

## **Examining EFL Student Response to Student-Centered Classroom Instruction**

**Hanna Juliaty\***

*Universitas Kristen Krida Wacana, Indonesia*

**Ignasia Yuyun**

*Universitas Kristen Krida Wacana, Indonesia*

**Athriyana S. Pattiwael**

*Universitas Kristen Krida Wacana, Indonesia*

**Emanuella C. Natalia Mau**

*Universitas Kristen Krida Wacana, Indonesia*

DOI: 10.22236/JER\_Vol4Issue1pp52-63

Student-centered learning has been the new trend in education field in recent years. Various levels of education have started to gradually shift their teaching approach from the traditional teacher-centered instruction into student-centered instruction. This transition that focuses the learning process on students is considered desirable by society as it offers various benefits for students' personal and academic growth (Clifford, 1999). However, in higher education, where most teaching instructions are naturally conducted in the form of lectures, the application of student-centered approach may appear as unfamiliar to students who are used to teacher-centered instruction. This study, hence, aims to investigate how undergraduate students responded to a shift in their classroom instruction, from teacher-centered into student-centered. An action research was conducted in three meetings of a Reading and Writing course for EFL undergraduate students in the Department of English. The study collected the data from class observations done by three observers. The field notes, observation reports, and discussion notes resulted from the three observation sessions were then analyzed using a qualitative approach to find out the students' responses towards the student-centered classroom instructions. The findings of this study reveal that most of the students responded positively towards the student-centered instruction, as shown in their active involvement during the learning activities, such as in pair works,

---

\* Corresponding author. Email: hanna.juliaty@ukrida.ac.id

ISSN: 2502-292X, e-ISSN 2527-7448.

© 2019, English Education Program, Graduate School

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA Jakarta

DOI: 10.22236/JER\_Vol4Issue1

group discussions, and collaborative work using technology. The implications and recommendations drawn from this study are discussed in the paper.

*Key words:* autonomous learning, EFL, higher education, student-centered learning

*Pembelajaran yang berpusat pada siswa telah menjadi tren baru di bidang pendidikan dalam beberapa tahun terakhir. Berbagai tingkat pendidikan telah mulai secara bertahap mengubah pendekatan pengajaran mereka dari pengajaran tradisional yang berpusat pada guru menjadi pengajaran yang berpusat pada siswa. Transisi ini yang memfokuskan proses pembelajaran pada siswa dianggap diinginkan oleh masyarakat karena menawarkan berbagai manfaat bagi pertumbuhan pribadi dan akademik siswa (Clifford, 1999). Namun, dalam pendidikan tinggi, di mana sebagian besar instruksi pengajaran dilakukan secara alami dalam bentuk kuliah, penerapan pendekatan yang berpusat pada siswa mungkin tampak asing bagi siswa yang terbiasa dengan pengajaran yang berpusat pada guru. Penelitian ini, oleh karena itu, bertujuan untuk menyelidiki bagaimana siswa sarjana menanggapi perubahan dalam instruksi kelas mereka, dari yang berpusat pada guru menjadi yang berpusat pada siswa. Penelitian tindakan dilakukan dalam tiga pertemuan kursus Membaca dan Menulis untuk mahasiswa sarjana EFL di Departemen Bahasa Inggris. Studi ini mengumpulkan data dari observasi kelas yang dilakukan oleh tiga pengamat. Catatan lapangan, laporan observasi, dan catatan diskusi yang dihasilkan dari tiga sesi observasi kemudian dianalisis menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif untuk mengetahui tanggapan siswa terhadap instruksi kelas yang berpusat pada siswa. Temuan penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa sebagian besar siswa merespons positif terhadap pengajaran yang berpusat pada siswa, seperti yang ditunjukkan dalam keterlibatan aktif mereka selama kegiatan pembelajaran, seperti dalam pekerjaan berpasangan, diskusi kelompok, dan kerja kolaboratif menggunakan teknologi. Implikasi dan rekomendasi yang diambil dari penelitian ini dibahas dalam makalah ini.*

## INTRODUCTION

Learner's autonomy is a very essential aspect in learning, especially in higher education, as its values affect the learners not only during their school years, but also for the rest of their lives. When students graduate from a college or university, they compete with each other for the best occupation. Generally, companies nowadays would value independence, boldness, creativity and willingness to take risks more than mere good academic scores when evaluating graduates who are seeking for a job. Unfortunately, not many graduates are able to accomplish such expectation. In fact, many college and university students today are more hesitant and apprehensive than confident and self-motivated (Wright, 2011). Consequently, awareness on learner's autonomy has been raised in various education levels through the student-centered learning.

Despite the fact that learner's autonomy is desirable by society (Clifford, 1999), most of the teaching and learning activities in college and university classrooms worldwide are still tremendously instructor-centered. In this traditional teaching practice, the instructor naturally designs the curriculum, organizes the learning materials, teaches the lessons and conducts the learning evaluation for the students. As a result, the instructor holds an exclusive control over the lessons and tends to produce a surface approach to teaching and learning, where learning is perceived as the instructor displaying information and the students absorbing the information (Biggs, 1999; Hodge, 2010).

As the main goal of higher education is to prepare students with knowledge and skills to function well in society, colleges and universities need much more than surface approach in educating their students. In fact, higher education must be able to foster learner's autonomy

and provide learning opportunities oriented to real-life experience and problems for its students (Margolis & Knowles, 1970). Therefore, many studies suggest that the traditional teaching practice in higher education is adjusted with a teaching approach that can enhance student learning (Sharkey & Weimer, 2003; Wright, 2011).

The concept of autonomous learning was first introduced by Holec (as cited in Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2011); it refers to learner's ability to take charge of his or her own learning. This concept is based on the constructivism, which suggests that learning is not simply receiving, retrieving and storing information in the brain to use later, but learning is a construction of new knowledge from prior knowledge (Henson, as cited in Wang, 2010). Drawing from this theory, student-centered learning promotes a learning approach where students are encouraged and facilitated to actively and independently construct their own knowledge during the learning process.

Student-centered classroom is meaningfully shaped by a number of core principles in which both the instructor and students have equally shared responsibilities for the learning process. These principles state that students are responsible for their own learning, the subject being learnt must be relevant for students, the learning requires student involvement and participation, students need to maintain relationships with their peers, and the instructor functions as a resource person and facilitator (Brandes & Ginnis, 1986). Consequently, the instructor and students have their own significant roles that need to be carried out well in order to have an effective and successful learning process.

Therefore, the way an instructor perceives and treats students in learning process in student-centered classroom and teacher-centered classroom is very different. For instance, the instructor in student-centered classroom must be able to view the students not as "empty vessels" waiting to be filled with knowledge, but as potential individuals that need guidance in their intellectual development (Wright, 2011). Accordingly, the instructor needs to shift the teaching focus from transferring course content to facilitating students as learning individuals; this means that course content and learning materials are used as a means to identify tasks that will assist students in learning instead of to assist the instructor to deliver the lesson. Based on these beliefs, the roles of an instructor in student-centered classroom include a provider (providing learning resources), a manager (organizing learning resources to enhance student learning), a facilitator (facilitating the establishment of conducive learning atmosphere and environment), a coach (guiding and scaffolding students in every step of their learning process and evaluating students' learning results), a motivator and counsellor (encouraging students to utilize proper learning strategies to learn), a consultant (providing advice when students are facing learning difficulties) and a delegator (trusting and empowering students to work independently towards the learning goal) (Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Grow, 1991; Wright, 1991; Shu, 2006).

Furthermore, in a student-centered classroom, the responsibility for learning is placed on the students. Consequently, students need to demonstrate several learning traits to facilitate and enhance the learning experience. These learning traits include internal locus of control (being aware that they have authority and responsibility to determine their learning outcomes), self-efficacy (being confident in their abilities and skills to succeed in learning) and self-regulation (being able to utilize proper learning strategies to achieve the learning goal)

(Macaskill & Taylor, 2010). When students are able to employ these traits effectively, they develop themselves to be self-directed learners.

In order to foster and maximize the learning experience for students in a student-centered classroom, approaches to classroom instructions can include learning resources, educational technologies, student interactions, and relationship between the instructor and students (Dörnyei, Zoltán, Ushioda, 2011). In some cases, these approaches may also be combined with traditional teaching formats, such as concept clarification where students prepare their learning beforehand and then have it checked by the instructor in the class (Chung & Chow, as cited in Wright, 2011). Furthermore, these approaches can be integrated into various active learning strategies, including brainstorming, pair or group discussion, demonstration, role play, problem-solving, presentation, simulation, project and many more. As students are facilitated to actively construct their own knowledge towards the subject matter without relying on the instructor, cooperative and collaborative learning are helpful to achieve learning goals. When students work together in pairs or groups, they share the same learning goals and hence become positively interdependent to each other (Wang, 2010), which can foster their teamwork skills and enrich their knowledge-making process.

Many studies have been conducted to study the implementation of student-centered learning in higher education. They range from describing effective ways that faculty members can use to apply student-centered learning within classroom lectures (Lom, 2012), to examining the effectiveness of student-centered learning models towards student achievement (Wang, 2010), to exploring student attitude and perception on their autonomy in student-centered learning (Abbasi & Hadadi, 2014; Henri, Morrell, & Scott, 2018).

In its implementation, transitioning to student-centered learning in higher education can be challenging (Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2011). Implementing student-centered learning requires instructors to shift the teaching focus from the lesson materials and themselves as the only knowledge provider to the students; for some instructors, this can be threatening as it requires them to share some control with students in the learning environment (Clifford, 1999). On the other hand, many students are only concerned about grades; hence, there may be student resistance to student-centered learning approach as it requires them to establish more commitment into their own learning process (Clifford, 1999; Sharkey & Weimer, 2003; Abbasi & Hadadi, 2014).

The transition from instructor-centered approach to student-centered learning in higher education is a gradual process. Particularly in a learning environment where students are used with instructor-centered practice, students may have different responses towards experiencing the shift in classroom instruction. For this reason, this study was conducted in order to implement a student-centered learning classroom instruction in higher education and examine the student response towards the implementation.

## **METHODS**

This study was conducted in action research design as its aim at examining students' response towards student-centered learning implementation. Action research is a process of self-reflective inquiry conducted by and for individuals doing the action in order to improve the rationality, understanding and process or situation in which a particular practice is carried out (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). It is a continued process where the individuals doing the action do not

only describe, analyze, interpret and theorize a certain situation, but also reflect on it, make actions to improve it and evaluate the changes. Therefore, action research procedure is a cyclical and ongoing process that includes planning the action research, acting on the plan, developing the plan for future cycles, and reflecting on the process (Mertler, 2013). This study applied a collaborative action research that involved a group of practitioners to examine student response towards the implementation of student-centered learning, in order to improve both the understanding and the practice on this teaching approach.

This study took place at a private university in Jakarta, particularly, at an English Department. The study was conducted in August and September 2018. The action research was conducted in Reading and Writing III course for undergraduate students who were studying in their third semester at the Department of English. The class consisted of 17 students, ranging from 18-24 years old. As this class was a multilevel classroom, the students were varied in their English proficiency level. The course was taught by an instructor with nearly four-year experience in teaching Reading and Writing courses at the university.

The Reading and Writing III course is a compulsory course for the third semester students of the Department of English. This course is a continuation of two previous courses, Reading and Writing I and II, which the students had taken in their first and second semesters. The course has four credits and is conducted twice a week for 100 minutes/meeting.

The course is mainly designed to train students in applying various reading strategies and writing skills for academic purposes. The course uses a resource book published by Oxford University Press, which contains reading skills, vocabulary skills, grammar, and writing skills. In each unit of the resource book, the students learn to read different kinds of academic or professional texts, apply reading strategies to enhance understanding of the texts and write a short essay as a response to their reading at the end of each unit.

The action research was conducted in three meetings. Since it was still the beginning of the semester, the lesson materials taught during the action research were taken from the first unit of the resource book. In these three meetings, the lessons were designed for students to learn reading and writing skills only (without vocabulary skills and grammar) due to time restriction. The learning objectives in those three meetings were to apply seven techniques of text annotation in reading (for Meetings 1-2) and to employ correct procedures in writing a procedural essay (for Meeting 3).

Before the action research, the course instructor was used to applying teacher-centered method in delivering the lessons; this means that she prepared important information about the lesson topic and delivered it to students in the classroom through lecture and presentation. After that, the students were assigned to practice applying a particular reading and writing skill that was being taught individually or in small groups for the rest of the class period. Classroom activities were often conducted, but most of them were only for introducing the lesson topic and brainstorming ideas for writing assignments. However, prior to the action research, the instructor joined a teacher training workshop on student-centered learning implementation and technology use to support learning in higher education, in which she was mentored to plan and prepare the chapter design and lesson design for the action research.

The data for the study were collected through classroom observations. Observation is useful for research on classroom teaching practices because it provides direct, precise and rich data on the teaching and learning process, and it also allows the data to be collected in authentic

settings. There were three observers sat in the class during the action research; all of them were teaching practitioners in English language and literature. The first and second meetings were observed by three of them, while the third meeting was observed by two observers.

There were three types of data collected for this action research: field notes, observation reports and discussion notes. The field notes and observation reports were collected during and after the class observation sessions respectively, while the discussion notes were gained from the evaluation meetings conducted after each teaching session to discuss the potential improvements on the classroom teaching practice for the following meeting.

In analyzing the data, the field notes, observation reports and discussion notes were read several times. Afterwards, the student response in each meeting was identified and classified according to the lesson structure in the three meetings: beginning (learning topic introduction), middle (learning activities) and end (lesson closing). Then, the classification results in each meeting were compared and interpreted in order to examine the student response towards the student-centered learning instruction in their class. Lastly, the findings were presented in a report.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

From the data analysis, the findings showed that the students mostly responded positively towards the implementation of student-centered classroom instruction during the three class meetings. However, the positive responses were varied based on the type of instruction given to the students throughout the lessons. These various responses were classified according to the lesson structure and were explained in the following subsections.

### **First Meeting**

In the first meeting, the students learned a reading skill: four techniques of text annotation. The lesson objective for that day was for the students to apply four text annotation techniques correctly in a reading text. The learning activities were divided into two main focuses: discussing the reading text and learning the reading skill.

As the reading text was about new media (e.g. blogs and social media use), in the beginning of the lesson, the students were instructed to discuss in pairs several questions related to their experience in using new media in the past and in the present time. This activity was aimed to be a pre-reading activity and as a topic introduction for their reading text. By assigning them to talk about their experience in using the Internet (e.g. blogs, social media and websites), the students were facilitated to activate their prior knowledge on new media, make relevant connections between the reading topic (new media) and their daily lives, and discuss further the main purpose and impact of engaging in new media practices (e.g. writing blogs and using social media to deliver information to the world). From the observation, the students were actively involved in sharing their experience on using the Internet.

In the while-reading activity, the instructor encouraged several students to volunteer themselves to read aloud the reading text in their textbook, while other students read the text silently. After reading the text together, the class discussed several comprehension questions related to the main ideas, details and key vocabulary of the text, led by the instructor. These comprehension questions had been completed by the students prior to the class. During this activity, the learning was highly instructor-led as the interactions only happened between the

instructor and the students. There was not much discussion on the content of the reading text as the students were led to focus on reporting their answers for the comprehension questions. Consequently, the student involvement was somewhat partially as not everyone was willing to report their answers to the instructor and the class.

After discussing the comprehension questions, the learning process shifted to the second focus, which was the reading skill (text annotation techniques). To introduce this target reading skill, the instructor at first oriented the students' attention to the term 'active reader.' The students were instructed to think about the definition of the term individually for a few minutes and to post their answers on the class' *Padlet*. This activity allowed the students to use their smartphone for brainstorming and learning the keyword for their learning on that day. Based on the observation, during this activity, the students were actively engaged in this activity. Two students could not access the *Padlet* in their smartphone, so they were asked to join a peer next to them and to post their answer using his or her peer's smartphone. As this was the first time for the students to explore *Padlet*, they were quite enthusiastic; this was shown in how they made positive comments on using the online application and in how some of them enjoyed using initials to mark their own posts on *Padlet*. Once everyone had finished posting their thoughts on what the term 'active reader' might mean, the instructor led the class to briefly look at the answers so that they could see other answers that their peers had posted. Their posts showed that many students already had some understanding or assumptions of the term 'active reader'; however, these assumptions were not quite sufficient. In responding to this finding, the instructor highlighted that the students would find out more about active reader after learning the text annotation techniques.

Afterwards, the students were once again instructed to access another page on the class' *Padlet*, where the instructor had prepared an online questionnaire about text annotation practices. There were five statements on the *Padlet*, and the students were asked to vote 'yes' by clicking a thumb-up or 'no' by clicking a thumb-down below each statement. The statements were arranged to provide insights whether the students had been or had not been familiar with text annotation and its techniques. During this task, the students showed excitement as they were exposed to different features of *Padlet*, and they could see how many classmates voted 'yes' and 'no' for each statement. After everyone finished completing the questionnaire, the instructor reviewed the results with the class. The result was highly predictable by the instructor, i.e. some students did not know what text annotation was, most of them were not familiar with its techniques, and almost all of them did not regularly apply any text annotation technique in their reading.

In teaching the four text annotation techniques, the instructor displayed the name of each annotation technique and instructed the students to discern how to apply it appropriately. For instance, the first annotation technique was to circle or highlight a particular part of the text. Hence, the students were given an instruction, e.g. 'circle or highlight particular words from the text', in which they did it individually. After they finished, they shared and compared their work with a peer and discussed what kind of words that they circled or highlighted, and why they chose those words. At the end, the instructor led a class discussion to summarize and conclude each pair's findings for the first annotation technique. The same instructions were given to teach the second, third and fourth annotation techniques to the students. During this activity, modelling and demonstration steps were not provided by the instructor to introduce

the text annotation techniques to the students; in other words, the students were directly given a task to construct by themselves their understanding of how to apply each annotation techniques. As a result, many students were confused at first as they felt the instruction was not quite clear or specific. However, although it seemed that there was not much scaffolding offered by the instructor, the students somehow managed to complete the annotating task by discussing it with their peers and consulting the textbook.

At the end of the lesson, the students were encouraged to reflect on their learning by briefly explaining how those text annotation techniques that they had just learned could help them to become an active reader. This reflection session was instructor-led and only a few students volunteered to share their learning reflection to the class. A possible reason for this was perhaps because the students felt burdened to speak in front of the whole class.

From the description above, it can be concluded that although the students responded positively and actively towards the classroom instructions, some of the instructions in this first meeting were still mostly instructor-led. Particularly during the text annotation learning session, initially the students were intentionally positioned to construct their own understanding and knowledge about the four text annotation techniques; however, the classroom instruction was mostly individual while the students actually needed scaffolding to construct their understanding and knowledge on the subject matter. In addition, the observation results noted that the students' pair discussion during the text annotation practice was more of mechanical than social-interactive; hence, the discussion focus was mostly on how to complete the text annotation task rather than on constructing new understanding and knowledge.

## **Second Meeting**

Learning another three text annotation techniques was the focus of second meeting. Since it was the continuation of first meeting then applying text annotation techniques correctly in a reading text was still the lesson objective of the meeting. Hence, the lesson objective for that day was similar to the previous meeting, which was applying another three text annotation techniques correctly in a reading text. The learning activities were divided into two main focuses: discussing the reading text and learning the reading skill.

For the first learning activity, similar to the previous meeting, some students volunteered themselves to read aloud another text in their textbook about blogging practices in several countries. Some quiet students were selected by the instructor to participate reading aloud several paragraphs of the reading text. Then, a class discussion was conducted by the instructor to check the students' answers of the comprehension questions, which the students had completed prior to the class. Similar to the previous meeting, this activity was still highly instructor-led, where the interactions happened only between the instructor and the students.

After discussing the comprehension questions on the reading text, the students learned to apply three new text annotation techniques, which were agreeing or disagreeing, making connections and making questions in relation to the text. At first, the instructor introduced the three text annotation techniques and assigned the students to work in small groups to figure out how to apply those techniques properly and to apply them individually on the text that the class had just read earlier. Similar to the previous meeting, modelling and demonstration steps were not provided by the instructor.

The students worked with their group members to find out what aspects of the text that they could agree or disagree with, connect to themselves, and explore further by question remarks. Once they could identify those aspects, they practiced annotating the reading text individually. In this activity, the students actively involved in their task. In addition, the instructor had more opportunities to walk around the classroom to monitor and supervise each group's progress on the task. As the number of students attending the class on that day was less than the previous meeting (previously 16 students attending the class, while in this meeting, there were only 10 students), this provided an opportunity for the instructor to pay more attention to the students during their group work. As the instructor monitored each group, students who were usually quiet and often had difficulties in learning started to speak up and asking questions to confirm their understanding on the subject to the instructor. This may occur because the students worked in groups and they had a shared responsibility to actively participate in the task; hence, it motivated the usually quiet students to speak up a bit more.

After the group work, each group was encouraged to share their group work on one of the annotation techniques to the class. Each group was able to give proper explanation on the technique and on how to apply it on the reading text. Then, similar to the previous meeting, the students were asked to reflect on their learning, particularly on how those text annotation techniques that they learned on that day had helped them to become an active reader. More students volunteered to share their reflection compared to the first meeting. Finally, at the end of the lesson, the instructor led an interactive class discussion to summarize all seven text annotation techniques that the students had learned in the first and second meetings. Then, the connection of those text annotation techniques and an active reader was highlighted as the conclusion of the learning session by the instructor.

From the description above, it can be concluded that the students showed more positive response towards the student-centered classroom instructions, as shown in their increased participation in group work, willingness to speak up and willingness to share their own learning reflection. However, some of the classroom instructions in this meeting remained the same as the previous one, which was instructor-led. In addition, during the text annotation learning session, it was evident that each group worked with different speed; hence, while the instructor was still directing and scaffolding a group that was having a difficulty, the other groups had completed their task and had to wait for a while until all groups finished the task.

### **Third Meeting**

The students learned to write a procedural text in the third meeting. The lesson objectives of this meeting were developing students' awareness of features of procedural texts and practicing writing a short sample of procedural text. Prior to this meeting, the students were assigned to individually browse a sample of procedural poster from the Internet or printed media and to bring it to the class.

In the beginning of the lesson, the instructor introduced the learning topic and interactively explained the significance or benefits of learning to write a procedural text to the students. Then, they were divided into small groups and assigned to briefly explain the content of their procedural poster to their group members. The students were actively engaged in this activity as they were both excited to share their sample poster and interested to learn about their peer's procedural text.

Later, each student was given a worksheet that contained incomplete information about the writing features of a procedural poster and a procedural text. Each group was then assigned to collaboratively complete the worksheet by comparing and analyzing their sample poster and sample text from their textbook. During the activity, the instructor supervised the groups by walking around the classroom and stopped in each group to monitor and provide additional directions for completing the worksheet. The students were actively involved in their small groups, and it was evident that they made efforts to construct new knowledge on the subject matter. For instance, some groups whose members had quite the same level of understanding on the subject matter made more efforts to analyze the sample writings carefully and later turned to the instructor for a confirmation of their analysis results. On the other hand, other groups whose members had different levels of understanding on the subject matter also cooperated to scaffold and assisted their group members to understand the subject matter better.

Afterwards, when all the groups had finished completing the worksheet, they reported their findings to the class. The class discussion was led by the instructor and aimed to check and clarify any potentially incorrect or misleading findings or conclusions made during the group work. Since the worksheet would later be used as a guide for their writing activity, it was essential for the instructor to ensure that what was written on each student's worksheet contained correct information. In this activity, the students participated actively, both in reporting their findings and in listening to other groups.

Next, each group was instructed to choose one sample of procedural poster and to modify it into a good procedural text on *Padlet*. Prior to this activity, the instructor had prepared a page on *Padlet*, with six empty boxes. Each group was assigned to write their procedural text and to upload a picture of the procedural poster on one of the boxes. The students were highly engaged throughout this activity. They carefully selected the sample poster for their group's procedural text, organized the writing outline, and collaborated well in constructing the text. The students were demonstrating their autonomy by being cooperative with their group members in completing the task, managing the time well, and sharing equal responsibilities based on their strengths and weaknesses (e.g. a student volunteered to type the writing on *Padlet* because she was confident that she could type fast, while her peer volunteered to check on the grammar since she was good at it).

At the end of the lesson, when each group had posted their procedural text on *Padlet*, the students were asked to summarize the writing features of a procedural text that they had learned and applied that day. The students were able to mention all of the important features and steps of writing a procedural text. Due to time constraint, the groups did not have the opportunity to read and review each other's writing on *Padlet*. As the class time was over, the lecturer suggested the group peer-review activity to be held at the following meeting.

From the description above, it can be concluded that the students demonstrated more positive response towards the student-centered classroom instructions, as shown in their increased active participation and engagement in group work, willingness to seek and cooperate together to construct new knowledge and understanding on the subject matter, and display of learner's autonomy while doing the group work. The findings of this study reinforce the concept of autonomous learning firstly introduced by Holec (1981, cited in Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2011) and Wang (2010). Besides, this study confirms the concept of student-centered learning proposed by Macaskill and Taylor (2010).

The result of data analysis displayed the fact that student's responses towards student-centered learning gradually changed in a positive way. In the first meeting, the students were active mostly on the level of participation in completing the task; however, in the second meeting, they showed more involvement in their group discussion to gain more knowledge on the subject matter, and in the third meeting, they were able to demonstrate a few aspects of learner's autonomy while engaging in their group task. To foster and maximize the students' engagement, the use of educational technology plays a pivotal role as an approach to classroom instruction to enhance the learning process (Dörnyei, Zoltán, Ushioda, 2011).

## CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study showed that EFL undergraduate students gradually changed to more positive response as their teacher moved from teacher-centered learning to student-centered learning, from an instructor-centered to student-centered. Moreover, their positive responses and active participation in the learning processes were highly influenced by the kind of instructions given by the lecturers. The absence of sufficient scaffolding from the instructor limited students' level of engagement in the construction of knowledge and understanding on the subject matter. On the other hand, when the students were provided sufficient resources, tools and scaffolding to construct their own knowledge and understanding on a new subject matter, they tended to perform better in their learning process.

Teacher's awareness and decision to adopt student-centered learning approach determines the transition of her role from being the centre of to the facilitator of teaching-learning process. When instructors can carry their roles well, it would also determine the student responses to the instructions and how they display them throughout their learning process. Therefore, it is recommended for instructors in higher education not only to be well-prepared when organizing a student-centered classroom instruction, but also to be more aware on how a particular role that they carry in a learning task may impact the students in fostering their level of response and participation.

## REFERENCES

- Abbasi, H., & Hadadi, A. (2014). The Possible Negative Outcomes of Putting Learners in Spotlight. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.381>
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Brandes, D., & Ginnis, P. (1986). A Guide to Student-Centred Learning. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btn182>
- Brown Wright, G. (2011). Student-Centered Learning in Higher Education: The Balance of Power. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 92–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079312331382498>
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Knowing through Action Research*.
- Clifford, V. A. (1999). The Development of Autonomous Learners in a University Setting, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(1), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180109>
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. PEARSON Education Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833750>

- Grow, G. O. (1991). *Adult Education Quarterly*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0001848191041003001>
- Henri, D. C., Morrell, L. J., & Scott, G. W. (2018). Student perceptions of their autonomy at University. *High Educ*, 75, 507–516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0152-y>
- Hodge, S. (2010). Student-centred learning in higher education and adult education. *2010 Occasional Papers on Learning and Teaching at UniSA - Paper 3*, 1–15.
- Lom, B. (2012). Classroom Activities: Simple Strategies to Incorporate Student-Centered Activities within Undergraduate Science Lectures. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education : JUNE : A Publication of FUN, Faculty for Undergraduate Neuroscience*, 11(1), A64-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10601325.2013.802196>
- Macaskill, A., & Taylor, E. (2010). The development of a brief measure of learner autonomy in university students, 35(3), 351–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903502703>
- Margolis, J., & Knowles, M. (1970). The modern practice of adult education. *Training & Development Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203802670>
- Mertler, C. A. (2013). Classroom-Based Action Research: Revisiting the Process as Customizable and Meaningful Professional Development for Educators. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 3(3), 38–42. Retrieved from <http://uobrep.openrepository.com/uobrep/bitstream/10547/335968/1/Classroom-based+action+research+revisiting+the+process+as+customizable+and+meaningful+professional+development+for+educators.pdf>
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharkey, S., & Weimer, M. (2003). Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice. *Teaching Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211318>
- Shu, D. (2006). On the New Model of Foreign Language Classroom Teaching. *Foreign Language World*, 4, 21–29.
- Wang, J. (2010). How to Develop College Students' Autonomous English Learning Skills --- Take Reading Course in Joint-Program in HCFT as An Example. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 221–228.
- Wright, T. (1991). *The Roles of Teachers and Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2011). Developing Learner Autonomy in Higher Education in Macedonia, 11, 150–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.01.051>