ABSTRACT
        This paper explores the concept of student-centered
instruction at the higher education level and proposes use of the STUCEN
scale to evaluate student centeredness as an institution-wide strategy and to
link it to performance criteria such as student recruitment, retention, and
graduation. The philosophy of student centeredness is discussed in terms of
three aspects student orientation, integration of effort, and institutional
objectives. The scale is comprised of 20 statements designed to measure the
perception of the effectiveness of an academic institution along three
dimensions of student centeredness: intelligence generation, intelligence
dissemination, and responsiveness. The scale is intended to assist in
distinguishing between student centeredness as a culture, as a strategy, and
as a tactic. The STUCEN scale is appended. (Contains 10 references.) (DB)

Student Centeredness: Conceptualizing and Operationalizing It

Abdul Karim Bangura
The African Institution
Bowie State University

Paper presented at the Mid-Atlantic Region Historically Black Colleges and Universities Faculty Showcase, *A Regional Conference on Successful Ideas and Practices*, held at The latham Hotel, Georgetown, Washington, DC, October 16, 1998.

Abstract

Realizing that no serious attempt has been made to conceptualize and operationalize student centeredness as an institution-wide strategy and link it to performance criteria such as student recruitment, retention, and graduation, this essay suggests the STUCEN scale for doing so. The scale is comprised of twenty statements designed to measure the perception of the effectiveness of an academic institution along the three dimensions of student centeredness: intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, and responsiveness. This approach will allow one to make a distinction between student centeredness as a culture, as a strategy, and as a tactic.

Introduction

Student-centered instruction, that is, the requirement for a course/class to focus on the various learning styles of students in guiding teaching strategies, has been a major focus of researchers since the 1960s (e.g., Faust 1963, Sund 1974, Raines 1985, and Glasgow 1997). However, student centeredness, that is, the requirement for an academic institution to focus on the needs of students to guide its strategies, has received very little attention (Popejoy 1994, McCombs 1997). Presumably, the student centered academic institution will be more successful in terms of increasing student motivation and success. Yet, there has been conflicting evidence that this is indeed so (e.g., Kinkead & Harris 1993, Schrenko 1994). For something presumably as important as student centeredness, there has been neither a serious attempt to measure the construct nor any effort expended on significantly linking it to performance criteria such as student recruitment, retention,

and graduation. In short, does it really pay an academic institution to be student centered?

The student centered academic institution is one that successfully applies the student centeredness concept. *Student centeredness* can be defined in three ways: as a philosophy, as a concept, and as currently implemented. This approach will allow one to make the distinction between student centeredness as a culture, as a strategy, and as a tactic.

Student Centeredness as a Philosophy

Student centeredness as a philosophy entails three aspects. They are as follows.

1. *Student orientation.* This requires an understanding of the psychological and social factors that determine students' actions. Such an understanding enables the academic administrator to ask the questions that make it possible to identify core student needs, and this will in turn give direction to basic research. By identifying the basic student needs that they serve and defining their visions and missions accordingly, academic institutions will avoid myopia.

2. *Integration of effort.* This enables the academic institution to provide the value to meet student needs. It involves coordinating endeavors in terms of the elements of the required mix for each program or service. Moreover, because student centeredness is an institution-wide strategy, it is necessary that the whole academic institution be organized and coordinated to serve the student.

3. The setting of *institutional objectives.* An adoption of the student centeredness concept means seeking to serve student needs in order to meet the requirements for achieving

recruitment, retention and graduation objectives. This is essential for long-term survival.

In short, student centeredness must be formulated with a view to providing the academic institution with long-term direction. Many administrators, however, especially in Western academic institutions, must balance this against demands for short-term performance.

Conceptualizing Student Centeredness and Developing a Measure

The following operational definition of student centeredness as a construct links the preceding three core elements of the philosophy of the concept. *Student centeredness* is the institution-wide generation of program and service intelligence pertaining to current and future student needs, dissemination of the intelligence across departments, and institution-wide responsiveness to it.

Thus, student centeredness must be based not only on verbalized student opinions but must also be seen as a broader concept, because it includes consideration of such factors as competing academic institutions and legislative and political changes that affect student needs and performance. The current and future needs of students are considered. Consequently, what is offered in this paper is STUCEN, an instrument for measuring student centeredness. This is similar to Bernie Jaworski and Ajay Kohli's (1993) MARKOR, an instrument used to measure marketing orientation (for a synopsis, see Leyland Pitt 1997:14-19).

Student Centeredness as Implementation

Here one may ask: How many academic institutions have actually implemented the student centeredness concept. The answer is: Too few. Only a handful of academic institutions actually

stand out as practitioners of the student centeredness concept. Employing STUCEN, academic institutions will now be able to measure and assess their level of student centeredness.

The STUCEN Scale

STUCEN is a scale developed to allow administrators to assess the degree of student centeredness within their academic institutions. The scale appears in the Appendix.

All that is required to use the STUCEN scale is that administrators assess their academic institution on each of the twenty statements and indicate the extent of their agreement by circling the appropriate point on the scale. When they have completed all the items, they can utilize the scoring instructions that follow. There are no right or wrong answers, and the best approach is to work quickly and record first impressions.

How to Score STUCEN

1. If the questionnaire is completed by a single individual, simply use the ratings for each item on the scale; if it is completed by several people, obtain an average rating for each item.

2. Sum the (average) ratings for items 1 through 6 and divide by 6; sum the (average) ratings for items 7 through 11 and divide by 5; sum the (average) ratings for items 12 through 20 and divide by 9.

3. The three numbers derived reflect the perception of the effectiveness of the academic institution along the three dimensions of student centeredness: that is, *intelligence generation*

(how well the institution generates intelligence), *intelligence dissemination* (how well this intelligence is disseminated throughout the academic institution), and *responsiveness* (how well the institution responds to changes in the academic environment). The average of items 1 through 6 is the score for intelligence generation; the average for items 7 through 11 is the score for intelligence dissemination; the average for items 12 through 20 is the score for responsiveness.

What Do the Scores Mean

The lowest possible score to be derived on any of the STUCEN dimensions is 1, the highest is 7—it is unlikely that many academic institutions will be at these extremes. The nearer to 7 the score along the particular dimension is, the better the institution is perceived to be performing along that dimension, and vice versa. The dimension along which performance is least effective must receive immediate attention.

Conclusion

Student centeredness should not be viewed as a panacea for all academic institutional ills. People unfamiliar with student centeredness expect it to influence students to do things they would normally not do. The student-centered approach cannot persuade students to do things that they would not do under normal circumstances. Rather, the approach is a judicious way of finding out what students want.

References

Faust, Irvin. 1963. *Entering Angel's world: A student-centered casebook.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Glasgow, Neal A. 1997. *New curriculum for new times: A guide to student-centered, problem-based learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Jaworski, B. J. and A. J. Kohli. 1993. Market orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing* 57:53-70.

Kinkead, Joyce A. and Jeanette G. Harris. 1993. *Writing centers in context: Twelve case studies.* Urbana, ILL: National Council of Teachers of English.

McCombs, Barbara L. 1997. *The learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement.* San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Pitt. Leyland F. 1998. *Marketing for managers: A practical approach.* Kenwyn, South Africa: Juta and Co., Ltd.

Popejoy, Michael W. 1994. The underprepared student: A student-centered process coordination model. Florida. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED390 468.

Raines, J. Thayer. 1985. The effect of the adventure activity of rappelling on the palmar sweat and state anxiety of fifth grade pupils under student-centered leadership. Indiana University Ph.D. Thesis.

Schrenko, Linda. 1994. Structuring a learner-centered school. Illinois. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED385 351.

Sund, Robert B. 1974. *Student-centered teaching in the secondary school.* Columbus, OH: Merrill Publications.

Appendix

The STUCEN Scale

Statement	Please circle one choice for each statement
1. In this academic institution, we meet with students at least once a year to find out what programs or services they will need in the future.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
2. In this academic institution, we do a lot of in-house student-needs research.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
3. We rapidly detect changes in our students' program and service preferences.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
4. We survey students at least once a semester to assess the quality of our programs and services.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
5. We are quick to detect fundamental shifts in the academic environment (e.g., competition, technology, funding requirements).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
6. We periodically review the likely effect of changes in our academic environment (e.g., budgetary constraints) on students.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
7. We have interdepartmental meetings at least once a semester/term to discuss academic trends and developments.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
8. Personnel of the department responsible for student services in our academic institution spend time discussing students' future needs with other departments.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
9. When something important happens to a segment of our students, the whole academic institution knows about it in a short period.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
10. Data on student satisfaction are disseminated at all levels in this academic institution on a regular basis.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly

9

11. When one department finds out something important about competing academic institutions, it is quick to alert other departments.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
12. It only takes us a very short time to decide how to respond to competing academic institutions' tuition or program changes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
13. We hardly ever ignore changes in our students' program or service needs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
14. We periodically review our program development efforts to ensure that they are in line with what students want.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
15. Several departments get together periodically to plan responses to changes taking place in our academic environment.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
16. If a major competing academic institution were to launch an intensive campaign targeted at our students, we would implement a response immediately.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
17. The activities of the different departments in this academic institution are well coordinated.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
18. Students' complaints never fall on deaf ears in this academic institution.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
19. If we came up with a great student recruitment, retention and graduation plan, we probably would be able to implement it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly
20. When we find that students would like us to modify a program or service, the departments involved make concerted efforts to do so.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I disagree strongly I agree strongly

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: STUDENT CENTEREDNESS: CONCEPTUALIZING AND OPERATIONALIZING IT.	
Author(s): Abdul Karim Bangura	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: October 16, 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _Sample_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _Sample_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _Sample_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1 Level 1 [✓]	2A Level 2A [ ]	2B Level 2B [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please	Signature: _[signature]_	Printed Name/Position/Title: Abdul Karim Bangura	
	Organization/Address: Bowie State University Department of History & Government 14000 Jericho Park Road, Bowie, MD 20715-9465	Telephone: 301-464-7546	FAX: 301 464-7574
		E-Mail Address: _abangura@havenet_	Date: N/19/98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	N/A
Address:	
Price:	

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	N/A
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com