PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS' FAMILIARITY AND EXPECTATION TOWARD THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STUDENT-CENTERED ENGLISH TEACHING METHODS

Arina Sofia, Nanik Sri Rahayu
UIN Sayyid Ali Rahmatullah Tulungagung
arina.shofiya@gmail.com, nanik.sri.rahayu@unisatu.ac.id

Abstract
The development of science and technology brings some impacts to various aspects of life, mainly English Language Teaching (ELT). . However, there is a shift of paradigm as the effect of modernization in ELT, the students become the main subjects of learning and the teaching methods are more student-centered. The prospective teachers need to understand any changes of teaching theories and make adjustment in their future practices. The present research is intended to answer the following research questions: 1) To what extent are the prospective teachers familiar with student-centered English language teaching methods?, 2) What is the perceived contribution of the student-centered English language teaching methods toward their knowledge development?, 3) What do the prospective teachers expect from the student-centered English language teaching methods? The research employed survey design involving 218 students of the fifth semester. The findings reveal that 1) the students show high familiarity to students-centered ELT methods, 2) the methods contribute to the development of their knowledge by providing theory and practices of student-centered ELT method, and 3) they have high expectation in mastering the theories and practice of student-centered ELT methods.

Key words: *Familiarity, expectation, student-centered ELT methods*

INTRODUCTION

The development of language teaching methods is affected by global change in the world. As an instance, during the World War 2 there was a high need for the soldiers to be able to communicate by using local languages quickly, the teaching method was designed so that learners can practice speaking quickly and accurately. Despite the fact that the result was not creative speaking even the learners tend to parroting, the Audio-Lingual Method gained its popularity. Such kind of method emphasized on the use of a variety of drilling techniques where mimicry is seen as an effective way for learning foreign language (Lennon, 2020). When the paradigm of foreign language changes to communicative use of language, the teaching method changes. Audio Lingual Method was seen as not enough in developing students' competence to communicate naturally. The students did not use the language creatively because the utterances they produced were not the result of their creative thinking.

The revolution of industry 4.0 is noted with the terms of digitalized, automatized, and connectivity. To survive in such era, human being should make some adaptation. Formerly, the use of traditional means of communication like letter, old-fashioned telephone, or others. At the time being, after the pandemic covid 19, the lifestyle changes where people use technology more often and in the field of education, a lot of changes also happen in terms of curriculum, teaching method, teaching media, and others (Alsagoff et al., n.d.; Dada et al., 2023; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Svinicki, 1998). The excellence of student-centered learning, so far, are seen only from the perspectives of the teachers and researchers. Teachers mostly view that student-centered learning highlights deeper learning, life-long learning, and problem-solving skills (Brueggeman & a, n.d.; Dada et al., 2023; Hammer, 1997).

The advocacy of student-centered English language teaching methods should not neglect the prospective teachers or students majoring in ELT's voices. Listening to them has some impacts on learning. According to

Mager & Nowak (2012), students' voices have an array of effects, from personal effects to institutional effects. Moreover, students play an important role as co-creators in the development of the curriculum. (Xin & Wang, 2023). Students' understanding of their learning is trusted to enhance the development of life skills and academic achievement. The present study is, therefore, intended to investigate the following research questions; 1) To what extent are the prospective teachers familiar with student-centered English language teaching methods? 2) What is the perceived contribution of the student-centered English language teaching methods toward their knowledge development? 3) What do the prospective teachers expect from the student-centered English language teaching methods?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Development of Teaching Methods

The history of teaching methods can be traced from the practice of classical method which is well known as Grammar Translation Method. Such kind of method helps the students to appreciate literary work written in a foreign language. It is expected that learning foreign language through its grammar and vocabulary will increase the students' understanding of the grammar of their native language (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). In the nineteenth century, there was a reform movement in the foreign language education which viewed the importance of natural process in learning language. Grammar Translation Method was seen as unnatural because it starts the teaching of language by reading and writing. Meanwhile, language learning is started by listening and speaking. The reformation, then, emerge with a new teaching method named as Direct Method (Norland & Pruett-Said, 2006). The Direct Method emphasizes on the use of direct and spontaneous target language in the classroom, inductive grammar teaching, and the use of mime and gestures to help explain the meaning. Those techniques are intended to enhance the natural process of foreign language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Nevertheless, in the Direct Method, no native language

use is allowed. As it is implied in the name of the method, the meaning is showed directly in the use of target language with the help of visual aids and demonstration (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

In line with the political changes in the world especially in the World War II era, foreign language teaching was developed to meet the quick need of soldiers to adapt in the foreign countries. The Audio Lingual Method (ALM), known also as Army Method, was established based on the behavioral psychology which believes that language learning is a habit formation strengthened with positive and negative reinforcement (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Norland & Pruett-Said, 2006). The popularity of the Audio-Lingual Method decreases along with the rise of cognitivism which view that learning is not a matter of mimicry or imitating the models. According to Belkhir (2020) cognitive psychology is concerned with the mental process by which knowledge and understanding is developed in the mind.

Along with the trend of globalization era where the communication is done mostly in English, the ability to use English is a must. People become more familiar with English due to the fact that all instruction in home appliances and households are written in English. Different from younger learners who feel free to make mistake, adult learners usually have problem with their self- confidence. As a result, the teacher should create meaningful interaction in the classroom. To manage communicative interaction, a teacher needs skills to do the following activities, namely, manage the teacher talk, manipulate types of questions, manage the giving of instruction, organize group and individual work, keep students on task, use comprehensible language, and handle affective variable in the classroom (Gebhard, 2009).

Together with the shift of teaching paradigm where students should be promoted to communicative use of language, another teaching approach gains its popularity. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is believed to be effective in making students successful in communication. CLT was developed by researchers in 1970s who saw language is equal to communication. Language is basically for communication and thus

language teaching should be directed to how the students use language for communication (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In the CLT, learning language does not contain merely translation and memorization of rules but actual practice of the language in the classroom. The focus is the authentic use of communication (Norland & Pruett-Said, 2006). Later, CLT develops into some teaching methods. One of them is Task Based Learning (TBL). Task Based Learning refers to the use of tasks as the basic unit of planning the lesson and carrying out the instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The tasks are usually accomplished in small group of four to eight students (Lennon, 2020).

Student- Centered English Language Teaching Methods

A student-centered class is carried out to boost student autonomy. The students do not rely on the teacher all the time, waiting for instruction, approval, correction, and praise. Indeed, they listen to each other, working together, solving problem in groups, and do other collaborative works. In addition, a student-centered class is a place to give a care of all the students' needs, individually or in group, and to promote students' participation in the learning process (Jones, 2007); (Brueggeman & a, n.d.).

In a student-centered class, the activities in the classroom includes such as 1) working alone, it includes making notes before doing discussion, doing listening task, writing short assignment, doing grammar and vocabulary exercises, 2) working in pairs, it includes comparing and discussing their answers, reading and reacting each other's answers, and suggesting improvement, 3) working together in discussion, role play, and share of ideas, and 4) interaction with teachers.

An ideal number of students in a class is 12-14. With small number of students in the classroom, they will have sufficient time to practice using the second language. However, in the context of secondary school in Indonesia, this situation is not possible. The number of the students is usually more than 25. In fact, the bigger the number of the students, the higher the need to use student-centered learning (Jones, 2007). Student-centered classes offer

various activities to be accomplished in groups. Through group activities, the teacher can save time to circulate across the room. In addition, the teacher's burden in paying attention to each student can be eased by student-student interaction.

Some examples of student-centered English language teaching methods are Active learning, Cooperative language learning (CLL) which consists of Three step interview, Roundtable, Think-Pair-Share, Solve-Pair-Share, Numbered Head, and inductive teaching and learning which consists of inquiry-based learning, case-based learning, problem-based learning, project-based learning, and discovery learning.

Autonomous Learning

Autonomy is defined as the ability to take charge of someone's learning. In language learning, autonomy is interpreted in some ways like independent learner, self-learner, and learner independence. Autonomy is a social process can be interpreted in terms of a point of a departure from education as well as in terms of redistribution of power attending to the construction of knowledge and the roles of the participants in the learning process (Chik et al., 2018; Masouleh & Jooneghani, 2012).

Three approaches regarding autonomy include positivism, constructivism, and critical theory. Positivism is a school of philosophy which hypothesizes that knowledge reflects objective reality. In learning, a teacher is seen as the holder of reality. Thus, learning occurs by the transmission from one to another. Learners are seemed to have a vessel that the teachers will fill with the knowledge (Masouleh & Jooneghani, 2012). Positivism also asserts that knowledge is acquired by discovery rather taught. It encompasses self-direction and self-evaluation.

METHOD

The present research is intended to explore the extent of the prospective teachers' familiarity with the theory and practice of student-centered learning methods as well as the perceived contribution of such theories

and practice toward the development of their knowledge. In addition, the study is also aimed at exploring the prospective teachers' expectations from student-centered learning method classes, whether they are as students or as teachers-to-be.

The research was conducted in the form survey of the students of the English Education Department UIN Sayyid Ali Rahmatullah Tulungagung. The students who have taken courses in teaching methodology are assumed to experience and be familiar with the theory and practice of student-centered learning methods. They are the targeted respondents of this research who will provide information about their familiarity and expectations of student-centered learning methods.

The research which was done in the first semester in the academic year of 2023-2034 required the participation of the English Education Department students. The number of the respondents of this study was 218 students of the fifth semester from English Education Department. The research data were collected from online questionnaires that were distributed to the students of the English Education Department. Thus, the instrument is a set of questionnaires containing questions related to familiarity, perceived contribution of student-centered learning method, and expectations from student-centered learning method. To ensure validity and reliability, validation and reliability testing were conducted.

The students' answers were analyzed and categorized based on the research questions. The result provides a portrait of the prospective teachers' perspective and expectation of student-centered learning methods which can be a source of information for decision-makers at the university level in reviewing the curriculum at the teacher training department.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present research are categorized based on the order of the research questions, namely, the familiarity of the prospective teachers to the student-centered English language teaching methods, the

perceived contribution of the methods on the prospective teachers' knowledge development, and the expectation of the prospective teachers from the student-centered English language teaching methods.

The familiarity of the prospective teachers to the student-centered English language teaching methods

The following data show the tendency of the students' answers regarding their familiarity with the concept, theory, and practices of student-centered English language teaching methods. The prospective teachers (students) show various answers but it can be classified into two main classifications. The first three alternatives of answers (know well, know fair amount, know little) is categorized as familiar. The two alternatives of answers (hardly know, never heard) is categorized as not familiar.

Table.1 The familiarity of the prospective teachers to student-centered English language teaching methods

Statement	Know Well (%)	Fairly Know (%)	Know Little (%)	Hardly Know (%)	Do Not Know (%)
I know what SCELT stands for	14.7	39.4	29.8	8.3	7.8
I can mention the definition of SCELT Method	5.5	40.4	35.3	9.6	9.2
I understand the concept of each method in SCELT	2.3	28.4	45.9	12.4	11.0
I identify similarities among SCELT methods	1.8	26.1	47.2	13.8	11.0
I identify differences among SCELT methods	1.8	28.4	45.4	10.6	13.8

I know the theory and practice of Cooperative Learning	11.9	34.4	41.3	9.2	3.2
I know the theory and practice of Jigsaw Learning	6.9	32.6	37.6	16.5	6.4
I know the theory and practice of Collaborative Learning	11.9	48.6	29.4	7.3	3.0
I know the theory and practice of Numbered Head Together	3.7	19.7	50.0	17.4	9.2
I know the theory and practice of Task-Based Learning	16.5	47.2	28.4	5.0	2.8
I know the theory and practice of Project-Based Learning	22.0	48.6	21.1	6.0	2.3
I know the theory and practice of other methods	7.3	30.7	50.0	8.3	3.7
I know that Project-Based Learning is applied in Kurikulum Merdeka	22.5	41.7	26.1	6.9	2.8

Regarding the first statement, "I know what SCELT stands for", it is shown that 32 (14.7%) of the respondents state that they know well what SCELT Methods stands for Student - Centered ELT Methods. It shows that they are very serious toward course they are taking and they are familiar with the course. 86 of the students (39.4%) state that they know a fair amount of understanding toward the name of the course they are taking. Meanwhile, 65

students (29.8%) state that they know a little about the abbreviation of the name of the course they are taking. It indicates that the name of the course is easy to understand and to be familiarized to the students despite the facts that there are 18 (8.3%) and 17 (7.8%) of the students indicate that they do not know the name of the course. It is possible that they are not aware with the name of the course. The trend among generation Z who are ignorant make possible that they do not know the name of the course they take.

With regard to the statement, "I can mention the definition of SCELT Method", the data show that 12 students (5.5%) of the students mention that they know well the definition of SCELT Method, 88 students (40.4%) answer that their knowledge of the definition of SCELT Method is fair. Meanwhile, 77 (35.3%) students know little about the definition of SCELT Method. Such findings indicate that most of the students can define SCELT Methods. In other words, they are familiar with SCELT Method. However, there is a fair amount of the students who are not familiar with the concept of SCELT. 21 of the students (9.6%) answer that they hardly heard of it and 20 students (9.2%) answer they never heard the definition of SCELT. When the percentage of the students who do not know the definition of SCELT is less than the percentage of those who know it, it can be understood that some students only come to the class with no purpose. Even they do not realize the name of the subject matter they are taking.

The statement, "I understand the concept of each method in SCELT" is answered like the following. 5 students (2.3%) know the concept well, 62 students (28.4%) fairly know the concept, and 100 students (45.9%) know the concept a little. It indicates that in general the students understand the concept of any method in SCELT method. The concept of SCELT method is distinct and easy to understand for the students. However, there is a fair portion of the answers reveal students' unfamiliarity to the concept of SCELT Method. 27 students (12.4%) answer that they hardly know the concept and 27 (11%) never heard the concept of SCELT Methods. Such portion rings the alarm to the lecturers to make sure the knowledge or concept in the course

is deliver well to the students.

The next statement," I identify similarities among SCELT methods", is answered that in terms of the familiarity with the similarities among the SCELT methods, the findings show that very little portion of the students, 4 (1,8%) of the students know well the similarities among SCELT methods either in terms of concepts or practices. A fair portion of the students, 57 (26,1%) of the student are fairly familiar with the similarities among the SCELT methods. Almost half of the students (47.2% or 103 students) state that they have little familiarity with the similarities exist among the SCELT Methods. Meanwhile, 30 students (13.8%) almost do not know the similarities among SCELT Methods. It indicates low absorption of the information presented to them. The situation is getting worse with a fact that 24 students (11%) do not know the similarities at all. The lecturers need to find out the reasons for such facts.

The statement, "I identify differences among SCELT methods", the findings show that very little portion of the students (4 or 1.8%) answered that they know well the differences among the SCELT methods in terms of theories and practices. A fair portion of the students (62 or 28.4%) are fairly familiar with the differences among the SCELT methods. Meanwhile, 99 students (45.4%) answer that they are little familiar with the differences among the SCELT. Finally, 23 students (10.6%) state that they do not know about the differences among the SCELT methods at all.

The statement, "I know the theory and practice of Cooperative Learning", is answered like the following . A quarter of them, 26 (11.9%) of the students answer that they are familiar or know well the theory and practice of Cooperative Learning. A large number of the students (75 0r 34.4%) are fairly familiar with the concepts and the practice of Cooperative Learning, a part of SCELT Method. Larger number of the students (41.3%) show fair familiarity with how Cooperative Learning works. The largest portion of the students show little familiarity to the concept of Cooperative learning. Smaller portion of the students (20 students or 9.2%) show that

they are not really familiar with the concept of Cooperative Learning. This fact is also an indication that the students actually are not familiar with the cooperative learning as shown by their choice that they hardly heard the theory and practice of Cooperative Learning. The last, very small portion (7 students or 3.2%) clearly state that they are not familiar at all with the theory and practice of Cooperative Learning.

The next statement is "I know the theory and practice of Jigsaw Learning". With regard to the theory and practice of Jigsaw Learning, the data above show that a small portion of the answers show that the students are well familiar. 15 students (6.9%) choose the answer "I know the theory and practice of Jigsaw Learning well. Bigger portion of the answers showing that they know fairly about theory and practice of Jigsaw learning is chosen by the students. 71 students (32.6%) chose this answer. The biggest number of the students (82 or 37.6%) choose to answer I know little about the theory and practice of Jigsaw learning. Meanwhile, only 36 students (16.5%) state that they hardly know the theory and practice of jigsaw learning. Almost the same number as the students who are very familiar with the theory and practice of jigsaw learning, 14 students (6.45) answer that they never heard the theory and practice of jigsaw learning. The bell curved diagram showed the normal distribution of the answers.

The statement, " I know the theory and practice of Collaborative Learning". The table shows that the term Collaborative learning seems to be more popular among the students. 26 (11.9%) of the students state that they know well about the theory and practice of collaborative learning. 106 (48.6%) of the students answer they are fairly familiar with the theory and practice of collaborative learning. Lesser number of the students (64 or 29.4%) state they know little about Collaborative learning. Meanwhile, 16 (7.3%) of the students answer they almost do not hear about collaborative learning. The last, only 6 students state they are not familiar with the term collaborative learning at all.

The statement, "I know the theory and practice of Numbered Head

Together". The table above shows that students' familiarity with one of SCELT Method namely Numbered Head Together is relatively low. Among them only 8 students (3.7%) state that they know well with the theory and practice of NHT. Bigger number of the students that is 43 (19.7%) reveal that they know fairly amount of the theory and practice of NHT. Half number of them (109 or 50%) state that they know little about NHT. Despite the familiarity is low, the students at least once heard such kind of term. Only about a quarter of the number of the students show unfamiliarity to the NHT. 38 students (17.4%) answer that hardly know the theory and practice of NHT. In addition, only 20 (9.2%) of them answer state they never heard the term of NHT.

The next statement is I know the theory and practice of Task-Based Learning. The findings show that students are familiar with such kind of teaching method. The data show that 36 students (16.5%) state they know well with the method. 103 students (47.2%) state they fairly know about task-based learning. In addition, 62 students (28.4%) state they know little about Task-based learning. Only small portion among the students who are not familiar with Task-based Learning. 11 students (5%) state that they hardly ever heard the term Task-Based learning. 6 students (2.8%) never heard the concept of Task-Based learning.

The statement, "I know the theory and practice of Project-Based Learning" is answered that Most of the students are familiar with the theory and practice of project-based learning. 48 students (22 %) answer that they know well the concept of project-based learning. Bigger number of students (106 or 48.6%) answer they know fairly amount of the theory and practice of project-based learning. Smaller portion of the number is occupied by the students (46 students or 21.1%) answer that they know little about project-based learning. Very small number of the answers indicate unfamiliarity with project-based learning. Only 13 students (6%) state that hardly know the concept of project-based learning. 5 students (2.3%) state that they never hear the term of project-based learning.

Regarding the statement, "I know the theory and practice of other methods", 16 students (7.3%) answer that they are familiar with the theory and practice of other methods. Some bigger portion (67students or 30.7%) show that they are fairly familiar with the other methods of SCELT Method. Half of the students show little familiarity to such kinds of methods. 109 students or 50% choose the answer of "I know little about it". Only 18 students or 8.3% answer they hardly know the other methods in SCELT method. The last, only 8 (3,7%) students state that they are not familiar at all.

The statement, "I know that Project-Based Learning is applied in Kurikulum Merdeka", The table above show that the students show their familiarity with the policy of Kurikulum Merdeka including the teaching method applied in such curriculum. 49 (22.5%) students understand very well that project-based learning is applied in Kurikulum Merdeka. Mostly, 91 students or 41.7% fairly know the policy that project-based is used as the method of teaching in Kurikulum Merdeka. 57 students (26.1%) state that they know little that project-based learning is implemented in Kurikulum Merdeka. 15 students (6.9%) hardly know that project-based learning is used as the main method to be implemented in Kurikulum Merdeka. Finally, 6 (2.8%) students state that they never know that project-based learning is used in the implementation of Kurikulum Merdeka.

The perceived contribution of student-centered English language teaching methods to the development of knowledge

The findings of the research show that the prospective teachers perceive the contribution of the student-centered English language teaching methods. They argue that the student-centered English language teaching methods contributes much on the development of their knowledge as future teachers. The detail answer is presented in the following table.

Table 2. The perceived contribution of student-centered English language

teaching methods

Statement	Know Well (%)	Fairly Know (%)	Know Little (%)	Hardly Know (%)	Do Not Know (%)
Understanding of SCELT methods is useful for my teaching career in the future	32.1	35.3	20.2	7.3	5.0
I think my understanding of SCELT methods can enrich my knowledge of being a teacher	29.4	31.7	32.1	3.2	3.7

The data above show that the students mostly agree that understanding SCELT methods is useful for their future career. 70 students (32.1%) understand very well this fact. Meanwhile 77 (35.3%) of the students show fair understanding of such need. 44 % (20.2) of the students state they know little that understanding the methods will support their future career. 16 (7.3%) students hardly know that they need to understand SCELT to support their future career. The last, 11 students (5%) do not know that they need to understand about SCELT methods.

The data in relation to the contribution of SCELT Method to the development of their knowledge reveal that most of the students show agree that understanding the SCELT methods can enrich their knowledge to teachers. 64 students (29.4%) answer that it is much more than their expectation than have enrichment on their knowledge to be a teacher by understanding the SCELT method. 69 students (31.7%) state that it is more than their expectation to develop their knowledge by understanding SCELT methods. Meanwhile, 70 students (32.1%) state that getting enrichment by understanding SCELT methods is as expected. Very small number of the students show their disagreement that understanding SCELT method contribute to development of their knowledge to be a teacher. 7 students

(3.2%) answer that it less expected to enrich their knowledge and 8 students (3.7%) state that they do not expect to enrich their knowledge of being teacher by understanding SCELT Methods.

The expectation of the prospective teachers from the student-centered English language teaching methods

The prospective teachers have high expectation that they will develop their knowledge that prepare them to be teachers and they also expect to have practices and simulation in teaching English by using student-centered English language teaching methods. The detail information about these expectations is presented in the following table.

Table 3. The expectation of the prospective teachers from student-centered English language teaching methods

Statement	Know Well (%)	Fairly Know (%)	Know Little (%)	Hardly Know (%)	Do Not Know (%)
I expect to understand all the concepts of SCELT methods	9.2	36.7	40.4	10.6	3.2
I expect to have simulation of teaching using SCELT Methods	14.7	36.3	39.4	5.5	4.1
I expect to practice SCELT methods during the internship program	18.8	38.5	33.9	4.1	4.6

Related to the students' expectation to understand all concepts of SCELT Methods, A total of 20 students (9.2%) stated that their grasp of the concepts was far beyond what was anticipated. Then, 80 students (36.7%) reported that their understanding exceeded expectations. Meanwhile, 88 students (40.4%) answer that understand all the concept of SCELT Method is expected by them. Only small portion of the answers show their unexpected understanding. 23 students (10.6%) answer they have less expectation to

understand all concepts of SCELT Method. The last, 7 students (3.2%) do not expect to understand the concepts of SCELT Method.

The students expect to have simulation of teaching by using SCELT Methods to prepare for internship. The findings show that 32 students (14.7%) having simulation of teaching by using SCELT method is much more than expected. For 79 students (36.3%) it is more than expected. Generally, having simulation of teaching by using SCELT Methods is expected by 86 students (39.4%). Little number of the students, 12 students (5.5%) have less expectation to simulate teaching by using SCELT Methods in the classroom. Very little number of them, 9 students (4.1%) do not expect to have simulation of teaching SCELT Methods in the classroom.

Most of the students expect to practice SCELT method during the internship program. After learning the theories of SCELT Method, 41 students (18.8%) answer that practicing the theories is much more than expected. For 84 students (38.5%) state is more than expected, and for 74 students (33.9%). Only small portion of the answers show low expectation. 9 students (4.1%) answer that practicing SCELT is less than expected and 10 students (4.6%) do not expect to practice them during their internship.

DISCUSSION

The students are very familiar with the term student-centered English language teaching methods as indicated by the number of the students who choose the statement "I know what SCELT Methods stand for". This fact show that the students are aware of what they are learning. Such kind of awareness is needed as the students is one of the important aspects in education. The importance of students in education is clearly noted. The role of the learner clearly disqualifies the passive role and aims at utilizing personal learning ability (Abdi, 2014; Ansarian & Teoh, 2018; Balım, n.d.; Shehadeh & Coombe, 2012). The data also shows that the students state the abbreviation of the student-centered ELT method is easy to remember because they are already familiar with the term of ELT. So, whenever there is a word containing ELT they can guess easily that it has something to do

with English language teaching. However, there are also some students who state that they do not know the name of the course. Such findings illustrate the diverse nature of students in the teaching and learning process, as it is widely recognized that learners come to class with varying characteristics— including differences in age, motivation, learning preferences, aptitude, and other individual factors. These differences intricately are locked to each other and contribute to students' learning significantly (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). The existence of 16,1 % of the students who state they do not know their course confirm this theory that the students' differences affect their learning. It this case, their motivation and language aptitude play important role on their awareness of the materials they learning and the courses they are taking.

Encountering the fact that the students are not aware to the course they join even they do not the name of the course should push the lecturer to be attentive to student differences. The lecturer needs to be close to the students in the beginning of the course by providing the students chance to express what they expect from this class. Making contract for learning is seen as essential to make the students know how they will accomplish the tasks in upcoming semester.

Besides being familiar with the name of the course, big number of the students 81, 12% are able to define what student-centered English language teaching methods means. It shows that after being taught student-centered ELT Methods, the students recognize the contents of the course from the name. In other words, the department is successful in creating the name of the course. Ideally, the name of the course represents its content, so whoever read the name of the course can guess what it is about. As a matter of fact, giving name of a course is intriguing. This is so because it often happens that between the name of a course and its contents is misleading.

The finding of the survey also reveals that almost 20% of the students do not know the definition of student-centered ELT method. It can be concluded that the students are demotivated in learning as it is proven that they come to class with no purpose so they do not what they should do in the

classroom. The finding of the current confirm a number of studies which reveal that as the effect of pandemic Covid-19, in a class, the problem of motivation need to be taken into account as the students' motivation differs very much ranging from not motivated to high motivation (Abdillah & Sueb, 2022). The students' intrinsic learning motivation is at moderate level and their extrinsic motivation in learning is also at moderate level (Firmansyah et al., 2023). The students have higher extrinsic motivation than intrinsic motivation (Fiddiyasari & Pustika, 2021). The students were demotivated in learning due to minimal support from the parents and increasing assignment (Nabila et al., 2022). The finding of the current research exposes a fact that many students are ignorant to their lesson since they enjoy a vary permissive and understanding learning system for more than two years. During the outbreak, the online learning system fails to make the students become discipline and purposeful to any learning activities. As a result, many students lose their orientation when they go back to school.

The present study is intended to seek the students' understanding of each method being discussed in student-centered ELT method classroom. As implied in its name, a student-centered ELT method, the course contains theory and practices of various teaching method and approaches in teaching English from traditional ones and the modern methods. In such class, the students explore and accomplish tasks about the methods in teaching second language like Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, Silent Way, and other. The students also learn student-centered ELT methods like Problem-Based learning, Task-based learning, Project-based learning, and some other new methods. In addition, the students are provided with the knowledge of teaching strategies needed to encounter curriculum changes. Therefore, a lot of theories of teaching methods are learned. The result of the present survey shows that more than one third of the students know the concept of each method. Such proportion show that after class, there are always a number of students who find difficulties in absorbing the knowledge even though the teacher has done the best. This is also evidence that students' difference

really matters. The students have different motivation levels, different attitude about teaching and learning, and different responses to specific classroom environments and instructional purposes (Felder & Brent, 2005). In addition, cultural differences also play important role toward the students' individual learning process (Viberg et al., 2024).

Student-centered ELT methods are used to push students' participation through collaborative activities. The students learn how to develop their second language capabilities and learning social communication by finishing task in group. As such, the students also identified all the steps in doing collaboration which ends on their understanding of the student-centered ELT methods. This fact give a confirmation to a research which notes the collaborative actions in the discovery learning affect students' success and inquiry skills (Balım, n.d.). Another finding of a study on the effect of inquiry-based learning notices higher achievement on the group of the students who work collaboratively in an inquiry-based group rather than the group which is taught without using inquiry learning (Abdi, 2014). It indicates the practice of student-centered ELT method can raise the understanding of the methods. As a matter of fact, the result of the survey which show 23,4% that the students do not know the concepts in student-centered ELT methods should raise the lecturers' awareness of the possibility that the materials or the concepts are not well delivered. So, they will search a strategy that make all the students can understand all the materials presented to them.

The differences across methods in the students-centered ELT methods are not subtle. All of them emphasizes problem-solving and cooperation in accomplishing classroom tasks. Other similarities lay upon the principles of constructivism, teacher as facilitator, daily language use, and student evaluation. Constructivism views that learning is an active construction of conceptual framework. All knowledge is fallible by virtue of lacking exactitude and comprehensiveness (Cobern, 1993). Constructivism is a model to describe learning where the students are the agent of learning. The student-centered ELT Methods can be identified from its prominent feature that put

the students as the main actor during the learning activities. The findings of the present research provide the evidence on this assumption. Two third of the students (75,1%) of the students can identify the similarities among the methods that is based on the students. Meanwhile, one third of the students (24,9) show they cannot identify the similarities. The discrepancy between the students who understand the concepts and those who do not understand the concepts of student-centered ELT methods implies that the lecturers should formulate suitable strategies to make the learning process effective. The implementation of cooperative learning perhaps helps to meet the gap.

Cooperative learning comprises some learning models that can be adapted to tailor the wide gap among students. The success of cooperative learning is dependent to a structured program where the students interact with each other and motivate each other in learning. Teaching collaborative skills is useful to promote peer correction for effective communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Examples of collaborative skills include activities to maintain social interaction such as asking for repetition, asking for clarification, and lower sound. The finding of the present research confirms that Richard& Rodgers' theory. The students can identify the similarity among student-centered ELT Methods as the result of practices they do in the classroom which focus on collaboration such as making mind maps in group or gallery walk activities.

Another fact showing the students' familiarity with students-centered ELT methods is their ability to identify differences among the methods. Recognizing similarities seems to be much easier than identifying the differences. As mentioned above that the student-centered ELT Methods rise from similar learning theory. In practice the teaching activities are difficult to distinguish. Most of student-centered ELT methods focus on group work. However, the finding of the present research spotlight the ability of the students to identify the differences of each student-centered ELT methods. More than 89.4% of the students state that they can identify the differences among methods in the student-centered ELT Methods. It can be inferred

that the implementation of student-centered ELT Methods brings significant effect on the students' understanding. As the effect of collaborative works, the students can construct understanding and increase their awareness of what they are learning. Such finding confirms the theory of cooperative learning which suggest that good classroom activities in cooperative learning benefits on improving student accountability, social skills, and structuring and structure (Chang-Tik et al., 2022; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). However, the fact that 10.6% of the students still cannot identify the differences. It is possible that they cannot grasp the meaning of each method so they find it difficult to identify the methods one by one.

The findings of the present research show that the students have high familiarity to theory and practice of Cooperative learning. Their answer indicate that cooperative learning is one of the most popular student-centered ELT methods. Cooperative learning is mostly used at school attempting to implement the current curriculum, Kurikulum Merdeka. Cooperative learning principles appears in some methods like Jigsaw learning, reciprocal teaching, Think-pair-share, Solve-Pair-Share, Numbered Head Together, and many others. Cooperative learning is preferred because it can foster independence and improve students' engagement (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). A lot of studies on the implementation of cooperation show positive effect and improvement of students' language skill and knowledge (Altun, 2015; Chang-Tik et al., 2022; Gillies, 2004; Jalilifar, 2010; Krause et al., 2009). The result of this research confirms the findings of these studies. The students' understanding of the concept of cooperative learning can be considered as the result of the practice of cooperative learning in the classroom.

Cooperative learning proves to be effective in a class where the students are independent. In the case of this research, cooperative learning is implemented in university level in which the students are already independent/ autonomous. Autonomous learners are those who understand their need in learning language so they can take charge of their learning and make use of the available resources especially outside the classroom (Masouleh &

Jooneghani, 2012). The learners who are autonomous show the following characteristics: have insights into their learning style and strategies, take an active approach to the task at hand, willing to take a risk in using language, good learner, positive thinker, and tolerant. In this research, the students' autonomy is represented by their answers that are free form intimidation. The students' statement "I know the theory and practice of cooperative learning" reflects their being active in the classroom process which can be concluded as reflect their being autonomous learners despite the facts that 12,4% of the students state their unfamiliarity to the theory and practice of cooperative learning.

Another method which is also popular is jigsaw learning. This method is commonly used for teaching reading and show its effectiveness in practices. A study in Vietnam show that students who are taught by using jigsaw learning outperformed those who are taught without using jigsaw learning (Tran & Lewis, 2012). In the field of educational psychology, it is proven that jigsaw learning has significant effect on the students' self-efficacy and motivation (Nur Rachmah, 2017). When the students get enough practice of jigsaw learning, they can develop their self-confidence because in jigsaw learning the students are trained to present in a homogeneous group first and then in a heterogeneous group. In this current research homogeneous means the students share the same part of a reading composition and then they have to share their understanding of the part of text in a group of different parts of the text so they will have complete understanding of the text. The finding of the present research shows large number of the students are familiar with jigsaw learning. 77,1% of the students can be categorized as familiar with such kind of learning. The practice of student-centered LET method can be said as successful because more than three quarter of the students can understand what they are learning. The implementation of student-centered ELT method, in this case jigsaw learning, can help to ease the burden in teaching English.

It is mentioned above that one of student-centered ELT methods is

Numbered Head Together. The procedures of teaching English by using this method are 1) student number offs in team, (2) teacher ask a question, 3) heads together (students literally put their heads together and make sure everyone knows and can explain the answer, 4) teacher calls a number and students with that number raise their hands to called on as in a traditional room. The procedures are very clear and the students realize the use of numbers. The finding of the research shows that 73,4% of the students choose the statement "I know the theory and practice of Numbered Head Together". This fact reveal that most students know well this method.

The familiarity with Numbered Head Together is not felt by all the students, of course. More than 25 % of them state they are not familiar with it. It is possible that this unfamiliarity is caused by their feeling uncomfortable working in group or they are not engaged in the classroom activities. This fact is in line with Zafar & Meenakshi (2012)'s statement that students bring differences in the classroom. In addition, the percentage of the students who do not learn well should imply that the lecturer needs to have more effort in the classroom. As it is widely known that the role of a teacher in a student-centered ELT method is crucial in providing assistance or guidance to the students, such kind of fact should raise the attention to the students individually. Perhaps some students need to be guided individually or in smaller group. There are cases that the students' learning preference in individualized learning. The students feel more comfortable and get more understanding when they finish the work on their own without any interference from their partners. The lecturer, therefore, need to be close personally to the students to make the students sure that working in group is more enjoyable and beneficial. Engaging the whole students in a student-centered ELT class will enable the students to persuade their classmates to work together (Jones, 2007).

Related to the theory and practice of Task-Based Learning (TBL), the findings show that 92,2% of the students answer that they know it. It implies that Task-Based Learning is one of the most popular student-centered ELT

methods. Task based Learning can be used to promote students' problem-solving skills at the same time with develop their second language skill. In a TBL class the students are exposed to task first. Then they have to work together to accomplish the task. The methodologies in doing task are various and can be summarized in the following: 1) observations in the target domain and in the selected language use situations, 2) gathering `expert' opinions: written and oral surveys, using open and/or closed questionnaires, can be administered to people who have long-term experience in the domain and in the relevant situations, 3) Sampling language learners' experiences: if the language learners already have personal experiences in the selected language use situations, they may be able to make explicit what particular tasks are relevant for their purposes or with which particular tasks they experience difficulties (Van den Branden, 2006).

The familiarity to TBL can be called as infinite. Such situation may due to a lot of practices of TBL by the lecturers so all the students can identify TBL easily based on their experiences. When a particular method is often implemented to the students, the students will easily identify it in other situations. In addition, the complexity of the task affects the performance of students across proficiency level. For the students with high proficiency, difficult task does not disturb them in completing it. However, low proficient students are more sensitive to the task, perceiving it as difficult and hard to finish (Shehadeh & Coombe, 2012). The finding of the present research confirms this research report. The students with high proficiency is not affected by any types of task and can finish the task as expected.

Despite the fact that most students are familiar with TBL, very small percentage of the students (7,8%) still show their unfamiliarity of TBL. This fact strengthens the hypothesis of Zafar & Meenakshi (2012) and Mupa & Chinooneka (2015b) that in the classroom there are always differences among students which can cause to some ineffectiveness in the class. There is always a chance that some students do not understand what they are doing and they do not realize that they already learn the material. Students' learning

is affected by some factors like cognitive learning style. Cognitive learning is divided into two, field independent and field dependent learning style (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). The students who belong to field independent style are confident to see part and details as a whole. The rational, mathematical, and mind is more active during learning process. In other words, they are aware of what they are learning. Meanwhile, a field dependent student is better at observing the ideas and the whole situation. He is visually and emotionally oriented. He is a social being who can develop interaction more easily. Student who state they are not familiar with TBL may belong to one kind of these cognitive learning style.

Another popular student-centered ELT method is Project Based Learning (PjBL). The data show that 91.7% of the students answer that they know the theory and practice of Project-Based Learning. PjBL is one of the teaching methods used in the latest curriculum in Indonesia, Kurikulum Merdeka. In the guideline for implementing Kurikulum Merdeka, beside learning in regular classes, the students must do projects in group intended to strengthen their characters. In teaching English, especially in higher education, PjBL is not new at all. Many courses are project based especially language skills and language pedagogies. That is the reason why the students are familiar with PjBL. This student-centered ELT method engages the students to participate actively in classroom. Discussion, presentation, and role play are examples of activities that can increase students' participation.

There is a difference between learning ended with a project and project- based learning. Learning ended with a project is an extension of a knowledge gained by the students in the classroom. So, the project is the end point of the learning that can be done at home or anywhere. Meanwhile, project based-learning requires the completion on the project during learning hours in the class. Project-based learning allows the students to have choices in the process of planning and doing the project. On the other hand, in a learning ended with a project, the students have no choices on any details of the project. Another difference is in term of the result. In the project-based

learning, the result is the answer to essential questions and in learning ended with project, the result is the practice of the knowledge.

Student-centered ELT methods are not limited to Jigsaw learning, Task-based Learning, Cooperative Learning or Project-Based Learning but there are still a lot of methods. The methods are also taught to the students in their teaching methodology classes. In short, they should be familiar with all the methods beside the abovementioned. The finding of the research shows that 88% of the students show the familiarity with other methods. The teaching of student-centered ELT method by using student-centered approach seem to bring impact on the students' understanding. The use of student-centered methods which encourage the students to perform discussion, make analysis, prepare presentation, do assessment, and administer evaluation is truly useful in providing the student with theory and practices of English language teaching. The class which is full of activities, in fact, can help the students in constructing their understanding. In line with the principles of discovery learning, the activities bring some benefit like improving intellectual potency, giving smart shift from extrinsic to intrinsic reward, learning the heuristic of discovering, and the aid to memory processing (Balım, n.d.; Hammer, 1997; Svinicki, 1998). Despite the number of the students who are not familiar with the other theories and practices of student-centered ELT methods it can be said the teaching brings positive impact the students.

It is mentioned above that the latest curriculum implemented in Indonesia in Kurikulum Merdeka. As implied in the name, such kind of curriculum provide freedom both to the teacher and the students. In the curriculum guideline, it is clearly stated that the teachers enjoy the freedom to select the materials and arrange the materials in a particular order based on the result of need analysis done by the teachers. In addition, the teachers are also free to select the teaching strategies and develop the most suitable lesson plan. For students, they are free to select subject matters they prefer to take. Of course, there are some compulsory courses they have to take.

The students are mostly familiar with the information that PjBL is

applied in Kurikulum Merdeka. 90,3% of the students state that they know that Kurikulum Merdeka use PjBL. Such fact is due to the existence of Englich Curriculum class that taught curriculum development and curriculum policy in Indonesia. In the English Curriculum course, the students learn about the history of English curriculum in Indonesia and its changes. As it is known that in Indonesia, the curriculum changes at least 8 times from the oldest curriculum in 1967 until the latest curriculum, Kurikulum Merdeka. In each curriculum, the discussion includes the goals of curriculum, the teaching methods, model of assessment, and others. The students make analysis by comparing and contrasting each curriculum. Therefore, the students must be familiar with the teaching method employed in Kurikulum Merdeka. However, there are 9,7 % of the students who are still left behind. It is possible that they do not know the information because they are not in the class when the discussion on such topic is carried out. So, they miss information about teaching method used in the latest curriculum.

As teachers to be, students need to complete themselves with sufficient pedagogical knowledge and spirit of change because they will play a sort of roles in the class depending the teaching method they implement. For example, a teacher is an authority in the classroom when he implements a Grammar Translation Method. A teacher can become a conductor when the method is Audio Lingual Method. In a student-centered class using Jigsaw learning, the role of the teacher is a facilitator who will make learning process become fun and meaningful. Thus, a teacher needs to understand various kinds of student-centered ELT methods in order that he can select the most suitable method according to the preset teaching objective. The finding of the present study shows that 87,7% agree that they need to understand student-centered ELT methods because it is useful for their teaching career in the future. A teacher takes the advantage of classroom to promote acquisition, provides guidance, feedback, and explanation where necessary as well as encouragement and censure (Lennon, 2020).

Acquiring knowledge about teaching methods is essential for the

students to support their teaching career. Related to the four competences of a professional teacher, pedagogical competence can be fostered by learning in the classroom. The fact of the present research is the students realize this importance. It is good that the students are aware of what they are learning so that they will have continuous increase of their knowledge. However, 12,3% of the students still cannot see the importance of the understanding student-centered ELT method to support their future career.

The choice of study program is not closely related to the future career. Sometimes a student chooses it because of the choice of the parents or just follow his friend. If not, he just follows the trend. The 12.3% of the students who choose the answer of not knowing that student-centered ELT methods can support the future career perhaps belong to this kind. They do not know the profile of the study program and what career they may take after they complete the study. This fact confirms the result of a study by Mudhar et al. (2024) who found out that 81.4% of the students choose study programs which are different from their choice of future career. Some factors like teacher, parents, or friend affect the choice of study program.

Commonly, the students want to get deep understanding of the knowledge they are learning. They do the efforts to master the knowledge such as by reading the materials, doing discussion, presenting in the class, and writing papers. Some students even retake the course if their score is not satisfying. The finding of the research show that 87,2% of the students expect that they can understand the concept of student-centered ELT methods. This datum shows the fact the students are aware of the changes in knowledge and language policy of language teaching. The adage "new minister of education new language policy" raises the awareness to prepare for every change in education. Thus, the understanding of teaching methods can help the teacher to adjust to any differences. Some students, however, do not show high expectation on understanding student-centered ELT methods. Some students only come to class just come into it without any expectation. This fact confirms a study that finds many students will choose career different

their study and therefore, they are not interested in the classroom activities (Mudhar et al., 2024).

To support students' mastery of pedagogical knowledge, the university prepares internship for students. Those who have taken all pedagogical course will join internship program at school. This program is done in two semesters to provide the students with practice is developing lesson plans and practicing the lesson plans. Before the internship is done, the students have micro teaching program in one semester. In a micro teaching class, the students have simulation of teaching and practice a lot of teaching methods. Due to large number of the students, sometimes the students cannot practice all the methods they have learned in the previous semesters. The data of this research show that 91,4 % of the students want to simulate the practice of student-centered ELT methods. By having teaching simulation, they will know the strength and weakness of each of the methods they perform as well as got input how to make their performance better.

Internship program in useful to provide real life working experience. During internship program, the students get the opportunity to practice the theory they learn in the classroom which may be different from the daily facts. In the field of education, internship program gives chances for the students to practice pedagogical knowledge and classroom management. 91.3% of the students choose a statement that they want to practice student-centered ELT methods during their internships. The students should realize that the implementation of Kurikulum Merdeka requires them to be active teachers who can implement various methods especially student-centered ELT methods. As it is stated in the document of curriculum, the education process accommodates students' differences. Therefore, the teacher should understand the concept of differentiated learning. To strengthen the attainment of the profile of Pancasila students, project-based learning in implemented. Some other teaching methods are also employed to meet the need in the curriculum. In order to prepare future teachers who can implement various teaching methods, internship program should provide the students with such

kinds of experiences.

Meaningful experiences in practicing student-centered ELT methods are not seen interesting for some students. 8.8% of the students do not expect the practice student-centered ELT methods in the teaching practice. Those who choose an answer that they expect to practice student-centered ELT methods in their internships might do not understand the questions. A term internship is not understood very well. It is admitted that some students are not very proficient in English despite the fact that they are English students.

The last statement of the questionnaire is understanding student-centered ELT methods can enrich the knowledge to a teacher. Most of the students 93,1% of the students agree with this statement. It means that they expect they can be good teachers if they understand the teaching methods. Student-centered ELT methods are difficult to distinguish because they have the same underlying learning theories. In addition, all the methods emphasized the same strategies that are group works and presentation. Meanwhile, to be a good teacher, the mastery of all teaching method is a must. Learning seriously about student-centered ELT methods dan increase the understanding of various methods so any time there is a change of policy, teacher can adjust.

Small portion of the respondent of this survey (6.9%) do not agree that the understanding of methods can enrich the knowledge of being teacher. A teacher is the implementor of policy. When there is a new policy in education, the teachers are the first who are affected. Therefore, they must have high knowledge and a lot of experience. The small number of the students who chose this answer perhaps do not yet realize that they have to be knowledgeable. Therefore, they do not seriously learn the student-centered ELT methods.

CONCLUSION

The results of the present research emerge with some conclusions. First, the prospective teachers show a high level of familiarity with the

student-centered ELT methods. The factors that contribute to such familiarity is that they have taken the courses of on language teaching methodology. In addition, the students also learn curriculum development, so they have prior knowledge about language teaching methods. Second, the present research reveals that the prospective teachers perceive the student-centered ELT methods contribute to the development of students' knowledge by providing sufficient concepts of language teaching methods which change from time to time. The students also get practices in teaching by using various methods by which such method can enrich their knowledge. Third, the prospective teachers have high expectation to the student-centered ELT methods classes to support their future career as teachers. To implement the latest curriculum, the teachers need the knowledge of the latest teaching methods. Therefore, the student-centered ELT method classes can help to prepare the prospective teachers.

REFERENCES

Abel, E. M., & Campbell, M. (2009). Student-centred Learning in an Advanced Social Work Practice Course: Outcomes of a Mixed Methods Investigation. Social Work Education, 3-17.

Abdi, A. (2014). The Effect of Inquiry-based Learning Method on Students' Academic Achievement in Science Course. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 2(1), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020104

Abdillah, J. A., & Sueb, S. (2022). Students' Learning Motivation toward the Implementation of Blended Learning during Post-Pandemic EFL Classroom. Pioneer: Journal of Language and Literature, 14(1), 278. https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v14i1.1706

Aditomo, A. (2022). Panduan Pembelajaran dan Asesmen Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Menengah, dan Atas. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Kebudayaan Riset dan Teknologi.

Altun, S. (2015). The Effect of Cooperative Learning on Students' Achievement and Views on the Science and Technology Course. 3.

Ansarian, L., & Teoh, M. L. (2018). Problem-based Language Learning and Teaching: An Innovative Approach to Learn a New Language. Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0941-0

Balım, A. G. (n.d.). The Effects of Discovery Learning on Students' Success and Inquiry Learning Skills. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research.

Belkhir, S. (Ed.). (2020). Cognition and Language Learning. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in Language Teaching and Learning. Language Teaching, 21-40.

Boghossian, P. (2006). Behaviorism, Constructivism, and Socratic Pedagogy. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 713-722.

Boyer, S. L., Edmonson, D. R., Artis, A. B., & Fleming, D. (2013). Self-Directed Learning: A Tool for Lifelong Learning. Journal of Marketing Education, 1-13.

Brueggeman, A., & a. (n.d.). Student-Centered Mentoring.

Chang-Tik, C., Kidman, G., & Tee, M. Y. (Eds.). (2022). Collaborative Active Learning: Practical Activity-Based Approaches to Learning, Assessment and Feedback. Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-4383-6

Chik, A., Aoki, N., & Smith, R. (Eds.). (2018). Autonomy in Language Learning and Teaching. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-52998-5

Cobern, W. W. (1993). Constructivism. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 4(1), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532768xjepc0401_8

Dada, D., Laseinde, O. T., & Tartibu, L. (2023). Student-Centered Learning Tool for ognitive Enhancement in the Learning Environment. Procedia Computer Science, 217, 507–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.12.246

Delisle, R. (with Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). (1997). How to use problem-based learning in the classroom. ASCD.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding Student Differences. Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x

Fiddiyasari, A., & Pustika, R. (2021). Students' Motivation in English Online Learning during Covid-19 Pandemic at SMA Muhammadiyah Gadingrejo. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 2(2), 57–61. https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v2i2.1217

Fischer, I., & Luiz, J. M. (2024). Exploring gender differences in Gen Z students' attribution of obstacles influencing their academic and professional success. The International Journal of Management Education, 22(2), 100989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100989

Firmansyah, B., Hamamah, H., & Emaliana, I. (2023). Recent Students' Motivation Toward Learning English After the COVID-19 Post-Pandemic. Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11(1), 130. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i1.6635

Gillies, R. M. (2004). The effects of cooperative learning on junior high school students during small group learning. Learning and Instruction, 14(2), 197–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(03)00068-9

Gebhard, J. G. (2009). Teaching English as a foreign or second language: A

teacher self-development and methodology guide (2. ed, [Nachdr.]). University of Michigan Press.

Hamidah, H., Rabbani, T., Fauziah, S., RA, P., Gasalba, R., & Nirwansyah. (2020). HOTS Oriented Module: Project Based Learning. Jakarta: SEAMEO QITEP in Language.

Hammer, D. (1997). Discovery Learning and Discovery Teaching. Cognition and Instruction, 15(4), 485–529. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1504_2

Hoidn, S. (2017). Student-Centered Learning Environments in Higher Education Classrooms. Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-94941-0

Hsieh, C. (n.d.). Active Learning: Review of Evidence and Examples.

Jacobs, G. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2019). Student Centered Cooperative Learning: Linking Concepts in Education to Promote Student Learning. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore .

Jacobs, G., & Renandya, W. (2019). Student Centered Cooperative Learning: Linking Concept in Education to Promote Student Learning. Singapore: Springer.

Jalilifar, A. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning techniques on college students' reading comprehension. System, 38(1), 96–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.009

Jones, L. (2007). The student-centered classroom. Cambridge University Press

Joseph, V., Sheikh, I., & Rajani, S. (2022). Inquiry Based Learning Method Of Teaching In Education: A Literature Review. Webology, 799-813.

Kokotsaki, D., Menzies, V., & Wiggins, A. (2016). Project-based learning: A review of the literature. Improving Schools, 19(3), 267–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480216659733

Kim, A., & Davies, K. (2014). A Teacher's Perspective on Students Centered Learning: toward the Development of Best Practices in Undergradutae Tourism Courses. Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism Education, 6-14.

Klemencic, M. (2017). From Student Engagement to Student Agency: Conceptual Consideration of European Policies on Student-Centered

Learning in Higher Education. Higher Education Policy, 69-85.

Krause, U.-M., Stark, R., & Mandl, H. (2009). The effects of cooperative learning and feedback on e-learning in statistics. Learning and Instruction, 19(2), 158–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.03.003

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). Techniques and principles in language teaching (3rd ed). Oxford University Press.

Lazonder, A. W., & Harmsen, R. (2016). Meta-Analysis of Inquiry-Based Learning: Effects of Guidance. Review of Educational Research, 86(3), 681–718. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315627366

Lennon, P. (2020). The Foundations of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429285998

Lie, A. (n.d.). Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: between the Commitment to Competence and the Quest for Higher Test Scores.

Mager, U., & Nowak, P. (2012). Effects of Student Participation in Decision Making at School. A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Empirical Research. Educational Research Review, 38-61.

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

McConnell, D. A., Chapman, L., Czajka, C. D., Jones, J. P., Ryker, K. D., & Wiggen, J. (2017). Instructional Utility and Learning Efficacy of Common Active Learning Strategies. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65(4), 604–625. https://doi.org/10.5408/17-249.1

Michael, J. (2006). Where's the evidence that active learning works? Advances in Physiology Education, 30(4), 159–167. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00053.2006

Monk, J., & Silman, C. (2011). Active learning in primary classrooms: A case study approach. Pearson/Longman.

Mudhar, M., Aisyah, A., & Hasanah, A. (2024). Kesesuaian Minat Karier dan Keputusan Memilih Program Studi di Perguruan Tinggi.

Munna, A. S., & Kalam, A. (n.d.). Teaching and learning process to enhance teaching effectiveness: A literature review.

Mupa, P., & Chinooneka, T. I. (2015). Factors contributing to ineffective

teaching and learning in primary schools: Why are schools in decadence? Journal of Education and Practice.

Muyskens, J. A., & Brumfit, C. (1986). Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy. The Modern Language Journal, 70(4), 414. https://doi.org/10.2307/326823

Nabila, A., Cahyono, B. Y., & Khoiri, N. E. (2022). Demotivation Level and Demotivators Among EFL Students In Home Online English Learning During The Pandemic. JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies), 8(2), 393–421. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i2.3567

Nkhoma, M., K Lam, T., Richardson, J., H Kam, B., & Hung Lau, K. (2016). Developing Case-based Learning Activities Based on the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. 085–093. https://doi.org/10.28945/3496

Norland, D. L., & Pruett-Said, T. (2006). A kaleidoscope of models and strategies for teaching English to speakers of other languages. Teacher Ideas Press.

Nur Rachmah, D. (2017). Effects of Jigsaw Learning Method on Students' Self-Efficacy and Motivation to Learn. Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology, 6(3), 1. https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v6i3.8314

Pedersen, S., & Williams, D. (2004). A Comparison of Assessment Practices and their Effect on Learning and Motivation in A Student-Centered Learning Environment. Journal of Educational Media and Hypermedia, 283-306.

Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to Teach in Higher Education. London: Routledge.

Richards, J. C., & Rogders, T. S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (Third edition). Cambridge University Press.

Riddell, D. (2014). Teach English as a foreign language (Third edition). Teach Yourself.

Shehadeh, A., & Coombe, C. A. (Eds.). (2012). Task-Based Language Teaching in Foreign Language Contexts: Research and implementation (Vol. 4). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.

org/10.1075/tblt.4

Svinicki, M. D. (1998). A theoretical foundation for discovery learning. Advances in Physiology Education, 275(6), S4. https://doi.org/10.1152/advances.1998.275.6.S4

Tran, D. V., & Lewis, R. (Rom). (2012). The Effects of Jigsaw Learning on Students' Attitudes in A Vietnamese Higher Education Classroom. International Journal of Higher Education, 1(2), p9. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v1n2p9

Van den Branden, K. (Ed.). (2006). Task-based language education: From theory to practice (1. publ). Cambridge Univ. Press.

Viberg, O., Kizilcec, R. F., Jivet, I., Martínez Monés, A., Oh, A., Mutimukwe, C., Hrastinski, S., & Scheffel, M. (2024). Cultural differences in students' privacy concerns in learning analytics across Germany, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, and the United States. Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 14, 100416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100416

Woods, P. J., & Copur-Gencturk. (2023). Examining the Role of Student-Centered Learning versus Teacher-Centered Pedagogical Approaches to Self Directed Learning through Teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 1-16.

Zafar, S., & Meenakshi, K. (2012). Individual Learner Differences and Second Language Acquisition: A Review. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(4), 639–646. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.4.639-646