P-ISSN: 2580-5525 | E-ISSN: 2580-5533
https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jk/

Promoting freedom of learning implementation through self-determined learning: Perspectives from students

Kartika Isna Sujati[1*], Amir Syamsudin[1], Delyanti Azzumarito Pulungan[2], Ernita Apriani[1], and Nimas Putri Dewi Puspitaningrum[1]
[1]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia
[*]Email: kartikaisnas@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aimed to describe students' perspectives towards self-determined learning to promote the implementation of freedom of learning. The survey research design with cluster sampling technique were used to collect 380 senior high school students' responses. The questionnaires utilized in the survey had been validated using Pearson Product Moment and, thus, was considered reliable according to the Alpha-Cronbach score. Descriptive statistics was employed as the data analytical technique to describe the senior high school students' perspectives towards self-determined learning in promoting the implementation of freedom of learning. The research results showed that the fundamental points of freedom of learning have similar notions to the principles of self-determined learning comprising heutagogy and autonomous learning skills. Hence, the present research concluded that the students' perspectives toward self-determined learning might promote the implementation of freedom of learning. Further research is needed to expand the cluster sampling and to integrate the case during and after the Covid-19 pandemic that is indirectly fostering students' heutagogy and autonomous skills by emphasizing self-determined learning.

Keywords: *freedom of learning, self-determined learning, senior high school students, students' perspective*

How to cite (APA 7th Style): Sujati, K. I., Syamsudin, A., Pulungan, D. A., Apriani, E., & Puspitaningrum, N. P. D. (2022). Promoting freedom of learning implementation through self-determined learning: Perspectives from students *Jurnal Kependidikan*, *7*(1), 41-57. https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v7i1.37374..

INTRODUCTION

The global changes bring challenges all around the world in every aspects. The rapid-dynamics world changes brought the high demands of the complex needs and unpredictable changes. Education is one aspect affected by the world's disruptive changes (Herţanu, 2020; Lemke & Sabelli, 2008; Serdyukov, 2017; Sumintono, 2017). The educational system, then, should quickly adapt to the disruptive era (Lubis, 2019; Hendrawansyah & Zamroni, 2020; Purfitasari, Prihatin, Masrukhi, & Mulyono, 2020). An open and integrative education system is needed nowadays to face disruptive learning (Bass, 2012; Brown & Adler, 2008; Siddhpura, Indumathi, & Siddhapura, 2020). Each country should be prepared to face the challenges through an adaptive learning system.

The fundamental thing that should be emerged in education is the learning process. The fast world changes embrace education to have open education standards (Yuan & Powell, 2013, p. 16) with multipurpose, multidirectional, and multi-resource (Keats & Schmidt, 2007, p. 8). The Indonesian government, through the Education and Culture Ministry,

responded to the situation by issuing the freedom of learning policy (Minister of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia, 2019; 2018) that have four primary components: the learning technology acceleration, diversity as the essential learning context, the values of Pancasila as the students' profile, and emergency learning. The freedom to learn policy is implemented in primary, secondary, and higher education as well as the community. The freedom to learn policy is still developing, supported by some programs such as the teacher activators, school activators, and students' assessment reformation.

The influential concept of freedom to learn was established and developed from the initial learning approach known as the person-centered approach (Rogers, 1969, pp. 157-164). This approach emphasized the learning process as the natural being, and the students have the autonomy to take place in the freedom to learn implementation and decide the competence that would be mastered (Joseph, Murphy, & Holford, 2020, p. 5). Freedom of learning allows a learner to organize the learning autonomy to establish personal learning agenda, shape the learning process, and develop the capacity (Little, 1996, pp. 203-218). Moreover, the learning autonomy gives students to determine the learning process itself (Çakici, 2015; Chan, 2001b; Furtak & Kunter, 2012; Yuan & Powell, 2013). Hence, students should understand the concept of learning autonomy to decide what the competencies to be achieved and which learning model to be used.

Learners' autonomy is essential for freedom of learning implementation (Chan, 2001a; Furtak & Kunter, 2012; Hedge & MacKenzie, 2016; Little, 2007). Some principles that should be considered by teachers or education stakeholders about the implementation of freedom to learn are the flexibility to choose the courses, adaptability/modifiability of the learning strategies, the shareability of the learning activities, and learning problems to others (Esch, 1996, pp. 37-47). In addition, freedom of learning emphasized the learning process in which the students led it (Cowan, 2011, pp. 135-136). The student-led life-wide learning has some characteristics: emerging the learning outcomes, choosing the various learning activities and places, developing the students' competencies, emerging students' learning competencies as learning facilitators, and reflecting learning sessions. Developing learning autonomy in the educational context needs to consider some principles: the importance of choice, the clear learner guidelines, the authentic language in the classroom, the learning evaluation, as well as prioritization of learning than teaching, (Dam, 2011, pp. 41-45). Students' perspective were the main matters about the freedom of learning and the factor affected its implementation. However, the condition showed that the students' learning process, unliked the freedom learning, they have not used their autonomy to determine their learning process. Accordingly, the students' perspective about freedom of learning needed to be discovered.

The educational context recognized the fundamental terms of the learning process. Those are pedagogy, andragogy, and heutagogy, even emerge the new term; academagogy (Jones, Penaluna, & Penaluna, 2019, p. 1171). Based on some research results, heutagogy is considered further conceptualized to be applied in the learning experiences (Hase & Kenyon, 2007, p. 113). Heutagogy focuses on what and how the students want to learn (Kenyon & Hase, 2013, p. 7). So, it is very similar to the autonomy learning concept in the freedom of learning implementation.

Moreover, heutagogy is a self-determined learning form of andragogy (Blaschke Blaschke, 2016, p. 56). Besides double-loop learning, non-linear learning, self-reflection, and metacognition, self-determined learning has two broad categories (Agonács & Matos,

2019, pp. 8-9). Those are the learner-centred and learner-determined learning and learner capability. Self-determined learning considers the learner autonomous to decide what to learn, how to learn, and how to assess learning. The learner also acquires competence to be developed in the self-determined learning process. Autonomy and competence are skills that should be known by students when practicing self-determined learning. The problem was that the students' level capability was not yet known to determine their learning process although it was known that freedom of learning will not be carried out effectively without the students' self-determination.

Covid-19 pandemic indirectly established students' learning autonomy (Baber, 2020, p. 287; Settersten *et al*., 2020, p. 10). During the coronavirus disease pandemic, the online learning process made the students implement self-determined learning and promoted the freedom of learning implementation. This study describes senior high school students' perspective towards self-determined learning. Self-determined learning is closely related to the freedom of learning concept, which enacts independence or autonomy as a crucial point. The students' perspective matters because their perspective is important to help teachers, school, and government stakeholders to understands students' condition, consider students' point of views, and create meaningful experience with freedom of learning implementation as the learning program and education policy.

METHODS

Conducted in 2020, a survey was used in this study to describe students' perspective towards self-determined learning to promote freedom of learning implementation. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the samples. The researchers managed to get 380 samples who possessed similar characteristics. All the samples were senior high school students on similar age range (15-18 years), developmental stage (adolescence), and living in Indonesia. All of participants were impacted by the freedom of learning policy and implementation.

A questionnaire used to collect the data. The questionnaire consisted of two variables. Those were variables of freedom of learning implementation and self-determined learning variables adapted from Goldman, Goodboy, and Weber (2017, pp. 9-10). Three items constructed the freedom of learning variables used to determine students' understanding towards freedom of learning concept and implementation. Meanwhile, self-determined learning variables constructed with two aspects: learning autonomy skill and students' competence in the learning process. Forty three items were used to identify the students' skill in expressing their autonomous skills on the learning process and in encountering the opportunities that allowed them to present their capabilities in the freedom of learning implementation. Total of the questionnaire items were 46. The questionnaire used Likert scale with 4 responses label from 1-strongly disagree to 4-strongly agree.

Initial test was conducted to measure the questionnaire validity using Bivariate Pearson formula, and the results showed some reduction on the questionnaire's items which was considered not valid enough. There were 1 valid items of freedom of learning implementation and 29 valid items of self-determined learning variables. The questionnaire redacted from 46 to 30 valid items. The valid items were employed to collect the data through the e-survey method.

Data analysis used the descriptive statistics method that was performed using IBM-SPSS software version 21. The data responses comprising the freedom of learning implementation

and self-determined learning perspectives were analyzed generally on each variable. The data were also analyzed based on students' gender, school types, grades, and majors.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The demographics of the respondents were shown in Table 1. The demographics showed that more than 70% female students carried out the survey. The samples majority were students at the public schools. Since the samples majority came from public school, vocational majors such as multimedia and accounting were considered minority in this research. The samples deployments were almost prevalent in all senior high school grades, but the third grades had highest participation on this research. The demographics showed the academic condition's differentiation, even though the sample targeted on senior high school students. The gaps on samples regarding the school types and majors made the data centralized on the majority condition. Therefore, the perspectives of the self-determined learning towards freedom of learning implementation came from the public school and science majors' students as the data majorities.

Table 1
Demographics of the respondents (n=380)

Aspects	Indicators	Quantity
Gender	Male	99
	Female	281
School type	Public	320
	Private	50
	Vocational	10
Grades	1	116
	2	128
	3	136
Majors	Science	293
	Social	62
	Religion	13
	Multimedia	4
	Accounting	2
	Others	6

The overarching research themes were freedom learning implementation and self-determined learning which consisted of autonomous learning and competence-determined skill aspects. The measured variables were consisting of the freedom learning, learning autonomy, and students' competence.

One item of the freedom of learning was used to describe the students' skill to implement the freedom to learn concept in their daily study activities. The mean score item was higher than the standard deviation score (3,23>0,715), presented on Table 2. The students' learning autonomy skill of the self-determined learning was described by seven items in which the mean scores of each item were higher than the standard deviation scores. Three items of

Table 2
Descriptive statistics of the survey result

Variables	N	Min.	Max.	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Var
Freedom Learning	380	1	4	1228	3.23	.715	.511
Autonomy 1	380	1	4	1361	3.58	.675	.455
Autonomy 2	380	1	4	1323	3.48	.698	.488
Autonomy 3	380	1	4	1185	3.12	.880	.775
Autonomy 4	380	1	4	1321	3.48	.698	.488
Autonomy 5	380	1	4	1203	3.17	.810	.656
Autonomy 6	380	1	4	1209	3.18	.810	.656
Autonomy 7	380	1	4	1316	3.46	.698	.487
Competence 1	380	1	4	1130	2.97	.719	.516
Competence 2	380	1	4	1157	3.04	.734	.539
Competence 3	380	1	4	1162	3.06	.731	.535
Valid N (listwise)	380						

competence were used to describe the students' competence of the self-determined learning in which the mean score of each item were also higher than the standard deviation scores. The results showed that all the variables' scores are higher than the standard deviation scores suggesting that most of the students have homogeneous perspectives toward each variables.

The students' perspective towards freedom of learning implementation showed homogeneity determined by the mean score that was higher than the standard deviation score (3.23 > 0.715) (Barde & Barde, 2012; Vetter, 2017)one should be aware of using adequate statistical measures. In biomedical journals, Standard Error of Mean (SEM as shown in Table 2. It means the students' perspectives towards freedom of learning implementation were homogeneous. The results were considered valid and accurate to describe the students' perspective. That is to say, students understood how to implement freedom of learning although some of them had not yet. There are 141 of 380 students who implemented the freedom to learn. It means 37,10% students have known and understood the concept of freedom to learn and able to implement it. Inversely, 10 of 380 students have not implemented the freedom of learning. It means 2,63% of students might know and understand the freedom to learn concept, but they have not implemented yet, or they do not know and/or understand the freedom of learning concept so that they could not implement it.

Students' perpetration towards the freedom of learning implementation are important to measure the accuracy and applicability of this educational policy. If the policy is accurate and applicable to solve the educational issue, it is considered as the successful indicators of policy implementation (Simanjuntak, Suseno, Setiadi, Lustyantie, & Barus, 2022). Therefore, the stakeholders need to make strategies to solve the issue regarding some students who have not realized or understood yet towards the freedom of learning implementation. Moreover, the freedom of learning implementation is still in the development process hence, ensuring the students' understanding towards freedom of learning as the education policy is considered as fundamental and first step that should take.

Table 3
Freedom learning based on gender

Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Flmale	99	3.20	.700	.489
Flfemale	281	3.24	.721	.520

The students' perspectives towards the impementation of freedom to learn based on gender were considered homogeneous since the mean scores of both male and female students were higher than the standard deviation scores as shown in the Table 3. It means, between male and female students, they almost have the same perspective towards the implementation of freedom to learn. Even though both male and female students have the same perspective towards the freedom to learn implementation, yet some of them might not understand yet.

The female students have a more variative perspective toward freedom of learning implementation based on the standard deviation score. The female students' standard deviation score was 0,520, it was higher than the male students' standard deviation score (0,489). If the standard deviation score was getting closer to 1 or even more than 1, it means the students' perspectives were more variative and, otherwise, if the standard deviation score was getting closer to 0, it means the students' perspectives were less variative (Clarke, Ruffin, Hill, & Beamen, 1992, pp. 649-651). Clarke *et al*. (1992, pp. 653-654) exposed that the demographic and consistency were the factors affected the variability. The male students' perspective was less variative because the demographics inconsistency responses. Based on the Table 1, the male students who were only 26% of the samples have a huge gap with the female student's percentage. It could be the causes of the male students less variative responses. Inconsistency responses to the subject, that is freedom of learning implementation, occurred within the male students' responses which affected the results.

The public, private, and vocational students' perspectives towards freedom of learning were considered homogenous. It was shown by the mean scores that were higher than the standard deviation scores. It means the students, whether in the public, private, and vocational schools, possessed almost similar perspective towards freedom of learning implementation. The students of public, private, and vocational schools have already known and understood the concept of freedom to learn so that they could implement the freedom to learn, yet some of them might could not implement it yet. Based on the standard deviation scores, the vocational students' perspectives (0,789) towards freedom of learning is more variative than those of public schools (0,698) and private schools (0,735), see in Table 4.

Table 4
Freedom learning based on the school types

School Type	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
FLPublic	320	3.29	.698	.488
FLPrivate	50	2.90	.735	.541
FLVocational	10	3.20	.789	.622

Table 5
Freedom learning based on students' grades

Grades	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
FL1st Grade	116	3.26	.687	.472
FL2nd Grade	128	3.21	.660	.435
FL3rd Grade	136	3.23	.788	.622

Homogenous condition was also shown from the students' perspective based on grades (Table 5). Whether the first, second, or third year of high schools, the students possessed almost the same perspective towards freedom of learning determined by the mean scores that were higher than the standard deviation scores. Those students' perspectives were then considered homogenous. Based on the standard deviation scores, the third year of high school students had more variative perspectives than those of the first- and second-year students. Yet, it was stated that the variability will less variative on higher level education (Clarke *et al*., 1992, p. 653), due to the grades differentiation causing the responses less variative. That is to say that Clarke's result was not in line with this research result. It can be, perhaps, there are other factors affected the variability perspectives on the third grades. If the freedom of learning implementation nurtured by the learning experiences, it can be said that the third grades students are more nurtured with freedom of learning experiences; thus, they have more diverse perspective towards freedom of learning implementation.

Table 6
Freedom learning based on students' majors

Student Major	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
FLScience	293	3.22	.713	.509
FLSocial	62	3.31	.737	.544
FLReligion	13	3.15	.689	.474
FLMultimedia	4	3.25	.957	.917
FLAccounting	2	3.50	.707	.500
FLOthers	6	3.00	.632	.400

The students' perspective towards freedom of learning implementation based on the majors showed a homogeneous result determined by the mean scores that were higher than standard deviation scores, see on Table 6. It means the students of all majors almost have the same perspective towards implementation of freedom to learn. Yet, the multimedia major students have more variative perspectives compared to other majors based on the standard deviation score. This result was in line with the students' perspective towards freedom of learning implementation (Table 4) obtained from the vocational students. Multimedia major students can also be included as the vocational high school students. Vocational schools have different characteristics from public and private schools. The objectives of the school are to boost the individual so that they can perform well in the world of work aspect, fill in

the needs of the vocational fields, as well as focus on the three curriculum aspects involving uniqueness success benchmark, development of work world sensitivity, facilities and infrastructure adequation, and the community support (Maryanti, Rohana, & Kristiawan, 2020, p. 57). Students with multimedia majors are usually confronted with the possibilities on their learning process using the multimedia which demonstrate complicated process (Savov, Antonova, & Spassov, 2019, p. 266). That condition made the students interfacing the process of identifying, gathering, organizing, constructing, managing, monitoring, and evaluating the multimedia learning process. The students can usually make their own learning paces through those complicated process.

The results of statistical descriptive showed that the students' perspectives towards freedom to learn implementation were homogenous. Those results were similar to the results of students' perspectives based on the students' gender, school types, grades, and majors. Nevertheless, the female students at senior high schools, vocational high schools students, the third year of senior high schools students, and the multimedia major students have more variative perspectives than others.

The autonomous learning skills have seven indicators: the freedom to learn in students' way, complete assignments in students' way, school allows learning in students' way, the freedom to complete the assignment on students' way, arrange to complete the assignment on students' way, opportunity to determine what is learned, and the freedom to determine success target. Students have variative perspectives on the freedom to complete the assignment on their own paces shown by the standard deviation score that was higher than the other items on the same variable; self-determined learning.

Table 7
Autonomous learning skill based on gender

Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Autonomy Male	99	22.95	3.955	15.640
Autonomy Female	281	23.65	3.370	11.357

Based on gender, students' perspectives towards autonomous learning skills within the concept of self-determined learning have homogenous responses, which means both male and female students almost have the same perspectives about autonomous learning skills. Students' perspectives towards autonomous learning based on gender showed that the male students have more variative perspectives than the female students determined by the standard deviation score (Table 7). It means the male students have more readiness skills to implement the autonomy to learn (Ramli, Muljono, & Afendi, 2018, p. 161). This prior research result was not in line with the students' perspective towards freedom of learning implementation based on gender. Therefore, the number of samples did not affect the perspective, yet there should be other factors such as their demographics background and learning experiences.

Based on the grades, students' perspectives have a homogeneity condition, which means the first year, the second year, and third-year students almost have the same perspective about autonomous learning skills, but some may not have yet (Table 8). Students' perspective towards autonomous learning skills based on grades showed that third-year senior high school

Table 8
Autonomous learning skill based on the grades

Grades	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Autonomous 1st grade	116	23.19	3.344	11.181
Autonomous 2nd grade	128	23.51	3.563	12.693
Autonomous 3rd grade	136	23.67	3.688	13.601

students have more variative perspective determined by the standard deviation score. The senior high school students that is categorized as adolescene have some characteritics. They possess with preferences, choices, and possibilities to become efficacious, autonomous, and masterful as individuals (Shek, Dou, Zhu, & Chai, 2019, p. 132). The third grade students nurtured with their learning experince that enhance their nature autonomous learning skills. This result is inverse with the Clarke's research that mentioned higher level education made the level responses more less variative (Clarke *et al*., 1992).

Table 9
Autonomous learning skill based on the school types

School Types	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Autonomous Public	320	23.62	3.520	12.393
Autonomous Private	50	23.04	3.344	11.182
Autonomous Vocational	10	21.40	4.789	22.933

Based on the types of school, whether in the public, private, or vocational schools, senior high school students have homogeneity towards autonomous learning skills determined by the standard deviation score. It means the students of private, public, and vocational schools almost have similar perspectives towards the concept of autonomous learning (Table 9). They have implemented the autonomous learning skills in the freedom to learn context, but some of them might not implement it yet. Vocational school students have the most variative perspectives toward autonomous learning skill than others. This result is in line with the previous explanation that the vocational schools students have unique characteristics to boost their students in having complex skills within their learning process (Maryanti *et al*., 2020; Savov *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the vocational school students have more opportunities to use their autonomous learning skills on the freedom of learning implementation in their daily learning process.

Autonomous learning skills showed homogeneity condition based on the students' majors (Table 10). It means the students of science, social, religion, multimedia, accounting, or other majors have same perspective towards autonomous learning skills. Students have known and understood that, in the self-determined learning, they should have the autonomous learning skills to promote the freedom to learn implementation on their daily study activities, but maybe some of them did not know and understand yet. Students who majored in multimedia have the most variative perspective towards autonomous learning skills than other majors. It was determined by the standard deviation score.

Table 10
Autonomous learning skill based on majors

Majors	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Autonomous Science	293	23.51	3.594	12.915
Autonomous Social	62	23.63	3.122	9.745
Autonomous Religion	13	23.23	3.059	9.359
Autonomous Multimedia	4	19.25	6.702	44.917
Autonomous Accounting	2	25.00	2.828	8.000
Autonomous Others	6	22.50	2.950	8.700

The pandemic outbreak condition fostered the multimedia and other digital platform using to enhance the learning process (Famularsih, 2020)teaching has changed drastically, with the distinctive rise of online learning, whereby teaching is embraced remotely and on computerized stages. Research recommends that online learning has been appeared to expand maintenance of data, and take less time, which means the progressions of coronavirus have caused may be digging in for the long haul. In this case, online learning application stages are broadly utilized by English educators in instructing and learning. The online learning stages are likewise utilized as a strengthening apparatus to advance autonomous learning. This study focuses on the utilization of online learning application in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The use of the digital platform has big potential to enhance the autonomous learning skills (Khotimah, Widiati, Mustofa, & Ubaidillah, 2019). Vocational school students of multimedia majors often used the digital platform on their daily learning process, therefore their perspective towards autonomous learning skill are more variative than the other majors.

The competence-determined skill was the second aspect of self-determined learning. This aspect consisted of three indicators: competence in the learning process, competence to complete assignments, and responsibility competence. The researchers describe the students' perspective of the competence-determined skills as the part of the self-determined learning to promote the freedom to learn implementation and also to consider the important roles of competence-determined skills in the self-determined learning.

Students' perspective towards competence-determined skill showed homogenous responses determined by the mean scores that were higher than standard deviation scores (Barde & Barde, 2012; Vetter, 2017), see Table 2. It means the students almost have similar perspectives about how important the competence-determined skills are towards self-determined learning. The second indicator has the most variative score, which means most students indicate that they have the competence to complete the assignments, but some have not yet.

There was a difference between male and female students' perspective (Table 11). Male students have more variative perspective towards competence-determined skills than female students, but both of male and female student have the homogeneous responses. It means both male and female students have the same perspectives to determine their competencies in the learning process, but some have not yet. This result is in line with the autonomous learning skill perspective result in which the male students have more variability on their perspectives. The enjoyment and competence are the two things affected the male student's

Table 11
Competence-determined skill based on gender

Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Competence Male	99	8.71	1.955	3.821
Competence Female	281	9.21	1.844	3.400

determination on the learning process. An explanation for this, might be that the importance of competence becomes more apparent as male students' age and their attitudes toward physical activity change when they are getting older.

Table 12
Competence-determined skill based on school types

School Types	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Competence Public School	320	9.17	1.919	3.681
Competence Private School	50	8.48	1.542	2.377
Competence Vocational School	10	9.50	1.780	3.167

The homogenous condition was also shown by the students' perspective towards competence-determined skills based on the school types (Table 12). Whether in public, private, or vocational schools, students have the same perspectives towards competence-determined skills. It means the perspectives of students in the public, private, and vocational schools were homogenous. That is to say, almost of them could determine their competences in implementing the self-determined learning, but some of them might not yet. The most variative perspectives came from public-school students compared to the students in the private and vocational schools.

Table 13
Competence-determined skill based on grades

Grades	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Competence 1st Grade	116	9.74	1.952	3.811
Competence 2nd Grade	128	9.84	1.905	3.629
Competence 3rd Grade	136	9.84	2.088	4.359

The third year of high school students have the most variative perspective towards competence-determined skills compared to students in the first and second year (Table 13). Overall, the senior high students have a homogenous perspective towards their ability to determine the learning process's competence. That result was determined by the mean scores that was higher than the standard deviation scores.

The students' perspectives toward competence-determined skill were considered homogeneous (Table 14). It means the student of science, social, religion, multimedia,

Table 14
Competence-determined skill based on majors

Majors	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Competence Science	293	9.06	1.932	3.732
Competence Social	62	9.16	1.720	2.957
Competence Religion	13	8.77	1.787	3.192
Competence Multimedia	4	9.75	2.217	4.917
Competence Accounting	2	10.50	.707	.500
Competence Others	6	8.50	1.517	2.300

accounting, and other majors have same perspectives to determine their competence in the self-determined learning, but some of them have not yet. It was shown on the mean scores that were higher than standard deviation scores. Students who majored in multimedia have the most variative perspectives to determine competence in the learning process, but all major students have homogenous perspectives. This result is in line with the two previous result showing that the multimedia students have most variability within their perspectives.

The freedom of learning policy issued in Indonesia last year has begun to carry out with the student-centered approach as curriculum implementation. This approach has a similar concept of freedom of learning: the initial approach, known as the person-centered approach, developed by (Rogers, 1969, p. 5). It shows that the applicable Indonesian curriculum has the core of freedom of learning.

The learning process applied in Indonesia nowadays emerged from student-led life-wide learning by prioritizing its learning process. Teachers as learning facilitators emerged, the students behaved competently by exploring their learning experiences (Motschnig-pitrik & Holzinger, 2002, p. 161). The student-centered approach emphasized the freedom to learn, which enhanced students to determine the learning process on their own (Rusli, Rahman, & Abdullah, 2020, p. 5). Those learning processes engaged the heutagogy approach, which emphasized students learning autonomy (Samin, 2019, pp. 24-26), which is conceptually called self-determined learning (Adams, 2014, p. 478; Ashton & Newman, 2006, p. 825; Kenyon & Hase, 2001, p. 2). Students' perspectives towards self-determined learning showed great results which could directly promote the freedom to learn implementation.

The students' perspectives were quite significant because the mean score was higher than the standard deviation score (Barde & Barde, 2012; Vetter, 2017). All indicators of the variables have the mean score that were higher than the standard deviation score, which determined students' perspective towards the freedom of learning implementation and self-determined learning was quite good. Based on the results, the students have good perspectives of the autonomous learning skills consisting of the independent skill to decide what to learn, how to learn, and how to assess learning. Students also have good perspectives on the competencies to present their abilities in implementing the freedom learn.

CONCLUSION

The freedom of learning fundamental points have similar notion as self-determined learning principles. The literature review and the results of this research conclude that the students' perspective toward self-determined learning could promote freedom ofe learning implementation. This research implicates the fundamental thing that should be considerd in implementing the freedom of learning policy. Those are the readiness of the schools, teachers, and students whose are the main groups affected by the policy. The readiness can occur by their perspectives, especially students' perspectives as the subject of the freedom of learning implementation policy. When the freedom of learning implementation is carried out, the strategies to enhance the input quality on the learning process are needed especially the students' ability to determine their learning process.

This study has some limitation regarding the respondents' distribution that concentrated only on Java and Sumatra Islands of Republic Indonesia, even though Indonesia has more islands or provinces spread over some large islands. Therefore, the basic recommendation for further study is to expand the cluster sampling. Additionally, future study needs to emerge the survey in the case during and after Covid-19 pandemic that is indirectly fostering the heutagogy by emphasizing the self-determined learning.

REFERENCES

Adams, P. (2014). Self-determined learning: heutagogy in action. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *62*(4), 476-478. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2014.970798.

Agonács, N., & Matos, J. F. (2019). Heutagogy and self-determined learning: A review of the published literature on the application and implementation of the theory. *Open Learning*, *34*(3), 223-240. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2018.1562329.

Ashton, J., & Newman, L. (2006). An unfinished symphony: 21st century teacher education using knowledge creating heutagogies. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *37*(6), 825-840. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00662.x.

Baber, H. (2020). Determinants of students' perceived learning outcome and satisfaction in online learning during the pandemic of Covid19. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, *7*(3), 285-292. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.73.285.292.

Barde, P., & Barde, M. (2012). What to use to express the variability of data: Standard deviation or standard error of mean? *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, *3*(3), 113. https://doi.org/10.4103/2229-3485.100662.

Bass, R. (2012). Disrupting ourselves: the problem of learning in higher education the post-course era. *EDUCAUSE Review*, *47*(2).

Betts, G. (2003). The autonomous learning model for high school programming. *Gifted Education Communicator, California Association for the Gifted*, *Fall/Winter*, 38-41, 60–61.

Blaschke, L. M. (2016). Heutagogy and lifelong learning: A review of heutagogical practice and self-determined learning abstract. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *89*(244), 56-71. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12135

Brown, J. S., & Adler, R. P. (2008). Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. *Educause Review*, *43*(1), 16-20.

Çakici, D. (2015). Autonomy in language teaching and learning process. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.17679/iuefd.16168538

Chan, V. (2001a). Learning autonomously: The learners' perspectives. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *25*(3), 285-300. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770120077649.

Chan, V. (2001b). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*(4), 505-518. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510120078045.

Clarke, V. A., Ruffin, C. L., Hill, D. J., & Beamen, A. L. (1992). Ratings of orally presented verbal expressions of probability by a heterogeneous sample. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *22*(8), 638-656. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00995.x

Cowan, J. (2011). Freedom to learn: a radically revised pedagogy to facilitate lifewide learning in the academic curriculum. In N. J. Jackson (Ed.), *Learning for a Complex World: A Lifewide Concept of Learning, Education and Personal Development* (pp. 122-136). AuthorHouse.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.

Dam, L. (2011). Developing learner autonomy with school kids: principles, practices, results. in d. gardner (ed.), *Fostering Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 40-51). Zirve University, Gaziantep.

De Bruijn, E., & Leeman, Y. (2011). Authentic and self-directed learning in vocational education: Challenges to vocational educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(4), 694-702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.11.007.

Esch, E. (1996). Promoting Learner autonomy: criteria for the selection of appropriate methods. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or, & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 35-48). Hong Kong University Press.

Lubis, F. (2019). Education in the disruption era. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BIoLAE) Journal*, *1*(2), 183-188. https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v1i2.85.

Furtak, E. M., & Kunter, M. (2012). Effects of autonomy-supportive teaching on student learning and motivation. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *80*(3), 284-316. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2011.573019

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1995). *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology*. Allyn & Bacon.

Goldman, Z. W., Goodboy, A. K., & Weber, K. (2017). College students' psychological needs and intrinsic motivation to learn: An examination of self-determination theory. *Communication Quarterly*, *65*(2), 167-191. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2016.1215338.

Hase, S., & Kenyon, C. (2007). Heutagogy: A child of complexity theory. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, *4*(1), 111-118. https://doi.org/10.29173/cmplct8766.

Hedge, N., & MacKenzie, A. (2016). Scotland's curriculum for excellence: A defence of autonomy and personhood. *Oxford Review of Education*, *42*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1128890

Hendrawansyah, & Zamroni. (2020). Evaluasi kebijakan sistem zonasi dalam penerimaan siswa baru sekolah menengah atas. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, *4*(1), 70-82. https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v4i1.27007.

Herţanu, C.-L. (2020). Future education within disruptive technologies developments. *International Conference Knowledge-based Organization*, *26*(2), 288-293. https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2020-0092.

Jones, C., Penaluna, K., & Penaluna, A. (2019). The promise of andragogy, heutagogy and academagogy to enterprise and entrepreneurship education pedagogy. *Education and Training*, *61*(9), 1170-1186. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-10-2018-0211

Joseph, S., Murphy, D., & Holford, J. (2020). Positive education: A new look at freedom to learn. *Oxford Review of Education*, *00*(00), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2020.1726310

Keats, D. W., & Schmidt, J. P. (2007). The genesis and emergence of education 3.0 in higher education and its potential for Africa. *First Monday*, *12*(3). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v12i3.1625

Kenyon, C., & Hase, S. (2001). Moving from andragogy to heutagogy in vocational education. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association (AVETRA) Conference*, 1-10.

Kenyon, C., & Hase, S. (2013). Heutagogy fundamentals. In S. Hase & C. Kenyon (Eds.), *Self-Determined Learning: Heutagogy in Action* (pp. 7-18). Bloomsburry Academic, Bloomsburry Publishing Plc.

Khotimah, K., Widiati, U., Mustofa, M., & Ubaidillah, M. F. (2019). Autonomous English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20234.

Lemke, J. L., & Sabelli, N. H. (2008). Complex systems and educational change: Towards a new research agenda. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *40*(1), 118-129. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00401.x.

Little, D. (1996). Freedom to learn and compulsion to interact: Promoting learner autonomy through the use of information systems and information technologies. In *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 203-218). Hong Kong University Press.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(1), 14-29. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt040.0

Lo, Y. F. (2010). Implementing reflective portfolios for promoting autonomous learning among EFL college students in Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(1), 77-95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809346509

Maryanti, N., Rohana, & Kristiawan, M. (2020). The principal's strategy in preparing students ready for the industrial revolution 4.0. *International Journal of Educational Review*, *2*(1), 54-69. https://doi.org/10.33369/ijer.v2i1.10628.

Minister of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia. (2019). *Kebijakan merdeka belajar (freedom learning policy)*. December 2019. https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2020/03/mendikbud-terbitkan-se-tentang-pelaksanaan-pendidikan-dalam-masa-darurat-covid19

Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic Indonesia. (2018). *Reformasi Pendidikan Nasional Melalui Merdeka Belajar (National Education Reformation through The Freedom Learning)* (No. 37).

Motschnig-pitrik, R., & Holzinger, A. (2002). Student-centered teaching meets new media: Concept and case study. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, *5*(4), 160-172.

Purfitasari, S., Prihatin, T., Masrukhi, & Mulyono, S. E. (2020). Teacher supervision models for answering educational challenges in the era of disruption. *Advances in Social*

Science, Education and Humanities Research, *443*, 457-460. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200620.089.

Ramli, N., Muljono, P., & Afendi, F. M. (2018). Faktor-faktor yang berpengaruh terhadap self directed learning readiness dan prestasi akademik. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, *2*(1), 153-166. https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v2i1.15307.

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Charles E. Merrill.

Rusli, R., Rahman, A., & Abdullah, H. (2020). Student perception data on online learning using heutagogy approach in the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences of Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia. *Data in Brief*, *29*, 105152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.105152.

Samin, S. M. (2019). Heutagogy in Arabic class: How It is applied in the islamic education study program of Universitas Islam Riau. *Journal of Arabic Linguistics and Education*, *5*(1), 20-29.

Famularsih, S. (2020). Students' experiences in using online learning applications due to COVID-19 in English classroom. *Studies in Learning and Teaching*, *1*(2), 112-121. https://doi.org/10.46627/silet.v1i2.40.

Savov, S. A., Antonova, R., & Spassov, K. (2019). Multimedia applications in education. In A. Al-Masri & K. Curran (Eds.), *Smart Technologies and Innovation for a Sustainable Future* (pp. 263–271). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01659-3_30

Serdyukov, P. (2017). Innovation in education: What works, what doesn't, and what to do about it? *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *10*(1), 4-33. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-10-2016-0007.

Settersten, R. A., Bernardi, L., Härkönen, J., Antonucci, T. C., Dykstra, P. A., Heckhausen, J., Kuh, D., Mayer, K. U., Moen, P., Mortimer, J. T., Mulder, C. H., Smeeding, T. M., van der Lippe, T., Hagestad, G. O., Kohli, M., Levy, R., Schoon, I., & Thomson, E. (2020). Understanding the effects of Covid-19 through a life course lens. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *45*(September 2020), 100360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2020.100360.

Shek, D. T., Dou, D., Zhu, X., & Chai, W. (2019). Positive youth development: Current perspectives. *Adolescent Health, Medicine and T.herapeutics*, *Volume 10*, 131-141. https://doi.org/10.2147/AHMT.S179946

Siddhpura, A., Indumathi, V., & Siddhpura, M. (2020). Current state of research in application of disruptive technologies in engineering education. *Procedia Computer Science*, *172*, 494-501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.163.

Simanjuntak, M. B., Suseno, M., Setiadi, S., Lustyantie, N., & Barus, I. R. G. R. G. (2022). Integration of curricula (Curriculum 2013 and Cambridge curriculum for junior high school level in three subjects) in pandemic situation. *Ideas: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Budaya*, *8*(1), 77. https://doi.org/10.32884/ideas.v8i1.615.

Sumintono, B. (2017). Science education in Malaysia: Challenges in the 21st century. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, *36*(3), 459-471. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v36i3.16761.

Suyanta, Laksono, E. W., Fadhilah, N. F., & Rizky, I. (2019). The effect of problem-based learning on students' self-regulated learning of chemistry learning. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, *3*(2), 187-193. https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v3i2.19695.

Triola, M. F. (2012). *Elementary Statistics* (Eleventh E). Pearson Education Inc.

Vetter, T. R. (2017). Descriptive statistics: Reporting the answers to the 5 basic questions of who, what, why, when, where, and a sixth, so what? *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *125*(5), 1797-1802. https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002471.

Yuan, L., & Powell, S. (2013). MOOCs and open education: Implications for higher education. In *MOOCs and Open Education Around the World*. The University of Bolton. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315751108-1.