, particularly in the context of language learning in higher education. While learner autonomy, defined as the capacity to take responsibility for one's own learning, has long been promoted in theory (Little, 1995; Lamb et al., 2008), its successful implementation hinges on a parallel emphasis on teacher autonomy. Teachers are not merely content transmitters but facilitators of a dynamic learning process that relies on their motivation, agency, and the institutional environment in which they operate (Nagai et al. 2020; Slemp et al. 2020). Yet the extent to which teachers can support learner autonomy is shaped by their own sense of autonomy, which is inherently relational, context-dependent, and institutionally mediated (Ganza et al. 2008; Lamkhanter et al. 2024).

In practice, significant gaps persist between the aspirational goals of autonomous teaching and the structural realities of many educational settings. Teachers often contend with rigid curricula,

performance-driven policies, and a lack of institutional support, all of which hinder autonomy-supportive teaching (Basri et al. 2020; Putro et al. 2022). Moreover, the global shift toward outcome-based education has intensified this tension. Increasingly, both teachers and students operate under pressure to produce quantifiable academic results, high test scores, standardised benchmarks, and external evaluations, at the expense of fostering deep, process-oriented learning (Tomasouw, 2018; Karademir, 2019). Such environments discourage intellectual risk-taking, critical inquiry, and self-reflection, which are essential for cultivating learner autonomy.

Autonomous learning requires students to set their own goals, monitor progress, and reflect on outcomes, capacities nurtured by teachers who are themselves autonomous and motivated (Najeeb, 2013; Salimi & Ansari, 2015). As emphasised by Littlewood (1999) and Yurdakul (2016), this transformation from passive knowledge acquisition to active learner agency necessitates not only curricular adjustments but

¹ Ph.D, Scholar, Department of English, Madurai Kamaraj University, India.  0009-0002-4228-2942
 mkrajessh@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor & Head, Department of English, Cardamom Planters Association College, Bodinayakanur, Tamil Nadu, India.  pvrajan15@gmail.com

also changes in teachers' attitudes and practices. However, despite broad acknowledgement of autonomy as a pedagogical ideal, few empirical studies have examined how teachers' motivation, environmental conditions, and autonomy-supportive behaviours interact to foster this shift, particularly in non-Western contexts and within English language teaching. Grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which posits that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are fundamental psychological needs, this study positions teacher autonomy support as central to enhancing student engagement, academic motivation, and achievement (Reeve, 2009; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). When teachers engage in autonomy-supportive practices, such as acknowledging student perspectives, providing rationale for tasks, and offering meaningful choices, students report higher engagement, resilience, and academic confidence (Jang et al. 2010; Patall et al. 2010; Vansteenkiste et al. 2004). Conversely, institutional constraints, unclear job security, and administrative burdens can demotivate teachers and erode their capacity to create autonomy-enhancing environments (Chang et al. 2016; Hospel & Galand, 2016).

While research has explored autonomy-supportive strategies from the learner's perspective, limited attention has been given to the teacher's experience, especially regarding how attitudes, intrinsic motivation, and institutional climate shape autonomy in practice. Addressing this gap, the present study examines how English language teachers in higher education perceive and enact autonomy, and how institutional factors either support or constrain these efforts. It focuses on three core dimensions: teachers' attitudes toward autonomous teaching, the role of intrinsic motivation in sustaining autonomy-supportive behaviour, and the environmental conditions, such as infrastructure, support systems, and policy enforcement, that influence the expression of teaching autonomy. By integrating quantitative data with thematic interpretation, the study contributes empirical insights into the complex interplay between teacher psychology, institutional structures, and the cultivation of autonomous learning. These findings aim to inform the design of pedagogical frameworks and policy interventions that empower educators and promote more adaptive, student-centred learning environments.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was carried out in Government, Government-aided, and self-financed Arts and Science Colleges located in Theni District, Tamil Nadu, India, during the academic year 2022–2023. The institutional context was particularly suitable for the inquiry since these colleges cater to a heterogeneous student population across multiple academic disciplines, thereby providing a representative context for examining teaching autonomy within higher education settings.

A total of 64 English faculty members, teaching either language or literature courses at the undergraduate level, were selected through random sampling procedures. The use of random sampling was intended to minimise the risk of selection bias while simultaneously capturing a diverse range of teachers' perspectives, thereby strengthening the external validity and generalizability of the findings to similar academic environments.

The data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire, developed through a multi-stage process. An extensive review of existing literature on teacher and learner autonomy was undertaken to identify theoretical constructs and operational dimensions relevant to the present investigation. Additionally, 15 subject-matter experts in English language education and pedagogy were consulted. Their evaluations were used to establish content validity, refine item wording, and ensure that the tool adequately captured the nuances of teaching autonomy in the Indian higher education context.

The final version of the instrument comprised multiple sections, reflecting the following major domains:

- Profile characteristics (sociodemographic details, academic qualifications, teaching experience).
- Teacher attitudes toward learner autonomy.
- Intrinsic motivation as it relates to teaching practices.
- Environmental factors (institutional support, workload, peer collaboration) that may facilitate or constrain teaching autonomy.

All items related to teaching autonomy were measured using a five-point Likert scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree), allowing for the quantification of subjective attitudes and perceptions. Responses were systematically coded and entered into a dataset for quantitative

analysis. Descriptive statistical methods (e.g., mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution) were employed to map overall trends in teacher attitudes, motivational orientations, and perceived environmental constraints. This analytical approach enabled a structured comparison of patterns across teachers and provided preliminary evidence for understanding the relationship between institutional context and teaching autonomy.

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics

The demographic composition of the sample reflects a predominantly female respondent group, with women accounting for 61% and men 39% of participants. In terms of academic qualifications, the majority (62.5%) hold an M.Phil. degree, while equal proportions (18.75%) possess either an M.A. or Ph.D. qualification. Institutional affiliation shows that over half of the respondents (54.7%) are employed in private colleges, followed by 34.4% in government-aided colleges and 10.9% in government colleges. Age distribution indicates a relatively young sample, with 53.1% of respondents aged between 20 and 30 years, 29.7% aged 31–40, and smaller proportions in the 41–50

(14.1%) and 51–60 (3.1%) age categories. No participants were above 60 years of age.

Teacher Autonomy

Attitudes towards Teaching

The data reveal that a substantial proportion of college faculty demonstrate a positive and learner-centred attitude towards teaching, particularly in fostering autonomy, providing feedback, and maintaining instructional engagement. Notably, 90.63% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they actively motivate students at the beginning of lessons, reflecting a high commitment to student engagement from the outset. Similarly, over 79% reported consistently incorporating group work (Table 1), indicating a strong inclination toward collaborative learning strategies. Recognition of student achievement is a central feature, with 93.75% of educators acknowledging learners' task accomplishments. Feedback provision is also robust, with 85.94% agreeing or strongly agreeing that they offer constructive evaluations of student performance. The facilitation of peer-group learning was similarly well-endorsed, with 87.51% affirming their engagement in this practice.

Table 1. Faculty attitudes toward learner autonomy and instructional practices in English language teaching

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I actively motivate students at the outset of each lesson.	6.25	3.13	0	23.44	67.19
I ensure students submit classwork during instructional time.	6.25	9.38	12.5	53.13	18.75
I incorporate collaborative group work as part of instructional design.	0	1.56	10.94	53.13	34.38
I provide constructive feedback to students on their academic performance.	1.56	6.25	6.25	45.31	40.63
I formally acknowledge students' successful task completion.	3.13	0	3.13	25	68.75
I support students in developing their own learning objectives.	6.25	1.56	7.81	40.63	43.75
I facilitate peer-group learning to enhance student engagement.	4.69	0	7.81	40.63	46.88
I promote students' awareness and practice of autonomous learning strategies.	3.13	4.69	9.38	51.56	31.25
I engage in self-directed professional learning to model autonomy.	6.25	3.13	7.81	53.13	29.69
I assist students in monitoring and evaluating their individual learning progress.	4.69	3.13	9.38	39.06	43.75
I foster learner responsibility through structured, autonomy-oriented activities.	0	0	7.81	60.94	31.25

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I believe students are capable of independent language learning without continuous teacher support.	1.56	6.25	31.25	32.81	28.13
I place priority on comprehensive coverage of the prescribed syllabus.	3.13	6.25	12.5	56.25	21.88
I emphasize the development of students' language proficiency alongside curriculum delivery.	6.25	3.13	3.13	35.94	51.56
I actively seek student feedback to improve my teaching effectiveness.	4.69	6.25	9.38	37.5	42.19
I refrain from extending instruction beyond the boundaries of the prescribed syllabus.	28.13	37.5	10.94	10.94	12.5
I consider myself sufficiently knowledgeable to meet my students' learning needs.	3.13	3.13	9.38	60.94	23.44
I accept accountability for the academic performance of my students.	7.81	6.25	10.94	57.81	17.19
I interpret learner autonomy as the capacity to learn without teacher intervention.	3.13	10.94	39.06	34.38	12.5
I view learner autonomy as involving students' ability to make informed decisions about their learning.	3.13	4.69	15.63	46.88	29.69
I help students recognize and accept responsibility for their learning through contextually meaningful activities.	6.25	3.13	7.81	50	32.81
As a facilitator, I consider it unnecessary to explicitly teach every concept or detail.	12.5	35.94	10.94	26.56	14.06

A notable emphasis on learner autonomy emerged across multiple items. 84.38% of educators reported assisting students in developing their own learning objectives, while 82.81% supported students in monitoring and evaluating their learning progress. Furthermore, 92.19% indicated they foster responsibility through structured autonomy-enhancing activities, underlining a pedagogical orientation toward self-directed learning. Nevertheless, perspectives on the definition of learner autonomy varied: while 76.57% agreed that autonomy involves learners making decisions about their own learning, only 46.88% endorsed the notion that students can learn independently without a teacher, suggesting nuanced views on the limits of autonomous learning in practice.

In terms of curriculum delivery, 78.13% prioritized syllabus completion, yet a slightly higher 87.5% emphasized the development of language skills, suggesting a balanced approach to content coverage and skill enrichment. Despite this, 65.63% rejected the idea of strictly adhering to syllabus boundaries, indicating openness to adaptive and responsive teaching practices.

Regarding accountability, 75% of respondents accepted responsibility for student outcomes, and 84.38% viewed themselves as sufficiently knowledgeable to meet instructional demands, reflecting strong professional confidence. However, when asked whether it is necessary to explicitly teach every concept, responses were more divided, with only 40.62% in agreement and 48.44% disagreeing, highlighting variation in facilitation styles and beliefs about instructional completeness.

Motivation

The results indicate a generally high level of professional motivation among college faculty, driven by both institutional support and intrinsic satisfaction. A majority of educators (76.57%) reported actively encouraging students to utilize language laboratories, suggesting an investment in fostering applied language learning through supplementary resources. Recognition of professional contributions appears to be a significant motivational driver. 75% of respondents affirmed that their academic activities, such as publishing, attending conferences, and leading

workshops, are acknowledged and rewarded by their institutions. Similarly, 79.69% agreed or strongly agreed (Table 2) that their institutions provide diverse opportunities for professional development, indicating a robust culture of academic growth. Access to research infrastructure was also reported positively by 78.12% of faculty, highlighting institutional investment in research capabilities. Job

satisfaction emerged as a strong motivator, with 84.38% expressing satisfaction with their teaching roles. However, satisfaction with remuneration was comparatively lower; only 48.44% expressed agreement or strong agreement, while 31.82% expressed dissatisfaction, and 18.75% remained neutral, indicating a potential gap between effort and compensation.

Table 2. Faculty motivation toward learner autonomy & instructional practices in English language teaching

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I actively encourage students to make regular use of the language laboratory.	1.56	0	21.88	54.69	21.88
My scholarly contributions, including publications, workshop facilitation, and conference participation, receive institutional recognition and reward.	6.25	7.81	10.94	39.06	35.94
My institution provides diverse professional development opportunities, such as conferences, workshops, and faculty enrichment programs.	3.13	9.38	7.81	35.94	43.75
I have access to adequate institutional infrastructure for conducting research.	3.13	4.69	14.06	45.31	32.81
I am professionally satisfied with my current teaching position.	4.69	7.81	3.13	35.94	48.44
I am satisfied with the remuneration provided for my academic role.	10.94	21.88	18.75	29.69	18.75
Promotions within my institution are determined by academic qualifications and length of service.	3.13	6.25	4.69	54.69	31.25
The institutional management incorporates faculty suggestions into policy decisions.	6.25	1.56	0	39.06	53.13
I receive performance-based incentives aligned with my academic contributions.	6.25	4.69	7.81	34.38	46.88
Institutional leadership supports the continuous development of my professional skills.	6.25	0	9.38	39.06	45.31
My efforts and commitment to teaching are formally acknowledged and rewarded.	6.25	4.69	23.44	34.38	31.25

Promotion practices were perceived positively by most respondents: 85.94% agreed that advancement is based on qualifications and tenure, which likely reinforces procedural transparency. Additionally, institutional responsiveness to faculty input was strongly endorsed by 92.19%, with a majority noting that their suggestions influence policy formulation, suggesting an inclusive governance environment. Performance-based incentives and managerial support for skill development were also well acknowledged, with 81.26% and 84.37%,

respectively, affirming institutional reinforcement of professional efforts. Nonetheless, the perception of institutional acknowledgement for teaching effort was slightly more tempered: only 65.63% felt their hard work was consistently recognised, while 23.44% remained uncertain.

Environmental Support for Teaching

The analysis reveals a complex interplay between supportive institutional conditions and structural challenges within the teaching environment. A majority of faculty (79.69%) reported having access to reliable transportation, indicating

relatively few logistical barriers to punctuality. Additionally, 82.81% affirmed that their classrooms are adequately equipped with modern technologies and teaching resources, highlighting institutional investment in instructional infrastructure. Cultural enrichment and collegiality were widely endorsed. 93.75% agreed (Table 3) that regularly organised cultural events and guest lectures enhanced the teaching atmosphere. Similarly, 89.07% indicated that the institution encourages collegial interactions and knowledge-sharing among faculty, suggesting a healthy

professional ecosystem conducive to collaboration and intellectual exchange. However, several indicators suggest environmental stressors that may undermine teaching effectiveness. Notably, 93.75% of respondents agreed that the lack of flexible scheduling and wellness support contributes to burnout, underscoring a systemic concern for faculty well-being. Likewise, 81.26% reported experiencing job insecurity, indicating widespread concern regarding employment stability.

Table 3. Faculty working environmental conditions toward learner autonomy & instructional practices in ELT

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have access to reliable transportation that facilitates timely arrival at the institution.	9.38	3.13	7.81	40.63	39.06
Classrooms are equipped with modern instructional technologies and adequate teaching resources.	3.13	4.69	9.38	50	32.81
Administrative and technical support services allow me to focus on instructional and academic responsibilities.	6.25	4.69	20.31	39.06	29.69
The absence of flexible scheduling and wellness initiatives contributes to teacher burnout.	3.13	1.56	1.56	26.56	67.19
I experience uncertainty regarding the long-term security of my employment.	3.13	0	15.63	28.13	53.13
Regularly organized cultural programs and guest lectures contribute positively to the teaching environment.	3.13	1.56	1.56	51.56	42.19
The institution actively fosters collegiality and facilitates knowledge-sharing among faculty members.	3.13	3.13	4.69	46.88	42.19
My institution provides sufficient infrastructure to support and enhance student learning outcomes.	3.13	6.25	4.69	45.31	40.63
My supervisor requires strict compliance with the prescribed academic syllabus.	6.25	31.25	14.06	39.06	9.38
I experience institutional pressure to ensure students attain high academic scores.	6.25	32.81	15.63	32.81	12.5
I spend more time on administrative tasks than on academic responsibilities.	4.69	1.56	9.38	45.31	39.06
Rigid institutional policies restrict opportunities for my professional growth and development.	9.38	21.88	29.69	18.75	20.31

Administrative burdens also appear substantial. A combined 84.37% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that administrative responsibilities often exceed academic tasks, suggesting a misalignment of roles that could detract from instructional focus. While 85.94% acknowledged that their institutions provide adequate infrastructure to support student learning, only 68.75% felt supported by administrative and

technical services in focusing on core academic duties, with 20.31% expressing uncertainty, indicating partial gaps in support mechanisms. Pressures related to academic performance and policy rigidity were also evident. 48.44% agreed that they face institutional pressure to deliver high student scores, and 48.44% indicated that their supervisors demand strict adherence to the syllabus. In contrast, 37.5% disagreed with these

statements, suggesting variability in institutional enforcement. Furthermore, 39.06% of educators agreed that rigid policies restrict professional growth, though 29.69% remained neutral, indicating possible inconsistency in the perception or application of institutional rules.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reaffirm the centrality of teacher autonomy, motivation, and environmental support in fostering autonomous teaching practices within English language education. As David Little (1995) postulated, the development of learner autonomy hinges on the nature of pedagogical dialogue, a process inherently shaped by the autonomy of the teacher. This study contributes empirical clarity to this proposition, revealing that while teachers generally demonstrate a positive disposition toward promoting learner autonomy, their attitudes and effectiveness are contingent upon broader institutional and motivational contexts. Teachers' self-perception as motivators and organisers, rather than facilitators, aligns with earlier observations by Siti Azhariah et al. (2023) and Fouzia Lamkhanter et al. (2024), suggesting that although educators recognise their role in scaffolding learner independence, their classroom practices remain tethered to managerial functions. This asymmetry in role execution indicates a gap between theoretical endorsement of learner autonomy and practical implementation, possibly rooted in deeply entrenched pedagogical norms and constrained professional agency.

Motivational indicators further illuminate this gap. While teachers report moderate to high levels of intrinsic motivation, consistent with Slemph et al. (2020), many also cite institutional constraints that undermine their autonomy-supportive practices. These include excessive administrative workload, lack of time for innovation, and limited recognition for autonomy-enhancing efforts, factors similarly identified by Basri et al. (2020) as systemic impediments to both learner and teacher autonomy in higher education. When teachers perceive limited control over instructional content, scheduling, and assessment, core domains of autonomy as defined by the CEFR (Nagai et al. 2020), their capacity to foster learner autonomy diminishes accordingly.

The environmental dimension presents a nuanced picture. A majority of respondents acknowledged

the presence of enabling infrastructure, technology-integrated classrooms, professional development opportunities, and administrative support. This aligns with Dung Tran et al. (2020), who emphasised that autonomy in foreign language education requires multidimensional support spanning physical, pedagogical, and relational domains. However, these facilitators are insufficient in isolation. The data reveal that without concurrent improvements in institutional culture, particularly in promoting teacher well-being, curricular flexibility, and student-centred pedagogy, environmental inputs alone fail to fully empower autonomous teaching practices.

Moreover, the relational dynamic between teacher and student emerged as a critical determinant. Teachers in this study expressed uncertainty about students' readiness and willingness to assume responsibility for their learning, echoing earlier concerns by Jingjing Hu et al. (2016) and Putro et al. (2022). This mutual underestimation, teachers doubting students' capacities, and students expecting greater teacher intervention, perpetuates a culture of dependency. Ganza et al. (2008) framed this interdependence as both a product of influence and a restraint from influence, highlighting the delicate balance required to establish a dynamic autonomy-supportive climate. Importantly, the findings suggest that teacher attitudes toward learner autonomy are not uniformly shaped by experience or training alone but are also moulded by contextual interactions and perceptions of institutional equity. Brandišauskienė et al. (2023) observed that teacher autonomy-supportive behaviour is most effective when aligned with perceived fairness and student engagement, an insight corroborated here by the observed variability in autonomy-related practices among otherwise similarly qualified educators.

To bridge the gap between theoretical ideals and operational reality, several pathways emerge. First, teacher education must foreground autonomy not as an abstract ideal, but as a set of teachable, observable behaviours embedded in curricular design, classroom interaction, and reflective practice (Borg et al. 2012; Yu et al. 2020). Second, institutional policies must prioritise workload reduction, meaningful recognition, and autonomy-supportive leadership structures to enable teachers to act as facilitators rather than mere transmitters of knowledge. Third, task design

and dialogic interaction must be reframed to centre learner agency, a recommendation echoed by Cotterall et al. (1995) and further supported by the increased efficacy of project-based and differentiated learning models (Yuliani et al. 2017; Nehe et al. 2025). Ultimately, the capacity to foster learner autonomy is not innate; it must be taught, scaffolded, and institutionally sustained (Masouleh et al. 2012; Almusharraf et al. 2020). This study extends the literature by providing empirical insight into how teacher motivation, institutional environment, and pedagogical role-perception collectively shape the autonomy landscape in English language teaching. In doing so, it affirms the assertion by Lamb et al. (2008) that learner and teacher autonomy must co-evolve within a collaborative, responsive educational ecology.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that English faculty in higher education exhibit strong commitment to autonomy-supportive teaching practices, integrating strategies such as student goal setting, constructive feedback, and responsibility-sharing. High levels of job satisfaction and access to professional development reflect a motivated teaching community. However, persistent structural constraints, including job insecurity, inflexible scheduling, administrative overload, and remuneration concerns, significantly limit teachers' ability to sustain autonomy-enhancing pedagogies. These findings underscore that learner autonomy cannot be meaningfully cultivated without parallel investment in teacher autonomy. Institutional reforms that reduce systemic burdens, strengthen professional recognition, and safeguard teacher agency are therefore critical for advancing student-centred learning. By addressing these constraints, higher education systems can create the conditions necessary for both teachers and learners to thrive as autonomous, intrinsically motivated participants in the educational process.

REFERENCES

- Almusharraf, N. (2020). Teachers' perspectives on promoting learner autonomy for vocabulary development: A case study. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1823154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1823154>
- Azhariah, S., & Handayani, R. (2023). Teacher roles in fostering learner autonomy. *SALÉE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 4(2), 356–368. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v4i2.829>
- Bajrami, L., & Ismaili, M. (2015). Teacher's new role in language learning and in promoting learner autonomy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 423–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.528>
- Basri, F., Sukyadi, D., & Padmadewi, N. (2020). Factors influencing learner autonomy and autonomy support in a faculty of education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(2), 270–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1798921>
- Brandišauskienė, A., & Raišienė, A. G. (2023). The relationship between teacher's autonomy-supportive behavior and learning strategies applied by students: The role of teacher support and equity. *SAGE Open*, 13(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181384>
- Borg, S., & Al-Busaidi, S. (2012). Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 283–292. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr065>
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.3.219>
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System*, 23(2), 195–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00008-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00008-8)
- Elmahjoub, A. (2019). Learner autonomy. In M. A. Danaher (Ed.), *Self-directed learning strategies in adult educational contexts* (pp. 50–66). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8018-8.ch004>
- Ganza, W. (2008). Learner autonomy – teacher autonomy. In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses* (pp. 63–79). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Guan, C., & He, Q. (2014). The investigation and analysis of teachers' involvement in students' autonomous learning. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4(3), 512–516. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.44044>
- Hospel, V., & Galand, B. (2016). Are both classroom autonomy support and structure equally important for students' engagement? A multilevel analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 41, 1–10.
- Hu, J., & Zhang, D. (2016). University student and teacher perceptions of teacher roles in promoting autonomous language learning with technology outside the classroom. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(4), 703–723. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2015.1016441>
- Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It is not autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 588–600.
- Khotimah, K., & Sari, Y. A. (2019). Autonomous English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 371–381. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20234>
- Lamkhanter, F. (2024). Teachers' attitudes towards learners' autonomy. *International Journal of Higher Education Pedagogies*, 5(3), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.33422/ijhep.v5i3.502>
- Lamb, T., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and*

- responses. John Benjamins Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/AALS.1>
- Little, D., Dam, L., & Legenhausen, L. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175–181.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00006-6)
- Ljubin-Golub, T., Rijavec, M., & Olčar, D. (2020). Student flow and burnout: The role of teacher autonomy support and student autonomous motivation. *Psychological Studies*, 65(2), 145–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-019-00539-6>
- Masouleh, N. S., & Jooneghani, R. B. (2012). Autonomous learning: A teacher-less learning! *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 835–842.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.570>
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133–144.
- Nagai, N. (2020). Teacher autonomy. In M. A. Danaher (Ed.), *Teacher professional development for the integration of content and language in higher education* (pp. 101–117). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5894-8_6
- Nehe, B. M., & Sitinjak, M. D. (2025). An analysis of differentiated learning in developing English reading skills. *Dialectical Literature and Educational Journal*, 9(2), 52–63.
<https://doi.org/10.51714/dlejpancasakti.v9i2.118>
- Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Robinson, J. C. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 270–300.
- Putro, N. H. P. S., & Susanto, H. (2022). Structural relationships among student teachers' roles-strategies in promoting autonomous language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 400–410.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.45069>
- Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist*, 44(3), 159–175.
- Riskandi, R., Rukmini, R., & Taufik, M. (2020). Analysis of the needs of English learning models in basic schools. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 23(1), 202–206.
<https://doi.org/10.52155/ijpsat.v23.1.2192>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2020). A meta-analysis of autonomous and controlled forms of teacher motivation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 121, 103459.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103459>
- Swatevacharkul, R., & Khamkhien, A. (2020). Learner autonomy: Attitudes of graduate students in English Language Teaching Program in Thailand. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 176–193.
- Tran, D., & Duong, M. T. (2020). Teacher's and learner's roles in autonomy-oriented foreign language teaching: A theoretical investigation. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 4(1), 31–36.
<https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2020.17>
- Tuấn, V. V., & Hà, T. L. (2020). English language teachers' beliefs and practices to promote learner autonomy. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 4(1).
- Yuliani, Y., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2017). Project-based learning in promoting learner autonomy in an EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 285–293. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8131>